



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Tuesday, January 6, 2015

The sixth day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 113-201 for the meeting of the 1st Session of the 114th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol and at 12:08 p.m. was called to order by the Vice President (Mr. BIDEN).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Lord of our lives and sovereign of our beloved Nation, as we begin this 114th Congress, guide our lawmakers, old and new, on the right road. We confess our need for Your supernatural power to provide them with insight, innovation, and inspiration to solve the problems we face.

Lord, give to our Senators uncommon guidance as they seek to do what is best for this land we love. Enable them to develop a slow exploratory wisdom, neither of the heart only nor of the head only, so that they will act with an integrity that will bring them to Your desired destination. May they not run from disquieting considerations but instead claim Your promise that the truth shall set us free.

We pray in Your omnipotent Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Vice President led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate one certificate of election to fulfill an unexpired term and the certificates of election for 33 Senators elected for 6-year terms beginning January 3, 2015. All certificates, the Chair is advised, are in the form suggested by the Senate or contain all the requirements of the form suggested by the Senate. If there is no

objection, the reading of the certificates will be waived and they will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify, that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Lamar Alexander was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Bill Haslam, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville this 2nd day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

BILL HASLAM,
Governor.
TRE HARGETT,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF NEW JERSEY CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, 2014, Cory Booker, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January, 2015.

Given, under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Jersey, this second day of December two thousand and fourteen.

By the Governor:

CHRIS CHRISTIE,
Governor.

Attest:

KIMBERLY M. GUADAGNO,
Lt. Governor / Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, Two Thousand Fourteen, Shelley Moore Capito was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the third day of January, Two Thousand Fifteen.

Witness: His Excellency our governor, Earl Ray Tomblin, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston this tenth day of December, in the year of our Lord, Two Thousand Fourteen.

By the Governor:

EARL RAY TOMBLIN,
Governor.
NATALIE E. TENNANT,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF LOUISIANA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 6th day of December, 2014, "Bill" Cassidy was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Bobby Jindal, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 16th day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

BOBBY JINDAL,
Governor of Louisiana.
TOM SCHEDLER,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 2014, Thad Cochran was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from Mississippi to represent Mississippi in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, Two Thousand Fifteen.

Given under my hand, and our seal affixed hereto, at the City of Jackson, this the 8th day of December in the year of our Lord, Two Thousand Fourteen.

PHIL BRYANT,
Governor.

Attest:

C. DELBERT HOSEMANN, JR.,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF MAINE

Greeting:
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

Know Ye, That this is to certify, that on the fourth day of November, in the year Two

Thousand and Fourteen, Susan M. Collins was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maine, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January, in the year Two Thousand and Fifteen.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Paul R. LePage, and our seal hereto affixed at Augusta, Maine this fifth day of December, in the year of our Lord Two Thousand and Fourteen.

By the Governor:

PAUL R. LEPAGE,
Governor.
MATTHEW DUNLAP,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day November, 2014, Christopher A. Coons was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3d day of January 2015.

Witness: His excellency our Governor Jack Markell, and our seal hereto affixed at 11:00 a.m. this 9th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

JACK A. MARKELL,
Governor of Delaware.
JEFFREY W. BULLOCK,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF TEXAS

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, John Cornyn was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Rick Perry, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Texas this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

In testimony Whereof, I have hereto signed my name and have officially caused the Seal of State to be affixed at my Office in the City of Austin, this the 1st day of December, 2014.

By the Governor:

RICK PERRY,
Governor.

Attest:

NANDITA BERRY,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF ARKANSAS

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, the Honorable Tom Cotton was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, the Honorable Mike Beebe, and our seal hereto affixed at the State Capitol in Little Rock,

Arkansas, this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

MIKE BEEBE,
Governor.
MARK MARTIN,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

IN THE NAME AND BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE
STATE OF MONTANA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

I, Linda McCulloch, Secretary of State of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that Steve Daines was duly chosen on November 4th, 2014, by the qualified electors of the State of Montana as a United States Senator from said State to represent said State in the United States Senate. The six-year term commences on January 3rd, 2015.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Steve Bullock, and the official seal hereunto affixed at the City of Helena, the Capital, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

STEVE BULLOCK,
Governor.

Attest:

LINDA MCCULLOCH,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF ILLINOIS

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Richard J. Durbin was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January, 2015.

Witness: His Excellency Our Governor, Pat Quinn, and our seal hereto affixed at the City of Springfield, Illinois, this 2nd day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

PAT QUINN,
Governor.
JESSE WHITE,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF WYOMING

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 2014, Mike Enzi was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January 2015.

Witness: His Excellency our governor, Matthew H. Mead, and our seal hereto affixed at the Wyoming State Capitol, Cheyenne, Wyoming, this 10th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the governor:

MATTHEW H. MEAD,
Governor.
MAX MAXFIELD,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF IOWA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION TO THE SENATE OF
THE UNITED STATES FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November 2014, Joni Ernst was duly elected as Senator to the Senate of the United States to represent the State of Iowa beginning on the 3rd day of January 2015.

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Iowa to be affixed. Done at Des Moines this 1st day of December in the year of our Lord two thousand fourteen.

TERRY BRANSTAD,
Governor of Iowa.

Attest:

MATT SCHULTZ,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF MINNESOTA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, 2014, Al Franken was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Mark Dayton, and our seal hereto affixed at Saint Paul, Minnesota this 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

MARK DAYTON,
Governor.
MARK RITCHIE,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF COLORADO

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, 2014, Cory Gardner was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January, 2015.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor John Hickenlooper, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver, Colorado this eighth day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

JOHN HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.
SCOTT GESSLER,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November A.D. 2014 Lindsey Graham was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from said state to represent said state in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January 2015.

Witness: Her excellency our Governor Nikki R. Haley and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, South Carolina, this twenty-fourth day of November in the year of our Lord 2014.

NIKKI R. HALEY,
Governor.
MARK HAMMOND,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Jim Inhofe was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent Oklahoma in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: Her Excellency our Governor Mary Fallin, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma this 12th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

MARY FALLIN,
Governor.
CHRIS BENGE,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR AN UNEXPIRED TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, James Lankford was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3rd day of January, 2017, to fill the vacancy in the representation from said State in the Senate of the United States caused by the resignation of Tom Coburn.

Witness: Her Excellency our Governor Mary Fallin, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, Oklahoma this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

MARY FALLIN,
Governor.
CHRIS BENGE,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, two thousand and fourteen Edward J. Markey was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January, two thousand and fifteen.

Witness: His Excellency the Governor, Deval L. Patrick, and Our Great Seal hereto affixed at Boston, this third day of December in the year of Our Lord two thousand and fourteen.

By His Excellency the Governor:

DEVAL PATRICK,
Governor.

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

[State Seal Affixed]

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Steven L. Beshear
Governor

To all Whom These Present Shall Come, Greeting: Know Ye That Honorable Mitch McConnell having been duly certified, that on November 4, 2014 was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Kentucky a Senator from said state to represent said state in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning the 3rd day of January 2015.

I hereby invest the above named with full power and authority to execute and discharge the duties of the said office according to law. And to have and to hold the same, with all the rights and emoluments thereunto legally appertaining, for and during the term prescribed by law.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent, and the seal of the Commonwealth to be hereunto affixed. Done at Frankfort, the 18th day of November in the year of our Lord two thousand and fourteen and in the 223rd year of the Commonwealth.

By the Governor:

STEVE BESHEAR,
Governor.
ALISON LUNDERGAN GRIMES,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF OREGON

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Jeff Merkley was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oregon, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, John Kitzhaber, and our seal hereto affixed at Salem, Oregon this 4th day of December, 2014.

JOHN A KITZHABER, MD,
Governor.
KATE BROWN,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF GEORGIA
By His Excellency
Nathan Deal

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, David Alfred Perdue, Jr. was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our Governor Nathan Deal, and the Great Seal of the State of Georgia hereto affixed at the Capitol, in the city of Atlanta, the tenth day of November, in the year of our Lord Two Thousand and Fourteen.

By the Governor:

NATHAN DEAL,
Governor.
BRIAN P. KEMP,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF MICHIGAN

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Gary Peters was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the state of Michigan this 1st day of December, in the Year of our Lord Two Thousand Fourteen.

By the Governor:

RICHARD D. SNYDER,
Governor.
RUTH JOHNSON,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE
PLANTATIONS

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, John F. Reed was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Lincoln D. Chafee, and our seal hereto affixed at this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

LINCOLN D. CHAFEE,
Governor.
A. RALPH MOLLIS,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF IDAHO

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, James E. Risch was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor C.L. "Butch" Otter, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER,
Governor.
BEN YSURSA,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF KANSAS

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM
To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Pat Roberts was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Sam Brownback, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kansas this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the governor:

SAM BROWNBACK,
Governor.
KRIS W. KOBACH,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
Office of the Secretary of State

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

This is to Certify that on the fourth day of November, 2014, at a general election, Mike Rounds was elected by the qualified voters of the State of South Dakota to the office of

United States Senator for the term of six years, beginning on the third day of January, 2015.

In Witness Whereof, We have hereunto set our hands and caused the Seal of the State to be affixed at Pierre, the Capital, this 13th day of November, 2014.

DENNIS DAUGAARD,
Governor.

Attested by:

JASON GANT,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF NEBRASKA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Ben Sasse was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Dave Heineman, and our seal hereto affixed at 1:26 p.m. this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

DAVE HEINEMAN,
Governor.

JOHN A. GALE,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF ALABAMA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Jefferson B. Sessions, III, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Robert Bentley, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

ROBERT BENTLEY,
Governor.

JIM BENNETT,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Executive Department

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, two thousand and fourteen Jeanne Shaheen was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the third day of January, two thousand and fifteen.

Witness, Her Excellency, Governor Margaret Wood Hassan and the Seal of the State of New Hampshire hereto affixed at Concord, this third day of December, in the year of our Lord two thousand and fourteen.

By the Governor, with advice of the Council:

MARGARET WOOD HASSAN,
Governor.

WILLIAM M. GARDNER,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF ALASKA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Dan Sullivan was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alaska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Sean R. Parnell, and our seal hereto affixed at Juneau this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

SEAN R. PARNELL,
Governor.

By the Lieutenant Governor:

MEAD TREADWELL,
Lieutenant Governor.

[State Seal Affixed]

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Thomas Roland Tillis was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Carolina, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto signed my name and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State, at the Capital City of Raleigh this 1st day of December, 2014.

PAT MCCRORY,
Governor.

ELAINE F. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

THE CANVASSING BOARD OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 9th day of December, 2014, Tom Udall was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January 2015.

Witness: Her excellency our governor Susana Martinez, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, NM this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

SUSANA MARTINEZ,
Governor.

DIANNA DURAN,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR SIX-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 2014, Mark R. Warner was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 3rd day of January, 2015.

Witness: His excellency our governor Terence R. McAuliffe, and our seal hereto affixed at Richmond, Virginia this 10th day of December, in the year of our Lord 2014.

TERRY MCAULIFFE,
Governor of Virginia.

LEVAR STONEY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

[State Seal Affixed]

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senators to be sworn will now present themselves at the desk in groups of four as their names are called in alphabetical order the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The clerk will read the names of the first group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. ALEXANDER of Tennessee, Mr. BOOKER of New Jersey, Mrs. CAPITO of West Virginia, and Mr. CASSIDY of Louisiana.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. Frist, Mr. Brock, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MANCHIN, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the second group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. COCHRAN of Mississippi, Ms. COLLINS of Maine, Mr. COONS of Delaware, and Mr. CORNYN of Texas.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. WICKER, Mr. KING, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CARPER, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the next group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. COTTON of Arkansas, Mr. DAINES of Montana, Mr. DURBIN of Illinois, and Mr. ENZI of Wyoming.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. Levin, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BARRASSO, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the next group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mrs. ERNST of Iowa, Mr. FRANKEN of Minnesota, Mr. GARDNER of Colorado, and Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. Harkin, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Vice President Mondale, Mr. BENNET,

and Mr. SCOTT, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the next group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. INHOFE of Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD of Oklahoma, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCCONNELL of Kentucky.

These Senators, escorted by Ms. WARREN and Mr. PAUL, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the next group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MERKLEY of Oregon, Mr. PERDUE of Georgia, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. REED of Rhode Island.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. Harkin, Mr. Chambliss, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. Levin, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the next group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. RISCH of Idaho, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. ROUNDS of South Dakota, and Mr. SASSE of Nebraska.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mrs. FISCHER, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the next group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. SESSIONS of Alabama, Mrs. SHAHEEN of New Hampshire, Mr. SULLIVAN of Alaska, and Mr. TILLIS of North Carolina.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SHELBY, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. MURKOWSKI,

and Mr. BURR, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the names of the final group of Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mr. WARNER of Virginia.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. KAINE, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority leader is recognized.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 1 Leg.]

Alexander	Fischer	Nelson
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Baldwin	Franken	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sanders
Cardin	Isakson	Sasse
Carper	Johnson	Schatz
Casey	Kaine	Schumer
Cassidy	King	Scott
Coats	Kirk	Sessions
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Lankford	Shelby
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Corker	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	Markey	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Vitter
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama—Richard C. Shelby and Jeff Sessions

Alaska—Lisa Murkowski and Dan Sullivan

Arizona—John McCain and Jeff Flake

Arkansas—John Boozman and Tom Cotton

California—Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer

Colorado—Michael F. Bennet and Cory Gardner

Connecticut—Richard Blumenthal and Christopher Murphy

Delaware—Thomas R. Carper and Christopher A. Coons

Florida—Bill Nelson and Marco Rubio

Georgia—Johnny Isakson and David Perdue

Hawaii—Brian Schatz and Mazie Hirono

Idaho—Mike Crapo and James E. Risch

Illinois—Richard J. Durbin and Mark Kirk

Indiana—Daniel Coats and Joe Donnelly

Iowa—Chuck Grassley and Joni Ernst

Kansas—Pat Roberts and Jerry Moran

Kentucky—Mitch McConnell and Rand Paul

Louisiana—David Vitter and Bill Cassidy

Maine—Susan M. Collins and Angus S. King, Jr.

Maryland—Barbara A. Mikulski and Benjamin L. Cardin

Massachusetts—Elizabeth Warren and Edward J. Markey

Michigan—Debbie Stabenow and Gary C. Peters

Minnesota—Amy Klobuchar and Al Franken

Mississippi—Thad Cochran and Roger F. Wicker

Missouri—Claire McCaskill and Roy Blunt

Montana—Jon Tester and Steve Daines

Nebraska—Deb Fischer and Ben Sasse

Nevada—Harry Reid and Dean Heller

New Hampshire—Jeanne Shaheen and Kelly Ayotte

New Jersey—Robert Menendez and Cory A. Booker

New Mexico—Tom Udall and Martin Heinrich

New York—Charles E. Schumer and Kirsten E. Gillibrand

North Carolina—Richard Burr and Thom Tillis

North Dakota—John Hoeven and Heidi Heitkamp

Ohio—Sherrod Brown and Rob Portman

Oklahoma—James M. Inhofe and James Lankford

Oregon—Ron Wyden and Jeff Merkley

Pennsylvania—Robert P. Casey, Jr. and Patrick J. Toomey

Rhode Island—Jack Reed and Sheldon Whitehouse

South Carolina—Lindsey Graham and Tim Scott

South Dakota—John Thune and Mike Rounds

Tennessee—Lamar Alexander and Bob Corker

Texas—John Cornyn and Ted Cruz

Utah—Orrin G. Hatch and Mike Lee

Vermont—Patrick J. Leahy and Bernard Sanders

Virginia—Mark R. Warner and Tim Kaine

Washington—Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell

West Virginia—Joe Manchin III and Shelley Moore Capito

Wisconsin—Ron Johnson and Tammy Baldwin

Wyoming—Michael B. Enzi and John Barrasso

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The acting Democratic leader is recognized.

ABSENCE OF DEMOCRATIC LEADER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Democratic leader is necessarily absent. I will be acting in his stead until his return.

INFORMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES THAT A QUORUM OF EACH HOUSE IS AS- SEMBLED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 1) informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 1) reads as follows:

S. RES. 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to S. Res. 1, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, as a committee to join the committee on the part of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President

of the United States and inform him that a quorum is assembled and the Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

INFORMING THE HOUSE OF REP- RESENTATIVES THAT A QUORUM OF THE SENATE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 2) informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 2) reads as follows:

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELECTING ORRIN G. HATCH TO BE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 3) to elect ORRIN G. HATCH, a Senator from the State of Utah, to be President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 3) reads as follows:

S. RES. 3

Resolved, That Orrin G. Hatch, a Senator from the State of Utah, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senator HATCH will be escorted to the desk.

Senator ORRIN G. HATCH, escorted by Mr. MCCONNELL and Mr. LEAHY, respectively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President, and the oath prescribed by

law was administered to him by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF A PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a resolution at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 4) notifying the President of the United States of the election of a President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 4) reads as follows:

S. RES. 4

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Orrin G. Hatch as President of the Senate pro tempore.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOTIFYING THE HOUSE OF REP- RESENTATIVES OF THE ELEC- TION OF A PRESIDENT PRO TEM- PORE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a resolution at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 5) notifying the House of Representatives of the election of a President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 5) reads as follows:

S. RES. 5

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Orrin G. Hatch as President of the Senate pro tempore.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXPRESSING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE HONORABLE PATRICK J. LEAHY FOR HIS SERVICE AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND TO DESIGNATE SENATOR LEAHY AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE EMERITUS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a resolution at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 6) expressing the thanks of the Senate to the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY for his service as President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate and to designate Senator LEAHY as President Pro Tempore Emeritus of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 6) reads as follows:

S. RES. 6

Resolved, That the United States Senate expresses its deepest gratitude to Senator Patrick J. Leahy for his dedication and commitment during his service to the Senate as the President Pro Tempore.

Further, as a token of appreciation of the Senate for his long and faithful service, Senator Patrick J. Leahy is hereby designated President Pro Tempore Emeritus of the United States Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FIXING THE HOUR OF DAILY MEETING OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 7) fixing the hour of daily meeting of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 7) reads as follows:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELECTING JULIE ADAMS AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 8) electing Julie Adams as Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) reads as follows:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That Julie E. Adams of Iowa be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Julie E. Adams, escorted by Mr. MCCONNELL, advanced to the desk of the Vice President, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to her by the President pro tempore.
(Applause, Senators rising.)

NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 9) notifying the President of the United States of the election of the Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 9) reads as follows:

S. RES. 9

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Julie E. Adams as Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOTIFYING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 10) notifying the House of Representatives of the election of the Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 10

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Julie E. Adams as Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELECTING FRANK LARKIN AS SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A resolution (S. Res. 11) electing Frank Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 11) reads as follows:

S. RES. 11

Resolved, That Frank J. Larkin of Maryland be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF A SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 12) notifying the President of the United States of the election of a Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 12) reads as follows:

S. RES. 12

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Frank J. Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOTIFYING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ELECTION OF A SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 13) notifying the House of Representatives of the election of a Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) reads as follows:

S. RES. 13

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Frank J. Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE AS SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 14) electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Majority of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 14) reads as follows:

S. RES. 14

Resolved, That Laura C. Dove of Virginia be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary for the Majority of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELECTING GARY B. MYRICK AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 15) electing Gary B. Myrick, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) reads as follows:

S. RES. 15

Resolved, That Gary B. Myrick of Virginia be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary for the Minority of the Senate.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 95-521, appoints Patricia Mack Bryan as Senate legal counsel for a term of service to expire at the end of the 115th Congress.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 16) to make effective appointment of Senate Legal Counsel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 16) reads as follows:

S. RES. 16

That the appointment of Patricia Mack Bryan of Virginia to be Senate Legal Counsel made by the President pro tempore this day, is effective as of January 3, 2015, and the term of service of the appointee shall expire at the end of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore, pursuant to

Public Law 95-521, appoints Morgan J. Frankel as deputy Senate legal counsel for a term of service to expire at the end of the 115th Congress.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 17) to make effective appointment of Deputy Senate Legal Counsel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 17) reads as follows:

S. RES. 17

That the appointment of Morgan J. Frankel of the District of Columbia to be Deputy Senate Legal Counsel, made by the President pro tempore this day, is effective as of January 3, 2015, and the term of service of the appointee shall expire at the end of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, en bloc, 11 unanimous consent requests and I ask for their immediate consideration, en bloc, and the motion to reconsider the adoption of these requests be laid upon the table, and that they appear separately in the RECORD.

Before the Chair rules, I would like to point out that these requests are routine and done at the beginning of each new Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the 114th Congress, the Ethics Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the 114th Congress, there be a limitation of 15 minutes each upon any rollcall vote, with the warning signal to be sounded at the midway point, beginning at the last 7½ minutes, and when rollcall votes are of 10-minute duration, the warning signal be sounded at the beginning of the last 7½ minutes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the 114th Congress, it be in order for the Secretary of the Senate to receive reports at the desk when presented by a Senator at any time during the day of the session of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority and minority leaders may daily have up to 10 minutes each on each calendar day following the prayer and disposition of the reading of, or the approval of, the Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXVIII, conference reports and statements accompanying them not be printed as Senate reports when such conference reports and statements have been printed as a House report unless specific request is made in the Senate in each instance to have such a report printed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized during the 114th Congress to file reports during the adjournments or recesses of the Senate on appropriations bills, including joint resolutions, together with any accompanying notices of motions to suspend rule XVI, pursuant to rule V, for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the duration of the 114th Congress, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossments of all Senate-passed bills and joint resolutions, Senate amendments to House bills and resolutions, Senate amendments to House amendments to Senate bills and resolutions, and Senate amendments to House amendments to Senate amendments to House bills or resolutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the duration of the 114th Congress, when the Senate is in recess or adjournment the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States, and—with the exception of House bills, joint resolutions and concurrent resolutions—messages from the House of Representatives; and that they be appropriately referred; and that the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the duration of the 114th Congress, Senators be allowed to leave at the desk with the Journal clerk the names of two staff members who will be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the specific matter noted, and that the Sergeant-at-Arms be instructed to rotate staff members as space allows.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the duration of the 114th Congress, it be in order to refer treaties and nominations on the day when they are received from the President, even when the Senate has no executive session that day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the duration of the 114th Congress, Senators may be allowed to bring to the desk bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions and simple resolutions, for referral to appropriate committees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELCOMING MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND WISHING SENATOR REID A SPEEDY RECOVERY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today is an important day for our country. Many Senators took the oath this afternoon—13 for the first time—and the new Republican majority accepted its new responsibility. We recognize the enormity of the task before us. We know a lot of hard work awaits. We know many important opportunities await as well.

I am really optimistic about what we can accomplish. I will have much more to say about that tomorrow. For now, I just want to welcome back all of our returning Members. I want to congratulate the many new ones, and I want to say a word about our colleague from Nevada.

Senator REID is a former boxer. He is tough. I know he will be back in fighting form soon enough. We all wish him a speedy recovery and I wish him the very best.

To all of you, enjoy the ceremonies today. Tomorrow is back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting minority leader.

THE NEW CONGRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for those kind words. I am happy to report the Democratic leader of the Senate, Senator REID, is making a speedy recovery from his New Year's run-in with some exercise equipment. His face and ribs are still sore. He is eager to get back to work. We met with him this morning, and we can expect him back in the Senate very soon.

In the meantime, it is a privilege on behalf of the Democratic Caucus to welcome our old colleagues back to work and welcome our new colleagues and their families to the U.S. Senate. I also want to wish Leader McCONNELL, as he takes up the new duties of the majority leader, the very best. Senator Dirksen was a Senator from my home State of Illinois who served as a Republican leader of the Senate from 1959 to 1969. He famously said, "I am a man of fixed and unbending principles, the first of which is to be flexible at all times."

That may sound comical, even contradictory. But Senator Dirksen's ability on flexible tactics and firmness on principles helped produce historic legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, one of the greatest achievements in our Nation's history. I am sure we all will remember that with fondness and pride.

The American people need us to work together to solve problems and create

opportunities. For their sake, let us all try to remember that what we are about is honorable compromise. The Constitution of the United States and the Senate itself are the results of just such a compromise.

One other point. One hundred years ago this week, an American industrialist and entrepreneur stunned the world by announcing he would start paying his workers double the industry average and cut the hours. That man, of course, was Henry Ford. He committed to pay his workers a minimum wage.

As we begin this new Congress, let us dedicate ourselves to the working men and women across America, the taxpayers of this country, and the men and women which we so proudly serve. I hope that we will show flexibility and principle. We can't solve America's challenges with the same old thinking. We have to address the problems with mutual respect and with a positive attitude.

I look forward to, on this side of the aisle, working with Senator REID and my colleagues to achieve that end.

Congratulations to Leader McCONNELL.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank my friend the acting minority leader. We are anxious to get to work here. In that regard, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to meet on January 7, tomorrow, for the purpose of hearing testimony on the Keystone Pipeline; that the meeting be chaired by Senator MURKOWSKI, with Senator CANTWELL as ranking member; that the following Senators not currently serving on the committee be considered Members of the committee for the purpose of this meeting: Senators DAINES, CASSIDY, GARDNER, CAPITO, HIRONO, KING, and WARREN; I further ask that the meeting be considered to comport with all Senate rules relating to the conduct of committees and that customary and authorized expenses be permitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. Under the traditions and rules of the Senate, all of the Senate committees are organized in a resolution, which we anticipate will be offered tomorrow for the organization of the committee structure of the U.S. Senate.

I say to the majority leader, we will continue this conversation in a positive manner in an effort to come up with a mutually agreeable approach to consider this legislation and others, but for that reason I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. If I may, let me just say again, nobody's rights would have been in any way impaired by going forward a day earlier. We are going to pass the committee resolution tomorrow. We all know that one of the things the Senate is best at is not doing much. I hope we can work this out so we can get started. Everyone knows the first measure that is going to be up is going to come out of the energy committee. I would say to my friends on the minority side, it is open for amendment. Why don't we get started? Hopefully Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL can work through this and we can get going and do the people's business. We are anxious to get started.

MORNING BUSINESS

REMEMBERING SYLVIA GARCIA RICKARD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to convey to my colleagues news of the tragic death of Sylvia Rickard—one of the Nation's top breast cancer advocates—a woman so full of life and joy, so deeply immersed in the science of her passion, that it is impossible to imagine this sad, sad occurrence.

Sylvia was truly an amazing person who touched many lives. I first met Sylvia when she visited my office so many years ago to educate me on the need for more breast cancer research, for better breast cancer screening, and for better patient navigation. Sylvia, herself a two-time survivor of breast cancer, and later of ocular melanoma, made sure that my staff and I, and indeed all of the Utah and Idaho delegations, regardless of party, were kept apprised of the latest developments in breast cancer research. She patiently walked us through the science behind the research—a science she made it her business to know in great detail.

Sylvia was such a good advocate because she had fought this dread disease, and won. Not once, but twice. Moreover, Sylvia, and her husband Rick, became friends to all—to me, my staff, and to my former staff—here in Washington, and in our beloved State of Utah. She always had a smile and a hug for everyone.

Sylvia made it her business not just to talk the talk, but also to walk the walk. She was a past president of the Women's State Legislative Council in Utah, a bipartisan group of women who meet to discuss issues of importance to Utah and the Nation. She also was the founder of the Utah Breast Cancer Network, and the president of the Hispanic Health Care Task Force in Utah. Sylvia became involved in building awareness at the local level, as well as the national level. Indeed, she was very proud to have been selected to be an

advisor to the National Institutes of Health—a remarkable recognition of her top-ranked talent. She was involved at all levels in advocating for better biomedical research, better support for that research, and for a non-partisan, commonsense approach to a disease that is now expected to affect one in eight women over their lifetimes.

I recall the twinkle in Sylvia's eye when top experts at the Huntsman Cancer Center in Salt Lake City sought her knowledge about eye cancer, after she was treated successfully. She had found a surgeon in another State who could treat her without the certain loss of her eye, and she helped to connect the physicians so they could learn from each other.

It was a great loss to Utah when Rick Rickard built Sylvia the house of their dreams for retirement in Boise, ID this past fall. But we were all happy they had achieved their dream. I heard she was absolutely delighted to cook in her new kitchen. I am so pleased she at least got to spend a few months in their new home, one they had worked for so hard over so many years finally to achieve.

So our hearts go out to the Rickard and Garcia families, to Sylvia and Rick's two sons, Richard, Jr. and David, and to the many millions of others whose lives have been made better by the significant achievements of my friend, Sylvia Rickard.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on December 17, 2014, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1206. An act to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1378. An act to designate the United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center" and to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2754. An act to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3027. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 Miller Valley Road in Prescott, Arizona, as the "Barry M. Goldwater Post Office".

H.R. 3572. An act to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units.

H.R. 3979. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4276. An act to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury.

H.R. 4416. An act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 161 Live Oak Street in Miami, Arizona, as the "Staff Sergeant Manuel V. Mendoza Post Office Building".

H.R. 4651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 West Baker Road in Baytown, Texas, as the "Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 5050. An act to repeal the Act of May 31, 1918, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5185. An act to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009.

H.R. 5331. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73839 Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms, California, as the "Colonel M.J. 'Mac' Dube, USMC Post Office Building".

H.R. 5562. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, as the "Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 5687. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the "Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office".

H.R. 5816. An act to extend the authorization for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bills were signed on December 17, 2014, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bill (H.R. 3979) was signed on December 18, 2014, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the Secretary of the Senate, on December 18, 2014, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1068. An act to enact title 54, United States Code, "National Park Service and Related Programs", as positive law.

H.R. 2901. An act to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3608. An act to amend the Act of October 19, 1973, concerning taxable income to

members of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

H.R. 4030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the "Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building".

H.R. 5771. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2013, the enrolled bills were signed on December 18, 2014, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

MEASURES HELD OVER/UNDER RULE

The following resolutions were read, and held over, under the rule:

S. Res. 18. A resolution making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress.

S. Res. 20. A resolution limiting certain uses of the filibuster in the Senate to improve the legislative process.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED, 113TH CONGRESS

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 17, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2338. An act to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, and for other purposes.

S. 3008. An act to extend temporarily the extended period of protection for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BURR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCH-

ER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COATS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PAUL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. SASSE):

S. 1. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; read the first time.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 11. A bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 12. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 13. A bill to establish the Hurricane Sand Dunes National Recreation Area in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 14. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain interest in Federal land acquired for the Scofield Project in Carbon County, Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 15. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to recognize the authority of States to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 16. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply the provisions of the Act to certain Congressional staff and members of the executive branch; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 17. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 18. A bill to prohibit authorized committees and leadership PACs from employing the spouse or immediate family members of any candidate or Federal office holder connected to the committee; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 19. A bill to appropriately manage the debt of the United States by limiting the use

of extraordinary measures; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 20. A bill to establish a procedure to safeguard the Social Security Trust Funds; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 21. A bill to ensure efficiency and fairness in the awarding of Federal contracts in connection with natural disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 22. A bill for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 23. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEE):

S. 24. A bill to clarify that an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority shall not authorize the detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 25. A bill to improve the coordination of export promotion programs and to facilitate export opportunities for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. COONS):

S. 26. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal defense contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 27. A bill to make wildlife trafficking a predicate offense under racketeering and money laundering statutes and the Travel Act, to provide for the use for conservation purposes of amounts from civil penalties, fines, forfeitures, and restitution under such statutes based on such violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 28. A bill to limit the use of cluster munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 29. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 30. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 31. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 32. A bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 33. A bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 34. A bill to prohibit assistance to the Palestinian Authority until it withdraws its request to join the International Criminal Court; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 35. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 36. A bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 37. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for State accountability in the provision of access to the core resources for learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. SASSE, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. DAINES):

S.J. Res. 1. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE:

S.J. Res. 2. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal

budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 1. A resolution informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 2. A resolution informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 3. A resolution to elect Orrin G. Hatch, a Senator from the State of Utah, to be President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 4. A resolution notifying the President of the United States of the election of a President pro tempore; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 5. A resolution notifying the House of Representatives of the election of a President pro tempore; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. REID):

S. Res. 6. A resolution expressing the thanks of the Senate to the Honorable Patrick J. Leahy for his service as President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate and to designate Senator Leahy as President Pro Tempore Emeritus of the United States Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 7. A resolution fixing the hour of daily meeting of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 8. A resolution electing Julie Adams as Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 9. A resolution notifying the President of the United States of the election of the Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 10. A resolution notifying the House of Representatives of the election of the Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 11. A resolution electing Frank Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 12. A resolution notifying the President of the United States of the election of a Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 13. A resolution notifying the House of Representatives of the election of a Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 14. A resolution electing Laura C. Dove, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Majority of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DURBIN (for Mr. REID):

S. Res. 15. A resolution electing Gary B. Myrick, of Virginia, as Secretary for the Minority of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 16. A resolution to make effective appointment of Senate Legal Counsel; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 17. A resolution to make effective appointment of Deputy Senate Legal Counsel; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. Res. 18. A resolution making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress; submitted and read.

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 19. A resolution relative to the death of Edward W. Brooke, III, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 20. A resolution limiting certain uses of the filibuster in the Senate to improve the legislative process; submitted and read.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 23. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, over the past few years we have seen remarkable progress in one of the defining civil rights issues of our era—ensuring that all lawfully married couples are

treated equally under the law. In 2011, when I chaired the first Congressional hearing to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, only 5 States, including Vermont, recognized same-sex marriage. With today's lifting of Florida's unconstitutional same-sex marriage ban, couples in 36 States and the District of Columbia now have the freedom to marry. This is welcome progress, and I hope we will see similar advancements in even more States this year so that all Americans can marry the one they love.

Despite this tremendous progress, there is still more to be done to ensure that no person faces discrimination based on who they marry or wish to marry. As I said when the Supreme Court struck down Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act, "All couples who are lawfully married under state law, including in Vermont, should be entitled to the same Federal protections afforded to all other married couples." Court challenges will continue this year in the remaining States that do not recognize marriage equality. But in Congress, there are several steps we can take immediately to help ensure our Federal laws treat all marriages equally.

Surprisingly, the Copyright Act, which protects our Nation's diverse creative voices, still bears vestiges of discrimination. A provision in the Act grants rights to the surviving spouse of a copyright owner only if the marriage is recognized in the owner's State of residence at the time he or she dies. This means that a writer who lawfully marries his or her partner in Vermont or California is not a "spouse" under the Copyright Act if they move to Michigan, Georgia, or one of the other States that do not currently recognize their marriage.

Congress should close this discriminatory loophole to ensure our Federal statutes live up to our Nation's promise of equality under the law. As the Supreme Court recognized in striking down key portions of the Defense of Marriage Act, it is wrong for the Federal Government to deny benefits or privileges to couples who have lawfully wed.

Today I am reintroducing the Copyright and Marriage Equality Act in the Senate to correct this problem. The bill, which I introduced in the Senate last Congress and which a bipartisan group of lawmakers including Representatives DEREK KILMER, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and JARED POLIS plans to reintroduce in the House of Representatives soon, amends the Copyright Act to look simply at whether a couple is lawfully married—not where a married couple happens to live when the copyright owner dies. It will ensure that the rights attached to the works of our Nation's gay and lesbian authors, musicians, painters, photographers, and other creators pass to

their widows and widowers. Artists are part of the creative lifeblood of our Nation, and our laws should protect their families equally.

When I introduced this bill last year, it failed to get the support of a single Republican in the Senate. I hope that in this Congress, Republicans will consider joining this effort to correct these remnants of discrimination in our Federal laws. On the issue of marriage equality, the arc of history is at long last bending towards justice, so that all Americans one day will be free to marry the one they love. Statutes like the Copyright Act, or laws governing the Social Security Administration and Department of Veterans Affairs which also contain remnants of discrimination, are no place for inequality in our country. I urge the Senate to take up and pass this important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 23

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Copyright and Marriage Equality Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF WIDOW AND WIDOWER IN TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking the definition of "widow" or "widower" and inserting the following:

"An individual is the 'widow' or 'widower' of an author if the courts of the State in which the individual and the author were married (or, if the individual and the author were not married in any State but were validly married in another jurisdiction, the courts of any State) would find that the individual and the author were validly married at the time of the author's death, whether or not the spouse has later remarried."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the death of any author that occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEE):

S. 24. A bill to clarify that an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority shall not authorize the detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Due Process Guarantee Act, which passed the Senate in 2012 with 67 votes as an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013.

Unfortunately, the amendment was taken out in the Conference Committee that year. It is my hope that the Senate will pass this legislation

again this year, and this time the House will support it so that it can finally be enacted into law to protect Americans from being detained indefinitely.

The bipartisan bill I am introducing today, with Senator LEE as the lead cosponsor, is almost identical to the amendment that passed the Senate in December 2012 with 67 votes. The previous version of this bill had a hearing in the Judiciary Committee on February 29, 2012.

This legislation is necessary to prevent the U.S. Government from detaining its citizens indefinitely.

Unfortunately, indefinite detention has been a part of America's not-too-distant past. The internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II remains a dark spot on our Nation's legacy, and is something we should never repeat.

To ensure that this reprehensible experience would never happen again, Congress passed and President Nixon signed into law the Non-Detention Act of 1971, which repealed a 1950 statute that explicitly allowed the indefinite detention of U.S. citizens.

The Non-Detention Act of 1971 clearly states:

No citizen shall be imprisoned or otherwise detained the United States except pursuant to an act of Congress.

Despite the shameful history of indefinite detention of Americans and the legal controversy over the issue since 9/11, during debate on the defense authorization bill in past years, some in the Senate have advocated for allowing the indefinite detention of U.S. citizens.

Proponents of indefinitely detaining U.S. citizens argue that the Authorization for Use of Military Force, AUMF, that was enacted shortly after 9/11 is, quote, "an act of Congress," in the language of the Non-Detention Act of 1971, that authorizes the indefinite detention of American citizens regardless of where they are captured.

They further assert that their position is justified by the U.S. Supreme Court's plurality decision in the 2004 case of *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*. However, the *Hamdi* case involved an American captured on the battlefield in Afghanistan.

Yaser Esam Hamdi was a U.S. citizen who took up arms on behalf of the Taliban and was captured on the battlefield in Afghanistan. The divided Court did effectively uphold his military detention, so some of my colleagues use this case to argue that the military can indefinitely detain even American citizens who are arrested domestically here on U.S. soil, far from the battlefield of Afghanistan.

However, the Supreme Court's opinion in the *Hamdi* case was a muddled decision by a four-vote plurality that recognized the power of the government to detain U.S. citizens captured

in such circumstances as “enemy combatants” for some period, but otherwise repudiated the government’s broad assertions of executive authority to detain citizens without charge or trial.

In particular, the Court limited its holding to citizens captured in an area of, quote, “active combat operations”, unquote, and concluded that even in those circumstances the U.S. Constitution and the Due Process Clause guarantees U.S. citizens certain rights, including the ability to challenge their enemy combatant status before an impartial judge.

The plurality’s opinion stated:

It [the Government] has made clear, however, that, for purposes of this case, the ‘enemy combatant’ that it is seeking to detain is an individual who, it alleges, was ‘part of or supporting forces hostile to the United States or coalition partners’ in Afghanistan and who ‘‘engaged in an armed conflict against the United States’’ there. Brief for Respondents 3. We therefore answer only the narrow question before us: whether the detention of citizens falling within that definition is authorized.”

The opinion goes on to say at page 517 that “we conclude that the AUMF is explicit congressional authorization for the detention of individuals in the narrow category we describe . . .”

Indeed, the plurality later emphasized that it was discussing a citizen captured on a foreign battlefield. Criticizing Justice Scalia’s dissenting opinion, the opinion says, “Justice Scalia largely ignores the context of this case: a United States citizen captured in a foreign combat zone.” The plurality italicized and emphasized the word “foreign” in that sentence.

Thus, to the extent the Hamdi case permits the government to detain a U.S. citizen “until the end of hostilities,” it does so only under a very limited set of circumstances, namely citizens taking an active part in hostilities, who are captured in Afghanistan, and who are afforded certain due process protections, at a minimum.

Additionally, decisions by the lower courts have contributed to the current state of legal ambiguity when it comes to the indefinite detention of U.S. citizens, such as Jose Padilla, a U.S. citizen who was arrested in Chicago in 2002. He was initially detained pursuant to a material witness warrant based on the 9/11 terrorist attacks and later designated as an “enemy combatant” who conspired with al-Qaeda to carry out terrorist attacks including a plot to detonate a “dirty bomb” inside the U.S.

Padilla was transferred to the military brig in South Carolina where he was detained for three and a half years while seeking habeas corpus relief. Padilla was never charged with attempting to carry out the “dirty bomb” plot. Instead, Padilla was released from military custody in November 2005 and transferred to Federal

civilian custody in Florida where he was indicted on other charges in Federal court related to terrorist plots overseas.

While he was indefinitely detailed by the military, Padilla filed a habeas corpus petition which was litigated at first in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, and then in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. In a 2003 decision by the Second Circuit known as *Padilla v. Rumsfeld*, the Court of Appeals held that the AUMF did not authorize his detention, saying: “we conclude that clear congressional authorization is required for detentions of American citizens on American soil because 18 U.S.C. §4001(a) the ‘Non-Detention Act’, prohibits such detentions absent specific congressional authorization. Congress’s Authorization for Use of Military Force Joint Resolution, . . . passed shortly after the attacks of September 11, 2001, is not such an authorization.”

This requirement for “clear congressional authorization” to detain is known as the Second Circuit’s “Clear Statement Rule.”

However, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals reached the opposite conclusion, finding that the AUMF did authorize his detention. It is worth pointing out, however, that their analysis turned entirely on the disputed claims that “Padilla associated with forces hostile to the United States in Afghanistan,” and, “like Hamdi, Padilla took up arms against United States forces in that country in the same way and to the same extent as did Hamdi.”

Facing an impending Supreme Court challenge and mounting public criticism for holding a U.S. citizen arrested inside the U.S. as an enemy combatant, the Bush administration relented, and ordered Padilla transferred to civilian custody to face criminal conspiracy and material support for terrorism charges in Federal court.

I believe that the time is now to end the legal ambiguities, and have Congress state clearly, once and for all, that the AUMF or other authorities do not authorize indefinite detention of Americans apprehended in the U.S.

To accomplish this, we are introducing legislation again this year which affirms and strengthens the principles behind the Non-Detention Act of 1971.

It amends the Non-Detention Act to provide clearly that no military authorization allows the indefinite detention of U.S. citizens or Green Card holders who are apprehended inside the U.S.

Like the amendment that passed with 67 votes in 2012, the bill creates a new subsection (b) of the Non-Detention Act which clearly states: “A general authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority, on its own, shall not be construed to authorize the imprisonment or detention without charge or

trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States apprehended in the United States.”

Like the previous version, this bill amends the Non-Detention Act to codify the Second Circuit’s “Clear Statement Rule” from the Padilla case. So new subsection (a) will read, “No citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States shall be imprisoned or otherwise detained by the United States except consistent with the Constitution and pursuant to an act of Congress that expressly authorizes such imprisonment or detention.”

Making the Clear Statement Rule part of subsection (a) strengthens the Non-Detention Act even more by requiring Congress to be explicit if it wants to detain U.S. citizens indefinitely. Subsection (b) clarifies that an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority does not authorize the indefinite detention of a U.S. citizen or a Lawful Permanent Resident of the U.S., also known as a Green Card holder.

Some may ask why this legislation protects Green Card holders as well as citizens. And others may ask why the bill does not protect all persons” apprehended in the U.S. from indefinite detention.

Let me make clear that I would support providing the protections in this amendment to all persons in the United States, whether lawfully or unlawfully present. But the question comes, is there enough political support to expand this amendment to cover others besides U.S. citizens and Green Card holders?

Wherever we draw the line on who should be covered by this legislation, I believe it violates fundamental American rights to allow anyone apprehended on U.S. soil to be detained without charge or trial.

The FBI and other law enforcement agencies have proven, time and again, that they are up to the challenge of detecting, stopping, arresting, and convicting terrorists found on U.S. soil, having successfully arrested, detained and convicted hundreds of these heinous people, both before and after 9/11.

Specifically, there have been 556 terrorism-related convictions in federal criminal court between 9/11 and the end of 2013, according to the Department of Justice.

Also, it is important to understand that suspected terrorists who may be in the U.S. illegally can be detained within the criminal justice system using at least the following 4 options:

They can be charged with a Federal or State crime and held; they can be held for violating immigration laws; they can be held as material witnesses as part of Federal grand jury proceedings; and they can be held for up to 6 months under Section 412 of the Patriot Act.

I want to be very clear about what this bill is and is not about. It is not about whether citizens such as Hamdi and Padilla, or others who would do us harm, should be captured, interrogated, incarcerated, and severely punished. They should be.

But what about an innocent American? What about someone in the wrong place at the wrong time? The beauty of our Constitution is that it gives everyone in the United States basic due process rights to a trial by a jury of their peers.

As President Obama said when referring to the indefinite detention of non-Americans at Guantanamo:

"Imagine a future—10 years from now or 20 years from now—when the United States of America is still holding people who have been charged with no crime on a piece of land that is not part of our country. . . . Is that who we are? Is that something that our Founders foresaw? Is that the America we want to leave to our children? Our sense of justice is stronger than that."

The same questions could be asked of those who would indefinitely detain Americans arrested on U.S. soil.

Is that who we are?

Does that reflect the America we want to leave to our children?

Now is the time to clarify U.S. law to state unequivocally that the government cannot indefinitely detain American citizens and Green Card holders captured inside this country without trial or charge.

The Federal Government experimented with indefinite detention of U.S. citizens during World War II, a mistake we now recognize as a betrayal of our core values.

Let us not repeat it. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 27. A bill to make wildlife trafficking a predicate offense under racketeering and money laundering statutes and the Travel Act, to provide for the use for conservation purposes of amounts from civil penalties, fines, forfeitures, and restitution under such statutes based on such violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Wildlife Trafficking Enforcement Act of 2015, which I authored along with my colleague Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM.

This bill will allow the Federal Government to crack down on poachers and transnational criminal organizations involved in the global trade in illegal wildlife products.

Wildlife trafficking has become a global crime that the State Department estimates is valued at between \$8 to \$10 billion annually. This ranks it as one of the most lucrative types of organized crime in the world, along with drug and human trafficking.

Besides being a major international crime, wildlife trafficking is a morally

repugnant practice that threatens some of our world's most iconic species with extinction.

The most disturbing example is that of elephants and rhinoceroses. A recent study estimates that over 100,000 elephants were illegally poached in Africa from 2010 to 2012. At this rate, the African elephant is being killed faster than the species can reproduce, putting it at risk of being wiped off the face of the earth.

Most disturbingly, poachers are slaughtering very young and juvenile elephants for their tusks due to the record high demand for ivory in places like China and the United States.

But the illicit ivory trade is not just a threat to African elephants; it is also a problem for global security. The State Department reports that there is increasing evidence that wildlife trafficking is funding armed insurgencies like Al Shabaab and the Lord's Resistance Army. The illegal ivory trade fuels corruption and violence in Africa.

The rhinoceros has also been decimated by poaching due to record high demand for its horn. Conservation organizations estimate that hundreds of rhinoceroses are illegally slaughtered in Africa each year. It is deeply concerning that the poaching rate for rhinoceroses in Africa appears to be increasing.

Some populations of rhinoceroses are on the brink of extinction. The population of the Sumatran rhinoceros has plummeted by over 50 percent in the last two decades due to poaching, and it is estimated that only about 100 remain in existence. It is estimated that fewer than 10 Northern White Rhinoceroses remain alive in the wild.

The problem is not just confined to elephants and rhinoceroses. Tigers, leopards, endangered sea turtles, and many other wildlife species are being decimated by poaching.

At its core, this legislation increases criminal penalties for wildlife trafficking crimes. The federal government needs stiffer penalties in order to go after organized and high volume traffickers. The President asked for this authority in the National Strategy to Combat Wildlife Trafficking released last year.

Specifically, this bill makes violations of the Endangered Species Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act that involve more than \$10,000 of illegal wildlife products predicate offenses under the money laundering and racketeering statutes and the Travel Act.

Currently, each of these wildlife laws carries a maximum prison sentence of only one year for a violation. Under this bill, wildlife trafficking violations can be subject to up to a 20-year prison sentence, as well as increased fines and penalties of up to \$500,000 for an offense.

These new penalties will allow the government to change the equation on wildlife crimes. Wildlife trafficking has increased at dramatic rates because the crime is high value and low risk due to weak penalties across the world. Under the new authorities, the Federal Government will have a full range of tools to prosecute the worst wildlife trafficking offenders and to put them behind bars with significant sentences. The new authorities will also act as a deterrent to the criminal organizations currently trafficking illicit wildlife products into and through the United States.

As one of the largest markets for products of illicit poaching in the world, the United States has a responsibility to step up and help to combat this scourge. With this legislation, the United States will set an example for other countries on the need for each country to strengthen penalties for wildlife trafficking. It is critical that other nations around the world with large markets for illicit wildlife products step up to tackle this global problem.

The Wildlife Trafficking Enforcement Act of 2015 will also allow fines, penalties, forfeitures, and restitution recovered through use of the bill's new authorities to be transferred to established conservation funds at the Departments of the Interior and of Commerce. This will enable the Federal Government to use the monetary penalties from a wildlife trafficking conviction to benefit the species that was harmed. Thus, the bill will both act to punish and deter criminals while supporting the conservation of those species that are directly harmed by poaching.

Addressing the issue of wildlife trafficking speaks to our values and morals as a Nation. We have a responsibility to help prevent these endangered species, which have existed for thousands of years, from becoming extinct in our lifetime. It is also clear that Federal law's weak penalties for wildlife crimes have been exploited by poachers and transnational criminals.

I therefore ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with me to enact this legislation this year. The stakes for endangered species like elephants, tigers, and rhinoceroses could not be higher. If we don't crack down on wildlife trafficking, we will be complicit in the slaughter.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 28. A bill to limit the use of cluster munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues Senators

LEAHY, BOXER, DURBIN, KLOBUCHAR, MURRAY, UDALL, FRANKEN, WYDEN and WHITEHOUSE to introduce the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act of 2015.

Our legislation places common sense restrictions on the use of cluster munitions. It prevents any funds from being spent to use cluster munitions that have a failure rate of more than one percent.

In addition, the rules of engagement must specify that: cluster munitions will only be used against clearly defined military targets; and will not be used where civilians are known to be present or in areas normally inhabited by civilians.

Our legislation also includes a national security waiver that allows the President to waive the prohibition on the use of cluster munitions with a failure rate of more than one percent if he determines it is vital to protect the security of the United States to do so.

However, if the President decides to waive the prohibition, he must issue a report to Congress within 30 days on the failure rate of the cluster munitions used and the steps taken to protect innocent civilians.

Cluster munitions are large bombs, rockets, or artillery shells that contain up to hundreds of small submunitions, or individual “bomblets.”

They are intended for attacking enemy troop and armor formations spread over a wide area.

But, in reality, they pose a far more deadly threat to innocent civilians.

According to the Cluster Munitions Monitor, over the past fifty years, there have been 19,419 documented cluster munitions deaths in 31 nations. The estimated number of total cluster munitions casualties, however, is an astonishing 55,000 people.

While cluster munitions are intended for military targets, in actuality civilians have accounted for 94% of cluster munition casualties.

Death and injury from unexploded ordnance left behind by cluster munitions continues to kill civilians to this day. Today, 23 States remain contaminated by unexploded ordnance left from cluster munitions.

Last year, nine of these countries suffered casualties from unexploded ordnance. They were: Croatia, Iraq, Laos, Lebanon, Cambodia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria and Vietnam.

More tragically, despite the risk they pose to civilians, cluster bombs continue to be used in conflicts.

Since July 2012, Syrian government forces have used cluster munitions in 10 of the country's 14 governates.

Human Rights Watch has documented that the Syrian government has used seven types of cluster munitions to date, six of which were manufactured in the former Soviet Union and the seventh of which is Egyptian-made.

In 2012 and 2013, the Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor recorded 1,584 deaths from government-launched cluster munitions in Syria. Approximately 97 percent of the deaths directly linked to cluster munitions were civilians.

For the first time, Human Rights Watch has also obtained evidence that the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, known as ISIL, has also used cluster bombs.

According to witness testimony and photographic evidence, ISIL used cluster bombs on at least two occasions near the besieged town of Kobani.

Terrorist groups and other non-state actors would not be able to obtain and use cluster bombs if the world adopted the Oslo Treaty on Cluster munitions.

The Oslo Treaty bans the production, sale, stockpiling and use of cluster munitions. It came into effect in 2010 and to date has been ratified by 88 nations.

Under the Treaty, 22 nations have destroyed 1.16 million cluster bombs and nearly 140 million submunitions.

Unfortunately, the United States is neither a signatory nor state party to the Oslo Treaty.

In fact, the United States maintains a stockpile of 5.5 million cluster munitions containing 728 million submunitions. These bomblets have an estimated failure rate of between 5 and 15 percent.

Rather than adopting the increasing international consensus that cluster bombs should be banned, the Pentagon continues to assert that they are “legitimate weapons with clear military utility in combat.”

I respectfully disagree. The benefit of using cluster bombs is outweighed by the continuing threat they pose to civilians long after the cessation of hostilities.

The Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act would immediately ban cluster bombs with unacceptable unexploded ordnance rates and in areas where civilians are known to be present.

Passing this legislation would move the United States closer to abiding by the requirements of the Oslo Treaty, which has been ratified by many of our allies, including the United Kingdom, France and Germany.

Since 2008 the Congress has banned the export of cluster munitions with a greater than one percent unexploded ordnance rate. While banning the export of these indiscriminate weapons was a positive first step, I strongly believe the United States can do better.

This body cannot compel the administration to sign the Oslo Treaty. However, we can surely take steps to abide by its spirit. Passing the Cluster Munitions Civilian Protection Act would do exactly that.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr.

BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 29. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to fully repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, and ensure that married same-sex couples are accorded equal treatment by the federal government.

When I first introduced this bill in 2011, only 5 States and the District of Columbia recognized same-sex marriage.

Today, due to a combination of actions by legislatures, voters, and the courts, 36 States and D.C. recognize same-sex marriage. Florida joined the group just this week.

This progress is nothing short of amazing. Over 70 percent of Americans now live in a State where same-sex couples can marry.

The Supreme Court's landmark decision in *United States v. Windsor*, which struck down Section 3 of DOMA, has caused most federal agencies to accord equal rights and responsibilities to married same-sex couples.

But, despite this progress, the mission of ensuring full equality under Federal law for married same-sex couples is still unaccomplished.

This bill will accomplish that mission. It will strike DOMA from Federal law, and ensure that legally married same-sex couples are treated equally by the federal government, period.

I want to thank my 41 colleagues who have cosponsored this bill.

For my colleagues who have not yet supported this bill: if you believe that couples who are married should be treated that way by the federal government, you should cosponsor this bill. It is as simple as that.

Two major agencies, which serve millions and millions of Americans—the Social Security Administration and Department of Veterans Affairs—still deny benefits to some married couples depending on where the couple has lived. This bill would fix that problem.

Let me address Social Security first. An example of the discrimination married same-sex couples still face is the

case of Kathy Murphy and Sara Barker. According to a legal filing, this couple married in Massachusetts and shared a ranch house in Texas for nearly 30 years.

In 2010, when Sara was 60 years old, she was diagnosed with an aggressive form of cancer. Sara went through several surgeries and chemotherapy, and Kathy was Sara's caregiver.

Sara passed away on March 10, 2012. As the complaint states: "Kathy lost her partner of more than thirty years and the love of her life."

In July 2014—over a year after she applied—Kathy's application for survivor's benefits from Social Security was denied because they lived in Texas together, and Texas does not recognize them as married.

This cost her an estimated \$1,200 per month in Federal survivor's benefits.

Veterans and active-duty military personnel in same-sex marriages also are being denied equal treatment by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Many of these brave individuals have served our country overseas or in war zones, but they may nevertheless be denied a huge range of benefits our nation grants to those who have served in the Armed Forces.

A court filing by the American Military Partners Association explains that:

lesbian and gay veterans and their spouses and survivors . . . will be denied or disadvantaged in obtaining spousal veterans benefits such as disability compensation, death pension benefits, home loan guarantees, and rights to burial together in national cemeteries.

This is wrong. Our married gay and lesbian soldiers put their lives on the line for our country the same way other soldiers do.

We owe them the same debt of gratitude we owe to all other men and women who serve, and this bill would ensure that we fulfill that solemn obligation.

Continued discrimination against married same-sex couples is not limited to these benefits programs.

Other Federal laws are not part of programs administered by agencies, but they nevertheless are designed to protect families, including spouses.

Let me just give one example—Section 115 of Title 18. Among other things, this law makes it a crime to assault, kidnap, or murder a spouse of Federal law enforcement officer, with the intent to influence or retaliate against the officer.

This law protects the ability of people like FBI agents and federal prosecutors to serve the public knowing there is protection from violence against their families.

These agents and prosecutors investigate and prosecute people like drug kingpins, terrorists, and organized crime figures.

But, even today, it is not clear whether this vital protection for these

officers covers those in lawful same-sex marriages everywhere in the country.

These public servants, who protect all of us, should not have to worry that they lack the full protection we provide to their colleagues—but that is the situation we confront today. This bill would fix it.

In addition, Section 2 of DOMA—which was not expressly addressed by the Supreme Court—continues to pose a serious risk to legal relief received by victims of crime and civil wrongs. This bill would repeal it.

Section 2 of DOMA is the full faith and credit provision of DOMA, and it has been the subject of many misconceptions.

When DOMA was enacted, some claimed Section 2 was designed to prevent the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution from forcing a state to recognize a marriage from another state.

But states have never needed permission from Congress to decide whether to recognize an out-of-state marriage. States have done that under their own laws, subject to other constitutional guarantees like the Equal Protection Clause.

Thus, repealing Section 2 of DOMA simply would not force a State, or a religious institution, to recognize a particular marriage.

While it is on the books, Section 2 may have a very serious impact: it may nullify legal relief awarded to victims of crime and other civil wrongs.

There is a general rule that the judgments of one state's courts will be enforced in another state's courts.

But Section 2 purports to exempt any "right or claim arising from" a same-sex marriage from this rule.

Imagine a woman killed by a drunk driver. Her surviving spouse would have a civil claim for wrongful death, or might obtain restitution in a criminal case.

But DOMA could prevent the court judgments in those cases from being enforced in the perpetrator's home State, allowing him to avoid the consequences of his actions.

The same problem could arise in numerous types of cases, such as assaults, batteries, and insurance claims.

Same-sex married couples are the only class of people who are burdened by this sort of legal disability, which hinders the court system from protecting them the same way that it does other citizens.

This is wrong, and it must be repealed.

As a Senator from California, I come to this bill with a strong sense of history.

In 1948, the California Supreme Court became the first state court to find that a ban on interracial marriage violates the Equal Protection Clause. At the time, 29 states still prohibited interracial marriage.

Prohibitions on interracial marriage then were eliminated in 13 other states, so that when the Supreme Court decided *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967, only 16 states retained bans on interracial marriage.

I very much hope that is where we are today on same-sex marriage.

People of all stripes have come to believe that loving and committed same-sex couples are worthy of the same dignity and respect other couples receive. Public opinion has changed dramatically, and 36 states now recognize same-sex marriage.

The tide has shifted, I hope irreversibly so.

But here, in Congress, we still have work to do.

We must end the discrimination married same-sex couples continue to face at the federal level.

DOMA remains on the books, where it should never have been placed. It could be revived by a different Supreme Court majority.

A future administration also could interpret other laws differently than this Administration has done, potentially restricting the availability of key benefits even further.

The solution is simple: pass this bill, which would eliminate DOMA and accord equal treatment under Federal law for married same-sex couples.

Let me again thank my cosponsors for joining me in this effort, and to urge my other colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 30. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today, Senator DONNELLY and I are reintroducing the Forty Hours is Full-time Act to correct a serious flaw in the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, that is already causing workers to have their hours reduced and their pay cut. We are pleased to be joined in this bipartisan effort by Senators MURKOWSKI and MANCHIN. Our legislation would raise the threshold for "full-time" work in Obamacare to the standard 40 hours a week. This is consistent with the threshold for overtime eligibility under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the common-sense understanding of "full-time" work.

Under Obamacare, an employee working just 30 hours a week is defined as "full-time," a definition that is completely out-of-step with standard employment practices in the U.S. today. According to a survey published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average American actually works 8.7

hours per day, which equates to roughly 44 hours a week. The Obamacare definition is nearly one-third lower than actual practice.

Similarly, the Obamacare definition of “full-time” employee is ten hours a week fewer than the 40 hours per week used by the GAO in its study of the budget and staffing required by the IRS to implement Obamacare. In that report, the GAO described a “full-time equivalent” as: “a measure of staff hours equal to those of an employee who works 2,080 hours per year, or 40 hours per week. . . .” Even the Office of Management and Budget recognizes that 30-hours is not “full-time.” A circular it issued to Federal agencies actually directs them to calculate staffing levels using more than 40 hours a week as a “full-time equivalent.”

The effect of using the 30-hour a week threshold is to artificially drive-up the number of “full-time” workers for purposes of calculating the penalties to which employers are exposed under Obamacare. These penalties begin at \$40,000 for businesses with 50 employees, plus \$2,000 for each additional “full-time equivalent” employee. While these draconian penalties were scheduled to begin in January of last year, we have yet to feel their full effect because the Obama administration delayed their implementation through 2014, perhaps knowing the negative impact that will result. But that artificial grace-period expired January 1 for employers with 100 or more workers and will end for employers with between 50 and 99 employees in January of next year.

Needless to say, these penalties will force many employers to restrict or reduce the hours their employees are allowed to work, so they are no longer considered “full-time” for the purposes of the law. In addition, these penalties will discourage employers from growing or adding jobs, particularly those close to the 50-job trigger.

These are not hypothetical concerns. According to the *Investors Business Daily*, more than 450 employers had cut work hours or staffing levels in response to Obamacare as of September of last year. Employees of for-profit businesses are not the only ones threatened by Obamacare’s illogical definition of full-time work. Public sector employees and those who work for non-profits are also affected.

I am concerned that educators, school employees, and students will be particularly hard hit. As the ASAA, the School Superintendents Association, explained in a letter in support of our bill, Obamacare’s 30-hour threshold puts an “undue burden on school systems across the Nation, many of [which] will struggle to staff their schools to meet their educational mission” while complying with this requirement.

For example, the school superintendent of Bangor, ME, has told me

that Obamacare will require that school district to reduce substitute teacher hours to make sure they don’t exceed 29 hours a week. This will harm not only the substitute teachers who want and need more work, but it will also harm students by causing unnecessary disruption in the classroom.

Likewise, in Indiana, a county school district had to reduce the hours of part-time school bus drivers to make sure they do not work more than the 30-hour threshold. As a result, the school district has been forced to cut field trips and transportation to athletic events, and employees who used to work more than 30 hours total in two jobs have been forced to give up one of their jobs, hurting their financial security.

The 30-hour rule will also affect our Nation’s institutions of higher education. According to the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, Obamacare’s full-time work definition has already caused 122 schools to announce new policies capping hours for students and faculty.

It is troubling that the 30-hour threshold will also harm delivery of home care services. The requirement will likely result in reduced access to needed services for some of our Nation’s most vulnerable citizens: home-bound seniors, individuals with disabilities, and recently discharged hospital and nursing home patients. Information provided to my office by the Home Care & Hospice Alliance of Maine shows that many of its member organizations will be forced to reduce work hours for employees or even to cease operations due to Obamacare’s definition of “full-time” work. If that happens, hundreds of home care workers could lose their jobs, and a thousand seniors could lose access to home care services—in Maine alone.

Data from Maine’s Medicaid program show that home care services are extremely cost-effective compared to alternatives. Thus, by making it harder for home care service providers to give their workers the hours they need, Obamacare’s definition of “full-time” work will end up reducing the home care services available to seniors, depriving them of care or forcing them into costlier care, driving up Federal costs.

Before I close, I would like to read a few lines from a letter I recently received from Randy Wadleigh, the owner of a well-known and much-loved restaurant institution in Maine called “Governor’s.” Randy’s letter sums up what Maine employers have always told me—their employees are the heart and souls of their businesses, and are the face of their companies to the public. As Randy puts it, businesses recognize the importance of their workers “because without GREAT employees, businesses really don’t have anything.

[The 30-hour threshold] is hurting many of our employees. They don’t understand it, they can’t afford it and they just want to work more hours.”

The bipartisan bill we are introducing today will protect these workers by changing the definition of “full-time” work in the ACA to 40 hours a week, and making a corresponding change in the definition of “full-time equivalent” employee to 174 hours per month. This is a sensible definition in keeping with actual practice.

Among the many organizations that have endorsed our bill are: the College & University Professional Association for Human Resources, the National Association for Home Care & Hospice, the American Hotel & Lodging Association, the American Staffing Association, the Asian American Hotel Owners Association, the Associated Builders and Contractors, the Food Marketing Institute, the International Franchise Association, the National Association of Convenience Stores, the National Association of Health Underwriters, the American Rental Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Theatre Owners, the National Grocers Association, the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Restaurant Association, the National Retail Federation, the Retail Industry Leaders Association, ASAA, the School Superintendents Association, the Society for Human Resource Management, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Regardless of the varying views of Senators on the Affordable Care Act, surely we ought to be able to agree to fix this problem in the law that is hurting workers’ paychecks and creating chaos for employers. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 19, 2014.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of AASA: The School Superintendents Association, the Association of Educational Service Agencies, the National Rural Education Association and the National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, I write to express our support for the Forty Hours is Full Time Act. Collectively, we represent public school superintendents, educational service agency administrators and school system leaders across the country, as well as our nation’s rural schools and communities. We have followed closely the Affordable Care Act and stand ready to implement the law, and see your proposed legislation as one way to alleviate an unnecessarily burdensome regulation.

The Forty Hours is Full Time Act would change the definition of “full time” in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to 40 hours per week and the number of hours counted toward a “full time equivalent” employee to

174 hours per month. The current ACA arbitrarily sets the bar for a full work week to 30 hours. This is inconsistent with how most Americans think: full-time is a 40 hour work week. The current definition causes confusion among employers who struggle to understand and comply with the new requirements, especially ones that are in conflict with long-standing practices built on the long-standing 40-hour work week premise.

We welcome the opportunity to ensure our employees have a positive work environment and we remain committed to providing a robust set of work benefits. We are concerned that the ACA, as currently written, puts additional, undue burden on school systems across the nation, many of whom will struggle to staff their schools to meet their educational mission while meeting the strict 30-hour regulation.

We applaud your continued leadership on this issue and look forward to seeing the Forty Hours is Full Time Act move forward. Sincerely,

NOELLE M. ELLERSON,
AASA, The School Superintendents
Association, Associate Executive Director,
Policy & Advocacy, AESA, NREA and NREAC
Legislative Liaison.

GOVERNOR'S RESTAURANT & BAK-
ERY, GOVERNOR'S MANAGEMENT
COMPANY, INC.,

Old Town, ME, December 22, 2014.

Re Definition of full time hours for the ACA

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
413 Dirksen Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SUSAN: Governor's Restaurants have been a staple in Maine since 1959. We have 6 locations and employ over 300 full and part time fine Maine folks while serving the great people of Maine. In general, we've had longevity because we pay attention to business and play by the rules dictated to us by local, state and federal agencies. In a nutshell, we take pride in doing the right things.

As our company's CEO, I recently conducted health insurance enrollment meetings at all of our locations for those 100+ eligible full time employees (as currently defined at 30 hours per week). We are strongly in favor of changing the current definition of a full time employee from 30 hours to 40 hours . . . but not necessarily for the reason(s) you may think.

On behalf of our employees, we've just got to increase the threshold to 40 hours. Our offered health plan is defined as affordable and meets minimum standards as defined by the law, but when you express to the employee that they must contribute +/- \$30 per week it becomes a heartfelt choice to pay for food, child care, rent OR pay for health care. On more than one occasion, I had employees (all of whom worked less than 32 hours per week) break down in tears because they just can't afford coverage. At the same time, those that worked over 38 hours, were more likely to participate and in fact could afford coverage.

When ACA was first introduced, I could never understand why the law defined 30 hours per week. Our company has had to make dramatic cuts in hours to some staffers to reduce exposure. But once again this hurts the employee.

So you see the obvious selfish thing to do as a business person is to cry foul about the health care law and how it affects our bottom line. But our company takes a bit of a different approach. We recognize the importance of our people because without GREAT employees, business owners really don't have

anything. This law is hurting many of our employees. They don't understand it, they can't afford it and they just want to work more hours. 30 hours is too restrictive to them. 40 would be better for them and ultimately for business and such change would benefit both the employee and the employer.

Thanks for your great work in Washington.

Sincerely,

RANDY WADLEIGH,
Owner and CEO,
Governor's Management Company.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL,
Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY,
and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 32. A bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Transnational Drug Trafficking Act of 2015 with my colleagues and friends, Senators CHARLES GRASSLEY, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, HEIDI HEITKAMP, AMY KLOBUCHAR and TOM UDALL.

This bill, which passed the Senate unanimously in the last Congress, supports the Obama Administration's Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime by providing the Department of Justice with crucial tools to combat the international drug trade. As drug traffickers find new and innovative ways to avoid prosecution, we cannot allow them to exploit loopholes because our laws lag behind.

This legislation has three main components. First, it puts in place penalties for extraterritorial drug trafficking activity when individuals have reasonable cause to believe that illegal drugs will be trafficked into the United States. Current law says that drug traffickers must know that illegal drugs will be trafficked into the United States and this legislation would lower the knowledge threshold to reasonable cause to believe.

The Department of Justice has informed my office that, it sees drug traffickers from countries like Colombia, Bolivia and Peru who produce cocaine but then outsource transportation of the cocaine to the United States to violent Mexican drug trafficking organizations. Under current law, our ability to prosecute source-nation traffickers from these countries is limited since there is often no direct evidence of their knowledge that illegal drugs were intended for the United States. But let me be clear: drugs produced in these countries fuel violent crime throughout the Western Hemisphere as well as addiction and death in the United States.

Second, this bill puts in place penalties for precursor chemical producers from foreign countries, such as those producing pseudoephedrine used for methamphetamine, who illegally ship precursor chemicals into the United States knowing that these chemicals will be used to make illegal drugs.

Third, this bill makes a technical fix to the Counterfeit Drug Penalty Enhancement Act, which increases penalties for the trafficking of counterfeit drugs. The fix, requested by the Department of Justice, puts in place a "knowing" requirement which was unintentionally left out of the original bill. The original bill makes the mere sale of a counterfeit drug a Federal felony offense regardless of whether the seller knew the drug was counterfeit. Under the original bill, a pharmacist could be held criminally liable if he or she unwittingly sold counterfeit drugs to a customer. Adding a "knowing" requirement corrects this problem.

As Co-Chair of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control and as a public servant who has focused on narcotics issues for many years, I know that we cannot sit idly by as drug traffickers find new ways to circumvent our laws. The illegal drug trade is constantly evolving and it is critical that our legal framework keeps pace. We must provide the Department of Justice with all of the tools it needs to prosecute drug kingpins both here at home and abroad.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr.
SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms.
KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr.
PORTMAN, and Mr. WHITE-
HOUSE):

S. 36. A bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Protecting Our Youth from Dangerous Synthetic Drugs Act of 2015, with my colleagues, Senators KELLY AYOTTE, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, BARBARA BOXER, AMY KLOBUCHAR, ROB PORTMAN, CHARLES SCHUMER, JEANNE SHAHEEN and SHEDDON WHITEHOUSE. This legislation addresses the significant harm that synthetic drugs cause our communities.

When Congress outlawed several synthetic drugs in 2012, traffickers did not stop producing them. Instead, they slightly altered the drugs' chemical structure to skirt the law, producing "controlled substance analogues" which are dangerous, chemically similar to Schedule I substances, and mimic the effects of drugs like ecstasy, cocaine, PCP, and LSD.

Manufacturers of synthetic drugs often prey upon youth, selling products such as Scooby Snax, Potpourri, and Joker Herbal. But make no mistake: these products are dangerous. In the first ten months of 2014 alone, poison centers nationwide responded to approximately 3,900 calls related to synthetic drugs.

Under current law, determining whether a substance meets the vague

legal criteria of a “controlled substance analogue” results in a “battle of experts” inside the courtroom. Significantly, a substance ruled to be an analogue in one case is not automatically an analogue in a second case.

The Protecting Our Youth from Dangerous Synthetics Drug Act addresses these issues. This bill creates an inter-agency committee of scientists that will establish and maintain an administrative list of controlled substance analogues. The Committee is structured to respond quickly when new synthetic drugs enter the market.

Because virtually all of these controlled substance analogues arrive in bulk from outside our borders, the bill makes it illegal to import a controlled substance analogue on the list unless the importation is intended for non-human use.

Finally, the bill directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to review, and if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines for violations of the Controlled Substances Act pertaining to controlled substance analogues.

In sum, this bill sends a strong message to drug traffickers who attempt to circumvent our Nation’s laws: no matter how you alter the chemical structure of synthetic drugs to try to get around the law, we will ban these substances to keep them away from our children.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 37. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for State accountability in the provision of access to the core resources for learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to reintroduce the Core Opportunity Resources for Equity and Excellence Act with my colleague Senator Brown. I would also like to thank Representative Fudge for introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives. This year, we will be commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Now is the time to reaffirm our commitment to educational equity, and in the words of President Johnson “bridge the gap between helplessness and hope.”

As we embark upon reauthorizing this landmark legislation, we must ensure that our accountability systems in education measure our progress towards equity and excellence for all children. The CORE Act will help advance that goal by requiring states to include fair and equitable access to the core resources for learning in their accountability systems.

More than 60 years after the landmark decision of *Brown v. Board of Education*, one of the great challenges still facing this nation is stemming the

tide of rising inequality. We have seen the rich get richer while middle class and low-income families have lost ground. We see disparities in opportunity starting at birth and growing over a lifetime. With more than one in five school-aged children living in families in poverty, according to Department of Education statistics, we cannot afford nor should we tolerate a public education system that fails to provide resources and opportunities for the children who need them the most.

We should look to hold our education system accountable for results and resources. And we know that resources matter. A recent study by researchers at Northwestern University and the University of California at Berkeley found that increasing per pupil spending by 20 percent for low-income students over the course of their K–12 schooling results in greater high school completion, higher levels of educational attainment, increased lifetime earnings, and reduced adult poverty.

In addition to funding, there are other opportunity gaps that we need to address. Survey data from the Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights show troubling disparities, such as the fact that Black, Latino, American Indian, Native Alaskan students, and English learners attend schools with higher concentrations of inexperienced teachers; nationwide, one in five high schools lacks a school counselor; and between 10 and 25 percent of high schools across the nation do not offer more than one of the core courses in the typical sequence of high school math and science, such as Algebra I and II, geometry, biology, and chemistry.

We are reintroducing the CORE Act to ensure that equity remains at the center of our federal education policy. Specifically, the CORE Act will require state accountability plans and state and district report cards to include measures on how well the state and districts provide the core resources for learning to their students. These resources include: high quality instructional teams, including licensed and profession-ready teachers, principals, school librarians, counselors, and education support staff; rigorous academic standards and curricula that lead to college and career readiness by high school graduation and are accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners; equitable and instructionally appropriate class sizes; up-to-date instructional materials, technology, and supplies; effective school library programs; school facilities and technology, including physically and environmentally sound buildings and well-equipped instructional space, including laboratories and libraries; specialized instructional support teams, such as counselors, social workers, nurses, and other qualified professionals; and effective family and community engagement programs.

These are things that parents in well-resourced communities expect and demand. We should do no less for children in economically disadvantaged communities. We should do no less for minority students or English learners or students with disabilities.

Under the CORE Act, States that fail to make progress on resource equity would not be eligible to apply for competitive grants authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For school districts identified for improvement, the State would have to identify gaps in access to the core resources for learning and develop an action plan in partnership with the local school district to address those gaps.

The CORE Act is supported by a diverse group of organizations, including the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, American Federation of Teachers, American Library Association, Coalition for Community Schools, Education Law Center, Fair Test, First Focus Campaign for Children, League of United Latin American Citizens, National Association of School Psychologists, National Education Association, National Latino Education Research and Policy Project, Opportunity Action, Public Advocacy for Kids, Public Advocates, Inc., Southeast Asia Resource Action Center, and the Texas Center for Education Policy.

Working with this strong group of advocates and my colleagues in the Senate and in the House, it is my hope that we can build the support to include the CORE Act in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I urge my colleagues to join us by cosponsoring this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 1—INFORMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES THAT A QUORUM OF EACH HOUSE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

SENATE RESOLUTION 2—INFORMING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A QUORUM OF THE SENATE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

SENATE RESOLUTION 3—TO ELECT ORRIN G. HATCH, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH, TO BE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 3

Resolved, That Orrin G. Hatch, a Senator from the State of Utah, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore.

SENATE RESOLUTION 4—NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF A PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 4

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Orrin G. Hatch as President of the Senate pro tempore.

SENATE RESOLUTION 5—NOTIFYING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ELECTION OF A PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 5

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Orrin G. Hatch as President of the Senate pro tempore.

SENATE RESOLUTION 6—EXPRESSING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE HONORABLE PATRICK J. LEAHY FOR HIS SERVICE AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND TO DESIGNATE SENATOR LEAHY AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE EMERITUS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 6

Resolved, That the United States Senate expresses its deepest gratitude to Senator Patrick J. Leahy for his dedication and commitment during his service to the Senate as the President Pro Tempore.

Further, as a token of appreciation of the Senate for his long and faithful service, Senator Patrick J. Leahy is hereby designated President Pro Tempore Emeritus of the United States Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 7—FIXING THE HOUR OF DAILY MEETING OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That the daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 8—ELECTING JULIE ADAMS AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That Julie E. Adams of Iowa be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 9—NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 9

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Julie E. Adams as Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 10—NOTIFYING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 10

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Julie E. Adams as Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 11—ELECTING FRANK LARKIN AS SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 11

Resolved, That Frank J. Larkin of Maryland be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 12—NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF A SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 12

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Frank J. Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 13—NOTIFYING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ELECTION OF A SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 13

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Frank J. Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 14—ELECTING LAURA C. DOVE, OF VIRGINIA, AS SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 14

Resolved, That Laura C. Dove of Virginia be, and she is hereby, elected Secretary for the Majority of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 15—ELECTING GARY B. MYRICK, OF VIRGINIA, AS SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. DURBIN (for Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 15

Resolved, That Gary B. Myrick of Virginia be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary for the Minority of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 16—TO MAKE EFFECTIVE APPOINTMENT OF SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 16

That the appointment of Patricia Mack Bryan of Virginia to be Senate Legal Counsel, made by the President pro tempore this day, is effective as of January 3, 2015, and the term of service of the appointee shall expire at the end of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION 17—TO MAKE EFFECTIVE APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 17

That the appointment of Morgan J. Frankel of the District of Columbia to be Deputy Senate Legal Counsel, made by the President pro tempore this day, is effective as of January 3, 2015, and the term of service of the appointee shall expire at the end of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION 18—MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was submitted and read:

S. RES. 18

Resolved, That the following be the majority membership on the following committees for the remainder of the 114th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Perdue, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Ms. Ayotte, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Lee, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cruz.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Heller, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Flake, Mr. Daines, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Alexander, Mrs. Capito.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Coats, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Barrasso.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Enzi, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. McCain, Mr.

Johnson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Flake, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Vitter, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Ernst, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Risch.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Corker, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Coats, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 19—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF EDWARD W. BROOKE, III, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE,

Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 19

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, was born in Washington, D.C. in 1919, graduated from Howard University in 1941 and Boston University Law College in 1948;

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, served in the United States Army during World War II, earning the rank of Captain, a Bronze Star, and a Distinguished Service Award;

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, was elected to the office of Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1962 and served as the first African American attorney general in the United States;

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, was first elected to the United States Senate in 1966 and served two terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, was the first African American to be elected to the Senate by popular vote;

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, was a pioneer and champion of civil rights;

Whereas Edward W. Brooke, III, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom on June 23, 2004, and the Congressional Gold Medal on July 1, 2008: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Edward W. Brooke, III, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Edward W. Brooke, III.

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—LIMITING CERTAIN USES OF THE FILIBUSTER IN THE SENATE TO IMPROVE THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was submitted and read:

S. RES. 20

Resolved,

SECTION 1. MOTIONS TO PROCEED.

Paragraph 1 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"Other than a motion made during the first 2 hours of a new legislative day as described in paragraph 2 of rule VIII, consideration of a motion to proceed to the consideration of any debatable matter, including debate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. This paragraph shall not apply to motions considered nondebateable by the Senate pursuant to rule or precedent."

SEC. 2. EXTENDED DEBATE.

Paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the second undesignated paragraph and inserting the following:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close? And if that

question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, except on a measure or motion to amend the Senate rules, in which case the necessary affirmative vote shall be two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, then cloture has been invoked.

"If that question is on disposition of a bill or joint resolution, a resolution or concurrent resolution, a substitute amendment for a bill or resolution, a motion with respect to amendments between the Houses, a conference report, or advice and consent to a nomination or treaty, and if such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority of Senators voting, a quorum being present, but less than three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn (or less than two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, in the case of a measure or motion to amend the Senate rules), then it shall be in order for the Majority Leader (or his or her designee) to initiate a period of extended debate upon the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, in relation to which the motion to close debate was offered, in which case the period of extended debate shall begin one hour later.

"During a period of extended debate, such measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business, except on action or motion by the Majority Leader (or his or her designee).

"During a period of extended debate it shall not be in order for a Senator other than the Majority Leader (or his or her designee) to raise a question as to the presence of a quorum, except immediately prior to a vote or when it has been more than forty-eight hours since a quorum was demonstrated. If upon a roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, then the Senate shall adjourn to a time previously decided by order of the Senate or, if no such time has been established, then to a time certain determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Minority Leader.

"During a period of extended debate a motion to adjourn or recess shall not be in order, unless made by the Majority Leader (or his or her designee) or if the absence of a quorum has been demonstrated. Notwithstanding paragraph 1 of rule XIX, there shall be no limit to the number of times a Senator may speak upon any question during a period of extended debate.

"If, during the course of extended debate, the Presiding Officer puts any question to a vote, the Majority Leader (or his or her designee) may postpone any such vote, which shall occur at a time determined by the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Minority Leader, but not later than the time at which a quorum is next demonstrated.

"If at any time during a period of extended debate no Senator seeks recognition, then the Presiding Officer shall inquire as to whether any Senator seeks recognition. If no Senator seeks recognition, then the Presiding Officer shall again put the question as to bringing debate to a close (and the Majority Leader or his or her designee may postpone such vote in accordance with the preceding paragraph), which shall be decided without further debate or intervening motion. If that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority of Senators voting, a quorum being present, then cloture has been invoked and the period of extended debate has ended. If that question shall be decided in the negative by a majority of Sen-

ators voting, a quorum being present, then the period of extended debate has ended.

"If cloture is invoked, then the measure, motion, other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, in relation to which the motion to close debate was offered, shall remain the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

SEC. 3. POST-CLOTURE DEBATE ON NOMINATIONS.

Paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking "After no more than thirty hours of consideration of the measure, motion, or other matter on which cloture has been invoked, the Senate shall proceed, without any further debate on any question, to vote on" in the fourth undesignated paragraph and inserting "After no more than 30 hours of consideration of the measure, motion, or other matter on which cloture has been invoked, except on the question of advice and consent to a nomination other than a nomination to a position as Justice of the Supreme Court in which case consideration shall be limited to 2 hours, the Senate shall proceed, without any further debate on any question, to vote on".

SEC. 4. CONFERENCE MOTIONS.

Rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs 1 through 9 as paragraphs 2 through 10, respectively;

(2) redesignating any reference to paragraphs 1 through 9 as paragraph 2 through 10, respectively; and

(3) inserting before paragraph 2, as redesignated, the following:

"1. A nondivisible motion to disagree to a House amendment or insist upon a Senate amendment, to request a committee of conference with the House or to agree to a request by the House for a committee of conference, and to authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees (or to appoint conferees), is in order and consideration of such a motion, including consideration of any debatable motion or appeal in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours."

SEC. 5. RIGHT TO OFFER AMENDMENTS.

Paragraph 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end the following:

"After debate has concluded under this paragraph but prior to final disposition of the pending matter, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader may each offer not to exceed 3 amendments identified as leadership amendments if they have been timely filed under this paragraph and are germane to the matter being amended. Debate on a leadership amendment shall be limited to 1 hour equally divided. A leadership amendment may not be divided."

RESOLUTION OVER, UNDER THE RULE—S. RES. 18

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 18) making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for its immediate consideration, and to send the

resolution over, under the rule, and I object to my own request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The resolution will go over, under the rule.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the RECORD be kept open until 4 p.m. today for the introduction of bills and resolutions, statements, and cosponsor requests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF EDWARD W. BROOKE, III, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 19, which was introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 19) relative to the death of Edward W. Brooke, III, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 19) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading on this measure, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 2015; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the provisions of S. Res. 19 as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Edward William Brooke III, of Massachusetts, following the remarks of Senator UDALL for 15 minutes and Senator MERKLEY for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION OVER, UNDER THE RULE—S. RES. 20

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I have a resolution at the desk of which Senator MERKLEY and I are cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 20) limiting certain uses of the filibuster in the Senate to improve the legislative process.

Mr. UDALL. I ask for its immediate consideration and to send the resolution over, under the rule, I, therefore, object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The resolution will go over, under the rule.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about our continuing effort to change the Senate rules as we begin the 114th Congress. This is the same process Senators MERKLEY, Harkin, and I used at the beginning of the last Congress when we introduced a similar resolution. At that time, Majority Leader REID wanted to have the debate about reforming our rules after the inauguration.

He was willing to work with us and protect our interests until we could debate our proposal. By doing so, he preserved the right of a simple majority of this body to amend the rules in accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution.

I hope Majority Leader MCCONNELL will extend to us this same courtesy if he chooses to address other issues before rules reform.

It has been the tradition at the beginning of many Congresses that a majority of the Senate has asserted its right to adopt or amend the rules. Just as Senators of both parties have done in the past, we do not acquiesce to any provision of Senate rules—adopted by a previous Congress—that would deny the majority that right.

The resolution I am offering today is based on proposals we introduced at the start of the 112th and 113th Congresses. At that time, many called our efforts a power grab by the majority. But we were very clear. We would support these changes even if we were in the minority, and here we are today, reintroducing the reform package as Members of the minority.

These changes do not strip minority rights. They allow the body to function as our Founders intended. The heart of our proposal is the talking filibuster. The filibuster once was a tool that was used sparingly. It allowed the minority to be heard. Today it is abused too often and far too easily.

I have said many times that the Senate has become a graveyard for good ideas. The shovel is the broken filibuster and other procedural tactics.

The system is broken. But in the last election I think the message was clear. The electorate said: Fix it, do your job, and make the government work. That is what our resolution is intended to do.

Our reforms were not adopted in the last Congress, but we made some progress. Strong support for fixing the Senate led leaders REID and MCCONNELL to address the dysfunction in the Senate and make some moderate changes.

Unfortunately, it did not take long for the leaders' gentlemen's agreement to break down. In November 2013 the abuse of the rules—and the obstruction—reached a tipping point, and so the majority acted within the precedent of the Senate. We changed the rules to prevent the minority from abusing the rules and obstructing

scores of qualified nominees for judicial and executive appointments.

I believe that drastic step was unfortunate, but it was also necessary. The minority has a right to voice objections but not to abuse the rules to obstruct justice by preventing judges from being confirmed or by preventing the President from getting his team in place.

By changing the rules, the 113th Senate was able to confirm 96 judges. In fact, it confirmed more judges than any modern Congress since 1980.

The 113th Congress also confirmed 293 executive nominations in 2014—the most since 2010.

That is an incredible change. It was a bold but necessary action. But it also led to even greater polarization in the Senate. That polarization could have been prevented if the Senate had adopted our reforms at the beginning of the 113th Congress.

That is why I strongly urge the new majority leader to continue the change that was adopted in November. It allows most judicial and executive branch appointees to be confirmed by a straight majority vote. I urge him to continue the progress we made last Congress and adopt the rest of our proposed reforms at the start of this Congress.

Anyone who has watched this Senate try to legislate in the past few years knows we still are hobbled by dysfunction. We voted on cloture 218 times just over the past 2 years. To put that in perspective, the Senate voted on cloture only 38 times in the 50 years after the rule was adopted in 1917. We cannot continue down this path.

The unprecedented use of the filibuster and other procedural tactics by both parties has prevented the Senate from getting its work done. The Senate needs to return to its historical practice and function as a deliberative yet majoritarian body, when filibusters were rare and bipartisanship was the norm.

We believe the proposed rule changes in our resolution provide commonsense reforms. This will restore the best traditions of the Senate and allow it to conduct the business the American people expect.

We have one goal, whether we are in the majority or in the minority: to give the American people the government they expect and deserve, a government that works.

We said before, and we say it again, that we can do this—with respect for the minority, with respect for differing points of view, with respect for this Chamber, but, most of all with respect for the people who send us here.

The right to change the rules at the beginning of a new Congress is supported by history and by the Constitution. Article I, section 5 is very clear. The Senate can adopt and amend its rules at the beginning of the new Congress by a simple majority vote. This is

known as the constitutional option, and it is well named.

It has been used numerous times—often with bipartisan support—since the cloture provision was adopted in 1917.

Opponents of the Constitutional Option say that the rules can only be changed with a two-thirds supermajority, as the current filibuster rule requires. And they have repeatedly said any attempt to amend the rules by a simple majority is “breaking the rules to change the rules.” This simply is not true.

The supermajority requirement to change Senate rules is in direct conflict with the U.S. Constitution. Article I Section 5 of the Constitution states that, “Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.” When the Framers required a supermajority, they explicitly stated so, as they did for expelling a member. On all other matters, such as determining the chamber’s rules, a majority requirement is clearly implied.

There have been three rulings by Vice Presidents, sitting as President of the Senate, on the meaning of Article I Section 5 as it applies to the Senate. In 1957, Vice President Nixon ruled definitively:

[W]hile the rules of the Senate have been continued from one Congress to another, the right of a current majority of the Senate at the beginning of a new Congress to adopt its own rules, stemming as it does from the Constitution itself, cannot be restricted or limited by rules adopted by a majority of a previous Congress. Any provision of Senate rules adopted in a previous Congress which has the express or practical effect of denying the majority of the Senate in a new Congress the right to adopt the rules under which it desires to proceed is, in the opinion of the Chair, unconstitutional.

Vice Presidents Rockefeller and Humphrey made similar rulings at the beginning of later Congresses.

In 1979, when others were arguing that the rules could only be amended in accordance with the previous Senate’s rules, Majority Leader Byrd said the following on the floor:

There is no higher law, insofar as our Government is concerned, than the Constitution. The Senate rules are subordinate to the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution in Article I, Section 5, says that each House shall determine the rules of its proceedings. Now we are at the beginning of Congress. This Congress is not obliged to be bound by the dead hand of the past.

In addition to the clear language of the Constitution, there is also a longstanding common law principle, upheld in the Supreme Court, that one legislature cannot bind its successors. For example, if the Senate passed a bill with a requirement that it takes 75 votes to repeal it in the future, that would violate this principle and be unconstitutional. Similarly, the Senate of one

Congress cannot adopt procedural rules that a majority of the Senate in the future cannot amend or repeal.

Many of my Republican colleagues have made the same argument. For example, in 2003 Senator JOHN CORNYN wrote in a law review article:

Just as one Congress cannot enact a law that a subsequent Congress could not amend by majority vote, one Senate cannot enact a rule that a subsequent Senate could not amend by majority vote. Such power, after all, would violate the general common law principle that one parliament cannot bind another.

So amending our rules at the beginning of a Congress is not “breaking the rules to change the rules.” It is reaffirming that the U.S. Constitution is superior to the Senate rules, and that when there is a conflict between them, we follow the Constitution.

And I would like to make clear that by moving on to other business, we are not waiving our constitutional right to amend the Senate’s rules with a majority vote. In 1975, when the cloture threshold was reduced from two-thirds to three-fifths, the reform effort lasted until March. But on the first day of that Congress, Senator Mondale introduced his resolution and unequivocally stated that he was reserving his right to call for a majority vote at a later date.

Senator Mondale made the following statement on that first day:

Mr. President, I wish to state, as has been traditional at the commencement of efforts to amend rule XXII, that, by operating under the Standing Rules of the Senate the supporters of this resolution do not acquiesce to the applicability of certain of those rules to the effort to amend rule XXII; nor do they waive any rights which they may obtain under the Constitution, the practice of this body, or certain rulings of previous Vice Presidents to amend rule XXII, uninhibited by rules in effect during previous Congresses.

Today, I take the same position as Senator Mondale and many other reformers did over the years. I understand that Majority Leader MCCONNELL may move on to other business, but I am not acquiescing to any provision in the Senate rules that prevents a majority from amending those rules. We can, and should, take time to debate our proposal and have an up or down vote. I know other colleagues also have reform proposals. They all deserve consideration.

This is not just about rules. It is about the norms and traditions of the Senate. They have collapsed under the weight of the filibusters.

Neither side is 100-percent pure. Both sides have used the rules for obstruction. No doubt they have had their reasons, but I don’t think the American people care about that. They don’t want a history lesson or a lesson in parliamentary procedure. They want a government that is reasonable and that works.

I hope all my colleagues, especially the new Senators, give special consid-

eration to reform. We do not need to win every legislative or nomination vote, but we need to have a real debate—and an open process—to ensure we are, actually, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

We changed the rule regarding nominations. That was an important start, but it was the beginning—not the end. We still need to reform the Senate rules.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FRANKEN be added as a cosponsor to S. Res. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Today we are at the start of a new Congress, and every new Congress provides the opportunity for a fresh start of the work we do on behalf of the American people. Congratulations to our newly elected Members and congratulations to our returning elected Members.

It is appropriate at this moment, at the start of a new, 2-year Congress, that we ponder how to make this institution work for the American people, work well within our constitutional framework and our responsibility for advice and consent on nominations, and work well in terms of our responsibility for legislation that will address the big issues facing our Nation.

Since I came to the Senate in 2009, it has been a pleasure to work with my colleague from New Mexico. My colleague from New Mexico came to the Senate from the House. I came here from the State of Oregon but with memories of how the Senate worked many years before when I first came to the Senate as an intern in 1976.

I must say, in the 1970s, this body worked very much in the manner that one might anticipate. A bill was put forward. There was no filibuster of a motion to proceed. The bill was debated. A group of Senators would be ready to call upon the President of the Senate to submit their amendment.

Whoever was called on first—that amendment was debated. That amendment was debated, and in a short period of time it was voted on and then the Senators would vie for the opportunity to present the next amendment.

What I saw in 2009 when I came back as a Senator was a very different Chamber, a Chamber where long periods of time would be spent debating what bills to debate. The motion to proceed would be filibustered. So we would waste the energy of this institution not upon delving into the complexities of an issue and how to best address it but simply on the procedural issue of whether we were going to start debate on a particular bill.

This situation has certainly been observed by the American public. The American public’s esteem for our institution has declined steadily over the

past several decades as the paralysis of this institution has increased.

Observers of Congress report that the past two Congresses have been among the least productive in modern history—too few amendments getting considered, paralysis even after a bill has come to the floor on which amendment to address first, and too many filibusters—filibusters not of the type of old in which a Senator would delay action on a bill by holding forth as long as his energies would enable him or her to stand on this floor and carry forth, but filibusters of the silent kind, the kind in which there is simply an objection to closing debate. But then this Chamber is filled with silence because no one has anything left to say on it, and no one is willing to spend the time and energy to even declare to the American people: I am here on this floor speaking at length because I want to block this bill. There is no accountability to the public in that fashion—no transparency. So the silent filibuster has come to haunt this hall.

Well, that is a very different Senate than the Senate in the mid-1970s and one that my colleague from New Mexico and I are determined to change—to restore this Chamber to being a great deliberative body. We can have all the interesting policy ideas in the world, and we can have, certainly, insights on how to make things work better, but if the machinery for this body to consider those ideas is broken, then, certainly, those abilities are not put into their best opportunity or framework. Many folks, when we have been debating the functionality of the Senate, have said: But, remember, it was George Washington who said that the Senate should be a cooling saucer—in other words, saying that the dysfunction and paralysis of the Senate is just exactly the way it was designed to be.

That is certainly a misreading of the comment attributed, perhaps apocryphally, to George Washington. George Washington was referring to the fact that the Senate was designed with a constitutional framework of 6 years, of one-third of the Members rotating every 2 years, of a Chamber that was initially elected indirectly by the States—rather than by popular election—and that this would give it more chance to be thoughtful and reflective on the issues that come before the Nation.

This thoughtfulness, this ability to gain reflexion, is, in fact, exactly what the Senate should be. It is the quality that led to the Senate being described as the world's greatest deliberative body. But the filibuster, and the abuse of it, has changed that. And certainly the inability of the minority and the majority to be able to put forth amendments in a timely fashion and to debate them has changed.

I think back to what Alexander Hamilton said early in the history of our

Nation. He said that the real operation of the filibuster “. . . is to embarrass the administration, to destroy the energy of government, to substitute the pleasure, caprice and artifices of an insignificant, turbulent or corrupt junto to the regular deliberations and decisions of a respectable majority.”

That phrase, isn't that what we need to restore in this body, the regular deliberations and decisions of a respectable majority?

This is all part of this cycle of a democracy in which citizens vote for an individual who they feel reflects what needs to be done in our Nation, and those individuals come to this [chamber/Chamber] and they proceed to have an agenda. That agenda, if it is part of the majority agenda or a bipartisan majority agenda, gets implemented and those ideas get tested. Those ideas that work well can be kept and those ideas that work poorly can be thrown out. But if this Chamber is locked in paralysis, that cycle of testing ideas and of citizens voting for a vision and seeing that vision implemented and tested is broken. That is much where we are now.

Alexander Hamilton went on to say that when the majority must conform to the views of the minority, the consequence is “. . . tedious delays; continual negotiation and intrigue; contemptible compromises of the public good.”

I think that is exactly what we have seen too much of in this Chamber, whether it be one party in charge or the other party in charge. As my colleague noted, this is not a partisan issue. The ideas we put forward when in the majority we are now putting forward in the minority. Isn't that the test of whether an idea is in fact designed for the good of this institution, rather than the advantage of the moment?

Our Senate is broken. The American people know that. And it is our responsibility as Senators to work to change that. That is why there should now be a full debate among the Members on the best ideas on how to enable this Chamber to work better. Those ideas should come from the right of the aisle, from the left of the aisle, and ideas in partnership between colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Again, this shouldn't be about the advantage of the moment, it should be about the successful function of our beloved Senate.

One of the things we have seen in the course of this broken Senate is our failure to adequately dispose of our responsibility for advice and consent on nominations under the Constitution. That responsibility is designed to be a check on outrageous potential nominations from the President. It is not designed to be a way for one coequal branch of government—that is the Congress—to seek to systematically undermine other branches of the govern-

ment, be it the judiciary or the executive. So we need to have a timely and systematic way of considering nominations. That certainly has fallen apart in the course of the poisonous and partisan nature of deliberations here over the last few years. But we can change that.

Indeed, we stepped forward a year ago November to test a rule to close debate on most nominations with a simple majority. The result has been quite spectacular. The number of district judges who have been considered on the floor of this Chamber has more than doubled—has almost tripled. Judicial vacancies have been cut in half—extremely important to a fair and capable judiciary. Executive nominations roughly doubled.

It should not be the goal of this Chamber, whether the majority or the minority, to disable the executive branch by preventing the positions from being filled in the executive branch. If a majority says a person is reasonable, then that nomination should proceed expeditiously.

Senator UDALL and I have put forward, as he noted, a resolution that is in keeping with the package of ideas we worked on in 2011 and 2013, so we are presenting those ideas here in 2015. But my encouragement is for people to put forward their ideas, individual Senators, to add their ideas or put forward individual components that will contribute to this dialogue.

One of the ideas we have, and I will be offering to this body, is to create a process to consider rule changes at the start of each legislative session—a detailed way of addressing that, since currently we have no pattern, no guide, to holding a debate about how the Senate functions.

A second will be to consider the expedited consideration of most nominations. We made a rule change a couple of years ago—well, November a year ago. And also, before that, we made some minor changes in timing in January 2013. That came out of the debate just 2 years ago. Those January 2013 changes are expiring. Those timelines are expiring. So that goes away. Should those be adopted as part of the standing rules rather than simply the standing orders which expire with the change of a Congress?

A third idea is to end the filibuster on the motion to proceed to legislation. Think about how this has changed. If you take the 10-year period between 1973 and 1982, a 10-year period that embraces when I first came here as an intern, there were 14 times there was a filibuster on a motion to proceed. If you take 10 years from roughly 2003 to 2012, that number went up to about 160—more than a tenfold increase in the paralysis of getting bills to the floor to be discussed.

Why should there be filibusters at all on a conference committee? If the

House has put forward an idea and passed it, and the same bill has been passed by the Senate, isn't it common sense to enable a delegation from each Chamber to meet together to work out a compromise? We did make a modest improvement in this procedure, but there is much more work to be done on this.

In fact, I was mystified when I came here in 2009 as to why there weren't conference committees going on. First I heard: Well, it is easier for Chairs of committees to get together informally and try to work out something behind the scenes. But then, as I asked more questions, the answer became: Because there are three steps required, and all three of which enable a filibuster, and that paralysis just isn't worth entertaining the time on the floor. Well, let

us restore conference committees. Let us get rid of filibusters on conference committees.

And certainly we must improve floor debate by ensuring amendments can be introduced and debated. The minority has said in recent years that this is a deep disadvantage to them. But I can tell you as a Member of the previous majority that it was a disadvantage to majority Members as well not to be able to introduce and debate amendments.

We also certainly must replace the silent filibuster with the talking filibuster so there is transparency and accountability to the use of this instrument on final passage of a bill.

Let us not let this opportunity pass. Let us not continue on autopilot from one Congress to the next. Let us take

this moment of opportunity to start on this path to restoring the U.S. Senate to being the world's greatest deliberative body in order to address the big issues before us and for the betterment of our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, and does so as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Edward William Brooke, III, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:40 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 7, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 6, 2015

This being the day fixed by Public Law 113-201, pursuant to the 20th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, for the meeting of the 114th Congress of the United States, the Representatives-elect met in their Hall, and at noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Karen L. Haas.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We gather on this most significant day when, once again, we celebrate the peaceful transition of democratic government. Though many return from the 113th Congress, this people's House is a new legislative assembly.

May the service of all the Members here gathered give You glory and acquit well the charge entrusted to them by their fellow citizens.

Give each Member an abundance of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, that they might know best how to proceed in the work they have been given to do, as well as the courage to act once they have discerned where Your Spirit might lead them.

And may all that is done this day and all the days of the 114th Congress be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The CLERK. The Representatives-elect and their guests will please remain standing and join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Clerk led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The CLERK. As directed by law, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect.

Certificates of election covering 435 seats in the 114th Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called.

The Representatives-elect will record their presence by electronic device and their names will be reported in alphabetical order by State, beginning with the State of Alabama, to determine whether a quorum is present.

Representatives-elect will have a minimum of 15 minutes to record their presence by electronic device.

Representatives-elect who have not obtained their voting ID cards may do so now in the Speaker's lobby.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Representatives-elect responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—401

ALABAMA

Aderholt
Brooks
Byrne

Palmer
Roby
Rogers

Sewell

ARIZONA

Franks
Gallego
Gosar

Grijalva
Kirkpatrick
McSally

Salmon
Schweikert
Sinema

ARKANSAS

Crawford
Hill

Westerman
Womack

CALIFORNIA

Aguilar
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Brownley
Calvert
Capps
Cardenas
Chu
Cook
Davis
Denham
DeSaulnier
Eshoo
Farr
Garamendi
Hahn
Honda

Huffman
Hunter
Issa
Knight
LaMalfa
Lee
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McNerney
Napolitano
Nunes
Pelosi
Peters
Rohrabacher

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schiff
Sherman
Speier
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson
Torres
Valadao
Vargas
Walters, Mimi

COLORADO

Buck
Coffman
DeGette

Lamborn
Perlmutter
Polis

Tipton

CONNECTICUT

Courtney
DeLauro

Esty
Himes

Larson

Emmer
Kline

DELAWARE

Carney

Harper

FLORIDA

Bilirakis
Brown
Buchanan
Castor
Clawson
Curbelo
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart

Frankel
Graham
Hastings
Jolly
Miller
Murphy
Nugent
Posey
Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster
Wilson
Yoho

Clay
Cleaver
Graves

GEORGIA

Allen
Bishop
Carter
Collins
Graves

Hice
Johnson
Lewis
Loudermilk
Price

Scott, Austin
Westmoreland
Woodall

Amodei
Hardy

HAWAII

Gabbard

Takai

IDAHO

Labrador

Simpson

Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Lance
LoBiondo

ILLINOIS

Hultgren
Kelly
Kinzinger
Lipinski
Quigley
Roskam

Rush
Schakowsky
Schock
Shimkus

INDIANA

Brooks
Bucshon
Carson

Messer
Rokita
Stutzman

Visclosky
Walorski
Young

IOWA

Blum
Loeb sack

King
Young

KANSAS

Huelskamp
Jenkins

Pompeo
Yoder

KENTUCKY

Barr
Guthrie

Massie
Rogers

Whitfield
Yarmuth

LOUISIANA

Abraham
Boustany

Fleming
Graves

Richmond
Scalise

MAINE

Pingree

Poliquin

MARYLAND

Cummings
Delaney
Edwards

Harris
Hoyer
Ruppersberger

Sarbanes
Van Hollen

MASSACHUSETTS

Capuano
Clark
Keating

Kennedy
Lynch
McGovern

Moulton
Neal
Tsongas

MICHIGAN

Amash
Benishek
Bishop
Conyers
Dingell

Huizenga
Kildee
Lawrence
Levin
Miller

Moolenaar
Trott
Upton
Walberg

MINNESOTA

Emmer
Kline

McColum
Paulsen

Peterson
Walz

MISSISSIPPI

Harper

Palazzo
Thompson

MISSOURI

Clay
Cleaver
Graves

Hartzler
Long
Luetkemeyer

Smith
Wagner

MONTANA

Zinke

NEBRASKA

Ashford

Fortenberry
Smith

NEVADA

Heck
Titus

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Quinta

Kuster

NEW JERSEY

Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Lance
LoBiondo

MacArthur
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell

Payne
Sires
Smith
Watson Coleman

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

NEW MEXICO
Lujan Grisham Luján, Ben Ray Pearce

NEW YORK
Collins King Slaughter
Gibson Reed Stefanik
Jeffries Rice Zeldin
Katko Serrano

NORTH CAROLINA
Adams Holding Meadows
Butterfield Hudson
Ellmers Jones Rouzer
Foxy McHenry Walker

NORTH DAKOTA

Cramer

OHIO
Beatty Jordan Stivers
Boehner Joyce Tiberi
Chabot Kaptur Turner
Fudge Latta Wenstrup
Gibbs Renacci
Johnson Ryan

OKLAHOMA
Bridenstine Lucas Russell
Cole Mullin

OREGON
Blumenauer DeFazio Walden
Bonamici Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA
Barletta Doyle Murphy
Boyle Fattah Perry
Brady Fitzpatrick Pitts
Cartwright Kelly Rothfus
Costello Marino Shuster
Dent Meehan Thompson

RHODE ISLAND

Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clyburn Mulvaney Wilson
Duncan Rice

SOUTH DAKOTA

Noem

TENNESSEE
Black Cooper Fincher
Blackburn DesJarlais Fleischmann
Cohen Duncan Roe

TEXAS

Babin Granger Olson
Barton Green, Al O'Rourke
Brady Green, Gene Poe
Burgess Hensarling Ratcliffe
Castro Hinojosa Sessions
Conaway Hurd Smith
Cuellar Jackson Lee Thornberry
Culberson Johnson, E. B. Veasey
Doggett Johnson, Sam Vela
Farenthold Marchant Weber
Flores McCaul Williams
Gohmert Neugebauer

UTAH

Bishop Love
Chaffetz Stewart

VIRGINIA

Beyer Forbes Rigell
Brat Goodlatte Scott
Comstock Griffith Wittman
Connolly Hurt

WASHINGTON

DelBene Larsen Newhouse
Heck McDermott Reichert
Herrera Beutler McMorris Smith
Kilmer Rodgers

WEST VIRGINIA

Jenkins McKinley Mooney

WISCONSIN
Duffy Moore Ryan
Grothman Pocan Sensenbrenner
Kind Ribble

WYOMING

Lummis

□ 1236

The CLERK. Four hundred and one Representatives-elect have recorded their presence. A quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CLERK

The CLERK. Credentials, regular in form, have been received showing the election of:

The Honorable PEDRO R. PIERLUISI as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for a term of 4 years beginning January 3, 2013;

The Honorable ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON as Delegate from the District of Columbia;

The Honorable MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO as Delegate from Guam;

The Honorable STACEY E. PLASKETT as Delegate from the Virgin Islands;

The Honorable AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN as Delegate from American Samoa; and

The Honorable GREGORIO SABLAN as Delegate from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The CLERK. The Clerk is in receipt of a letter from the Honorable MICHAEL G. GRIMM of New York indicating that he will not serve in the House in the 114th Congress.

Without objection, the letters relating to his resignation will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 2, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I am writing to inform you that I have notified Cesar Perales, Secretary of State of the State of New York of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives effective January 5, 2015. A copy of that letter is attached.

I do not intend to take the oath of office of Representative for the Eleventh District of New York in the 114th Congress.

It has been a tremendous honor to represent the Eleventh Congressional District of New York. This decision is made with a heavy heart, as I have enjoyed a very special relationship and closeness with my constituents, whom I care about deeply, it is now time for me to start the next chapter of my life.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve the hardworking families of Staten Island and Brooklyn, and I am sincerely grateful for the love and support that I have received from so many over the past few difficult months. I have seen first-hand how extraordinary the people of this District are—their values, their love of community, and

their care for each other in the best and worst of times—it is humbling. I am grateful, and I will always keep them in my prayers.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GRIMM,
*Member of Congress,
Eleventh District of New York.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 2, 2015.

CESAR PERALES,
Secretary of State, State of New York, Albany, NY.

DEAR SECRETARY PERALES: I am writing to resign my position as United States Representative from the Eleventh Congressional District of New York, effective January 5, 2015. It has been a tremendous honor to represent the Eleventh Congressional District.

This decision is made with a heavy heart, as I have enjoyed a very special relationship and closeness with my constituents, whom I care about deeply, it is now time for me to start the next chapter of my life.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve the hardworking families of Staten Island and Brooklyn, and I am sincerely grateful for the love and support that I have received from so many over the past few difficult months. I have seen first-hand how extraordinary the people of this District are—their values, their love of community, and their care for each other in the best and worst of times—it is humbling. I am grateful, and I will always keep them in my prayers.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GRIMM,
*Member of Congress,
Eleventh District of New York.*

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. Pursuant to law and precedent, the next order of business is the election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress.

Nominations are now in order.

The Clerk recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Clerk, it is an honor to address the House at the start of the 114th Congress. If there is one thing I have learned as a legislator, it is that we cannot achieve great things alone. It takes a willingness to come together, find common ground, and advance solutions that make people's lives better. In that spirit, I welcome America's new Congress, one that will chart the path towards a government that is more open, transparent, and trustworthy.

To lead us on this path, the Republican Conference has nominated a man of great character and conviction. The second oldest of 12 children, he grew up mopping floors and waiting tables at his family's tavern. He ran a successful small business. He was elected to the Ohio State House and then this House, where he served as committee chairman, Republican Conference chairman, minority leader, majority leader, and Speaker. He is a reformer who works every day to make government more

accountable to the people. For all of this, he calls himself a regular guy with a big job; and that job, he says, is to listen, because if we listen to the people, listen to one another, there is no telling what we can accomplish together for the future of this great country.

Madam Clerk, as chair of the Republican Conference and by unanimous vote of that conference, I present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress the name of the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, our dear friend and colleague, a Representative-elect from the State of Ohio.

The CLERK. The Clerk now recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Clerk, first I would like to recognize each and every Member who has taken to this floor to represent the people of the United States and say congratulations to them and to all of their loved ones who are here witnessing this solemn event where we will have an opportunity to lead our country. We say congratulations to them as well.

Madam Clerk, I have the distinct pleasure of nominating someone who is a proven leader, someone who already will go down in history as one of the most effective Speakers the House of Representatives has ever seen, someone who has shown that it doesn't take a man to get the job done, that it can be done by an American who is devoted to this country, someone who knows her heritage, someone who has worked tirelessly for the American people, but someone who understands first and foremost that the job of this House is to get things done.

I have been empowered, Madam Clerk, to nominate on behalf of all working Americans, those Americans who still believe in the American Dream, to put the name of the gentlewoman from San Francisco who will serve again in the House of Representatives, put her name forward for the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress. I, therefore, at this point put before you the name of NANCY PELOSI to serve as the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The CLERK. The names of the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, a Representative-elect from the State of Ohio, and the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, a Representative-elect from the State of California, have been placed in nomination.

Are there further nominations?

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Clerk, I present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress the name of the Honorable TED YOHO, a great defender of the Constitution and Representative-elect from the great State of Florida.

The CLERK. Are there further nominations?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Clerk, I present for the election of the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress the name of Judge LOUIE GOHMERT, a Representative-elect from the great State of Texas.

Madam Clerk, Judge GOHMERT proudly serves the First District of Texas. He is serving his fifth term in the House of Representatives. Prior to being elected to serve in Congress, he was elected to three terms as district judge in Smith County and was appointed by Governor Rick Perry to be the chief justice of the 12th Court of Appeals.

Madam Clerk, this is not about Judge GOHMERT; it is about establishing a strong check on the executive branch. I think a quote applies to my friend LOUIE GOHMERT. It is from Mark Twain. He said:

In the beginning of a change, the patriot is a scarce man, and he is brave and hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot.

My constituents from the First District of Oklahoma are looking for this kind of patriot.

The CLERK. Are there further nominations?

□ 1245

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Clerk, I rise to place in a nomination for election to the constitutional office of Speaker of the United States House of Representatives a man who has served as speaker of the statehouse, a man who respects this institution, a man who understands that power and principle cannot coexist without recognizing the sanctity of each Member's vote in this House of Representatives, a man who will restore this institution of the House of Representatives. I place in nomination the name of DANIEL WEBSTER, a Representative-elect from the great State of Florida.

The CLERK. Are there further nominations?

The names of the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, a Representative-elect from the State of Ohio; the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, a Representative-elect from the State of California; the Honorable TED YOHO, a Representative-elect from the State of Florida; the Honorable LOUIE GOHMERT, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas; and the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER, a Representative-elect from the State of Florida, have been placed in nomination.

Are there further nominations?

There being no further nominations, the Clerk appoints the following tellers:

The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER);

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY);

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR); and

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

The tellers will come forward and take their seats at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding to their names will indicate by surname the nominee of their choosing.

The Reading Clerk will now call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for the Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]
BOEHNER—216

Abraham	Hanna	Pearce
Aderholt	Hardy	Perry
Allen	Harper	Pittenger
Amodel	Harris	Pitts
Barletta	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Barr	Heck (NV)	Poliquin
Barton	Hensarling	Pompeo
Benishek	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Reichert
Black	Hudson	Renacci
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Bost	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hunter	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Jolly	Roskam
Calvert	Jordan	Ross
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Rothfus
Chabot	Katko	Rouzer
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Coffman	King (NY)	Russell
Cole	Kinzing (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Collins (GA)	Kline	Salmon
Collins (NY)	Knight	Sanford
Comstock	Labrador	Scalise
Conaway	LaMalfa	Schock
Cook	Lamborn	Schweikert
Costello (PA)	Lance	Scott, Austin
Cramer	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Crawford	LoBiondo	Sessions
Crenshaw	Long	Shimkus
Culberson	Loudermilk	Shuster
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Stefanik
Dold	Marino	Stewart
Duffy	McCarthy	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McClintock	Thornberry
Emmer	McHenry	Tiberi
Farenthold	McKinley	Tipton
Fincher	McMorris	Trott
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Turner
Fleischmann	McSally	Upton
Fleming	Meehan	Valadao
Flores	Messer	Wagner
Forbes	Mica	Walberg
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walden
Fox	Miller (MI)	Walker
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi
Gibbs	Mullin	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Westerman
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Williams
Graves (MO)	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Griffith	Nunes	Wittman
Grothman	Olson	Womack
Quinta	Palazzo	
Guthrie	Paulsen	

Woodall	Young (IA)	Zeldin
Yoder	Young (IN)	Zinke

PELOSI—164

Adams	Fudge	Neal
Aguilar	Gabbard	Norcross
Ashford	Gallego	O'Rourke
Bass	Garamendi	Pallone
Beatty	Grayson	Pascarell
Becerra	Green, Al	Payne
Bera	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Beyer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peters
Blumenauer	Hahn	Peterson
Bonamici	Hastings	Pingree
Boyle (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Hoyer	Richmond
Butterfield	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Israel	Ruiz
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rush
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Kaptur	T.
Castor (FL)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Chu (CA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schrader
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sires
Cuellar	Lawrence	Slaughter
Cummings	Lee	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lieu (CA)	Takai
DeGette	Loeb	Takano
Delaney	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Torres
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Dingell	(NM)	Van Hollen
Doggett	Lynch	Vargas
Doyle (PA)	Matsui	Veasey
Edwards	McCollum	Vela
Ellison	McDermott	Visclosky
Eshoo	McGovern	Walz
Esty	McNerney	Wasserman
Farr	Moore	Schultz
Fattah	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth

WEBSTER (FL)—12

Blum	Jones	Posey
Garrett	King (IA)	Rigell
Gosar	Meadows	Stutzman
Huelskamp	Nugent	Webster (FL)

GOHMERT—3

Bridenstine	Gohmert	Weber (TX)
-------------	---------	------------

YOH0—2

Massie	Yoho
--------	------

JORDAN—2

Amash	DesJarlais
-------	------------

DUNCAN (SC)—1

Brat

HON. RAND PAUL—1

Clawson (FL)

COLIN POWELL—1

Cooper

GOWDY—1

Duncan (SC)

MCCARTHY—1

Gibson

COOPER—1

Graham

DEFAZIO—1

Lipinski

HON. JEFF SESSIONS—1

Palmer

LEWIS—1

Sinema

PRESENT—1

Babin

NOT VOTING—25

Boehner	Higgins	Nunnelee
Carter (TX)	Lowey	Price (NC)
Cicilline	Maloney,	Rangel
Clarke (NY)	Carolyn	Tonko
Costa	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Crowley	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Duckworth	Meng	Welch
Engel	Nadler	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Nolan	

□ 1402

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tallies that the total number of votes cast is 408, of which the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER of the State of Ohio has received 216, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI of the State of California has received 164, the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER of the State of Florida has received 12, the Honorable LOUIE GOHMERT of the State of Texas has received 3, the Honorable TED S. YOH0 of the State of Florida has received 2, the Honorable JIM JORDAN of the State of Ohio has received 2, the Honorable JIM COOPER of the State of Tennessee has received 1, the Honorable PETER A. DEFAZIO of the State of Oregon has received 1, the Honorable JEFF DUNCAN of the State of South Carolina has received 1, the Honorable TREY GOWDY of the State of South Carolina has received 1, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS of the State of Georgia has received 1, the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY of the State of California has received 1, the Honorable RAND PAUL of the Commonwealth of Kentucky has received 1, the Honorable JEFF SESSIONS of the State of Alabama has received 1, and the Honorable Colin Powell has received 1, with 1 recorded as “present.”

Therefore, the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER of the State of Ohio, having received a majority of the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY)

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI)

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE)

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER)

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS)

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN)

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN)

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA)

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER)

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL)

The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS)

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO)

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX)

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS)

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS)

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN)

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS)

The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN)

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY)

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS)

And the Members of the Ohio delegation:

Ms. KAPTUR

Mr. CHABOT

Mr. TIBERI

Mr. RYAN

Mr. TURNER

Mr. JORDAN

Mr. LATTI

Ms. FUDGE

Mr. GIBBS

Mr. JOHNSON

Mr. RENACCI

Mr. STIVERS

Mrs. BEATTY

Mr. JOYCE, and

Mr. WENSTRUP

The committee will retire from the Chamber to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

The Sergeant at Arms announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 114th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the Committee of Escort.

Ms. PELOSI. My colleagues of the United States House of Representatives, it is a high honor to welcome you and your families to the 114th Congress.

To our newest Members, this is a special pleasure to give you an exceptional welcome and congratulations. Welcome to our newest Members.

As was indicated by the vote, many of our colleagues from the State of New York are not with us because they are attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo. I extend condolences to our colleagues from the State of New York and have extended the sympathies of many in this body to Governor Cuomo's widow, Matilda, and to his family. As an Italian American, I am especially proud of his leadership and extend sympathies to his family. Thank you, Cuomo family. Thank you, New York delegation.

None of us would be standing here without the support and the strength of our families. Today, I am going to

thank my dear husband of 51 years, Paul Pelosi, and my five children and nine grandchildren, all the Pelosis and D'Alessandros. Let all of us applaud all of our families.

To my Democratic colleagues and to my constituents in San Francisco, I thank you for the privilege of serving in the House, but to my colleagues, I thank you for the honor of serving as leader, but all of us should applaud all of our constituents for sending us here. So let us, again, applaud our constituents.

Each one of us, Mr. Speaker, as you know, represents Republicans, represents Democrats, Independents, and others, and we should always pay tribute to the American people. The American people have called upon each of us to serve them. They have entrusted us with their hopes, their dreams, and they have asked us to address their challenges.

The financial stability of a strong middle class and those who aspire to it is the bedrock of our economy and the backbone of our American democracy. We have a moral imperative to ensure that working men and women enjoy the bounty of their unprecedented productivity and to expand the purchasing power of families.

To that end, today, Democrats will put forward a legislative package to put Americans back to work building our roads and bridges and meeting the needs of the American people, paid for by bringing our tax dollars back home and to increase the paycheck of America's working families.

We invite our Republican colleagues to join us in supporting the Stop Corporate Expatriation and Invest in America's Infrastructure Act. It is time to stop rewarding companies to move overseas and instead use those dollars to create good-paying jobs here at home.

We ask for Republican support and action on the CEO-Employee Pay Fairness Act, legislation to ensure that workers share in the fruit of their productivity, denying CEOs the ability to claim tax deductions on annual income over \$1 million unless they give their employees a well-deserved raise.

We must have an economy that works for everyone, not just the privileged few, and we hope Republicans will join us to achieve a better infrastructure and bigger paychecks for the working people of our country—better infrastructure, bigger paychecks.

We open this 114th Congress in the year we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act, one of the most consequential pieces of legislation in our history. President Lyndon Johnson and Congress passed it. The President signed it. Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., and others, along with our own JOHN LEWIS, fought for it and inspired it. We must continue to inspire the engagement of every Amer-

ican. It is the vote that preserves our democracy, ends injustice, advances dreams, and sustains our freedom.

In terms of protecting our freedom, let us recognize, salute, and thank all of those brave Americans who protect our rights—indeed, protect all of our liberty—our men and women in uniform, our veterans, and our military families.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are at the start of a new year and a new Congress, with fresh opportunity for the American people. Today is the Feast of the Epiphany, the visit of the magi; so let us have our own epiphany, for this moment, on this day, we are not just Republicans and Democrats, we are Americans not just in name, but in spirit, standing on higher ground than the last election.

My hope is that in the inevitable exchanges and clashes that may happen in the months ahead, we will not lose sight of the truth that is as fresh as this ceremony is today and as historic as our Republic that the ideals that unite us are stronger than the issues that divide us in this House.

That does not mean that we are dispensing with all disagreements in this debate. Our democracy is robust precisely because we have beliefs and we stand proudly, even persistently, for them; and our democracy endures and prevails because in the end, we are humble enough to find a way forward together.

My fellow colleagues of the 114th Congress, let us uphold our deep and different convictions, but let us honor our common obligation to our country. In this Congress, we will do so under the leadership of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER.

□ 1415

This House will continue to be led by a proud son of Ohio and a happy fan of the Ohio State football team. A man of abiding faith, great heart, and deep dedication, JOHN BOEHNER is truly a gentleman from Ohio.

Congratulations to you, JOHN, to Mr. Speaker, to Debbie, to your daughters, Lindsay and Tricia, and the entire Boehner family. Thank you for sharing JOHN BOEHNER with us. God bless you and your family, Mr. Speaker.

May God continue to bless the Members of the House of Representatives. This is the people's House. This is the people's gavel. In the people's name, it is my privilege to hand it to the Speaker of the House for the 114th Congress, the Honorable JOHN BOEHNER.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker, and God bless America.

Mr. BOEHNER. Thank you.

Friends, colleagues, countrymen, and especially the people of Ohio's Eighth Congressional District, thank you for sending me here. Let us today welcome all of the new Members and all of their families to what we all know to be a truly historic day.

As we welcome all of the Members back who were reelected, we want to welcome your families as well, and I want to thank my family. I was doing pretty well on the walk over here from my ceremonial office until I ran into DEVIN NUNES' three little girls—my three biggest fans—and one of them came running over and gave me a kiss, and I was a mess.

This is the day the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad. We rejoice that our new Members and families are here. We welcome them. We are glad and humbled to begin anew as servants of the people's House. Here, it is our duty and our privilege to lend a willing ear to the people, to make laws in tune with their priorities and within the limits of their Constitution.

In recent months, our economy has shown signs of improvement, and after difficult years, it may be a temptation to accept what I will call the new normal. But America did not become exceptional by ease. Far too many Americans remain out of work, and too many are working harder only to lose ground to stagnant wages and rising costs. We can do better. We can build an economy that furthers better-paying jobs, more growth, and more opportunity for the Nation's middle class. This is our vital task.

We will begin this endeavor on common ground, both in letter and in spirit. It was actually my predecessor, Nicholas Longworth of Cincinnati, who changed the order of things so that all Members now take the oath of office at the same time. He called this innovation a timesaving device. He sounds like my kind of guy. But this shared ritual is no passing formality. It is a frontier where words end and where deeds begin.

The pessimists don't see us crossing this channel. They say nothing is going to be accomplished here, that division is wider than ever and so gridlock will be even greater. Frankly, fair enough. Skepticism of our government is healthy and, in our time, quite understandable. But one problem with saying it can't be done is that it already has been done—or at least started.

In the last Congress, this House passed a number of jobs bills with broad support from the majority and the minority, and we will begin our work on this common ground, taking up measures to develop North American energy, restore the hours of middle class workers, and help small businesses hire more of our veterans. We invite the President to support and sign these bipartisan initiatives into law. It will be a good start; and more, it will be a sign that the logjam is breaking, and it will be a foundation on which to address the bigger challenges in the pursuit of freedom and security.

No, this won't be done in a tidy way. The battle of ideas never ends and, frankly, never should. As Speaker, all I

ask—and, frankly, expect—is that we disagree without being disagreeable. In return, I pledge to help each of you carry out your duties. My door, of course, is always open. Now don't get carried away with it—all right?—but it is always open.

My colleagues, some things we do here will be characterized as shadow-boxing and show business, but let me tell you and the American people, it is real work. It is a grind, as it should be, in striving to preserve the things that we all hold dear.

Every day, you and I come out here, try to plant good seeds, cultivate the ground, and take care of the pests; and then, with patience and some sacrifice and God's grace, there will be a harvest. Along the way, we may falter, but we Americans do not fall away from the task. We do not quit.

So let's stand tall and prove the skeptics wrong. Let's make this a time of harvest, and may the fruits of our labors be ladders our children can use to climb the stairs to the stars.

Thank you all, and God bless the United States of America.

I am now ready to take the oath of office.

I ask the Dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS of Michigan, to administer the oath of office.

Mr. CONYERS then administered the oath of office to Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Mr. CONYERS. Congratulations, Mr. Speaker.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to precedent, the Chair will swear in the Members-elect en masse.

The Members-elect will rise and raise their right hands.

The Members-elect rose, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 114th Congress.

MAJORITY LEADER

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from California, the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY.

MINORITY LEADER

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as minority leader the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable NANCY PELOSI.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Republican Conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the Republican Members have selected as majority whip the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable STEVE SCALISE.

MINORITY WHIP AND ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC LEADER

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as minority whip the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable STENY HOYER, and as assistant Democratic leader, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable JAMES CLYBURN.

ELECTING OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1

Resolved, That Karen L. Haas of the State of Maryland, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Paul D. Irving of the State of Florida be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Ed Cassidy of the State of Connecticut be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and

That Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

□ 1430

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the resolution, but

before offering the amendment, I request that there be a division of the question on the resolution so that we may have a separate vote on the Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question will be divided.

The question is on agreeing to that portion of the resolution providing for the election of the Chaplain.

That portion of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the remainder of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECERRA:

That Drew Hammill of the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Wendell Primus of the Commonwealth of Virginia be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; and

That Nadeam Elshami of the Commonwealth of Virginia be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remainder of the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

The remainder of the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now swear in the officers of the House.

The officers presented themselves in the well of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

TO INFORM THE SENATE THAT A QUORUM OF THE HOUSE HAS ASSEMBLED AND OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that John A. Boehner, a Representative from the State of Ohio, has been

elected Speaker; and that Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 3

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 3

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Pursuant to House Resolution 3, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) and

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 4

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected John A. Boehner, a Representative from the State of Ohio as Speaker, and Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland as Clerk, of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 5

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, including applicable provisions of law or concurrent resolution that constituted rules of the House at the end of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, are adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, with amendments to the standing rules as provided in section 2, and with other orders as provided in sections 3, 4, and 5.

SEC. 2. CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES.

(a) COMMITTEES.—

(1) DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN PAYMENTS TO WITNESSES.—Amend clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI to read as follows:

“(5)(A) Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof.

“(B) In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

“(C) The disclosure referred to in subdivision (B) shall include—

“(i) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and

“(ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

“(D) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.”.

(2) JURISDICTIONAL CHANGES.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—In clause 1(1)(7) of rule X, insert before the period “and criminalization”.

(B) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—In clause 1(b) of rule X, add the following:

“(5) Bills and joint resolutions that provide new budget authority, limitation on the use of funds, or other authority relating to new direct loan obligations and new loan guarantee commitments referencing section 504(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.”.

(3) CLARIFYING THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) Clause 4(d)(1)(A) of rule X is amended by striking “for the” and inserting “for the Chief Administrative Officer and the”.

(B) Clause 4(a) of rule II is amended by striking “the oversight” and inserting “the policy direction and oversight”.

(4) COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS.—In clause 1(d) of rule XI—

(A) in subparagraph (1), insert “odd-numbered” after “each”; and

(B) in subparagraph (2)(A), strike “applicable period” and insert “Congress”;

(C) in subparagraph (2)(B), strike “in the case of the first such report in each Congress,”; and

(D) in subparagraph (3), strike “a regular session of Congress, or after December 15” and insert “the last regular session of a Congress, or after December 15 of an even-numbered year”.

(5) DISSENTING VIEWS.—In the standing rules, strike “supplemental, minority, or additional” each place it appears and insert (in each instance) “supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting”.

(6) CONSOLIDATING REQUIREMENTS FOR WRITTEN RULES.—

(A) In clause 2(a)(1) of rule XI—

(i) in subdivision (B) after the semicolon, strike “and”; and

(ii) in subdivision (C), strike the period and insert “; and”; and

(iii) add the following new subdivision:

“(D) shall include provisions to govern the implementation of clause 4 as provided in paragraph (f) of such clause.”.

(B) In clause 4(f) of rule XI, strike “Each committee shall adopt written rules to govern its implementation of this clause. Such rules shall contain provisions to the following effect” and insert “Written rules adopted by each committee pursuant to clause 2(a)(1)(D) shall contain provisions to the following effect”.

(7) CONFORMING COMMITTEE AND HOUSE BROADCAST STANDARDS.—In clause 4(b) of rule XI, strike “used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office” and insert “used for any partisan political campaign purpose or be made available for such use”.

(8) ELIMINATING THE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERING APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES WITHOUT PRINTED HEARINGS.—In clause 4 of rule XIII, strike paragraph (c).

(9) PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.—In clause 11(a)(1) of rule X, strike “20” and insert “22” and strike “12” and insert “13”.

(10) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Clause 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(s) The committee may not take any action that would deny any person any right or protection provided under the Constitution of the United States.”.

(b) BIPARTISAN LEGAL ADVISORY GROUP.—Amend clause 8 of rule II to read as follows:

“8.(a) There is established an Office of General Counsel for the purpose of providing legal assistance and representation to the House. Legal assistance and representation shall be provided without regard to political affiliation. The Speaker shall appoint and set the annual rate of pay for employees of the Office of General Counsel. The Office of General Counsel shall function pursuant to the direction of the Speaker, who shall consult with the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group.

“(b) There is established a Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group composed of the Speaker and the majority and minority leaderships. Unless otherwise provided by the House, the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group speaks for, and articulates the institutional position of, the House in all litigation matters.”.

(c) COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.—

(1) Amend rule XIII by adding the following:

“Estimates of major legislation

“8.(a) An estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

“(b) An estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

“(c) An estimate referred to in this clause shall, to the extent practicable, include—

“(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in paragraphs (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that set forth appropriate levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

“(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

“(d) As used in this clause—

“(1) the term ‘major legislation’ means any bill or joint resolution—

“(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

“(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

“(2) the term ‘budgetary effects’ means changes in revenues, outlays, and deficits.”.

(2) Amend clause 3(h) of rule XIII—

(A) by striking “(1)”, by striking “(A)” and inserting “(1)”, and by striking “(B)” and inserting “(2)”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (2).

(d) PROVIDING FOR RECONVENING AUTHORITY FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In clause 12 of rule I, add the following:

“(e) During any recess or adjournment of not more than three days, if in the opinion of the Speaker the public interest so warrants, then the Speaker, after consultation with the Minority Leader, may reconvene the House at a time other than that previously appointed, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, and notify Members accordingly.

“(f) The Speaker may name a designee for purposes of paragraphs (c), (d), and (e).”.

(e) PROVIDING CONFERENCE COMMITTEES WITH TIME TO REACH AGREEMENT.—In clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII, strike “20” and insert “45” and strike “10” and insert “25”.

(f) CONTENTS OF COMMITTEE REPORTS SHOWING CHANGES TO EXISTING LAW.—Clause 3(e)(1) of rule XIII is amended by striking “accompanying document—” and all that follows and inserting “accompanying document—

“(A) the entire text of each section of a statute that is proposed to be repealed or amended; and

“(B) a comparative print of each amendment to a section of a statute that the bill or joint resolution proposes to make, showing by appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed.”.

(g) MANDATORY ETHICS TRAINING FOR NEW MEMBERS.—Clause 3(a)(6)(B)(i) of rule XI is amended by striking “new officer or employee” and inserting “new Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CHANGES.—

(1) UPDATING REFERENCES TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION.—

(A) In clause 3(h) of rule XIII, strike “Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation” each place it appears and insert (in each instance) “Joint Committee on Taxation”; and

(B) In clause 11(a) of rule XXII, strike “Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation” and insert “Joint Committee on Taxation”.

(2) UPDATING CROSS-REFERENCES.—

(A) In clause 2(i)(2) of rule II, strike “31b-5” and insert “5128”.

(B) In clause 3 of rule XXVI, strike “pursuant to clause 1” and insert “by August 1 of each year”.

SEC. 3. SEPARATE ORDERS.

(a) INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 1899A(d) of the Social Security Act shall not apply in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(b) STAFF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES.—

(1) During the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, the chair of a committee designated in paragraph (3), upon consultation with the ranking minority member of such committee, may order the taking of depositions, including pursuant to subpoena, by a member or counsel of such committee.

(2) Depositions taken under the authority prescribed in this subsection shall be subject to regulations issued by the chair of the Committee on Rules and printed in the Congressional Record.

(3) The committees referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows: the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(c) PROVIDING FOR TRANSPARENCY WITH RESPECT TO MEMORIALS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO ARTICLE V OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—With respect to any memorial presented under clause 3 of rule XII purporting to be an application of the legislature of a State calling for a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States pursuant to Article V, or a rescission of any such prior application—

(1) the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary shall, in the case of such a memorial presented in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and may, in the case of such a memorial presented prior to the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, designate any such memorial for public availability by the Clerk; and

(2) the Clerk shall make such memorials as are designated pursuant to paragraph (1) publicly available in electronic form, organized by State of origin and year of receipt.

(d) SPENDING REDUCTION AMENDMENTS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.—

(1) During the reading of a general appropriation bill for amendment in the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it shall be in order to consider en bloc amendments proposing only to transfer appropriations from an object or objects in the bill to a spending reduction account. When considered en bloc under this paragraph, such amendments may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment (following disposition of any points of order against such portions) and are not subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a spending reduction account in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

(3) It shall not be in order to consider an amendment to a general appropriation bill proposing a net increase in budget authority in the bill (unless considered en bloc with another amendment or amendments proposing an equal or greater decrease in such budget authority pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI).

(4) A point of order under clause 2(b) of rule XXI shall not apply to a spending reduction account.

(5) A general appropriation bill may not be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union unless it includes a spending reduction account as the last section of the bill. An order to report a general appropriation bill to the House shall constitute authority for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations to add such a section to the bill or modify the figure contained therein.

(6) For purposes of this subsection, the term “spending reduction account” means an account in a general appropriation bill that bears that caption and contains only a recitation of the amount by which an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of new budget authority proposed by the bill.

(e) BUDGET MATTERS.—

(1)(A) During the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, pending the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2015—

(i) the provisions of titles III, IV, and VI of House Concurrent Resolution 25, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though Congress has adopted such concurrent resolution;

(ii) the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels as contained in the statement of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2014, as adjusted in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels under titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(iii) all references in titles IV and VI of House Concurrent Resolution 25, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, to a fiscal year shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be references to the succeeding fiscal year; and

(iv) all references in titles IV and VI of House Concurrent Resolution 25, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, to allocations, aggregates, or other appropriate levels in “this concurrent resolution” (or, in the case of section 408 of such concurrent resolution, “this resolution”) shall be considered for all purposes in the House to be references to the allocations, aggregates, or other appropriate

levels contained in the statement of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2014, as adjusted in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(B) The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels provided for in subparagraph (A)(ii) for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2025.

(C) The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels provided for in subparagraph (A)(ii) to take into account the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

(2)(A) During the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, except as provided in subparagraph (C), a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report a bill to the House shall not be in order if the bill, as amended, exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as estimated by the Committee on the Budget.

(B) If a point of order under subparagraph (A) is sustained, the Chair shall put the question: "Shall the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted notwithstanding that the bill exceeds its allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974?". Such question shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the question and an opponent but shall be decided without intervening motion.

(C) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply—

(i) to a motion offered under clause 2(d) of rule XXI; or

(ii) after disposition of a question under subparagraph (B) on a given bill.

(D) If a question under subparagraph (B) is decided in the negative, no further amendment shall be in order except—

(i) one proper amendment, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and

(ii) pro forma amendments, if offered by the chair or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, for the purpose of debate.

(f) CONTINUING LITIGATION AUTHORITIES.—

(1) OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM AND THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL.—

(A) The House authorizes—

(i) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress to act as the successor in interest to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress and the One Hundred Twelfth Congress with respect to the civil action Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, United States House of Representatives v. Eric H. Holder, Jr., in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States, filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress pursuant to House Resolution 706; and

(ii) the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elect-

ed), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Office of General Counsel to take such steps as may be appropriate to ensure continuation of such civil action, including amending the complaint as circumstances may warrant.

(B) The House authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and until such committee has adopted rules pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI, to issue subpoenas related to the investigation into the United States Department of Justice operation known as "Fast and Furious" and related matters.

(C) The House authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Office of General Counsel to petition to join as a party to the civil action referenced in paragraph (1) any individual subpoenaed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress or the One Hundred Twelfth Congress as part of its investigation into the United States Department of Justice operation known as "Fast and Furious" and related matters who failed to comply with such subpoena, or any successor to such individual.

(D) The House authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected), on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Office of General Counsel, at the authorization of the Speaker after consultation with the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, to initiate judicial proceedings concerning the enforcement of subpoenas issued to such individuals.

(2) THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL.—

(A) The House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress is authorized to act as the successor in interest to the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress with respect to the civil action United States House of Representatives v. Sylvia Mathews Burwell, in her official capacity as the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, et al., filed by the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress pursuant to House Resolution 676; and

(B) The House authorizes the Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives, and the Office of General Counsel to take such steps as may be appropriate to ensure continuation of such civil action, including amending the complaint as circumstances may warrant.

(C) The authorities provided by House Resolution 676 of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress remain in full force and effect in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(3) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TESTIMONY.—The House authorizes Michael W. Sheehy to provide testimony in the criminal action United States v. Jeffrey Sterling in accordance with the authorizations provided to Mr. Sheehy by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress and the One Hundred Twelfth Congress.

(g) DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

(1) The chair of a committee may request that the Government Accountability Office perform a duplication analysis of any bill or joint resolution referred to that committee. Any such analysis shall assess whether, and the extent to which, the bill or joint resolu-

tion creates a new Federal program, office, or initiative that duplicates or overlaps with any existing Federal program, office, or initiative.

(2) The report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution that establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government shall include a statement, as though under clause 3(c) of rule XIII, indicating whether any such program is known to be duplicative of another such program. The statement shall at a minimum explain whether—

(A) any such program was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139; or

(B) the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220, as amended by Public Law 98-169), identified other programs related to the program established or reauthorized by the measure.

(h) ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) It shall not be in order to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, unless it contains a separate heading entitled "Direct Spending", which shall include a category for "Means-Tested Direct Spending" and a category for "Nonmeans-Tested Direct Spending" and sets forth—

(A) the average rate of growth for each category in the total amount of outlays during the 10-year period preceding the budget year;

(B) estimates for each such category under current law for the period covered by the concurrent resolution; and

(C) information on proposed reforms in such categories.

(2) Before the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget by the Committee on the Budget for a fiscal year, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record a description of programs which shall be considered means-tested direct spending and nonmeans-tested direct spending for purposes of this subsection.

(i) DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULEMAKINGS.—

(1) The report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution shall include a statement, as though under clause 3(c) of rule XIII, estimating the number of directed rule makings required by the measure.

(2) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term "directed rule making" means a specific rule making within the meaning of section 551 of title 5, United States Code, specifically directed to be completed by a provision in the measure, but does not include a grant of discretionary rule making authority.

(j) SUBCOMMITTEES.—Notwithstanding clause 5(d) of rule X, during the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress—

(1) the Committee on Agriculture may have not more than six subcommittees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services may have not more than seven subcommittees;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have not more than seven subcommittees; and

(4) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may have not more than six subcommittees.

(k) EXERCISE FACILITIES FOR FORMER MEMBERS.—During the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress—

(1) The House of Representatives may not provide access to any exercise facility which is made available exclusively to Members and former Members, officers and former officers of the House of Representatives, and

their spouses to any former Member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or any successor statute or agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause 5 of rule XXV. For purposes of this section, the term "Member" includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

(2) The Committee on House Administration shall promulgate regulations to carry out this subsection.

(l) **NUMBERING OF BILLS.**—In the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, the first 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 1 through H.R. 10) shall be reserved for assignment by the Speaker and the second 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 11 through H.R. 20) shall be reserved for assignment by the Minority Leader.

(m) **INCLUSION OF CITATIONS FOR PROPOSED REPEALS AND AMENDMENTS.**—To the maximum extent practicable and consistent with established drafting conventions, an instruction in a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend any law or part thereof not contained in a codified title of the United States Code shall include, in parentheses immediately following the designation of the matter proposed to be repealed or amended, the applicable United States Code citation (which may be a note in the United States Code), or, if no such citation is available, an appropriate alternative citation to the applicable law or part.

(n) **BROADENING AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATIVE DOCUMENTS IN MACHINE READABLE FORMATS.**—The Committee on House Administration, the Clerk, and other officers and officials of the House shall continue efforts to broaden the availability of legislative documents in machine readable formats in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress in furtherance of the institutional priority of improving public availability and use of legislative information produced by the House and its committees.

(o) **TEMPORARY DESIGNATION.**—Pending the designation of a location by the Committee on House Administration pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXIX, documents may be made publicly available in electronic form at an electronic document repository operated by the Clerk.

(p) **CONGRESSIONAL MEMBER ORGANIZATION TRANSPARENCY REFORM.**—

(1) **PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND EXPENSES THROUGH ACCOUNT OF ORGANIZATION.**—A Member of the House of Representatives and an eligible Congressional Member Organization may enter into an agreement under which—

(A) an employee of the Member's office may carry out official and representational duties of the Member by assignment to the Organization; and

(B) to the extent that the employee carries out such duties under the agreement, the Member shall transfer the portion of the Members' Representation Allowance of the Member which would otherwise be used for the salary and related expenses of the employee to a dedicated account in the House of Representatives which is administered by the Organization, in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Committee on House Administration under paragraph (2).

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—The Committee on House Administration (hereafter referred to as the "Committee") shall promulgate regulations as follows:

(A) **USE OF MRA.**—Pursuant to the authority of section 101(d) of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5341(d)), the Committee shall prescribe regulations to

provide that an eligible Congressional Member Organization may use the amounts transferred to the Organization's dedicated account under paragraph (1)(B) for the same purposes for which a Member of the House of Representatives may use the Members' Representational Allowance, except that the Organization may not use such amounts for franked mail, official travel, or leases of space or vehicles.

(B) **MAINTENANCE OF LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF SHARED EMPLOYEES.**—Pursuant to the authority of section 104(d) of the House of Representatives Administrative Reform Technical Corrections Act (2 U.S.C. 5321(d)), the Committee shall prescribe regulations to provide that an employee of the office of a Member of the House of Representatives who is covered by an agreement entered into under paragraph (1) between the Member and an eligible Congressional Member Organization shall be considered a shared employee of the Member's office and the Organization for purposes of such section, and shall include in such regulations appropriate accounting standards to ensure that a Member of the House of Representatives who enters into an agreement with such an Organization under paragraph (1) does not employ more employees than the Member is authorized to employ under such section.

(C) **PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.**—Pursuant to the authority of section 105(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 4536(b)), relating to the student loan repayment program for employees of the House, the Committee shall promulgate regulations to provide that, in the case of an employee who is covered by an agreement entered into under paragraph (1) between a Member of the House of Representatives and an eligible Congressional Member Organization and who participates in such program while carrying out duties under the agreement—

(i) any funds made available for making payments under the program with respect to the employee shall be transferred to the Organization's dedicated account under paragraph (1)(B); and

(ii) the Organization shall use the funds to repay a student loan taken out by the employee, under the same terms and conditions which would apply under the program if the Organization were the employing office of the employee.

(D) **ACCESS TO HOUSE SERVICES.**—The Committee shall prescribe regulations to ensure that an eligible Congressional Member Organization has appropriate access to services of the House.

(E) **OTHER REGULATIONS.**—The Committee shall promulgate such other regulations as may be appropriate to carry out this subsection.

(3) **ELIGIBLE CONGRESSIONAL MEMBER ORGANIZATION DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term "eligible Congressional Member Organization" means, with respect to the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, an organization meeting each of the following requirements:

(A) The organization is registered as a Congressional Member Organization with the Committee on House Administration.

(B) The organization designates a single Member of the House of Representatives to be responsible for the administration of the organization, including the administration of the account administered under paragraph (1)(B), and includes the identification of such Member with the statement of organization that the organization files and maintains with the Committee on House Administration.

(C) At least 3 employees of the House are assigned to work for the organization.

(D) During the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, at least 30 Members of the House of Representatives used a portion of the Members' Representational Allowance of the Member for the salary and related expenses of an employee who was a shared employee of the Member's office and the organization.

(E) The organization files a statement with the Committee on House Administration and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives certifying that it will administer an account in accordance with paragraph (1)(B).

(q) **SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—

(1) **POINT OF ORDER.**—During the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 4. COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, AND HOUSE OFFICES.

(a) **SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI.**—House Resolution 567, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, shall apply in the same manner as such resolution applied in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, except that notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI, the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi may adopt a rule or motion permitting members of the select committee to question a witness for ten minutes until such time as each member of the select committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question such witness.

(b) **HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP.**—House Resolution 24, One Hundred Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress in the same manner as such resolution applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress except that the commission concerned shall be known as the House Democracy Partnership.

(c) **TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.**—Sections 1 through 7 of House Resolution 1451, One Hundred Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress in the same manner as such provisions applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress, except that—

(1) the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission may, in addition to collaborating closely with other professional staff members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, collaborate closely with professional staff members of other relevant committees; and

(2) the resources of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which the Commission may use shall include all resources which the Committee is authorized to obtain from other offices of the House of Representatives.

(d) **OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS.**—Section 1 of House Resolution 895, One Hundred

Tenth Congress, shall apply in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress in the same manner as such provision applied in the One Hundred Tenth Congress, except that—

(1) the Office of Congressional Ethics shall be treated as a standing committee of the House for purposes of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i));

(2) references to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall be construed as references to the Committee on Ethics;

(3) the second sentence of section 1(b)(6)(A) shall not apply;

(4) members subject to section 1(b)(6)(B) may be reappointed for a second additional term;

(5) any individual who is the subject of a preliminary review or second-phase review by the board shall be informed of the right to be represented by counsel and invoking that right should not be held negatively against them; and

(6) the Office may not take any action that would deny any person any right or protection provided under the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 5. ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The Speaker may recognize a Member for the reading of the Constitution on any legislative day through January 16, 2015.

Mr. MCCARTHY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO REFER

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion that is at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. NORTON moves to refer the resolution to a select committee of five members, to be appointed by the Speaker, not more than three of whom shall be from the same political party, with instructions not to report back the same until it has conducted a full and complete study of, and made a determination on, whether there is any reason to deny Delegates voting rights in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in light of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Michel v. Anderson* (14 F.3d 623 (D.C. Cir. 1994)) upholding the constitutionality of such voting rights, and the inclusion of such voting rights in the Rules for the 103rd, 110th and 111th Congresses.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to table at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to table.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCCARTHY moves to lay on the table the motion to refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 160, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—230

Abraham	Hardy	Pittenger
Aderholt	Harper	Pitts
Allen	Harris	Poe (TX)
Amash	Hartzler	Poliquin
Amodei	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Barletta	Hensarling	Posey
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Price (GA)
Barton	Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe
Benishek	Hill	Reed
Bilirakis	Holding	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Hudson	Renacci
Black	Huelskamp	Ribble
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Blum	Hultgren	Rigell
Bost	Hunter	Roby
Boustany	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Jolly	Roskam
Bucshon	Jones	Ross
Burgess	Jordan	Rothfus
Byrne	Joyce	Rouzer
Calvert	Katko	Royce
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Salmon
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Cole	Kline	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Knight	Schock
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Schweikert
Comstock	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Lance	Sessions
Costello (PA)	Latta	Shimkus
Cramer	LoBlundo	Shuster
Crenshaw	Long	Simpson
Culberson	Love	Smith (MO)
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Dent	MacArthur	Stefanik
DeSantis	Marchant	Stewart
DesJarlais	Marino	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Dold	McCarthy	Thornberry
Duffy	McCaul	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Turner
Ellmers	McKinley	Upton
Emmer	McMorris	Valadao
Farenthold	Rodgers	Wagner
Fincher	McSally	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walden
Fleming	Meehan	Walker
Flores	Messer	Walorski
Forbes	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Garrett	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Wittman
Gosar	Noem	Womack
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Olson	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Yoho
Griffith	Palmer	Young (IA)
Guinta	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Guthrie	Pearce	Zeldin
Hanna	Perry	Zinke

NAYS—160

Adams	Brown (FL)	Clay
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Ashford	Bustos	Clyburn
Bass	Butterfield	Cohen
Beatty	Capps	Connolly
Becerra	Capuano	Conyers
Bera	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Bonamici	Chu (CA)	Davis (CA)
Boyle (PA)	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio

DeGette	Kildee	Quigley
Delaney	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
DeLauro	Kind	Richmond
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeSaulnier	Kuster	Ruiz
Deutch	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Doyle (PA)	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
Duckworth	Lee	T.
Edwards	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lewis	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lieu (CA)	Schakowsky
Esty	Lipinski	Schiff
Fattah	Loeb	Schrader
Foster	Loeb	Scott (VA)
Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Scott, David
Fudge	Lowenthal	Serrano
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Sherman
Gallego	(NM)	Sires
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Slaughter
Graham	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Grayson	Lynch	Speier
Green, Al	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Green, Gene	McCollum	Takai
Gutiérrez	McDermott	Takano
Hahn	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Moore	Titus
Himes	Moulton	Torres
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Tsongas
Hoyer	Neal	Van Hollen
Huffman	Norcross	Vargas
Israel	O'Rourke	Veasey
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Vela
Jeffries	Payne	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Walz
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kaptur	Peters	Schultz
Keating	Peterson	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Yarmuth
Kennedy	Pocan	
	Polis	

NOT VOTING—25

Babin	Gowdy	Price (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Sewell (AL)
Carney	Grijalva	Sinema
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Stutzman
Cartwright	Honda	Trott
Cicilline	Loudermilk	Watson Coleman
Crawford	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Farr	Nugent	
Fleischmann	Pascrell	

□ 1507

Mr. RATCLIFFE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was detained in meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, because of inclement weather and two grounded flights, I was unable to vote during rollcall 2—Electing the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I would have proudly voted for Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI of California for Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I was also unable to vote during rollcall vote 3—Motion to Table. Had I been present, I would have voted against the Motion to Table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the hour to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but I also want to thank Chairman SESSIONS for the hard work he has done in putting the rules package together today.

Today, the House will adopt these rules to govern the 114th Congress and dictate how this House will function over the next 2 years. As you will hear over the course of this debate, they are a recommitment by the Republican majority to govern transparently.

The rules ensure that both Members and the public have a chance to read bills before they come up for a vote, institute more accurate accounting for the economic effect of legislation, and restore the constitutional balance of power between the legislative and executive branches.

With these rules in place, the House can now proceed in tackling the challenges facing America today and pass legislation that creates jobs, grows the economy, and promotes freedom for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rules package.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the resolution as well as a July 21, 2014, memorandum prepared by the Office of the Parliamentarian for the Over-Criminalization Task Force of the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. RES. 5

ADOPTING RULES FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Resolved Clause.

This section provides that the Rules of the 113th Congress are the Rules of the 114th Congress, except with the amendments contained in section 2 of the resolution and orders contained in sections 3, 4, and 5.

Section 2. Changes to the Standing Rules.

Disclosure of Foreign Payments to Witnesses. Subsection (a)(1) requires, to the greatest extent practicable, nongovernmental witnesses to disclose payments or contracts to the witness or an organization they represent originating from foreign governments received in the current and preceding two calendar years, to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, that hearing.

While failure to comply fully with this requirement would not give rise to a point of order against the witness testifying, it could result in an objection to including the witness's written testimony in the hearing record in the absence of such disclosure.

Jurisdictional Changes. Subsection (a)(2) adds language to the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional statement with respect to the criminalization of conduct.

The Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over criminal penalties and criminal law enforcement would remain unchanged. That is, the committee would maintain its existing jurisdiction over measures that create or repeal a crime, and over measures that alter criminal penalties with regard to crimes already existing in law.

The rules change is intended to cover measures that alter the elements of a crime so as to criminalize new conduct and, in so doing, trigger an existing criminal penalty. This rules change is not intended to cover measures that merely supply the regulatory framework or address the regulatory underpinnings of the overall enforcement scheme. Past measures proposing merely to adjust the elements of such a crime—as opposed to adjusting the penalty for commission of the crime—have been out of the jurisdictional reach of the Committee on the Judiciary. Even though such measures have left the criminal penalty unchanged, they have nonetheless subjected new conduct to that criminal penalty. In other words, new conduct was criminalized. If the relatively rare practice of criminalizing new conduct within the framework of existing penalties is left unchecked, it calls into question the efficacy of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional statement in providing a comprehensive look at criminal penalties and criminal law enforcement. Hence, a rule X statement of “criminalization” is the most appropriate way to address this circumstance.

The jurisdiction of other committees over the elements of a crime—particularly in the context of a regulatory scheme and outside of title 18, United States Code—would remain the same, except that it potentially would be shared with the Committee on the Judiciary in some instances. In that respect, it is similar to the criminalization of new conduct accompanied by a new criminal penalty; this change is to ensure that it is the act of criminalizing conduct, and not just the penalties themselves, that gives rise to a jurisdictional interest by the Committee on the Judiciary.

This rules change is not intended to alter existing jurisdiction over any enforcement

scheme that falls outside of the ambit of criminal law enforcement. Rather, it is to confirm that the creation of a new crime subject to criminal law enforcement is what gives rise to the Committee on the Judiciary's interest, and not merely the establishment or modification of the penalty.

For instance, the change is intended to address a situation analogous to H.R. 2492 of the 112th Congress, which addressed attendance at animal fighting events through amendments to the Animal Welfare Act—compiled in title 7 of the United States Code—and to title 18. That measure was referred to both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Judiciary. Portions of that measure were later included in H.R. 2642 of the 113th Congress and addressed a type of animal fighting to be covered by the Animal Welfare Act, but did not amend the existing criminal penalty in the Animal Welfare Act and did not touch title 18. As a result, the Committee on the Judiciary did not receive a referral of that measure.

Committees with jurisdiction over a regulatory statute will continue to exercise that jurisdiction, and the interest of the Committee on the Judiciary will extend to the creation of a new crime without a change to an existing penalty only to the same extent it would to creation of a new crime with an accompanying penalty prior to the 114th Congress.

The subsection adds language to the Committee on Appropriations' jurisdictional statement with respect to certain loan obligations and new loan guarantees with a textual reference to section 504(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

Clarifying the Jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. Subsection (a)(3) clarifies the Committee on House Administration's jurisdiction over the Chief Administrative Officer.

Committee Activity Reports. Subsection (a)(4) reduces the frequency of committee activity reports from two times per Congress to one time per Congress.

Dissenting Views. Subsection (a)(5) codifies current practice by updating the rule regarding supplemental, minority, or additional views to include “dissenting” views.

Consolidating Requirements for Written Rules. Subsection (a)(6) requires committees to include in their written rules pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule XI certain audio and visual coverage rules described in clause 4(f) of rule XI and formerly required by such clause.

Confirming Committee and House Broadcasting Standards. Subsection (a)(7) conforms the language in clause 4(b) of rule XI with clause 2(c) of rule V to ensure consistent application of broadcasting standards.

Eliminating the Point of Order Against Considering Appropriations Measures without Printed Hearings. Subsection (a)(8) eliminates the point of order against the consideration of appropriations measures without printed hearings. This information is largely available through archived broadcasts, testimony, and other documents available on the Appropriations Committee's website and the public hearings themselves.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Subsection (a)(9) increases the size of the committee to 22 members, with not more than 13 from the same party.

Committee on Ethics. Subsection (a)(10) prohibits the Committee on Ethics from taking action that would deny a person any rights or protections provided under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group. Subsection (b) updates the authorization for the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group to conform to

current practice and codifies a separate order of the 113th Congress.

Cost Estimates for Major Legislation to Incorporate Macroeconomic Scoring. Subsection (c) requires the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation, to the extent practicable, to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of “major legislation” into the official cost estimates used for enforcing the budget resolution and other rules of the House. The subsection requires, to the extent practicable, a qualitative assessment of the long-term budgetary and macroeconomic effects of “major legislation”, which is defined to cover legislation that causes a gross budgetary effect in any fiscal year covered by the budget resolution that is equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the projected GDP for that year. This subsection also allows the chair of the Committee on the Budget, or in the case of revenue legislation the House member serving as the Chair or Vice Chair of the Joint Committee on Taxation, to designate “major legislation” for purposes of this rule.

This subsection also repeals the existing provision in clause 3(h)(2) of rule XIII that requires a macroeconomic impact analysis of revenue legislation, which is superseded by the new rule.

Providing for Reconvening Authority for the House of Representatives. Subsection (d) allows the Speaker, after consultation with the Minority Leader, to reconvene the House during an adjournment of three days or less, at a time other than previously appointed. This codifies separate orders from the 112th and 113th Congresses.

Providing Conference Committees with Time to Reach Agreement. Subsection (e) modifies clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII by providing conference committees 45 calendar days and 25 legislative days after the formation of a conference to reach agreements before additional motions to instruct managers may be offered.

Contents of Committee Reports Showing Changes to Existing Law. Subsection (f) requires that a Ramseyer print to show the entire text of amended or repealed sections of a statute along with the proposed changes.

Mandatory Ethics Training for New Members. Subsection (g) requires that new Members of the House, in addition to employees, complete ethics training.

Technical and Conforming Changes. Subsection (h)(1) conforms the standing rules to reflect the name in statute of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT). Subsection (h)(2) updates an outdated statutory citation and removes a reference inadvertently left in place at the start of the 113th Congress, which is no longer necessary due to the enactment of the STOCK Act.

Section 3. Separate Orders.

Independent Payment Advisory Board. Subsection (a) eliminates provisions contained in the Affordable Care Act that limit the ability of the House to determine the method of consideration for a recommendation from the Independent Payment Advisory Board or to repeal the provision in its entirety.

Staff Deposition Authority for Certain Committees. Subsection (b) provides the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Science, Space, and Technology, and Ways and Means deposition authority to be conducted by a member or committee counsel during the first session of the 114th Congress. Depositions taken under this authority shall be subject to regulations issued by the chair of the Committee on Rules and printed in the Congressional Record.

Providing for Transparency with Respect to Memorials Submitted Pursuant to Article V of

the Constitution of the United States. Subsection (c) clarifies the procedures of the House upon receipt of Article V memorials from the States by directing the Clerk to make each memorial, designated by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, electronically available and organized by State of origin and year of receipt.

In carrying out section 3(c) of House Resolution 5, it is expected that the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary will be solely charged with determining whether a memorial purports to be an application of the legislature of a state calling for a constitutional convention. The Clerk’s role will be entirely administrative. The chair of the Committee on the Judiciary will only designate memorials from state legislatures (and not petitions from individuals or other parties) as it is only state legislatures that are contemplated under Article V of the Constitution.

In submitting the memorials to the Clerk, the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary will include a transmission letter with each memorial indicating it has been designated under section 3(c) of House Resolution 5. The Clerk will make publicly available the memorial and the transmission letter from the chair. Ancillary documentation from the state or other parties is not expected to be publicized.

The chair of the Committee on the Judiciary is also permitted to designate memorials from earlier Congresses to be made publicly available under the same procedure.

Spending Reduction Amendments in Appropriations Bills. Subsection (d) carries forward the prohibition from the 112th and 113th Congresses against consideration of a general appropriation bill that does not include a “spending reduction” account, the contents of which is a recitation of the amount by which, through the amendment process, the House has reduced spending in other portions of the bill and indicated that such savings should be counted towards spending reduction. It provides that other amendments that propose to increase spending in accounts in a general appropriations bill must include an offset of equal or greater value.

Budget Matters. Subsection (e)(1) provides that titles III, IV, and VI, of House Concurrent Resolution 25 (113th Congress), as well as the allocations, aggregates, and appropriate levels contained in the chair of the Committee on the Budget’s statement submitted in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2014, as adjusted, will continue to have force and effect until a budget resolution for fiscal year 2015 is adopted. This subsection also provides that the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise allocations, aggregates, and appropriate levels for measures maintaining the Highway Trust Fund, provided such a measure does not increase the deficit over the 11-year window and revise allocations, aggregates, and appropriate levels to take into account updated CBO baselines.

Subsection (e)(2) carries forward from the 113th Congress the requirement that prevents the Committee of the Whole from rising to report a bill to the House that exceeds an applicable allocation of new budget authority under section 302(b) (Appropriations subcommittee allocations) as estimated by the Budget Committee and creates a point of order.

Continuing Litigation Authorities. Subsection (1) addresses continuing litigation in which the House is a party. Paragraph (1) authorizes the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, through the House Of-

fice of General Counsel, to continue litigation to enforce a subpoena against the Attorney General related to the “Fast and Furious” investigation. This lawsuit was authorized by H. Res. 706 (112th Congress). It also authorizes the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (when elected) to take certain actions necessary to continue the litigation. Paragraph (2) authorizes the House to act as the successor in interest with respect to ongoing civil actions regarding the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The lawsuit was authorized by H. Res. 676 (113th Congress). The subsection also carries forward the authorities provided by H. Res. 676 (113th Congress) to remain in effect in the 114th Congress. Paragraph (3) authorizes Michael W. Sheehy to provide testimony in an ongoing criminal action in accordance with authorizations from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the 112th and 113th Congresses.

Duplication of Federal Programs. Subsection (g) carries forward from the 113th Congress the authorization of a committee chair to request that the Government Accountability Office perform a duplication analysis of any bill or joint resolution referred to that committee. The subsection also requires committee reports to include a statement on whether any provision of the measure establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program. This order has been modified to allow for a statement that no program is being established or reauthorized for purposes of complying with the order.

Estimates of Direct Spending. Subsection (h) carries forward from the 113th Congress the prohibition of consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, or any proposed amendment to or conference report thereon, unless it includes specified information and estimates related to direct spending, including means-tested direct spending and nonmeans-tested direct spending. The subsection also requires the chair of the Committee on the Budget to publish a description in the Congressional Record of covered programs.

Disclosure of Directed Rulemakings. Subsection (i) carries forward from the 113th Congress the requirement that committee reports on bills or joint resolutions are to include an estimate of the number of directed rule makings required by the measure. The subsection defines “directed rule making” to include those rule makings specifically directed to be completed by a provision in the legislation, but does not include a grant of discretionary rule making authority.

Subcommittees. Subsection (j) waives clause 5(d) of rule X to allow the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs up to seven subcommittees and the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Agriculture up to six subcommittees. Other than the inclusion of the Committee on Agriculture, this is similar to provisions carried in the rules package during the last several Congresses.

Exercise Facilities for Former Members. Subsection (k) continues the prohibition on access to any exercise facility that is made available exclusively to Members, former Members, officers, and former officers of the House and their spouses to any former member, former officer, or spouse who is a lobbyist registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

Numbering of Bills. Subsection (1) reserves the first 10 numbers for bills (H.R. 1 through

H.R. 10) for assignment by the Speaker and the second 10 numbers (H.R. 11 through H.R. 20) for assignment by the Minority Leader.

Inclusion of U.S. Code Citations. Subsection (m) adds, to the maximum extent practicable, a requirement for parallel citations for amendatory instructions to Public Laws and Statutes at Large that are not classified in the U.S. Code.

Broadening Availability of Legislative Documents in Machine Readable Formats. Subsection (n) instructs the appropriate officers and committees to continue to advance government transparency by taking further steps to publish documents of the House in machine-readable formats.

Temporary Designation. Subsection (o) designates a temporary location for documents to be made publicly available pending the official designation by the Committee on House Administration under clause 3 of rule XXIX.

Congressional Member Organization Transparency Reform. Subsection (p) allows participating Members to enter into agreements with eligible Congressional Member Organizations for the purpose of payment of salaries and expenses. The subsection requires the Committee on House Administration to promulgate regulations, consistent with current law, to carry out this subsection.

Social Security Solvency. Subsection (q) creates a point of order against legislation that would reduce the actuarial balance of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, but provides an exemption to the point of order if a measure improves the overall financial health of the combined Social Security Trust Funds. This subsection would protect the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) Trust Fund from diversion of its funds to finance a broken Disability Insurance system.

Section 4. Committees, Commissions, and House Offices.

Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi. Subsection (a) carries forward the select committee as authorized by H. Res. 567 (113th Congress) as it existed at the end of the 113th Congress. Additionally, the subsection provides the select committee authority to adopt a rule or motion allowing for a ten-minute rule for the questioning of witnesses.

House Democracy Partnership. Subsection (b) reauthorizes the House Democracy Assistance Commission, now known as the House Democracy Partnership.

Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. Subsection (c) reauthorizes the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Office of Congressional Ethics. Subsection (d) reauthorizes the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE) for the 114th Congress and clarifies that term limits do not apply to members of the OCE. The subsection reaffirms that a person subject to a review by the Office of Congressional Ethics has a right to be represented by counsel, and establishes that invoking such right is not to be held as a presumption of guilt. The subsection also prohibits the Office of Congressional Ethics from taking action that would deny a person any rights or protections provided under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Section 5. Additional Order of Business.

Reading of the Constitution. This section allows the Speaker to recognize Members for the reading of the Constitution on any legislative day through January 16, 2015.

OFFICE OF THE PARLIAMENTARIAN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

MEMORANDUM

To: Over-Criminalization Task Force of the Committee on the Judiciary.

From: Office of the Parliamentarian.

Date: July 21, 2014.

The Over-Criminalization Task Force of the Committee on the Judiciary is tasked with assessing the current federal criminal statutes and making recommendations for improvements. One of its areas of study is legislative jurisdiction in the House over proposals addressing Federal criminal law. This memo provides guidance on the rules of the House and precedents in this area.

RULE X—THE JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Parliamentarian, acting as the Speaker's agent, refers bills and other matters upon their introduction to committees pursuant to the jurisdiction of each committee as defined by rule X, taking into account any relevant precedents. Rule XII guides the Speaker in the type and timing of a referral.

The jurisdiction of each of the 20 standing committees of the House is set out in rule X of the rules of the House. The jurisdictional statement of the Committee on the Judiciary is found in clause 1(l) of rule X. The referral of measures on the subject of criminalization is based on clause 1(l)(1) addressing, "The judiciary and judicial proceedings, civil and criminal," and clause 1(l)(7), addressing "Criminal law enforcement."

The jurisdictional statement regarding "The judiciary and judicial proceedings, civil and criminal" has been in place since the creation of the Committee on the Judiciary in 1813. That statement has been interpreted to apply to matters "touching judicial proceedings." Hinds, vol. 4, sec. 4054.

The jurisdictional statement regarding "Criminal law enforcement" was added in the 109th Congress (sec. 2(a)(2), H. Res. 5, Jan. 4, 2005). This statement has been interpreted by the Office of the Parliamentarian as a codification of the committee's existing de facto jurisdiction over legislation addressing law enforcement powers, consistent with the absence of legislative history supplying any other meaning (Cong. Rec. Jan 4, 2005). This area of the committee's jurisdiction is often manifested in * * *

REFERRAL PATTERNS

The issue presented by indirect criminalization can be found in examples spanning many different subject matters. One illustration is in the referrals of the Lacey Act, a frequently amended statute that regulates the trafficking of fish, wildlife, and plants. The Lacey Act is compiled in both title 16 and title 18 of the United States Code. In the case of H.R. 3049 of the 109th Congress (regulating the trafficking in Asian carp), the bill amended 18 U.S.C. 42 and addressed criminalization. Accordingly, it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. In contrast, H.R. 1497 of the 110th Congress (regulating plants harvested outside the United States) amended various regulatory sections of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 that have been compiled in title 16 of the United States Code. The bill extended the Lacey Act's coverage to plants harvested outside the United States and any address of criminalization was indirect. Accordingly, it was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

A more recent example is found in the animal welfare area. H.R. 2492 of the 112th Congress addressed attendance at animal fighting events through amendments to the Ani-

mal Welfare Act—compiled in title 7 of the United States Code—and to title 18. The bill was referred to both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Judiciary. Parts of the contents of this bill were later included in a larger measure in the 113th Congress—H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 (section 11311). The provision addressed a type of animal fighting to be covered by the Animal Welfare Act, but did not amend the existing criminal penalty in the Animal Welfare Act and did not touch title 18. The Parliamentarian advised that a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary was not consistent with past precedent.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me the time, and if I could just take a minute to wish everybody a great new session. It is good to be back. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we rise today to set a new course for this Congress, though, with the record of the past Congresses, we know we have a lot of work to do.

During their tenure, the majority has careened from crisis to crisis, sued the President for doing his job, brought the House to new heights of dysfunction and closed debate with the most closed rules in a single Congress in our Nation's history, chased nonexistent scandals in Benghazi and at the IRS, and, since 2011, had this House vote more than 50 times to take health care away from their own constituents.

This legacy of dysfunction, of partisanship and prioritizing political games over the public policy has dealt the American people a bad hand. By governing this House in such a haphazard way, the majority has closed down the process and shut out the American people.

Sadly, the majority is poised to double down on their partisanship and even reinvent the mathematics of public policy. By using what is called "dynamic scoring" to pretend that tax cuts pay for themselves, Republicans will require the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and Joint Taxation Committee to use math that Bruce Bartlett, an economic adviser for both Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, called "smoke and mirrors." This new math cooks the books in favor of the majority to pretend that the tax cut bills are revenue neutral.

Time and time again, the falsehoods of dynamic scoring have come to light. The first President Bush even called this tactic "voodoo economics." But even so, the House Republicans want to change the rules and inject their partisan ideology into even the mathematics which underlies our Nation's public policy.

Rising above partisanship, the House Democrats will propose today two measures that would do immeasurable good for the American people.

First, giving average Americans the paychecks that they deserve, our commonsense legislation would deny CEOs the ability to claim tax deductions on incomes over \$1 million unless their own employees get a well-deserved raise first. This would ensure that average workers share in the fruit of the Nation's productivity, not just the millionaires and the billionaires. Today, as our Tax Code stands, CEOs get a break and their workers are left out. The CEOs get the money, the deduction on taxes, and we get the bill to pay for that deduction. It is destroying the middle class.

Second, Democrats will bring forward the Stop Corporate Expatriation and Invest in America's Infrastructure Act, which prevents U.S. corporations from renouncing their citizenship to dodge paying their fair share of taxes. It is time to stop rewarding companies that move overseas and, instead, use those dollars to create good-paying jobs here at home and rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure.

□ 1515

By closing this loophole and ending the so-called tax inversions, we would raise an estimated \$33.6 billion to invest in our roads, railways, and bridges which are falling apart all over the country.

Last fall, I stood by a 100-year-old bridge in Bushnell's Basin that fell into such disrepair that firefighters stopped using it for fear the bridge could not bear the weight of the engines. It endangered the safety of the people they were expected to serve.

In my home State of New York, 40 percent of the bridges have been rated structurally deficient or functionally obsolete, which is even worse. I wonder what the number is for the United States.

This is an unconscionable state of affairs. Repairing the Nation's highways and bridges is now, literally, life or death. We can do it with the Democrat proposals. We can, and we must.

These are the types of bills that we hope to be bringing to the floor in this session of Congress. We will debate them and ultimately pass them. That is what Congress is about, not a legislative branch that silences half of this Nation by bypassing the committee process and bringing to Rules emergency bills that silence the Representatives of half of the people in the United States.

It is my fervent hope that the new Congress will bring about an era of willingness to tackle the big problems facing our Nation, a renewed call for true bipartisanship, and a culture of enlivened debate, and I promise that our side will be a willing partner.

In describing how the Bill of Rights came to be, former Supreme Court Justice, the late Harry Blackmun, said that the Founding Fathers survived a

"crucible of disagreement" to give us a more perfect Union. Forging through that crucible is not only good for the legislative branch, but good for the Nation.

Truly, it is the debate that makes us stronger, and time and time again, debate in the House has been stalled, strangling policies and solutions that could have benefited the Nation. Sadly, this is the legacy of the last Congress.

I would like to insert the text of Justice Blackmun's speech into the RECORD.

HARRY A. BLACKMUN

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES
SUPREME COURT REMARKS TO THE PHILADELPHIA BAR ASSOCIATION "CELEBRATION OF THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS"

NOV. 22, 1991

TRANSCRIPT AVAILABLE IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

So there you are. Does it bother you that, in this Bicentennial year, the Bill of Rights which we regard almost as Holy Writ in our national consciousness, was forged in the crucible of disagreement and contest and tempered by the Founders' diverse estimates of political reaction? It should not bother us, I submit, for that is the very stuff from which strong constitutions emerge—the lessons derived from past adversities, from hardening experiences with our fellows and with those who would govern us, and, from the fervent desire to avoid, as Santayana warned us, the necessity of living history over again. Our Constitution and Bill of Rights are of our own making. They are the product of hard bargaining, not the divine gift of a visionary presence.

My final observation is of a different and lighter touch. A great poet, one whom T.S. Eliot once called "the greatest poet of our times" * * * certainly the greatest in this language, and so far as I am able to judge, in any language," wrote two things that have intrigued me.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the past does not dictate the future. We can right our path forward. We may be able to prioritize that the American people will win over politics; and, today, we have the opportunity to do that with the beginning of this, the 114th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, too, want to welcome the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, as we begin another session in this new year. I am delighted to know that the Rules Committee will be ready and available to handle the pieces of legislation that the gentlewoman spoke of in terms of helping the American people to understand what Congress' role is in working with the President to help with policies that will get this country back to work.

Mr. Speaker, just a year ago, we recognized as we came back to Washington that we were at a GDP growth of a negative GDP. We had to fight out of these terrible, terrible tax increases

and the things that are occurring to our economy.

The American people found new footing this year because it was the Republican majority who gave new meaning and life to "we are going to make this place, meaning Washington, D.C., and government, smaller and make things bigger and better for people back home."

We have now lived through what has become a reality with Republican policies on energy, for a competitive marketplace for there to be alternative fuels that are available that have dominated the marketplaces and put other countries on their heels and have given an advantage to American drivers who are here, families who are trying to make a go of it. The price of gasoline at the pump has dropped.

We still have much to do. As we know of the first year that President Obama was in office, food prices began doubling, energy prices began doubling. Republicans now are giving the American people a sense that we can manage our country better, so that they cannot only have a job and keep a job, but that they can take care of their families.

We are going to aim this year on a lot of things; but today, we are here for the rules package that will enable the opportunities for all of our Members to know what the rules are and to become engaged.

Four years ago, Mr. Speaker, we pledged to the American people that Speaker BOEHNER, through the rules of this House and our package that we would have, would allow Members from both sides of the aisle to engage in robust debate under an open process.

I am proud to announce that in following through with that promise, which is what we have done, we now have a new, larger group of Republicans because of the hard work we have done and have sold to the American people about effectively managing their affairs in Washington, D.C.

Republicans have put forth all sorts of reforms, not just in the House of Representatives—more transparency, more opportunities for debate—but the opportunity for the American people to see that what we are trying to do is to give the American people a chance to debate and to vote and to move forward legislative ideas, not just about jobs and not just about a better economy and not just about more freedom and not just about trying to take care of energy, but also to protect the men and women who protect this country. The 114th Congress is going to present also an opportunity, I think, for all of us to up our game, to work together.

The House and the Senate because they are in Republican control—instead of things being roadblocked and set aside and stacked up—over 300 bills, Mr. Speaker, this past term on which we are waiting for Senatorial action—

can work together to enact legislation. We can talk with the American people. We can fashion transparency in bills for accountability, something that the American people want and need.

It also represents an opportunity for us to jump-start our economy. We are here to serve people back home. We are here to make things better for people back home, not to give away our country, but to make it stronger, a chance to empower people in their communities to make their own decisions and, hopefully, reap the rewards that come from that.

Many times, it is not just about the creation of a job, but really of sustaining these families who are trying to work and make things happen and make more decisions about themselves and their futures.

To begin that process today, as we open the House for the 114th Congress, we have a rules package. As we begin, I want to say let's not forget why we are here. We are here because those from our individual congressional districts sent us here—mine, the 32nd Congressional District of Texas, sent me here to accomplish things on their behalf—to make life better for them, to create better opportunities for people today, and a better America in the future, so that we are able to extend our lead among other nations with, I believe, American ingenuity and opportunity—American exceptionalism, as we say it in Dallas, Texas, Mr. Speaker, American exceptional power.

Whether it is leading in the United States military or providing leadership for freedom, that is what we are best at, and we have this privilege by serving in this body.

We must also be held accountable, I believe, to the Constitution. We have, all of us today, raised our hands to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. It doesn't mean certain parts of that Constitution; it means the Constitution.

By our being here today, we are, once again, reaffirming that in this rules package—the support to the Constitution, that basis of power, that is so important in that we understand the House, the Senate, the Presidency but, most of all, the power that lies with people, the rules package helps us to achieve these goals.

H. Res. 5 is a continuation of the House Republicans' efforts to streamline processes, to increase transparency, and to improve accountability. Specifically, it preserves the important reforms that were made in the previous two Congresses. It also adds a few perfecting amendments and orders to help further advance our twin goal of transparency and openness for all of the Members of this body. I would like to take a few minutes, if I can, to highlight some of the key parts of this rules package, Mr. Speaker.

First, it builds upon the fiscal restraint imposed upon the Federal Gov-

ernment by House Republicans in the last two Congresses. We have seen in the last 4 years that the American economy is able to grow when the government shrinks and when less taxpayer money is used to support the government, more freedom and opportunity. We should have a smaller government and a larger free enterprise system. That is a goal. "Limited government" means unlimited opportunity for people back home.

In 2011, the Federal Government was spending 24 percent of our GDP, and the economy was suffering. Thanks to the leadership of House Republicans, the Federal Government's spending is now down. In fact, the Federal Government now spends 19.9 percent of our GDP, which is nearly 5 percent less than just 4 years ago.

This has come through fiscal restraint. This has come through making sure that we spoke to the American people about government that was getting too big, costing too much money, and had too much power. The American people understood that because the government was getting in the way, not playing its role of making life better for people but, rather, getting in the way and making onerous decisions on our economy, on people's jobs, and, perhaps worst of all, on stifling families and the American Dream.

In turn, we are finally now seeing, as a result of these 5 years in which we have held government spending—it has decreased from 24 percent of GDP to 19.9 percent—an economic growth rate that the American people, I think, want and deserve.

Are we where we want to be? Absolutely not. What is the approximate level? We need a GDP growth of 4 percent. We need a GDP growth not just in Dallas, Texas, but all over this country where we have people who in their homes, in their cities, and in their regions are able to take care of themselves, to sustain their economies, and to take care of their infrastructures in a responsible way.

This Congress, Republicans are going to provide for fiscal discipline that restrains spending and gets the government out of the way. Getting government out of the way means you take money away from it which does one of two things: it leaves more money back home for people, or it simply gives people more opportunity to invest in the marketplace to grow jobs.

This rules package will ensure that Congress has the necessary budget enforcement tools in place to continue our work that will help create jobs and grow the economy.

We have a brandnew Budget chairman. He is one of the finest members of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE). Mr. PRICE has been not only a professional at his job as a physician where he healed people, but he came to Washington to do the same for us.

His ascension to be the chairman of the Budget Committee will offer this country and, I believe, more specifically, this body a reevaluation of the important attributes of having a good economy through better budgeting and ways that we can restrain the Federal Government from unwanted and unnecessary spending to that which is done for the American people that makes sense. TOM PRICE will become a household name, and he will earn the accolades that he will get from his chairmanship.

Second, the rules package includes a commonsense requirement for Congress when we consider legislation that will have a larger impact on our economy. In short, the House is going to require the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to provide nonpartisan macroeconomic analyses for legislation that costs .25 percent of projected GDP.

What does this mean? This means that, now, we are going to be able to recognize on percentage basis points how close is the impact of our decisions that we make and to project them out to where we are able to actually know what the impact will be of the legislation that we pass in order to create more jobs.

It is meant to err on the side of people and the free enterprise system, as opposed to stymieing what would end up going to them and erring on the side of growing this government.

□ 1530

This means that the House will take time to analyze how legislation that we consider will really impact the American economy to where we can project what it will be as a result of including billions of dollars back into the economy for economic growth and development on the side of the free enterprise system.

This is going to allow us to measure the impact of legislation, it is going to help us to use some commonsense projections on how our ideas are going to help the bottom line.

Gosh knows we have been through 4 years where we saw high taxes, high spending, Big Government that caused America to fall not only in relative power to the rest of the world, but it placed on the American people disillusionment, unemployment, high taxation, people who could not pay their bills, a loss of their own identity within their own systems.

Unemployment up to 23 million people unemployed and underemployed; we have now turned that corner. We will continue to turn that corner and extrapolate out how we want to get to all sectors of our economy to have a better shot at jobs in their hometown, in their region, and ones that they can keep, not have and then lose again.

It is these current opportunities that lie right before us, and the gentleman

from Georgia and the gentleman, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN, are perfectly suited for selling to this body and the American people why we believe that we have got to look at and change the way we authorize bills.

So under one method, which would be called static scoring, which is what we have, we assume that major legislation does not change economic behavior. They just plug a new number in, and then we assume nothing really happens.

But in fact we know when you raise taxes, you lower the opportunity for people not only to create more economic benefit, but you take that incentive away.

Our friends, the Democrats, would leave you to believe that taxation is a zero sum game, that when rates go up, revenues always come that way, and aren't we for making sure that we balance our budget?

Well, let me tell you what? It didn't work that way. We were spending hundreds of billions of dollars more. Instead of an economy that was working, we were paying unemployment compensation—people not to be employed, people to be at home, a terrible cost not only to humanity but also to our Treasury.

We need people to go to work, and encouraging them to do this through our Tax Code means that people can have the dignity of work, the opportunity to make their life better, and perhaps more importantly, a chance for America to grow its GDP.

We have examples over and over that we have seen about how taxation legislation affects behavior, and certainly in my home State of Texas, I remember in the 1980s and the early 1990s, when revenue was at a premium for the Democrats who ran our House and Senate in Texas, and of course they wanted to raise more revenue, and they were always looking for ways to raise revenue.

I remember them looking when I was just out of high school at personalized license plates, and they looked at how much money came in for personalized license plates. I want to say it was \$30 for the plates. They needed more revenue, so they just doubled that amount of money that it would cost, knowing they would get twice as much revenue.

But it didn't work that way, Mr. Speaker. Not surprisingly, fewer Texans bought more license plates. But to the Democrats, it was a simple matter under static scoring of just saying they wanted more money, and they were going to increase the rates. It doesn't happen that way because the American people or citizens understand they would no longer buy something at a different rate.

The same thing is true of tax rates, Mr. Speaker. We have the exact same problem, where people who are working

and working hard, when you take away their money, there is less money that they can put into the economy to grow another job, to give somebody a chance at a new job.

These are the things we are going to be looking at, how we can maximize through the effort of Dr. PRICE, through the effort of PAUL RYAN, the Ways and Means Committee, the Budget Committee to bring the leading edge ideas instead of saying, no, it is really a zero sum game. If you want to do something, you have to really raise taxes; you can't give money back to people because, oh my gosh, the Federal Government would be in trouble. Well, we are not.

It would change from unemployment compensation to people working, and Republicans believe in work. We believe in empowering communities and people standing a chance to go from unemployment and welfare to a chance to have a job. We are going to get this done.

Let me be clear. Republicans are not arguing that tax cuts always pay for themselves. They don't. But instead we are acknowledging that when it is done right, when you study what you are doing, you can make an effort to have a tax cut to grow the economy. I believe Republicans understand that the American economy and Americans are better off when they keep more of their paychecks.

Lastly, this rules package defends the House's constitutional role in our system of checks and balances by providing for continuation of legal actions against the executive branch. It will allow the House to pursue its lawsuits and to enforce subpoenas, for instance, in the Fast and Furious investigation, where we have seen guns that were sold by the United States Government and put into hands of very dangerous people all around our world, including in Mexico and other places, only to find they come back and appear where they were involved in murders in the United States. It is a lawless action that was taken by our Department of Justice. It is wrong, and we are going to continue pursuing this.

So it means that we are going to look at those things that this Federal Government is doing that we believe are unconstitutional and should change also. We also believe in a lawsuit against the executive branch regarding the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. In short, this package makes it perfectly clear that our constitutional order still matters, and it is Congress' job to write the law and for the President to faithfully execute it. We are not going to stand by and watch this President go and write laws and to execute them down the block. We are going to make sure we do it the way the Constitution spoke about.

Certainly we know that IPAB, which is a part of the President's package,

where he has this group of people that have unlimited power to make decisions over health care, over people as opposed to a physician, we are going to limit that authority. We believe we are within the right in doing this because the American people want and need a health care system that works, not one that we cannot afford and we cannot find a doctor, and where the government and a bureaucrat make decisions as opposed to a physician and a patient.

Regardless of what one thinks about ObamaCare, all Members of Congress should be united to preserve and protect the role of the House of Representatives and our ability to make the laws on behalf of people and work with the President in that.

Finally, the package is going to allow the Speaker to recognize Members for the reading of the Constitution on any legislative day through January 16, 2015. I believe it is vital. We saw this several years ago, Mr. Speaker, where we came down to the floor of the House and took turns at reading the Constitution. It is a vital part of our history. It is important that we understand it serves this great Nation that separates us from so many other countries, the rule of law and constitutional guidance.

This rules package that I have outlined will better enable the House to perform our duties. It will help us with our obligations, our integrity, and transparency and accountability, and it is going to help us to make sure that we work well together with each other.

Our friends, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, elected Members of this body, I am very proud to say that this resolution represents so many great things. I think it is a balanced package, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding. Unfortunately, I don't have time to respond to many of the representations that Mr. SESSIONS made with reference to our economy, but we can all agree that our most important responsibilities as Members of Congress is to grow this economy, create the kinds of jobs that Americans need so that they can succeed and support themselves and their families.

I want to speak about a couple of things in this rules package. Traditionally, Democrats will vote against and Republicans will vote for because traditionally this is a partisan vote. I urge the Rules Committee chairman to adopt a couple of changes which I thought would make this rules package a better one.

First, I ask the House to move to ban discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender employees. We

provide in our rules that you cannot discriminate against people based upon race, nationality, gender, and other arbitrary distinctions. We should have added this as we have in so many of our laws. Currently there are no protections for a congressional staffer fired or refused promotion simply for LGBT status. I regret that the Rules Committee was unprepared to offer such a protection to our employees.

Secondly, since Republicans assumed the majority in 2011, Delegates from the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands as well as the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico have been denied the opportunity to vote in the Committee of the Whole. They can vote in committees, and the Committee of the Whole is of course a committee of the House. It is not a final arbiter.

When I was majority leader, I offered that amendment in the rules. It passed. My Republican friends took it to court, and the court said that it was sustainable and sustained it. This effectively, unfortunately, denies representation to nearly 5 million Americans, Americans, one of whom is on the Republican side of the aisle from American Samoa. So this is a bipartisan concern that I have. Unfortunately, this rules package put forward by the Republican majority does not include either change.

In addition, this rules package does not live up to the responsible governing the American people expect and deserve from Congress. Mr. SESSIONS spent a long time talking about scoring, static scoring versus dynamic scoring.

Dynamic scoring I would suggest to the American people is a gamble. It is a gamble that your projection is correct. If your projection is not correct, as it has so often been, then you end up putting the deficit even higher because you bet on the come.

The more conservative policy, I would suggest, would be to get the money first and then decide how you are going to apply it. Don't gamble on the fact that you are going to get the money, which is what dynamic scoring is. The gentleman admitted—he did not argue—that cutting taxes always paid for themselves. In fact, Alan Greenspan said exactly that in the last decade.

What it means is the Republicans will be able to hide the true cost of tax cuts behind a debunked mantra that tax cuts pay for themselves. They do not. This provision will allow them to explode the deficit as they did the last time they were in charge.

The last time the budget was balanced was not under the Bush administration when you had a Republican Congress, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President. It was when Bill Clinton was President of the United States. For 4 years we had a balanced budget.

It also threatens to politicize the Congressional Budget Office, which has maintained its role as impartial and nonpartisan arbiter on budget scoring for four decades, which makes us be honest, which is what the American public expects. Rely on the figures that are not political figures but are independent analytical figures on which we can rely.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rules package. It can be a better package; it should be. And if it is defeated, we can adopt a better, more fair package.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the start of a new Congress, and we have an opportunity to right two wrongs in the rules of this House.

I wrote to the Chairman of the Rules last month asking that two changes be made in today's rules package.

First, I asked that the House move to ban discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender employees.

Currently, there are no protections for a Congressional staffer fired or refused a promotion simply for LGBT status.

Second, since Republicans assumed the majority in 2011, delegates from the District of Columbia, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands, as well as the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, have been denied the opportunity to vote in the Committee of the Whole House.

This effectively denies representation to nearly 5 million Americans.

Unfortunately, this rules package, put forward by the Republican majority, does not include either change.

In addition, this rules package does not live up to the responsible governing the American people expect and deserve from their Congress.

First, it includes something called "Dynamic Scoring."

What it means is that Republicans will be able to hide the true cost of tax cuts behind a debunked mantra that "tax cuts pay for themselves."

They do not—and this provision will allow them to explode the deficit, as they did the last time they were in charge.

It also threatens to politicize the Congressional Budget Office, which has maintained its role as impartial and nonpartisan arbiter on budget scoring for four decades.

The rules package also extends the Benghazi select committee, placing conspiracy theories above fact.

At least three committees—two led by Republicans—exhaustively investigated the Benghazi tragedy.

Everything has been reviewed; a million dollars in taxpayer money last year were wasted.

And, furthermore, these rules would limit the ability of Congress to reallocate resources between Social Security trust funds, making it more difficult to prevent automatic cuts to Social Security disability insurance.

We can do better—and should do better—in this House for the 114th Congress.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rules package, and I call on Chairman SESSIONS and his Republican colleagues to work in a bipartisan way with Democrats to enact rules

that enhance the work of this House, protect LGBT employees, include all of the voices in our democracy, and set guidelines that facilitate greater cooperation, not more partisan gridlock.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished returning ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1545

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely astounding that within minutes—minutes—of our being sworn in, our Republican colleagues want to pass a rule that will stack the deck in favor of trying to give another big tax cut not to the middle class, but to millionaires, the folks at the very top. That is what their budget does.

What is equally astounding is that this economic theory of trickle-down economics crashed and burned in the real world between 2001 and 2008. Our Republican colleague says that if you give millionaires these tax cuts, they are going to spend them, and a little bit will trickle down to the middle class and people who aspire to the middle class and boost everybody up.

That is not what happened. What happened? Sure, the folks who got the tax cuts at the top, they did better. Nobody else did. In fact, real wages went down. What went up? The deficit—and everybody has to pay for that deficit.

Now, I heard the Speaker this morning say he wanted to deal with the issue of wage stagnation. That is what we should be focused on. We shouldn't be talking about tax cuts for the wealthy and a trickle-down theory. We should try to build this economy from the middle class out and from the bottom up.

I am glad the Speaker said that because we are going to give him an opportunity to vote for something that will address wage stagnation. I am going to offer a motion at the end of this debate. It is called the CEO-Employee Paycheck Fairness Act, and it addresses this issue.

If you look back in the 1960s and 1970s, when workers were working hard, they got paid more, but beginning around 1979, they kept working hard, productivity kept going up, but their wages got flat. What happened during the same time? CEOs took care of themselves. Their pay started to go up and up and up. It used to be about 20 times that of the average worker.

In other words, the CEO and the folks at the top got about 20 times what they were paying their employees, but as you can see, it has now shot up so that CEOs and the top guys get paid about 300 times what their workers are getting paid.

We have a simple proposition: that corporations should not be able to deduct the bonuses and compensation for their CEOs and other executives over \$1 million unless they are giving their employees a fair shake, a fair wage. Right? Why should the taxpayers be subsidizing that?

Between 2007 and 2010, they took about \$66 billion, thereabouts, in deductions for bonuses for performance pay when they were sometimes laying off employees and cutting their paychecks, so we say: "Hey, okay, pay yourselves what you want, but if you want the taxpayers to allow you to deduct your bonuses and performance pay, for goodness' sakes, you had better be giving your employees a fair shake."

Over time, that would close that gap in worker productivity and wages and do what the Speaker said he wanted to do this morning, which is deal with wage stagnation. Let's help the workers, not just the CEOs. Let's vote for the CEO-Employee Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, there they go again, more tax increases, bigger government, the Democrat party. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) to respond to that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Actually, what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is a Republican plan that actually cuts the top rate for folks at the top from 39 percent to 25 percent.

The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center has said that will actually leave the middle class family—typical family—paying another \$2,000, so that you can give the folks at the very top another tax break.

When you increase the deficit, guess who pays the bill? Everybody, all the taxpayers do. So you give a tax break to the folks at the top, increase the deficit, and everybody else is left to pay the bill. That is not the right way to go. Vote for this motion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has been successful already about inversions.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican rule package and to the previous question. If we defeat that question, Ms. SLAUGHTER will offer an amendment to end corporate desertion.

Over the last decade, we have seen nearly 50 American companies try to avoid taxes by moving their mailboxes overseas, but they leave their operations here, effectively renouncing their U.S. citizenship in order to dodge taxes.

These companies benefit from American education, research and develop-

ment incentives, and infrastructure, all taxpayer supported, but when their own tax bill arrives, they hide overseas and are no longer American corporations.

They even have the temerity—and this is legal under the law today, and it shouldn't be—they have the temerity then to apply for Federal contracts, but they deny their U.S. citizenship when it comes to paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, what this amendment would do is make sure that they pay their fair share. The extra revenue goes to the highway trust fund. That trust fund runs out of money in May if we do not act. Anyone who has driven a car lately knows how badly our roads need investment.

Our highways are crumbling beneath our wheels, 65 percent of our major roads are in less than good condition, and one-quarter of our bridges require repair or improvements. The backlog of projects grows longer by the day.

At a time when globalization is gathering pace, this state of affairs puts America's competitiveness in jeopardy. According to the World Economic Forum, the United States has slipped from 7th to 18th in the quality of our roadways. Replenishing the highway trust fund will reverse this trend, unleash economic growth, and create thousands of good jobs that cannot be sent overseas.

If we want business to invest in this Nation, we must be prepared to do the same. Instead of lining the pockets of corporate deserters, we should be revitalizing our roadways. That is the path to a better, stronger, and more sustainable economy. This amendment puts us back on the right track.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I spent the holidays with family and friends reflecting on the blessings of the past year. There were many.

Since 2009, the stock market has soared another 10,000 points. In 2009, our budget deficit stood at \$1.4 trillion. Today, according to current projections, we have sliced that deficit to \$514 billion, and we have created 10 million new jobs, the longest stretch of private sector job growth in American history.

When I left home yesterday, I left my wife with a full tank of gas, and I did so paying less than \$2 per gallon. It was the first time I have been able to do that in 5 years. We have achieved much progress over the past several years. Now, we must get about the work of making sure that progress is shared by all.

Mr. Speaker, in a few moments, we will cast some substantive votes. These votes will literally set the rules of the game for the next 2 years. They will be a very clear reflection of our respective parties' priorities.

While Republicans' rules changes seem to rig the game in favor of the wealthy, Democrats will immediately force a vote on job creation, bigger paychecks for working families, and American competitiveness and economic growth.

Democrats want to put people to work building roads and bridges that will connect our economy in the 21st century. We will ensure that every American shares in our Nation's prosperity by taking away corporate tax deductions for millionaire executive compensation unless their employees get a raise as well.

It is simple, Mr. Speaker. House Republicans' first priority in the 114th Congress is stacking the deck for those with the highest incomes and for voodoo, trickle-down economics. House Democrats' first priority is to put Americans in a better place by creating jobs, standing up for working families, and growing the economy for all. The contrast could not be more stark.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats' numbers may be smaller in the 114th, but we are stronger in our unity and resolve to grow and strengthen middle income Americans. Today, with our votes on the new rules, Mr. Speaker, we will be demonstrating our support for hardworking American families.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should simply take this time to say to my colleagues: welcome back, happy new year, and I missed you.

Technically, we are considering, debating, and voting on the Republican majority's "rules package," but that is sort of a misnomer. The word "rules," as most of us understand it, means a set of procedures that someone is required to follow, but if my Republican friends have demonstrated anything over the past few years, it is that they have absolutely no intention of following the rules of the House. They routinely waive, ignore, or break the rules of this House whenever it is convenient or politically expedient for them to do so.

The gentleman from Texas says the Speaker of the House promised the most open Congress in history. I hate to remind him that the Republicans presided over the most closed Congress in history during the 113th Congress.

Let me just mention a couple of the most egregious provisions in this package before us today. First, my Republican friends believe we should adopt the voodoo economics of so-called dynamic scoring. Under this fairy tale, they would have us believe that tax cuts for the very wealthy don't increase the deficit. Never mind that time after time after time in our history, those tax cuts for the rich have caused an explosion in our deficit. This rules package would have us believe that up is down and left is right.

Second, this package would allow committee staff from the Ways and Means Committee, Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and the Science Committee to take depositions under oath. Currently, only the Oversight Committee has that authority.

Mr. Speaker, I served as a staff member in this House for the late Congressman Joe Moakley. Our staff members are dedicated public servants who work incredibly hard, but this provision, quite frankly, goes too far.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be spending our time on rebuilding our aging infrastructure and increasing workers' paychecks rather than making it easier to conduct more political witch hunts, which the American people are fed up with.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve on the Rules Committee, and that word "rules" used to mean something. My hope is that in this Congress, enough of my Republican colleagues will demonstrate the political courage to make it mean something again.

Vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to those who have wondered, what would be the top priority of this Republican-controlled Congress? What would they do on day one? Well, now we know. It is deception, what some could even rightly call tax fraud, since this amounts to deliberate misrepresentation of tax data.

Republicans are admitting right here on day one that they don't know how to balance the budget. When the budget numbers will not add up, when the arithmetic just doesn't work for them, they change the numbers with magical new math. Where the books won't balance with the numbers that you have got, Republicans say, "Use the numbers you would like to have."

All their previous talk about budget discipline and balancing budgets was really about trying to dismantle Democratic efforts to provide an opportunity ladder up for all Americans, to assure dignity in retirement, and to protect families from the risk of illness—that ladder of security and protection that

many Republicans were never for in the first place.

Now, to free themselves from the hard work of responsible, balanced budgets, Republicans are compelling the House for the first time in American history to rely upon something they call "dynamic scoring"—That is just a euphemism for whimsy, speculation, and wishful thinking—the thin veneer for a failed political ideology.

One leading Republican expert, former Senate budget staff director Bill Hoagland, has said that instead of this scoring gimmick that they are using today, he would "rather [they] just simply belly up to the bar" and "admit up front that they can't lower rates without adding to the deficit."

□ 1600

Today's actions remind me of a riddle some attribute to President Abraham Lincoln: "How many legs does a dog have if you call the tail a leg? Four, because calling a tail a leg doesn't make it a leg."

And calling a budget "balanced" when it doesn't have adequate revenue does not make it so.

Passing a budget requires hard work. Republicans would rather use a sleight of hand than offer a helping hand from all to get the job done. Vote no.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in fact, Republicans are going to use a doctor to get the budget done this time.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the young chairman from the Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this package and his work throughout this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am actually surprised—well, I am not surprised. I thought we might actually go a day without having the kind of hyperbole that we have grown used to from the other side of the aisle.

I want to speak to the issue of macroeconomic analysis as the incoming chair of the Budget Committee. The other side has said this is a gamble, that we are gambling that the projections are going to be correct. Mr. Speaker, this is craziness. That is not so. In fact, all economic projections—static, dynamic—all of them have a level of uncertainty.

We have heard that it is "stacking the deck" or that it is "cooking the books" in favor of tax cuts. Nonsense. Nonsense. It doesn't game the system at all. All we are trying to do is make certain that Members of Congress have more information upon which to be able to make decisions. That is the kind of commonsense things that our folks back home want.

Scoring, which is what we are talking about here, the Congressional Budget Office works hard to try to determine what the effect is of the kind of policies that we adopt around here.

They will tell you right now that now it is inaccurate. Now it is inaccurate. What we are trying to do is simply say that if a piece of legislation is going to have a large effect on the economy, that we include that effect in the official estimate.

So if you think a bill is going to help or hurt the economy—help or hurt the economy—then they ought to tell us. They ought to let us know how many more jobs are going to be created, what kind of tax revenue up or down is going to occur. Is it going to harm jobs? The people who prepare our cost estimates, I tell you, they are the best in the business, and they have been working on this issue for years.

Mr. Speaker, this may come as some surprise to our friends on the other side, but they already do this kind of analysis. They already do the macroeconomic analysis. It is just that we don't include it in our cost estimate because of the rules. And we should. That is why we are offering this change today.

We don't predetermine the outcome. We simply make it so that the Congressional Budget Office is allowed, the scorekeepers are allowed, to have a more realistic score. It has come as no surprise, talking to economists from around the country over the past couple of weeks, over the past couple of months, and to a person they say economic scoring, the effects of legislation that we pass, it is an inaccurate science. It is hard to do. But what we want to do is to make certain that they have greater opportunity to get that scoring correct, to give us the kind of information so we can make wiser decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about cooking the books or gaming the system. This is about trying to do the hard work of the American people, trying to get the policies that we adopt here in this Congress correct so that we can get the American people back to work and get this economy thriving again.

I commend the gentleman from Texas for the work that he has done and urge adoption of the rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

It is time to get to work. Americans don't care who won or lost in the election. They just want us to get our work done. They want us to work together to solve the problems that they see every day. They want us to boost job growth, and they want us to build an economy that works for all Americans, not just the privileged few.

The rules of the road that should guide this Congress should be built on the foundation that has increased opportunities for American families over

the last few years—nearly 11 million new jobs, 57 consecutive months of job growth, the longest streak in our country's history. There are 10 million more Americans with health insurance, which means more security for those Americans. The deficit has been cut by two-thirds since 2009.

What is the one piece of the puzzle that we now need to work on? In that span of time since we have seen things go better; the economy has grown 12 percent; corporate profits have grown by 46 percent, and the stock market by 92 percent. What hasn't grown? The paycheck that the average American gets day in and day out for working to do all those things to make it possible for the stock market and corporations to succeed. So it is time for us to focus on the middle of America that works hard every month and gets a paycheck but doesn't see that paycheck grow.

This rules package requires Congress to use fuzzy math, so-called dynamic scoring, to make it easier to give massive tax breaks to special interests and the wealthy. Is that what the middle class wants? No.

Republicans have also added a mid-night change to this rules package that rigs the rules against 59 million Americans who currently receive Social Security and to the 160 million Americans who are working today to get Social Security in the future and don't know if Social Security will be there based on these rules. That is not what Americans in the middle want.

Congress should be in the business of making life better, not worse, for everyday Americans. So let's establish rules of the road for this Congress that let us build on the economic progress of nearly 11 million new Americans going back to work, 57 months straight of job growth.

What we don't need are rules of the road for this House that give a green light to reckless legislating that favors special interests and the privileged few at the expense of the middle class and America's Social Security.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished returning ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, what was said by the Budget Committee chairman is not correct. This is not about more information. This is a requirement that these official cost estimates really be part of the enforcement of the budget resolution. So what this is, in a few words: Republicans today are extending their embrace of voodoo economics by wrapping their arms around voodoo score keeping. Again, it is not about more information. It is being able to cook the books to implement their long-held discredited notion that tax cuts pay for themselves.

I think the former Reagan and George H.W. Bush administration official Bruce Bartlett said it best:

It is not about honest revenue estimating. It is about using smoke and mirrors to institutionalize Republican ideology in the budget process.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this is all about.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from my colleague if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. I do have one additional speaker, and then I will close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank her for her wonderful work on behalf of the American people as the ranking member on the Rules Committee for such a long time and in such a very strong way.

My colleagues, I congratulate you and your families on your swearing in today. We had a lovely ceremony earlier. Eventually it became that, after we knew the outcome of the vote. But it is clear that the election at the polls in November demonstrated that the American people are hopeful that this new Congress can work together to grow our economy and, in turn, grow paychecks for American workers. Honoring that trust, House Democrats today are putting forward a legislative package to increase paychecks for working families and put Americans back to work building the roads and bridges our country needs, paid for by keeping our tax dollars here at home. I talked about this a little bit earlier when I introduced the Speaker.

What we are proposing, sadly, is in sharp contrast to what the Republicans have in this rule. The first vote that the Republicans are asking this Congress to take in the new Congress will be to advance additional tax cuts for the wealthy and special interests. When they talk about dynamic scoring—when they talk about dynamic scoring—it is a very bad deal for middle-income families in our country.

In sharp contrast to them, we will bring forth the Stop Corporate Expatiation and Invest in America's Infrastructure Act, which prevents U.S. corporations from renouncing their citizenship in order to dodge paying their fair share of taxes. It is time to stop rewarding companies that move overseas and instead use those dollars to create good-paying jobs here at home.

Every chance any of us gets, we have to make that point. I don't see anything partisan about it. And many Republicans have voted in this manner in the past. So this was supposed to be something where we have common ground.

House Democrats will also put forth the CEO-Employee Pay Fairness Act, and that is legislation to ensure that workers share in the fruit of their productivity, denying CEOs the ability to claim tax deductions on income over \$1 million unless they give their employees a well-deserved raise.

The American people are owed an open and transparent debate on these issues. Today, with this rules package, Republicans are shutting down debate for Democrats and Republicans. With their extending of the amount of time it takes for Members to put forth a motion to instruct, they are shutting down debate. They are rejecting transparency and openness. That is what the American people want: transparency and openness.

In all that we do in Congress, we must keep the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of the American people in the forefront. We must be committed to do this in a bipartisan way, an open and transparent way. This bill today rejects that.

Now what I want to say, and we all have been reading our Christmas cards and all the rest, but one of the ones that I want to share with you which is irrelevant to our discussion today is from my friend Jack Trout. What he said in "A Seasonal Greeting for the Times":

To borrow a Biblical reference, the money changers have taken over the temple.

What is behind all of this is a concerted effort by wealthy companies and people to protect the status quo and their vested interests. The result is the sad fact that the middle class gets squeezed while the rich get richer. This squeeze is why the consumer-led economy has been so slow to rebound after the financial crisis.

What people fail to realize is the simple fact that the middle class are the real job creators in America. They generate demand, which, in turn, builds markets. The middle class put "merry" into Merry Christmas.

I mention this because the fact is that it is true that when the consumer economy, which is what we are, is alive and well and thriving, they spend money, inject demand in the economy, create jobs, and our economic recovery is accelerated.

Dynamic scoring, suppressing debate, and some of the other things contained in this rule are contrary to that and antagonistic to the financial stability of the middle class. So I hope that our colleagues—and there are so many reasons to go through. But what means the most to America's working families is their financial stability. On that subject alone, were it not even for other things in this bill which we could talk about all day that should be rejected, but just because it, again, has a negative impact on the growth of our economy when it comes to supporting the financial stability of the middle class we should vote "no" on this.

The Democrats offer a sharp contrast. The motion that will be made to

call the previous question is one that calls for us to talk about building the infrastructure of America. The motion to commit that will be put forth by Mr. VAN HOLLEN is one that is fair in terms of pay to our workers.

So for many reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to vote "no." This isn't what was talked about in terms of ideals and values this morning. This is about putting the squeeze on the middle class, doing it in a nontransparent way, and doing it under the rules of the House. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

□ 1615

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all of my colleagues on our swearing in. I just hope that it doesn't trigger 2 years of swearing at. It really does not have to be that way, Mr. Speaker. Democrats in this House will work with the majority to find commonsense solutions to ease the squeeze, to support paycheck growth for the middle class.

What better middle ground than the middle class, Mr. Speaker. The problem with this rules package is it is stacked against the middle class, it is stacked against tax cuts for the middle class, it is stacked against paycheck growth for the middle class.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, here is what House Democrats are proposing. It is very simple.

Number one, bigger paychecks for the middle class. Under the current rules that the majority supports, Mr. Speaker, a CEO can get a million-dollar bonus and deduct that million dollars from taxes. That shifts that tax burden to an underpaid worker for that CEO. Now, how is that fair? How is that fair? It is not.

It is bad enough that middle class workers' paychecks are squeezed, but sticking the middle class worker with a bill for the CEO's taxes as a result of that million dollar bonus is unconscionable. We have a better way, a better contrast, something that will grow paychecks for the middle class.

Second, under the rules, in the stacked deck that the majority supports, a big corporation can ship jobs overseas. With those jobs overseas go bigger bridges, better roads, better airports, and faster airplanes. Meanwhile, in my district on Long Island, Mr. Speaker, the average middle class worker has to drive through potholes, has longer delays, slower trains, antiquated transportation systems, and delayed airplanes because all of the infrastructure is being built abroad.

It is bad enough that corporations are given incentives to ship jobs over-

seas. It is unconscionable that under these rules those corporations are able to build infrastructure in those foreign places while America decays.

Under our contrast, Mr. Speaker, we will invest in America, we will rebuild America, we will create new jobs in America, improving our infrastructure.

It is bad enough to be underpaid, Mr. Speaker, but to be underpaid and have to drive through potholes, that is even worse.

Mr. Speaker, on this first day of this new Congress until the very last day of this new Congress, the American people are going to want to know whose side we are on. With these two votes we clearly demonstrate and clearly establish who is on whose side.

I urge my colleagues in this majority on this first day to establish for the American people whose backs they have: the special interests, tax deductions for million-dollar bonuses, foreign corporations; or rebuilding America and rebuilding American jobs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rules package for the 114th Congress.

I would like to begin by taking this opportunity to thank you, Chairman SESSIONS, the Speaker's Office, and the other committee chairmen for working with me to hone and clarify the Judiciary Committee's criminal law jurisdiction.

For many years, the House rules have given the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction over, among other things, the judiciary and judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, and criminal law enforcement. The Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction over criminal law dates back to the creation of the committee in 1813.

In recent years, however, we have become aware of an anomaly in the referral pattern that occasionally prevents the Judiciary Committee from obtaining a referral when a bill criminalizes new conduct without actually addressing the penalty portion of the criminal law. In other words, while the Judiciary Committee would have had jurisdiction over the underlying statute when it was enacted, it is sometimes unable to assert jurisdiction when the statute is amended in such a way as to criminalize new conduct. The result is that new criminal offenses are being created without being considered by the lawmakers on the Judiciary Committee, which is the committee best situated to provide valuable expertise in drafting and resolving potential conflicts with existing criminal law.

Last Congress, the Judiciary Committee created a bipartisan Over-Criminalization Task Force with the goal of examining the problems associated

with a bloated, disorganized, and often redundant collection of Federal criminal offenses. The Congressional Research Service recently reported to us that there are nearly 5,000 Federal criminal laws on the books. Unfortunately, Congress continues to add to this number at a rate of roughly 50 new crimes per year.

One of the recurring themes from both the witnesses who appeared before the task force as well as the members of the task force is that it is crucial that the Judiciary Committee have the opportunity to review all new Federal criminal laws.

Throughout its existence, this bipartisan task force endeavored to closely examine the problems posed by over-criminalization and over-Federalization, and to identify potential solutions to combat the regrettable circumstances that inevitably arise from the tangled web of Federal criminal provisions. Examples of similarly-situated defendants convicted of the same conduct under different statutes with different penalties, or individuals convicted of offenses without proof of any level of criminal intent, have been detailed in our hearings and are far too commonplace.

The rules package today clarifies the committee's jurisdiction over criminal matters by adding one word—"criminalization"—to our existing jurisdiction over criminal law. By making this change, the Judiciary Committee will have a new jurisdictional interest only in those relatively rare instances that a bill criminalizes new conduct by amending a statute that is attached to a criminal penalty without amending the penalty itself. In this instance, the Judiciary Committee will look to work with the other committee on ensuring that the new conduct is worthy of criminalization and that the attached criminal penalties are appropriately drafted.

The Judiciary Committee is not looking to insert itself into the regulatory schemes under the jurisdiction of other committees. However, to the extent that another committee chooses to use the criminal justice system to enforce the regulation under its jurisdiction, we would like to be involved so that we may ask the important question together as to whether particular conduct should be criminalized.

In conclusion, I believe this small clarification of the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction will allow us to address many of the problems associated with the tangled web of Federal criminal laws.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and his staff for working very closely with us on this issue and express my strong support.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rules package.

I rise today in support of the Rules package for the 114th Congress.

I would like to begin by taking this opportunity to thank Chairman SESSIONS, the Speaker's office, and the other Committee Chairmen for working with me to hone and clarify the Judiciary Committee's criminal law jurisdiction.

For many years, the House Rules have given the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction over, among other things, "the judiciary and judicial proceedings, civil and criminal," and "criminal law enforcement." The Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction over criminal law dates back to the creation of the committee in 1813.

Typically, the Judiciary Committee either receives a referral upon introduction or has the opportunity to seek a sequential referral when a bill creates a new criminal law or criminal penalties. This allows us to ensure that a criminal provision is properly drafted, or eliminated if it is unnecessary.

In recent years, however, we have become aware of an anomaly in the referral pattern that occasionally prevents the Judiciary Committee from obtaining a referral when a bill criminalizes new conduct without actually addressing the penalty portion of the criminal law. In other words, while the Judiciary Committee would have had jurisdiction over the underlying statute when it was enacted, it is sometimes unable to assert jurisdiction when the statute is amended in such a way as to criminalize new conduct. The result is that new criminal offenses are being created without being considered by the lawmakers on the Judiciary Committee, which is the Committee best situated to provide valuable expertise in drafting and resolving potential conflicts with existing criminal law.

Last Congress, the Judiciary Committee created a bipartisan Over-Criminalization Task Force with the goal of examining the problems associated with a bloated, disorganized and often redundant collection of federal criminal offenses. The Congressional Research Service recently reported to us that there are nearly 5,000 federal criminal laws on the books. And, unfortunately, Congress continues to add to this number at a rate of roughly 50 new crimes per year.

One of the recurring themes from both the witnesses who appeared before the task force, as well as the Members of the task force, is that it is crucial that the Judiciary Committee have the opportunity to review all new federal criminal laws.

Our Members and staff have the long-standing expertise to ensure that criminal laws are appropriately drafted, that they fit with the overall federal criminal law scheme, that they are appropriate in force relative to other criminal laws, and finally, that the new criminal law is even necessary.

Throughout its existence, this bi-partisan task force endeavored to closely examine the problems posed by over-criminalization and over-federalization, and to identify potential solutions to combat the regrettable circumstances that inevitably arise from the tangled web of federal criminal provisions. Examples of similarly-situated defendants convicted of the same conduct under different statutes with different penalties, or individuals convicted of offenses without proof of any level of criminal intent, have been detailed in our hearings and are far too commonplace.

The Rules package today clarifies the Committee's jurisdiction over criminal matters by adding the word "criminalization" to our existing jurisdiction over criminal law. By making this change, the Judiciary Committee will have a new jurisdictional interest only in those relatively rare instances that a bill criminalizes new conduct by amending a statute that is attached to a criminal penalty without amending the penalty itself. In this instance, the Judiciary Committee will look to work with the other committee on ensuring that the new conduct is worthy of criminalization and that the attached criminal penalties are appropriately drafted.

The Judiciary Committee is not looking to insert itself into the regulatory schemes under the jurisdiction of other committees. However, to the extent that another committee chooses to use the criminal justice system to enforce the regulation under its jurisdiction, we would like to be involved so that we may ask the important question together as to whether particular conduct should be criminalized.

In conclusion, I believe this small clarification to the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction will allow us to address many of the problems associated with the tangled web of federal criminal laws.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman SESSIONS for working with me on this issue, and express my strong support for this Rules package.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The legacy of the 113th Congress shows us a broken institution: broken by partisanship and recalcitrance.

I urge my colleagues to change course in the 114th Congress, to encourage openness, transparency, and true bipartisanship. If we can achieve this, we will come together.

If we defeat the previous question, I will move to amend the resolution to bring up the Stop Corporate Expatriation and Invest in America's Infrastructure Act of 2015 to stop giving up American citizenship to avoid paying taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Overall, this package demonstrates Republicans' commitment to an open process from Members on both sides of the aisle on the issues of the day that need to be debated, on legislation that will make a difference in the lives of the American people.

We have heard from the Republican chairman of the Budget Committee and the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I believe this is a great package.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this House rules package has a number of other provisions with which we have serious concerns. Most significantly, the rules change relating to Social Security. Late last night, the Republican rules package was revised to include a major new provision that will likely force Social Security benefit cuts. The new rule would prevent the House from considering legislation to prevent a scheduled 20 percent cut to Social Security benefits for 11 million disabled workers and their families (by creating a point of order against legislation that reallocates FICA taxes between the Social Security Trust Funds, which have a current overall balance of \$2.8 trillion), unless the legislation also includes Social Security benefit cuts or tax increases. Without any substantive debate and out of public view, the rule would prevent the House from even considering a mechanism endorsed by more than 50 advocacy groups and which Congress has used 11 times in the past to address shortfalls in one of the trust funds.

H. Res. 5 also extends staff deposition authority to four more committees (Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Science, and Ways and Means). We are deeply concerned that these new authorities will be used to launch politically motivated attacks on the Affordable Care Act, Environmental Protection Agency actions, the implementation of Dodd-Frank financial industry reform, and IRS regulations.

Democrats are disappointed that House Republicans have decided to continue their politically-motivated lawsuit against the President over implementation of the Affordable Care Act and their partisan investigations into "Fast and Furious" and the attack in Benghazi, Libya. Extensions of those authorities also appear in H. Res. 5.

H. Res. 5's changes to the motion to instruct also concern us deeply. Under current rules, motions to instruct conferees can be offered 25 legislative days and 10 calendar days after conference committees have been appointed. H. Res. 5 lengthens these periods, so that motions to instruct would be privileged 45 calendar days and 25 legislative days after the conference is appointed. This is clearly an attempt to weaken the Minority's ability to participate in the conference committee process in the future.

Changes to the authorizing language of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group have the potential to make it politically easier for the Majority to file additional lawsuits against the President, and this possibility disturbs us given the events surrounding the filing of the ACA-related lawsuit last Congress.

H. Res. 5 contains a number of other provisions, some of which raise concerns and some of which appear to be innocuous. For example, small changes to the jurisdiction of certain committees, an increase in the size of the Intelligence Committee, an allowance for extra subcommittees on the Agriculture, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees, and allowing the Speaker to reconvene the House at a time other than previously appointed after consultation with the Minority Leader, among others.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in this resolution, we are establishing a new requirement in clause 8 of Rule XIII that the

Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) incorporate into the official cost estimates required under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Budget Act) the macroeconomic effects of “major legislation.” Because this rule builds on the existing requirement for cost estimates, it does not apply to appropriations legislation.

By including an analysis of how major legislation will affect the economy, this rule provides the House with a more comprehensive estimate than can be produced using only the traditional, conventional scoring methods which implicitly assume that legislation has no effect on the broader economy. In particular, this analysis is required to include the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, the capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from major legislation. In addition, this rule requires a qualitative assessment of the long-term budgetary and macroeconomic effects of major legislation.

Major legislation is defined as legislation causing an increase or decrease in revenues, outlays, or deficits in any fiscal year covered by the budget resolution equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the projected gross domestic product for that year. In applying the 0.25 percent threshold, CBO and JCT are required to look at the gross budgetary effects of the legislation. In carrying out this requirement, the intent is that CBO and JCT review provisions in the bill that have a significant effect. Thus, the test is whether any provision in the legislation has a budgetary effect larger than the threshold, or if the absolute value of the sum of the provisions exceeds the threshold, rather than whether the legislation as a whole has such an effect when all of the provisions are netted out.

Alternately, for legislation that may not have a large fiscal effect, but would still have significant economic impacts, the new rule empowers the House to designate “major legislation.” For all legislation other than purely revenue legislation, the rule authorizes the chair of the Budget Committee to designate “major legislation.” For purely revenue legislation (i.e., legislation that contains only provisions described in section 201(f) of the Budget Act), the rule authorizes the House Member serving as the chair or vice chair of JCT, to designate “major legislation” for purposes of this rule.

The rule carefully preserves the existing division of labor between CBO and JCT, which requires close collaboration between these two non-partisan institutions. When major legislation involves both revenue and non-revenue provisions, CBO and JCT will need to work together to produce a single, integrated cost estimate for the legislation drawing on each agency’s institutional responsibilities.

The rule requires enhanced transparency around these budgetary estimates. Both CBO and JCT, as applicable, must provide together with their estimates a description of the critical assumptions and the source data underlying such estimates. It is important that CBO and JCT make this information available so that the public, academic, and other experts have an opportunity to review the analysis and pursue possible improvements in the methodologies used to develop these estimates. Dis-

tributional analyses of proposed tax changes that JCT provides as background information is another area where estimates could be improved by incorporating macroeconomic effects into these analyses.

The preparation of cost estimates incorporating macroeconomic effects is frequently more complex and requires more time than the preparation of conventional cost estimates. Committees should therefore build in additional time to allow for the completion of the cost estimate. Both CBO and JCT should strive to promptly produce the estimates required by this rule. To the extent it is not practicable for CBO and JCT to produce the required estimates, the rule provides an accommodation in this instance. Two possible circumstances may arise when it is not feasible to produce the required analysis. First, committees and the House may be operating under tight deadlines and it is not possible for CBO or JCT to complete the analysis prior to the legislation’s consideration. Second, while CBO and JCT have developed a great deal of expertise and experience in producing these analyses, there may be situations where it is not possible for CBO and JCT to produce the required analysis.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 5 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 6. STOP CORPORATE EXPATRIATION AND INVEST IN AMERICA’S INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2015.

Not later than January 31, 2015, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of a bill consisting of the text specified in section 8 of this resolution, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations and to transfer the resulting revenues to the Highway Trust Fund. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 8 of this resolution.

Sec. 8. The text referred to in section 6 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Corporate Expatriation and Invest in America’s Infrastructure Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

“(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘60 percent’, or

“(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

“(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term ‘substantial business activities’ shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States.

The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

“(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

“(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

“(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

“(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

“(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “after March 4, 2003,” and inserting “after March 4, 2003, and before May 9, 2014.”.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”, and

(ii) by inserting “or (b)(2)(A)” after “(a)(2)(B)(i)” in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be,” after “(a)(2)(B)(ii)”,

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”, and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting “or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,” after “surrogate foreign corporation”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

SEC. 3. TRANSFERS TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS TO TRUST FUND.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated—

“(A) \$26,852,000,000 to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund, and

“(B) \$6,713,000,000 to the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 168, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—239

Abraham	Flores	Luetkemeyer
Aderholt	Forbes	Lummis
Allen	Fortenberry	MacArthur
Amash	Fox	Marchant
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Babin	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Barletta	Garrett	McCarthy
Barr	Gibbs	McCaul
Barton	Gibson	McClintock
Benishek	Gohmert	McHenry
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McKinley
Bishop (MI)	Gosar	McMorris
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Rodgers
Black	Granger	McSally
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Blum	Graves (LA)	Meehan
Bost	Graves (MO)	Messer
Boustany	Griffith	Mica
Brady (TX)	Grothman	Miller (FL)
Brat	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Mulvaney
Buchanan	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Buck	Harris	Neugebauer
Bucshon	Hartzler	Newhouse
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Noem
Byrne	Hensarling	Nugent
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Olson
Chabot	Hill	Palazzo
Chaffetz	Holding	Palmer
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Paulsen
Coffman	Huelskamp	Pearce
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Perry
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Pittenger
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pitts
Comstock	Hurd (TX)	Poe (TX)
Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Poliquin
Cook	Issa	Pompeo
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Posey
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	Price (GA)
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Culberson	Jolly	Reichert
Curbelo (FL)	Jordan	Renacci
Davis, Rodney	Joyce	Ribble
Denham	Katko	Rice (SC)
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
DeSantis	King (IA)	Roby
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Dold	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rokita
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Ellmers	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Emmer	Latta	Roskam
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Ross
Fincher	Long	Rothfus
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Fleischmann	Love	Royce
Fleming	Lucas	Russell

Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik

Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi

Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NAYS—168

Adams
 Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle (PA)
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu (CA)
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle (PA)
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge

Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lujan Grisham
 Lujan (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNerney
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Norcross

O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Skelowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Cárdenas
 Carney
 Cleaver

Huffman
 Knight
 Lieu (CA)

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER (during the vote). While Members are coming in to record their votes, it is the intention of the Chair to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

PRICE), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Messrs. GOWDY, WELCH, CICILLINE, PRICE of North Carolina, and COOPER appeared at the bar of the House, and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 114th Congress.

□ 1652

Ms. MOORE and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 4, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves that the resolution (H. Res. 5) be committed to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report it forthwith back to the House with the following amendment:

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 6. CEO-EMPLOYEE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015.

Not later than January 31, 2015, the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of a bill consisting of the text specified in section 8 of this resolution, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause

1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 8 of this resolution.

Sec. 8. The text referred to in section 6 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “CEO-Employee Paycheck Fairness Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXCESSIVE EMPLOYEE REMUNERATION.

(a) EXPANDED APPLICATION OF DEDUCTION DENIAL IF PAY FAIRNESS REQUIREMENT NOT MET.—Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF COMPANIES NOT MEETING PAY FAIRNESS REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a publicly held corporation which does not meet the pay fairness requirement of subparagraph (B) for the taxable year—

“(i) no deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for applicable employee remuneration with respect to any employee to the extent that the amount of such remuneration for the taxable year with respect to such employee exceeds \$1,000,000, and

“(ii) paragraph (4) shall be applied without regard to subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘employee’ includes any officer or director of the taxpayer and any former officer, director, or employee of the taxpayer.

“(B) PAY FAIRNESS REQUIREMENT.—The pay fairness requirement of this subparagraph is satisfied if—

“(i)(I) the average compensation paid by the taxpayer to or for all applicable United States employees for the taxable year, exceeds

“(II) the inflation and productivity growth adjusted average of such compensation for the preceding taxable year, and

“(ii) the aggregate compensation paid by the employer to or for all applicable United States employees for the taxable year is not less than the aggregate of such compensation for the preceding taxable year.

“(C) APPLICABLE UNITED STATES EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘applicable United States employee’ means, with respect to any taxable year, any employee—

“(i) whose services with respect to the employer are substantially all performed within the United States, and

“(ii) whose compensation from the employer for the taxable year does not exceed the dollar amount in effect under section 414(q)(1)(B)(i) with respect to the calendar year in which such taxable year begins.

“(D) INFLATION AND PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH ADJUSTED AVERAGE.—The inflation and productivity growth adjusted average of compensation under subparagraph (B)(i)(II) for any taxable year shall be determined by multiplying—

“(i) the average of the compensation paid by the taxpayer to or for all applicable United States employees for the taxable year, by

“(ii) the sum of the cost-of-living adjustment and the productivity adjustment for the taxable year.

“(E) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (D)(ii), the cost-of-

living adjustment for any taxable year shall be the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'the second preceding calendar year' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(F) PRODUCTIVITY ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (D)(ii)—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The productivity adjustment for the taxable year shall be an amount (expressed as a percentage) equal to the average annual increase in the business productivity index for the period beginning with calendar year 2000 and ending with the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the taxable year begins.

“(ii) BUSINESS PRODUCTIVITY INDEX.—The term ‘business productivity index’ means the nonfarm business productivity index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as adjusted by the Secretary to account for depreciation.

“(G) COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘compensation’ means, with respect to any employee, the sum of—

“(i) the employee’s wages on which the tax under section 3101(b) is imposed, plus

“(ii) any amount described in paragraph (9), (11), (12), or (14) of section 6051(a) with respect to the employee.

“(H) AGGREGATION RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraph (5)(B)(iii) shall apply for purposes of this paragraph.

“(I) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, including adjustments to the pay fairness requirements of subparagraph (B)—

“(i) to prevent avoidance of this paragraph through changes in the composition of the taxpayer’s workforce, and

“(ii) to account for significant, non-tax-motivated changes in the size and composition of the taxpayer’s workforce (including mergers, spinoffs, or changes in the occupational composition of a taxpayer’s workforce).”.

(b) MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF COVERED EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “as of the close of the taxable year, such employee is the chief executive officer of the taxpayer or” and inserting “such employee is the chief executive officer or the chief financial officer of the taxpayer at any time during the taxable year, or was”;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “(other than the chief executive officer)” and inserting “(other than any individual described in subparagraph (A))”, and

(C) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, or”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) was a covered employee of the taxpayer (or any predecessor) for any preceding taxable year beginning after December 31, 2014.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 162(m)(3)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “4 highest” and inserting “3 highest”.

(c) APPLICABLE EMPLOYEE REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(H) SPECIAL RULE FOR REMUNERATION PAID TO BENEFICIARIES, ETC.—Remuneration shall not fail to be applicable employee remunera-

tion merely because it is includible in the income of, or paid to, a person other than the covered employee, including after the death of the covered employee.”.

(d) EXPANSION OF APPLICABLE EMPLOYER TO INCLUDE NON-LISTED PUBLIC COMPANIES.—Paragraph (2) of section 162(m) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) PUBLICLY HELD CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘publicly held corporation’ means any corporation which is an issuer (as defined in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934)—

“(A) that has a class of securities registered under section 12 of such Act, or

“(B) that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of such Act.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

Mr. SESSIONS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 168, nays 243, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—168

Adams	DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.
Aguiar	DeGette	Kaptur
Bass	Delaney	Keating
Beatty	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	DeBene	Kennedy
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Beyer	Deutch	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kind
Blumenauer	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Doyle (PA)	Kuster
Boyle (PA)	Duckworth	Langevin
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Lawrence
Bustos	Esty	Lee
Butterfield	Farr	Levin
Capps	Fattah	Lewis
Capuano	Foster	Lieu (CA)
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Carney	Fudge	Loeb
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lofgren
Cartwright	Galleo	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham
Castro (TX)	Grayson	(NM)
Chu (CA)	Green, Al	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cicilline	Green, Gene	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Lynch
Clarke (NY)	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clay	Hahn	McCollum
Cleaver	Hastings	McDermott
Clyburn	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Cohen	Himes	McNerney
Connolly	Hinojosa	Moore
Conyers	Honda	Moulton
Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Courtney	Huffman	Napolitano
Cuellar	Israel	Neal
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Norcoss
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Pallone

Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano

NAYS—243

Abraham	Gosar	Mullin
Aderholt	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Allen	Graham	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Granger	Neugebauer
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Newhouse
Ashford	Graves (LA)	Noem
Babin	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Barletta	Griffith	Nunes
Barr	Grothman	Olson
Barton	Guinta	Palazzo
Benishek	Guthrie	Palmer
Billirakis	Hanna	Paulsen
Bishop (MI)	Hardy	Pearce
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Perry
Black	Harris	Peters
Blackburn	Hartzler	Pittenger
Blum	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Bost	Hensarling	Poliquin
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hice (GA)	Posey
Brat	Hill	Price (GA)
Bridenstine	Holding	Ratcliffe
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Reichert
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buck	Hultgren	Ribble
Bucshon	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Rigell
Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Roby
Calvert	Issa	Roe (TN)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Coffman	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Roskam
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Ross
Comstock	Katko	Rothfus
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Cook	King (IA)	Royce
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Russell
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Crawford	Kline	Salmon
Crenshaw	Knight	Sanford
Culberson	Labrador	Scalise
Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa	Schock
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Schweikert
Denham	Lance	Scott, Austin
Dent	Latta	Sensenbrenner
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Sessions
DesJarlais	Long	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Shuster
Dold	Love	Simpson
Duffy	Lucas	Sinema
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Ellmers	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	Marino	Stefanik
Fincher	Massie	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Stivers
Fleischmann	McCaul	Stutzman
Fleming	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Flores	McHenry	Thornberry
Forbes	McMorris	Tiberi
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Tipton
Fox	McSally	Trott
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Upton
Garrett	Messer	Valadao
Gibbs	Mica	Wagner
Gibson	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Walden
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Walker

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Capps
DeLauro
Deutch
Duffy
Larson (CT)
Mooney (WV)
Pitts
Watson Coleman

□ 1730

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 6 regarding the “The Rules Package for the 114th Congress” (H. Res. 5). Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to resolutions:

S. RES. 2

In the Senate of the United States, January 6, 2015.

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

S. RES. 5

In the Senate of the United States, January 6, 2015.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Orrin G. Hatch as President of the Senate pro tempore.

S. RES. 10

In the Senate of the United States, January 6, 2015.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Julie E. Adams as Secretary of the Senate.

S. RES. 13

In the Senate of the United States, January 6, 2015.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Frank J. Larkin as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 6

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Conaway, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Chair.

NOT VOTING—4

McKinley
Mooney (WV)
Pitts
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1714

Messrs. GOHMERT, ASHFORD, and PALMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TAKANO changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 172, answered “present” 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart

Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Ciocile
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

NAYS—172

Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Mulanvey

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Thornberry, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Tom Price of Georgia, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Kline, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Upton, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Dent, Chair; Mr. Meehan; Mr. Gowdy; Mrs. Brooks of Indiana; and Mr. Marchant.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Hensarling, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Royce, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. McCaul, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Mrs. Miller of Michigan, Chair; Mr. Harper; Mr. Schock; Mr. Nugent; Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois; and Mrs. Comstock.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Goodlatte, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Bishop of Utah, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Chaffetz, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON RULES: Mr. Sessions, Chair; Ms. Foxx; Mr. Cole; Mr. Woodall; Mr. Burgess; Mr. Stivers; and Mr. Collins of Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Smith of Texas, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Chabot, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Shuster, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Miller of Florida, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin, Chair.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Foxx). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 7

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. Peterson.

(2) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Mrs. Lowey (when sworn), Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Serrano, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Farr, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Honda, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Israel, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Ruppersberger, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Cuellar, Ms. Pingree of Maine, and Mr. Quigley.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Smith of Washington.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Van Hollen.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Mr. Scott of Virginia.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—Mr. Pallone, Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Engel, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Ms. DeGette, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Doyle, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Butterfield, Ms. Matsui, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Welch, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Tonko (when sworn), Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. Clarke of NY, Mr. Loebsack, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Cárdenas.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—Ms. Waters (when sworn), Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York (when sworn), Ms. Velázquez (when sworn), Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks (when sworn), Mr. Capuano, Mr. Hinojosa, Mr. Clay, Mr. Lynch, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Cleaver, Ms. Moore, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Perlmuter, Mr. Himes, Mr. Carney, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Foster, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Murphy of Florida, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Sinema, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Heck of Washington, and Mr. Vargas.

(8) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—Mr. Engel (when sworn).

(9) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Mr. Thompson of Mississippi.

(10) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.

(11) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Conyers.

(12) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Grijalva.

(13) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Cummings.

(14) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Ms. Slaughter, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Hastings of Florida, and Mr. Polis.

(15) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas.

(16) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Velázquez (when sworn).

(17) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Mr. DeFazio.

(18) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Ms. Brown of Florida.

(19) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—Mr. Levin, Mr. Rangel (when sworn), Mr. McDermott, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Neal, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Kind, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Crowley (when sworn), Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, and Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Foxx). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 8

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, the six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following named persons, effective January 6, 2015, until otherwise ordered by the House, to-wit: Nadeam Elshami, George Kundanis, Diane Dewhirst, Richard Meltzer, Wyndee Parker, and Drew Hammill, each to receive gross compensation pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 119, Ninety-fifth Congress, as enacted into permanent law by section 115 of Public Law 95-94. In addition, the Minority Leader may appoint and set the annual rate of pay for up to 3 further minority employees.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING THE DAILY HOUR OF MEETING OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 9

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be 2 p.m. on Mondays; noon on Tuesdays (or 2 p.m. if no legislative business was conducted on the preceding Monday); noon on Wednesdays and Thursdays; and 9 a.m. on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 22

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hire More Heroes Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. EMPLOYEES WITH HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING EMPLOYERS TO WHICH THE EMPLOYER MANDATE APPLIES UNDER PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) EXEMPTION FOR HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION.—Solely for purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer under this paragraph for any month, an individual shall not be taken into account as an employee for such month if such individual has medical coverage for such month under—

“(i) chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, including coverage under the TRICARE program, or

“(ii) under a health care program under chapter 17 or 18 of title 38, United States Code, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within to which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 22, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, only a law as bad as ObamaCare would penalize a small business for hiring a veteran.

Madam Speaker, right now, the law says if you have at least 50 full-time employees, you must give all of them health insurance even if they are already getting health insurance elsewhere. In fact, over 9 million veterans are already getting health care through the VA, but they are not exempt. Every employer has to cover them anyway.

So here is what is happening. Businesses have an incentive to turn away veterans, not because they don't want to hire them, but because it is too expensive to hire them. This is serving as a penalty to hiring our Nation's veterans.

Madam Speaker, nobody works harder than our men and women that serve us in our military. They fought for our country, and they sacrificed. The least we can do is remove this penalty from putting a veteran on your payroll. The way I see it is we owe it to them. We should make it as easy as possible for them to find a job. That is what we are trying to do with this legislation.

What this bill says is that if you are already getting health care through TRICARE or the VA, then you are exempt from the mandate. Anyone can

hire you without any fear of this penalty. I think we can all agree that more veterans on the payroll means a healthier economy for all of us.

Now, I think all families need relief from ObamaCare. All of us need relief from this law that we think is going to collapse under its own weight, but I consider this bill as an installment plan, as one piece of our ongoing efforts to fully repeal and replace this law.

Madam Speaker, we have an enormous generation of talented men and women who have served this country so honorably overseas in the recent years. The least we can do is make it easier for an employer to hire them and remove this penalty that puts a price tag on hiring the bravest among us.

Most of all, I want to thank Congressman RODNEY DAVIS for bringing this issue to our attention. I want to thank Congressman DAVIS for introducing this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

First of all, I would like to congratulate Mr. RYAN on your selection in election, I guess, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. We look forward to working together.

Madam Speaker, I support this bill. This bill encourages the hiring of veterans. The unemployment rate has continued to decline for post-9/11 veterans, and these improvements are part of a larger economic recovery.

In November 2013, the unemployment rate for these veterans was nearly 10 percent. One year later, the rate has dropped to 5.7 percent, the national average; yet for female post-9/11 veterans, the unemployment rate remains high, above 8 percent.

This bill continues as part of our national commitment to help the veterans of this country. I want to emphasize this if I might: as we legislate, we need to balance priorities. We need to maintain—very differently than just spoken—the basic structure of ACA, which is providing millions and millions of Americans with insurance and with coverage they never had.

We also need to encourage the hiring of the veterans of this country who have served this Nation and serve this Nation so well. That is a supreme obligation of this institution; therefore, I support this legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Topeka, Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I was a freshman lawmaker in 2010 when the President's partisan health care law was passed

through Congress and became law. I worried at the time that it would take our health care system in the wrong direction and would lead to numerous unintended consequences that could hurt American families. Now that the law is being implemented, we can see that this is indeed true.

The employer mandate penalty tax is a troublesome and confusing piece of the President's health care law. The American people want to see it fixed. The legislation that we are debating right now will exempt those who employ members of our Nation's military and veterans from the employer mandate.

Because our current and former servicemembers already receive health care from TRICARE and the VA, it simply does not make sense to force small businesses to treat these folks as if they do not have health insurance, which drives up the cost of doing business, leaving less for employees' salaries. In fact, the current law effectively punishes small businesses for hiring these heroes.

Madam Speaker, I was a proud cosponsor and supporter of this legislation in the last Congress, and I am happy to again stand today in support of this commonsense provision. I ask that you support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield as much time as she shall consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), someone who has served this Nation and now serves all of the people of Hawaii and I think, once again, all the people of this country.

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I am rising today in very strong support of this Hire More Heroes Act introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), someone whom I have been privileged to work with and am proud to cosponsor this legislation.

When he first came to me with this idea, it was a no-brainer that I would support it because of the key constituencies that this legislation serves: our veterans and our small businesses. In addition to that, I think, as we kick off this 114th Congress, it is a great message and exactly the right tone that we are focused on these two constituencies.

By exempting veterans who have health insurance through the VA or from the DOD from being counted toward that 50-employee limit under the Affordable Care Act, this legislation creates important incentives. It encourages small businesses to grow and expand their workforce, and it establishes an incentive to hire more veterans.

Madam Speaker, there are many people who already receive insurance because of their service to our country. I used to be one of them. I was covered under TRICARE for a long period of

time after both of my deployments to the Middle East, and it just makes sense that these individuals who already have great medical coverage would not have to count towards the numbers of employees that would trigger the employer mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

Most importantly, this bill is about serving veterans. Servicemembers who are transitioning to civilian life bring exceptional training, critical skill sets, and proven leadership ability back to their local communities.

□ 1745

Unfortunately, as a country, we are facing an unacceptable number of unemployed veterans, people who are experienced, who are capable and energetic, who are coming back from serving oftentimes in conflicts overseas. These are veterans who will serve as a great asset to businesses and organizations of any size because they come with a built-in unique work ethic, a great deal of training, and real-world experience. These are people who are highly disciplined, who know what it means to work as a member of a team. They know what it means to put the mission first, and they are servant leaders at their very best.

This bill provides an incentive for businesses to hire these veterans and, in turn, helps these veterans be successful in their transition to civilian life. This commonsense legislation benefits both veterans and small businesses, while also growing our economy. I urge all of our colleagues to strongly support H.R. 22.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and Representative RODNEY DAVIS.

Today I honor the 54,000 veterans in my district and 20 million veterans across America who deserve the opportunity to have a job with the Hire More Heroes Act. The bill makes a change to ObamaCare and encourages small businesses to hire more veterans by exempting veterans as long as they already have health insurance.

Currently, the employer mandate under ObamaCare requires that all businesses with more than 50 employees provide health insurance to their employers or pay a penalty. But according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate for veterans last year was 6.6 percent, for those who served on Active Duty after 9/11 it was 9 percent. What saddens me about this is both of these percentages were higher than the national average of 6.3 percent.

No veteran in the United States of America should be jobless because of ObamaCare's employer mandate. Our brave men and women return from

serving our Nation, return to civilian life while facing many challenges. Getting a job should not be one of them. This bill will ensure that employers can and will hire veterans and will not be penalized.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. We must do everything in our power to ensure our finest men and women who come home have every opportunity we promised them.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), the author of this legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity today. Chairman RYAN, my colleague from the great State of Michigan, I thank you for your support for this piece of legislation.

Earlier today, a new Congress was sworn in, each of us swearing to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. A new Congress is another opportunity to do the people's work, to further the ideas and priorities of our constituents and put our Nation on solid footing for an even brighter future.

I am honored that this 114th Congress is opening with the Hire More Heroes Act, a bill that I have introduced and an idea that didn't come from Washington, D.C. It began with a constituent of mine, Brad Lavite, who is actually up in the gallery today. Brad had this idea, and as a superintendent of the Madison County Veterans' Assistance Commission, I am proud to have him here today to see the culmination of what that idea has turned into and the bipartisan support that you see for this idea on the floor of the House today.

Brad helps the nearly 35,000 veterans living in Madison County navigate the VA system and actually find other resources, including helping our veterans find employment. After explaining ObamaCare to veterans throughout southwestern Illinois and how it impacts their VA health benefits, he began wondering why they were subject to the employer mandate if they were not even in need of health care coverage. Brad raised his concern with me at one of our veterans advisory board meetings, and shortly thereafter we began work on the Hire More Heroes Act.

This bill will help businesses hire more of our Nation's veterans by making a commonsense change to ObamaCare. In just a few months, the President's health care law will mark its fifth anniversary; 5 years of delays, canceled policies, costly Web site glitches, and increased out-of-pocket expenses for hardworking middle class families. Unfortunately, the law's problems don't end there. We continue to see its lingering impact on our econ-

omy as many small businesses delay hiring, cut hours, and, in some cases, reduce payroll. In fact, the National Small Business Association found that 91 percent of small businesses have seen increases in their health care costs, and two-thirds of their members listed ObamaCare as a reason for holding off on investing in people. And, Madam Speaker, I must remind everybody that investing in people is how we create jobs here in America.

The Hire More Heroes Act exempts veterans already enrolled in their own health care plans through the Department of Defense or through the VA from being counted toward the 50-employee limit as part of the employer mandate required under ObamaCare. By making this commonsense change to the law, we will not only provide small businesses with much-needed relief, but also help more of our veterans find work.

Despite receiving some of the best training in the world, post-9/11 veterans are consistently faced with higher unemployment rates than that of other veterans. So as more and more of our veterans return home, the Hire More Heroes Act will give those who have sacrificed and served our country a leg up in a very competitive job market. Last Congress, this legislation passed this House overwhelmingly by a count of 406-1, almost as bipartisan as you can get, but it was held up in the Senate.

The Hire More Heroes Act is just one example of the bipartisan bills that the House will bring up this Congress. Later this week, we will further the American people's call for greater energy independence and job creation by voting to approve the Keystone XL pipeline and by helping Americans by restoring the 40-hour workweek under ObamaCare. With a new Congress, and if the President is willing to work with us, we have an opportunity to end the stagnation in Washington and make our government work for the people again.

I ask all of my colleagues to defend the oath that they have just taken and help hire more of our heroes by voting "yes" on this piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid references to occupants in the gallery.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman if he has other speakers.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We have four additional speakers.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in the fall, we made a commitment to the American people,

a commitment to produce solutions that grow our economy and create more opportunity and help our small businesses and make life better for working families. Today, the new American Congress begins the work of making good on that commitment, and we start with a bill that helps two groups critical to America's success: our veterans and our small businesses.

The Hire More Heroes Act is a bipartisan bill which passed the House, as has been mentioned before, with more than 400 votes last year. It would make it easier for small businesses to hire veterans by exempting those veterans who already receive health care at the VA from ObamaCare's costly employer mandate. This commonsense solution offsets the cost of hiring a veteran by addressing one of ObamaCare's many failures, and there are many.

As I have said many times before, I and many of my colleagues believe that ObamaCare should be repealed in its entirety. It may take awhile to do that, and so we can do some other things in the meantime. This is one of those things, a realistic thing which will actually help the American people.

ObamaCare is placing tremendous burdens on small businesses looking to grow and individuals looking for work. This bill alleviates one of the many burdens ObamaCare places on our small businesses and, in doing so, helps our returning war fighters find meaningful work.

Small businesses are responsible for the majority of new jobs created in America today. As the new incoming chairman of the House Small Business Committee, my goal each day will be to make life better for America's small businesses so they can continue to innovate and create jobs for more Americans who are seeking them.

Even though unemployment has come down to some degree, we need to do a lot better. The bill before us today is an important step towards that goal and towards our commitment to the American people to create more jobs, real jobs in the private sector. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Hire More Heroes Act. In my home State of Tennessee, we have over 525,000 veterans who have served our country in both war and peace—veterans, people like my son, Steve, and my husband, Dave.

But today, too many of these Americans are struggling to find work. In fact, the unemployment rate among post-September 11 veterans is chron-

ically higher than the national unemployment rate. I believe that we can do better. After all, our veterans have sacrificed for our country. Congress should, at the very least, make certain that Washington does not stand between them and access to a steady job.

The Hire More Heroes Act will help accomplish this by exempting veterans who already have health insurance from being counted as full-time workers under ObamaCare's employer mandate, meaning that business owners can hire veterans without fear of being slapped with an ObamaCare penalty. That is why this body passed the legislation by an overwhelming vote of 406-1 last year. Unfortunately, our efforts were stonewalled in the Democrat-controlled Senate. But today, we have an opportunity to start anew.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Hire More Heroes Act, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his work on this critical measure.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This basically is how it is supposed to work. A constituent in central Illinois, Brad Lavite, approaches his Congressman, Congressman DAVIS, and says there is a problem with the law affecting our Nation's veterans. So his Congressman goes to work, does the research, and then writes legislation to fix the law, and here we are. This is how it is supposed to work. This is how the Founders intended the Congress to work.

Here is what we are fixing. We are saying there will not be a penalty based on the health care law affixed to our veterans. We have got a new, great generation. We have all read the books and heard the stories, and it is true, of the Greatest Generation, the World War II generation. We now have a new great generation, the men and women since 9/11 who have bravely fought for this country and sacrificed for us are a generation of people who have developed the kinds of leadership skills, the kinds of courage, the experiences, the sacrifices their families made, and they are bringing that home to serve our country even further. They are bringing this great experience and talent and skills to our economy. We need to remove every conceivable barrier that exists that prevents them from sharing these talents with us.

This bill takes us a big step in the right direction to removing this barrier that disincentivizes a small business from hiring a veteran and instead turns it into an incentive so we can hire our heroes, our veterans.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I said at the beginning, we need to, as we legislate, balance priorities.

We have here a very different view of the ACA than has been expressed by several. But that isn't the point of this legislation. This is about the veterans of this country.

□ 1800

This isn't about Keystone. We will debate that some other time. We have very different views. This is no way a precedent to that. We will debate the 40-hour week later this week. We have some very different views, to put it mildly, about the legislation entitled the "40-hour week."

I should also like to point out regarding ACA that businesses, small businesses with fewer than 50 employees, aren't even required to contribute to or offer insurance to their employees.

This bill is called the Heroes Act because the focus of this bill is to make sure that there isn't any disincentive for anybody to hire veterans. The rate of unemployment for veterans has been higher. I had the chance in Roseville, Michigan, to meet with veterans, Vietnam veterans, some months ago. I was deeply troubled by the high rate of unemployment for those Vietnam veterans. This country has not done an adequate job in terms of making sure that veterans have a real opportunity to work.

That is the tribute that we must provide, and it is more than a tribute; it is an obligation to those who have served this Nation. That is why this is called the Heroes Act. Let's not distort it. Let's not undermine what is the purpose of this legislation. Those who have served deserve as our priority any reasonable effort to provide them with the opportunity that they want. They have served. Now they want to work. We need to make sure they have that opportunity to work.

It is within that spirit that I support this legislation and urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time only to say that our constituents have been very clear to all of us on both sides of the aisle that they want to see us come together to find common ground to make a positive difference in the lives of Americans, particularly our veterans, and this bipartisan effort reflects that.

I am very proud to be here with Congressman DAVIS, with Congressman LEVIN, to be doing this.

With that, I simply ask all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 22.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—412

Abraham	Cummings	Hill
Adams	Curbelo (FL)	Himes
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Aguiar	Davis, Danny	Holding
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Honda
Amash	DeFazio	Hoyer
Amodei	DeGette	Hudson
Ashford	Delaney	Huelskamp
Babin	DeLauro	Huffman
Barletta	DelBene	Huizenga (MI)
Barr	Denham	Hultgren
Barton	Dent	Hunter
Bass	DeSantis	Hurd (TX)
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Hurt (VA)
Becerra	DesJarlais	Israel
Benishkek	Deuth	Issa
Bera	Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee
Beyer	Dingell	Jeffries
Bilirakis	Doggett	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Doyle (PA)	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Duckworth	Johnson (OH)
Black	Duffy	Johnson, E. B.
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Blum	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jones
Bonamici	Ellison	Jordan
Bost	Ellmers	Joyce
Boustany	Emmer	Kaptur
Boyle (PA)	Eshoo	Katko
Brady (PA)	Esty	Keating
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Kelly (IL)
Brat	Farr	Kelly (PA)
Bridenstine	Fattah	Kennedy
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Kildee
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Brown (FL)	Fleischmann	Kind
Brownley (CA)	Fleming	King (IA)
Buchanan	Flores	King (NY)
Buck	Forbes	Kinzinger (IL)
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Kirkpatrick
Burgess	Foster	Kline
Bustos	Fox	Knight
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
Byrne	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Capps	Fudge	Lamborn
Capuano	Gabbard	Lance
Cárdenas	Gallego	Langevin
Carney	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Garrett	Latta
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	Lawrence
Cartwright	Gibson	Lee
Castor (FL)	Gohmert	Levin
Castro (TX)	Goodlatte	Lewis
Chabot	Gosar	Lieu (CA)
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Lipinski
Chu (CA)	Graham	LoBiondo
Cicilline	Granger	Loeb
Clark (MA)	Graves (GA)	Lofgren
Clarke (NY)	Graves (LA)	Long
Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Clay	Grayson	Love
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lucas
Coffman	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Cohen	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Cole	Grothman	(NM)
Collins (GA)	Guin	Luján, Ben Ray
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	(NM)
Comstock	Gutiérrez	Lummis
Conaway	Hahn	Lynch
Connolly	Hanna	MacArthur
Conyers	Hardy	Marchant
Cook	Harper	Marino
Cooper	Harris	Massie
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	Matsui
Courtney	Hastings	McCarthy
Cramer	Heck (NV)	McCaul
Crawford	Heck (WA)	McClintock
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McCollum
Cuellar	Herrera Beutler	McDermott
Culberson	Hice (GA)	McGovern

McHenry	Renacci	Smith (WA)
McKinley	Ribble	Speier
McMorris	Rice (NY)	Stefanik
Rodgers	Rice (SC)	Stewart
McNerney	Richmond	Stivers
McSally	Rigell	Stutzman
Meadows	Roby	Swalwell (CA)
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Takai
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Takano
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Thompson (PA)
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Thornberry
Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Moore	Roskam	Tipton
Moulton	Ross	Titus
Mullin	Rothfus	Torres
Mulvaney	Rouzer	Trott
Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Murphy (PA)	Royce	Turner
Napolitano	Ruiz	Upton
Neal	Ruppersberger	Valadao
Neugebauer	Rush	Van Hollen
Newhouse	Russell	Vargas
Noem	Ryan (OH)	Veasey
Norcross	Ryan (WI)	Vela
Nugent	Salmon	Visclosky
Nunes	Sánchez, Linda	Wagner
O'Rourke	T.	Walberg
Olson	Sánchez, Loretta	Walden
Palazzo	Sanford	Walker
Pallone	Sarbanes	Walorski
Palmer	Scalise	Walters, Mimi
Pascarella	Schakowsky	Walz
Paulsen	Schiff	Wasserman
Payne	Schock	Schultz
Pearce	Schrader	Watson Coleman
Pelosi	Schweikert	Weber (TX)
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Webster (FL)
Perry	Scott, Austin	Welch
Peters	Scott, David	Wenstrup
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Pingree	Serrano	Westmoreland
Pittenger	Sessions	Whitfield
Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Williams
Poe (TX)	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Poliquin	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Polis	Shuster	Wittman
Pompeo	Simpson	Womack
Posey	Sinema	Woodall
Price (GA)	Sires	Yarmuth
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Yoder
Quigley	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Young (IN)
Reichert	Smith (TX)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—3

Larson (CT) Pitts Zinke

□ 1831

Mrs. CAPPS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015—I was not present for rollcall votes 6 and 7. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: “nay” on rollcall vote 6, “aye” on rollcall vote 7, the Hire More Heroes Act, as I had done previously in the 113th Congress when it passed the House (rollcall vote 115) on March 11, 2014.

REGARDING CONSENT TO ASSEMBLE OUTSIDE THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That pursuant to clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, during the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, may notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to assemble at a place outside the District of Columbia if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS DURING THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the 114th Congress, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEANOUS MATERIAL IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DURING THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the 114th Congress all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material within the permitted limit in that section of the RECORD entitled “Extensions of Remarks.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the first session of the 114th Congress:

(1) On legislative days of Monday or Tuesday when the House convenes pursuant to House Resolution 9, the House shall convene 2 hours earlier than the time otherwise established by the resolution for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate;

(2) on legislative days of Wednesday or Thursday when the House convenes pursuant to House Resolution 9, the

House shall convene 2 hours earlier than the time otherwise established by the resolution for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate;

(3) when the House convenes pursuant to an order other than House Resolution 9, the House shall convene for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate only as prescribed by such order;

(4) the time for morning-hour debate shall be allocated equally between the parties and may not continue beyond 10 minutes before the hour appointed for the resumption of the session of the House; and

(5) the form of proceeding for morning-hour debate shall be as follows:

(a) the prayer by the Chaplain, the approval of the Journal and the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag shall be postponed until resumption of the session of the House;

(b) initial and subsequent recognitions for debate shall alternate between the parties;

(c) recognition shall be conferred by the Speaker only pursuant to lists submitted by the majority leader and by the minority leader;

(d) no Member may address the House for longer than 5 minutes, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip;

(e) no legislative business shall be in order except the filing of privileged reports; and

(f) following morning-hour debate, the Chair shall declare a recess pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I until the time appointed for the resumption of the session of the House; and

(6) the Speaker may dispense with morning-hour debate upon receipt of a notification described in clause 12(c) of rule I, or upon a change in reconvening pursuant to clause 12(e) of rule I, and notify Members accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair customarily takes this occasion at the outset of a Congress to announce her policies with respect to particular aspects of the legislative process. The Chair will insert in the RECORD announcements concerning:

first, privileges of the floor;
second, introduction of bills and resolutions;

third, unanimous-consent requests for the consideration of legislation;

fourth, recognition for 1-minute speeches;

fifth, recognition for Special Order speeches;

sixth, decorum in debate;

seventh, conduct of votes by electronic device;

eighth, use of handouts on the House floor;

ninth, use of electronic equipment on the House floor; and

tenth, use of the Chamber.

These announcements, where appropriate, will reiterate the origins of the stated policies. The Chair intends to continue in the 114th Congress the policies reflected in these statements. The policy announced in the 102nd Congress with respect to jurisdictional concepts related to clause 5(a) of rule XXI—tax and tariff measures—will continue to govern but need not be reiterated, as it is adequately documented as precedent in the House Rules and Manual.

Without objection, the announcements will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

1. Privileges of the Floor

The Chair will make the following announcements regarding floor privileges, which will apply during the 114th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO STAFF

Rule IV strictly limits those persons to whom the privileges of the floor during sessions of the House are extended, and that rule prohibits the Chair from entertaining requests for suspension or waiver of that rule. As reiterated by the Chair on January 21, 1986, January 3, 1985, January 25, 1983, and August 22, 1974, and as stated in Chapter 10, section 2, of House Practice, the rule strictly limits the number of committee staff on the floor at one time during the consideration of measures reported from their committees. This permission does not extend to Members' personal staff except when a Member's amendment is actually pending during the five-minute rule. It also does not extend to personal staff of Members who are sponsors of pending bills or who are engaging in special orders. The Chair requests the cooperation of all Members and committee staff to assure that only the proper number of staff are on the floor, and then only during the consideration of measures within the jurisdiction of their committees. The Chair is making this statement and reiterating this policy because of Members' past insistence upon strict enforcement of the rule. The Chair requests each committee chair, and each ranking minority member, to submit to the Speaker a list of those staff who are allowed on the floor during the consideration of a measure reported by their committee. The Sergeant-at-Arms, who has been directed to assure proper enforcement of rule IV, will keep the list. Each staff person should exchange his or her ID for a "committee staff" badge, which is to be worn while on the floor. The Chair has consulted with the Minority Leader and will continue to consult with her.

Furthermore, as the Chair announced on January 7, 2003, in accordance with the

change in the 108th Congress of clause 2(a) of rule IV regarding leadership staff floor access, only designated staff approved by the Speaker shall be granted the privilege of the floor. The Speaker intends that his approval be narrowly granted on a bipartisan basis to staff from the majority and minority side and only to those staff essential to floor activities.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO FORMER MEMBERS

The Speaker's policy announced on February 1, 2006, will continue to apply in the 114th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, FEBRUARY 1, 2006

The SPEAKER. The House has adopted a revision to the rule regarding the admission to the floor and the rooms leading thereto. Clause 4 of rule IV provides that a former Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner or a former Parliamentarian of the House, or a former elected officer of the House or a former minority employee nominated as an elected officer of the House shall not be entitled to the privilege of admission to the Hall of the House and the rooms extending thereto if he or she is a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal; has any direct personal pecuniary interest in any legislative measure pending before the House, or reported by a committee; or is in the employ of or represents any party or organization for the purpose of influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage, defeat, or amendment of any legislative proposal.

This restriction extends not only to the House floor but adjacent rooms, the cloakrooms and the Speaker's lobby.

Clause 4 of rule IV also allows the Speaker to exempt ceremonial and educational functions from the restrictions of this clause. These restrictions shall not apply to attendance at joint meetings or joint sessions, Former Members' Day proceedings, educational tours, and other occasions as the Speaker may designate.

Members who have reason to know that a person is on the floor inconsistent with clause 4 of rule IV should notify the Sergeant-at-Arms promptly.

2. Introduction of Bills and Resolutions

The policy that the Chair announced on January 3, 1983, with respect to the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions will continue to apply in the 114th Congress. The Chair has advised all officers and employees of the House who are involved in the processing of bills that every bill, resolution, memorial, petition or other material that is placed in the hopper must bear the signature of a Member. Where a bill or resolution is jointly sponsored, the signature must be that of the Member first named thereon. The bill clerk is instructed to return to the Member any bill which appears in the hopper without an original signature. This procedure was inaugurated in the 92d Congress. It has worked well, and the Chair thinks that it is essential to continue this practice to insure the integrity of the process by which legislation is introduced in the House.

3. Unanimous-Consent Requests for the Consideration of Legislation

The policy the Chair announced on January 6, 1999, with respect to recognition for unanimous-consent requests for the consideration of certain legislative measures will continue to apply in the 114th Congress. The Speaker will continue to follow the guidelines recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual conferring recognition for

unanimous-consent requests for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other measures only when assured that the majority and minority floor leadership and the relevant committee chairs and ranking minority members have no objection. Consistent with those guidelines and with the Chair's inherent power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XVII, the Chair, and any occupant of the chair appointed as Speaker pro tempore pursuant to clause 8 of rule I, will decline recognition for the unanimous-consent requests chronicled in section 956 without assurances that the request has been so cleared. This denial of recognition by the Chair will not reflect necessarily any personal opposition on the part of the Chair to orderly consideration of the matter in question, but will reflect the determination upon the part of the Chair that orderly procedures will be followed; that is, procedures involving consultation and agreement between floor and committee leadership on both sides of the aisle.

4. Recognition for One-Minute Speeches

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

The Speaker's policy announced on August 8, 1984, with respect to recognition for one-minute speeches will apply during the 114th Congress. The Chair will alternate recognition for one-minute speeches between majority and minority Members, in the order in which they seek recognition in the well under present practice from the Chair's right to the Chair's left, with possible exceptions for Members of the leadership and Members having business requests. The Chair, of course, reserves the right to limit one-minute speeches to a certain period of time or to a special place in the program on any given day, with notice to the leadership.

5. Recognition for Special-Order Speeches

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO SPECIAL-ORDER SPEECHES

The Speaker's policy with regard to special-order speeches announced on February 11, 1994, as clarified and reiterated by subsequent Speakers, will continue to apply in the 114th Congress, with the following modifications.

The Chair may recognize Members for special-order speeches for up to 4 hours. Such speeches may not extend beyond the 4-hour limit without the permission of the Chair, which may be granted only with advance consultation between the leaderships and notification to the House. However, the Chair will not recognize for any special-order speeches beyond 10 o'clock in the evening.

The 4-hour limitation will be divided between the majority and minority parties. Each party is entitled to reserve its first hour for respective leaderships or their designees. The second hour reserved to each party will be divided into two 30-minute periods. Recognition for one-hour periods and for 30-minute periods will alternate initially and subsequently between the parties each day. The Chair wishes to clarify for Members that any 60- or 30-minute period that is not claimed at the appropriate time will be considered to have expired; this includes the first 60-minute period of the day.

The allocation of time within each party's 2-hour period (or shorter period if prorated to end by 10 p.m.) will be determined by a list submitted to the Chair by the respective leaderships. Members may not sign up with their leadership for any special-order speeches earlier than one week prior to the special order. Additional guidelines may be established for such sign-ups by the respective leaderships.

Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule V, the television cameras will not pan the Chamber, but a "crawl" indicating the conduct of morning-hour debate or that the House has completed its legislative business and is proceeding with special-order speeches will appear on the screen. The Chair may announce other adaptations during this period.

The continuation of this format for recognition by the Speaker is without prejudice to the Speaker's ultimate power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XVII and includes the ability to withdraw recognition for longer special-order speeches should circumstances warrant.

6. Decorum in Debate

The Chair's announced policies of January 7, 2003, January 4, 1995, and January 3, 1991, will apply in the 114th Congress. It is essential that the dignity of the proceedings of the House be preserved, not only to assure that the House conducts its business in an orderly fashion but also to permit Members to properly comprehend and participate in the business of the House. To this end, and in order to permit the Chair to understand and to correctly put the question on the numerous requests that are made by Members, the Chair requests that Members and others who have the privileges of the floor desist from audible conversation in the Chamber while the business of the House is being conducted. The Chair would encourage all Members to review rule XVII to gain a better understanding of the proper rules of decorum expected of them, and especially: to avoid "personalities" in debate with respect to references to other Members, the Senate, and the President; to address the Chair while standing and only during, and not beyond, the time recognized, and not to address the television or other imagined audience; to refrain from passing between the Chair and a Member speaking, or directly in front of a Member speaking from the well; to refrain from smoking in the Chamber; to wear appropriate business attire in the Chamber; and to generally display the same degree of respect to the Chair and other Members that every Member is due.

The Chair would like all Members to be on notice that the Chair intends to strictly enforce time limitations on debate. Furthermore, the Chair has the authority to immediately interrupt Members in debate who transgress rule XVII by failing to avoid "personalities" in debate with respect to references to the Senate, the President, and other Members, rather than wait for Members to complete their remarks.

Finally, it is not in order to speak disrespectfully of the Speaker; and under the precedents the sanctions for such violations transcend the ordinary requirements for timeliness of challenges. This separate treatment is recorded in volume 2 of Hinds' Precedents, at section 1248 and was reiterated on January 19, 1995.

7. Conduct of Votes by Electronic Device

The Speaker's policy announced on January 4, 1995, with respect to the conduct of electronic votes will continue in the 114th Congress with modifications as follows.

As Members are aware, clause 2(a) of rule XX provides that Members shall have not less than 15 minutes in which to answer an ordinary record vote or quorum call. The rule obviously establishes 15 minutes as a minimum. Still, with the cooperation of the Members, a vote can easily be completed in that time. The events of October 30, 1991, stand out as proof of this point. On that occasion, the House was considering a bill in

the Committee of the Whole under a special rule that placed an overall time limit on the amendment process, including the time consumed by record votes. The Chair announced, and then strictly enforced, a policy of closing electronic votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed period of 15 minutes. Members appreciated and cooperated with the Chair's enforcement of the policy on that occasion.

The Chair desires that the example of October 30, 1991, be made the regular practice of the House. To that end, the Chair enlists the assistance of all Members in avoiding the unnecessary loss of time in conducting the business of the House. The Chair encourages all Members to depart for the Chamber promptly upon the appropriate bell and light signal. As in recent Congresses, the cloakrooms should not forward to the Chair requests to hold a vote by electronic device, but should simply apprise inquiring Members of the time remaining on the voting clock. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber. Members will be given a reasonable amount of time in which to accurately record their votes, and the Chair will endeavor to assess the presence of the membership and the expectation of further votes prior to exercising his authority under clause 8(c)(2) of rule XX or clause 6(g)(2) of rule XVIII. No occupant of the Chair would prevent a Member who is in the well before the announcement of the result from casting his or her vote. The Speaker believes the best practice for presiding officers is to await the Clerk's certification that a vote tally is complete and accurate.

8. Use of Handouts on House Floor

The Speaker's policy announced on September 27, 1995, which was prompted by a misuse of handouts on the House floor and made at the bipartisan request of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, will continue in the 114th Congress. All handouts distributed on or adjacent to the House floor by Members during House proceedings must bear the name of the Member authorizing their distribution. In addition, the content of those materials must comport with standards of propriety applicable to words spoken in debate or inserted in the Record. Failure to comply with this admonition may constitute a breach of decorum and may give rise to a question of privilege.

The Chair would also remind Members that, pursuant to clause 5 of rule IV, staff is prohibited from engaging in efforts in the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto to influence Members with regard to the legislation being amended. Staff cannot distribute handouts.

In order to enhance the quality of debate in the House, the Chair would ask Members to minimize the use of handouts.

9. Use of Electronic Equipment on House Floor

The Speaker's policy announced on January 27, 2000, as clarified on January 6, 2009, and as modified by the change in clause 5 of rule XVII in the 112th Congress, will continue in the 114th Congress. All Members and staff are reminded of the absolute prohibition contained in clause 5 of rule XVII against the use of mobile electronic devices that impair decorum. Those devices include wireless telephones and personal computers. The Chair wishes to note that electronic tablet devices do not constitute personal computers within the meaning of this policy and thus may be unobtrusively used in the Chamber. No device may be used for still photography or for audio or video recording.

The Chair requests all Members and staff wishing to receive or make wireless telephone calls to do so outside of the Chamber. The Chair further requests that all Members and staff refrain from wearing telephone headsets in the Chamber and to deactivate any audible ring of wireless phones before entering the Chamber. To this end, the Chair insists upon the cooperation of all Members and staff and instructs the Sergeant-at-Arms, pursuant to clause 3(a) of rule II and clause 5 of rule XVII, to enforce this prohibition.

10. Use of Chamber

The Speaker's policy announced on January 6, 2009, with respect to use of the Chamber will continue in the 114th Congress.

The Chair will announce to the House the policy of the Speaker concerning appropriate comportment in the chamber when the House is not in session.

Under clause 3 of rule I, the Speaker is responsible to control the Hall of the House. Under clause 1 of rule IV, the Hall of the House is to be used only for the legislative business of the House, for caucus and conference meetings of its Members, and for such ceremonies as the House might agree to conduct there.

When the House stands adjourned, its chamber remains on static display. It may accommodate visitors in the gallery or on the floor, subject to the needs of those who operate, maintain, and secure the chamber to go about their ordinary business. Because outside "coverage" of the chamber is limited to floor proceedings and is allowed only by accredited journalists, when the chamber is on static display no audio or video recording or transmitting devices are allowed. The long custom of disallowing even still photography in the chamber is based at least in part on the notion that an image having this setting as its backdrop might be taken to carry the imprimatur of the House.

The imprimatur of the House adheres to the Journal of its proceedings, which is kept pursuant to the Constitution. The imprimatur of the House adheres to the Congressional Record, which is kept as a substantially verbatim transcript pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVII. The imprimatur of the House adheres to the audio and visual transmissions and recordings that are made and kept by the television system administered by the Speaker pursuant to rule V. But the imprimatur of the House may not be appropriated to other, ad hoc accounts or compositions of events in its chamber.

APPOINTMENT—HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2001, and the order of the House of today, of the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with the Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order

of the House of today, of the following Member to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. NUNES, California, Chairman

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of today, of the following Member to the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi:

Mr. GOWDY, South Carolina, Chairman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Speaker has delivered to the Clerk a letter dated January 6, 2015, listing Members in the order in which each shall act as Speaker pro tempore under clause 8(b)(3) of rule I.

RECALL DESIGNEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CLERK: I hereby designate Representative Kevin McCarthy of California to exercise any authority regarding assembly, reassembly, convening, or reconvening of the House pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 1, clause 12 of rule I, and any concurrent resolutions of the current Congress as may contemplate my designation of Members to exercise similar authority.

In the event of the death or inability of that designee, the alternate Members of the House listed in the letter bearing this date that I have placed with the Clerk are designated, in turn, for the same purposes.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING THE 114TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Jeff Denham, the Honorable Mac Thornberry, the Honorable Fred Upton, the Honorable Andy

Harris, the Honorable Barbara Comstock, and the Honorable Luke Messer to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through the remainder of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointments are approved.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that the whole number of the House is 416.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TONKO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the funeral of Governor Cuomo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Navy case number 13-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports created by the Clerk, pursuant to Rule II, clause 2(b), of the Rules of the House; (H. Doc. No. 114-4); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2014 Base Period T-Bill Rate (Rev. Rul. 2014-33) received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida,

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 3. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 21. A bill to provide for a comprehensive assessment of the scientific and technical research on the implications of the use of mid-level ethanol blends, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COOK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MARINO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HARDY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. COLE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MICA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 22. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into

account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means; considered and passed.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 23. A bill to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. AMASH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 24. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WOODALL (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. FOX, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 25. A bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 26. A bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 27. A bill to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 28. A bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline project permit; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COOK, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 29. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for granting deferred action or other immigration relief to aliens not lawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. HILL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YODER, Mr.

FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BRAT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BARR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. REED, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MESSER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KLINE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 30. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 31. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to implement the immigration policies set forth in the memoranda issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security on November 20, 2014, or the memoranda issued by the President on November 21, 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 32. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to expand the definition

of an unauthorized alien to include aliens who have not been admitted to and are not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 33. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SABLON, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 34. A bill to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 35. A bill to increase the understanding of the health effects of low doses of ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 36. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 37. A bill to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COOK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FORBES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YODER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 38. A bill to prohibit the executive branch from exempting from removal categories of aliens considered under the immigration laws to be unlawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 39. A bill to make 1 percent across-the-board rescissions in non-defense, non-homeland-security, and non-veterans-affairs discretionary spending for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 40. A bill to acknowledge the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to examine the institution of slavery, subse-

quently de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 41. A bill to enhance Federal enforcement of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 42. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals reimbursed under the Medicare system to establish and implement security procedures to reduce the likelihood of infant patient abduction and baby switching, including procedures for identifying all infant patients in the hospital in a manner that ensures that it will be evident if infants are missing from the hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 43. A bill to provide for emergency deployments of United States Border Patrol agents and to increase the number of DEA and ATF agents along the international border of the United States to increase resources to identify and eliminate illicit sources of firearms into Mexico for use by violent drug trafficking organizations and for other lawful activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SABLON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 44. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Guam War Claims Review Commission; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 45. A bill to provide for research and education with respect to triple-negative breast cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 46. A bill to increase the evidentiary standard required to convict a person for a drug offense, to require screening of law enforcement officers or others acting under color of law participating in drug task forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 47. A bill to ensure secure gun storage and gun safety devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 48. A bill to require a review of the completeness of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the derivative terrorist watchlist utilized by the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 49. A bill to make 2 percent across-the-board rescissions in non-defense, non-homeland-security, and non-veterans-affairs discretionary spending for each of the fiscal

years 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 50. A bill to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 51. A bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 52. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to comprehensively reform immigration law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 53. A bill to codify an office within the Department of Homeland Security with the mission of strengthening the capacity of the agency to attract and retain highly trained computer and information security professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 54. A bill to enhance the security of chemical facilities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 55. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the use of contractors for intelligence activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 56. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to the Donbass People's Militia or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 57. A bill to require that activities carried out by the United States in South Sudan relating to governance, reconstruction and development, and refugee relief and assistance will support the basic human rights of women and women's participation and leadership in these areas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 58. A bill to make 5 percent across-the-board rescissions in non-defense, non-

homeland-security, and non-veterans-affairs discretionary spending for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 59. A bill to provide for a reduction in the amount that may be awarded to a unit of local government under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.) for a unit of local government that funds an amount that is greater than 18 percent of its operating budget using revenue generated from collecting fines and other fees related to violations of traffic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 60. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the feasibility of establishing a Cyber Defense National Guard; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 61. A bill to preserve the access of victims of trafficking to information about their eligibility to receive SNAP benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 62. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1900 West Gray Street in Houston, Texas, as the "Hazel Hainsworth Young Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 63. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a database that shall serve as a central location for information from investigations relating to human trafficking for Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 64. A bill to encourage States to provide for enhanced sentencing penalties for persons convicted of committing, or attempting to commit, an act of domestic violence in the presence of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 65. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the use of contractors for intelligence activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 66. A bill to require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that includes significant legal interpretation of section 501 or 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 unless such disclosure is not in the national security interest of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 67. A bill to establish a grant program to empower relatives, friends, and co-workers of domestic violence victims to create safety plans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 68. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the use of Juvenile Accountability Block Grants for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying and to reau-

thorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 69. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Malala Yousafzai, a recipient of the Nobel Prize for Peace, in recognition of her devoted service to education, justice, and equality in Pakistan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 70. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to initiate immediate action to create jobs in America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 71. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an alternate release date for certain nonviolent offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 72. A bill to establish a grant program for nebulizers in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 73. A bill to establish a grant program for stipends to assist in the cost of compensation paid by employers to certain recent college graduates and to provide funding for their further education in subjects relating to mathematics, science, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 74. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants to States and units of local government for the video recording of custodial interrogations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 75. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 76. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to encourage private employers to hire veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the reasonable efforts an employer may make under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act with respect to hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 77. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional immigration judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 78. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to make grants to States, units of

local government, and Indian tribes to carry out employment training programs to assist long-term unemployed job hunters obtain the skills and training to reenter the workforce and fill jobs in high-growth sectors of the economy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 79. A bill to conduct a study to ensure that enhanced communication is provided between commercial aircraft and air traffic control towers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 80. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish an Ombudsman Office within the Transportation Security Administration for the purpose of enhancing transportation security by providing confidential, informal, and neutral assistance to address work-place related problems of Transportation Security Administration employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 81. A bill to increase the number of Federal air marshals for certain flights, require criminal investigative training for such marshals, create an office and appoint an ombudsman for the marshals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 82. A bill to establish conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may commence U.S. Customs and Border Protection security screening operations at a preclearance facility outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 83. A bill to assist States and local governments to develop and implement emergency notification systems suitable for use on public recreational lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 84. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to take actions to ensure that not fewer than 2 air traffic controllers are on duty and physically situated within the air traffic control room or tower of certain airports at all times during periods of airfield operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 85. A bill to codify the objective of Presidential Policy Directive 21 to improve critical infrastructure security and resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 86. A bill to repeal the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990 and amendments to that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 87. A bill to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 88. A bill to amend subtitle IV of title 40, United States Code, regarding county additions to the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 89. A bill to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 90. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct reviews of certain budget requests of the President for the medical care accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 91. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 92. A bill to provide that rates of pay for Members of Congress shall not be adjusted under section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 in the year following any fiscal year in which outlays of the United States exceeded receipts of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 93. A bill to prohibit United States Government recognition of Russia's annexation of Crimea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 94. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 95. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 11 of the United States Code to improve protections for employees and retirees in municipal bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 96. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 97. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 98. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to dispense with the requirement of providing assurance of payment for utility services under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 99. A bill to prohibit anticompetitive activities and to provide that health insur-

ance issuers and medical malpractice insurance issuers are subject to the antitrust laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 100. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to stop abusive student loan collection practices in bankruptcy cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 101. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to modification of certain mortgages on principal residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 102. A bill to establish a corporate crime database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 103. A bill to improve public safety through increased law enforcement presence and enhanced public safety equipment and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 104. A bill to protect cyber privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 105. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by clarifying the application of the antitrust laws to negotiations between groups of health care professionals and health plans and health care insurance issuers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 106. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to restore State sovereignty over public education and parental rights over the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 107. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase from 1 to 2 years the post employment restrictions on Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 108. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of further retirement coverage of Members of Congress, except for the right to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 109. A bill to provide that no pay adjustment for Members of Congress shall be made with respect to any pay period occurring during the One Hundred Fourteenth

Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 110. A bill to provide for rates of pay for Members of Congress to be adjusted as a function of changes in Government spending; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 111. A bill to protect the Social Security and Medicare trust funds from the public debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 112. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to restore the 10 year statute of limitations applicable to collection of debt by administrative offset, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 113. A bill to improve the accountability and transparency of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 114. A bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 115. A bill to prohibit the Transportation Security Administration from performing security screening operations for surface transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 116. A bill to permit small business concerns operating in the United States to elect to be exempt from certain Federal rules and regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 117. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the mandate that individuals purchase health insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal tax on fuels by the amount of any increase in the rate of tax on such fuel by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 119. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 120. A bill to repeal the War Powers Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 121. A bill to allow a State to opt out of K-12 education grant programs and the requirements of those programs, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to taxpayers in such a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 122. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the calculation of the minimum wage based on the Federal poverty threshold for a family of 4, as determined by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself and Ms. CHU of California):

H.R. 123. A bill to extend the pilot program under section 258 of the National Housing Act that establishes an automated process for providing alternative credit rating information for mortgagors and prospective mortgagors under certain mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 124. A bill to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 125. A bill to authorize a pilot program to improve asset recovery levels, asset management, and homeownership retention with respect to delinquent single-family mortgages insured under the FHA mortgage insurance programs by providing for in-person contact outreach activities with mortgagors under such mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 126. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds to local educational agencies for initiatives to provide voter registration information to secondary school students in the 12th grade; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 127. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to urbanized area formula grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 128. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to revise regulations concerning the recording and reporting of occupational injuries and illnesses under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 129. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of longer combination vehicles on the Interstate System in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 130. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act to provide equity for certain eligible survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. ELLMERS):

H.R. 131. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 132. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for waivers of user fees imposed with respect to applications for reinstatement of tax-exempt status of small, subsidiary tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 134. A bill to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the "Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 135. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to provide that if the head of the agency managing Federal property objects to the inclusion of certain property on the National Register or its designation as a National Historic Landmark for reasons of national security, the Federal property shall be neither included nor designated until the objection is withdrawn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 136. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, as the "Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 137. A bill to require an adequate process in preplanned lethal operations that deliberately target citizens of the United States or citizens of strategic treaty allies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 138. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 and to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a national health program administered by the Office of Personnel Management to offer Federal employee health benefits plans to individuals who are not Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Rules, Appropriations, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 139. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that Federal, State, and local agencies to which surplus military equipment and personal property is sold or donated demonstrate that agency personnel are certified, trained, or licensed, as appropriate, in the proper operation of the equipment prior to the sale or donation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.R. 140. A bill to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 141. A bill to ensure fairness in premium rates for coverage for business properties and second homes under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 142. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1989 to expand the Coast Guard Junior Reserve Officers Training Program Pilot Program to include a Coast Guard unit at Pinellas Park High School in Pinellas Park, Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a maximum rate of Federal, State, and local tax imposed on taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 145. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the work opportunity tax credit and to allow the transfer of such credit in the case of contracted veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 146. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the

Armed Forces serving on active duty who are diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury have access to hyperbaric oxygen therapy at military medical treatment facilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 147. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the cost of any transportation provided by the Secretary to Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives or Senate who are carrying out official duties outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 148. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that every military chaplain has the prerogative to close a prayer outside of a religious service according to the dictates of the chaplain's own conscience; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 149. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 150. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against the conversion of contributions to personal use to contributions accepted by political committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 151. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit L06, Topsail, North Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 152. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement to provide for management of the free-roaming wild horses in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 153. A bill to restore the Free Speech and First Amendment rights of churches and exempt organizations by repealing the 1954 Johnson Amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 154. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, which amended the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to establish separate contribution limits for contributions made to national parties to support Presidential nominating conventions, national party headquarters buildings, and recounts; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. ROTHFUS):

H.R. 155. A bill to provide that no funds appropriated or otherwise made available may be used to implement, administer, carry out, or enforce certain memoranda related to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on

Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 156. A bill to repeal the crude oil export ban under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 157. A bill to limit the use of cluster munitions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 158. A bill to clarify the grounds for ineligibility for travel to the United States regarding terrorism risk, to expand the criteria by which a country may be removed from the Visa Waiver Program, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on strengthening the Electronic System for Travel Authorization to better secure the international borders of the United States and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 159. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr.

KIND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BARR, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DENT, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. DELBENE,

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLORES, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. REED, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BOST, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BERA, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BUCK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BLUM, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. KEATING, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 161. A bill to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 162. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to allow certain loans that are not fully amortizing to be used in seller carryback financing on residential mortgage loans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 163. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to collect, publish, and keep current an objective index of dollar-denominated loan interest rates of various maturities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 164. A bill to require that the United States Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public, Social Security benefits, and military pay in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 165. A bill to provide that the President shall submit to Congress a report detailing the priority of Federal spending if the statutory debt limit is reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 166. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit judges, to divide the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the United States into two judicial circuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 167. A bill to provide for adjustments to discretionary spending under section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to support wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 168. A bill to authorize an additional district judgeship for the district of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LOESACK, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 169. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 170. A bill to extend the nonenforcement instruction for the Medicare direct supervision requirement for therapeutic hospital outpatient services insofar as it applies

to critical access hospitals and rural hospitals, to require a study of the impact on critical access hospitals and rural hospitals of a failure to extend such instruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 171. A bill to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, Ways and Means, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 172. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself,

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OLSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 173. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 174. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 by April 15, 2015; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 175. A bill to provide for the revision of certification requirements for the labeling of certain electronic products under the Energy Star program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 176. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 to permit the collection of user fees by non-Federal entities in connection with the challenge cost-sharing program for management of recreation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 177. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to continue the national security exemption from emissions regulations when an excess Department of Defense vehicle covered by the exemption is transferred to a firefighting agency in a State or to any other State agency; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 178. A bill to amend section 349(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to add certain acts of allegiance to a foreign terrorist organization to the list of acts for which nationals of the United States lose nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 179. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to reduce the rates of pay of Members of Congress by 5 percent and eliminate future cost-of-living adjustments in such rates of pay; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 180. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of further retirement benefits for Members of Congress, except the right to continue participating in the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.J. Res. 1. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SALMON):

H.J. Res. 2. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitu-

tion of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution expressing support for designation of September 2015 as "Gospel Music Heritage Month" and honoring gospel music for its valuable and long-standing contributions to the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.J. Res. 4. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the effect of treaties, Executive orders, and agreements with other nations or groups of nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.J. Res. 6. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve to 4 in the House of Representatives and 2 in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.J. Res. 7. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced and that an increase in the Federal debt requires approval from a majority of the legislatures of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution regarding consent to assemble outside the seat of government; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 106th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of George Thomas "Mickey" Leland; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in

the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 1. A resolution electing officers of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 2. A resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled and of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 3. A resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. Res. 4. A resolution authorizing the Clerk to inform the President of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 5. A resolution adopting rules for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 6. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 7. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 8. A resolution providing for the designation of certain minority employees; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 9. A resolution fixing the daily hour of meeting of the First Session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Res. 10. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Transportation Security Administration should, in accordance with existing law, enhance security against terrorist attack and other security threats to our Nation's rail and mass transit systems and other modes of surface transportation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 11. A resolution providing for authority to initiate litigation for actions by the President or other executive branch officials inconsistent with their duties under the Constitution of the United States with respect to the implementation of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 12. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of its 6-day mail delivery service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr.

BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 13. A resolution recognizing the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MASSIE):

H. Res. 14. A resolution urging the president to release information regarding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks upon the United States; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 15. A resolution congratulating Pope Francis on his election and recognizing his inspirational statements and actions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 16. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution carrying more than one subject; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H. Res. 17. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of a concurrent resolution to provide for a recess of the House after July 31 of any year unless the House has approved each regular appropriation bill for the next fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign nations and among the several States).

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 21.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 22.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 23.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures" and "to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States."

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 25.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 26.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 27.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 28.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 29.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 30.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1.

Within the Enumerated Powers of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the power to lay and collect taxes. This provision grants Congress the authority over this particular piece of legislation.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 31.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 32.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 33.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 34.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 35.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—"Congress shall have the Power to regulate Commerce with Foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—"Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 36.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 37.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the Power "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 39.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 states that Congress shall have the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 40.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 41.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 42.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 43.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 76.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 77.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 4, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 78.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 79.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 80.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 81.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 82.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 83.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 84.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 85.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 86.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Act is justified by the lack of a mandate or assertion of authority in the United States Constitution for the federal government to establish the laws affected by this Act; by Article One of the United States Constitution that grants legislative powers; by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution that recognizes the right to bear arms; and by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, which recognize that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and to the States.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 87.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ."

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 88.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ."

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 89.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause III: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. . . ."

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 90.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 91.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 92.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 93.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the authority delineated in Article I, Section I, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 94.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 95.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 96.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 97.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 98.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 99.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 and Section 9. This legislation changes the terms and conditions for receipt of federal dollars in order to reaffirm and restore the autonomous sovereign authority of the States over public education. The Constitution contains no reference to public education. Therefore, under the Tenth Amendment and the structure and text of the Constitution, control over public education is reserved to the States and the people of the United States.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the Necessary and Proper Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution, which states "The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the treasury of the United States."

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution, which states “The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.” and clause 1 of Section 1 of Article I, which states “All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 6 and Amendment XXVII

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes); Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 (To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures); Article I, Section 8, Clause 6 (To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department thereof).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States); Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 (No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time), and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof). This legislation authorizes appropriations for “Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad” for the Department of State, such sums as may be necessary to establish a United States Embassy in Israel in the capital of Jerusalem.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution (“The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects,

against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath of affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”)

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested). This legislation, through Congress's power to regulate commerce with foreign powers and among the several states, gives small businesses the option to alleviate the burdens of onerous regulations that the federal government has imposed.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States); Article I, Section 9, Clause 5 (No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken), and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof). In *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, the Supreme Court ruled that the financial penalty for failing to purchase health insurance as mandated by the Affordable Care Act is a tax that Congress may impose through the taxing power. Even if the penalty imposed by the Affordable Care Act must be construed to be a tax, it does not satisfy the three types of taxes—income, excise, or direct—that are listed as valid in the Constitution. The penalty is not assessed on income so it is not a valid income tax. The penalty is not assessed uniformly and is triggered by economic inactivity so it is not a valid excise tax. Finally, the penalty is not apportioned among the states by population and therefore is not a valid direct tax. The tax imposed by the Affordable Care Act, by every measure, extends beyond the taxing power granted to Congress by the Constitution and it is only necessary and proper that Congress repeal the individual mandate.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment to the Constitution “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 (The Congress shall have power . . . to declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16) which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution (“the Commerce Clause”).

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 3 (relating to the authority to regulate commerce among the several states).

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution, which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collected Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises." Therefore, Congress' taxing power would be the authority to repeal ObamaCare's individual mandate.

In addition, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, consistent with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section III: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To . . . provide for the common defence [sic] and general Welfare of the United States;" Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 11 through 16 which give Congress additional authorities to ensure the national security of the United States; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have power . . .

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 5 of the Amendment XIV to the Constitution and Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (clause 14), which grants Con-

gress the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 5, of the U.S. Constitution which grants Congress the authority to determine the rules of its own proceedings, and Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to make rules for the government and regulation of the armed forces.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to make laws governing the time, places and manner of holding federal elections.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which states that "Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations" regarding the "Times, Places and Manner of holding elections."

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, and Article IV, Section 3, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, which states that, among other things, Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Appropriations Clause, Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States of America, which grants to Congress the authority necessary to limit or control spending by the federal government.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3: Congress has the power . . . "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations."

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare); Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 (to make Rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval Forces); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (to make laws necessary and proper . . . in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7. Which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time"

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 9, which states "The Congress shall have Power . . . To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court."

In addition, Article III, Section 1 states that "The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 9, which states "The Congress shall have Power . . . To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court."

In addition, Article III, Section 1 states that "The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Just as Congress is empowered to regulate interstate commerce under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, it has the power to repeal such regulations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 1: The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the United States.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.J. Res. 1.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.J. Res. 2.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.J. Res. 3.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 4.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article V or the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.J. Res. 5.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.J. Res. 6.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.J. Res. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.J. Res. 8.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5 of the Constitution states: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three

fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.J. Res. 9.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 3 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Ways and Means in H.R. 30 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE COMMITTEE ON
THE JUDICIARY AND THE COM-
MITTEES ON AGRICULTURE, EN-
ERGY AND COMMERCE, AND
WAYS AND MEANS**HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following memoranda of understanding.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

On January 6, 2015, the House agreed to H. Res. 5, establishing the rules of the House for the 114th Congress. Section 2(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 5 contained a provision adding "criminalization" to the jurisdictional statement of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Agriculture jointly acknowledge as the authoritative source of legislative history concerning section 2(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 5 the description printed in the Congressional Record and submitted by Rules Committee Chair Pete Sessions.

By this memorandum, the committees record their further mutual understandings by providing the following example, which will supplement the statement cited above.

In general, this change is not intended to cover measures that make changes to a regulatory or revenue collection scheme without making changes to the specific conduct that triggers a criminal penalty that is part of the enforcement regime.

For instance, where a statute prohibits unauthorized movement of certain prohibited plants or animals without the proper permit and imposes a criminal sanction for a violation of the permit, a measure which simply makes changes to the permitting process would not fall within the scope of this rules change, even in the case where a criminal penalty applies broadly to the statute in question. It is the conduct of moving the prohibited item, not the permitting process, which gives rise to the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest.

This example is intended to be merely illustrative rather than exclusive or exhaustive. Nothing in this memorandum precludes a further agreement between the committees with regard to the implementation of this provision.

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary.

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chair, Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

On January 6, 2015, the House agreed to H. Res. 5, establishing the rules of the House for the 114th Congress. Section 2(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 5 contained a provision adding "criminalization" to the jurisdictional statement of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Energy and Commerce jointly acknowledge as the authoritative source of legislative history concerning section

2(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 5 the description printed in the Congressional Record and submitted by Rules Committee Chair Pete Sessions.

By this memorandum, the committees record their further mutual understandings by providing the following examples, which will supplement the statement cited above.

In general, this change is not intended to cover measures that make changes to a regulatory or revenue collection scheme without making changes to the specific conduct that triggers a criminal penalty that is part of the enforcement regime.

For instance, where there is a regulatory statute that prohibits discharge of a pollutant without a permit or in a manner inconsistent with that permit and which imposes a criminal sanction for a violation thereof, and a measure adds another substance to the list of pollutants, that would not fall within the scope of this change. It is the conduct of discharging the pollutant, not the identification of the pollutant, which gives rise to the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest.

This example is intended to be merely illustrative rather than exclusive or exhaustive. Nothing in this memorandum precludes a further agreement between the committees with regard to the implementation of this provision.

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary.

FRED UPTON,
Chair, Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

On January 6, 2015, the House agreed to H. Res. 5, establishing the rules of the House for the 114th Congress. Section 2(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 5 contained a provision adding "criminalization" to the jurisdictional statement of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means jointly acknowledge as the authoritative source of legislative history concerning section 2(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 5 the description printed in the Congressional Record and submitted by Rules Committee Chair Pete Sessions.

By this memorandum, the committees record their further mutual understandings by providing the following example, which will supplement the statement cited above.

In general, this change is not intended to cover measures that make changes to a regulatory or revenue collection scheme without making changes to the specific conduct that triggers a criminal penalty that is part of the enforcement regime.

For instance, where a statute prohibits evasion of taxes or tariffs, and imposes a criminal sanction for a violation thereof, a modification of, repeal of, or addition to a substantive provision that is used to determine taxes (and, if applicable, interest) or tariffs owed would not fall within the scope of this rules change because it would not by itself address a specific element relating to its criminal enforcement. It is the conduct of evading taxes or tariffs, not the imposition or calculation of the tax or tariff itself, which gives rise to the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest.

This example is intended to be merely illustrative rather than exclusive or exhaus-

tive. Nothing in this memorandum precludes a further agreement between the committees with regard to the implementation of this provision.

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary.

PAUL RYAN,
Chair, Committee on Ways and Means.

RECOGNIZING TENNANT TRUCK
LINES FOR ITS PARTICIPATION
IN WREATHS ACROSS AMERICA**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Tennant Truck Lines of Colona, Illinois. For the last five years, Tennant Truck Lines has participated in the Wreaths Across America program, which honors veterans by coordinating wreath laying ceremonies throughout all 50 states.

I had the honor of participating in the Wreaths Across America ceremony on December 13, 2014, at the Rock Island National Cemetery, in my home district in Illinois. This was the 10th Wreaths Across America ceremony held at the Cemetery, one of thousands of ceremonies held across the nation.

Tennant Truck Lines played a vital role in transporting wreaths, volunteering their trucks and manpower to move 3,072 wreaths to over 900 veteran ceremonies by December 13. Two trucks from Tennant Truck Lines drove all the way to Arlington National Cemetery, and many more played a vital role in transporting wreaths within the Midwest as they traveled from Maine to California.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of the work Tennant Truck Lines and CEO Aaron Tennant have done to remember and honor the veterans who bravely served our country. It is my honor to recognize them today.

"TAX CODE TERMINATION ACT"

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to re-introduce the "Tax Code Termination Act," legislation that will abolish the Internal Revenue Code by December 31, 2019, and call on Congress to approve a new Federal tax system by July of the same year.

There is no denying that our current tax system has spiraled out of control. Americans devote countless hours each year to comply with the tax code and it is very clear we need tax simplification. Today's tax code is unfair, discourages savings and investment, and is impossibly complex. Businesses and families

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

need relief from uncertainty and the burdensome task of complying with the tax code. However, the problem is Congress won't act on fundamental tax reform unless it is compelled to do so. The Tax Code Termination Act will finally force Congress to debate and address fundamental tax reform.

Once the Tax Code Termination Act becomes law, today's oppressive tax code would survive for only four more years, at which time it would expire and be replaced with a new tax code that will be determined by Congress, the President, and the American people. The Tax Code Termination Act will allow us, as a nation, to collectively decide what the new tax system should look like. Having a date-certain to end the current tax code will force the issue to the top of the national agenda, where it will remain until Congress finishes writing the new tax law.

This legislation has gained wide support in past Congresses and had 122 bipartisan cosponsors in the 113th Congress. In fact, similar legislation has already been passed twice by the House of Representatives, first in 1998 and then in 2000.

Although many questions remain about the best way to reform our tax system, if Congress is forced to address the issue we can create a tax code that is simpler, fairer, and better for our economy than the one we are forced to comply with today. Congress won't reach a consensus on such a contentious issue unless it is forced to do so. The Tax Code Termination Act will force Congress to finally debate and address fundamental tax reform.

America's future partially depends on overcoming the impairment that is our current tax code. There is a widespread consensus that the current system is broken, and keeping it is not in America's best interest. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and end the broken tax system that exists today and provide a tax code that the American people deserve.

**STOPPING ABUSIVE STUDENT
LOAN COLLECTION PRACTICES
IN BANKRUPTCY ACT OF 2015**

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the "Stopping Abusive Student Loan Collection Practices in Bankruptcy Act of 2015" targets ruthless collection tactics employed by some student loan creditors against debtors who have sought bankruptcy relief, as documented by the New York Times in its cover story last year.

Specifically, my legislation bill would empower a bankruptcy judge to award costs and reasonable attorney's fees to a debtor who successfully obtained the discharge of his or her liability for a student loan debt based on undue hardship if: (1) the creditor's position was not substantially justified, and (2) there are no special circumstances that would make such award unjust. The Bankruptcy Code already grants identical authority to a bankruptcy judge to award costs and reasonable

attorney's fees to debtor where a creditor requests the determination of dischargeability of a consumer debt based on the allegation that it was fraudulently incurred and the court thereafter finds that the creditor's position was not substantially justified and there are no special circumstances that would make such award unjust.

Although parties typically do and should pay their own attorney's fees in litigation, dischargeability determinations concerning student loan debts present compelling factors that warrant the relief provided by this legislation. Under current bankruptcy law, debtors must meet a very high burden of proof, namely, that repayment of the student loan debt will present an undue hardship on the debtor and the debtor's dependents. The litigation typically requires extensive discovery, trial-like procedures, and legal analysis.

Unfortunately, some student loan debt collectors engage in abusive litigation tactics that exponentially drive up the potential cost of legal representation for a debtor. As a result, debtors, who may legally qualify for the Bankruptcy Code's undue hardship dischargeability exception for student loans, may be unable to obtain such relief because of the potential risk of excessive and unaffordable legal fees that the debtor may have to incur not only to meet the high standard of proof, but also to combat an abusive litigation stance taken by a well-funded adversary.

The "Stopping Abusive Student Loan Collection Practices in Bankruptcy Act of 2015" will help level the playing field for debtors overwhelmed by student loan debts, the repayment of which would present an undue hardship for themselves and their families. It is my hope that should this measure become law, bankruptcy judges will not hesitate to award debtors attorney's fees in appropriate cases of abusive litigation engaged in by student loan creditors.

**GOVERNOR JAMES B. EDWARDS
SERVICE**

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, at the Service of Worship Celebrating the Life of James Burrows Edwards at historic St. Philip Episcopal Church of Charleston (American statesman John C. Calhoun is buried in the St. Philips Churchyard), his beloved son-in-law Kenneth B. Wingate, Sr., Esq. delivered the following Reflections.

REFLECTIONS

I'm Jim's son-in-law, and I want to reflect on the life of James Burrows Edwards, the Charming Captain of my Ship.

Jim Edwards was a great man, by any possible measure. Webster defines "great" as eminent or excellent. Jim accomplished more in a lifetime than any other 10 people combined. He served the nation in the Merchant Marines as a 17 year-old during World War II, crossing the Atlantic 11 times, carrying equipment and supplies to England, France and Germany, and returning each time with wounded American soldiers. By

the end of the war, Jim had ascended in rank from dishwasher to able-bodied seaman to quartermaster. He studied hard while off duty, and ultimately earned his third-mate's license which authorized him to guide ships "of any tonnage, on any waters of the world." And guide ships he did, all of his life.

Jim paid his way through the College of Charleston, working summer jobs such as transporting general cargo to ports of call around Europe, South America, and the Caribbean. Not your typical undergraduate student at the College, was he, President McConnell?

Jim married his childhood sweetheart, Ann Darlington, in 1951, though not everyone in her family could see the potential in this young man. Ann's step-grandmother, "Gran" was at home shortly before their wedding. Jim dropped by and asked Gran what she thought of all this commotion. She replied, "I guess it's okay, but Ann sure could do better than that little boy from Rifle Range Road!" Jim said, "I think so, too."

Jim and Ann worked their way through dental school at the University of Louisville. Ann worked for the Red Cross in the hills of Kentucky as a nurse, while Jim ran for and was elected president of the student body in his spare time. These early ventures honed his impressive personal skills, teaching him how to break down barriers, build rapport, pull together a team. Jim also worked odd jobs, such as selling mint juleps at the Kentucky Derby. One year at the Derby, while selling concessions, Jim bet \$6 on Dark Star, a long-shot at odds of 25-1, simply because the horse had trained in South Carolina. Dark Star won the race, and Jim took home a fat purse, and a lesson on long-shot victories.

I don't intend to drag you through each of his fascinating and successful careers in oral surgery, in state politics, in serving on President Reagan's cabinet as Secretary of Energy, and then returning to the Medical University of South Carolina for 17 years as president. You were all there with him and with Ann, his forever first lady, at every memorable and enjoyable step of the way.

Not only was Jim a great man, but far more importantly he was a good man. The Bible only refers to two people, Barnabas and Joseph of Arimathea, as "good." The biblical definition of good is generous, with a willingness to put other's interests above one's own. It's rare to find a great man; it is more rare to find a good man. But it is exceedingly rare to find a great man who is good.

Jim had three specific qualities that endeared him to us all:

First was his HUMOR; that quick wit, often self-deprecating, never vulgar. He loved to tell the true story of being in the hardware store in Moncks Corner, wearing his old hunting clothes, when a woman going up and down the aisles kept staring at him. Finally, she came over and said, "Has anyone ever told you you look like Jim Edwards?" He said, yes, and before he could say anything else, she said, "Makes you mad as hops, doesn't it?"

Even the name of O' Be Joyful, his magnificent home overlooking Charleston harbor is a whimsical, double-entendre. Yes, it's intended to reflect the biblical encouragement to live each moment joyfully. But it's also a reminder of how Jim and Ann got the house. A widow, Kathryn McNulta, owned the home but was reluctant to sell it. Periodically Jim and Ann would go sit with her on the piazza, and she would offer them a drink called an O' Be Joyful—a can of limeade, a can of light rum, a can of dark rum, and the white of an

egg. Ann would look at Jim quietly and say, "I can't drink that!" And he said, "You will if you want the house!"

Jim's second endearing quality was his HUMANITY; he had a genuine concern for the well-being of others. He always looked for the best in people, but cast a patient and sympathetic eye when they fell short. His care for others could be seen in his lifelong commitment to improvements in healthcare and in education. One of the landmark pieces of legislation while he was governor was the Education Finance Act, which altered the way funds were distributed to schools across South Carolina. And of course his thirty years of service as president and then president emeritus of his beloved Medical University. He continued fundraising for MUSC literally to the end of his life. After his stroke in 2013, when he could no longer take potential donors out to restaurants, he and Ann would entertain them at home. As recently as three weeks ago, he attended the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the refurbished College of Nursing.

Jim's humanity could be seen in his legendary generosity, as well as his friendliness and hospitality to all. He never met a stranger, never turned down a request for help, and never let race or creed or party affiliation color his love for people. Though he held his Republican ideals closely, he embraced everyone across the aisle. He loved and served with Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and Strom Thurmond, but he also loved and served with Bob McNair, Rembert Dennis, and Fritz Hollings. He was always collegial, always the statesman.

Finally, Jim will be remembered for his HUMILITY. He never let success go to his head. Though he had many titles (third mate, lieutenant commander, doctor, chairman, senator, governor, secretary, president—in fact, he often joked he couldn't keep a steady job) his favorite title was just plain Jim. His beautiful Limerick Plantation was simply "the farm." His favorite vehicle was always his old truck, which always had a few dents. Though he walked with kings and presidents, and sat with captains of industry and commerce, he never forgot his roots on Rifle Range Road. He often quipped that when you leave office, you go from "who's who" to "who's he?" very quickly. He was never pretentious.

I guess in a word, Jim was a Renaissance man—he could do anything, and do it well. He could repair engines, recite poetry, build furniture, design jewelry, grow luscious vegetables and flowers, win elections, shoot the lights out with a shotgun, navigate by the stars, negotiate a deal, close a sale, cast a vision and recruit a team to transform an institution or a party or a state. And he could make his grandchildren laugh. His "joi de vie" was contagious, and he infected all of us with his charm.

A few months ago, sitting in O' Be Joyful at the magnificent table he built with his own hands, Jim and I talked about what I should say to you today. First he asked me to exhort you in your faith. Jim first placed his trust in Jesus Christ at age 5, sitting on the knee of his grandfather, Joseph Hooker Hieronymus, an itinerant Methodist minister in the hills of eastern Kentucky. Jim always treasured this little Bible given to him by his grandfather at that time, and had this tucked inside a larger Bible when he was sworn in as governor. After Jim's stroke last year, we spent many evenings as a family reading and discussing the parables of Jesus, how we enter, grow, live and finish in the kingdom of God. And finish in faith Jim has done.

Second, he asked me to encourage you, especially Ann, and Jim, and Cathy, and you grandchildren, not to grieve as others do who have no hope. For we believe that Jesus died and rose again, and even so will return one day and will bring with him those who have fallen asleep, and that we will always be together with them who trust Christ and loved his coming. We declare this by the word of the Lord. May it be so, for each of us today.

The Sermon was lovingly delivered by the Right Reverend Dr. C. Fitz Simons Allison.

SERMON

Rarely have I had such an encouraging experience as helping to plan this funeral service with the family of Jim Edwards. They knew exactly what they and Jim wanted. They knew because their Christian faith was continually expressed within their family and at family gatherings. If you want to know what Jim Edwards believed, examine carefully this funeral service. The psalms, hymns, lessons, and prayers, The Old Rugged Cross truly express his faith. They told me right away that Jim's favorite biblical text was Micah 6:6-8.

"And what does the Lord require of you but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God."

"Doing justly" is enormously difficult. In medicine, when a life is at stake, justice does not allow ineptness, incompetence, carelessness, or sloth. Instead discipline, rigor, warnings, and possibly terminations are needed. Surely Jim had to face such decisions continually in his public life.

Loving mercy seemed to come easily to Jim and many of us have experienced his encouragement that we did not deserve. Mercy is at the heart of all graceful relationships, but inappropriate mercy can lead to inefficiency, poor performance, and sentimentality. Sentimentality is long range cruelty. Good bedside manners are desirable but not at the expense of knowledge and rigorous training. I am sure that Jim faced uncertain and complex issues of mercy. Doing justly and loving mercy can be very difficult and frustrating.

Walking humbly with God is a key to dealing with decisions of justice and mercy, not unlike issues we all face daily. Walking humbly with God is an acknowledgement that our truth is only partial and inadequate. Only God's truth is perfect. My physician father used to say, "Deliver me from people who are certain they are right." Walking humbly with God as expressed by Abraham Lincoln, "with malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see that right."

The humility that is required for the decisions of justice and mercy is clearly expressed by the phrase "as God gives us to see the right." Jim certainly faced many frustrations and difficulties in his leadership. I remember General James Grimsley, when he was President of the Citadel, asking Jim what was the difference between his experience in professional politics and that of academic politics. Jim's answer was that professional politics was Sunday school sin; academic politics was graduate school sin."

Jim's humor was an essential part of his humility. He could laugh at frustration and laugh at himself. He knew something of Christopher Frey's wisdom: "Comedy is an escape, escape not from truth, but from despair, a narrow escape into faith." Walking humbly with God enables us to see the laughableness of human pretension and the joy of knowing and trusting in the benevolent truth beyond ourselves, in God's truth.

If I think my opinion is absolute with no higher truth over it, my truth becomes my God. My opinions become dogmas. If I am a doctor there is no check on my view short of the morgue. Or in the case of politics, without humility, we will have stagnation, chaos, or tyranny.

Jim and Ann, the two names come naturally together after 63 years of marriage. A trained nurse and childhood sweetheart, she became a partner in all activities whether politics, administration, fund raising, entertainment, or whatever needed attention. But above all she shares his faith.

Recently Martha and I had lunch with them. Jim's concern for the health and morality of our society was uppermost on his mind. He seemed to sense that absence of humility in these times, and the lack the of "walking with God," the underpinning of our society. The result being society's unbecoming commitment to certainties, about what is really uncertain, and uncertain about what is really certain.

Cathy and Ken told me that he knew that his favorite text from Micah "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God" was an ideal that needs the gospel to make it effective. "I am the way the truth and the light." This text is only understood when one realizes that the Christian God is perfect, and we are not. We cannot as sinners stand in his presence. And "no one comes to the father except by me" is not meant to be discourteous to other religions but to express the Christian commitment to the majestic perfection of God. Only by God's word, his only begotten Son, can a Christian stand in his presence.

Our problems were diagnosed years ago by J. B. Phillips in his very short book, *Your God is Too Small*. Jim's God was not a small God but a God before whom we are all sinners. As a sinner himself Jim could have compassion for other sinners and knowing he was a forgiven sinner his life could be lived with compassion for others. This produced the charm and diplomacy so well and widely described in our newspapers.

But the journalists failed to mention that his extraordinary gifts, love and consideration for others, were rooted in his realization that he was a forgiven sinner. It nurtured and influenced all his commendable activities.

Psalm 103, the family's choice, was the fruit of their family devotions in which they recited the Psalm antiphonally. They knew it by heart: "He has not dealt with us according to our sins, nor punished us according to our iniquities." This verse can help us walk humbly with our God.

The Gospel also makes it abundantly clear that Christ has gone to prepare a place for us. Where our goodness falls short, his goodness stands in our stead. The secular dogma, that this world is all there is, in Reinhold Niebuhr's phrase, leaves us bereft of true hope.

The secular hope is that nature is no longer creation revealing the awesome majesty of God but a mere object of random chance without design or purpose. One of the most accomplished and attractive leaders of secular belief is the psychiatrist, Allen Wheelis. In his later years he is now unpersuaded by his earlier attempts to make death a meaningful conclusion rather than a fated inescapable and meaningless end. He now protests: "A symphony has a climax, a poem builds to a burst of meaning but we are unfinished business. No coming together of strands. The game is called because of darkness." The secular hope ends with the dark

oblivion of death. This is the unacknowledged cry of the world for a deeper and meaningful hope.

CONGRATULATING LAGOMARCINO'S IN MOLINE, ILLINOIS FOR BEING DESIGNATED AS AN OFFICIAL "ENJOY ILLINOIS: DELICIOUS DESTINATION"

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lagomarcino's in Moline, Illinois, for achieving the distinction of an official "Enjoy Illinois: Delicious Destination."

Lagomarcino's became a member of the select group to receive this honor from the Illinois Office of Tourism—one of only 19 restaurants to date. The award recognizes local restaurants around our state for being beloved destinations for both visitors and locals alike. Lagomarcino's earned this honor because of its long-standing customer services and tasty treats that attract visitors from all over the globe.

Lagomarcino's, a beloved ice cream parlor in downtown Moline, is famous for its hot fudge sundaes, sponge candy, filled chocolate eggs, and hand-dipped cones. The turn-of-the-century parlor features mahogany booths custom built by Moline Furniture Works, Tiffany lamps designed in New York, and the terrazzo floor was installed by Cassini Tile of Rock Island. In 1997, Lagomarcino's expanded and opened a second location in the Village of East Davenport, Iowa, and fans from all over the world can order delectable treats online.

Angelo Lagomarcino, an immigrant from Italy, opened Lagomarcino's Confectionery in Moline in 1908 after obtaining a secret recipe for hot fudge sauce from a traveling salesman in the early 1900s. Against his wife's wishes, he paid \$25 dollars for that recipe—a price that clearly paid off for the restaurant's many, many fans. That same recipe is used today and Lagomarcino's sauce has earned national and international recognition from food editors and culinary magazines.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate Lagomarcino's for achieving this honored distinction and wish them even more success in the future.

HONORING KEN VOGEL

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor San Joaquin County Supervisor Ken Vogel and to thank him for his leadership and dedication to the citizens of San Joaquin County.

Ken Vogel was born in Stockton, California on March 9, 1945, and moved to the Linden/Waterloo area in 1947. Mr. Vogel's family has been in the area since 1852 when his great-

grandparents came to the Jackson Valley in Amador County, and in the early 1900s, moved to the Stockton/Lodi area.

Ken graduated from Linden High School in 1963, then went on to receive a BA, MA, and Teaching and Administrative credentials from Fresno State University. He worked as a teacher, vice principal, and principal in the Lodi Unified School District from 1980 until retirement in 2004 but continued as a substitute principal until his election to the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors.

Ken has had the honor of receiving the Lodi Lodge #256 of Masons Award for Outstanding Professional Service to Students of Public Schools and the John Terry Award from the Lodi School Administrators Association for Outstanding Educator. In 2001, he was named Boss of the Year by the Lodi CSEA group of classified employees.

Ken raises over a hundred acres of walnuts and cherries in the Linden and Farmington areas and has farmed in the area for over 30 years, marketing walnuts and cherries through local companies. In 2004, he received an award from Diamond Walnut as the Outstanding Hartley Walnut Grower of the area for that year. He has been an active member of the San Joaquin County Cherry Growers Association and a Farm Bureau member for many years and, as a Supervisor, continues to attend Farm Bureau meetings regularly.

Ken's community involvement activities include: Trustee and Past President of the Board of the Linden Unified School District from 1992–2006, Trustee and Vice President of the Board of the Lodi Public Library from 2003–2006, Member and Past Director of the San Joaquin County Farm Bureau, Member of the San Joaquin Farm Bureau Water Committee, Member and Past Director of the Kiwanis of Greater Lodi, Member of the Escalon Kiwanis Club, Member of the Ripon Chamber of Commerce, Member of the Linden Chamber of Commerce, Member of the Linden Athletic Boosters Club, Member of the Friends of the Linden Library, Member of the Morada Area Association, Member of the Stockton Chamber of Commerce, Member of the Lodi Chamber of Commerce, Member of the Clements-Lockeford Chamber of Commerce, Member of the Historical Society of the Germans from Russia, Member of the San Joaquin County Historical Society, Member of the Lockeford Historical Society, Member of the Escalon Historical Society, Member of the Ripon Historical Society, and Member of the Lodi American Legion Post #22. He also served in the United States Army Reserve from 1968–2000 and was honorably discharged with the rank of Captain.

Ken has always been committed to the economic development of his community, including the protection and expansion of our large agricultural industry. In addition, water has been one of his most focused areas of involvement as a member of the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending Ken Vogel, San Joaquin County Supervisor, for his numerous years of selfless service to the betterment of our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOB MERWIN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Bob Merwin, the Chief Executive Officer of Mills-Peninsula Health Services, who is retiring after a remarkable 27-year-career there and a lifelong career in health care. Bob knew early on that hospital administration would be his future and his passion.

Under his leadership for almost three decades Bob proved what he often said—that he is not afraid of change. He led Mills-Peninsula through major changes and transitions and is leaving it prepared for a long and strong future.

Bob came to Mills-Peninsula in 1987 as the Executive Vice President, rose to Chief Operating Officer and then in 1991 to CEO. One of his biggest and most recent accomplishments was the building and opening of the state-of-the-art Mills-Peninsula Medical Center in 2011. The 241-bed, 450,000 square foot hospital features private rooms with 21st century patient life technology, electronic charting and online capabilities that allow for efficient communication, family sleeping accommodations, advanced earthquake technology designed to withstand an 8.5 quake, and a top-notch emergency department. It also has its own chef preparing sustainably and locally grown food for patients, staff and for special events for the public.

Looking at the 241-bed hospital today, it is humbling to remember its beginnings. Founded by Elizabeth Mills Reid, the Church of St. Matthew Red Cross Guild opened in San Mateo in 1908 with just six beds. It was later renamed Mills Memorial Hospital. Due to significant growth during the following decades, Peninsula Hospital opened in 1954 in Burlingame. In 1985, Mills and Peninsula merged into Mills-Peninsula Health Services. Bob oversaw the integration of both hospitals. He was also at the helm for the next large merger with Sutter Health System in 1996 striving to further strengthening the system of care.

Under Bob's leadership, Mills-Peninsula developed and opened the first community hospital Breast Center with advanced diagnostic technologies, the Mack E. Mickelson Arthritis Center, the Family Birth Center, the Dorothy E. Schneider Cancer Center, the Women's Center, and a Behavioral Health facility. During the years leading up to national health reform, Bob kept his optimism and focus on building an organization that cares for its community.

In his career and in life, Bob has had a strong partner equally committed to health care. He was married to Jean Merwin, a nurse for Sutter Care at Home, in 1999. The two first met in the early 70s when they both worked at Long Beach Community Hospital. Bob went on to earn his Master's Degree in Hospital Administration from UCLA and become the Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer at Pacific Presbyterian Medical Center in San Francisco. Jean moved to the Mendocino Coast and worked as an administrator for a non-profit clinic. Nearly 20 years later, Bob

and Jean re-connected at a conference on the Mendocino Coast. Between the two of them they have three children, two grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

In their well-deserved retirement, Bob and Jean are looking forward to spending more time with family and pursue their common passion for golf.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Bob Merwin for his remarkable career and dedication to health care. He has built Mills-Peninsula Health Services into an organization that will serve patients, provide jobs and advance our health care system for decades to come.

PREVENTING TERMINATION OF UTILITY SERVICES IN BANKRUPTCY ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, utility companies provide many basic and life-saving services, such as electricity to light our homes, water to drink, and gas to heat our homes. Sometimes, however, individuals, through no fault of their own, struggle to pay for these services often in the face of devastating medical debt, job loss, or economic disruption caused by divorce. While resorting to bankruptcy provides some relief from financial distress, current law permits utility companies to force these debtors to pay security deposits for continued service even if they were current on their bills before filing for bankruptcy or if they promise to be current on their bills after bankruptcy. Utility companies typically insist that debtors pay at least two months or more of their average bills as a deposit—in addition to requiring that they remain current on their utility bills after bankruptcy—in exchange for the utility continuing to supply service.

The “Preventing Termination of Utility Service in Bankruptcy Act of 2015” corrects this injustice. It provides that if the debtor remains current on his or her utility bills after filing for bankruptcy relief, the debtor should not have to pay a deposit to the utility to continue service.

In Detroit, for example, families across the city have seen their water rates increase by 119% over the past decade. During the same period, the Nation generally and Detroit in particular suffered in the aftermath of a global financial crisis that left one-in-five local residences in foreclosure and sent local unemployment rates skyrocketing.

Fortunately, we are incrementally recovering from the Great Recession of 2008. For those individuals who must seek bankruptcy relief, however, we should ensure that their ability to pay their utility bills going forward is not hindered by unnecessary demands for deposits if these debtors remain current on their payments to these companies.

Terminating a family's access to such life-saving services that keeps the lights on, warms our homes, and ensures that they can bathe, hydrate, and prepare meals is simply wrong if these utility bills are being paid on time.

This legislation is part of a range of solutions that are needed to address the still pervasive adverse impacts of the Great Recession of 2008. I continue to work with my colleagues in Congress, state and federal officials, and my constituents to defend the right to water and protect public health. I will not tolerate the notion that—in the 21st Century, in the wealthiest nation on earth—families should go without access to affordable public water and sanitation services.

COMMEMORATING THE CLOSING OF THE ICE CREAM PALACE IN SILVIS, ILLINOIS AFTER 50 YEARS IN BUSINESS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Ice Cream Palace in Silvis, Illinois, owned by Mr. Umberto “Red” Ponce, which closed on December 27th after 50 years of business and service to our community.

The Ice Cream Palace has been a staple for the community of Silvis for the past five decades. Despite its name, Ice Cream Palace is known for serving favorite traditional Mexican cuisine dishes like the popular carne-de-res burritos since 1965. The dishes served come from authentic recipes from Mr. Ponce's mother, Celia Ponce, who was initially a partner in the business and worked there for the restaurants' first 25 years.

Locals who began frequenting the restaurant as children now bring their own families to enjoy both the food and the close-knit relationships between staff and regulars. Some can even remember the days that the Ice Cream Palace served up chilly treats and say that the great tasting food has not changed a bit over 50 years thanks to Mr. Ponce's loyalty to his mother's original recipes. Locals young and old alike have all expressed sadness for the end of such a long-lasting part of their community. Mr. Ponce is looking forward to spending more time with his children and grandchildren during his retirement and says he will miss the friends he has made over the years in his staff and customers.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to recognize the Ice Cream Palace, and am glad that places like this exist, helping to create traditions and bonds within our communities and families.

APPRECIATION OF GOVERNOR JAMES B. EDWARDS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the State newspaper of Columbia, South Carolina, on December 27, 2014, published an article of statements issued upon learning of Governor Edwards' death.

WHAT THEY ARE SAYING ABOUT GOV. EDWARDS

A COLLECTION OF REMARKS AND REMEMBRANCES ABOUT FORMER S.C. GOV. JAMES EDWARDS, WHO PASSED AWAY FRIDAY AT AGE 87:

Glenn McConnell, president of College of Charleston and former S.C. Senate president pro tempore: “As an alumnus of our institution, Gov. Edwards represents the best traits of a College of Charleston education: leadership and a passion for lifelong learning. On a personal note, Gov. Edwards was a mentor and a dear friend to me. He helped launch my career in public service and inspired me, through his tireless and selfless efforts, on how to best serve the people of South Carolina. In every facet of his life, he believed in making things better for others.”

U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-Seneca: “He was truly one of the most decent men to have ever served as governor of South Carolina. He was a pioneer for the Republican Party and continued to stay involved in party building activities throughout his life.”

U.S. Sen. Tim Scott, R-North Charleston: “Jim was an early mentor of mine as I entered public service, and I am forever thankful for his advice and encouragement. From the dedication of Patriot's Point during his time as governor to his efforts expanding MUSC while serving as president, Gov. Edwards has left an important legacy in our state.”

U.S. Rep. Joe Wilson, R-Springdale: “Dr. Edwards was a tireless stalwart for conservative limited government to expand freedom. In high school, I would visit his dental office for Goldwater materials, in his capacity as Charleston County Republican Chairman. . . . Dr. Edwards' vision of an inclusive Republican Party came to fulfillment this month with the U.S. Senate victory in Louisiana, from his start with no elected statewide Republican officials in the five-state Deep South, and now all statewide officials are Republicans.”

Medical University of South Carolina President David Cole: “With his leadership and vision MUSC started to transform and grow in scope, scale, and quality. As an individual he was universally liked and respected—he had a personality that filled the room—truly he never met anyone that he did not like. I had the privilege of joining the faculty as an assistant professor of surgery in 1994, and from day one he made me feel respected, included, and at times like I quite possibly was his long lost younger brother.”

S.C. Senate President Pro Tempore Hugh Leatherman, R-Florence: “A Palmetto gentleman who sought only the best solutions for his community, state, and nation. I know that the entire Senate of South Carolina joins me in sending our deepest condolences to the Edwards family. The Medical University of South Carolina, South Carolina, and the United States are a better place because of his leadership.”

S.C. Republican Party Chairman Matt Moore: “Gov. Edwards made an incredible mark on South Carolina history. His legacy will live on through the countless lives he touched as governor, dentist and particularly as a man of faith.”

Former congressman and federal judge John Napier: “Jim Edwards was a giant force for good in everything he ever did. A mentor and creator of the modern Republican Party. Pam and I express our deepest sympathy to Anne and the family.”

Rusty DePass, campaign manager of Edwards' 1974 gubernatorial win: “He was

laid back, easygoing. He was opinionated, but he did not have a hard edge to him and didn't have a mean bone in his body. And he was the same person in private as he was in public."

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT ROSS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Robert Ross, a successful business owner, exceptional law enforcement officer and dedicated public servant who is retiring from the San Mateo City Council after five years of service. He was the Mayor in 2014 and Deputy Mayor in 2013. Robert is a genuine, hard-working and deeply committed city council member and will truly be missed.

Robert was first elected to the council in 2009 after a 27-year-career as a police officer in San Mateo. His experience in law enforcement made security and sustainability one of his priorities for the city. As a real estate agent for 25 years, Robert also brought substantial business experience to the Council, guiding the city toward financial stability.

While on the Council, Robert served on the City Council Audit and Budget Committee, the City Council Legislative Committee, the Community Development Department Audit Committee, the Grand Boulevard Task Force, the North B Street Improvement Initiative and the Planning Commission. In addition, he was very active in the Association of Bay Area Governments, the League of California Cities, San Mateo County Council of Cities, the San Mateo-Foster City Elementary School Board, the San Mateo Oversight Board, the San Mateo Union High School District Board, the Sister City Association and the South Bayside Waste Management Authority.

Robert received his Police Officers Standard & Training at the Modesto College Police Academy and his BSBA in Business Administration from the University of Phoenix. He started his law enforcement career as a police officer in Hayward in 1979 and transferred to the San Mateo Police Department in 1981 where he rose through the ranks to Police Lieutenant in 2003. His professionalism and proactive approach have been recognized and he has been commended on numerous occasions. For example, in the late 1980s, then Corporal Ross was in charge of setting up a task force to fight drug crimes in San Mateo. The group became known as "Ross' Raiders" and their effective anti-drug campaign was lauded by the City Council, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, the District Attorney, the San Mateo County Trial Lawyers Association and the late Congressman Tom Lantos.

Among the many awards Robert received was a Lieutenant's Commendation for proactive policing, the San Carlos/Belmont Exchange Club Officer of the Year Award, Employee of the Quarter by past Police Chief Don Phipps for ongoing leadership and proactive policing, the Trial Lawyers Association's Police Officer of the Year Award, the Peninsula Lions Club's Police Award for outstanding service to the community, the Gordon

Joinville Special Merit Award for day-to-day excellence in policing, and the Medal of Honor, the Police Department's highest award for saving a life during a fire.

Whether in his capacity as a city council member, a peace officer, a small business owner or a San Mateo resident, Robert has always seized opportunities to help his community. He has given countless presentations at our schools to help troubled and underprivileged youths find a positive direction in their lives. He has visited homes of at-risk youth gang members during the holidays handing out presents. He has worked with the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center and the Tongan Interfaith Council to prevent and solve conflicts. He has worked with Samaritan House to assist needy families. He is a member of the San Mateo Lion's Club which supports local and international charities.

It is obvious from this long list of accomplishments and engagements that Robert Ross has a heart of gold and an inexhaustible drive to help others. Because of his vision and commitment, San Mateo is a better place. I feel privileged to count Robert as a friend and colleague and wish him well as he shifts his focus to his personal and family life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize the lasting contributions Robert Ross has made while serving as Mayor, City Councilmember and law enforcement officer. He will always be a role model and inspiration to his fellow San Mateo residents.

THE HOME FORECLOSURE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

SUMMARY

The "Home Foreclosure Reduction Act of 2015" would permit a bankruptcy judge, with respect to certain home mortgages, to reduce the principal amount of such mortgages to the fair market value of the homes securing such indebtedness. My legislation will encourage homeowners to make their mortgage payments and help stem the endless cycle of foreclosures that further depresses home values. It also would authorize the mortgage's repayment period to be extended so that monthly mortgage payments are more affordable. In addition, the bill would allow exorbitant mortgage interest rates to be reduced to a level that will keep the mortgage affordable over the long-term. And, it would authorize the waiver of prepayment penalties and excessive fees. Further, the bill would eliminate hidden fees and unauthorized costs.

This bill addresses a fundamental problem: homeowners in financial distress simply lack the leverage to make mortgage lenders and servicers engage in meaningful settlement negotiations, even when in the interest of all parties. My legislation would empower a homeowner, under certain circumstances, to force his or her lender to modify the terms of the mortgage by allowing the principal amount of the mortgage to be reduced to the

home's fair market value. And, the implementation of this measure will not cost taxpayers a single penny.

The "Home Foreclosure Reduction Act of 2015" is identical to H.R. 101 (introduced in the 113th Congress) and H.R. 1587 (introduced in the 112th Congress). It contains similar provisions included in H.R. 1106, which the House passed nearly six years ago. Unfortunately, those provisions were removed in the Senate and not included in the final version of the bill that was subsequently enacted into law.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

Section 1. Short Title. Section 1 sets forth the short title of this Act as the "Home Foreclosure Reduction Act of 2015."

Section 2. Definition. Bankruptcy Code section 101 defines various terms. Section 2 amends this provision to add a definition of "qualified loan modification," which is defined as a loan modification agreement made in accordance with the guidelines of the Obama Administration's Homeowner Affordability and Stability Plan, as implemented on March 4, 2009 with respect to a loan secured by a senior security interest in the debtor's principal residence. To qualify as such, the agreement must reduce the debtor's mortgage payment (including principal and interest) and payments for various other specified expenses (i.e., real estate taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, homeowners' association dues, ground rent, and special assessments) to a percentage of the debtor's income in accordance with such guidelines. The payment may not include any period of negative amortization and it must fully amortize the outstanding mortgage principal. In addition, the agreement must not require the debtor to pay any fees or charges to obtain the modification. Further, the agreement must permit the debtor to continue to make these payments as if he or she had not filed for bankruptcy relief.

Section 3. Eligibility for Relief. Section 3 amends Bankruptcy Code section 109, which specifies the eligibility criteria for filing for bankruptcy relief, in two respects. First, it amends Bankruptcy Code section 109(e), which sets forth secured and unsecured debt limits to establish a debtor's eligibility for relief under chapter 13. Section 3 amends this provision to provide that the computation of debts does not include the secured or unsecured portions of debts secured by the debtor's principal residence, under certain circumstances. The exception applies if the value of the debtor's principal residence as of the date of the order for relief under chapter 13 is less than the applicable maximum amount of the secured debt limit specified in section 109(e). Alternatively, the exception applies if the debtor's principal residence was sold in foreclosure or the debtor surrendered such residence to the creditor and the value of such residence as of the date of the order for relief under chapter 13 is less than the secured debt limit specified in section 109(e). This amendment is not intended to create personal liability on a debt if there would not otherwise be personal liability on such debt.

Second, section 3 amends Bankruptcy Code section 109(h), which requires a debtor to receive credit counseling within the 180-day period prior to filing for bankruptcy relief, with limited exception. Section 3 amends this provision to allow a chapter 13 debtor to satisfy this requirement within 30 days after filing for bankruptcy relief if he or she submits to the court a certification that the

debtor has received notice that the holder of a claim secured by the debtor's principal residence may commence a foreclosure proceeding.

Section 4. Prohibiting Claims Arising from Violations of the Truth in Lending Act. Under the Truth in Lending Act, a mortgagor has a right of rescission with respect to a mortgage secured by his or her residence, under certain circumstances. Bankruptcy Code section 502(b) enumerates various claims of creditors that are not entitled to payment in a bankruptcy case, subject to certain exceptions. Section 4 amends Bankruptcy Code section 502(b) to provide that a claim for a loan secured by a security interest in the debtor's principal residence is not entitled to payment in a bankruptcy case to the extent that such claim is subject to a remedy for rescission under the Truth in Lending Act, notwithstanding the prior entry of a foreclosure judgment. In addition, section 4 specifies that nothing in this provision may be construed to modify, impair, or supersede any other right of the debtor.

Section 5. Authority to Modify Certain Mortgages. Under Bankruptcy Code section 1322(b)(2), a chapter 13 plan may not modify the terms of a mortgage secured solely by real property that is the debtor's principal residence. Section 5 amends Bankruptcy Code section 1322(b) to create a limited exception to this prohibition. As amended, the exception only applies to a mortgage that: (1) originated before the effective date of this amendment; and (2) is the subject of a notice that a foreclosure may be (or has been) commenced with respect to such mortgage.

In addition, the debtor must certify pursuant to new section 1322(h) that he or she contacted—not less than 30 days before filing for bankruptcy relief—the mortgagee (or the entity collecting payments on behalf of such mortgagee) regarding modification of the mortgage. The debtor must also certify that he or she provided the mortgagee (or the entity collecting payments on behalf of such mortgagee) a written statement of the debtor's current income, expenses, and debt in a format that substantially conforms with the schedules required under Bankruptcy Code section 521 or with such other form as promulgated by the Judicial Conference of the United States. Further, the certification must include a statement that the debtor considered any qualified loan modification offered to the debtor by the mortgagee (or the entity collecting payments on behalf of such holder). This requirement does not apply if the foreclosure sale is scheduled to occur within 30 days of the date on which the debtor files for bankruptcy relief. If the chapter 13 case is pending at the time new section 1322(h) becomes effective, then the debtor must certify that he or she attempted to contact the mortgagee (or the entity collecting payments on behalf of such mortgagee) regarding modification of the mortgage before either: (1) filing a plan under Bankruptcy Code section 1321 that contains a modification pursuant to new section 1322(b)(11); or (2) modifying a plan under Bankruptcy Code section 1323 or section 1329 to contain a modification pursuant to new section 1322(b)(11).

Under new section 1322(b)(11), the debtor may propose a plan modifying the rights of the mortgagee (and the rights of the holder of any claim secured by a subordinate security interest in such residence) in several respects. It is important to note that the intent of new section 1322(b)(11) is permissive. Accordingly, a chapter 13 may propose a plan that proposes any or all types of modification authorized under section 1322(b)(11).

First, the plan may provide for payment of the amount of the allowed secured claim as determined under section 506(a)(1). In making such determination, the court, pursuant to new section 1322(i), must use the fair market value of the property at the date that such value is determined. If the issue of value is contested, the court must determine such value in accordance with the appraisal rules used by the Federal Housing Administration.

Second, the plan may prohibit, reduce, or delay any adjustable interest rate applicable on, and after, the date of the filing of the plan.

Third, it may extend the repayment period of the mortgage for a period that is not longer than the longer of 40 years (reduced by the period for which the mortgage has been outstanding) or the remaining term of the mortgage beginning on the date of the order for relief under chapter 13.

Fourth, the plan may provide for the payment of interest at a fixed annual rate equal to the applicable average prime offer rate as of the date of the order for relief under chapter 13, as determined pursuant to certain specified criteria. The rate must correspond to the repayment term determined under new section 1322(b)(11)(C)(i) as published by the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council in its table entitled, "Average Prime Offer Rates—Fixed." In addition, the rate must include a reasonable premium for risk.

Fifth, the plan, pursuant to new section 1322(b)(11)(D), may provide for payments of such modified mortgage directly to the holder of the claim or, at the discretion of the court, through the chapter 13 trustee during the term of the plan. The reference in new section 1322(b)(11)(D) to "holder of the claim" is intended to include a servicer of such mortgage for such holder. It is anticipated that the court, in exercising its discretion with respect to allowing the debtor to make payments directly to the mortgagee or by requiring payments to be made through the chapter 13 trustee, will take into consideration the debtor's ability to pay the trustee's fees on payments disbursed through the trustee.

New section 1322(g) provides that a claim may be reduced under new section 1322(b)(11)(A) only on the condition that the debtor agrees to pay the mortgagee a stated portion of the net proceeds of sale should the home be sold before the completion of all payments under the chapter 13 plan or before the debtor receives a discharge under section 1328(b). The debtor must pay these proceeds to the mortgagee within 15 days of when the debtor receives the net sales proceeds.

If the residence is sold in the first year following the effective date of the chapter 13 plan, the mortgagee is to receive 90 percent of the difference between the sales price and the amount of the claim as originally determined under section 1322(b)(11) (plus costs of sale and improvements), but not to exceed the unpaid amount of the allowed secured claim determined as if such claim had not been reduced under new section 1322(b)(11)(A). If the residence is sold in the second year following the effective date of the chapter 13 plan, then the applicable percentage is 70 percent. If the residence is sold in the third year following the effective date of the chapter 13 plan, then the applicable percentage is 50 percent. If the residence is sold in the fourth year following the effective date of the chapter 13 plan, then the applicable percentage is 30 percent. If the residence is sold in the fifth year following the

effective date of the chapter 13 plan, then the applicable percentage is ten percent. It is the intent of this provision that if the unsecured portion of the mortgagee's claim is partially paid under this provision it should be reconsidered under 502(j) and reduced accordingly.

Section 6. Combating Excessive Fees. Section 6 amends Bankruptcy Code section 1322(c) to provide that the debtor, the debtor's property, and property of the bankruptcy estate are not liable for a fee, cost, or charge that is incurred while the chapter 13 case is pending and that arises from a claim for debt secured by the debtor's principal residence, unless the holder of the claim complies with certain requirements. It is the intent of this provision that its reference to a fee, cost, or charge includes an increase in any applicable rate of interest for such claim. It also applies to a change in escrow account payments.

To ensure such fee, cost, or charge is allowed, the claimant must comply with certain requirements. First, the claimant must file with the court and serve on the chapter 13 trustee, the debtor, and the debtor's attorney an annual notice of such fee, cost, or charge (or on a more frequent basis as the court determines) before the earlier of either: one year of when such fee, cost, or charge was incurred, or 60 days before the case is closed. Second, the fee, cost, or charge must be lawful under applicable non-bankruptcy law, reasonable, and provided for in the applicable security agreement. Third, the value of the debtor's principal residence must be greater than the amount of such claim, including such fee, cost or charge.

If the holder fails to give the required notice, such failure is deemed to be a waiver of any claim for such fees, costs, or charges for all purposes. Any attempt to collect such fees, costs, or charges constitutes a violation of the Bankruptcy Code's discharge injunction under section 524(a)(2) or the automatic stay under section 362(a), whichever is applicable.

Section 6 further provides that a chapter 13 plan may waive any prepayment penalty on a claim secured by the debtor's principal residence.

Section 7. Confirmation of Plan. Bankruptcy Code section 1325 sets forth the criteria for confirmation of a chapter 13 plan. Section 7 amends section 1325(a)(5) (which specifies the mandatory treatment that an allowed secured claim provided for under the plan must receive) to provide an exception for a claim modified under new section 1322(b)(11). The amendment also clarifies that payments under a plan that includes a modification of a claim under new section 1322(b)(11) must be in equal monthly amounts pursuant to section 1325(a)(5)(B)(iii)(I).

In addition, section 7 specifies certain protections for a creditor whose rights are modified under new section 1322(b)(11). As a condition of confirmation, new section 1325(a)(10) requires a plan to provide that the creditor must retain its lien until the later of when: (1) the holder's allowed secured claim (as modified) is paid; (2) the debtor completes all payments under the chapter 13 plan; or (3) if applicable, the debtor receives a discharge under section 1328(b).

Section 7 also provides standards for confirming a chapter 13 plan that modifies a claim pursuant to new section 1322(b)(11). First, the debtor cannot have been convicted of obtaining by actual fraud the extension, renewal, or refinancing of credit that gives rise to such modified claim. Second, the modification must be in good faith. Lack of good faith exists if the debtor has no need for relief under this provision because the debtor

can pay all of his or her debts and any future payment increases on such debts without difficulty for the foreseeable future, including the positive amortization of mortgage debt. In determining whether a modification under section 1322(b)(11) that reduces the principal amount of the loan is made in good faith, the court must consider whether the holder of the claim (or the entity collecting payments on behalf of such holder) has offered the debtor a qualified loan modification that would enable the debtor to pay such debts and such loan without reducing the principal amount of the mortgage.

Section 7 further amends section 1325 to add a new provision. New section 1325(d) authorizes the court, on request of the debtor or the mortgage holder, to confirm a plan proposing to reduce the interest rate lower than that specified in new section 1322(b)(11)(C)(ii), provided:

(1) the modification does not reduce the mortgage principal; (2) the total mortgage payment is reduced through interest rate reduction to the percentage of the debtor's income that is the standard for a modification in accordance with the Obama Administration's Homeowner Affordability and Stability Plan, as implemented on March 4, 2009; (3) the court determines that the debtor can afford such modification in light of the debtor's financial situation, after allowance of expense amounts that would be permitted for a debtor subject to section 1325(b)(3), regardless of whether the debtor is otherwise subject to such paragraph, and taking into account additional debts and fees that are to be paid in chapter 13 and thereafter; and (4) the debtor is able to prevent foreclosure and pay a fully amortizing 30-year loan at such reduced interest rate without such reduction in principal. If the mortgage holder accepts a debtor's proposed modification under this provision, the plan's treatment is deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 1325(a)(5)(A) and the proposal should not be rejected by the court.

Section 8. Discharge. Bankruptcy Code section 1328 sets forth the requirements by which a chapter 13 debtor may obtain a discharge and the scope of such discharge. Section 8 amends section 1328(a) to clarify that the unpaid portion of an allowed secured claim modified under new section 1322(b)(11) is not discharged. This provision is not intended to create a claim for a deficiency where such a claim would not otherwise exist.

Section 9. Standing Trustee Fees. Section 9(a) amends 28 U.S.C. § 586(e)(1)(B)(i) to provide that a chapter 13 trustee may receive a commission set by the Attorney General of no more than four percent on payments made under a chapter 13 plan and disbursed by the chapter 13 trustee to a creditor whose claim was modified under Bankruptcy Code section 1322(b)(11), unless the bankruptcy court waives such fees based on a determination that the debtor has income less than 150 percent of the official poverty line applicable to the size of the debtor's family and payment of such fees would render the debtor's plan infeasible.

With respect to districts not under the United States trustee system, section 9(b) makes a conforming revision to section 302(d)(3) of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986.

Section 10. Effective Date; Application of Amendments. Section 10(a) provides that this measure and the amendments made by it, except as provided in subsection (b), take effect on the Act's date of enactment.

Section 10(b)(1) provides, except as provided in paragraph (2), that the amendments made by this measure apply to cases commenced under title 11 of the United States Code before, on, or after the Act's date of enactment. Section 10(b)(2) specifies that paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to cases that are closed under the Bankruptcy Code as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 11. GAO Study. Section 11 requires the Government Accountability Office to complete a study and to submit a report to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees within two years from the enactment of this Act. The report must contain the results of the study of: (1) the number of debtors who filed cases under chapter 13, during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act for the purpose of restructuring their principal residence mortgages; (2) the number of mortgages restructured under this Act that subsequently resulted in default and foreclosure; (3) a comparison between the effectiveness of mortgages restructured under programs outside of bankruptcy, such as Hope Now and Hope for Homeowners, and mortgages restructured under this Act; (4) the number of appeals in cases where mortgages were restructured under this Act; (5) the number of such appeals where the bankruptcy court's decision was overturned; and (6) the number of bankruptcy judges disciplined as a result of actions taken to restructure mortgages under this Act. In addition, the report must include a recommendation as to whether such amendments should be amended to include a sunset clause.

Section 12. Report to Congress. Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office, in consultation with the Federal Housing Administration, must submit to Congress a report containing: (1) a comprehensive review of the effects of the Act's amendments on bankruptcy courts; (2) a survey of whether the types of homeowners eligible for the program should be limited; and (3) a recommendation on whether such amendments should remain in effect.

RECOGNIZING DUANE BURLINGAME OF FREEPORT, ILLINOIS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Mr. Duane Burlingame of Freeport, Illinois.

Duane Burlingame is a tremendous athlete and is currently one of the top master powerlifters in the world. He has won six world titles and recently achieved best lifter heavy-weight honors at the 18th annual Welker Engineering World Association of Bench Pressers and Deadlifters Championships in Las Vegas. He has accomplished all of this despite previous injuries, and while serving his community.

Duane Burlingame truly lives his life for others while doing what he loves to do. Over his 17 year career, he has raised funds for AIDS, the American Cancer Society, and St. Jude Children's Hospital through asking friends and supporters to pledge money per pound he lifts. By lifting 551 pounds for one of his most re-

cent competitions, he made it clear that he is putting his talent to work for the benefit of those in need in a very big way. This year, Duane Burlingame will be sending toys to children at St. Jude's for Christmas. He explained that he was "much more excited going out and buying toys to send to children" than when he went to the World Championships. He believes that by giving back during difficult times we can all make a big difference. Duane also runs a personal training business and has previously provided fitness and nutrition plans free of charge to those in his community in need.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Duane Burlingame for his dedication to our community and for supporting important organizations that help to keep all of our communities healthy.

HONORING NAMM'S DEALER OF
THE YEAR THE CANDYMAN
STRINGS & THINGS

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Association of Music Merchants (NAMM) Dealer of the Year, The Candyman Strings & Things of Santa Fe.

The Candyman Strings & Things, owned by Rand and Cindy Cook, has been a staple in the Santa Fe community since they opened its doors in 1969, and was awarded Dealer of the Year for its innovative and effective practices, as well as for setting an outstanding example for its peers in the musical instrument and products industry. Additionally, Candyman was also given the Music Makes a Difference award for promoting music in its community. Candyman serves to inspire its industry and also aspires to serve its community through numerous educational and scholarship programs. Through its charitable contributions and outreach work, Candyman has made a difference in the lives of customers, schools, and children.

Small businesses are an important part of local communities. Candyman is an example of a small business that has been successful and has had a positive impact in Northern New Mexico. While I applaud Candyman's efforts to ensure a high level of service to its customers, I am even more impressed by its service to the community and efforts to provide mentoring and learning opportunities for young music enthusiasts. Once again, I congratulate The Candyman Strings & Things for being awarded both the Dealer of the Year and Music Makes a Difference awards, and thank the entire team for its exceptional service to our community.

HONORING FRANK "LARRY"
RUHSTALLER

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor San Joaquin County Supervisor Frank "Larry" Ruhstaller on his retirement from the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors and to thank him for his dedicated, life-long spirit of community service.

Mr. Ruhstaller was born in San Francisco on April 3, 1948. He is a third generation Stocktonian and a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley where he earned his Bachelors of Arts in US History emphasizing in US City Planning. Larry was a Lieutenant Junior Grade in the U.S. Navy.

Currently, Larry is serving his eighth year on the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors representing the 2nd District, which encompasses most of central and northern Stockton.

During his tenure as Supervisor, Larry has been instrumental in creating a green purchasing policy for the county departments and has been a strong advocate for a comprehensive Delta restoration plan, serving the Chairman of the Delta Protection Commission and as a member of the Delta Stewardship Council and the 5 Delta Counties Coalition. Supervisor Ruhstaller also serves on the Board of Directors of the Health Plan of San Joaquin, the Mental Health Board and Hospital Medical Executive Committee, overseeing the San Joaquin General Hospital operations. In addition, Larry serves as the Board Representative on the Local Agency Formation Commission and as Chairman of the San Joaquin Flood Control Agency.

Prior to his election to the Board, Larry served two terms on the Stockton City Council from 1997–2004. His community involvement includes time as the Chairman of the Stockton Asparagus Festival and President of the Board of Directors of the Stockton Visitors and Convention Bureau.

Frank and his wife, Kitty, have been married 28 years. They have 3 children and 4 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring San Joaquin County Supervisor Larry Ruhstaller on his retirement and thank him for his exemplary leadership and service to the community.

REMEMBERING CLINT REIF

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of an important and respected member of the Chicago community.

On December 21st, we lost a vital asset and key individual to the Chicago Blackhawks team, with the passing of Clint Reif.

In his ninth season with the Blackhawks and sixth as assistant equipment manager, Clint

ensured that his team was suited up and ready to play to the best of their ability day in and day out.

Arriving early and leaving late, Clint had one of the all-important duties of maintaining and repairing equipment. And we all know how gentle hockey players are on their equipment. Because of Clint's attention to detail and professionalism, no Blackhawks player was ever left on the ice without exactly what he needed.

But beyond that, he was a family man, with four charming children—Florence, C.J., Aislynn and Colette—and his loving wife, Kelly. He was also devoted to his community, spearheading the team's initiative to outfit the Wounded Warriors hockey team with brand new equipment this past March. The Wounded Warriors Project (WWP) aims to raise awareness and enlist the public's generosity for the needs of injured service members. Clint respected and admired those brave men and women who fought to ensure our freedoms and gave back in true Clint fashion—with hockey equipment.

Another great sports influence in the city of Chicago, Phil Jackson, once said, "The strength of the team is each individual member. The strength of each member is the team." With the passing of Clint, the Chicago Blackhawks lost an irreplaceable individual from their team, one that helped lead them to two Stanley Cup Championships.

A one of a kind guy, Clint will be greatly missed by the Blackhawks, the City of Chicago and the entire hockey community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating his life.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROTECT THE PRIVACY OF CONSUMERS AND REDUCE THEIR VULNERABILITY TO IDENTITY THEFT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the "Cyber Privacy Fortification Act of 2014." This bill would provide criminal penalties for the failure to comply with federal or state obligations to report security breaches of the sensitive personally identifiable information of individuals. Certain breaches would also be required to be reported to the FBI or the Secret Service. The bill would also require federal agencies engaged in rulemaking related to personally identifiable information to publish privacy impact statements relating to the impact of the proposed rule.

One of the main motivators for cybercrime and computer network intrusions is financial gain. Intrusions into networks of financial institutions and businesses may yield information, often on a large scale, about customers such as credit and debit card numbers, Social Security numbers, birth dates, account passwords, and other personally identifiable information. Information obtained through such data breaches may be used to steal from the accounts of the customers, use their credit cards, hack into their personal communica-

tions, or the information may be sold to others who commit these crimes or compile provides about individuals which others might find valuable.

With constant revelations about new data breaches impacting millions of Americans, we must take additional steps to protect the sensitive information of consumers maintained on corporate databases. This bill will provide a greater incentive for companies to provide notice of breaches consumers' sensitive information such as Social Security numbers and financial account numbers. This protects the privacy of our citizens and allows them to be vigilant against identity theft.

TRIBUTES FOR GOV. JAMES B. EDWARDS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the hometown, Charleston Lowcountry daily newspaper of the Post and Courier recognized Doctor Edwards with a thoughtful editorial and heartfelt columns were provided by former staffers Robert G. Liming and Ron Brinson.

[From The Post and Courier, Dec. 27, 2014]

JAMES B. EDWARDS

James B. Edwards exhibited, among many other positive attributes, a keen sense of the politically possible. So when the oral surgeon from Mount Pleasant launched his 1974 gubernatorial bid, he knew it was a very long shot.

Yet he also knew something few politicians or pundits of that time realized: A powerful public demand for limited government and fiscal responsibility—and for a more conservative Republican party to lead that charge—was on the rise.

It was made to order for Dr. Edwards' political philosophy. And his engaging personal style helped him advance those goals on behalf of the public he served so well for so long as, among other jobs, governor of South Carolina and president of the Medical University of South Carolina.

His death Friday at age 87 warrants a fresh recognition of his remarkable, admirable legacy—in and out of elective office.

How stacked did the deck look against Dr. Edwards' 1974 run for governor?

It had been less than two years since he had won his first elective office as a state senator. It had been three years since he had lost his run for the 1st District congressional seat, though he did win the GOP nomination in that race.

And it had been 100 years since South Carolinians had elected a Republican governor. Dr. Edwards' GOP primary opponent, retired Gen. William Westmoreland, had a huge name-recognition edge. And even after Dr. Edwards won that primary, he again was the underdog in the general election.

But Democratic primary winner Charles "Pug" Ravenel was removed as his party's nominee on a residency challenge, elevating runner-up William Jennings Bryan Dorn to the ballot. Dr. Edwards made 20th century history by defeating the 13-term congressman from the 3rd District.

During his 1975–79 gubernatorial tenure, Dr. Edwards further established himself as a

major player in the GOP's shift to the right. After initially supporting former Texas Gov. John Connally, Gov. Edwards became a prominent supporter of Ronald Reagan's 1976 bid for the party's presidential nomination against incumbent Gerald Ford. Though that effort fell short, it set the stage for Mr. Reagan's successful 1980 run.

Despite his solid conservative credentials, Gov. Edwards established himself as a master of crossing party lines. As governor, he worked with the Democratic-controlled Senate and House to expand South Carolina's industrial base with assorted incentives, uplift poor school districts with the Education Finance Act and protect the state's long-term financial stability with a "rainy day" fund.

Gov. Edwards also advanced the reorganization of state government. One of his allies in Columbia, Carroll Campbell, later became an effective champion of that cause during his two terms as governor (1987-95).

S.C. governors were limited to a single term when Dr. Edwards served in that position. So after Mr. Reagan won the presidency in 1980, Dr. Edwards became U.S. energy secretary.

He and President Reagan advocated eliminating the department. As then-Secretary Edwards warned: "There is only one thing that produces energy, and that's the private sector, which government has hamstrung."

Secretary Edwards and his boss pushed to fold the agency into the Department of Commerce. Though Congress wouldn't go along with that, Energy Secretary Edwards did manage to deeply cut the agency's budget and reduce its staff by 2,000.

He stepped up to another challenge in 1996, joining fellow former Govs. Campbell, John West, Robert McNair and Dick Riley in bipartisan backing of Gov. David Beasley's courageous call to remove the Confederate battle flag from the Statehouse dome.

And under his 1982-99 leadership as MUSC president, the size of the campus more than tripled from 1.5 million square feet to 5 million square feet. Along the expanding way, MUSC's reputation for providing both high-quality medical education and health care grew, too. In that ongoing process, the school has attracted top medical, research and teaching talent.

MUSC paid fitting tribute to its former leader in 2010 when it dedicated the James B. Edwards College of Dental Medicine. At the time of the dental college dedication, Dr. Jack Sanders, dean of that school, offered this accurate assessment of Dr. Edwards' lasting contributions:

"His entire life stands as a testament to the values of integrity and service, which we hope to instill in each of our students."

James B. Edwards' legacy in South Carolina, at MUSC and beyond will long live on.

[From The Post and Courier, Dec. 27, 2014]

JIM EDWARDS HAD TRANSFORMATIVE ROLE IN S.C. SHIFT TO GOP

(By Robert G. Liming)

He wasn't a four-star general, legendary Old South congressman or media-savvy Wall Street investment broker, yet he forever transformed Palmetto State politics.

James Burrows Edwards was the exception to every rule in predictable partisan politics. The affable oral surgeon was given no chance of being elected as he paid his filing fee at GOP Headquarters on Columbia's Harden Street in spring of 1974.

He defied backroom dealmakers in the then fledgling Republican Party by thrashing their hand-picked contender, West Pointer Gen. William C. Westmoreland, in the Republican primary.

Democratic Party bosses were so fearful of a Westmoreland candidacy they failed to notice the meteoric rise of Wall Street whiz Charles D. "Pug" Ravenel who used slick television ads and media manipulation to stunningly defeat their anointed, veteran Greenwood congressman, William Jennings Bryan Dorn, in a bitterly contested primary.

Dorn surprisingly became the eventual Democratic nominee after a tumultuous legal battle resulting in a Supreme Court ruling disqualifying Ravenel because he failed to meet the state's legal residency requirement. The court's decision paved the way for Edwards' implausible November election win. His cash-starved campaign's upset signaled the end of the Democratic death-grip dominance over the state's 46 county courthouses.

Jim Edwards took the oath on a frigid January morning in 1975 and rocked the very political foundation of the Statehouse. Defying political pundits and power brokers, he became the first Republican chief executive since the Union troops fled Columbia, leaving then-Gov. Daniel Chamberlain holding his empty carpetbag.

Most current "life-long" Republican officeholders never met Jim, and those who did can hardly grasp the fact they owe their very opportunity to serve to his courage, character and dedication to public service. There were less than two dozen Republicans in the legislature in 1974, and Nikki Haley was only three years old the evening Jim gave his first state of the State address.

I was a brash and flippant political reporter when I accepted the role as his official spokesman, a hard choice for him since he really didn't know me well. But like so many decisions he made, Jim took his time, weighed all the facts, sought the advice of others and made the final decision on his own. We grew closer and soon our inner office humor abounded. I recall how I coined his nickname as "veto king" and he labeled me as "Dr. No" because of the effort I put into composing the veto messages he signed on numerous pieces of legislation. As a Republican it was his strongest weapon against a Democratic-dominated General Assembly when compromise became impossible.

In today's atmosphere of instant assessment, weblogs of every ilk, and babbling talking heads few if any will recall his countless accomplishments. Jim's strongest skill was his personal ability to sit down one on one and resolve issues, a talent so sadly missing today in Columbia and Washington. Jim was the leader in establishing the state's "rainy day" reserve fund to cover budget shortfalls and unforeseen emergencies; he championed the Education Finance Act to ensure equal funding options for all public schools; led the fight for the state's first tidelands protection laws; and pioneered the reform of the state's festeringly inefficient and ineffective cash-devouring welfare system.

He had no political hit list and he held no grudges. Jim was guided by the wisdom and character he learned from his school teacher parents; the patriotism he shared as a Merchant Marine and later Navy officer; the caring he learned as a surgeon; and his abiding faith and trust in God.

His first love was for his forever first lady, Ann, their precious daughter and son, Catherine and James Jr., and the beloved grandchildren. Yet there was always a special place in his heart for the people of South Carolina, including the Allendale dyed-in-the-wool Democrat farmer who Jim always trusted because he voted for the other guy!

As I recall Jim, this verse will always come to mind: Mark 1:11. We will miss you and your wonderful smile; you were an extraordinary governor, wonderful boss and a dear friend.

[From The Post and Courier]

FUNDAMENTAL GOODNESS WAS THE ESSENCE OF JIM EDWARDS
(By Ron Brinson)

Jim Edwards has died, and there is a void in the heart and soul and political spirit of his beloved South Carolina.

This good man was an American patriot, a principled leader.

His gracious humility framed his soaring intellect.

His life was anchored by those simple old-fashioned American values of education and enterprise, of caring for your family and your neighbors and your country—and always translating that "care" with meaningful commitments and achievement.

He was my friend. He was everyone's friend.

History's bare facts will describe Dr. Edwards as one of those upstart Goldwater Republicans who back in the '60s forged a special brand of post-war American conservatism. He stood side by side with the likes of Ronald Reagan as the Grand Old Party of Abraham Lincoln was reborn, or in today's parlance, "rebooted."

But in the mid-'60s, Jim Edwards was a young oral surgeon, married to Ann Darlington, the love of his life, and they had a very young family. Personal and professional sacrifice defined his entry into what he once called "patriot politics." He was determined, he said, to square America's political compass with "the values and principles that make America America."

In 1974, he was a Charleston-area state senator encouraged to run in the Republican primary for governor—against William Westmoreland, the retired four-star commanding general of U.S. forces in Vietnam. At the time it seemed to many—and perhaps to Dr. Edwards himself—that he was merely the sacrificial political lamb for Gen. Westmoreland's homecoming reach for the governor's office.

Four decades later, we might reckon it was a package of mysterious and fortuitous political providence at work, confecting a dramatic turning point for South Carolina's politics and for Jim Edwards' leadership career. Dr. Edwards was a natural born campaigner, so genuine and sincere. Truth is, Gen. Westmoreland really never had much of a chance to win that primary.

But then Jim Edwards didn't have much chance, either, to prevail in his general election campaign against Democrat Charles "Pug" Ravenel, the Charleston-born Wall Street whiz-kid investment banker. Ah, but providence often is a persistent force in the chancy processes of politics. Mr. Ravenel ran afoul of a five-year residential requirement. He might still have had Lowcountry pluff-mud in his toes, but the S.C. Supreme Court nullified his candidacy. Jim Edwards had performed well on the primary campaign trail, and some big-name folks with big bank accounts were lining up to respond to his call for a march back toward "conservatism."

U.S. Rep. William Jennings Bryan Dorn, D-Greenwood, with his late start and his party well off balance, had only a puncher's chance as Ravenel's replacement. On Nov. 5, 1974, James Burrows Edwards became the first Republican governor of South Carolina since Reconstruction. In his affable and witty

manner, he declared. "A lot of Democrats will say I'm the first mistake South Carolina has made in a hundred years."

Dr. Edwards, in his inaugural speech, emphasized an often-neglected value of elected governance—results over partisanship. "I begin not with any partisan goals or debts to any special interests, but rather as the recipient of a public trust from 2.8 million great people; people who are hungry for leadership that is not concerned with politics, but dedicated to building responsive and effective government. Let us all reach across political barriers and work together to improve our state . . ."

The politics of election and then governance are different, and for Gov. Edwards, "non-partisanship" equaled political smartness. With only a handful of Republicans in the Legislature, he worked proactively to calibrate agendas with Speaker of the House Sol Blatt, and Senate leaders Marion Gressette and Rembert Dennis.

"The agenda is important," he once told Sens. Gressette and Dennis. "But we have to work, too, on how best to work together."

A few years ago, he lamented with that warming smile, "Sometimes, it feels like the biggest problem with Republicans is that we've forgotten how to get along with each other."

Everyone, it seemed, got along with Jim Edwards. His gubernatorial record showed steady improvements fiscally and in public education, a nice package of organizational and management reforms and a new emphasis on marketing South Carolina for industrial and commercial growth. Against the very strong opposition of his Mount Pleasant neighbors, Gov. Edwards approved the S.C. State Ports Authority's Wando container terminal project.

And folks always appreciated Jim Edwards' "style" of friendship and loyalty.

As President Reagan's energy secretary, he fronted Reagan's agenda to terminate the Department of Energy. Editorialists were merciless. "It was a joyless ride of misinformed 'establishment' ridicule," Dr. Edwards once said, laughing. "But President Reagan felt very strongly about this and my job was to try to get it done."

The U.S. Department of Energy still stands, of course, but respect and admiration for Jim Edwards were ascending even as he left Washington in 1982 to assume the presidency of the Medical University of South Carolina. His tenure there was exceptional, especially in growing the school's foundation endowments, something very related to his standing in industry and politics.

Every elected leader should consider Jim Edwards' point about working first to get along with each other. Every American might consider the grid of patriotic and good governance principles that guided his personal, professional and political lives. But for those who knew this good man for a moment—or for 50 years—we will rejoice that we crossed paths with him.

A year ago, after Dr. Edwards had suffered a stroke, I asked him about his "legacy." He answered softly, "That can be so subjective; it's in the eyes of the beholder."

I told him I wanted an answer, that I might be writing commentary one day about his "legacy."

He paused for a moment and then added, "I hope someone will say I loved my family and my country, and that they noticed I always tried to do my best."

Let us not be confused by such natural humility; Jim Edwards truly was a great man.

GUAM WORLD WAR II LOYALTY RECOGNITION ACT

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, a bill that would implement the findings of the Guam War Claims Review Commission. Since being elected to the House of Representatives ten years ago, I have introduced a version of this legislation in each Congress. Over the last several Congresses, H.R. 44 passed the House on five separate occasions.

This bill would implement the recommendations of the Guam War Claims Review Commission, which was appointed by Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton and established by an Act of the 107th Congress (Public Law 107-333). The Review Commission, in a unanimous report to Congress in June 2004, found that there were significant disparities in the treatment of war claims for the people of Guam as compared with war claims for other Americans. The Review Commission also found that the occupation of Guam was especially brutal due to the unflinching loyalty of the people of Guam to the United States of America. The people of Guam were subjected to forced labor, forced marches, internment, beatings, rapes and executions, including public beheadings. The Review Commission recommended that Congress remedy this injustice through the enactment of legislation to authorize payment of claims in amounts specified. Specifically, the bill would authorize discretionary spending to pay claims consistent with the recommendations of the commission.

It is important to note that the Review Commission found that the United States Government seized Japanese assets during the war and that the record shows that settlement of claims was meant to be paid from these forfeitures. Furthermore, the United States signed a Treaty of Peace with Japan on September 8, 1951, which precludes Americans from making claims against Japan for war reparations. The treaty closed any legal mechanism for seeking redress from the Government of Japan, and the United States Government has settled claims for U.S. citizens and other nationals through various claims programs authorized by Congress.

The text that I introduce in this Congress addresses concerns that have been raised about the legislation. First, the text reflects a compromise that was reached with the Senate when they considered the legislation as a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. That compromise removes payment of claims to heirs of survivors who suffered personal injury during the enemy occupation. The bill continues to provide payment of claims to survivors of the occupation as well as to heirs of citizens of Guam who died during the occupation. The compromise continues to uphold the intent of recognizing the people of Guam for their loyalty to the United States during World War II.

Further, the bill that I introduce today contains an offset for the estimated cost of the

bill. I understood the concerns expressed by some of my colleagues in a July 14, 2011 hearing on this legislation. My colleagues expressed concern that there was no offset to pay for the cost of the bill. Guam war claims has a very simple offset that will pay for the cost of the legislation over time. The bill would be paid by section 30 funding remitted to Guam through the U.S. Department of Interior at any level above section 30 funds that were remitted to Guam in fiscal year 2012. With the impending relocation of Marines from Okinawa to Guam as well as additional Navy and Air Force personnel relocating to Guam it is expected that Guam will receive additional section 30 funds. Claims would then be paid out over time based off the additional amounts that were made available in any given year. Not only does this offset address payment of claims but it only impacts my jurisdiction and is a credible source of funding that will ensure that claims will be paid. Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) indicates in Senate report 113-146 that accompanied S. 1237, the Omnibus Territories Act of 2012, that the offset ensures the bill would not cost the federal government additional funds. Specifically it states, "any such future payments due to Guam that exceed the amount paid in 2012 would instead be paid to a new U.S. Treasury fund that would be available to make compensation payments. CBO estimates that the collection and spending of those funds would have no significant net impact on direct spending over the 2015–2024 period." Congressional passage of this bill has a direct impact on the future success of the military buildup. The need for Guam War Claims was brought about because of mishandling of war claims immediately following World War II by the Department of the Navy. The long-standing inequity with how Guam was treated for war reparations lingers today. If we do not bring this matter to a close I believe that support for the military build-up will erode and impact the readiness of our forces and the bilateral relationship with Japan.

Mr. Speaker, resolving this issue is a matter of justice. This carefully crafted compromise legislation addresses the concerns of the Senate and fiscal conservatives in the House of Representatives. This bill represents a unique opportunity to right a wrong because many of the survivors of the occupation are nearing the end of their lives. It is important that the Congress act on the recommendations of the Guam War Claims Review Commission to finally resolve this longstanding injustice for the people of Guam.

PROTECTING EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES IN MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCIES ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

SUMMARY

When a municipality files for bankruptcy, its employees and retirees who have devoted

their lives to public service—such as police officers, firefighters, sanitation workers and office personnel—risk having their hard-earned wages, pensions and health benefits cut or even eliminated.

This is why I am introducing the “Protecting Employees and Retirees in Municipal Bankruptcies Act of 2015.” This legislation strengthens protections for employees and retirees under chapter 9 municipality bankruptcy cases by: (1) clarifying the criteria that a municipality must meet before it can obtain chapter 9 bankruptcy relief; (2) ensuring that the interests of employees and retirees are represented in the chapter 9 case; and (3) imposing heightened standards that a municipality must meet before it may modify any collective bargaining agreement or retiree benefit.

While many municipalities often work to limit the impact of budget cuts on their employees and retirees, as demonstrated in the chapter 9 plan of adjustment approved by Detroit’s public employees and retirees, other municipalities could try to use current bankruptcy law to set aside collective bargaining agreements and retiree protections.

My legislation addresses this risk by requiring the municipality to engage in meaningful good faith negotiations with its employees and retirees before the municipality can apply for chapter 9 bankruptcy relief. This measure would also expedite the appellate review process of whether a municipality has complied with this and other requirements. And, the bill ensures employees and retirees have a say in any plan that would modify their benefits.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Sec. 1. Short Title. Section 1 of the bill sets forth the short title of the bill as the “Protecting Employees and Retirees in Municipal Bankruptcies Act of 2015.”

Sec. 2. Determination of Municipality Eligibility To Be a Debtor Under Chapter 9 of Title 11 of the United States Code. A municipality can petition to be a debtor under chapter 9, a specialized form of bankruptcy relief, only if a bankruptcy court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the municipality satisfies certain criteria specified in Bankruptcy Code section 109. In the absence of obtaining the consent of a majority of its creditors, section 109 requires the municipality, in pertinent part, to have negotiated in good faith with its creditors or prove that it is unable to negotiate with its creditors because such negotiation is impracticable.

Section 2(a) of the bill amends Bankruptcy Code section 109 in three respects. First, it provides clear guidance to the bankruptcy court that the term “good faith” is intended to have the same meaning as it has under the National Labor Relations Act at least with respect to creditors who are employees or retirees of the debtor. Second, section 2(a) revises the standard for futility of negotiation from “impracticable” to “impossible.” This change ensures that before a municipality may avail itself of chapter 9 bankruptcy relief it must prove that there was no possible way it could have engaged in negotiation in lieu of seeking such relief. Third, the amendment clarifies that the standard of proof that the municipality must meet is “clear and convincing” rather than a preponderance of the evidence. These revisions to section 109 will provide greater guidance to the bankruptcy court in assessing whether a municipality has satisfied the Bankruptcy Code’s eligibility requirements for being granted relief under chapter 9.

Bankruptcy Code section 921(e), in relevant part, prohibits a bankruptcy court from or-

dering a stay of any proceeding arising in a chapter 9 case on account of an appeal from an order granting a municipality’s petition to be a debtor under chapter 9. Section 2(b) strikes this prohibition thereby allowing a court to issue a stay of any proceeding during the pendency of such an appeal. This ensures that the status quo can be maintained until there is a final appellate determination of whether a municipality is legally eligible to be a chapter 9 debtor.

Typically, an appeal of a bankruptcy court decision is heard by a district or bankruptcy appellate panel court. Under limited circumstances, however, a direct appeal from a bankruptcy court decision may be heard by a court of appeals. Until a final determination is made as to whether a municipality is eligible to be a debtor under chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code, the rights and responsibilities of numerous stakeholders are unclear. To expedite the appellate process and promote greater certainty to all stakeholders in the case, section 2(c) of the bill allows an appeal of a bankruptcy court order granting a municipality’s petition to be a chapter 9 debtor to be filed directly with the court of appeals. In addition, section 2(c) requires the court of appeals to hear such appeal *de novo* on the merits as well as to determine it on an expedited basis. Finally, section 2(c) specifies that the doctrine of equitable mootness does not apply to such an appeal.

Sec. 3. Protecting Employees and Retirees. The chapter 9 debtor must file a plan for the adjustment of the municipality’s debts that then must be confirmed by the bankruptcy court if it satisfies certain criteria specified in Bankruptcy Code section 943. Section 3 of the bill makes several amendments to current law intended to ensure that interests of municipal employees and retirees are better protected. With respect to plan confirmation requirements, section 3 amends Bankruptcy Code section 943 to require consent from such employees and retirees to any plan that impairs—in a manner prohibited by non-bankruptcy law—a collective bargaining agreement, a retiree benefit, including an accrued pension, retiree health, or other retirement benefit protected by state or municipal law or as defined in Bankruptcy Code section 1114(a).

Such consent would be conveyed to the court by the authorized representative of such individuals. Subject to certain exceptions, section 3 specifies that the authorized representative of individuals receiving any retirement benefits pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement is the labor organization that signed such agreement unless such organization no longer represents active employees. Where the organization no longer represents active employees of the municipality, the labor organization that currently represents active employees in that bargaining unit is the authorized representative of such individuals.

Section 3 provides that the exceptions apply if: (1) the labor organization chooses not to serve as the authorized representative; or (2) the court determines, after a motion by a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, that different representation is appropriate. Under either circumstance, the court, upon motion by any party in interest and after notice and a hearing, must order the United States Trustee to appoint a committee of retired employees if the debtor seeks to modify or not pay the retiree benefits or if the court otherwise determines that it is appropriate for that committee be comprised of such individuals to serve as the authorized representative.

With respect to retired employees not covered by a collective bargaining agreement, the court, on motion by a party in interest after notice and a hearing, must order the United States Trustee to appoint a committee of retired employees if the debtor seeks to modify or not pay retiree benefits, or if the court otherwise determines that it is appropriate to serve as the authorized representative of such employees. Section 3 provides that the party requesting the appointment of a committee has the burden of proof.

Where the court grants a motion for the appointment of a retiree committee, section 3 requires the United States Trustee to choose individuals to serve on the committee on a proportional basis per capita based on organization membership from among members of the organizations that represent the individuals with respect to whom such order is entered. This requirement ensures that the committee, in a case where there are multiple labor organizations, fairly represents the interests of the members of those various organizations on a proportional basis.

Finally, section 3 of the bill imposes a significant threshold that must be met before retiree benefits can be reduced or eliminated. Current law has no such requirement. In a case where the municipality proposes in its plan to impair any right to a retiree benefit, section 3 permits the committee to support such impairment only if at least two-thirds of its members vote in favor of doing so.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,080,402,933,324.23. We’ve added \$7,453,735,606,331.18 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MICK FOUNTS, ED.D.,
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPER-
INTENDENT OF EDUCATION

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Mick Founts, Ed.D., San Joaquin County Superintendent of Education, who is retiring after many years of outstanding service to our community.

In 1976, Mick Founts graduated from Humboldt State University with a B.A. in English. Four years later, he obtained his Master’s Degree in Education and two credentials: Administrative and Pupil Personnel Services. Mick was awarded his Doctor of Education degree from University of the Pacific in 1995. During

his 38 year career in education he has been an English classroom teacher, high school and college football coach, assistant principal for a continuation school, assistant principal for a comprehensive high school, a Coordinator of Child Welfare and Attendance, a Director of Alternative Programs, an Assistant Superintendent of Alternative Education Programs and Charters, an Associate Superintendent of County Operated Schools and Programs, Deputy Superintendent of San Joaquin County Office of Education Student Programs and Services, and in 2010 was elected as San Joaquin County Superintendent of Schools. As Superintendent of Schools, Founts is charged with the ultimate responsibility for all activities of San Joaquin County Office of Education.

In 1991 Mick began the San Joaquin County Office of Education Community School Program. The "one.Program" includes Court School as well as Community School and is recognized throughout the State as an innovative alternative education program. It now serves more than 1,500 at-risk students working to overcome obstacles leading to a high school diploma. Mick was the Juvenile Court, Community, and Alternative School Administrators of California President elect (1996-97), President (1997-1998), and Past President (1998-1999).

Superintendent Founts has either authorized or developed some of the most unique public charter schools in California. These include agricultural academies, technology sites, fine and performing arts high schools, collegiate sports academies, career and technical education academies, and many more . . . all within San Joaquin County. Dr. Founts currently served as a Commissioner on the California State Board of Education Advisory Commission on Charter Schools. His commitment to Career and Technical Education, Agriculture, Migrant Education, Technology, and Outdoor Education is constant, as is his commitment to Teachers College of San Joaquin; the first college operated by a County Office of education. This commitment extends to the many events that SJCOE sponsors for students throughout the County: Academic Decathlon, Science Olympiad, Math Olympiad, Mock Trial, as well as the local and State Spelling Bee, to name just a few.

In 2013, he was one of twenty Superintendents to work with Governor Brown to support the reform effort aimed at bringing more money to children in our schools. In addition, he championed a variety of programs to fill the void in operations and support programs created from budget cuts in sports, technology, and art clinics, as well as helped fundraise to send more than 200 students to Outdoor Education by way of fundraising.

Also during his term as San Joaquin County Office of Education Superintendent, Mick served as an environmental steward for schools by designing a cutting edge Solar Parking Lot linked to the SJCOE Clean Transportation Technologies Academy and New Energy Academy funded by a partnership between PG&E, SJCOE, and California Department of Education. Its curriculum is devoted to renewable energy and green technology topics with the goal of giving students a foundation for college and jobs in the clean tech industry.

Superintendent Founts was instrumental in the formation of the County's career academy

concept that will prepare kids for work and college. His vision created a state-of-the-art career and technical education facility along with regional occupational programs and centers such as Career Academy of Cosmetology. In addition, through SJ Building Futures Academy and SJ Regional Conservation Corps, he helped give young adults viable work skills as well as keeping them off the street by providing a second chance at a high school diploma.

Like his taste for variety in education, Mick also enjoys an array of hobbies. In addition to his career in education, he is a ranch owner and farmer for his family's South African Boer Goat business Biggy Farms and regularly competes in National livestock shows. Mick played and coached both high school and college football and continues to enjoy sports. He can often be found at a local football or basketball game. Mick was raised in a musical family and played in bands during his younger years. He continues to play the guitar for his own enjoyment and has an appreciation for many different musical styles. He also has a love for Victorian homes and he and his family have enjoyed restoring one on their own property.

Mick's impact on students covers many years and it is not unusual to hear grown men refer to him as "coach" to this day. Previous students often call his office or stop by to share that they would not be where they are today had it not been for his influence. When Mick retires at the end of his term, he leaves a legacy that spans many generations.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending the outstanding contributions made to education and the San Joaquin community by Superintendent Mick Founts and hereby wish him continued success in his retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF TWO CORPORATE CRIME BILLS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing two bills to help hold accountable corporations who market dangerous products and who violate the law. We rely on corporations to provide necessary goods and services to consumers and to provide jobs for our citizens. Unfortunately, sometimes corporations engage in acts that may harm us or that otherwise run afoul of the law. That is why I am introducing these measures.

The Dangerous Products Warning Act concerns businesses who learn that products they are marketing are dangerous but who do not inform the appropriate federal agency or warn the public.

It amends the federal criminal code to impose a fine and/or prison term of up to 5 years on any business entity or product supervisor with respect to a product or business practice who knows of a serious danger associated with such product or business practice and knowingly fails within 15 days after discovering such danger to inform an appropriate federal

agency in writing, warn affected employees in writing, and inform other affected individuals. The bill imposes a fine and/or prison term of up to 1 year on any individual who intentionally discriminates against an employee who informs a federal agency or warns employees of a serious danger associated with a product or business practice.

The Corporate Crime Database Act deals with the concern that the public has inadequate means of learning about the degree to which companies are engaging in acts in violation of the law, and sets up a mechanism to track such violations and make the information available to the public.

The bill directs the Attorney General to: (1) acquire data, for each calendar year, regarding all administrative, civil, and criminal judicial proceedings against any corporation or corporate official involving a felony or misdemeanor or civil charge where potential fines may be \$1,000 or more; (2) establish and maintain a publicly available website on improper conduct by all corporations with annual revenues of more than \$1 billion; and (3) prepare an annual report to Congress detailing the number of civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement actions brought against any corporation or corporate official and the final dispositions of such actions.

With the enactment of these two bills, we would take important steps toward protecting our citizens from harm and empowering them to know which corporations are violating our laws.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR JACOB
"JAKE" A. WHITESIDE FOR EX-
CEPTIONAL SERVICE TO THE
UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major Jacob "Jake" A. Whiteside for his dedication to duty and service as a Defense Legislative Fellow. Major Whiteside will be transitioning from his present assignment with my office to serve as the Executive Officer for the 12th Aviation Battalion, United States Army.

A native of Memphis, Tennessee, Major Whiteside was accepted into the Carson-Newman University Reserve Officer Training Corps program in 1999, where he earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree in English Literature and graduated as a Distinguished Military Graduate with the class of 2003. Upon graduation, Jake was commissioned as an Army Aviation Branch Officer. He has subsequently earned a Master's degree in Legislative Affairs from the George Washington University.

Prior to entering the Army Congressional Fellowship Program, Jake served in numerous tactical leadership and staff assignments as an Army Aviation Branch Officer, and Scout/Attack OH-58 helicopter Pilot. Major Whiteside's assignments include Flight School Student, United States Army Aviation Center of Excellence, Fort Rucker; Flight Platoon Leader, 1st Battalion (Attack), 82nd Combat

Aviation Brigade, Fort Bragg; Future Operations and Current Operations Officer, 1st Squadron, 17th CAV, Fort Bragg; Headquarters Troop Commander, 1st Squadron, 17th CAV, Fort Bragg; Student, Army Aviation Captain's Career Course, Army Aviation Center of Excellence, Fort Rucker; and most recently Aviation Branch Representative, United States Military Academy, West Point. Additionally, Major Whiteside was deployed in direct support of combat operations in Mosul, Iraq, in 2006–2007, and Regional Command—South, Afghanistan, in 2009–2010. While deployed, Jake accumulated over 500 hours of combat flight time in direct support of soldiers in the fight.

Throughout his career, Major Whiteside has positively impacted his soldiers, peers, and superiors. Our country has been enriched by his extraordinary leadership, thoughtful judgment, and exemplary work.

As a personal matter, in his role as Defense Legislative Fellow, Jake provided me with candid advice and became a trusted source of counsel to me, my personal staff, and committee staff. Blessed with a sterling intellect and nimble mind, he vigorously and effectively addressed any challenging task placed before him. Further, his incomparable work ethic, poise under pressure, and generosity will be sorely missed. To put it simply, Major Whiteside's performance has set a standard on which I will evaluate all future Congressional Fellows.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with Major Jake Whiteside over the last year. On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Jake for his service to his country and we wish him, his wife Marci, and boys, Bryce and Gavin, all the best as they continue their journey in the United States Army.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH
BIRTHDAY OF MERCY HIGH
SCHOOL BURLINGAME'S KOHL
MANSION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Centennial of Mercy High School Burlingame's Kohl Mansion, an historic and beautiful building with deep meaning for the community and for me personally. As an alumna of Mercy High and the mother of a daughter who also graduated from this outstanding school, this institution has shaped my life.

Today, Mercy High School Burlingame, a Catholic college preparatory high school, educates 400 young women a year, with the majority coming from San Mateo County. About three quarters of the students are Roman Catholic and 90 percent of the students are engaged in at least one extra-curricular activity. Mercy encourages students to discover themselves and explore their dreams; they receive an education of mind, body and spirit. This recipe and small class sizes prove to be highly successful. In the class of 2014, 87 per-

cent matriculated to four year colleges and 13 percent matriculated to community colleges.

Mercy education finds its origins in Ireland in the ministry of Catherine McAuley, the foundress of the Sisters of Mercy. Their work is marked by a special concern for the needs of the poor, in particular women and children. This tradition continues to this day.

The Kohl Mansion was originally built from 1912 to 1914 by Charles Frederick "Freddie" Kohl for his wife Bessie. Kohl, born in San Jose in 1863, grew up in a mansion on an estate in San Mateo, now known as Central Park. His father had made a fortune as the founder of Alaska Commercial Company and so Kohl Junior was used to an opulent lifestyle. Freddie and Bessie's travels to Europe further inspired them to build the lavish four-story Tudor named "The Oaks."

In 1924, the Sisters of Mercy bought the house and turned it into a chapel. When the sisters moved down the hill to a new building, Principal Sister Mary Lorenzo Murphy and seven other nuns opened Mercy High School in the mansion in 1931, admitting 36 freshmen and sophomores.

The old Kohl Mansion has embraced technology and modern facilities. Mercy launched its website in 1999. Over the decades, a state-of-the-art athletic center with an Olympic size pool, a commercial kitchen, a new cafeteria and a multi-media center were built, among the many improvements. At every step of the way, the focus of the school was to provide its students with the best education and learning environment possible.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor one of the finest high schools in the country, Mercy High School Burlingame on the occasion of the Kohl Mansion's 100th birthday. May this historic building remain the home of education and learning for centuries to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "SHIELD OUR STREETS ACT OF 2015"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing an important bill to respond to the crisis that some jurisdictions are facing with respect to hiring police officers and funding programs to enhance public safety. This bill would establish two public safety grant programs.

Section 2 establishes Shield Police Hiring Grants, to be implemented by the Attorney General, to provide grants to law enforcement agencies that operate in Elevated Need Localities. An "Elevated Need Locality" is a county (or unit of local government which is not part of a county) which (1) has a crime rate above the national average, and (2) has had budget reductions during the most recent 5-year period. These law enforcement agencies could apply to the Attorney General to receive funds to hire law enforcement officers, or to rehire officers who have been laid off due to budget reductions.

Grants would last for three years and may be extended by two years at the discretion of

the Attorney General. \$100 million for each fiscal year 2016 through 2021 are authorized to be appropriated for this program.

Section 3 establishes Shield Public Safety Enhancement Grants, to be implemented by the Attorney General, to provide grants to units of local government that has jurisdiction over all or part of an Elevated Need Locality. Local governments could apply to the Attorney General to receive funds to enhance public safety in a number of ways, such as purchasing public safety equipment, finding public safety programs, making infrastructure improvements for the purpose of enhancing public safety, purchasing and installing street lights to deter crime, funding activities related to crime labs, and funding public defender programs. Non-profit organizations operating in Elevated Need Localities may also apply for grants under this program to fund initiatives designed to reduce crime in these jurisdictions.

Grants would be for one year but may be extended at the discretion of the Attorney General. \$100 million for each fiscal year 2016 through 2021 are authorized to be appropriated for this program.

These programs will help enhance public safety in jurisdictions facing high crime rates and particularly acute budget issues. The programs would be available to fund the hiring of police officers and the operation of initiatives to address public safety and crime. Programs that enhance public safety will prevent crime, which will decrease the victimization of our citizens and reduce the financial costs associated with crime. That is why this legislation is necessary.

IN MEMORY OF GOVERNOR JAMES BURROWS EDWARDS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during Christmas week the people of South Carolina lost a true patriot with the death of Doctor James B. Edwards of Mount Pleasant. The following obituary highlights his love and affection for his devoted family and community.

JAMES BURROWS EDWARDS

OBITUARY

James Burrows Edwards Mt. Pleasant—James Burrows Edwards, DMD, 87, of Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, died Friday, December 26, 2014. Jim was born June 24, 1927, in Hawthorne, Florida to the late O.M. and Bertie Ray Edwards. Both parents were school teachers, careers which led them to St. Andrews, South Carolina, in 1935 and Mt. Pleasant in 1937.

As a boy in Mt. Pleasant, Jim spent his spare time at Ft. Moultrie, home of the 263rd Coast Artillery, and acquired a lifelong love of the military and life at sea. Jim graduated from Moultrie High School in June 1944, and took a job with the Army Transportation Corps as a deck hand on an L-78 tug boat. Though only 17 years old, he joined the Merchant Marines in December 1944. Jim was assigned to the Dogwood, a Liberty Ship converted to a hospital ship transporting

wounded servicemen home from Europe. Eventually he also served on the U.S.A.T. Bridgeport, the George Washington, and the Larkspur. Jim worked his way through the ranks from ordinary seaman to an officer by age 19, licensed to pilot ships transporting "any tonnage on any water in the world."

In 1947, Jim began studies at the College of Charleston, while also working as a night officer on ships as a member of the Master, Mates and Pilots Association. During summers, he remained active in seafaring trade, delivering coal to France and England, granite for the Santee Cooper Dam, and general cargo to ports throughout the Caribbean and South America.

Jim graduated from the College of Charleston in 1951, married Ann Darlington, his childhood sweetheart, and entered dental school at the University of Louisville. Upon graduation, he served two years on active duty with the U.S. Navy in Chincoteague, Virginia, as a general dentist. He would remain active in the United States Naval Reserve until 1967, retiring as a lieutenant commander.

After completing graduate medical training at the University of Pennsylvania in 1958 and a residency at Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit, Michigan, in 1959, Jim pursued his dream to return to Charleston, establishing his practice in Oral and Maxillofacial surgery in 1960.

While building a thriving practice, Jim entered the political arena, serving six years as the Charleston County Republican Party chairman. An unsuccessful bid for the United States Congress in 1971 was soon followed by his election to the South Carolina State Senate in 1972. Two years later, Jim was elected Governor of South Carolina—the state's first Republican Governor since reconstruction. Jim served as governor from 1975 to 1979, returning briefly to his oral surgery practice in Charleston.

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan appointed Jim as Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, a position he held until November 1982, when he was called as president of the Medical University of South Carolina. Jim served as president of MUSC for 17 years, retiring in 2000. As president emeritus, Jim actively continued fundraising for the MUSC Health Sciences Foundation until 2014.

Among numerous civic and academic honors, Jim was granted the Order of the Palmetto for his public service to the State of South Carolina, and is an inductee into the South Carolina Hall of Fame. He served on the Board of Directors of the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, the Gaylord and Dorothy Donnelly Foundation, SCANA, South Carolina National Bank, Encyclopedia Britannica, Waste Management, Chemical Waste Management, J. P. Stevens, Brendles, IMO Delaval, Inc., Philips Petroleum, National Data Corporation, Burris Chemical Co., the W. M. Benton Foundation, the MUSC Health Sciences Foundation, and the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT).

Jim is survived by his beloved wife of 63 years, Ann; his son, James B. Edwards, Jr. and his wife, Jenny, of Columbia; his daughter, Catharine E. Wingate, and her husband, Ken, of Columbia; grandchildren, Miriam Wingate Ashworth, K. Bryan Wingate, Jr., Ansley Darlington Edwards, James B. Edwards, III, Catharine Paxson Wingate, and Hellen Tucker Edwards; one great-grandchild, Eliza Ann Wingate, and numerous nephews and nieces. In addition to his parents, Jim was preceded in death by his sister,

Josephine E. Pinckney, his brother, Dr. Morton Thomas Edwards, his sisters, Ada Frances E. Melchers and Jane Ann E. Varn.

Visitation will be from 5:30 until 7:30 p.m. on Sunday, December 28, 2014 at St. Luke's Chapel, on the Campus of the Medical University of South Carolina. The funeral service will be conducted at St. Philip's Church at 1:00 p.m. on Monday, December 29, 2014 by The Rt. Rev'd. Dr. C. FitzSimons Allison. Interment will follow in the churchyard of Christ Church, Mt. Pleasant, after which the family will receive visitors in the parish hall of Christ Church.

The family requests, in lieu of flowers, that memorials be made to the MUSC Foundation for the College of Nursing or for the College of Dental Medicine. (MUSC Foundation, 18 Bee Street, Charleston, SC 29425).

Arrangements by J. Henry Stuhr Inc., Mount Pleasant Chapel. A memorial message may be sent to the family by visiting our website at www.jhenrystuhr.com. Visit our guestbook at www.legacy.com/obituaries/charleston.

The Lexington County Chronicle published an inspiring tribute which reflects the extraordinary impact of Lexington County voters in 1974 where the county's victory margin of 10,433 was a large majority of the statewide victory margin of 17,477.

As an indication of the family's appreciation of Lexington County, its Member of Congress, JOE WILSON, was selected to be an Honorary Pall Bearer.

FORMER S.C. GOV. JAMES EDWARDS SUCCUMBS TO STROKE

(By Hal Millard)

James B. Edwards, the state's first GOP governor since Reconstruction, has died.

He was 87.

Edwards, a dentist by trade who in 1974 became the first Republican governor in South Carolina since 1876, died Dec. 26 at his Mount Pleasant home from complications caused by a stroke.

Politicians throughout the state mourned his passing.

Expressing her sympathy, Gov. Nikki Haley wrote on Facebook that Edwards "appreciated the opportunities and challenges of this office."

"Governor Edwards always offered kind words of support and encouragement—and we are forever grateful for his friendship," Haley wrote. "Michael and I are deeply saddened by the passing of Governor Edwards, whose love for South Carolina inspired him to serve until his last day . . ."

GOP Congressman Joe Wilson of Springdale echoed those sentiments and added, "I am grateful to have had a lifetime of working with Dr. Jim Edwards, and the honor of knowing his wife Anne, daughter Cathy, and son Jim. Dr. Edwards was a tireless stalwart for conservative limited government to expand freedom."

"In high school, I would visit his dental office for Goldwater materials, in his capacity as Charleston County Republican Chairman," Wilson continued. "In 1974, he courageously ran and was elected as South Carolina's first Republican governor. At that time, I worked with him on the State Development Board, where he recruited Michelin Tire Corporation to produce job opportunities for our citizens. I was honored to serve him in the visionary Reagan Administration as Deputy General Counsel as he achieved success in deregulation as Secretary of Energy."

Wilson also hailed Edwards' 17-year tenure as president of the Medical University of South Carolina.

"His return to Charleston as president of the Medical University of South Carolina resulted in MUSC becoming recognized for world-class universities," Wilson said. "South Carolina has lost a Southern Gentleman, devoted dad and grandfather, who has made a difference as a key architect for a political revolution."

Wilson noted that Edwards' groundbreaking win in 1974 was a precursor to the current Republican dominance in the Deep South.

"Dr. Edwards' vision of an inclusive Republican Party came to fulfillment [in December] with the U.S. Senate victory in Louisiana, from his start with no elected statewide Republican officials in the five-state Deep South, and now all statewide officials are Republicans," Wilson said.

Edwards became governor amid the turmoil of the Watergate years and was one of the few GOP bright spots in an election year in which Democrats dominated. A long-shot candidate who had previously served two years as a state senator from Charleston County, Edwards defeated Gen. William Westmoreland in the GOP primary, then upset long-time Democratic Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn in the general election.

Edwards served in an era when governors were prohibited from serving consecutive terms. Following his term as governor, Edwards was nominated as President Ronald Reagan's Energy Secretary; serving two years in that role before resigning to become president of MUSC.

PROTECTING EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES IN BUSINESS BANKRUPTCIES ACT OF 2015

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

SUMMARY

Throughout our Nation's history, hard-working American men and women have labored to make our businesses become the most productive and dynamic in the world. Unfortunately, when some of these businesses encounter financial difficulties and seek to reorganize their debts under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, these very same workers and retirees are often asked to make major sacrifices through lost job protections, lower wages, and the elimination of hard-won pension and health benefits, while the executives and managers of these businesses are not required to make comparable sacrifices.

We must do more to ensure that America's most important resource—workers and retirees—are treated more fairly when these businesses seek to reorganize their financial affairs under the protection of our bankruptcy laws. The Protecting Employees and Retirees in Business Bankruptcies Act of 2015 accomplishes this goal by amending the Bankruptcy Code in several respects. First, it improves recoveries for employees and retirees by: (1) increasing the amount of worker claims entitled to priority payment for unpaid wages and contributions to employee benefit plans up to \$20,000; (2) eliminating the difficult to prove restriction in current law that wage and benefit claims must be

earned within 180 days of the bankruptcy filing in order to be entitled to priority payment; (3) allowing employees to assert claims for losses in certain defined contribution plans when such losses result from employer fraud or breach of fiduciary duty; (4) establishing a new priority administrative expense for workers' severance pay; and (5) clarifying that back pay awards for WARN Act damages are entitled to the same priority as back pay for other legal violations.

Second, the legislation reduces employees' and retirees' losses by: (1) restricting the conditions under which collective bargaining agreements and commitments to fund retiree pensions and health benefits may be eliminated or adversely affected; (2) preventing companies from singling out non-management retirees for concessions; (3) requiring a court to consider the impact a bidder's offer to purchase a company's assets would have on maintaining existing jobs and preserving retiree pension and health benefits; and (4) clarifying that the principal purpose of Chapter 11 bankruptcy is the preservation of jobs to the maximum extent possible.

Third, the bill restricts excessive executive compensation programs by: (1) requiring full disclosure and court approval of executive compensation packages; (2) restricting the payment of bonuses and other forms of incentive compensation to senior officers and others; and (3) ensuring that insiders cannot receive retiree benefits if workers have lost their retirement or health benefits.

This legislation is identical to H.R. 100, introduced in the 113th Congress, and H.R. 6117, introduced in the 112th Congress. It is supported by the AFL-CIO and many of its largest affiliates, and the United Steelworkers.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Sec. 1. Short Title. Section 1 sets forth the short title of the bill as the "Protecting Employees and Retirees in Business Bankruptcies Act of 2015." It also includes a table of contents for the bill.

Sec. 2. Findings. Section 2 sets forth various findings in support of this bill.

TITLE I—IMPROVING RECOVERIES FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

Sec. 101. Increased Wage Priority. Bankruptcy Code section 507 accords priority in payment status for certain types of claims, i.e., these priority claims must be paid in full in the order of priority before general unsecured claims may be paid. Section 507(a)(4) accords a fourth level priority to an unsecured claim up to \$10,000 owed to an individual for wages, salaries, or commissions (including vacation, severance, and sick leave pay) earned within the 180-day period preceding the filing of the bankruptcy case or the date on which the debtor's business ceased, whichever occurs first. Section 101 amends section 507(a)(4) to increase the amount of the priority to \$20,000 and eliminate the 180-day reachback limitation.

Bankruptcy Code section 507(a)(5) accords a fifth level priority for unsecured claims for contributions to an employee benefit plan arising from services rendered within the 180-day period preceding the filing of the bankruptcy case or the date on which the debtor's business ceased (whichever occurs first). The amount of the claim is based on the number of employees covered by the plan multiplied by \$10,000, less the aggregate amount paid to such employees pursuant to section 507(a)(4) and the aggregate amount paid by the estate on behalf of such employees to any other employee benefit plan. Section 101 amends Bankruptcy Code section 507(a)(5) to: (1) in-

crease the priority amount to \$20,000; (2) eliminate the offset requirements; and (3) eliminate the 180-day limitation.

Sec. 102. Claim for Stock Value Losses in Defined Contribution Plans. Section 102 amends the Bankruptcy Code's definition of a claim to include a right or interest in equity securities of the debtor (or an affiliate of the debtor) held in a defined contribution plan for the benefit of an individual who is not an insider, senior executive officer or one of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor (if one or more are not insiders), providing: (1) such securities were attributable to employer contributions by the debtor (or an affiliate of the debtor), or by elective deferrals, together with any earnings thereon; and (2) the employer or plan sponsor who commenced the bankruptcy case either committed fraud with respect to such plan or otherwise breached a duty to the participant that proximately caused the loss of value.

Sec. 103. Priority for Severance Pay. Bankruptcy Code section 503(b) establishes an administrative expense payment priority for certain types of unsecured claims. Among all types of unsecured claims, administrative expenses are accorded the highest payment priority, i.e., they must be paid in full before priority and general unsecured claims may be paid. Section 103 amends section 503(b) to accord administrative expense priority for severance pay owed to the debtor's employees (other than an insider, other senior management, or a consultant retained to provide services to the debtor) under a plan, program or policy generally applicable to the debtor's employees (but not under an individual contract of employment) or owed pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement for termination or layoff on or after the date the bankruptcy case was filed. Such pay is deemed earned in full upon such termination or layoff.

Sec. 104. Financial Returns for Employees and Retirees. Bankruptcy Code section 1129(a) specifies various criteria that must be satisfied before a chapter 11 plan of reorganization may be confirmed. Section 104 amends section 1129(a) to add a further requirement. The plan must provide for the recovery of damages for the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement or for other financial returns as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative under section 1113 to the extent such returns are paid under, rather than outside of a plan.

Section 104 also replaces Bankruptcy Code section 1129(a)(13), which pertains to the payment of retiree benefits under section 1114. As revised, section 1129(a)(13) requires a plan to provide for the continuation after the plan's effective date of the payment of all retiree benefits at the level established under either section 1114(e)(1)(B) or (g) at any time prior to confirmation of the plan, for the duration of the period for which the debtor has obligated itself to provide such benefits. If no modifications are made prior to confirmation of the plan, the plan must provide for the continuation of all retiree benefits maintained or established in whole or in part by the debtor prior to the petition filing date. In addition, the plan must provide for recovery of claims arising from the modification of retiree benefits and other financial returns as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative to the extent such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan.

Sec. 105. Priority for WARN Act Damages. Section 105 amends Bankruptcy Code section 503(b)(1)(A)(ii) to provide administrative ex-

pense status to wages and benefits awarded pursuant to a judicial or National Labor Relations Board proceeding as back pay or damages attributable to any period of time occurring after the commencement of the bankruptcy case. This provision applies where the award was made as a result of the debtor's violation of federal or state law, without regard to the time of the occurrence of unlawful conduct on which the award is based or to whether any services were rendered on or after the commencement of the bankruptcy case. It includes an award by a court under section 2901 of title 29 of the United States Code of up to 60 days' pay and benefits following a layoff that occurred or commenced at a time when such award period includes a period on or after the commencement of the case, if the court determines that payment of wages and benefits by reason of the operation of this clause will not substantially increase the probability of layoff or termination of current employees or of nonpayment of domestic support obligations during the case under this title.

TITLE II—REDUCING EMPLOYEES' AND RETIREES' LOSSES

Sec. 201. Rejection of Collective Bargaining Agreements. Bankruptcy Code section 1113 sets forth the requirements by which a collective bargaining agreement may be assumed or rejected. Section 201 amends section 1113 in several respects. First, it amends section 1113(a) to clarify that a chapter 11 debtor may reject a collective bargaining agreement only in accordance with section 1113.

Second, it amends Bankruptcy Code section 1113(b) to clarify that no provision in title II of the United States Code may be construed to permit a trustee to unilaterally terminate or alter the terms of a collective bargaining agreement absent compliance with section 1113. The provision further specifies that the trustee must timely pay all monetary obligations arising under such agreement and that any payment required to be made pre-confirmation has the status of an allowed administrative expense under Code section 503.

Third, it amends Bankruptcy Code section 1113(c) to require a trustee, when seeking to modify a collective bargaining agreement, to provide notice of such proposed modification to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the agreement. The trustee must also promptly provide an initial proposal for modification. In addition, the trustee must confer in good faith with the labor organization, at reasonable times and for a reasonable period, given the complexity of the case, in an effort to reach a mutually acceptable modification of the agreement. Each modification proposal must be based on a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor and reflect the most complete and reliable information. As amended, section 1113(c) requires the trustee to provide to the labor organization all information relevant for negotiations. If such disclosure could compromise the debtor's position with respect to its competitors in the industry, the provision authorizes the court to issue a protective order, subject to the needs of the labor organization to evaluate the trustee's proposal and any application to reject the collective bargaining agreement or for interim relief under section 1113.

In consideration of federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the agreement, any modification proposed by the trustee must: (1) only be

proposed as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the debtor's reorganization, including savings in management personnel costs; (2) be limited to modifications designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for employees covered by the agreement, taking into consideration any labor cost savings negotiated within the 12-month period prior to the filing of the bankruptcy case; (3) be no more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation is not likely to be followed by the liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization of the debtor; and (4) not be disproportionate or overly burden the employees covered by the agreement, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such employees or the nature of the modifications.

Fourth, it amends Bankruptcy Code section 1113(d) to provide that if the trustee and the labor organization (after a period of negotiations) do not reach an agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking rejection of the collective bargaining agreement after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement by the parties, the hearing may not be held earlier than 21 days from when notice of the hearing is provided. Only the debtor and the labor organization may appear and be heard at the hearing. An application for rejection must seek rejection effective upon the entry of an order granting such relief.

In consideration of federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the agreement, section 1113(d) (as amended) provides that the court may grant a motion seeking rejection of such agreement only if the court: (1) finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of section 1113(c); (2) has considered alternative proposals by the labor organization and concluded that such proposals do not meet the requirements of section 1113(c)(3)(B); (3) finds that further negotiations regarding the trustee's proposal or an alternative proposal by the labor organization are not likely to produce an agreement; (4) finds that implementation of the trustee's proposal will not: (a) cause a material diminution in the purchasing power of the employees covered by the agreement, (b) adversely affect the debtor's ability to retain an experienced and qualified workforce; or (c) impair the debtor's labor relations such that the ability to achieve a feasible reorganization will be compromised; and (5) concludes, based on clear and convincing evidence, that rejection of the agreement and immediate implementation of the trustee's proposal is essential to permit the debtor's exit from bankruptcy such that confirmation is not likely to be followed by the liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization of the debtor in the short term. If the trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants (or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the bankruptcy case was filed), the court must presume that the debtor has failed to satisfy the requirements of section 1113(c)(3)(C).

Subsection (d), as amended, prohibits the court from entering an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement that would result in modifications to a level lower than

that proposed by the trustee in the proposal found by the court to have complied with the requirements of section 1113.

At any time after an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement is entered (or mutually satisfactory agreement between the trustee and the labor organization is entered into), the labor organization may apply to the court for an order seeking an increase in the level of wages or benefits or relief from working conditions based on changed circumstances. The court must grant such relief only if the increase or other relief is not inconsistent with the standard set forth in section 1113(d)(2)(E).

Fifth, section 201 amends Bankruptcy Code section 1113(e) to provide that during the period in which a collective bargaining agreement at issue under this section continues in effect and if either essential to the continuation of the debtor's business or in order to avoid irreparable damage to the estate, the court, after notice and a hearing, may authorize the trustee to implement interim changes in the terms, conditions, wages, benefits, or work rules provided by the collective bargaining agreement. Any hearing under this provision must be scheduled in accordance of the trustee's needs. The implementation of such interim changes will not render the application for rejection moot.

Sixth, section 201 amends Bankruptcy Code section 1113(f) to provide that the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement constitutes a breach of such agreement and is effective no earlier than the entry of an order granting such relief. Solely for the purpose of determining and allowing a claim arising from rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, such rejection must be treated as a rejection of an executory contract under Bankruptcy Code section 365(g) and shall be allowed or disallowed in accordance with section 502(g)(1). Subsection (f), as amended, further provides that no claim for rejection damages may be limited by section 502(b)(7). In addition, the provision permits economic self-help by a labor organization upon a court order granting rejection of a collective bargaining agreement under either subsection (d) or (e) of section 1113. It further provides that neither title 11 of the United States Code nor other provisions of State or Federal law may be construed to the contrary.

Seventh, section 201 adds new subsection (g) to require the trustee to provide for the reasonable fees and costs incurred by a labor organization under section 1113, upon request and after notice and a hearing.

Eighth, section 201 adds new subsection (h) to require the assumption of a collective bargaining agreement to be done in accordance with section 365.

Sec. 202. Payment of Insurance Benefits to Retired Employees. Bankruptcy Code section 1114 sets out criteria pursuant to which a debtor may modify retiree benefits, among other matters. Retiree benefits include payments to retired employees, their spouses, and dependents for medical, surgical, and hospital care benefits. It also includes benefits in the event of sickness, accident, disability, or death under any plan, fund or program.

Section 202 amends section 1114 in several respects. First, it amends the provision's definition of "retiree benefits" to specify that it applies whether or not the debtor asserts a right to unilaterally modify such benefits under such plan, fund or program.

Second, it amends Bankruptcy Code section 1114(b)(2), which specifies the rights, powers and duties of a committee of retired

employees appointed by the court. As amended, the provision would apply to a labor organization serving as the authorized representative under section 1114(c)(1).

Third, section 202 replaces Bankruptcy Code section 1114(f), which requires a trustee to make a proposal to the authorized representative before seeking modification of retiree benefits. As amended, section 1114(f)(1) specifies that if a trustee seeks to modify retiree benefits, the trustee must provide notice of such proposed modification to the authorized representative as well as promptly provide the initial proposal. In addition, the trustee must thereafter confer in good faith with the labor organization, at reasonable times and for a reasonable period, given the complexity of the case, in attempting to reach a mutually satisfactory modification. Each modification must be based on a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor and reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee must provide the authorized representative all information relevant for the negotiations. If such disclosure could compromise the debtor's position with respect to its competitors in the industry, the court may issue a protective order, subject to the needs of the authorized representative to evaluate the trustee's proposal and an application pursuant to subsection (g) or (h).

Modifications proposed by the trustee must: (1) only be proposed as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs; (2) be limited to modifications designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the retiree group represented by the authorized representative (taking into consideration any labor cost savings negotiated within the 12-month period prior to the filing of the bankruptcy case with respect to the retiree group); (3) be no more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation is not likely to be followed by the liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization of the debtor; and (4) not be disproportionate or overly burden the retiree group, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such group or the nature of the modifications.

Fourth, section 202 amends Bankruptcy Code section 1113(g) to provide that if the trustee and the authorized representative do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement (after a period of negotiations) and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking to modify the payment of retiree benefits after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, the hearing may not be held earlier than 21 days from when notice of the hearing is provided. Only the debtor and the authorized representative may appear and be heard at the hearing.

The court may grant a motion to modify the payment of retiree benefits only if the court: (1) finds that the trustee complied with the requirements of section 1114(f); (2) considered any of the authorized representative's alternative proposals and determined that such proposals do not meet the requirements of section 1114(f)(3)(B); (3) finds that further negotiations are not likely to produce a mutually satisfactory agreement; (4) finds that implementation of the trustee's proposal will not cause irreparable harm to the affected retirees; and (5) concludes that, based on clear and convincing evidence, an

order granting the trustee's proposal and its immediate implementation is essential to permit the debtor's exit from bankruptcy such that confirmation is not likely to be followed by the liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization of the debtor in the short term.

If the trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants (or such program was implemented within 180 days before the bankruptcy case was filed), the court must presume that the debtor failed to satisfy the requirements of section 1114(f)(3)(C).

Fifth, section 202 strikes subsection (k) and makes conforming revisions.

Sec. 203. Protection of Employee Benefits in a Sale of Assets. Section 203 amends Bankruptcy Code section 363(b), which authorizes a debtor to sell or use property of the estate other than in the ordinary course of business (under certain circumstances), to add a new requirement. New section 365(b)(3) requires the court, in approving a sale, to consider the extent to which a bidder's offer: (1) maintains existing jobs; (2) preserves terms and conditions of employment, and (3) assumes or matches pension and retiree benefit obligations in determining whether such offer constitutes the highest or best offer for the property.

Sec. 204. Claim for Pension Losses. Section 204 adds a new subsection to Bankruptcy Code section 502, which pertains to the allowance of claims and interests. New subsection (1) requires the court to allow a claim by an active or retired participant (or by a labor organization representing such participants) in a defined benefit pension plan terminated under section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) for any shortfall in pension benefits accrued as of the effective date of the pension plan's termination as a result of such termination and limitations upon the payment of benefits imposed pursuant to section 4042 of such Act, notwithstanding any claim asserted and collected by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation with respect to such termination.

In addition, section 204 adds subsection (m) to Bankruptcy Code section 502 to require a court to allow a claim described in Bankruptcy Code section 101(5)(C) (as amended by this legislation) by an active or retired participant (or a labor union representing such participant) in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of ERISA). The amount of such claim must be measured by the market value of the stock at the time of contribution to, or purchase by, the plan and the value as of the commencement of the case.

Sec. 205. Payments by Secured Lender. Bankruptcy Code section 506(c) authorizes the debtor to recover from property securing an allowed secured claim the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to preserve or dispose of such property to the extent the secured creditor benefits from such expenditures. Section 205 amends section 506(c) to add a new provision. As amended, section 506(c) deems unpaid wages, accrued vacation, severance or other benefits owed under the debtor's policies and practices or owed pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, for services rendered on and after commencement of the case to be necessary costs and expenses of preserving or disposing of property securing an allowed secured claim. Such obligations must be recovered even if the trustee has otherwise waived the provisions

of section 506(c) pursuant to an agreement with the allowed secured claimant or a successor or predecessor in interest.

Sec. 206. Preservation of Jobs and Benefits. Section 206 adds a statement of purpose to chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code specifying that a chapter 11 debtor must have as its principal purpose the reorganization of its business to preserve going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of its assets and the preservation of jobs that will sustain productive economic activity.

In addition, section 206 amends Bankruptcy Code section 1129(a), which sets out the criteria for confirming a plan, to add a new requirement. New section 1129(a)(17) requires the debtor to demonstrate that the reorganization preserves going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of the debtor's assets and preserves jobs that sustain productive economic activity.

Section 206 also amends Bankruptcy Code section 1129(c), which requires the court to consider the preferences of creditors and equity security holders in determining which plan to confirm. Section 1129(c), as amended, instead requires the court to consider the extent to which each plan would preserve going concern value through the productive use of the debtor's assets and the preservation of jobs that sustain productive economic activity. The court must confirm the plan that better serves such interests. It further provides that a plan that incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization shall presumptively constitute the plan that satisfies this provision.

Sec. 207. Termination of Exclusivity. Bankruptcy Code section 1121, in pertinent part, gives a debtor the exclusive authority to file a plan and obtain acceptances of such plan for stated periods of time, under certain circumstances. Section 207 amends section 1121 to specify that cause for shortening these exclusive periods includes: (1) the filing of a motion pursuant to section 1113 seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, if a plan based upon an alternative proposal by the labor organization is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time; or (2) the proposed filing of a plan by a proponent other than the debtor, which incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization, if such plan is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Executive Compensation Upon Exit From Bankruptcy. Bankruptcy Code section 1129 specifies the criteria for confirmation of a chapter 11 plan. Section 1129(a)(4), for example, requires that certain services, costs and expenses in connection with the case (or in connection with the plan and incident to the case) to have either been approved by the court (or subject to approval by the court) as reasonable. Section 301 amends section 1129(a)(4) to add a requirement that payments or other distributions under the plan to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, and any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor may not be approved unless: (1) such compensation is subject to review under section 1129(a)(5), or (2) such compensation is included as part of a program of payments or distributions generally applicable to the debtor's employees and only to the extent that the court determines that such payments are not excessive or disproportionate

as compared to distributions to the debtor's nonmanagement workforce.

In addition, section 301 amends section 1129(a)(5), which requires the plan proponent to disclose the identity and affiliations of the debtor's officers and others, such as the identity of any insider who will be employed or retained by the reorganized debtor and such insider's compensation. Section 301 amends section 1129(a)(5) to add a requirement that such compensation must be approved (or subject to approval) by the court in accordance with the following criteria: (1) the compensation is reasonable when compared to that paid to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry; and (2) the compensation is not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the debtor's nonmanagement workforce during the case.

Sec. 302. Limitations on Executive Compensation Enhancements. In general, Bankruptcy Code Section 503(c) prohibits a debtor from making certain payments to an insider, absent certain findings by the court. Section 302 amends section 503(c)(1), which prohibits such payments when they are intended to induce the insider to remain with the debtor's business, in several respects. First, it expands the provision so that it applies a debtor's senior executive officer and any of the debtor's 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants. Second, it clarifies that the provision prohibits the payment of performance or incentive compensation, a bonus of any kind, and other financial returns designed to replace or enhance incentive, stock, or other compensation in effect prior to the commencement of the case. And, third, it specifies that the court's findings must be based on clear and convincing evidence in the record.

In addition, section 302 also amends Bankruptcy Code section 503(c)(3), which prohibits other transfers made or obligations incurred outside of the debtor's ordinary course of business and not justified by the facts and circumstances of the case, including transfers made and obligations incurred for the benefit of the debtor's officers, managers or consultants hired postpetition. Section 302 replaces section 503(c)(3) with a provision prohibiting other transfers or obligations incurred to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, managers or consultants providing services to the debtor unless they meet certain criteria. First, the court must find, based on clear and convincing evidence (without deference to the debtor's request for authorization to make such payments), that such payments are essential to the survival of the debtor's business or, in the case of a liquidation, essential to the orderly liquidation of the debtor's business and maximization of the value of the debtor's assets. Second, the services for which compensation is sought must be essential in nature. Third, such payments must be reasonable compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry and not disproportionate in light of economic concessions made by the debtor's nonmanagement workforce during the case.

Sec. 303. Assumption of Executive Retirement Plans. Section 303 amends Bankruptcy Code section 365, which sets forth the criteria pursuant to which executory contracts and unexpired leases may be assumed and rejected, to add two provisions. New subsection (q) provides that no deferred compensation arrangement for the benefit of a debtor's insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees may be assumed if a defined benefit pension

plan for the debtor's employees has been terminated pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of ERISA on or after the commencement of the case or within 180 days prior to the commencement of the case.

New subsection (r) provides that no plan, fund, program, or contract to provide retiree benefits for insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor may be assumed if the debtor: (1) has obtained relief under subsection (g) or (h) of section 1114 to impose reductions in retiree benefits; (2) has obtained relief under subsection (d) or (e) of section 1113 to impose reductions in the health benefits of the debtor's active employees; or (3) or reduced or eliminated active employee or retiree benefits within 180 days prior to the commencement of the case.

Sec. 304. Recovery of Executive Compensation. Section 304 adds a new provision to the Bankruptcy Code. New section 563(a) provides that if a debtor reduces its contractual obligations under a collective bargaining agreement pursuant to section 1113(d), or retiree benefits pursuant to section 1114(g), then the court, as part of the order granting such relief, must make certain determinations. The court must determine the percentage of diminution in the value of the obligations as a result of such relief. In making this determination, the court must include any reduction in benefits as a result of the termination pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of ERISA of a defined benefit plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, effective at any time within 180 days prior to the commencement of the case. The court may not take into consideration pension benefits paid or payable under title IV of ERISA as a result of such termination.

If a defined benefit pension plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, is terminated pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of ERISA, effective at any time within 180 days prior to the commencement of the case, and the debtor has not obtained relief under section 1113(d), or section 1114(g), new section 563(b) requires the court, on motion of a party in interest, to determine the percentage in diminution in the value of benefit obligations when compared to the total benefit liabilities prior to such termination. The court may not take into account pension benefits paid or payable pursuant to title IV of ERISA as a result of such termination.

After such percentage diminution in value is determined, new section 563(c) provides that the estate has a claim for the return of the same percentage of the compensation paid, directly or indirectly (including any transfer to a self-settled trust or similar de-

vice, or to a nonqualified deferred compensation plan under section 409A(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to certain individuals. These individuals include: (1) any officer of the debtor serving as a member of the debtor's board of directors within the year before the filing of the case; and (2) any individual serving as chairman or as lead director of the board of directors at the time when relief under section 1113 or section 1114 is granted, or if no such relief has been granted, then the termination of the defined benefit plan.

New section 563(d) provides that a trustee or committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover such claims. If neither commences such action by the first date set for the confirmation hearing, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover such claims for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery must be borne by the estate.

New section 563(e) prohibits the court from awarding postpetition compensation under section 503(c) or otherwise to any person subject to the provisions of section 563(c) if there is a reasonable likelihood that such compensation is intended to reimburse or replace compensation recovered by the estate pursuant to section 563.

Sec. 305. Preferential Compensation Transfer. Bankruptcy Code section 547 authorizes preferential transfers to be avoided. Section 305 adds a new subsection to section 547 to permit the avoidance of a transfer to or for the benefit of an insider (including an obligation incurred for the benefit of an insider under an employment contract) made in anticipation of bankruptcy. The provision also permits the avoidance of a transfer made in anticipation of a bankruptcy to a consultant who is formerly an insider and who is retained to provide services to an entity that becomes a debtor (including an obligation under a contract to provide services to such entity or to a debtor) made or incurred within one year before the filing of the bankruptcy case. In addition, new section 547(j) provides that no provision of section 547(c) (specifying certain exceptions to section 547) may be utilized as a defense. Further, section 547(j) permits the trustee or a committee to commence such avoidance action. If neither do so as of the date of the commencement of the confirmation hearing, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover the claims for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery must be borne by the estate.

TITLE IV—OTHER PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Union Proof of Claim. Section 401 amends Bankruptcy Code section 501(a) to

permit a labor organization (in addition to a creditor or indenture trustee) to file a proof of claim.

Sec. 402. Exception from Automatic Stay. Section 402 amends Bankruptcy Code section 362(b) to create an additional exception to the automatic stay with respect to the commencement or continuation of a grievance, arbitration or similar dispute resolution proceeding established by a collective bargaining agreement that was or could have been commenced against the debtor before the filing of the bankruptcy case. The exception also applies to the payment or enforcement of awards or settlements of such proceeding.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WAYZATA HIGH SCHOOL SWIMMING AND DIVING

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the Wayzata High School Girls' Swimming and Diving Team for winning the Minnesota State Championship.

The title was clinched at the University of Minnesota Aquatic Center with a well-rounded team effort that saw eight top-four finishes by the Elizabeth Hansen-coached Trojans.

Madison Priess led the way with an individual State Championship in the 200-yard Individual Medley. Wayzata also won the title in the 200 medley relay thanks to strong swims from Carly Quast, Alexis Schaaf, Colleen Donlin, and Madison—coming just short of setting a state record.

The title was Wayzata's second in a row and was due to the hard work these athletes put in everyday. Swimming takes a tremendous effort and practice in order to reach the goals that the Trojans accomplished this season. In addition to the hard work in the pool, these student-athletes have to balance their studies, family responsibilities, and social commitments as well. The Wayzata team took all that was asked of them in stride to reach the top of their sport. Family, friends, and fans should all be proud of their effort.

It is my pleasure to honor and congratulate the Wayzata Girls' Swimming and Diving team on bringing home another state title!

SENATE—Wednesday, January 7, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, ultimate judge of us all, provide for the needs of our lawmakers from Your boundless resources. Lead them along paths that will bring glory and honor to Your Name as You surround them with the shield of Your divine favor. Lord, intervene in their lives to keep them from becoming weary in choosing the harder right and lead them in the way everlasting. Keep our Senators from presuming that You are automatically on their side. Instead, let them earnestly seek to be on Your side. Enable them to find unity with each other because of their connection with You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk which is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time

between 2:15 p.m. and 3:15 p.m. be controlled by Senator HOEVEN and the time from 3:15 p.m. to 4:15 p.m. be controlled by the Democratic leader or his designee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. This morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business while we continue to organize for the new Congress. We will need to pass a resolution making committee appointments later today so they can begin their work on the Keystone Pipeline bill and other important priorities.

As we announced last month, the bipartisan keystone energy bill will be on the floor and it will be open for amendment next week. The House is also sending over a reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program today, and we will need to take action on that quickly as well.

OPENING THE 114TH SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yesterday we inaugurated the 114th Senate of the Congress. We welcomed back many dedicated Members and swore in many new ones. I have high hopes for our new colleagues. They share the resolve of my conference to restore the Senate to a place of high purpose, and they are determined to make a positive difference in the lives of the people who sent them.

The men and women we have just sworn in have inaugurated one significant change already; that is, the majority we seated yesterday. I look to this new beginning with optimism and a profound sense of purpose, and I look to my colleagues with gratitude for their trust. Next to serving the people of Kentucky, this is the highest of honors. I recognize the serious expectations of the American people and I know they are counting on us—and I do mean all of us—every single Member of this body.

We are in a moment of great anxiety as a nation. The people we represent have lost faith in their government. They no longer trust Washington to do the right thing. Many face the reality of losing health plans after being told otherwise. Many struggle with rising medical costs after Washington officials repeatedly said they would be lowered. Confidence in the American dream has plunged. Anxiety about the type of country we leave to the next generation is widespread. For many it has never seemed more difficult just to get by.

When Americans look overseas they see a world filled with chaos: instability roiling the Middle East, terrorists pressing an aggressive agenda, and autocrats scoffing at a superpower that doesn't seem to have a real plan.

At home they see a government that is either uninterested in or incapable of addressing their concerns, a government that seems to be working for itself instead of them. Whether it is Washington's dysfunction or a bureaucracy that has grown so Byzantine and unaccountable, it tried to muzzle political opponents and ignore the needs of veterans.

The American people have simply had enough, and this past November they had their say. The message they sent was clear. If voters hit the brakes 4 years ago, this time they have spun the wheel. They said they want the administration to change course and move to the middle. They said they want Congress to send legislation to the President that addresses their concerns. This November the American people didn't ask for a government that tries to do everything and fails, and they didn't demand a government that aims to do nothing and succeeds. They asked simply for a government that works.

They want a government of the 21st century, one that functions with efficiency and accountability, competence and purpose. They want a Washington that is more interested in modernizing and streamlining government than adding more layers to it, and they want more jobs, more opportunity for the middle class, and more flexibility in a complex age with complex demands.

That is why we plan to pursue commonsense jobs ideas, including those with bipartisan support: measures such as reforming a broken tax system to make it simpler and friendlier to job creation, opening more markets to American-made products so we can create more jobs at home, and moving forward with bipartisan infrastructure projects such as the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Americans are challenging this Congress and this President to work for them. They are challenging lawmakers in Washington to work for jobs for Americans, not just jobs for themselves. It seems simple enough. But in the end, in the era of divided government control, we are going to have to work hard to meet expectations and we are going to have to work together.

Step No. 1 is getting Congress functioning again. That means fixing the Senate. Last session the House sent

over countless commonsense bipartisan bills. Too many of them died right here without so much as a hearing, and Senators from both parties with ideas for jobs and growth were routinely stopped.

So it is time to change the business model. We need to return to regular order. We need to get committees working again. We need to recommit to a rational, functioning appropriations process. We need to open the legislative process in a way that allows more amendments from both sides.

Sometimes it is going to mean actually working late, but restoring the Senate is the right and practical thing to do because we are only going to pass meaningful legislation if Members of both parties are given a stake in the outcome. That is the genius of regular order. That is the genius of the Senate.

I am reminded of this every time I walk into my office. On the wall are portraits of John Sherman Cooper, a Republican, and Alben Barkley, a Democrat. Keeping watch from below is a bust of Henry Clay. Each of these Senators—each of these Kentuckians—came from a different political party. Each viewed the world through a different ideological lens, but all of them believed in the Senate and all of them left behind important lessons for today: Clay, about putting country first and pursuing principled compromises; Cooper, about choosing when to make a stand and making it; and Barkley, about having the courage to think differently from a President of the same political party he had served dutifully for years.

These lessons echo into the present and they help point the way toward a better functioning government. A Senate and a Congress that function again will help move us past an era of government by crisis. It doesn't mean everything will be perfect, it doesn't mean we will never come up against a deadline, and it doesn't mean we will always agree, but together we can commit to changing the way Washington operates. This can be done. It can be done.

This Senate has seemed imperfect at moments, but it has been proven to be a place of high purpose at many other times, a place where our country has come together to confront great challenges and advance solutions that once seemed completely out of reach. That is the Senate I saw when I saw Senator Cooper whip votes for the Civil Rights Act many believed would never pass, that is the Senate I saw when President Reagan worked with Democratic leaders to pass major reforms to taxes and Social Security, and that is the Senate I saw when a Republican Congress worked with President Clinton to pass historic welfare reform.

The promise of the Senate is real. Time and time again it has been an engine for bipartisan achievement to

which both parties can assume either credit or blame, and that is how we should view it today.

So, yes, the American people elected divided government, but that doesn't mean they don't want us to accomplish anything. If there is a will to do so, we can come together to achieve great things. If President Obama is interested in a historic achievement of his own, this can be his time as well.

The President has already indicated a willingness to work with us on trade and infrastructure and comprehensive tax reform. These efforts are going to require a lot of work. Navigating the political pitfalls will not be easy, but passing these types of measures will represent a win for the American people—wins we could all be proud of. The truth is we could work for bigger things too. We could work together to save and strengthen Medicare, to protect Social Security for future generations, to balance the budget and put our growing national debt on a path to elimination. But bipartisan reform can only be achieved if President Obama is interested in it. The President is the only one who can bring his party on board. He is the only one, obviously, who can sign something that Congress sends him. I assure you, threatening to veto a jobs and infrastructure bill within minutes of a new Congress taking the oath of office—a bill with strong bipartisan support—is anything but productive.

I appreciate that bipartisan compromise may not come easily for the President—not his first inclination. The President's supporters are pressing for militancy, not compromise. They are demanding the comforts of purity over the duties of progress.

From DC to Montpelier, they see the limits of an exhausted 20th century mindset asserting itself, even when nearly every lever of power has been in hand. Across the Atlantic, they see the Sun setting on the social democratic idea. They see the tragic legacies of welfare states—empty promises and fear of the future. It is understandable why the President's supporters might want to retreat to past comforts, but now is the time to accept reality. Now is the time to actually move forward.

Americans know that democracy is not about what you can get away with, it is about what you can achieve together. Many in this body, on both sides of the aisle, understand that. I have talked to many colleagues on the other side of the aisle who understand this fully.

We are calling on the President to ignore the voices of reaction and to join us. Whatever he decides, though, this Congress is going to function again. Let's pass legislation that focuses on jobs and the real concerns of the middle class.

After so many years of sluggish growth, we are finally starting to see

some economic data that can provide a glimmer of hope. The uptick appears to coincide with the biggest political change of the Obama administration's long tenure in Washington—the expectation of a new Republican Congress. This is precisely the time to advance a positive, progrowth agenda.

Some of the measures the new Congress will pass may seem significant; others may seem modest. That is OK. As we have seen in recent years, a bigger bill does not always mean a better bill.

While we are always going to search for areas where we can agree, the President may not be enamored of every bill we pass, and that is OK too. It is not our job to protect the President from good ideas. A little creative tension between the Executive and the legislature can be pretty healthy in a democracy such as ours. Presidents and Congresses have disagreed before. They have confronted challenges that eclipse the ones we see today. What is important to remember is that the Senate has always endured—always. We have a duty to restore it now so we can meet the mandate of the people who sent us here.

Former majority leader Howard Baker once noted that making the Senate work is like “trying to make 99 independent souls act in concert under rules that encourage polite anarchy.” Yet he also reminded us that “it doesn't take Clays and Websters and Calhouns to make the Senate work.” It simply takes men and women of honor working in a spirit of good faith.

It may be difficult, but it has been done before and it can be done again, and if we are going to get there, it helps to recall in whose footsteps we walk today. This is the same Chamber where Dirksen and Mansfield allied for historic progress. This is where Byrd drew from antiquity to rouse colleagues to present challenges and where in later years he would critique successors on the finer points of procedure. This is where Mitchell honed the skills he needed to help bring warring communities together, enemies who responded to critics not just with floor speeches or press conferences but actually live ammunition. This is where Dole shared war stories with Inouye, and with a fateful tap on the shoulder, he would partner with Moynihan in their effort to reform Social Security.

The names of many Senators who came before us are etched into the desks we sit at today. The men and women who precede us include future Presidents and Vice Presidents. They include former athletes, veterans, and astronauts. We have forgotten some, we remember others, but their legacies live on.

Here is how Senator Claude Pepper put it:

The Senate is inefficient, unwieldy [and] inconsistent; it has foibles, its vanities, its

members who are great . . . and those who think they are great. But like democracy . . . it is strong . . . it has survived many changes, it has saved the country [from] many catastrophes, [and] it is a safeguard against any form of tyranny.

In the last analysis, Pepper noted, the Senate “is probably the price we in America have to pay for liberty.” For everything Senator Pepper and I may not have agreed on, we certainly agreed on that.

In the same way, each of us here may not agree on every issue. We may be Republican, we may be Democrat, but we are all Americans. We each have a responsibility to make the Senate function, and we each have a duty to work for the people who sent us here in serious times to get serious results.

Let's restore the Senate we love. Let's look for areas of agreement when we can. Above all, let's make Washington work again for the people we serve.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

PRESERVING THE SENATE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I read a statement into the RECORD which was written by the minority leader, Senator REID, I have to say that the Senators who serve on the Democratic side of the aisle are committed to the traditions, precedents, and the rules of the Senate. We, of course, will work to preserve this great institution and protect our own individual rights and responsibilities in the Senate.

I welcome what Senator MCCONNELL, our new majority leader, has envisioned as a more active floor in the Senate where we do not run into lengthy and repeated filibusters but bring amendments to the floor, debate them, vote on them, and ultimately pass legislation. That is the procedure of the Senate which historically had been honored but fell, sadly, into disrepair over the last several years.

Although we hope our minority status in the Senate is short-lived, I think we will establish that the Democrats are a much better minority when it comes to the Senate than perhaps those on the other side of the aisle, but only time will tell.

NEW CONGRESS

Mr. DURBIN. I have the opening remarks from the Democratic leader, HARRY REID, which I wish to read into the RECORD.

Senator REID states:

As some already know, I had a mishap in my home last week while exercising. As a re-

sult, I sustained several broken bones in my face and ribs. As bad as that sounds, I am doing well and recovering quickly.

I regret I am not on the Senate floor to make these remarks in person, but my doctors have urged caution and ordered me to stay home while I recuperate.

I thank my friend, the Assistant Democratic Leader, for delivering my remarks today.

A Greek philosopher once wrote: “There is nothing permanent except change.” Our nation's elections prove that theory every two years. This is one of those times of change—for the Senate and for our country.

The desks in this Chamber have been rearranged, committee assignments adjusted, and a new majority assumes control for the next two years. Or in other words, it's just another Wednesday in January at the start of a new Congress.

For all of the changes, our duties as United States Senators remain the same: We are here to help working Americans and ensure our government has all it needs to serve the people.

In spite of almost no Republican cooperation over the last six years, we've made significant strides in many regards. The new Majority Leader claims the Senate hasn't achieved, in his words, “squat” in recent years. The numbers, however, tell a different story. Today the U.S. unemployment rate stands at 5.8 percent. Over the last six years the American economy has added 10 million jobs. The stock market has reached all-time highs. Our nation's manufacturers are thriving. The American automobile industry was brought back from the brink of collapse in spite of Republican opposition. And let's not forget that there are more than 10 million Americans newly insured with health care coverage.

While some here in Washington may see that as “squat,” the economic recovery has been very real to American families. I know how important it has been to working Nevadans.

And while we worked to improve the economy without Republicans' help, we also worked to fulfill our constitutional obligation to offer advice and consent on Presidential nominations.

Just last Congress we confirmed 132 judges—the most since the Carter Administration. Overall, we confirmed 611 of the President's nominees last Congress in spite of Republican opposition. As we speak, we have an Attorney General and a Secretary of Defense waiting to be confirmed. I remind everyone that last Congress the Republicans mounted an unprecedented filibuster for a nominee for Secretary of Defense [a former Republican Senator].

I challenge my friend, the Majority Leader, to change course and work with Senate Democrats in confirming the President's nominees in the 114th Congress. Working together, we can easily meet and surpass last Congress's benchmark of 611 confirmations.

My Republican colleagues, and especially the Majority Leader, should also know that Senate Democrats are especially eager to continue to help American families.

Working together, we can send meaningful, bipartisan legislation to the President for his signature.

The mistakes of the past, the gratuitous obstruction and wanton filibustering will not be a hallmark of the Democratic minority in the 114th Congress. The filibuster is an indispensable tool of the minority, but Republicans' abuse of it last Congress has come to epitomize the gridlock here in the United States Capitol.

To be clear, I have no intention of just rolling over. I can't. Not when the middle class is teetering on the verge of extinction.

Any attempt to erode protections for working American families—the dismantling of Dodd-Frank, the weakening of net neutrality rules, or the Republicans' never-ending quest to repeal the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare—will be met with swift and unified Democratic opposition.

But we'd rather legislate together. And there's plenty of common ground for bipartisan compromise if Republicans are willing.

That is the end of the statement from Senator REID.

TERRORIST ATTACK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, throughout the history of the United States of America, we have had a remarkable alliance with the nation of France. It bears remembering and repeating that the French stood by our side when America was fighting for its independence from Great Britain. The French were honored in many ways for that alliance and help, including, as I recall, a portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette which hangs in the U.S. House of Representatives to this day.

That was not the only time by any means that the French have stood with us and we have stood by their side. It happened during World War I, World War II, and many times after that. Through the NATO alliance and in many other ways, we have worked with the people of France for common goals and common purpose, and that is why we were so saddened this morning to learn of the news that was reported by the Tribune:

Masked gunmen shouting “Allahu akbar!” stormed the Paris offices of a satirical newspaper Wednesday, killing 12 people before escaping. It was France's deadliest terror attack in at least two decades.

With a manhunt on, French President Francois Hollande called the attack on the Charlie Hebdo weekly . . . “a terrorist attack without a doubt.” He said several other attacks have been thwarted in France “in recent weeks.”

France raised its security alert to the highest level and reinforced protective measures at houses of worship, stores, media offices and transportation. Top government officials were holding an emergency meeting and Hollande planned a nationally televised address in the evening. Schools closed their doors.

World leaders including President Barack Obama and German Chancellor Angela Merkel condemned the attack, but supporters of the militant Islamic State group celebrated the slayings as well-deserved revenge against France.

This event in Paris recalls what we lived through not that long ago when the United States—on September 11, 2001—was attacked by terrorists and more than 3,000 innocent Americans lost their lives in New York, in Washington, and in the countryside of Pennsylvania. Many of us recall that at that moment—that sad, awful moment—people around the world rallied to

stand with the United States in our grief and in our determination for justice. We particularly remember that the people of France did that, and they spoke out in one voice saying they were going to be by our side in this battle against terrorism. I think it is appropriate today that we follow suit, that we join in that same spirit. "A ce moment tragique, nous sommes tous Parisiens, nous sommes tous Français."

Let us all work together not only to bring justice to this horrible situation—this attack on free press in France—but let us also work together to bring an end to terrorism in our time. We can work with our allies and friends in France to achieve that goal.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY ON 40 YEARS IN THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 40 years ago this week, a young prosecutor from Vermont was sworn into the Senate. He was part of a historic group of lawmakers often referred to as the "Watergate babies." Today that man is President pro tempore emeritus as well as the most senior Member of the Senate. It is an honor to serve with him and to recognize Senator PATRICK LEAHY for reaching this historic milestone.

PATRICK LEAHY remains the youngest Senator—and the only Democratic Senator—ever sent to this body by the people of his home State of Vermont. But that is not what makes PATRICK LEAHY exceptional. What makes him exceptional is the fact that he is a consensus builder—a thoughtful man committed to making government work better. It has been a privilege for me to work closely with Senator LEAHY serving on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

As a member of that committee since 1979 and for many years as chairman,

Senator LEAHY made a profound mark on America's system of justice. He has voted on the nominations of every sitting member of the U.S. Supreme Court. He has fought to preserve the balance between liberty and security during especially difficult times. Senator LEAHY has also fought to make America's respect for human rights a cornerstone of our Nation's foreign policy. He has been a leader in the global effort to ban antipersonnel landmines. He championed the "Leahy Law" to prevent U.S. tax dollars from benefiting human rights abusers abroad. He was a leader in recent efforts to free U.S. citizen Alan Gross from a Cuban jail and in the modernization of our Nation's policy toward that island.

One last point, PAT LEAHY is also, almost certainly, the biggest "Dead Head" in the Senate. Twenty years ago, he invited his good friend, Jerry Garcia—the lead guitarist for the Grateful Dead—to join him for lunch here in the Capitol. Two other members of the band came, too: drummer Mickey Hart and bass player Phil Lesh. As one might imagine, this unusual foursome created a bit of a stir in the Senate Dining Room. Then in walked Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. Ever the bridgebuilder, Senator LEAHY walked over to Senator Thurmond and said: "Please join us. There's someone I want you to meet."

It is a story worth pondering as we begin the 114th Congress. If we could all be so open to creating unlikely alliances, there is no telling what we might achieve in the next 2 years.

Again, I thank my friend Senator LEAHY on his 40 years of service to the people of Vermont, America, and to the great causes that face our generation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESTORING THE SENATE'S GREATNESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to address the state of the Senate and how to restore its greatness.

Yesterday, I was sworn in as the President pro tempore. Although there have been some notable exceptions throughout history, the modern practice of the Senate has been to elect as the President pro tempore the most senior Member of the majority party. As one noted historian of the Senate has generously written, "election of a senator to the office of president pro tempore has always been considered one of the highest honors offered to a senator by the Senate as a body."

I am greatly honored to have been selected for this position, but I am keenly aware of the great responsibilities that come with it. The President pro tempore of the Senate is one of only three legislative offices established by the U.S. Constitution, and in recent decades it has been occupied by true giants of the Senate. Their names, which include Vandenberg, Russell, Byrd, Stevens, Inouye, and LEAHY, resonate as some of the greatest legislators ever to serve in this body.

Beyond the President pro tempore's formal responsibilities in presiding over the Senate and helping ensure the continuity of government, this office represents a unique opportunity to assist the majority leader in guiding the Senate as it addresses the critical issues facing our Nation. In that sense, the President pro tempore serves as an elder statesman, sharing accumulated knowledge and lessons learned through long experience.

I consider it fortuitous that the beginning of my service as President pro tempore coincides with the start of a new year. For many, the new year is a time for reflecting upon the past and reviewing commitments for the future. I believe we as Senators should use this opportunity for some much needed introspection about the state of this institution.

The Senate has long been heralded as the world's greatest deliberative body. With so many critical challenges facing our Nation today, there has never been a more important time for the Senate to live up to its storied legacy and to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people.

Central to properly understanding our responsibilities as Senators is to appreciate the Senate's role in our system of government. This means understanding both the Senate's purposes and its unique place at the center of our constitutional structure. It is important for us to consider these issues.

James Madison famously called the Senate the great anchor of the government. He described its purpose as twofold: "first to protect the people against their rulers; secondly to protect the people against the transient impressions on to which they themselves might be led."

The Senate accomplishes the first goal—protecting the people against their rulers—by playing a crucial role in the appointment and removal of both judges and executive branch officers. The President's power to appoint is tempered by the requirement that his appointees receive the Senate's advice and consent. Additionally, the Senate possesses the power to remove from office any official that has engaged in high crimes and misdemeanors. The President's power to enter into treaties is also critically checked by the requirement that the Senate provide its advice and consent to a treaty before ratification.

As such, the President does not have unfettered power to fill up executive offices, pack the courts or make agreements with foreign nations. He cannot staff agencies with corrupt, incompetent or ideologically extreme cronies unless the Senate allows him to do so. He cannot conclude treaties that will harm American interests unless the Senate gives its assent. In selecting life-tenured judges to apply the Constitution and laws of the land, the President cannot act unless the Senate confirms his nominee. In all of these settings, the Senate serves as a crucial check against executive abuse.

The Senate accomplishes the second of Madison's goals—protecting against temporary shifts in popular opinion—through its character and its institutional structure. In contrast to the large, transient House, the Senate is small, more stable, and therefore, it has the opportunity to be more thoughtful. Four hundred thirty-five Members inhabit the House, and only 100 fill this Chamber. The entire House stands for election every 2 years. Naturally, reelection is constantly on Representatives' minds. Senators, by contrast, have 6-year terms and only one-third go before the voters each election. Even with the pressures of modern campaigns, these divergent characteristics produce fundamentally different institutions.

But the Framers designed the Senate to do much more than merely check transient and occasionally intemperate impulses. They created the Senate to refine the public's will and to give more wisdom and stability to the government. The Framers chose the Senate's relatively small size to enable more thorough debate and to provide individual Members greater opportunity to improve legislative proposals. Longer, staggered terms would give Members greater flexibility to resist initially popular yet ultimately unwise legislation. They would also guard against temporary majorities. A fluke election may produce significant majorities for one party that 2 years later disappears. This can lead to wild swings in the law as each new majority seeks to enact a vastly different agenda during its brief period of power. Overlapping terms help to avert this danger.

Finally, statewide constituencies require Senators to appeal to a broader set of interests—including the concerns of the State governments themselves—than do narrow, more homogenous House districts.

To these constitutional characteristics, the Senate has added a number of traditions—some formal and others informal—that have enhanced its deliberative character. These include the right to extended debate, an open amendment process, and a committee system that gives all Members—from the most seasoned chairmen to the

newest freshmen—a hand in drafting and improving legislation.

The late Senator Byrd liked to say that “as long as the Senate retains the power to amend and the power of unlimited debate, the liberties of the people will remain secure.”

The Senate protects liberty by giving each Senator an active role in the legislative process. This multiplies the checks against bad laws and expands the universe of individuals working to make good laws better. It erects what Madison called a necessary fence against hasty and unwise government action. It enables each Senator to bring his or her own wisdom and considered judgment to bear on pressing national issues.

When the Senate functions properly, it is a truly deliberative body in which all Senators work to identify the common good and the best means to achieve that common good. The Federalist describes the common good as the permanent and aggregate interests of the community. This is to be distinguished from the individual good, which may vary from person to person and which may not result in the Nation's benefit.

Much like the Senate is designed to protect against transient shifts in public opinion, it is also designed to enable Senators to pursue the common good. Senators are able to prioritize achieving the correct results over doing what is politically convenient. The best answers do not always immediately present themselves nor are they always easily explained. Longer terms give Senators more time to investigate, to analyze, to reconsider, and to recalibrate, and so do robust debate and an open amendment process. These are critical elements of our deliberative pursuit of the common good.

Another crucial component of our pursuit of common good is prudence. Aristotle called prudence the legislative science because it concerns the best means of achieving the most good in practice. Prudence restrains us from seeking immediate and complete vindication of a single abstract principle. Instead, it counsels us to work within our existing circumstances to vindicate the enduring principles upon which our liberty depends.

While we should remain true to our principles, we must also recognize that we operate in an imperfect world where we do not control all of the levers of power. We cannot simply charge forward blind to present realities. To do so is to jeopardize our hopes for achieving any meaningful success, because in the messy world of politics, adopting an all-or-nothing strategy usually produces only the latter—nothing.

Politics is the art of the possible. Ideology is important, and rhetoric is captivating. But at the end of the day, when the campaign is over, the American people sent us here to govern. We

are here to protect their liberties and to protect and improve their lives. When we grandstand or hold out for impossible demands, we do nothing but a disservice. The Framers gave us staggered, extended terms so that we could use our independent judgment to get things done. We should try to get to it.

An astute commentator observed that the Senate stands at the crossroads of our constitutional system. It shares power with the other branches of the Federal Government. It ensures temperance in the legislative branch. It must consent or not consent to the President's treaties and appointments, and it plays a critical role in appointments to the Supreme Court.

But it also—and this is unique among the branches of the Federal Government—embodies the interests of federalism and State power at the national level.

The Framers created the Senate to be much more than a simple legislative body. The Senate is uniquely positioned to mediate both among the Federal branches of government and between the Federal and State governments. As such, the Senate truly embodies the role described by one wise commentator as the sober guardian of the Republic.

Our responsibilities as Senators follow directly from the Senate's constitutional role. As the people's representatives and as envoys of our individual States' interests, we are accountable to our States and to our Nation. We do not serve any one party or principle, or any particular ideology or faction. We may align ourselves into certain groups—Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal—for purposes of organization and cooperation, but we are Senators first. Other labels are secondary.

Civility and statesmanship must be our constant ideals. Madison once instructed that “the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system, and with more wisdom, than the popular branch.” A key purpose of this body is to calm the passions that arise from the heat of political discourse. As such, we must always be courteous in our communications one with another, both formal and informal, on the floor and off, face-to-face or on a video screen. When we disagree we need to do so with dignity and respect, acknowledging the sincere motives and passions of even our most firm adversaries.

Statesmanship connotes public spiritedness and a willingness to compromise in pursuit of broader goals. Petulance and unilateralism accomplish nothing in this body. Any Senator who would choose the glow of the camera over the prospect for meaningful achievement seriously misunderstands their role as a Senator.

Next on the list of practices Senators must follow are prudence and considered judgment. I have already spoken

about prudence. It is a habit of mind that focuses on present realities and achievable goals—not pie-in-the-sky pipedreams. Prudent lawmakers make experience—not theory—their guide, and they recognize that success in a republic requires harmonizing competing values.

Considered judgment is closely tied to prudence. Prudence is not rash. It requires deliberation and thoughtful analysis. Our constituents sent us here because they trusted our judgment and favored the general outlines we presented in our campaigns. Now that we are here, it is time to put our plans into action. We do this by studying problems, investigating proposals, and carefully choosing solutions that best cohere with our principles. Exercising judgment is an individual matter. Colleagues and opinion leaders may guide our deliberations, but the ultimate choice of policy is one which we each must make on our own.

The final two obligations I wish to highlight are our responsibilities: first, to seek the common good through earnest deliberation, and second, to achieve consensus to the extent possible.

As I explained, the Framers designed the Senate so that Members would be able to seek the common good encumbered by few political constraints. Because we stand for election only every 6 years, we are less susceptible to swings in public opinion. We have the independence to value long-term impact over short-term politics. And because we are a small body—relatively speaking—all Members are able to participate fully in the legislative process and to add their voice of praise, warning or suggestion to each proposal that we consider. We deliberate not to score points or to craft sound bites but because we believe that in the contest of opposing views, the best answers will win out.

I mentioned consensus. Although much of our day-to-day operations are conducted by unanimous consent, obviously we do not do everything around here by consensus. We are 100 fiercely independent legislators. Even at the end of a lengthy debate with numerous opportunities for amendment, we may remain sharply divided about a bill's wisdom or the objective it seeks to achieve. But that does not mean consensus should not be our goal. We should take counsel from past legislative victories which show that broad victories produce lasting reform, whereas narrow partisan power plays tend to yield only rancor and repeated attempts to repeal.

For 38 years I have had the extraordinary privilege of serving in the Senate. During that time, I have witnessed it at its best and, more recently, at its worst. My experience throughout the last four decades has confirmed to me the wisdom of the first Adlai Steven-

son, then Vice President, who in his 1897 farewell address captured the essence of the Senate:

In this Chamber alone are preserved without restraint two essentials of wise legislations and good government: the right of amendment and of debate. Great evils often result from hasty legislation; rarely from the delay which follows full discussion and deliberation.

In recent years these foundations of the Senate's unique character—meaningful debate and an open amendment process—have come under sustained assault by those who have prioritized scoring political points over preserving the Senate's essential role in our system of self-government.

Rather than simply bemoan this recent institutional damage, we have a duty to use this new Congress to restore the Senate. By returning to regular order and committee work, promoting robust debate, and enabling a deliberative amendment process, we can make the Senate work again—both Democrats and Republicans.

First, robust debate. Senators' ability to engage in meaningful, substantive debate is at the core of the Senate's identity. Through robust discussions and inclusive deliberation, Senators examine all sides of an issue. We air opposing views and ensure that in haste we do not make worse the problems we are trying to solve.

When individual Senators have the right to debate a matter fully, it engenders confidence that the final legislation produced represents the best possible bill upon which the Senate can agree. Many pieces of legislation that seemed imperfect passed this way and have gone on to benefit the Nation greatly. For over 200 years, the Senate has provided each Member broad prerogative to debate and discuss the critical issues of the day. In the early years of the Republic, visitors flocked to the Senate gallery to hear Senators such as Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and John C. Calhoun, just to mention three, to hear them expound upon matters of national concern.

It was in this body that some of our Nation's most important debates over taxation, slavery, expansion, and foreign affairs took place. For many years, free-flowing debate was so intertwined with the identity of the Senate that no effective cloture mechanism to cut off debate even existed until well into the 20th century.

While the need to end debate in certain circumstances is clear, we have strayed too far from this important deliberative tradition. In particular, the practice of filing for cloture at the very same time a bill is brought up for consideration has proliferated to a disturbing degree. When a full and robust debate has occurred, invoking cloture is often appropriate. But we must not abuse this power by reflexively seeking to cut off debate before it even begins.

Let us return to a system where all Senators have a say in what the Senate does and are able to express their views without getting cut off.

The second Senate hallmark we must restore is an open amendment process. The reason for an open amendment process is to improve legislation. No single Member can foresee all contingencies that may arise or identify all of the potential pitfalls.

There is a reason there are 100 Senators, not just 1. More eyes mean more mistakes caught and more opportunities for improvement. An open amendment process also facilitates consensus. One amendment may resolve a particular Senator's concern, allowing him to support what he or she once opposed. Another may make a bill politically palatable to Senators who support the bill in principle but not in its current form.

Amendments may also achieve buy-in as Senators who successfully amend a bill find themselves more committed to final passage. When Senators retain the ability to amend legislation, such input can establish a wide and lasting base of support that crosses partisan and ideological lines. Indeed, an open and honest amendment process has frequently enabled diverse coalitions to find important areas of agreement.

I even found that the former Senator from Massachusetts, the late Ted Kennedy, the famed liberal lion of the Senate, a man I came to Washington to battle, could be a productive partner. In the process, he became one of my closest friends, even if we widely disagreed on a lot of things. I miss him personally. We were able to do things that would not have been done had it not been for the work we did together.

Unfortunately, over the past several years, the Senate's traditionally open amendment process has come under increasing attack. For the sake of shielding electorally vulnerable Senators from tough votes, we have emasculated one of this institution's critical characteristics. It is time to stop manipulating Senate rules to prevent amendments. It is time to stop blocking amendments for fear of tough votes. It is time to return to healthier ways of doing things, where we work together to improve legislation rather than doing all we can to keep Members out of the process.

The third hallmark we must restore is a vigorous and productive committee system. Although perhaps not as moribund as our amendment process, the role our committees play in drafting and refining bills has indeed suffered in recent years. For centuries Senate committees have served as the primary forum for critical deliberation and amendments in this body.

Bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the relevant committees where Members have the opportunity to consider, debate, and amend the bill

at length. Committees are the workhorses of the Senate or at least should be. On the floor we can do only one thing at a time. But any number of committees and subcommittees may operate simultaneously, allowing Senators to work out language and make compromises on multiple bills at the same time.

Committees also perform a crucial investigative function. They hold hearings, call witnesses, and solicit expert opinions on a wide variety of issues, enabling Members to expand their understanding and to better fine-tune individual bills. Lately, however, we have witnessed a disturbing trend of bypassing the committee process altogether by bringing bills directly to the floor for votes.

This practice undermines committee work and frustrates Members who diligently seek to move their legislative priorities through the committee. It also deprives bills of the benefits of committee review, which include more search and consideration of language, opportunities for comment by outside experts, and the ability to address support for amendments without tying up precious floor time.

A healthy committee process is essential to a well-functioning Senate. This body is not a fiefdom. We do not convene merely to give our assent to immutable messaging bills. We are supposed to work together to write, amend, and pass important legislation. When Senators bring up for consideration bills they have written without input from other Members, manipulate Senate procedure to prevent floor amendment on those bills, and then simultaneously file cloture to cut off debate, they act as autocrats rather than agents of democracy.

Let's return this body to one that operates by consensus, not dictate. Let's return the committee process to its proper place in our legislative landscape, as the first line of review rather than an utter irrelevancy. Let's restore the Senate to its proper role in our constitutional system by restoring the traditions that have made this body so great: robust debate, an open amendment process, an active, meaningful committee process.

Equipped with these tools, the Senate historically never shied away from taking on what everyone agreed were the toughest issues of the day. Yes, we had to take tough votes. Yes, we could not rush legislation through as fast as we sometimes would have liked. Yes, we sometimes felt deep disappointment when proposals we championed fell short. But while the Senate's rules can be frustrating and politically cumbersome, they are what allowed the Senate to serve the country so well for so very long.

Restoring the Senate in this manner will not be easy. After years of bitter partisan tension, we cannot expect a

complete change to come overnight. But by reestablishing our historic aims and reinstituting our designing modes of operation, including robust debate, an open amendment process, and regular order through committee work, the Senate can once more be about the peoples' business and observe the title of the world's greatest deliberative body.

WISHING SENATOR HARRY REID A SPEEDY RECOVERY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, one of my friends in this body is the distinguished minority leader, HARRY REID. HARRY and I have been friends for a long time. He has served here for a long time. He served well in many respects. He certainly was a tough majority leader. He is a tough guy.

Recently he suffered some very severe injuries. He is mending. These injuries seem to be injuries he can handle, although very strong, tough injuries. I wish him the best, that he may be able to recuperate well, come back again to this deliberative body, and play the role he needs to play for the minority in this illustrious body.

HARRY and I believe many things together, especially in the religious area. He is a fine man. His wife Landra is a very fine woman. I am glad to see that her health has improved. She is a terrific person. Both of them are terrific people in their own right. I pray that the Lord will heal HARRY and make it easier for him to come back as soon as he can. Being a tough guy, he will be back here pretty soon. I wish him the best. It is no secret that Elaine and I have been praying for him. Hopefully, those prayers will be efficacious.

I have great respect for my colleagues on the other side as well as my own colleagues on this side. These are good people. There are very few Senators—not more than 2—in my 38 years in the Senate that I thought might not have much redeeming value. Everybody else has played significant roles in this body, sometimes that I hotly contested and differed with, but nevertheless very good people over all these years.

HARRY REID is one of the nicest people one will ever meet off the Senate floor. He is all right on the Senate floor too. All I can say is that I wish him well. I am praying for his recovery. I want him to succeed in every way. He is from our neighboring State. Nevada is very important to us. We like both Senators from Nevada. Senator HELLER is one of the finest Senators here. They work well in Nevada's interests together. I hope everything goes well with Senator REID and his wife Landra and his lovely family. They are good family people.

I wanted to make those comments on the floor because of the high esteem in which I hold HARRY. Yes, we disagree on a lot of issues, sometimes pretty

strongly we disagree, but great Senators can do that. They can get over it quickly too.

I hope the remarks I made earlier in the day on this deliberative body will be taken up by everybody in the Senate to realize this is the greatest deliberative body in the world. We need to make sure it remains such. That means tough votes. It means tough amendments. It means long days here sometimes, but it also means an ability to have a rapport with my friends, not only on this side but the other side as well and for them to have a rapport not only with their side but with our side.

Let's hope we can build something and let's hope we can bring our two sides together and work in the best interests of the country and get some things done that are sorely in need and do things that both Democrats and Republicans can say: We did it together. Yes, there were tough times. Yes, we differed from time to time. But we did it together, and we did it in the best interest of the country.

I hope both leaders will be able to work together in this manner and that all of us will do our work in the best interest of this country. I do not think we necessarily have to forget politics, but we ought to sublimate them sometimes to the point where they do not interfere with getting very important work done.

I wish HARRY REID the best. As I said, he is in my prayers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

JOBS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, first of all, this is the first opportunity I have had to follow our new President pro tempore of the Senate on the floor. He was just elected yesterday.

I have spoken on the floor at times when he has been in other leadership roles. He is a solid Member of this Senate whom we rally around in so many ways. The comments he just made about the leader of our friends on the other side and the importance of family to Senator REID—that is also important to Senator HATCH. People are important to Senator HATCH. I believe he is going to be a tremendous President pro tempore of the Senate, chairman of the Finance Committee, and a critical leader at a critical time.

The comments he made on the floor today about Senators being willing to take tough votes, to take positions on issues, to let the American people know where we stand—that is not only where the Senate ought to be but in so many ways it is where Senator HATCH has always been as a Member of the Senate and now as the highest elected official in the Senate, the President pro tempore of the Senate. I look forward to seeing him do that job, seeking his advice, and watching his leadership

as he leads us now in multiple ways in the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my dear friend from Missouri for being so kind and thoughtful to me and the Senate. I appreciate our friendship and the leadership he provides in this body.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for his leadership and his comments.

The Presiding Officer and I are looking at legislation we looked at last year where the Senate would simply have to stand up on rules and regulations that have an impact on the economy and say "Yes, we are going to improve those" or "No, we are not going to do those." That would be a role for the Senate where the regulators for the first time have an obstacle and an opportunity to come to the people who have to go to the voters and say: What do you think about this rule? What do you think about this regulation?

I look forward to seeing the REINS Act again that would put some more controls over regulators, which both the Presiding Officer and I have worked on.

Today I will talk for a few moments about the work we will hopefully get to quickly.

The first numbered bill in this new Senate is the bill to authorize the Keystone Pipeline. In the 6 years that Canada has been waiting to try to sell us a product that we need, I have spoken about this—as many of us have—many times. It is hard to actually think about what I might say today that hasn't been said before in that 6-year period of trying to do what I believe and what most Americans believe is the logical thing for us to do.

Our best trading partner, Canada—more North American energy is one of the critical keys to our economic future. As I over and over again think of the list of opportunities in front of us, that has to be near the top. What happens when we have more American energy? What happens when we are more self-sufficient with our two closest neighbors for the energy we use, the energy we need? What happens when we are less dependent on economies that we don't do as much business with or places that aren't as friendly to us as our neighbors to the north and our neighbors to the south?

More American energy has an impact on utility bills, it has an impact on transportation, and it has an impact on whether we are going to make more things. An economy that grows things and makes things is stronger than an economy where we just trade services with each other. We should be looking for those things which create that competitive incentive for us to get back into manufacturing.

In the last session of Congress, we were able to pass a bill I cosponsored

with Senator BROWN from Ohio on advanced manufacturing, and I think it is going to have an impact on doing things in different ways, but I don't suggest that it would have a greater impact than a utility bill that somebody thinking about building a factory understood that they had a great likelihood of being able to pay for a long time and in a competitive way or a delivery system that works. Those are the kinds of things that will create more American jobs.

The Keystone Pipeline clearly creates some jobs in and of itself. I think 20,000 jobs or so is the estimate just to build the pipeline and another 20,000 for all of the support of material and things that go into that pipeline.

I think the President's own State Department has a number of 42,000 jobs that would be created if we go to this shovel-ready project. We had a lot of discussion in the country when the President became President about the importance of finding shovel-ready projects. This is a project where people have had the shovels in hand for a long time. They have a product we need. We are their best trading partner. It is logical that they would want to sell it to us. It is equally logical that we should want to buy it from them. The State Department says over and over again—and this is the State Department where the Secretary of State was put in place by the President, who yesterday said he would veto this bill—the State Department says over and over again that there is no environmental impact we should be concerned about.

For people who say: Well, the Canadians should be concerned about the impact of taking that oil out of the ground, that is really going to happen. The oil sands are going to be heated up. The oil is coming out of the ground. It is going to be sold to somebody. The question is, Do we take advantage of that logical opportunity or do we give that opportunity to somebody else?

When we get into this debate next week, somebody will say: Well, maybe there are 40,000 jobs to build the pipeline, but there are only three or four dozen jobs to run the pipeline. Well, of course—it is a pipeline. It is not complicated to do, but it is the logical and easiest way to move fuel that we need, oil that we need, oil that would become part of our commerce and other commerce.

But anybody who thinks that those are the only jobs that would be created when we grasp the idea of more American energy just isn't thinking about what this means to our economy. There are many jobs to be created. That is why this has become such an important issue and such an important vote—not just for the pipeline itself but for the message it sends to the American workforce, the message it sends to people who are thinking about making things in America, and the

message it sends about our future economy. This is one of many things that are just waiting for us to take advantage of them so that we can grow our economy in new and positive ways.

Among the things that will be said that I will disagree with on this in the next few days: Well, this is only 35 permanent jobs. Anybody who believes that embracing more American energy is only 35 American jobs is either kidding themselves or just trying to kid the American people.

We need to take advantage of this opportunity. There is no government funding involved. It is just government approval. This is a \$7 billion project, 42,000 jobs. The government just has to say yes.

Six years and several months ago—I think about 2 months ago now we passed the 6-year anniversary of the Canadians having the application and asking us to let them do this. Why do they even have to do that? Because they cross an international border. We build pipelines in the country all the time with very little Federal involvement.

This is revenue for the States, communities, and counties this pipeline goes through. There is a revenue stream there. You pay for the permanent ability to have that infrastructure available to you. It is a \$7 billion project, revenue for State and local government, but most importantly, it is a sign from the people of the United States of America through their government that we are going to take advantage of this great opportunity of more American energy that is in front of us.

Since he came to the Senate the same day I did 4 years ago, Senator HOEVEN has been a leading advocate as a North Dakotan. He understands what energy can do for the economy. He also understands the importance of being able to transport that energy product around in the right way. It frees train cars for manufactured goods, agriculture, and other things. It does so in the best way. Senator MANCHIN, joining with Senator HOEVEN as the principal sponsors of the bill, is a leader on these energy issues. He understands energy issues. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill. I believe there are 60 of us who have cosponsored the bill—clearly enough to send the bill to the President's desk. It would be nice if the President would look at the opportunity and decide to sign this bill.

This is an important part of the future of the country. It is time for the Senate, the Congress, and the Government of the United States to wrap its arms around what this means to the people of the United States. It means good jobs. It means a different future than if we don't have it.

One other topic I wish to mention while on the floor is—speaking of good jobs—jobs for veterans. A bill I filed in

the last Congress in the Senate has passed the House again last night, the Hire More Heroes Act. I hope we can get to it quickly. Last year it passed in the House 406 to 1, but the Senate wouldn't take up the bill that passed the House 406 to 1.

How do we hire more heroes under this act? We give people who already have veterans health benefits—TRICARE or other VA benefits—a little bit of an exception as an employee. Employers don't have to count them toward the 50 employees that trigger a law that many employers are trying to avoid being affected by, the so-called Affordable Care Act.

We have a chance to go to those who served us and say: Look, we are going to create one additional opportunity. We are not going to count the fact that you already have health care against you; we are actually going to let it work in favor of your opportunity to get a job and to move forward with that job.

Whether it is more American energy or hiring our heroes for jobs they need to have—the veteran unemployment numbers are unacceptable. Veterans who have served since 9/11 at one time last year had an unemployment rate right at the 9 percent number. Any number is unacceptable. We need to take those veterans' skills and put them to work. I hope we do that by quickly following our colleagues on the other side of the building—who now have passed this bill twice—and getting this bill on the President's desk as well.

Hiring our heroes, creating jobs, looking at more American energy—I am hopeful these are the kinds of things this Congress will quickly send a message to the President and the country—these are the kinds of things we want to see happen for more opportunity for young Americans and for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I share the view of my colleague from Missouri about the importance of the Keystone Pipeline. We will have an opportunity over the next several days to talk more extensively about that and the importance it has to our economy and to energy security. Obviously it is something that we think is about jobs and the economy, which is why there is so much support for it in the Senate among Republicans in the Senate, and I would argue—I think there will be a lot of Democrats as well.

Yesterday Republicans assumed the majority in the Senate thanks to the overwhelming support of the American people, and we are ready to roll up our sleeves and go to work.

This week President Obama is going to be traveling around the country at-

tempting to take credit for the recent shred of economic good news we have finally seen after 6 years of economic stagnation under the President's policies. Unfortunately, all of the campaign-style tours in the world cannot disguise the fact that our economy is nowhere near where it should be. More than 5 years after the recession supposedly ended, Americans are still feeling the pinch. Wages are stagnant. Household income has declined by almost \$3,000 on the President's watch. The price of everything from health care to education has risen. And the President's policies have done nothing to help. In fact, the President's policies have actually made things worse. Whether it is the taxes in the President's health care law or the energy tax proposed by the President's out-of-control EPA, the President's policies have done nothing to help the economy.

But there is reason for Americans to be hopeful. Poll after poll has demonstrated that the American people are concerned about jobs and the economy, and in the new Congress Republicans are going to make jobs and the economy our priorities. We are committed to passing legislation that would help create jobs, grow the economy, and expand opportunities for struggling middle-class families, and we plan to get started right away.

This week the senior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. HOEVEN, reintroduced legislation to approve the job-creating Keystone XL Pipeline. According to the President's own State Department, this commonsense project would support more than 42,000 jobs. It would also substantially increase revenue to State and local governments, providing increased funding for local priorities such as schools, roads, and bridges.

I can speak firsthand to that because it would cross my home county, Jones County, in South Dakota. I can say the people in my home county see the opportunity to generate revenues that would help support the local school district in an area of the State which is losing population and having a harder and harder time keeping the school open.

The pipeline has bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress, and I am hopeful that the President will drop his inexplicable opposition and finally sign off on this job-creating project.

Republicans also plan to take up the other job-creating measures that spent far too long languishing in the Democratic-led Senate. The Obamacare tax on lifesaving devices, such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, has already had a negative impact on jobs and the medical device industry. At a time when our economy is still suffering from years of stagnation, repealing this tax is a no-brainer. I am confident we will have bipartisan support for this

repeal, and I hope—I hope—the President will sign it.

Republicans also plan to repeal the Obamacare provision that changed the definition of full-time work from 40 hours per week to 30 hours per week. This provision is forcing businesses to reduce employees' hours and wages and hire part-time rather than full-time workers in order to comply with the Obamacare requirements. Millions of Americans who want full-time work are currently stuck in part-time jobs because they can't find anything else. The last thing the government should be doing is making it more difficult for employers to offer full-time positions.

Another Obamacare position that is making it difficult for employers to hire is the employer mandate. Later today I will introduce a bill called the HIRE Act, which would make it easier for employers to hire new workers by exempting Americans who have been unemployed for more than 27 weeks from counting as employees for whom a tax penalty must be paid by the employer under Obamacare's employer mandate.

In addition to passing job-creating legislation, the new Republican majority is committed to increasing congressional oversight. Executive branch agencies have been out of control under the Obama administration. The President's EPA alone has proposed billions of dollars' worth of regulations that will have a catastrophic effect on our economy and eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, if not hundreds of thousands of jobs. Just one of these regulations—the backdoor national energy tax on coal-fired powerplants—would cause Americans' energy prices to soar and destroy families' livelihoods.

In my State of South Dakota, household energy prices could increase by as much as 90 percent. South Dakotans with incomes below \$50,000 a year already spend one-fifth—one-fifth—of their aftertax income on residential and transportation energy costs, which is twice the national average, I might add. They can't afford a 90-percent increase in their costs.

What is more, this national energy tax will have almost no effect on our air quality. It would devastate communities and drive up energy bills in this country for nothing.

The EPA is far from the only Federal agency to have abused its power under the Obama administration. Take the Obama IRS, for example, which targeted organizations for extra scrutiny based on their members' political beliefs. It is past time for Congress to assert its oversight authority and check the executive branch's overreach.

While Republicans want to work with Democrats as much as possible, we will not hesitate to draw a bright line between Democratic and Republican priorities.

Republicans want to address some of the biggest challenges facing our economy, to put our Nation on the path to long-term prosperity. That means doing things such as reforming our Tax Code, which is inefficient and bloated, making it simpler and fairer for families and businesses in this country. It also means reforming our regulatory system to eliminate inefficient and ineffective regulations that are discouraging job growth.

The Democratic-led Senate was pretty dysfunctional. The minority party was largely shut out of the legislative process. Bills were frequently written behind closed doors. The committee process was largely defunct. Too often the Senate floor was a forum for partisan politicking rather than serious debate. What was the result? The voices of too many Americans got shut out of the process and the Senate accomplished next to nothing for the American people.

Republicans intend to change all of that. Under Republican control, the Senate will return to regular order. That means bills will once again be debated and amended in the open, in committee, before coming to the Senate floor. Once bills come to the floor, all Senators, regardless of party, will have the opportunity to offer amendments and to fully debate legislation before it comes to a vote.

The American people deserve a Senate that works and Republicans intend to give it to them. The American people have spent a long time struggling in the Obama economy, but they are about to get some relief. Republicans are determined to pass solutions that will help create jobs, grow our economy, and expand opportunities for American families. We hope—we hope—the Democrats in the Senate and the President will join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING OUR COUNTRY

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, as we begin this new session, I think it is important for us to remember why we are here and what our job is as Senators. What our job is, it seems to me, is to try to understand the needs of the American people, the problems facing our constituents, and propose real solutions to those problems. So before we get involved in all of the debates I know we are going to have, let me put on the floor what I believe—in hearing from the people of the State of Vermont—are some of the most important issues facing our country and the need for the Senate, the Congress, and the President to address those issues.

First and foremost, to my mind, is the state of American democracy. We are a democracy, and men and women

have fought and died to preserve American democracy, which means the people of America—not kings, not queens, not an aristocracy but the people of this country—regardless of where they come from or their economic status, have the right to participate in the political process, to elect their leaders and create the future they want for themselves and their kids.

What is the status of American democracy today? We just came out of a midterm election where Republicans did very well. But I think it is important to understand that in that election—that national election—63 percent of the American people didn't vote. Eighty percent of young people didn't vote. The overwhelming majority of low-income and working people didn't vote.

There are a million reasons an individual doesn't vote, but my guess is that for many people they look at the political process and they say: Yes, my family is hurting. I am working longer hours for lower wages. My job went to China. My kid can't afford to go to college. I can't afford health insurance. What are those people in Washington doing to protect my interest? Not much—not the Republicans, not the Democrats. I am hurting. What are they doing? People say: Hey, I don't want to participate in this process. It doesn't mean anything. I am not going to vote.

I think another aspect about why people don't vote is they turn on their TVs and they are bombarded with 30-second ugly television ads—often ads that come not even from the candidate but from people who do “independent expenditures.” As a result of the disastrous Supreme Court decision on Citizens United, billionaires, corporations are now allowed to spend unlimited sums of money in a political process. If somebody is a billionaire, they can now spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to destroy other candidates or to elect the candidates they want.

Is that truly what American democracy is supposed to be about? Do we believe that men and women fought and died for us so billionaires can elect candidates to protect the wealthy and the powerful?

I would say at the very top of the agenda for this Congress should be a movement to overturn, through a constitutional amendment, this disastrous Supreme Court ruling on Citizens United. In my view, we should move toward public funding of elections so all of our people, regardless of their economic status, can participate in the political process and run for office.

I think the next issue we have to take a very hard look at is the 40-year decline of the American middle class. I know some of my Republican friends talk about what has happened under the Obama administration, and they

are right in saying we are nowhere where we should be economically. No one debates that. But let us not forget where we were 6 years ago when George W. Bush left office. Everybody remembers where we were: 700,000 people a month—a month—were losing their jobs.

People say: Hey, we are growing 200,000 or 300,000 jobs a month now, not good enough. Right, it is not good enough, but growing 200,000 or 300,000 jobs a month is a heck of a lot better than losing 700,000 jobs a month.

Our financial system—the U.S. and the world's—was on the verge of financial collapse. That is where we were when Bush left office. Now Wall Street is doing very well.

In terms of our deficit, when Bush left office we had a \$1.4 trillion deficit. Now that deficit is somewhere around \$500 billion. Are we where we want to be? No. Are we better off than we were 6 years ago? Absolutely.

But when we look at the middle class today, we understand the problems are not just the last 6 years or the last 12 years. The problems are what has been going on over the last 40 years. The fact is, we have millions of working people who are earning, in real inflation-accounted dollars, substantially less than they were 40 years ago.

How does it happen, when we are seeing an explosion in technology, when worker productivity has gone up, that the median male worker—that male worker right in the middle of the economy—earns \$783 less last year than he made 41 years ago?

Look at why people are angry. That is why they are angry. In inflation-accounted-for dollars, the median male worker is making \$783 less last year than he made 41 years ago. The median woman worker made \$1,300 less last year than she made in 2007.

Since 1999, the median middle-class family has seen its income go down by almost \$5,000 after adjusting for inflation. So people all over this country look to Washington and they say: What is going on? You gave us this great global economy. You have all these great unfettered free-trade agreements. We have all this technology. Yes, I know the billionaires are getting richer, millionaires are getting richer, with 95 percent of all new income going to the top 1 percent. We have one family, the Walton family, now owning more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of Americans. Yes, the billionaires are doing great, but what is happening to me?

What is happening to the middle class? The answer is, for a variety of reasons, in the last 40 years the middle class has shrunk significantly. Today we have more people living in poverty than at almost any other time in American history, and we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth.

So what do we do? What do we do to rebuild the middle class? What do we do to create the millions of decent-paying jobs we need? Let me throw out a few suggestions that I hope in this session of Congress we will address.

For a start, everybody in America understands our infrastructure is collapsing—no great secret. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, nearly one-quarter of the Nation's 600,000 bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete, and more than 30 percent have exceeded their design life.

What that means is that all over this country bridges are being shut down because they are dangerous and they need repair, almost one third of America's roads are in poor or mediocre condition, and 42 percent of major urban highways are congested. As we speak, in cities all over America people are backed up in traffic jams, burning fuel and wasting time because we don't have proper infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers says we must invest \$1.7 trillion by 2020—5 years—just to get our Nation's roads, bridges, and transit to a state of good repair—more than four times the current rate of spending.

So what happens when we invest in infrastructure? I will introduce legislation to invest \$1 trillion in rebuilding our roads, bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, aquifers, older schools, and rail. When we do that, \$1 trillion in infrastructure investment not only makes our country more productive and efficient, but it also creates a substantial number of decent-paying jobs. A \$1 trillion investment would maintain and create 13 million decent-paying jobs. The fastest way to create good-paying jobs is to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. In my view, that should be a very, very high priority for this Congress.

The second issue I think we need to address—and I understand there are differences of opinion on this issue. I think when our kids and our grandchildren look back on this period and they look at an issue such as the Keystone Pipeline, they will be saying: What were you people thinking about? How could you go forward in terms of increasing the exploration and production of some of the dirtiest oil on this planet when virtually all of the scientists were telling us that we have to substantially reduce carbon emissions and not increase carbon emissions?

In my view, an important mission of this Congress is to listen to the science and the scientific community. They are telling us loudly and clearly that climate change is real, climate change is caused by human activity, climate change is already causing devastating problems in America and around the world in terms of drought, in terms of flooding, in terms of extreme weather disturbances, and we have to transform

our energy system away from fossil fuel and into energy efficiency, into weatherization, into wind, into solar, into geothermal, and into other sustainable energies. When we do that, we not only lead the world in reversing climate change, but we also create a significant number of jobs.

In this last election, interestingly enough in some of the most conservative States in America, voters voted to raise the minimum wage because they understand that a minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour—here in Washington, DC, the Federal minimum wage—is literally a starvation wage. No family, no individual can live on \$7.25 an hour. I applaud all those fast food workers all over this country—people who work at McDonald's and Burger King—for having the courage to go out on the streets and say: We have to raise the minimum wage. I applaud their courage in doing that, and I applaud the many States around this country, including the State of Vermont, who have raised the minimum wage. In my view, if someone works 40 hours a week, they should not be living in poverty. I hope that one of the major priorities in this Congress is to raise the minimum wage to a living wage. Over a period of years, I would raise that minimum wage to \$15 an hour.

It is also unacceptable that in America today women who do the same work as men earn 78 cents on the dollar compared to male workers. I think we have to address this discrimination, and we need to move forward with pay equity for women workers.

When we talk about the decline of the American middle class and the fact that millions of workers are working longer hours for lower wages, when we talk about the fact that in the last 14 or so years this country has lost 60,000 factories and millions of good-paying manufacturing jobs—when we put that issue on the table, we begin the discussion which is long, long overdue about our trade policies. That is what we have to talk about. The truth of the matter is that from Republican leadership in the White House to Democratic leadership in the White House, there has been support for a number of trade policies which, when looking at the cold facts, have failed. NAFTA has failed. CAFTA has failed. Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—PNTR—has failed. Over the last 30 years, Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents have continued to push unfettered free trade agreements which say to American workers: Guess what. You are now going to be competing against somebody in China who makes \$1.50 an hour. If you don't like it, we are going to move our plant to China.

And many companies have done exactly that. Do we think that is fair? Do we think that is right? I don't.

We are going to be coming up with the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade

agreement, TPP. Without going into great detail at this point, I have very, very serious problems with that agreement. In terms of the process, no Member of this Congress has been able to walk into the office where these documents—highly complicated legal documents—are held, bring staff in there, and copy the information. We are not allowed to do that, but we are supposed to vote on a fast-track agreement to give the President the authority to negotiate that agreement. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

So I hope we use the TPP as an opportunity to rethink our trade agreements. Trade is a good thing, but American workers should not suffer from unfettered free trade. Trade should be used to benefit the middle class and working families of this country and not just the multinational corporations.

We live in a highly competitive global economy. Everybody understands that. I think we also understand that our young people are not going to do well and our economy does not do well unless our people have the education they need to effectively compete in this global economy. It saddens me to note that a number of years ago the United States of America led the world in terms of the percentage of people who had college degrees. We were number one. Today we are number 12. The reason is that the cost of college has soared at the same time that the income of many middle-class and working-class people has declined. We are in a position now where hundreds of thousands of young people thinking about their future look at the cost of college, look at the debt they will incur when they leave college, and they are saying: I don't want to go to college. I am not going to go to college. I am not going to get post-high school education. That is a very bad thing for this country. It is a bad thing for our economy. We should put high up on the agenda the issue of how in America all of our people, regardless of the income of their families, can get the education they need without going deeply in debt. This issue of college indebtedness is a horror.

I remember a few months ago talking to a young woman in Burlington, VT, who left medical school \$300,000 in debt. Her crime was that she wanted to become a doctor and work with low-income people. She shouldn't be punished with a debt of \$300,000. Other people are graduating college \$50,000 in debt. And graduate school—we have attorneys in my office who have a debt of over \$100,000. We can do better than that as a nation.

Those are some of the issues. There are others out there. But I think what is most important is that we try to listen to where the American people are today—to the pain of a declining middle-class, to single moms desperately

struggling to raise their kids with dignity, to older people trying to retire with a shred of dignity.

On that issue, let me be very clear. If there is an attempt going to be made here in the Senate to cut Social Security or to cut Medicare, there will be at least one Senator fighting vigorously on that. Poverty among seniors is going up. Millions of seniors in this country are trying to make it on \$12,000, \$13,000, \$14,000 a year. The last thing we should be talking about is cutting Social Security. In fact, we should be talking about expanding Social Security.

There are a lot of issues out there. I hope we don't get lost in the weeds. I hope we focus on those issues that are major concerns to the American people. I hope very much that we have the courage to stand up to the very, very wealthy campaign contributors and their lobbyists who have enormous influence over what takes place here, and that we in fact represent the people who sent us here who are overwhelmingly middle-class and working-class people.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, under the direction of our new majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, we have been entrusted with a great opportunity to lead this new Congress—the 114th Congress—and it is a great honor. Maybe people assume that to be the case, but it is always a good idea to express it out loud and to say how grateful we are for the opportunity to be able to lead the 114th Congress and serve in the majority in the Senate.

It is also important to say we approach this opportunity with great humility—not just with humility but with also a determination and a commitment to address the top priorities of the American people. If there is one issue I heard about from my constituents in Texas during my reelection campaign, which concluded on November 4, it is: Why can't you guys and gals get things done? How come you can't address the problems that confront the American people? By and large, at the top of that list were jobs and stagnant wages, part-time work when people want to work full-time. They were kitchen table, bread-and-butter sorts of issues.

Now we have an opportunity starting this week to address one of those prior-

ities, which is creating jobs with the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The Keystone XL Pipeline is important for a lot of reasons, one of which is job creation. It obviously transports oil from Canada through the United States, bypassing the delivery of this oil in railcars, which has been the subject of some news reports when some of them have gone off-rail and created some accidents. The oil ends up in Southeast Texas, where we have a lot of refineries which create a lot of jobs but where that crude oil will then be refined into gasoline and jet fuel and other refined products.

This is also important because this is a supply of oil from a friendly neighbor, Canada—one of our closest allies—and reduces our dependence on oil from parts of the world that aren't quite as stable certainly as Canada is. So it is important from a jobs perspective. It is important from a geopolitical perspective and a national security perspective as well.

I went back and looked and noted that the President actually formed a Jobs Council during his first term in office. The job of the members of the council was to put their heads together and provide strategic advice on ways to boost the economy. This is the President's Jobs Council that he created during the first term of his Presidency. The group's main homework assignment was to produce this framework for job creation and enhance national competitiveness. In fact, they produced something entitled "Road Map to Renewal." I haven't Googled that or Binged it or put it in a search engine, but I bet if anybody who happens to be listening is interested, they could type that into a search engine on the Internet—the "Road Map to Renewal"—and find out all they want to know about it. It includes a number of specific and practical recommendations for action.

One of those recommendations to the President was to "optimize all of the nation's natural resources and construct pathways (pipelines, transmission and distribution) to deliver electricity and fuel."

That would seem to be right in the wheelhouse of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The report added that regulatory and "permitting obstacles that could threaten the development of some energy projects, negatively impact jobs and weaken our energy infrastructure need to be addressed." So the President's own Jobs Council recognized that the key to America's energy security is to focus on America's energy development, including the transmission lines and pipelines by which this natural resource is transported.

I know perhaps coming from an energy State such as Texas we are perhaps a lot more familiar with the pipelines and the oil and gas industry because it creates so many jobs and so

much prosperity in my State, but some people are a little apprehensive about the idea of a pipeline going under the ground. I invite them to again type into their favorite search engine on the Internet "oil and gas pipelines" and look at the map that pops up. It is astonishing how many existing pipelines exist in the United States today. I bet 98 percent of Americans don't even know they exist. Maybe that is too high; maybe it is 95 percent. So this is a safe and efficient and effective way of transporting these natural resources all around the United States. Obviously, if they are transported by pipeline, they don't have to be transported by railcar, including through some populated parts of our country, and subjected to some of the accidents we have read and heard so much about. These underground pipelines are a fairly common reality in our country, which leads me to be absolutely mystified at the resistance from some on the other side of the aisle and in the White House to doing what should be in our self-interests, which should be something that addresses one of the most important things the American people care about, which is jobs, and the other thing they care an awful lot about, which is security and reducing our dependence on imported energy from the Middle East.

That was 3 years ago last month that the President's Jobs Council made this recommendation. Then there is last month, when the President said this: "I'm being absolutely sincere when I say I want to work with this new Congress to get things done."

Hearing that was like music to my ears and I think to a lot of people, to have the President say he wants to work with the Congress, even though Republicans won the majority in the House and in the Senate. So imagine my confusion and the confusion on the part of so many Americans when yesterday the White House Press Secretary said the President would veto any legislative approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Think about the timing of that statement. We had an election on November 4, we had the new Congress sworn in yesterday, the President said a month ago he wanted to work with the Congress, and then the first day of the Congress, before the legislation was even filed much less voted out of committee and brought to the floor, the President said: If you pass that, I am going to veto it. I am probably not the only one who is confused by the contradiction.

We know this pipeline would produce thousands of well-paying jobs and would enhance the supply of energy from a close ally and neighbor, as I said earlier.

So the President issued a veto threat on the day the new Congress was sworn in, and it is clear to me that notwithstanding the President's previous

statements, he is either confused or he has changed his mind about cooperating with the Congress. I hope he meant what he said when he said he would work with us to try to address the concerns of middle-class families when it comes to jobs and help grow the economy and help America prosper. But I am here to say that Republicans who now have the honor and responsibility of serving as the majority in the Senate and in the House did listen. We heard the message delivered to us by the voters on November 4. We know they don't want more bickering. They don't want more dysfunction. The American people, including my constituents in Texas, want results. They want jobs. They want full-time, not just part-time work, and they want the security that would come with legislation such as this that we are considering today.

That is why this week our new majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, has decided we will take up this energy project as job No. 1. This is bipartisan legislation. I was watching TV this morning, I think with the Presiding Officer, and we were together and saw that Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia and Senator HOEVEN from North Dakota were appearing on a morning TV show talking about the importance of this legislation, and they estimate they have as many as 63 votes in the Senate, which by definition is a bipartisan majority, to pass this legislation.

This place can be pretty confusing at different times, and I am perplexed why the same President who said he wants to work with us is issuing premature veto threats, even though there is a bipartisan majority for this legislation.

Again, the President said he is for an "all of the above" approach to take care of our energy future. If that is true, then this should be a part of that approach. He has acknowledged the important connection between job growth and energy development. If there is a poster child for the role that the energy sector can play in growing the economy, it is my State. Texas is a State where we are quite familiar with the oil and gas industry. We are not just sold on oil and gas because we do produce the most electricity from wind turbine of anywhere in the country. We are truly an "all of the above" State. But after years of anemic economic growth and the lowest workforce participation in four decades, does the President of the United States think this is an inconsequential piece of legislation? Why does he not work with us as opposed to remaining an obstruction to real progress the American people are crying out for?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this is my first "Time to Wake Up" speech in the Senate as a Member of the minority. Being in the minority will give me the opportunity, for the first time, to use the tools uniquely available to Members of the Senate minority. On the issue of climate change, which is affecting all of our States but particularly Rhode Island, I intend to use those tools politely and persistently.

We have just left a period of partisanship and obstruction by the minority unique in the Senate's history. I do not intend to return us to those days. My intent is to enliven the Senate and see to it that it does its duty, that we as Senators do our duty to our fellow Americans. My intent is not to blockade and degrade this great institution with obstruction for the sake of obstruction. My goal, in short, is Senate action, not Senate inaction.

Pope Francis recently spoke to the world about mankind's care of God's creation. He warned us against what he called negligence and inaction. I hope to be a constant spur in the Senate against negligence and inaction, specifically the negligence and inaction that is our present Senate standard of care for God's Earth.

I know that powerful forces of negligence and inaction are arrayed against us. I know the Supreme Court's reckless and shameful decision in the Citizens United case has empowered those forces as never before. I know there has resulted an unprecedented campaign by polluting interests of political spending and threats. It is plain to see that the polluters' campaign has, for now at least, silenced meaningful bipartisan debate about carbon pollution. We can line up the Citizens United decision and the silence almost exactly. Coal and oil interests are enjoying massive economic subsidies—massive subsidies—and similar to any special interest, they will fight to protect those special benefits. But it can't last. It can't last. My confidence is strong because our American democracy is ultimately founded in the will of the American people, and the American people understand the need to end our days of negligence and inaction. They want us to run the blockade that polluters have built around Congress.

Polling shows this. More than 80 percent of Americans say they see climate change happening right around them. Sixty-three percent say they would pay more for electricity if it would help solve this problem. Among Independents, that is 64 percent.

Even among young Republicans, voters get it—young voters, anyway. Under the age of 35, most Republican voters, according to polls, think that climate denial is ignorant, out of touch or crazy. Those are the words from the poll. Under 50 years of age, a majority

of Republicans and Republican-leaning Independents support action against climate change. Among all Republicans of all ages, fully half support restrictions on carbon dioxide, and nearly half think the United States should lead the fight.

Trusted American institutions get it, too—from the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our military services to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, from all of America's major scientific societies to the experts we trust day in and day out at NOAA and at NASA, and from the leaders of America's corporate community—Walmart and Target, Apple and Google, Ford and GM, Mars and Nestle USA, Alcoa and Starbucks, Coke and Pepsi. From all of them and from many other respected voices comes the message that climate change is a serious threat. I have confidence that Congress will soon have to heed their voices.

We might mention the recent agreement in Lima where 194 countries all agreed to carbon reductions. Does the Republican Party in the United States of America really want to be aligned with Vladimir Putin, the great international climate denier?

My confidence also comes from necessity. This simply must be done. Our human species developed on this earth in a climate window that has always been between 170 and 300 parts per million of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere—always. For as long as human kind has been here on Earth, carbon concentration has wobbled up and down but always within that range—through our entire history. We have now rocketed outside that range and broken 400 parts per million, a condition on Earth that is a first in millions of years.

Our oceans, as a result, are acidifying measurably at a rate unprecedented in the life of our species. One has to go back into distant geologic time to find anything similar. If you go back that far and look at what the geologic record tells us about what life was like on the planet in those primal eras, it presents a daunting prospect.

The scientific warnings about what this means are now starting to be matched in our experience with unprecedented rain bursts and droughts, wildfires and heat seasons, sea levels and ocean temperatures. In the tropic seas, coral reefs are dying off at startling rates; in the Arctic seas, sea ice is vanishing at levels never recorded until now. Everywhere the oceans shout a warning to those who will listen. Rhode Island, as a coastal State, as the Ocean State, is particularly hard hit. We get the land problems such as the rain bursts heavily associated with climate change, which in 2010 brought unprecedented flooding along our historic rivers. We have the sea level rise. It is expected now to be several feet by the end of the century—by a warming sea that has also disturbed our fisheries

and distressed our fishing economy. "It is not my grandfather's ocean out there," as one commercial fisherman told me.

This only goes one way. There is no theory of how this magically gets better on its own. Every theory—and now most observations—all point to all this getting worse and perhaps very badly worse. The time for negligence and inaction has passed.

In the Senate we need to begin a conversation about this. We have to begin at the beginning. We have to agree on a baseline of facts, principles, and laws of nature that can then inform our judgments about what to do. I do not think it is asking too much of the new majority in the Senate to begin an honest conversation about carbon dioxide and climate change. I don't think that it is too much to ask the new majority in the Senate that we undertake this conversation in a serious and responsible manner. I do not think that is extreme or unreasonable. We need to begin at the beginning in this conversation, and I will make every effort to see to it that we begin. But even as we begin, we can keep the end in sight. That end is a world where polluters pay the costs of their pollution. That in turn creates a world where market forces work properly in our energy markets. The end is a world where it is America that seizes the economic promise of these new energy technologies, where we are builders—not buyers—of the energy devices of the future. The end is a world that turns back from the brink of a plainly foreseeable risk where the consequences of negligence and inaction could well be dire for us and for the generations that follow us.

In sum, we in this Senate have a duty before us, and negligence and inaction will not meet what that duty demands. For those of you with a coal economy or an oil economy in your States, I understand and I want to work with you. There are answers to be found. But please, do not pretend that this problem doesn't exist. That is false and unacceptable.

I must, on behalf of my State and on behalf of our future, insist that we in the Senate meet our duty, even under this new Senate majority—and I will.

I yield the floor, and I thank the Presiding Officer for his patience.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:25 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:15 p.m. will be controlled by Senator HOEVEN or his designee.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to engage in a colloquy until 3:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, along with Senator JOE MANCHIN—and actually a total of 60 sponsors—I have filed S. 1, which is the Keystone approval bill. It is a very simple, straightforward bill. This is legislation we have seen before in this body. What it does, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, is authorize Congress to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

I have this map in the Chamber to show you the project. It runs from Hardisty in Alberta, Canada, all the way down to our refineries in Texas along the gulf coast.

This project will move 830,000 barrels of oil a day. Some of that will be oil from Canada. Some of that will be domestic oil from the Bakken region in Montana and North Dakota.

This is part of building the infrastructure so we can build a comprehensive energy plan for our country. We are producing more and more oil and gas in our country from shale from places such as the Bakken in North Dakota and Montana, the Eagle Ford in Texas, natural gas from places such as the Barnett and the Marcellus in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

What we are working toward is—some people refer to it as energy independence, but really energy security for our country.

What does that mean? It means we produce more energy than we consume. Obviously, energy has a global market. The market for energy is a global market. We know that. The market for oil and gas is a global market.

But the point is, working together with our closest friend and ally, Canada, we can have North American energy security where we produce more energy than we consume.

Why is that important? That is important because it is about creating jobs. It is important because it is about economic growth. It is important because it is a national security issue.

Why do we continue to rely on oil from the Middle East? Why are we continuing to send dollars to the Middle East where you have—look at what happened in Paris today with an attack by Islamic extremists. One of the ways we fight back, one of the ways we push back is we take control of our own energy destiny. We can do it. We are doing it. Why are gas prices lower today at the pump? Is it because OPEC decided to give us a Christmas present? I do not think so. It is because we are producing far more energy than we ever have before. But to continue to

produce that energy, we have to have the infrastructure to move that energy from where it is produced to where it is consumed. That means pipelines. That means roads. That means rail. For electricity, that means transmission. But we cannot have an energy plan for this country that really works without the infrastructure to move that energy safely and effectively. That is what this project is all about.

So why are we here talking about it today? It seems like a pretty straightforward proposition. After all, I think there are something like 19 different pipelines that cross the border. In fact, there are millions of miles of pipelines in this country. Here is a map I have in the Chamber of just some of them. We have millions of miles of pipeline in this country. A lot of them, as you can see, cross the border.

So why are we standing here today talking about another pipeline project? Because for the past 6 years—for the past 6 years—the administration has held this project up. They keep saying: There is a process. As a matter of fact, Josh Earnest, just yesterday, said: Oh, we have a process. Congress should not intervene in the Keystone XL Pipeline approval issue because there is a process. Really, Mr. President, there is a process? Let's see. The TransCanada company filed application to build the Keystone XL Pipeline in September of 2008—September 2008. If you do the math, that is more than 6 years ago. And there is a process somehow to get to a conclusion?

So that company, which has invested hundreds of millions already, wants to build, ultimately, an \$8.9 billion project that will move 830,000 barrels of oil a day. And here they are 6 years later still waiting for approval. That is why today we are asking Congress to step forward and do what the American people want.

Keystone is not a new issue. The American people understand this issue. Poll after poll shows the American people, by a margin of about 70 percent to 20-some percent, support this project. Whom do we work for? We work for the people of this great country, and 70 percent of the people of this great country say: Approve the project. After 6 long years, where all of the requirements have been met, approve the project.

But the President, of course, continues to hold it up, and even yesterday issued a veto threat. Why? Why is he wanting to threaten a veto on a project that 70 percent of the American people support? It is really hard to understand, isn't it? Because every time an objection comes up, we have worked to address that objection.

When there was an objection on the route, the company rerouted. So the President says: Well, it is an environmental concern. He says: Well, it is an environmental concern. Really? An environmental concern?

This is what his own study found. After 6 years of study, the State Department, in multiple environmental impact statements—three draft statements and two final environmental impact statements—this is what they found: no significant environmental impact, according to the U.S. State Department environmental impact statements.

That is not something I did. That is not something the company did. That is something the Obama administration did—repeatedly—and came to the same conclusion: no significant environmental impact. In fact, if you do not build the pipeline, you have to move that oil with 1,400 railcars a day.

Now, Canada is going to produce the energy. North Dakota, Montana, other States, are going to continue to produce the energy. So that energy is going to move. The question is, how and where? If we cannot build the pipeline, then it has to go by railcar. So do we really want 1,400 railcars a day moving that product around or do we want it to move more safely, more cost-effectively, with better environmental stewardship through a pipeline? Common sense.

Then there is this idea somehow: Well, Canada is not going to produce that oil if they do not have a pipeline. Wrong. They will move it by rail, and they will build other pipelines. Here are several that are already in the planning stages, as shown on this map. They will move it to the East Coast to refineries they have there or they will send it west and it will go to China.

Now, does that make sense? It does not make sense to the American public, which is why the American public wants to work with Canada as well as produce energy in our country to become energy secure. The idea that we would say no to our closest friend and ally, Canada: We are not going to work with you, we are going to continue to buy oil from the Middle East, and we are going to have you send your oil to China, makes no sense to the American people. And it should not. It should not. That is why they overwhelmingly support this project.

So here we are. We are starting the new Congress. I think, very clearly, in the last election, the people said: We support this project. You saw it time after time with candidate after candidate who supported this project who won their election. But on an even bigger issue, an even bigger message, the people of this great country said: We want the Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to get things done. We want the Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to get things done.

So here we have legislation that has passed the House repeatedly with a bipartisan majority. Here we have legislation that has bipartisan support in this body. Here we have legislation that the American people overwhelm-

ingly support, after clearly giving the message in the last election that they want us working together to get work done, and the President issues a veto message right out of the gates. Why? For whom? Whom is he working for?

So it is incumbent upon us to work together in a bipartisan way to get this legislation passed. The way we are approaching it—and I see my good friend and colleague from the great State of West Virginia is here. I want to thank him and turn to him, but I want to do it in the form of a question.

It was my very clear sense from the last election—and I think the very clear sense that we all got from the last election—that they want to see Congress working together in a bipartisan way, in an open process to get the important work of this country done.

So with this legislation, it is not just that it is about important energy infrastructure. It is also that we want to return to regular order in this body, offer an open amendment process, allow people to bring forward their amendments, offer those amendments, debate them, and get a vote on those amendments. If they have amendments that can add to and improve this legislation, great, let's have that process. Let's have that debate. Let's have those votes. Let's make this bill as good as we can possibly make it. Then the President needs to work with us. The President needs to meet us halfway and get this done for the American people.

So I would like to turn to my good colleague from the great State of West Virginia and say: Aren't we doing all we can here to try to make sure we are approaching this in a bipartisan way with an open, transparent process to try to build support for this legislation?

Mr. MANCHIN. I say to the Senator, he is absolutely correct. I thank him for this opportunity not only to work with him but also to bring the facts forward.

We have heard many times: We are all entitled to our own opinions, we are just not entitled to our own facts. If you start looking at what we are consuming today in America, at last count 7 million barrels of crude oil is purchased every day in America from other countries—7 million barrels of crude a day. So this line would possibly furnish 830,000 barrels of that dependency that we have.

Let's look and see where it comes from right now. Mr. President, 2.5 million barrels we are already purchasing from Canada—our best, greatest ally we could possibly have; the best trading partner and the No. 1 trading partner that 35 of the 50 States have. So it is not an unknown there.

But let's look at where we are purchasing some of the rest of the oil from. We purchase 755,000 barrels of heavy crude a day from Venezuela.

Let's look at Venezuela, where it is an authoritarian regime. It impoverishes its citizens. It violates their human rights. It shows its willingness to put down political protests with horrific violence.

We also purchase 1.3 million barrels a day from Saudi Arabia. We all have our concerns about Saudi Arabia and a lot of the money we follow goes into the wrong hands. Forty-two thousand barrels a day from Russia—from Russia. We know their intent and what they have been doing with their energy policy. Their regime has invaded its neighbors and they armed pro-Russian separatists in Ukraine.

So when we start looking at what we are doing, those are the facts. This is not just hearsay. It is not just rumors. These are facts. We purchase 7 million barrels. When I first was approached on this 4 years ago when I came to the Senate, they said: What do you think about the Keystone Pipeline that will be bringing oil from Canada into America?

I said: Where I come from in West Virginia it is pretty common sense. We would rather buy from our friends than our enemies. I would rather support my friends, my allies, my trading partners more so than I would the enemies who use anything I buy from them—the money they receive from that product that I buy from them and use it against me.

It is pretty common sense, not real complicated. I know everybody is trying to make this complicated. Also, they talk about—we just had a caucus talking about what would happen to the oil. I know the Senator has been watching this very closely. But they said the Keystone Pipeline will strictly be just an avenue and a vehicle for exporting this oil out. They are just going to use America to bring that oil through.

We checked into that a little bit further. That is not true. Even the Washington Post gave it three Pinocchios that said it was untrue. We found out, basically, the crude oil from Canada is expected to be mixed with the domestic oil from the Bakken, from the Senator's region, North Dakota, and that the Canadian oil is a heavier crude, similar to Venezuelan oil. It will be mixed with the light crude from the Bakken, which enables it to flow much easier and be produced. Once it commingles, this oil is basically American oil. It lives and dies and basically is marketed with the policies of the United States of America. Our policy is not to export crude oil.

So I do not know why people are using this argument and scaring people that we will get no benefit. Then we talked about the jobs. They said there is not that many jobs. In West Virginia, you give us 42,000 jobs. We would be very appreciative. We will thank you. These are all high-paying jobs.

They said: Well, they are only contract jobs.

But yet I hear everybody talking, Republicans and Democrats, about building roads and building bridges. Those are also seasonal types of jobs. Those are also contracting jobs. They are not permanent jobs, but we are tickled to death to get them. That is the whole trade union. All the unions that I know of are supportive of this piece of legislation. Every working man and woman whom we keep talking about who supports themselves and their family supports this legislation.

Why we are running into such a roadblock I have no idea. Then when we put the map up—the other map we had, I said: When I first heard about this pipeline, I thought it was an anomaly that we did not have many pipelines in America. Then we put up this map. This is what we have in America today. So this is not foreign to any of us in any State we have pipelines, many in West Virginia and all through this country.

Then we look at public support. We think: Here we are Democrats and Republicans. We look at the polls, and we live and die by the polls, they tell us, or we should. But the bottom line is that if we do believe in the polls, this has been a consistent poll. It has not varied for over 5 years. We have not seen the numbers fluctuate that much.

Overwhelmingly, we have Americans in all aspects of the political realm—whether you are a Democrat, Republican or an Independent—who overwhelmingly support this pipeline. So I cannot see the objections to it. I was very disappointed when the President said he would veto it—or the White House once we said we would go through this process.

I think the Senator and I talked about this. We thought this is going to be an open process. I was encouraged by my colleagues on the Democratic side who have some good amendments, I believe, that should be considered and I believe would pass and enhance the bill. We only need four more—four more Senators on my side of the aisle who can see the benefit of a good bill, a good process with good amendments to strengthen this bill, to put us in a position that is veto-proof.

That should be our goal. Basically, we should not be deterred by the White House or the President saying already that they are going to veto this bill. Let's see if we can make this bill so good that when we are finished with this product and this process 2 or 3 weeks from now, we will have a product that basically we are all proud of, that the American people are proud of and will support, and maybe, just maybe, the White House will change its mind.

I am hopeful for that. I appreciate all the effort and work. We are working very well together. At last count, we

had nine Democrats working with our Republican colleagues. That puts us at 63. I am hopeful to get four more at least that will look at the virtues of this and the assets and what it will do for our country.

My main goal is this: Energy independence makes a secured and protected Nation. Anytime we do not have to depend on oil coming from other parts of the world—and the resources we give them when we purchase their product, they use those resources against us time after time again. We can see now, with the oil prices dipping, the benefits the consumers in America receive, the strength that gives our country.

I am so thankful for that, that we are getting a break. I think we can continue to make that happen for many years to come if we are able to be smart strategically in what we do today. I think the Senator spoke about the environment. He might want to touch on that again. But most of this oil is being produced now, some way or another, and it is also getting transported in different ways and means.

The bottom line is there is no significant environmental impact. I think the State Department has even done five studies that show that to be true. I said also 2.5 million barrels a day are being purchased from Canada today. Refineries in Illinois are now refining this product. They said we should not do it. We have been doing it for quite some time. We are using this product. With technology we are using it better. It has helped us be more independent of foreign oil.

That is No. 1, the security of our Nation. Being an American, and for West Virginians, the security of our Nation is first and foremost what we support. That is why I think we see a tremendous amount of people from the Mountain State, I say to the Senator, who support this piece of legislation.

We are going to work diligently. We have a long way to go, but I think the facts are on our side. We are all entitled to our opinions, but we cannot change the facts.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from West Virginia not only for his support on this project but for his willingness to work hard, to work together to find bipartisan solutions, whether it is this legislation or other legislation. That is what it is incumbent upon us to do. It is not easy, but we have to be willing to engage in the hard work it takes to get to this legislation, to get these solutions in place for the American people.

I again thank the Senator for his leadership. I look forward to continuing to work with the Senator and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come to good solutions. That is what this effort is all about.

I want to turn to the Senator from the State of Montana. The pipeline

project goes right through his State. Here is somebody who has dealt with the issue on the House side of Congress and who has the project in his home State. So he is talking on behalf of people where the pipeline is right there.

I would like to turn to him and ask: What are the people in Montana saying? It is fine for somebody far removed from a project to say I am OK or I am not OK with it, but how about the people who are right there on the site? They are directly affected. Tell us what is the sense in the Senator's home State? What is the Senator hearing when he talks to people?

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I applaud, first of all, the Senator from North Dakota for his leadership on this most important issue and his commitment to making it a priority for this Senate, the first bill introduced into this Senate. I also applaud the Senator from West Virginia; one example of, as we sit in this Chamber today, Republicans and Democrats discussing and supporting the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I reiterate many of the comments expressed by my colleagues and convey the importance of this pipeline, because as the Senator from North Dakota mentioned and showed on his map, the very first State the Keystone Pipeline enters as it comes from Canada is the State of Montana. Let me tell you something. It is not just a pipeline. This is also changing the way of life and economic stimulus for our great State.

I spend a lot of time traveling around the State in my pickup. As I drive around Eastern Montana, where the Keystone Pipeline will travel, I recognize this is a lifeline for many of our rural communities. In fact, Circle, MT—Circle, MT, is a small town of around 600 people. It is located in McCone County. It is one of six Montana counties that the Keystone XL Pipeline will run through. Circle, similar to a lot of small communities in Montana, has experienced the same economic and population declines that other towns have faced in recent years.

In fact, the county has significant infrastructure needs that have gone unresolved in the wake of a shrinking tax base. For towns such as Circle, the Keystone XL Pipeline is not just about energy. It represents economic opportunity and hope for the future. You see, McCone County alone would see \$18 million in property tax revenue from the Keystone Pipeline construction. That is just in the pipeline's first year of operation. That is money for neighborhoods. It is money for roads, not to mention the influx of jobs for the area.

Another \$45 million would be distributed among five other Montana counties, and \$16 million would go to Montana's schools and university systems. You see, the Keystone XL Pipeline means lower energy costs for Montana families, for our senior citizens, and for small businesses.

In Glasgow, MT—I remember traveling in my pickup into Glasgow. I met with the NorVal Electric Co-op. They told me that if the Keystone Pipeline is approved, they will hold electric rates flat for their customers for the next 10 years. That is several thousand Montana families up in the northeast part of our State.

The reason for that is because they will supply electricity to these pump stations on the Keystone Pipeline. If the Keystone Pipeline is not approved, those ratepayers will see an approximate 40-percent increase in their utility rates over the next 10 years. That is a potential increase of \$480 per year for the average household in Montana.

As the Senator from North Dakota mentioned, 100,000 barrels a day of the oil traveling through the Keystone Pipeline will be Montana and North Dakota oil. That supports the Bakken formation. With the revolution of hydraulic fracturing, what it is creating now is lower gas prices at the pump today.

Montanans know this pipeline is not just a lofty idea or some kind of DC-based rhetoric. It is hope for the people of my State. It is a tangible result and a solution that Montanans deserve. I have to tell you, that is why it is so disappointing that once again we are seeing the President and some Senate Democrats playing political games and perpetuating the 6 years of gridlock that have held back this job-creating project.

Rather than putting the American people first, the President has threatened to refuse the people of Montana their right to determine their economic future. It took the Canadians just 7 months to approve their end of the Keystone Pipeline. It has taken this President more than 6 years. That is 6 years without the hundreds of good-paying jobs that will be created in Montana and thousands more across the Nation.

That is 6 years without millions of dollars in critical revenue for Montana schools, for infrastructure, for teachers. That is 6 years without the answers and actions that Montanans deserve. I think the pipeline checks every box of common sense. It is environmentally sound, it creates jobs, it is economic opportunity, and it is going to help us move toward North American energy independence.

So the question is: Why are we still waiting? The people of Montana, the people of this country have said they have had enough. That is why we are here today speaking in support of this important project. I am proud the Senate is taking steps to move forward with the Keystone XL Pipeline. I know the House intends to do the same shortly. President Obama can continue to obstruct progress on American jobs and American energy independence, but the American people have sent a

strong message that they are ready to remove any roadblocks that President Obama intends to put in the way.

The time for partisanship, the time for political games is over. It is time the Congress and this government gets to work for the American people and starts getting results for this country. The polls are clear. Sixty-seven percent of the American people want the Keystone Pipeline approved.

Seventy-five percent of Montanans want the Keystone Pipeline approved. Prior to serving in Congress, I spent 28 years in the private sector, where we were focused on getting results in the real world. It seems only in DC are we outside of the real world of doing something and getting results on behalf of the American people. That starts with approving the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to thank the Senator from Montana again. We are hearing from somebody who is there, who is talking to people, where this project is going to be located, one of the States it would pass through. I thank the Senator for his perspective and for his hard work and commend him for being here and for his continued efforts not only to work with our caucus but to reach out to the Democratic caucus as well and find common ground on this important issue—something the Senator from West Virginia said a minute ago; that is, let's focus on the facts. I think the more understanding we create as to what the facts are, the more this gets done on the merits.

I turn to the Senator from Wyoming—somebody who has long experience with energy, somebody who comes from an energy State, a State that produces a variety of sources of energy, and pose the same question to him. In terms of focusing on the facts, whether it is the environmental aspect, whether it is the jobs, whether it is making our country energy secure, talk to us a little bit about the importance of this kind of vital infrastructure—projects such as Keystone—for our country.

Mr. BARRASSO. First let me thank and congratulate the Senator from North Dakota for his dogged determination in fighting for these American jobs and for energy security for our country. I am so grateful for his hard work. He has really been tenacious in this fight to get this bill past the Senate and to the President's desk.

I also congratulate my friend and colleague from Montana. Last fall the American people elected 12 new Republican Senators to work in this body, and he is one of them. I have had the opportunity to travel with him in Montana. He has a great background. He is innovative, and he is energetic. He is going to do a tremendous job not only for his State and the Rocky Mountain West but for the entire United States as a Member of the Senate. He just took his oath yesterday. We were able

to hear from him today, and he is going to be a remarkable addition to this body.

I know that all of these dozen new Republican Senators are as eager as the rest of us in the new Republican majority to start fulfilling our obligation to the people we represent. Americans elected a Republican Congress because they wanted a change. They wanted to change the direction that President Obama and Democrats have taken the country.

Under the Democratic leadership over the past several years, the Senate was a place of dysfunction and gridlock. More than 40 jobs bills passed by the House of Representatives in the last Congress never even came up for a vote in the Senate. Many of those bills had overwhelming bipartisan support, just like this one we are debating today. Those days are over. That is a completely unacceptable way to run the Senate.

All of us here in the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, have been given an opportunity to work together and to get things done. That is what the American people told us on election day, that is what they are expecting from us, and I believe that is what they are demanding of us.

The poster child for the gridlock and dysfunction of Washington has been the Keystone XL Pipeline. For more than 6 years it has been a symbol of out-of-control Washington bureaucracy. The State Department has absolutely refused to do its job and to make any kind of decision on the pipeline's application.

The Keystone XL Pipeline has also been a symbol of gridlock in the Senate. A small group of extreme environmentalists with deep pockets has bullied Democratic Members of the Senate to block a bill that would move this important jobs project further.

According to the latest figures, America's labor force participation rate is woefully low; it is just 62.8 percent. Are Democrats in this body satisfied with that number? Is the President of the United States, President Barack Obama, satisfied with this pathetic participation in America's labor force? I can say that people in my State, Republicans all across the country—they are not satisfied. That is why we are determined to push job-creating legislation such as this Hoeven bill to advance the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The President said there is no benefit to this important infrastructure project. During a press conference last month, President Obama actually claimed that the project is "not even going to be a nominal benefit to U.S. consumers." Apparently, that is what the President believes. Well, he is wrong. Just ask the Obama administration's own State Department. It says the pipeline would support more than 42,000 jobs. Some of those are construction jobs. Some of them are in the

transportation field and the manufacturing field. It includes jobs at warehouses, restaurants, and motels along the route. Does President Obama think that a good job is not even a "nominal benefit" to the Americans who could get those 42,000 jobs from this pipeline?

According to the Congressional Research Service, there are already 19 pipelines operating across U.S. borders. Why is this the one that suddenly offers not even a nominal benefit, according to President Obama? Why does President Obama refuse to make a decision about whether to approve the pipeline? Well, the President has taken a position on this bipartisan bill—according to the White House Press Secretary on Tuesday, the President will not sign this bill once Congress passes it.

The State Department has done one study after another showing that the pipeline would create jobs and that it would have no significant environmental impact. President Obama has been downplaying those benefits and threatening to veto the bill. That is not Presidential leadership.

Now Republicans are going to show the leadership that the American people have been asking for and that they voted for last November. We are going to bring a bill to the floor and force the President to finally do something by putting it on the President's desk.

Democrats have been playing politics with this pipeline bill. The Republican majority will now get it done. We are going to allow a vote on this project. We are going to allow Senators to offer amendments. What a unique situation in the Senate. We are going to let everyone say which side they are on. This will be a bellwether decision. Are Members of the Senate in favor of 42,000 jobs for American workers or are they in favor of more Washington delay? Democrats will have a chance to make their arguments. The extreme opponents of this project will make misleading claims to try to discount the pipeline's benefits, and they will try to stoke people's fears. We have seen it all before.

At the end of the day, here is what this all comes down to—four things:

No. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline will support more than 42,000 jobs in the United States.

No. 2, it will be a private investment of \$8 billion—not taxpayer spending, private spending.

No. 3, it will have minimal effect on the environment.

No. 4, the pipeline is actually safer than other methods of getting that oil to market.

Congress should approve this pipeline and pass this bill and the President should sign it.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is a job creator. It has bipartisan support. It has been stuck in Washington's bureaucratic gridlock.

It is interesting. When I listen to and think of the President and his comments about jobs and what the impact is going to be, it makes me think of what the president of the Laborers' International Union of North America said in the summer 1 year ago. He was scheduled to testify today at the Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearing—a hearing that now the minority, the Democratic acting leader, Senator DURBIN, objected to having yesterday. He objected to just a hearing and a discussion.

It is interesting. There was a press release from the president of the union, who was quoted on the subject of the economic benefits associated with the construction of the pipeline. Terry O'Sullivan said:

The President [President Obama] seems to dismiss the corresponding economic opportunities that would benefit other laborers, manufacturers, small businesses, and communities throughout Keystone's supply chain.

He said:

The Washington politics behind the delay of the Keystone XL pipeline are of little concern to those seeking the dignity of a good, high-paying job. We renew our call to the President [President Obama] to approve this important, job-creating project without delay.

This is what a job is. It is about someone's dignity, their identity, and their self-worth. People take a lot of personal pride in their work and in their job. I think we ought to approve it. I am ready to vote for it.

The American people have been clear: They are tired of Washington's gridlock and delay, and they are tired of the direction President Obama has been taking this country. The American voters demanded change, they demanded action, and this Republican Congress is going to deliver just that.

So I say to my friend and colleague from North Dakota—and I see that the chairman of the Senate energy committee has arrived—thank you both for your leadership. To the Senator from North Dakota, former Governor there, thank you for your leadership on energy in North Dakota. And to the senior Senator from Alaska, the chair of the energy committee, thank you specifically for your leadership. I look forward to working with both of you specifically on this project and on additional issues that will bring American energy security and jobs to our Nation.

Mr. HOEVEN, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comments today and for his continued hard work in support of the issue. I look forward to working with him again to get this done for the American people.

I turn to our leader on the energy committee, the chairman of the energy committee, the Senator from Alaska, who understands energy. She is from another State that produces a huge amount of energy for this country, wants to produce more, and can

produce more but only with the infrastructure to do it. Isn't that what we are talking about here today? This country can have more jobs, more economic growth, and more energy that we produce right here at home. But, Senator, don't we need the infrastructure to move that energy as safely and as cost-effectively as possible?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. To my friend and colleague from North Dakota, it is all about infrastructure.

In Alaska, my home State, we have boundless supplies of oil and natural gas, but until we were able to build that 800-mile pipeline across two mountain ranges to deliver oil from Alaska's North Slope to tidewater in Valdez, that oil didn't do anybody any good. Today, the oil pipeline in Alaska is less than half full.

So we are working to try to figure out how we can do more as a State to contribute more to our Nation's energy needs, to allow us as a State to be producing more for the benefit not only of our State but of the Nation as well, but we are held back by policies that limit us. So it is policies and it is infrastructure. It is absolutely infrastructure.

We are trying to move Alaska's natural gas to market as well. But, again, if we don't have the infrastructure, it sits. It stays. It doesn't benefit consumers, it doesn't create jobs, and it doesn't help any of us out.

So Keystone truly is about infrastructure. I thank my colleague from North Dakota for leading on this issue for years now and for reintroducing the legislation, S. 1, the first bill to be filed in the Senate this year. It will be among the first bills to pass in this new Congress and appropriately so. This is a measure that not only enjoys bipartisan support in the Senate, it enjoys broad support over in the House, and it enjoys support across our Nation for great reason. So why are we where we are? Why are we looking at this situation and saying there is so much frustration going on?

Senator MCCONNELL has promised to allow open and full debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline project, the legislation in front of us. I think we are looking forward to it. As the chairman of the energy committee, I am looking forward to robust debate on Keystone XL and what it will provide for this country in terms of jobs and in terms of opportunities.

We are all frustrated. We are all frustrated by a President's decision—or unwillingness, really, to make a decision about this pipeline. It has been 2,301 days and counting since the company seeking to build it submitted an application for this cross-border permit—2,301 days. That is more than 6 years ago.

Yesterday the President was finally able to make a decision. He issued his statement of administration policy. In

his statement he says that by advancing this measure, it would cut short consideration of important issues.

Excuse me, Mr. President—cut short a process that has been underway for over 6 years? That is amazing to me. Again, when we talk about decisions, let's get moving with this.

The President seems to be advancing some pretty interesting things when it comes to the energy discussion. He was quoted in an interview just this morning in the *Detroit News*. He basically told Americans that we are enjoying lower energy prices right now, but we had better enjoy them fast because they are not going to last.

He said we have to be smart about our energy policy. I am with you there, Mr. President. We do have to be smart about our energy policy. But to think the suggestion is just enjoy low prices while they last, take advantage of the sunshine—no. Mr. President, your energy policies need to make sense for today, for the midterm, and for the long term. For the long term and for the short term we need to make sure we have infrastructure that will allow us the energy supply that is so important to this country. It amazes me we would be so defeatist with this approach.

We have an opportunity in this Congress. We had an opportunity this morning in the energy committee. We had scheduled a hearing on the Keystone XL Pipeline. We were going to hear testimony on original legislation to approve Keystone XL as we did last year on a bipartisan basis. But as Members in the body know, there was objection to that unanimous consent. We had to postpone the hearing. I quite honestly was surprised. It would have been nice to know an objection was coming before we had organized the hearing, before we had invited witnesses, before we had completed all the preparation. We are going to do our best in our committee to adhere to regular order. I hope our colleagues will work with us.

I wish to introduce for the RECORD some of the testimony we received from the three witnesses who graciously agreed to participate in our hearing we had scheduled for this morning.

Andrew Black, president and CEO of the Association of Oil Pipe Lines, described pipeline safety issues and the gains Keystone XL would bring to the American economy in terms of jobs and payrolls. An excerpt from his testimony is as follows:

While there is much controversy associated with the Keystone XL Pipeline, the facts are that pipelines are the safest way to transport crude oil and other energy products. A barrel of crude oil has a better than 99.999 percent chance of reaching its destination safely by pipeline, safer than any competing transportation mode.

A second witness we had invited was David Mallino, legislative director of

the Laborers' International Union of North America. In his testimony he explored the positive jobs impact of the pipeline and responded to some environmental concerns. Here is an excerpt from Mr. Mallino's testimony:

Regardless of characterizations by the project's opponents, it is indisputable that jobs will be created and supported in the extraction and refining of the oil, as well as in the manufacturing and service sectors.

We also invited Greg Dotson, vice president for energy policy at the Center for American Progress. He submitted his testimony in opposition. We made sure we had opposition testimony presented as well. He discussed climate change. He responded to the arguments in favor of Keystone. While he may be an opponent of the pipeline and as usual would have been outnumbered by the supporters of the project, I will still reference his testimony for the RECORD.

A copy of the testimony of Mr. Black, Mr. Mallino, and Mr. Dotson may be found on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee Web site.

I do believe that had we been allowed to hold the hearing this morning, we would have heard very strong bipartisan statements in support of Keystone XL from many members of our committee. The majority of our committee supports this pipeline and is already cosponsoring this bill.

I will close my comments by assuring members of this body, we are in day 2 of this 114th Congress. This is not going to be our only debate on energy legislation over the years. I know it has been a long 7 years since we have had comprehensive energy legislation. A lot has changed. A lot of people have great ideas to improve and reform our policies, and I welcome those ideas. I am looking forward to the debate, to advancing these proposals through the energy committee. I think we can make significant progress on supply and infrastructure, on efficiency, on accountability. Those areas in particular should be the forum or the focus of an energy bill that we would hope to report out.

We are going to work hard on the energy committee. We are planning on legislating. Keystone XL is a natural point for this Congress because it has been delayed for so long, 2,301 days. It is clear this President is not going to make a decision on this, so the Congress needs to make it instead.

I look forward to coming back to the floor in a couple days when we have S. 1 officially in front of us. We are going to have good debate on it. I look forward to working with my colleague who has been so determined on this issue for so long. His leadership has been key in getting us here, but we need to finish it. We need to make the connects so we can move the resource and provide jobs for this country and for our allies and friends in Canada.

I again thank my friend and look forward to these next couple days and the next couple weeks where we will have an opportunity to put this before the American people on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for her leadership on the Energy Committee and also for her willingness to work in an open way on these important issues.

Across this body, on both sides of the aisle, there should be a deep appreciation for her willingness to bring these bills forward so we can debate them and we can offer amendments and we can build the kind of energy future for this country our people so very much want to have.

The Senator from Alaska is somebody who lives and breathes this topic when we talk energy—somebody who is truly committed to it but truly committed to an open dialogue on all types of energy, giving everybody an opportunity to weigh in and build the best energy plan for our country that we possibly can.

So I extend my thanks to her and also my appreciation, and likewise say I look forward to working with her on this issue and on so many important energy issues.

I wish to turn to my colleague from the State of North Dakota and ask her for her perspective on why this project is so important for our country and for the energy future of our country.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

I rise to join my colleagues on the other side who represent States that know a little bit about energy and certainly my colleague from North Dakota who has led this effort from the first day he arrived in the Senate.

It is no big surprise because we know we can have much oil out there and we can know where the reserves are, but if we don't have the infrastructure to move that oil to market, what it does is drive up prices. I haven't checked today, but oil price is below \$40 a barrel. If someone doesn't think that is supply-demand economics 101, they don't understand what is happening. The fact is we have known reserves in places such as North Dakota and Alaska, we have produceable reserves in Canada, and we have an opportunity to continue to develop these resources in a way that benefits in an incredible way American consumers.

Think about what is happening for the average American family today when they fill up at the pump, and think what that means and how that will ripple through our economy as discretionary income grows. But that is only possible when we have a known supply that is moveable, it is transportable, it is in fact capable of reaching its market or reaching the refinery. That is what we are talking about when we are talking about North American crude oil.

We are going to hear a lot of stories about this debate about how this crude oil is more dangerous to the environment, how it is different than Bakken crude. Guess what. It is different than Bakken crude, but it is not different than the crude refined in refineries in Texas, where we will be displacing crude that is refined from Venezuela, and we are going to be replacing it with crude that is produced by our friends to the north, Canada.

So infrastructure is a huge part. In fact, that is why, when Secretary Moniz declared the Quadrennial Energy Review, he looked at not just where is the supply and the future of supply of energy, he focused on transportation of energy because that is a huge part of our challenge.

As we look at the Keystone XL Pipeline—and we say Keystone XL because a lot of people don't know we already have a Keystone Pipeline. We already have a pipeline that is bringing oil sands from Canada into the United States for refining. A lot of people don't realize this is the second pipeline that will be named Keystone, and it is a pipeline that has been in process for literally a decade, from their planning process to the time they actually ask for a permit.

I am going to address some of the concerns of some of my colleagues as we hear them so we can kind of lay the groundwork.

We frequently hear the Keystone XL Pipeline will be exporting, and all of the oil that is coming down will find its way directly into China. That gets said all the time, and guess what the Washington Post gave it: three Pinocchios. It is not true.

It is going to get refined. It is going to get refined in the United States of America, it is going to displace Venezuelan crude, and it is going to find its way into the American markets and continue to provide that supply that is in fact today driving down costs. So let's get rid of the first argument that this is going to somehow not benefit American consumers, that this is going to somehow find its way onto a barge immediately upon arrival into the gulf. That is the first thing we need to be talking about, which is let's actually have a fact-based discussion about what this pipeline is.

The second argument we will hear is that this somehow will have a huge effect on climate and on climate change, and for those reasons alone it ought to be rejected. Let's take a look at what the experts who have repeatedly looked at this very issue—because one thing we know that I think is beyond dispute when we talk to the officials in Canada, is that we are going to produce oil sands oil from Canada, regardless of whether we build a pipeline. That oil is going to find its way into the transportation system and quite honestly is going to burden our rail transportation

system because we haven't figured out how to build a pipeline.

So all those who want to confuse the issue about the pipeline versus the development in Canada of the oil sands, let's separate it. Let's look at what in fact is the decision before the United States of America; that is, the decision of whether it is in our national interest to approve a permit for a pipeline.

I will say this over and over again as we pursue this debate: This is a pipeline and not a cause. So many people have talked about it, and I think in some ways this process has gotten exaggerated on both sides. I mean it is going to be a panacea and prevent all unemployment or it is going to be the worst thing—an Armageddon for the environment. And you know what, this is a pipeline. This is a transportation system. This is an essential part of the infrastructure to bring an important fossil fuel into our country so that it can be refined and utilized by the American people. And by the way, knowing those reserves are there, knowing that we have the reserves we have in the Bakken, and knowing that we are developing more untraditional sources of supply has driven the price down and has created the situation we have today that is saving consumers millions and billions of dollars in our country.

The second thing I want to say is people say we have to respect the process. I respect the process as part of what I have done my whole life—I am a lawyer. So you hear repeatedly about due process and having to go through due process. Occasionally, the process is broken—6 years to site a pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The time reserved for the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent to exceed for 5 minutes to wrap up the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Back to the process. When you look at 6 years, we fought World War II and defeated the greatest evil known to mankind, Adolf Hitler, in 4 years, and we cannot site a pipeline in 6 years. The process is broken.

The other issue that is raised is that the pipeline is somehow going to disrupt what is happening in Nebraska. I think the Senator from North Dakota was absolutely correct to put as part of this bill a provision in that says that all bets are off if Nebraska reverses the decisions that were made in Nebraska. But somehow that is getting forgotten in this debate.

So we are going to have a lot of hours of debate, I think, on Keystone XL Pipeline. We are going to have a lot of amendments.

I am grateful for the opportunity to go back to regular order. I am grateful for the opportunity to talk about

amendments. But I want so badly for us to have a reasoned and fact-based debate—not an emotional debate but a debate that basically puts this pipeline issue in perspective.

I want to congratulate my colleague from North Dakota for the success in raising this issue and bringing this issue to an early debate. I hope that we will be able to move this along and that we will be successful in getting enough people to provide the momentum to achieve ready approval.

Finally, I want to say why it is so important that we do it now. Those of us who live in the northern tier, we know what construction season is, and you cannot put pipeline in the ground in September and October—not without a lot of additional costs with which we have already burdened this pipeline. We need to get this decision done, get this going in the spring as early as possible so plans can be made and people can begin their construction season and we can begin to rationally address the infrastructure needs for development of our energy resources in North America.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to thank my colleague from North Dakota for speaking on the important points she made, and that is that the energy we are producing in this country is helping consumers at the pump by bringing down prices.

I want to turn to my colleague from Kansas who wants to close this colloquy and address the very point that we need this infrastructure to keep doing that, to benefit our consumers at the pump.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my colleague, Senator HOEVEN, for leading this colloquy and I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for her remarks.

In the Washington Times today, Jack Gerard, the President and CEO of the American Petroleum Institute said:

Falling oil prices have empowered the United States and weakened OPEC and Russia. The result is that increased U.S. production in North Dakota has “fundamentally re-ordered the world's energy markets.”

This is a national security issue. This is an issue where Russia—I think the break-even point for them is about \$110 a barrel. Right now it is at \$48. They never dreamed this would happen. Their entire economy is at stake, and hopefully it will cause Mr. Vladimir Putin to start thinking about some of his adventuresome antics around the world.

In addition, the pipeline represents not only everything that the distinguished Senator has brought out but it is a symbol that says that we are going to go ahead with all of our energy production. We are going to go “all of the above” here. This is not either-or with green projects or fossil fuels or whatever. So if you vote for the pipeline you

are voting for something that really affects our national security.

Think about potential exports to Europe. They could be less dependent on Russia and so Vladimir does not have his choke hold on them, if you will. There is a lot going on with regard to this issue that people haven't thought about.

Additionally, the President told us at a meeting with a group of Republicans 2 years ago—2 years ago—that he would make a decision between 2 and 3 months and that it was just a matter of tying down some legal matters. Now he says he is not for it and obviously he will never be for it. You can make whatever conclusion you want to make about that, but it is not a good conclusion. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Kansas, and with that we will wrap up the colloquy. I would like to thank my colleagues, and we will be back.

Again, we are looking to work with all of our colleagues here in an open process to offer amendments and pass legislation that is important for the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and with that I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the time until 4:15 p.m. will be controlled by the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. President. I take this time—and some of my colleagues will be joining me—to express concerns about the first major bill that has been brought to the floor under the Republican leadership dealing with the Keystone Pipeline.

I want to start first by talking about the so-called urgency for us to take this issue up and circumvent the normal process. The normal process would be for this matter to continue through the regulatory review, which is there to protect the public interest. To short-circuit that in an unprecedented way and for Congress to approve a site for a pipeline is not the way it is done.

In order to consider this there must be some urgency. First, let me just share with my colleagues what the American people are experiencing with the price of gasoline at the pump. It is at a historic low over the last 5 years, with \$2.19 the average price for gasoline at the pump. So there is certainly no urgency if we are talking about trying to get more oil in the pipelines for the cost of energy. By the way, I think we all understand that our actions here in this Congress will have very little to do with the availability of oil in the near term. It would take some time to construct the pipeline and for it to have an impact on the level of oil that is available.

The second issue that I find somewhat puzzling with regard to the urgency of this issue—and some of my

colleagues have pointed it out on both sides of this issue—is that there is already a pipeline that is available that could be used. Admittedly, it is not as efficient as what they are trying to do with the Keystone, and that is to make tar sand, the dirty oil we have, more economically available and feasible to be transported. That makes little sense under today's economics and the price of gasoline makes it even more hard to understand. Construction of this pipeline and the approval of this Congress will have very little to do with the consumer availability of energy here in the United States.

Now, compound the fact that we are talking about Canadian oil, the dirtiest oil—the tar sand oil—that is being transported through the United States because Canada doesn't want to transport it through their own country because of their concerns on the environmental side and which ends up in Texas at the Port Arthur, TX, refinery. Now for those who are not familiar, that is a foreign tax zone which is tax-free. So, therefore, the oil can go into the international marketplace in a very easy manner. Valero, which is one of the potential users—consumers of this oil—is building export facilities in order to handle more exports to the international communities. None of us can speak with any definitive judgment as to how much of this oil will in fact end up in the United States, but the fact that they are transporting it to a southern port—they are not transporting it to a refinery in the Midwest, which would be a lot closer and a lot cheaper—is a clear indication this oil will end up in the international marketplace and will have very little to do with energy security in the United States. I think we have to make that clear.

We are bypassing the normal process to allow Canadian oil to enter the international marketplace more efficiently with risk to the United States and very little benefit. Why are we doing this? We hear it will give us jobs. I am for job creation. I would like to see us work on a transportation bill where we could create millions of jobs in a far more harmonious way than we can with Keystone. I am for clean energy policies which will create great permanent jobs in the United States. But the job creation estimates for the Keystone Pipeline are that it will create literally a few thousand temporary construction jobs. They are not permanent jobs. There are only a handful of permanent jobs. So it isn't about creating jobs, and it is not about energy security in the United States.

What is this all about? There is very little benefit compared to the risk factors in the United States. Let me talk about the risk factors which give most of us concern. The environmental risk factors have us the most concerned. Tar sand is a multitype of product that

is literally mined and processed into a crude oil which is very thick and dirty. There are different ways to get to the tar sand, but one way to get to the tar sand is to take the topsoil off the property and mine it through a strip mining process. That has been done in Canada, and it is still being done in Canada, causing tremendous environmental damage. It is, in and of itself, a process that most of us would want to avoid. Yet this legislation does nothing to prevent that type of processing of the tar sands. Tar sands produce a very thick oil product that can only make its way through the pipeline by it being processed, and it creates additional risk factors because of the way it is processed.

There have been oil spills of the tar sands product. We have seen it in Arkansas and we have seen it in Michigan. It caused devastating damage. It is not easy to clean up. It is not like normal crude. It causes permanent-type damage to a community, as we saw most recently in Michigan. So there are risks associated with taking Canadian oil in an effort to make it easier to reach the international marketplace, unlikely to end up in the United States, creating few permanent jobs. Frankly, a lot of us don't quite understand this.

As I said, it is dirty. The use of this tar sands oil produces a much larger carbon footprint than other crude oil, causing additional problems in dealing with climate change. We have a serious issue with what is happening to our environment. I am proud to represent the State of Maryland. Most of the people in my State live in coastal areas. They know the consequences of global climate change. They understand it. They know what is happening along the coast, and they know we are at risk. They understand the fact that we have inhabitable islands in the Chesapeake Bay that have disappeared and are disappearing. They understand that our seafood crop, the blue crab, is threatened because the warming water affects the sea grass growth which is critically important for juvenile crabs to survive. They understand the risks and want us to be responsible in dealing with climate change. They also know that we are getting a lot more extreme weather in the east coast of the United States and throughout our country.

They know on the west coast. They are getting dry spells and wildfires. They understand the risks. They understand the cost to America of not dealing with climate change issues. The costs involve not only direct damage that is caused but also in the global consequences of climate change.

So we are worried about our carbon fingerprint. We are proud the United States is joining other countries in dealing with climate issues.

I applaud the work of President Obama, in the most recent international meetings, when he dealt with climate change issues. We need to do a better job.

Why are tar sands an issue? Because tar sands produce more carbon emissions than other types of oil. It is about 81 percent higher than the average use of crude oil and 17 percent higher than the well-to-wheels basis of producing oil. That is a concern. That translates into millions and millions of cars—the difference between that and having millions of cars on the roads. It is an important part of our leadership.

If we are trying to establish international credibility and then we facilitate more of this dirty tar sands oil, what message does that send? What type of cooperation should we expect to receive?

I am trying to figure out why this is the new priority of the leadership in the Senate. Why is this the very first bill to come to the floor of the Senate when, as I pointed out earlier, there seems to be no urgency. I have been told it has been delayed and delayed and delayed. The reason it was delayed is because the construction operating firm changed the routes of the pipeline. They had one route mapped out—and no alternative routes—but didn't check to make sure it didn't violate State laws. Now they are wondering why it is taking so long. It is taking so long because they had to change the route. It is not the governmental process that is slowing this down, it is the fact that the proposers of this route did not have their ducks lined up in a row before they submitted the route that could be approved. We are still not sure about that.

As I said earlier, for Congress to dictate where a pipeline should be is wrong. That is not our role. We should let the regulatory process, which is there to protect the public, go forward. It would also trample on States rights. There are some serious legal challenges pending in State courts as to the actions of a Governor dealing with a location issue. That should be resolved by the courts, and we are pretty close to having that ruling. It is very unclear to me what impact this legislation would have on States rights as it is currently being litigated in the State court. Why are we doing that?

The delays have been caused because of the way this pipeline was suggested. The regulatory process that would protect the public safety is moving forward. Considering oil and gasoline prices at the pump there is no urgency. There are serious environmental risk issues.

I understand the State Department report has been mentioned frequently. Look at the State Department report and look at what it is saying about the price for oil. The per barrel price of oil was a lot higher when they did that re-

port. Lower costs have a major impact on what we are talking about here.

I urge my colleagues to let the process go forward. I thank the President for spelling out his concerns and his desire to let the regulatory process reach its conclusion, let the State court decision go forward as to what the State believes is the right thing to be done here. I believe all of that will give us a much better process than us trying to substitute our judgment for what should be done through a regulatory process.

I am going to close by quoting from one of the individuals, Ben Gotschall, from Nebraska, who has been very active on this issue. He said:

The Cowboy Indian Alliance shows our co-operation and our working together in mutual respect. That shared bond proves that we pipeline fighters are not just a few angry landowners holding out, or environmentalists pushing a narrow agenda. We are people from all walks of life and include people who have been here the longest and know the land best.

I think that is pretty instructive. This is a broad coalition that is concerned about the actions that are being contemplated in the Senate—actions that would overrule landowner rights, actions that would take away State rights, actions that would shortcut regulatory process, actions that help private companies directly without taking into account the regulatory protections that are provided under law.

It seems rather unusual that this would be the very first issue where we could work together in a bipartisan way to expand opportunities for energy in the United States. Clean energy produces a lot more jobs, and we could be talking about incentives so we could have a larger production of clean energy in the United States. Democrats and Republicans would clearly work together to come up with ways we could have more efficient use of energy.

Democrats and Republicans could clearly work together in that regard. There are so many areas where we could work together and show the American people that we understand their frustration with Congress's failure to deal with many of the issues in the last Congress, but instead it looks as though we are picking an issue that is more about special interest than it is one that will help deal with an energy problem in the United States and has the potential to broaden our environmental challenges in the United States.

For all of those reasons, I hope my colleagues will reject this approach and let us go back and work together to find a common way to help us deal with our environment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I seek recognition to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the issue we are going to be debating over the next 2 weeks in the United States is really a story about two gasoline stations.

In July of 2008, the average price of gasoline in America was \$4.11 a gallon. In January of 2015 in the United States of America the price is \$2.21 a gallon. That is great for every driver across our country, and that is great for Americans who buy home heating oil. They are saving a lot of money this winter and the predictions are that it will continue throughout the rest of this year. That is great.

However, it is not great for the oil companies. It is not great for the Canadians. It is not great for Wall Street. They are not happy with this incredible benefit that is now flowing to Americans all across our country who now have a gasoline station that has \$2.21, on average, as to what people will pay.

What does the Keystone XL Pipeline truly stand for? It truly stands for the Keystone "export" pipeline. That is right. What the Canadians want to do is to basically construct a straw through the United States of America, bring that straw down to Port Arthur, TX, which is a tax-free export zone, and then export the oil out of the United States.

Why would they want to do that since they advertise that it is all about North American energy independence? There is a simple reason. The price of tar sands oil in Canada right now is getting \$13 less per barrel than it would get in the United States, but it is \$17 less than if they can get it into ships and send it around the world. That is the very simple economic strategy of the Canadians.

How do I know this? Because during a hearing in the House of Representatives I asked the head of the pipeline for TransCanada: Would you accept an amendment to keep all of the oil here in the United States of America? He said: No.

By the way, I asked the same question of the head of the American Petroleum Institute. He said: No.

There is a lot of false advertising going on here. On one hand they say this is great for American energy independence. On the other hand, when we say let's have an amendment on the floor of the Senate that will keep the Keystone oil here in the United States, they say: Oh, no. They are absolutely opposed to that.

Logically, we have to reach the conclusion that their goal is to get the extra \$17 per barrel which they will get if they can start selling it to China, Latin America, and other parts of the world. That is the plan. There are no two ways about it.

By the way, that should be their plan. That is what their responsibility

is—it is to the shareholders of their companies.

What is the strategy for the American driver? That is whom we have a responsibility to. We need to make sure they get the lowest possible price. My goodness. They have been tipped upside down and had their money shaken out of their pockets at gas stations all across our country for years, and finally the day of deliverance has arrived and they have \$2.21, on average, for the price of a gallon of gas, and now we are told the price of oil is too low. We have to get it back up again. Of course, the best way of accomplishing that is to start exporting oil because the less there is in North America, the higher the price will be for American drivers and for American home heating oil consumers. It is a very simple plan.

It is not about helping Americans at the pump. It is about pumping up the prices so oil companies will have new profits. It is very simple. If it is not that, then just accept an amendment that keeps all the oil here. It is a simple thing to do, and then the rhetoric matches with the reality of what is going to happen. The oil should stay here, but they will not accept that, and they have made that clear.

This is all part of a wish list we are going to see on the Senate floor for the rest of this year. This is the Big Oil wish list of 2015. We start with the Keystone “extra large export” Pipeline to take oil and send it out of the country. Then they want to lift the ban on the exportation of U.S. crude oil, which is now on the books—a ban on U.S. crude oil. This is Canadian oil. There are no laws against that. Then they want to begin exporting our natural gas, even as consumers and businesses and natural gas vehicle firms are enjoying record-low prices, which in turn is transforming the American manufacturing sector and our relationship with natural gas in America. They essentially want to declare war on the Environmental Protection Agency and their authority to protect Americans against pollution and to make sure the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive continue to rise and rise.

Honestly, if we want to tell OPEC we are serious and keep them awake at night, then we should keep the oil here so the prices will drop, and we also need to increase the fuel economy standards and consume and import less oil. But that is not going to be the agenda that comes out here on the Senate floor from the majority. It is going to be just the opposite. In a way, that is why this first debate is actually a preview of coming attractions of what will be happening out here on the floor of the Senate throughout the course of this entire year.

There is kind of a Keystone kabuki theater that is debuting this afternoon on the Senate floor. The reality is this

bill will never become law. The President is going to veto this bill. There are not enough votes to override the veto. So instead what we have is just a preview of this entire agenda, notwithstanding the fact that they are not going to be supporting a national renewable electricity standard or dramatically increasing the energy efficiency laws in our country or making sure the Canadians finally have to pay their taxes for the oil liability trust fund which they are now exempt from. American oil companies have to have a trust fund—in the event there is an oil spill in the pipeline—but the Canadians don't have to have a trust fund. Over 10 years, that is \$2 billion that American companies have to pay, which Canadians don't have to pay, to make sure that something is done to protect against oil spills.

Back when the Democrats took over the House and Senate in 2007, we worked together to put together a comprehensive energy bill. What was in it? Dramatically increasing the fuel economy standards of the vehicles in our country, having a new biofuels law to expand that production, and making sure that energy efficiency in America was enhanced dramatically. We worked on a bipartisan basis, and President Bush, a Republican, signed that bill because it was done in a bipartisan, “all of the above” approach.

That is not what this is all about. This is not “all of the above”; this is “oil above all.” That is the strategy the Keystone Pipeline embodies—shouts. It is not balanced. It is not where we should be as a country.

So I say let's have an amendment to the bill that keeps the oil here in the United States. Let's have this debate here on the floor. Let's match up the rhetoric of the oil stays here with protection of the American economy and the American driver within the reality that we voted for that to keep it here. Let's have that debate. I think it is important because otherwise the Canadians and the American Petroleum Institute will continue to engage in false advertising about where this oil is going to be used.

So from my perspective, this is the dirtiest oil in the world that is going to contribute mightily to an expansion of global warming. We know that 2014 was the warmest year ever recorded in history—notwithstanding the fact that it snowed here in Washington, DC, yesterday—the warmest year in history. That is what I think the green generation out there knows as they look at this issue. What are we going to do to make sure we avoid the catastrophic consequences of a dangerously warming planet?

We have to engage in preventive care of this planet. There are no emergency rooms for planets. We have to engage in preventive care to make sure we do not pass on this ever-increasing danger

to future generations. We are going to get a chance here to debate this. The Keystone Pipeline is a good example of how there is not, in fact, a balanced policy.

I asked for an amendment on the floor so that we can debate whether the oil goes through a pipeline from Canada—the dirtiest oil in the world—like a straw, potentially causing environmental catastrophes across our country, and then gets exported around the rest of the planet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I think this is the kind of debate the American people expect the Senate to engage in.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the truth is that despite our rather big egos, much of what we do in the Senate is pretty quickly forgotten. People have a hard time remembering what we did 2 months ago or yesterday, let alone last year. But I have a feeling that the Keystone Pipeline bill we are now discussing and decisions that will be made about that bill will not soon be forgotten—not by our children or our grandchildren and not by people throughout the world and, in fact, not by history. I believe that decades from now our kids and our grandchildren will scratch their heads and they will say: What world were these people—Members of Congress—living in in 2015 when they voted for this Keystone Pipeline? How did it happen that they did not listen to the overwhelming majority of scientists who told us we have to cut greenhouse gas emissions, not increase them? I think our kids and our grandchildren will be saying to us: Why did you do that to us? Why did you leave this planet less habitable than it could have been?

The issue we are dealing with today is of huge consequence. I fear very much that a majority of the Members in the Senate and in the Congress are poised to make a very dangerous and wrong decision. In that light, I am more than delighted that President Obama has indicated he will veto this Keystone Pipeline bill if it is passed.

Climate change is one of the great threats not only facing our country but facing the entire planet. It has the capability of causing severe harm to our economy, to our food supply, to access to water, and it raises all kinds of international national security issues.

Let me read an excerpt from a letter sent to the Senate back in October 2009:

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary

assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science.

Moreover, there is strong evidence that on-going climate change will have broad impacts on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increased risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and a disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

This statement was signed by virtually every major scientific organization in this country, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Meteorological Society, and many other scientific organizations.

Scientists are not the only people warning us about the danger of climate change. Hear what the Department of Defense has to say about the impact of climate change on international and national security. What they point out—and I think what every sensible person understands—is that when people are unable to grow the food they need because of drought, when flood destroys their homes, when people throughout the world are forced to struggle for limited natural resources in order to survive, this lays the groundwork for the migration of people and international conflict. That is what the Department of Defense tells us.

Now, given all of the scientific evidence and given the concerns raised by our own Department of Defense and national security experts all over the world and given the fact that the most recent decade—the last 10 years—was the Nation's warmest on record, one would think that when the National Climate Assessment warns us that global warming could exceed 10 degrees Fahrenheit in the United States by the end of the century—can we imagine this planet becoming 10 degrees Fahrenheit warmer and what this means to the planet? When sea levels have already risen by nearly 7 inches over the last century and are expected to rise another 10 inches to 2.6 feet by the end of the century—when all of that is on the table, one would think this Senate would be saying: All right, we have an international crisis. How do we reverse climate change? Instead, what the debate is about is how we transport some of the dirtiest oil in the world and thereby cause more carbon emissions into the atmosphere.

I suspect our kids and our grandchildren will look back on this period and say: What world were you living in? Why did you do that to us?

It would seem to me that what we should be debating here is how we im-

pose a tax on carbon so that we can break our dependence on fossil fuel. That is what we should be discussing, not how we increase carbon emissions. We should be discussing what kind of legislation we bring forward that moves us aggressively toward energy efficiency, weatherization, and such sustainable energies as wind, solar, and geothermal. That is the kind of bill that should be on the floor. We should be having a debate about legislation that makes our transportation system far more efficient, that expands rail and helps us get cars and trucks off the road. We should be having a debate about how we can create the kind of automobiles that run on electricity and make them less expensive and how we can get cars running 80 to 100 miles per gallon. Those are the kinds of debates and that is the kind of legislation we should be having on the floor, not how do we expand the production and the transportation of some of the dirtiest oil on the planet.

In my view, the U.S. Congress in a very profound way should not be in the business of rejecting science because when we reject science, we become the laughingstock of the world. How do we go forward? How do we prepare legislation if it is not based on scientific evidence? And to say to the overwhelming majority of scientists that we are ignoring what they are telling us and we are going to move in exactly the wrong direction I think makes us look like fools in front of the entire world. How do we go forward and tell China and India and Russia and countries around the world that climate change is a huge planetary crisis at the same time as we are facilitating the construction of the Keystone Pipeline?

So I am delighted the President will veto this legislation if it happens to pass the Congress. Our job now is not to bring more carbon into the atmosphere; it is to transform our energy system away from coal, away from oil, away from fossil fuel, and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy. That should be the direction of this country, and we should lead the world in moving in that direction.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BURR, and Mr. KING pertaining to the introduction of S. 108 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MEDICARE/MEDICAID ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in his first legislative message to the 89th Congress in 1965, 50 years ago I believe this month, President Johnson laid out what would become a key marker in the legislative fight for Medicare and Medicaid. Ultimately, the bill was passed in July 1965. President Johnson signed it in Independence, MO, I believe at the home of former President Truman.

President Johnson, in his legislative message to the House and Senate in 1965 said:

In this century, medical scientists have done much to improve human health and prolong human life. Yet as these advances come, vital segments of our population are being left behind—behind barriers of age, economics, geography or community resources. Today, the political community is challenged to help all our people surmount these needless barriers to the enjoyment of the promise and reality of better health.

Fifty years later we have made historic improvements to our health care system, thanks in large part to a couple of things: No. 1, medical research, funded both by taxpayers and often by drug companies, foundations, universities, and others; and No. 2, because of social insurance programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

Before the passage of Medicare—listen to these numbers—30 percent of our Nation's seniors lived below the poverty line, only half our Nation's seniors—at this time 50 years ago, early in 1965, had health insurance, and insurance usually only covered visits to the hospital in those days.

Now, thanks to Medicare, 54 million seniors and people with disabilities have access to guaranteed health care benefits.

Let me share a letter a constituent named Donald, from Toledo, OH, wrote to me last Congress, when the House of Representatives threatened to turn Medicare into a voucher program as part of its budget proposal. Donald wrote:

Thank you for your efforts to keep Medicare from being privatized. At the age of 63, I am going to be eligible for Medicare before too long and looking at the affordability of health care is critical. If Medicare is privatized, we will not be able to afford it any more than we can afford private insurance today.

That is the whole point. The reason there is a government health care program, the reason there is social insurance, is because people, as in 1965, only half the people in the country had any kind of health insurance.

It is a little disconcerting to know that after working all our lives and living comfortably, that in our retirement years we will either have to try to find full-time employment to be in a position of affording Medicare, privatized Medicare. I am sure I don't need to tell you how difficult finding a job is these days when you are an older citizen.

I know normally I am writing you from the opposing side, but this time we definitely see eye to eye.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, 150 or 160 years ago, said that history has always been a fight between conservators and innovators. There is a legitimate place in society for both, creating the tension that moves our country one way or the other. Conservators want to protect the status quo. They want to preserve privilege and want to hold on to their wealth. Conservators fundamentally don't believe the government should be involved in ensuring a decent standard of living. Innovators—what we might call today progressives—understand our society is only as strong as its most vulnerable members.

If we go back to the key congressional votes—the key congressional votes, not necessarily final passage—to advance debate of a Medicare bill in 1965, most Republicans voted no. Then it was the John Birch Society that opposed it. Today, 50 years later, it is the tea party that opposes social insurance.

Some of the most privileged interest groups in Washington opposed the creation of Medicare. But they were wrong. As I said earlier, 30 percent of seniors lived below the poverty line prior to Medicare. Medicare helped to cut the poverty rate in half by 1973, only 8 years after its passage.

We see the same attacks today. Budgets proposed in the House of Representatives over the past several years have tried to dismantle Medicare, by and large by privatized vouchers, to help offset the cost of tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. They would privatize the program and undermine its guaranteed benefits.

Ohio's seniors have worked hard, they have paid into Medicare, and they deserve a program that truly meets their health care needs. They deserve better than the underfunded voucher that would put them at the mercy of the private insurance industry. Thankfully, we have been able to block this plan in the Senate. We will continue to do that.

Interestingly, the Affordable Care Act has provided significantly enhanced benefits for Medicare beneficiaries. In my State alone more than 1 million Ohio seniors have gotten free—meaning no copay, no deductible—preventive care benefits under the Affordable Care Act.

If you are on Medicare and your doctor prescribes an annual physical or asks that you be given an osteoporosis screening, a diabetes screening—all the things doctors order for their patients for preventive care—those are provided under the Affordable Care Act and under Medicare, no copays, no deductible.

Many of the efforts to privatize and voucherize Medicare mean taking away preventive care, taking away prescrip-

tion drug protections added to Medicare under the Affordable Care Act. Others want to raise the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67.

I was in Youngstown, OH, a couple of years ago at a townhall. A woman stood up and said: I hold two jobs, and I am barely making it.

I think the two jobs were close to minimum wage, so she was probably making \$8 an hour in one and \$8.50 in the other. She was a home care worker and doing something else. She had tears in her eyes.

She said: I am 63 years old. I need to stay alive until I can get health insurance.

This was maybe 5 years before we passed the health care law. Imagine being 63 years old and your goal in life is just to find a way to stay alive so you can have health insurance.

Some geniuses in the House and maybe in the Senate think it is a good idea to raise the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67. Just because we dress like this and have jobs that aren't all that physical other than walking back and forth from our offices to the floor, just because we have this kind of lifestyle and just because we are privileged enough to get to dress like this and get paid well and get to do these incredibly privileged jobs as Members of the Senate—there are a whole lot of people in this country whose bodies won't last until they are 67. They can't work until they are 67 to get Medicare. They are working at Walmart, standing on floors all day, they are home care workers, they are working at fast food restaurants, they are construction workers.

Both my wife's parents died before the age of 70 in large part because of the work they did, the kind of heavy, strenuous work, and the chemicals they were exposed to and all that. So when I hear my colleagues propose to raise the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67—and I know they say we can't sustain these entitlements, whatever that means. What they really want to do is raise the eligibility age. To raise the eligibility age for Medicare to 67, they need to take Abraham Lincoln's advice. His staff wanted him to stay in the White House and win the war, free the slaves, and preserve the Union. President Lincoln said: No. I need to go out and get my public opinion bath.

What did he mean by that? He meant: I have to go out and talk to people. So when I hear Senators say they want to raise the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67—whether they are in Gallipolis or Troy or Zanesville, OH—when I hear people say they want to raise the retirement age or the Medicare eligibility age—what I think when I hear Senators say that is they are not out talking to real people.

We know we can do a number of things to improve and strengthen these programs so future generations can

continue to move into retirement years with a sense of security.

Last Congress I was an original co-sponsor of the Medicare Protection Act, which would make it difficult for Congress to make changes that would reduce or eliminate guaranteed benefits or restrict eligibility criteria for Medicare beneficiaries. With several of my Senate colleagues, I will submit a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the creation of Medicare and Medicaid, a reminder that these programs must be protected, not weakened, not rolled back, not undercut, not privatized, not voucherized—if that is a word—a reminder that all these programs must be strengthened.

As we move forward in protecting social insurance, we should remember President Johnson's words when speaking to the House and the Senate 50 years ago: Whatever we aspire to do together, our success in those enterprises—and our enjoyment of the fruits that result—will rest finally upon the health of our people.

TRIA

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think it is important to understand that TRIA is legislation that we need, which is the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. We passed a bill with only two or three “no” votes in the Senate last year. But what the House of Representatives has done looks like what they will probably do in the future: They have taken legislation which is really important to the country, which passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis, and they have loaded on to that legislation extraneous provisions.

Frankly, that is what people in this country are tired of—when legislation that must pass and has overwhelming support is about to pass, special interest groups come and add their language to it. That is exactly what happened here. If the House of Representatives gets its way, if Wall Street gets its way, it is the first step to begin to slice away at the Dodd-Frank legislation.

When I hear a number of my colleagues in this body and down the hall in the House of Representatives say they support progrowth policies and deregulation, what they are saying is they want to roll back the protections for consumers in Dodd-Frank, the Wall Street reform bill, and they want to weaken the provisions in the rules that govern Wall Street behavior. I don't quite understand it because what I do understand is less than a decade ago, because of Wall Street greed, because of Wall Street overreach, because this body and the body down the hall weakened the rules on Wall Street, and because the previous administration appointed regulators who would really look the other way, we had terrible damage done to our economy. About a mile north of the ZIP Code I live in in

Cleveland had the highest number of foreclosures of any ZIP Code in the United States of America because of deregulation, because of Bush appointees to many of the bank regulatory bodies.

So I caution my colleagues, as we accept this legislation, the TRIA legislation—and I assume we will—to understand that is not going to be behavior that we are going to sanction in the Senate, where they take must-pass legislation and they find ways to attach to this legislation rollback of consumer protections and weakening of Wall Street rules. That is what got us into this. We can't let these special interests who have so much power in the House of Representatives, who have so much influence in the House of Representatives—we can't let them have their way on legislation like this.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICARE/MEDICAID ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to highlight a Presidential message that was delivered to the Congress 50 years ago today. But before I go into the importance of Medicare and Medicaid—facts that I think all my colleagues and I can agree to—I would like to take a brief look back at where America has been and recall what life was like for so many of those who were poor, disabled, vulnerable, and uninsured or unlucky before these programs, which today are a lifeline, Medicare and Medicaid, were in place.

Those were the days of the “poor farm” and the “almshouse.” These were the places where the poor and uninsured would go for care, very often on the outskirts of town—out of sight, out of mind. It was not a happy choice, and more often than not for seniors and the poor it was the only choice.

These were places that provided care and was often very basic and very often it carried a stigma. The accommodations were sparse at best. In return for health care and housing, residents were expected to work on an adjoining farm or do housework or other chores to offset the costs of their stay. This was the primary option for someone whose extended family could not offer care—or didn't want to offer care. This was not thousands of miles away from the shores of our country, it was right here in the United States. Not very many Americans remember those days. In fact, I think it is fair to say hardly

anybody under 50 remembers those days.

President Johnson submitted his message to the Congress 50 years ago today, and fewer than half of America's older people even had any health insurance. In that era, it was not uncommon for older people who got an illness to be treated like second-class citizens, and many older people without family to care for them and no health care coverage ended up destitute and would often end up on our streets.

It was a time no one wants to revisit. It is a time sociologists described as another America—where 40 to 50 million Americans were poor and lacked adequate medical care and were socially invisible to a majority of the population.

I bring this up because I wish to spend a few minutes this evening talking about how far America has come. I want to make sure that we in the Congress—as we look to this anniversary of these critical programs, Medicare and Medicaid, and the vivid difference they made in the daily lives of Americans, we should all spend just a few minutes talking about the health care advances we have seen over the years.

Here are a couple of facts: Today with rock-solid essential medical services, 54 million Americans—or virtually every senior and those with disabilities—now has access to what we call—and I remember this from my days as director of the Gray Panthers—the Medicare guarantee. It is a guarantee of secure Medicare benefits for our old people.

Medicaid has made a critical difference for 68 million of the Nation's most vulnerable, including more than 32 million kids, 6 million seniors, and 10 million individuals with disabilities. Because Medicare and Medicaid made health care possible for millions of people, they have also been the catalyst for innovation in treatment that benefits people of all ages. I emphasize that fact because it is often not appreciated that Medicare, as the flagship Federal health care program, often is the spark, the catalyst for innovations that get copied in the private sector.

For example, in the first 30 years of Medicare alone, the Medicare Program helped to reduce deaths from heart disease by one-third for people over age 65. By providing coverage and access for millions, these programs became catalysts for change in how medicine is practiced and paid for Americans across the age spectrum and helped us to find the root causes of disease and perfecting better therapies to treat. As time has marched on, these programs evolved and improved and the rest of the health care system followed.

In 1967, Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment programs, comprehensive services for all Medicaid youngsters under age 21, was created, and that has helped to improve

our country's health, starting with our children. In 1981, home and community-based waivers were established so States could provide services in a community setting, allowing individuals to remain in their home for as long as possible.

Every State uses this option to facilitate better care and services to the Medicaid population, and I think it is fair to say that every single senior—and this is something I heard again and again and again in the those Gray Panthers days—would say: Why can't we have the option to have good, quality, affordable care at home because it will also save money compared to the alternative, which is institutional care.

In 1983, Medicare took one of many big leaps away from fee-for-service with the advent of a new reimbursement system for hospitals. It was called prospective payment—a system that pays hospitals based on a patient's illness and how serious it is and not solely on how much it costs to treat them. This was a radical change at the time. Today it is commonplace and acceptable.

In 2003, the prescription drug coverage benefit was added to Medicare, providing access to necessary medications to those most likely to need them. As a result of greater access to prescription drugs, senior health has dramatically improved.

In 2010, as a result of health care reform, preventive services became free to patients, prescription drugs became cheaper for beneficiaries who fell into what was known as the doughnut hole, and again Medicare moved further away from fee-for-service, volume-driven care and on to paying for quality and value. Not only was that good for seniors, it was good for taxpayers because it helped to extend the life of the Medicare trust fund.

Finally, in 2012, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid began releasing for the public to use actual claims data. Access to this information, in my view, is a key element of the challenge with respect to understanding the costs of care, the variations and the way medicine is practiced across the country. Clearly, access to Medicare claims data is part of the path to improving quality and holding down the costs of health care in our country.

These examples are easy to forget—the most recent ones—because now they are commonplace, but that makes them no less remarkable.

I will close with one last point that I hope will be part of what guides the work of the Senate in this session.

I see the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN. He is to be joined by the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, shortly.

I will just close my remarks with respect to these critical programs by pointing out—and I hope it will be remembered frequently as big issues are

tackled in this Congress—Medicare and Medicaid were bipartisan efforts, and the enactment of these programs shows that the Congress can craft bipartisan solutions to complex and politically difficult problems. That is what happened in 1965 when the Senate passed a legislation creating Medicare and Medicaid by a 68-to-32 vote after the House approved it 3 months earlier on a 313-to-115 vote.

As this Congress gets underway, and as the leaders come to the floor to discuss a critical aspect of how we move ahead, I hope all of us take a page from that particular playbook. Let us recognize that with Medicare and Medicaid there was an opportunity to come together to tackle a big issue, and my hope is that this Congress will not use partisan tactics when the solutions have to be bipartisan, and that is the lesson.

Despite sharp differences and partisanship, the Congress of the days I have been speaking of was able to rise above the culture and those challenges to find agreement and make our country a better place.

As this new Congress begins, I hope we can use that 50-year-old spirit to strengthen, protect, and improve Medicare and Medicaid to keep that guarantee strong, ensure health care to those who need it most, and protect a program that has been a lifeline to millions of Americans.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Oregon for reminding us of this 50th anniversary of President Johnson's recommendation to Congress to create Medicare and Medicaid. Today, as we witness 54 million people benefitting in America from Medicare—in my State some 2 million—and 68 million from Medicaid—in my State 3 million—we understand the importance of this program. Almost half the people who live in Illinois are covered with health insurance by Medicare and Medicaid. When we add in the Affordable Care Act, we have literally half the population of my State.

It is a testament to the fact that when we made a commitment and followed through on a bipartisan basis, as the Senator from Oregon said, we created programs that had vibrancy and really served people for a long time.

I read something the Senator from Oregon is, I am sure aware, of, which is that because Medicare was a complete Federal payout, it was implemented throughout the United States almost within a year. It took 17 years for every State to join the Medicaid Program. It wasn't until 1982 that the last State joined into Medicaid—Arizona—because there was a State contribution. Look at the experience we have now with the Affordable Care Act,

where some States are reluctant to join in. So that is part of it.

The point I wish to get to and which the Senator made so well is how it changed life for senior citizens and for those who were poor. It gave them a chance for quality health care that didn't bankrupt them in the process.

Medicaid has been a dramatic success. For critics of government health programs and critics of Medicaid, the 2011 survey found that 70 percent of physicians across America accept Medicaid patients. People would believe from some of the critics that the opposite is true. Seventy percent accept Medicaid patients. So it is a good program. The reimbursement attracts 70 percent of physicians willing to treat them.

The last point I will make to the Senator from Oregon particularly, if he happens to know a good bookstore, I would suggest he consider the new book by Dr. Gawande entitled "Being Mortal." I am virtually through it, and he really challenges us to look beyond health care for the elderly to where they are living, how they are living, and how they are being treated.

So I am hoping we can rise to another level of conversation beyond Medicare and Medicaid, celebrating this anniversary but accepting a new responsibility to that generation of seniors who served America so well.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for reminding us of this anniversary.

I am proud to stand with my colleague Senator WYDEN today in support of his resolution honoring President Johnson's commitment to creating the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

Fifty years ago today, President Lyndon Johnson sent a message to the Congress which he titled "Advancing the Nation's Health."

In that message the Johnson quoted President Thomas Jefferson who in 1787 wrote, "without health there is no happiness. An attention to health, then, should take the place of every other object." Those words were true then, true in 1965, and true now.

President Johnson was concerned about the health of our nation because of the staggering effect that no insurance and chronic disease had on the elderly. At that time, 80 percent of people over 65 were disabled or lived with a chronic disease. Unfortunately, 50 percent of people over 65 did not have health insurance.

From his concern and effort came the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Both programs created a social safety net that has improved the lives of millions of Americans.

Today more than 54 million people are enrolled in Medicare, 2 million in Illinois. The vast majority of Medicare enrollees are seniors. They receive quality, affordable, care and access to prescription drugs because of the President Johnson's commitment. In this

new Congress, we should work together to ensure this highly successful program remains in place for future generations.

Medicaid has been a lifeline for millions of people, especially for children. Sixty-eight million people are enrolled in Medicaid, 3 million in Illinois. And thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 600,000 became newly eligible for the program last year. Medicaid makes it possible for more than half of the babies born in Illinois to be delivered with medical care. Some argue that Medicaid isn't working because physicians refuse to see people in the program. But the data says that isn't true. 2011 data shows that 70 percent of office-based physicians nationwide were willing to see new Medicaid patients. I call that a success.

As we remember President Johnson's tireless effort today, we should also keep in mind our commitment to these vital programs and work together to strengthen them.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the 50th anniversary of Medicare as well. I commend the remarks of both the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Illinois about this 50-year anniversary since President Lyndon Johnson first sent his message to Congress that would later become both the Medicare and Medicaid Programs. As was referred to earlier, there are 100 million Americans benefiting, including over 4.8 million in my home State of Pennsylvania, when we consider both programs together.

When President Johnson sent this message, he said:

Our first concern must be to assure that the advance of medical knowledge leaves none behind. We can—and we must—strive now to assure the availability of and accessibility to the best health care for all Americans, regardless of age or geography or economic status.

So said President Johnson all those years ago, and how prescient he was and how knowledgeable he was as well to be thinking about the future and to be considering advances in technology and holding all of us to the highest possible standard when it came to health care for older Americans or health care for the poor and for children.

We know that in the ensuing 50 years we have strived to make that vision of President Johnson a reality, first, of course, with Medicare and Medicaid; and then more recently—"recently" meaning the last 20 years or so—with the Children's Health Insurance Program, known by the acronym CHIP; and then followed by, a number of years after that, the Affordable Care Act, which included an expansion of the Medicaid Program, providing coverage to millions more Americans.

We know that when Medicaid was created in 1965, the U.S. Government

put forth a promise to ensure that the most vulnerable members of society would have access to health care. Whether it is our children or whether it is frail, elderly members of our family living in nursing homes or individuals with disabilities, Medicaid ensures they have access to health care. So we have made great strides.

Let me quote again from President Johnson:

Poor families increasingly are forced to turn to overcrowded hospital emergency rooms and to overburdened city clinics as their only resource to meet their routine health care needs.

Again, President Johnson was way ahead of his time in dealing with what was then a problem and still remains a problem but less so a problem because of Medicaid.

This important lifeline—Medicaid—to health care, having been created 50 years ago, was strengthened in 2010 and helps ensure that millions of Americans have access to quality, comprehensive health care.

We must continue to make sure that we guarantee Medicaid remains strong and provides such needed care to those in our society who often get overlooked. We must never forget that Medicaid is the program that many middle-class families and lower income older citizens who are on assistance and people with disabilities turn to when they need extended nursing home care, sometimes referred to as long-term care. So when it comes to long-term care for poorer families as well as long-term care for middle-class families, often millions of Americans are turning and have turned for their long-term care to Medicaid, and we should remember that.

As we celebrate this 50th anniversary, let's always ensure that both Medicare and Medicaid remain strong programs that so many Americans can turn to. We must do our best to be true to Lyndon Johnson's vision "that the advance of medical knowledge leaves none behind." It is a very important anniversary, and it is a good reminder about our obligations in the Senate to protect both Medicare and Medicaid.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Senator DURBIN on behalf of the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in the 112th Congress the Senate adopted a new funding allocation for Senate committees. This approach has served the Senate for the past two Congresses when the Democrats controlled the ma-

jority. I believe this approach will continue to serve the interests of the Senate and the public, regardless of which party is in the majority, by helping to retain core committee staff with institutional knowledge. This funding allocation is based on the party division of the Senate, with 10 percent of the total majority and minority salary baseline going to the majority for administrative expenses. However, regardless of the party division of the Senate, the minority share of the majority and minority salary baseline will not be less than 40 percent, and the majority share will not exceed 60 percent. It is my intent that this approach will continue to serve the Senate for this Congress and future Congresses.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this approach met our needs for the last two Congresses, and I too would like to see it continue. In addition, last Congress, special reserves was restored to its historic purpose. We should continue to fund special reserves to the extent possible in order to be able to assist committees that face urgent, unanticipated, nonrecurring needs. Recognizing the tight budgets we will face for the foreseeable future, it is necessary to continue to bring funding authorizations more in line with our actual resources while ensuring that committees are able to fulfill their responsibilities. I look forward to continuing to work with the majority leader to accomplish this.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint leadership letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

WE MUTUALLY COMMIT TO THE FOLLOWING FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS: The Rules Committee is to determine the budgets of the committees of the Senate. The budgets of the committees, including joint and special committees, and all other subgroups, shall be apportioned to reflect the ratio of the Senate as of this date, including an additional ten percent (10%) from the majority and minority salary baseline to be allocated to the chairman for administrative expenses. Special Reserves has been restored to its historic purpose. Requests for funding will only be considered when submitted by a committee chairman and ranking member for unanticipated, non-recurring needs. Such requests shall be granted only upon the approval of the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Funds for committee expenses shall be available to each chairman consistent with the Senate rules and practices of the 113th Congress.

The division of committee office space shall be commensurate with this funding agreement.

The chairman and ranking member of any committee may, by mutual agreement, modify the apportionment of committee funding and office space.

MITCH MCCONNELL.
HARRY REID.

REMEMBERING EDWARD BROOKE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a former member of this Chamber, and note with pleasure the passage of S. Res. 19.

Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts passed away on January 3, 2015 at the age of 95. I was deeply saddened by his loss. I had the privilege of hosting an event last year celebrating America's Black Senators. We invited Senator Brooke, but he was unable to attend. We did honor him that day, because as one of the two African Americans to currently serve in this great body, I know that I stand on the shoulders of giants like Senator Brooke and those who have come before me in public service. Senator Brooke was a true trailblazer, and those of us who followed cannot thank him enough. As the first African American Senator to be popularly elected to serve, he was a true inspiration.

From his service to our Nation beginning as a captain in the U.S. Army during World War II, to his service as chairman of the Finance Commission for the city of Boston and then as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' attorney general before coming to the Senate, Senator Brooke was a committed public servant. Having served for two terms in the Senate, he was a powerful voice for housing reform and advancing issues like economic opportunity for all Americans. Recognized with both the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2004 and the Congressional Gold Medal in 2008, our Nation was truly blessed by his life and accomplishments, and his place in history will stand the test of time.

May God bless the family of Senator Brooke.

REMEMBERING MARIO M. CUOMO

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the life and extraordinary legacy of former New York State Governor Mario M. Cuomo.

Governor Mario Cuomo inspired a generation of Americans to be unafraid of idealism. He was a role model for Americans with big dreams, and he was a champion for the causes and values that we cherish in this country.

He was a tenacious competitor on the baseball diamond, the basketball court, and in the halls of the capitol in Albany, but it wasn't merely the abstract desire to win that drove him. The quest for justice and fairness in our country motivated him to act, and he used his pulpit as a public servant to push for a better world for all Americans.

Throughout his career, he spoke powerfully to us about the value of equality, and the visionary words of his most famous speech, the Tale of Two Cities, still hold true today, decades later.

Governor Cuomo was a brilliant and generous mentor, and I was honored

that he took a risk and helped me when I was an untested Congressional candidate a decade ago. Whenever we met, he was always kind, thoughtful, and always generous.

I know that Mario Cuomo's most cherished title wasn't Governor—it was husband and father. He took these roles as seriously as his governorship, and it is clear that he succeeded in both. He loved his wife and children, and he instilled in his sons and daughters an unwavering commitment to service.

Mario Cuomo was one of the great, motivating, and inspirational leaders of our time, and I will always be grateful to him for his leadership, his service, and his inspirational mentorship. He was a friend that my family and I truly admired.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:31 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 22. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution regarding consent to assemble outside the seat of government.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 1, resolving that Karen L. Haas of the State of Maryland, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives, and that Paul D. Irving of the State of Florida be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, and that Ed Cassidy of the State of Connecticut be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative

Officer of the House of Representatives, and that Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon, be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 2, resolving that the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that JOHN A. BOEHNER, a Representative from the State of Ohio, has been elected Speaker; and that Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 4, resolving that the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected JOHN A. BOEHNER, a Representative from the State of Ohio as Speaker, and Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland as Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

The message further announced that pursuant to House Resolution 3, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make: Mr. MCCARTHY of California and Ms. PELOSI of California.

At 11:41 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2001, and the order of the House of today the Speaker appoints the following Members to the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself: Mr. MCCARTHY of California and Ms. PELOSI of California.

At 5:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1. A bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with

accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0449)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters (Type Certificate Currently Held by AgustaWestland S.p.A.) (Agusta)" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0472)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0425)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0132)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0191)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0062)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0170)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0489))

report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (130); Amdt. No. 3611” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-33. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (67); Amdt. No. 3612” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-34. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (101); Amdt. No. 3614” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-35. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (124); Amdt. No. 3613” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-36. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (60); Amdt. No. 3617” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-37. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (19); Amdt. No. 3616” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-38. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (60); Amdt. No. 3615” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-39. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (296); Amdt. No. 3618” (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-40. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Aviation Training Device Credit for Pilot Certification” (RIN2120-AK62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-41. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; North Central and Northeast United States” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0986)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-42. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Roanoke Rapids, NC” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0792)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-43. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class D and E Airspace; Hammond, LA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0600)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-44. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D Airspace; MacDill AFB, FL” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0541)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-45. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lakeport, CA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0309)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-46. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Apalachicola, FL” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0831)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-47. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0540)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-48. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0305)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-49. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0174)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-50. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0232)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-51. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0483)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-52. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Credit Union Ownership of Fixed Assets” (RIN3133-AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-53. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Industry and Security Annual Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-54. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report relative to the status of the Commission’s licensing activities and regulatory duties; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-55. A communication from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Representation—Case Procedures” (RIN3142-AA08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-56. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)" (RIN0578-AA62) (Docket No. NRCS-2014-0007) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-57. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-58. A communication from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2014 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-59. A communication from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-60. A communication from the President and CEO of the African Development Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to 2014 grant audits; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-61. A communication from the Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions from the Unanticipated Needs Account for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-62. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-63. A communication from the Special Counsel, United States Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Office of Special Counsel's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-64. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, the President's Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of locality based comparability payments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-65. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relative to the ongoing negotiations of the Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA); to the Committee on Finance.

EC-66. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-4160); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-67. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Na-

tional Instant Criminal Background Check System Regulation" (RIN1110-AA27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 38. A bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health care coverage mandate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 39. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 40. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that prohibit certain preferential treatment or prioritization of Internet traffic; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 41. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction for travel expenses to medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with examinations or treatments relating to service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 42. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address certain inconsistencies between the self-attested information provided by an applicant in enrolling in a health plan on an Exchange and being determined eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions or in being determined to be eligible for enrollment in a State Medicaid plan or a State child health plan under the State Children's Health Insurance Program and the data received through the Federal Data Services Hub or from other data sources; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 43. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a Federal income tax credit for certain stem cell research expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 44. A bill to provide for the expedited processing of unaccompanied alien children illegally entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 45. A bill to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 46. A bill to reduce the amount of financial assistance provided to the Government

of Mexico in response to the illegal border crossings from Mexico into the United States, which serve to dissipate the political discontent with the higher unemployment rate within Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 47. A bill to prohibit the implementation of any program that grants temporary legal status to, or adjusts the status of, any individual who is unlawfully present in the United States until the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the US-VISIT system has been fully implemented at every land, sea, and air port of entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 48. A bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 49. A bill to include a question to ascertain United States citizenship and immigration status in each questionnaire used for a decennial census of population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 50. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 51. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 52. A bill to close the loophole that allowed the 9/11 hijackers to obtain credit cards from United States banks that financed their terrorist activities, to ensure that illegal immigrants cannot obtain credit cards to evade United States immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 53. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 54. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 55. A bill to extend the seaward boundaries of certain States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 56. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 57. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prevent the illegal trafficking of supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits by requiring all program beneficiaries to show valid photo identification when purchasing items with program benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 58. A bill to ensure orderly conduct of Nuclear Regulatory Commission actions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 59. A bill to reject the final 5-year Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program for fiscal years 2012 through 2017 of the Administration and replace the plan with a 5-year plan that is more in line with the energy and economic needs of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 60. A bill to prohibit aliens who are not lawfully present in the United States from being eligible for postsecondary education benefits that are not available to all citizens and nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 61. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 62. A bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 63. A bill to require all public school employees and those employed in connection with a public school to receive FBI background checks prior to being hired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 64. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of assistance under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 65. A bill to authorize the Moving to Work Charter program to enable public housing agencies to improve the effectiveness of Federal housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 66. A bill to prohibit any regulation regarding carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gas emissions reduction in the United States until China, India, and Russia implement similar reductions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 67. A bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to confirm that a customer's net equity claim is based on the customer's last statement and that certain recoveries are prohibited, to change how trustees are appointed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 68. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make voting in a Federal election by an unlawfully present alien an aggravated felony and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 69. A bill to require that the Government give priority to payment of all obligations on the debt held by the public and payment of Social Security benefits in the event that the debt limit is reached; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 70. A bill to direct the General Accountability Office to conduct a full audit of hur-

ricane protection funding and cost estimates associated with post-Katrina hurricane protection; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 71. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 72. A bill to allow for the portability of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 73. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 74. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for dependent care savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 75. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Social Security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution for purposes of education tax credits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 76. A bill to provide tax relief with respect to the Hurricane Isaac disaster area; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 77. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 78. A bill to impose admitting privilege requirements with respect to physicians who perform abortions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 79. A bill to impose a fine with respect to international remittance transfers if the sender is unable to verify legal status in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 80. A bill to prohibit appropriated funds from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 81. A bill to authorize preferential treatment for certain imports from Nepal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 82. A bill to suspend sales of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until certain conditions are met; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 83. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to improve nonretaliation provisions relating to equal pay requirements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. COONS):

S. 84. A bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 85. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a simplified income-driven repayment plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 86. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 87. A bill to require the disclosure of determinations with respect to which congressional staff will be required to obtain health insurance coverage through an Exchange; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 88. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify the definition of accidental release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 89. A bill to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 90. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to authorize hunting under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 91. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds of Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 92. A bill to reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking regulatory experience on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure that the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 93. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the United Nations until the United Nations formally retracts the final report of the "United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 94. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to State and local governments for payment of obligations, to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from financially assisting State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 95. A bill to terminate the \$1 presidential coin program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 96. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide consumers with a free annual disclosure of information the Bureau of Consumer Financial

Protection maintains on them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 97. A bill to clarify that the anti-kick-back laws apply to qualified health plans, the federally-facilitated marketplaces, and other plans and programs under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 98. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote innovation, investment, and research in the United States, to eliminate the diversity immigrant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 99. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow workers who attain age 65 after 1981 and before 1992 to choose either lump sum payments over four years totaling \$5,000 or an improved benefit computation formula under a new 10-year rule governing the transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 100. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax deduction for itemizers and nonitemizers for expenses relating to home schooling; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the Coverdell education savings accounts to allow home school education expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 102. A bill to amend the public charter school provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 103. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a funding gap caused by the failure to enact interim or full-year appropriations for the Armed Forces occurs, which results in the furlough of non-emergency personnel and the curtailment of Government activities and services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 104. A bill to provide for full and open competition for Federal contracts related to natural disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 105. A bill to permit management of the red snapper by Gulf Coast States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 106. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit removal to United States district courts of certain civil actions filed in State courts; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 107. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to repeal certain designation authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to repeal the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Supervision Act of

2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 108. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve access for students to Federal grants and loans to help pay for postsecondary, graduate, and professional educational opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 109. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless the authority provided by the Constitution of the United States for the legislation can be determined and is clearly specified; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 110. A bill to rescind funds made available to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency if the Administrator fails to meet certain deadlines; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 111. A bill to prohibit a Federal agency from establishing or implementing a policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a resort or vacation destination as the location for a conference or event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 112. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior to publish and make available for public comment a draft economic analysis at the time a proposed rule to designate critical habitat is published; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 113. A bill to ensure that Federal Register notices submitted to the Bureau of Land Management are reviewed in a timely manner; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 114. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide the public with access to research of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 115. A bill to increase oversight of small business assistance programs provided by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communications services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 117. A bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 118. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address certain inconsistencies between the self-at-tested information provided by an applicant in enrolling a health plan on an Exchange and being determined eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions or in being determined to be eligible for enrollment in a State Medicaid plan or a State child health plan under the State Children's

Health Insurance Program and the data received through the Federal Data Services Hub or from other data sources; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 21. A resolution making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DURBIN (for Mr. REID):

S. Res. 22. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. Con. Res. 1. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax is not in the economic interest of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 16

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to apply the provisions of the Act to certain Congressional staff and members of the executive branch.

S. 23

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 23, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes.

S. 29

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 29, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT),

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 31

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 31, a bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 40. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that prohibit certain preferential treatment or prioritization of Internet traffic; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for nearly a year now, Americans across the country have made their voices heard on the critical issue of how we protect an open Internet. Their message has been loud and clear—they want meaningful rules that protect the Internet as a platform for free expression and innovation. Consumers want to see the online space as we have always known it, as a place where the best ideas and services can reach users on merit rather than based on a financial relationship with a broadband provider. Last

Congress I joined with my friend in the House, Representative DORIS MATSUI of California, to introduce bicameral legislation requiring the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, to ban “pay-to-play” deals on the Internet. Today, I am pleased to once again join with her to reintroduce this important bill.

When we originally introduced this legislation last June, nearly 300,000 Americans had commented on FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler’s open Internet proposal. That number alone would have been an impressive level of public engagement. Since that time, however, the number of public comments filed at the FCC has swelled to nearly 4 million. As the comments show, consumers are concerned that without meaningful rules the Internet will become a place where broadband providers charge tolls to websites or applications for them to reach end users. This would represent a fundamental departure from the way in which consumers and entrepreneurs interact with the Internet. A two-tiered Internet based on ability to pay would harm the innovative and competitive environment we have all come to expect in the online world.

Like an overwhelming number of the public, I have grave concerns that a pay-to-play Internet would allow larger companies to squeeze out their competitors, stifling competition online. A small web company in Vermont that develops an idea to rival the largest Silicon Valley titans should not have to worry that its access to consumers could be blocked because its competitors have a paid arrangement with broadband providers. The next generation of Internet companies and retailers should have the same protections that allowed a company like the Vermont Country Store to become a thriving online success.

Pay-to-play arrangements would also harm consumers, who would not have the assurance that the service they are paying for will provide the speed that they want. Too many Americans currently lack real choice in broadband providers, particularly those in rural areas. A pay-to-play Internet could result in whole swaths of the Internet becoming functionally inaccessible to the customers of certain Internet providers. This is not the Internet we know today, and the FCC or Congress must act to ensure that it does not come to pass.

The Online Competition and Consumer Choice Act is straightforward. It requires the FCC to establish rules preventing providers from charging websites for priority access. It also requires rules to prevent providers from prioritizing their own affiliated content or services. These are simple rules to preserve the equal platform we know online today.

This legislation should not be used by opponents of meaningful open Inter-

net rules to undermine the FCC’s important work to craft open Internet rules that will protect consumers and innovators. To the contrary, this bill sets out important policy positions that the FCC should adopt in its current consideration of open Internet rules. The FCC should not hesitate to act at its February meeting to ban these deals outright.

The importance of an open Internet is an issue that resonates in homes and businesses across the country. I spent significant time last year listening to voices outside of Washington, particularly those of Vermonters, so that I could hear firsthand about the impact the Internet has had on small businesses and consumers. The Judiciary Committee held two hearings on this issue, including one in Vermont, where I heard exactly these kinds of stories. These are not people looking for a handout or special treatment—these are entrepreneurs and consumers who simply want the Internet to remain an equalizing tool regardless of where you live or how deep your pockets are.

There should be widespread agreement to prevent special deals that harm consumers and dampen online innovation. The FCC and Congress should rightly focus on this timely and significant issue to protect innovation and competition online.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 40

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Online Competition and Consumer Choice Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FCC REGULATIONS PROHIBITING CERTAIN PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OR PRIORITIZATION OF INTERNET TRAFFIC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations that—

(1) prohibit a broadband provider from entering into an agreement with an edge provider under which the broadband provider agrees, for consideration, in transmitting network traffic over the broadband Internet access service of an end user, to give preferential treatment or priority to the traffic of such edge provider over the traffic of other edge providers; and

(2) prohibit a broadband provider, in transmitting network traffic over the broadband Internet access service of an end user, from giving preferential treatment or priority to the traffic of content, applications, services, or devices that are provided or operated by such broadband provider, or an affiliate of such broadband provider, over the traffic of other content, applications, services, or devices.

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) CERTAIN TRAFFIC NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as superseding any obligation or authorization a

broadband provider may have to address the needs of emergency communications or law enforcement, public safety, or national security authorities, consistent with or as permitted by applicable law, or as limiting the ability of the provider to do so.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law, including the authority to promulgate regulations prohibiting or limiting preferential treatment or prioritization of the traffic of an edge provider by a broadband provider under GN Docket No. 14-28 (relating to the matter of protecting and promoting the open Internet).

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—For purposes of sections 503(b) and 504 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 503(b); 504), this section shall be considered to be a part of such Act. With respect to enforcement under this section only, the following modifications of such section 503(b) shall apply:

(1) Paragraph (5) shall not apply.

(2) Paragraph (6) shall be applied by substituting the following: “No forfeiture penalty shall be determined or imposed against any person under this subsection if the violation charged occurred more than 3 years prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability.”.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AFFILIATE.—The term “affiliate” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(2) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—The term “broadband Internet access service” has the meaning given such term in section 8.11 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) BROADBAND PROVIDER.—The term “broadband provider” means a provider of broadband Internet access service.

(4) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(5) EDGE PROVIDER.—The term “edge provider” means an individual, institution, or other entity that provides—

(A) any content, application, or service over the Internet; or

(B) a device used for accessing any content, application, or service over the Internet.

(6) END USER.—The term “end user” means an individual, institution, or other entity that uses a broadband Internet access service.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 81. A bill to authorize preferential treatment for certain imports from Nepal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Nepal Trade Preferences Act.

This legislation is simple and straightforward. It grants duty-free status to imports of Nepalese garments for a ten year period.

I have been a friend of Nepal and the Nepalese people for over 25 years. I have witnessed its political struggle and sadly the deterioration of its ready-made garment industry.

The Nepal Trade Preferences Act bill will promote much-needed economic development and contribute to lasting political stability in one of the world's poorest countries.

Allow me to go over some basic facts of everyday life in Nepal.

Nepal has a per capita income of \$730. Approximately 25 percent of the Nepal's 24 million people live in poverty.

The unemployment rate in Nepal stands at a staggering 47 percent; and most Nepalese live on \$2 a day.

The 2005 phase-out of the Micro-Fiber Arrangement, which established export quotas from developing nations, has deeply damaged Nepal's apparel industry.

Instead of continuing to import garments from Nepal, U.S. importers have shifted their orders to China, Bangladesh and other low-cost labor markets.

In fact, the number of people employed by the Nepalese garment industry dropped from over 90,000 people to less than 5,000 today; textile and apparel exports from Nepal to the United States fell from approximately \$95 million in 2005 to \$45 million in 2013; and the number of garment factories plummeted from 212 to 30.

Despite Nepal's poverty and the near-collapse of the garment industry, Nepalese garment imports are still subject to an average U.S. tariff of 11.7 percent and can be as high as 32 percent.

In essence, we are unfairly taxing the imports of a highly impoverished country that cannot afford it. Taxing textile and apparel imports from Nepal, which constitute .01 percent of all U.S. imports, makes no sense.

I would point out that U.S. tariffs on Nepalese garments stand in contrast to the policies of the European Union, Canada, and Australia, which all allow Nepalese garments into their markets duty free.

It should come as no surprise, then, that while the U.S. share of Nepalese garment exports has fallen, the European Union's share has risen from 18.14 percent in 2006 to 46 percent in 2010.

The purpose of the “Nepal Trade Preferences Act” is to ensure that we provide Nepal with the same trade preferences afforded to it by other developed countries. No more, no less.

Humanitarian and development assistance programs should be critical components of our efforts to help Nepal. I was proud to support the President's budget request of \$77 million for Nepal in fiscal year 2015.

But assistance is no substitute for organic economic development. We should help the Nepalese people help themselves by reopening the U.S. market to a once thriving export industry.

In the end, economic growth and prosperity can be best achieved when Nepal is given the chance to compete and grow in a free and open global marketplace.

With this legislation, the United States can make a real difference now to help revitalize the garment industry in Nepal and promote economic growth and higher living standards.

There is no doubt that Nepal has struggled to draft a new constitution

and coalesce around a governing majority.

While only Nepal can chart its political course, passing this measure would undoubtedly help regenerate Nepal's stagnant economy.

Let us show our solidarity with the people of Nepal by passing this commonsense measure.

I urge my colleagues to support the Nepal Trade Preferences Act.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, Mr. KING, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 108. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve access for students to Federal grants and loans to help pay for postsecondary, graduate, and professional educational opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask consent that the Senator from Colorado, Mr. BENNET, and I, along with the Senator from Maine, Mr. KING, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BOOKER, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. ISAKSON, and the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, be able to engage in a colloquy on higher education for the next half hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I further ask unanimous consent to use a piece of demonstrative evidence in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senator from Colorado, MICHAEL BENNET, and I have been working for 1 year to make it easier for the 20 million American families who fill out the Federal application form each year in order to receive grants and loans for college.

The piece of demonstrative evidence that Senator BENNET and I have been carrying around in Tennessee and Colorado is the Free Application for Federal Student Aid or FAFSA. This is the form that 20 million Americans fill out. It is familiar to many families as it has 108 questions, and it is important to them because about half of the American families who have students in college have a Federal grant or loan to help pay for college.

The problem with the 108 questions is that they are generally unnecessary. Senator BENNET and I were at a Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing. We heard four witnesses representing different perspectives in our country saying that we only need two questions to know whether we could make a Federal grant or loan to a student from Wisconsin who wanted to go to community college with roughly 95 percent accuracy.

So today we are introducing legislation which is named the Federal Aid Simplification and Transparency, or

FAST, Act. It will turn these 108 questions into two—one about the amount of family income and one about the size of family. It will free students and their families from the dreaded FAFSA. It will eliminate thousands of hours of busywork by guidance counselors, college administrators, parents, and accountants.

I will use a specific example. On Friday I am going to Tennessee with President Obama, who has been attracted to our great State because we have become the first State to say to all of our high school graduates that community college is tuition-free. How can we do that in Tennessee? Tuition at community colleges, like in some places in the country, is about \$3,600 per year, and the Pell grant can pay up to \$5,700, but on average needy students receive about \$3,300. So for about half the students, there is only a small gap between the amount the Federal Pell grant pays and what tuition costs. Tennessee has committed to make up the difference.

But here is the catch: The major obstacle to Tennesseans who want to take advantage of the new Tennessee Promise Program is the 108-question form. The president of the community college in Memphis, Southwest Tennessee Community College, tells me he thinks he loses 1,500 students a semester because of the complexity of the form. They just don't fill it out.

So it is a terrific example of how the Federal Government, with good intentions, has built up over the years an enormous amount of paperwork that is getting in the way of the single greatest need our State has, which is to have more of our students better trained. This will help the businesses that are attracted there offering good jobs will be able to hire people who are properly trained.

In addition to that, our bill does the following things:

It not only eliminates the 108 questions and replaces them with 2, it tells families the result earlier in the process. For example, if you have a daughter who is a junior in high school, now you will be able to go online and find out—answering two questions—how much money you are eligible for in grants and loans. Now you have to wait until the second semester of your senior year.

The next thing it does is it streamlines the Federal grant and loan programs by combining two Federal programs into one Pell Grant Program and reduces the six different Federal loan programs into three—one undergraduate loan program, one graduate loan program, and one parent loan program—resulting in more access for students.

Fourth, it enables students to use a Pell grant in a manner that works for them. They can use it year-round—now they cannot use it for three straight semesters—or at their own pace.

Next, it discourages overborrowing. Too many students borrow extra money they do not need to go to college. For example, under the Federal rules a student is entitled to borrow the same amount of money if they go full time as they are if they go half time. That makes no sense. It saddles students with debt they cannot pay back.

Finally, it simplifies the repayment options. Now there are nine different ways to make repayments. We suggest two.

Senators KING and BURR have their own bill, which they will be introducing today and talking about a little later, that streamlines repayment options.

I have been delighted to work with Senator BENNET. I congratulate him. His background as the Denver school superintendent and as a father has made him a very effective advocate for this effort. We have listened to educators and parents in our own States. The bill has been out there now for more than half a year. We have attracted other sponsors, including Senator BOOKER and Senator ISAKSON. We hope other Senators will want to join us.

Finally, I would say before going to Senator BENNET that as chairman of the Senate committee that handles education—the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee—we are ready to move on this. As soon as we can finish our work on fixing No Child Left Behind, which we have been working on for 6 years and have held 24 hearings. In addition, almost all of the members of the current committee were there last year when we reported a bill—as soon as we can finish that work, we will be ready to move to reauthorize the Higher Education Act to deregulate higher education starting with the FAST Act and the legislation Senators KING and BURR have promoted.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for his partnership on this. I salute him for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I am delighted to be on the floor today with, among others, Senator ALEXANDER, who has worked so hard on the bill we are talking about today. Through the Chair, I want to wish him well in his new role as chair of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee on which I serve. He is quite right to have said this bill came to us as a result of testimony in front of that committee by a variety of witnesses but all of whom agreed that the current system is completely unwieldy. I would also like to thank the other cosponsors—Senators BURR, BOOKER, ISAKSON, and KING—for joining the efforts and for being here today as well.

I first became aware of this problem when I was superintendent of the Den-

ver public schools. We had a couple who very generously donated \$50 million for scholarships for kids who were graduating from the Denver public schools and who had applied to college. One of the things we learned in that process was how terrible the process was for filling out the financial aid forms for the Federal Government. That was a requirement we had for people to be able to be eligible for this scholarship. We literally had to put new rooms in our schools, in our high schools, and staff them with people in order to fill out these forms.

Every year tens of thousands of students and parents in Colorado and millions more across the country fill out the FAFSA as part of the college application process. It is the gateway to financial aid. By some estimates, over 2 million people who are eligible for financial aid and Pell grants do not get it simply because of the complexity of the form.

I ask unanimous consent to show some demonstrative evidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Here is this year's form. It is a different color than the one we had last year. This is the form a student has to fill out—108 questions. This is the instruction manual that goes with the form, which is something in the neighborhood of 66 pages long. It is very tiny print.

To be honest, the ridiculousness of this form would be funny if it were not for the lost time, money, and energy our country spends on it. Here are some of the examples of the questions families have to put up with on this form. Several times there are questions about income. We have been told by the witnesses we had that we only need two questions. There are a number of questions about income, investments, and assets. Each requires notes and instructions which are contained in here.

Question 36: What was your and your spouse's adjusted gross income for 2014?

Question 37: Enter your and your spouse's income tax for 2014.

Question 39: How much did you earn from working in 2014?

Question 40: How much did your spouse earn from working in 2014?

It is ridiculous.

The questions become even more complicated.

Question 42: As of today, what is the net worth of your and your spouse's investments, including real estate but don't including the home you live in?

That is the kind of reaction we get all over the country when we talk about this at home.

The instruction form here says, for question No. 43, the net worth of businesses and/or investments.

Business or farm value includes the current market value of land, buildings, machinery, equipment, inventory, et cetera. Do not include your primary farm. Do not include the net worth of a family-owned and

controlled small business with more than 100 full-time or full-time equivalent employees.

Just to make it really clear, in dark print, bolded print, it says: business/farm value minus business/farm debt equals net worth of business. This is as complicated as any tax form.

At a time when the demands of the global economy require us to have more college access, not less, it is a shame that this bureaucratic piling up of questions is making it harder and harder for people to go to college.

So I think this is going to be great for our students, to get it down to a postcard that has two questions. The estimate is that the time saved by moving away from this existing form is the equivalent of 50,000 jobs that could be spent actually providing college guidance to young people who will now have the benefit of knowing, as Senator ALEXANDER said so eloquently, what financial aid they will be eligible for in their junior year before they apply to college rather than waiting until their senior year, until they have already been admitted to college. That makes no sense to the people we represent, and there is a reason for it—it is because it makes no sense.

My hope is that this is a bill we will be able to move this year. Again, I thank Senator ALEXANDER for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank Senator BENNET.

I would like to send to the desk the FAST Act that Senator BENNET and I are introducing, with the cosponsorship of Senator BOOKER, Senator BURR, Senator KING, and Senator ISAKSON.

In this colloquy, I would like now to recognize the Senator from New Jersey for 5 minutes to comment on the bill, if he would like.

Mr. President, following that—the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Maine, who are cosponsors of this bill, are here, but they also have a separate bill on income repayments which they will discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I wish to thank Senators BENNET and ALEXANDER for their work on this legislation. It is going to help our Nation's students make better, smarter, and more-informed decisions about higher education.

Historically, the United States has been the leader globally in expanding college opportunity. We understand that an educated workforce is essential to our Nation's economic competitiveness. Without highly skilled workers, America will not be able to compete in the global economy.

The average price of a college degree in the United States is climbing—about \$13,856. Please put that in perspective with our competitor nations, nations that are keeping the cost of college low, knowing that their long-term competitiveness as a country depends

on the education of their children, nations such as the United Kingdom, where a college education costs less than half of ours, and Germany, where kids pay a mere \$933.

The average American student now is graduating from college with around \$29,000 in loans. In New Jersey, that is up from an average of \$27,000 in 2011 and \$23,000 and change in 2010. This is unacceptable. Mounting debt is undermining not only the success of our individual young people in our country, but it is undermining the long-term competitiveness our Nation has in a global knowledge-based economy. That is one reason why it is important that we work to make the process of obtaining financial aid simpler and more straightforward.

We saw the ridiculousness which Senator BENNET held up in the length of the form and the explanation document. Well, this has to change. This is something I recognized when I was mayor of the city of Newark. We had classes. Literally we called it, I think, Financial Aid University, where we brought experts in just to try to help students navigate all of that. We spent so many resources knowing that for our kids from Newark to be competitive, we had to help them navigate this labyrinth of challenging questions and documents that it takes perhaps a college degree or even more to figure out.

When I first came to the Senate about 13 months ago, one of the first pieces of legislation I offered, having had that experience, was a way of simplifying these forms. There is an urgency here because the College Board estimates that 2.3 million students do not fill out the FAFSA form, the free application for financial aid. Because the form is a gateway to financial aid, having 2.3 million being deterred from actually filling it out is a harm to our Nation, not just to those individual students. Many students who qualify for Federal aid skip the form because they find it—as we obviously saw—too complex.

Because eligibility is currently based on income information for the year immediately preceding enrollment, financial aid deadlines mean that tax data is not yet available. As a result, students must determine how to fill out financial aid questions on the FAFSA form and take additional steps then to submit later the tax documents.

We know more can be done to make this process simpler and accessible, which is why I am pleased. I was really rejoicing when Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BENNET showed me there was a way we could work—even further than the legislation I introduced in the last Congress—to reduce it to two questions—saving time, saving energy, saving stress but even more importantly empowering students to get their education and contribute to our economy so that we can compete with those

other countries that seem to be doing a much better job than we are in keeping the cost of college low.

This bill streamlines the financial aid system, simplifies the FAFSA form, discourages overborrowing—which is a problem—and, most importantly, gives students and families better information earlier in the process to enable them to make better decisions for them. This bill is a good step.

This bill is a great step. I am looking forward to working with the higher education community as well as students and families in New Jersey on how we can be successful in simplifying this process, increasing access to college and boosting not only enrollment but the economic output of our citizenry.

Again, I thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BENNET for their work and leadership. I am pleased to be with them in this effort, and I look forward to continuing the conversation this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senator from New Jersey is known in his State and across the country as a pioneer in education, putting children first.

Having his support and advice on this bill will be a great advantage in helping it go from the Senate floor through the House to the President's desk and into law.

In 2013 the Congress and President Obama made significant steps forward in improving the student loan program—a \$100 billion per year Federal program to help students go to college. That law created a market-based, market-pricing system, and it had the effect in that year of reducing the rate for undergraduates, cutting it about in half.

The two Senators who led that were the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, and the Senator from Maine, Mr. KING. Senator BURR and Senator KING have continued to work on student loans, making it easier for students to go to college, easier for them to pay their loans, and easier for them to pay them back.

We are proud to have them as cosponsors, but they have their own legislation on student loan repayments, which I am pleased to cosponsor and which will be a top priority in the Senate HELP Committee as soon as we finish fixing No Child Left Behind.

I now yield in this colloquy to Senator BURR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. I thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BENNET, and I thank them for what they propose in the FAST Act.

As a parent who went through two kids going to college, when I was presented that form, I realized I wasn't capable of doing it.

I remember a story still today of a dear colleague of mine in the House of Representatives—many know Sonny Bono. We asked Sonny one day: Why did you come to Congress? How did you get into politics?

He said: Well, I became mayor of a city for one reason—because I opened a restaurant. When I went to get a sign permit, they gave me 50 pages to fill out. I didn't graduate from high school, but I figured out it was easier for me to run for mayor, win, and make the sign permit 1 page than it was for me to fill out 50 pages.

That is how he got his start in politics.

I might say, as a parent, to be able to—on a post card—apply and know whether I was eligible for my children's student aid would be a tremendous thing for all parents.

Senator KING and I are on the floor to talk specifically about the Repay Act.

As we have looked at student loans and as the government has become the primary loan component for student loans, what we have seen is that the consolidation of one's loans has dramatically increased in an incoherent way. Now, some might say that is exactly what government does. We say we are going to fix a problem, and we fix it in a way that you don't understand it; it is way too cumbersome.

What we have tried to do is we have made an effort to provide more avenues for or options for children to choose or parents to choose how to pay back student loans. What we have done is we have made it as complicated as the form that Senator BENNET showed, which determines eligibility.

Currently, the Federal Government offers 12 repayment options for students. Among these 12 options, students are offered a series of terms and conditions that often overlap amongst several other programs with very similar sounding names and stated benefits. The problem gets worse annually.

The administration continues to do new regulations every time we see a problem, and those regulations then overlap with existing regulations on student loans to where individuals don't know exactly what their options are—what Senator KING and I want to do.

We will introduce, hopefully later today, the Repay Act. It provides two options that kids choose from: a fixed-rate option for repayment and an income-based option for repayment.

We also realize that under the income-based options that are out there today an individual who is married could file as married—filing an individual tax form—and their household income isn't considered for the amount they are going to repay on a monthly basis. That is not how we designed it.

We designed it so what their income capability was, their repayment would

reflect it. In other words, we have people who are gaming the system today because their one spouse makes a lot of money and one spouse doesn't make much, and they pay a minimal amount of monthly student loan repayments. When they do that, they cheat the other students behind them because they take money out of the system that can be used for those individuals who desperately need it.

The Repay Act streamlines a multitude of loan programs and creates a fixed-base and income-based repayment. It does it by consolidating all income-based repayment programs into one repayment program that caps borrowing at \$57,500 for 20 years and limits to 25 years the repayment period for loans over \$57,500, while ensuring the monthly payments rise at a reasonable rate based upon that annual income level—again, the household income level.

The benefit for students is they will up front have the knowledge they need of what they will expect to pay based upon the amount they borrow.

We believe this will drive smarter borrowing decisions and will lead students to limit the amount of debt they take prior to going to school. Behavioral economists argue that when an individual's options are less complex and straightforward, individuals are more likely to make rational decisions.

Senator KING and I believe the changes included in the Repay Act will promote those rational decisions that will ultimately lead to smarter borrowing that leads to repayment and ultimately healthier financial situations for our Nation's graduates.

Why are we here? It is because only 80 percent of our student loans are being repaid. That means 20 percent is in default.

What we want to do is we want to see kids get a great education. We want to see the ability for that to be paid for, and we want that money to be repaid based upon their success in the marketplace. I believe this act will put us on that road to do it.

Now, I don't want to pretend, and I don't think Senator KING will pretend, this isn't something that we crafted and created. This is the result of ideas that were put forward by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, the Lumina Foundation for Education, the Education Finance Council, the American Council on Education, the Young Invincibles, the Institute for College Access and Success, the New America Foundation, and many other groups.

This is truly Congress, the Senate at its best, reaching out to organizations that do this day in and day out, just as I think the chairman did on the application-card student aid form.

We have tried to search the best ideas. From that we have gleaned them and put them into the Repay Act. We

will introduce this bill. I thank the chairman. It does complement very much the FAST Act.

I thank my colleague, Senator KING, for his help on the introduction of this bill.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. No one was more instrumental in the work in 2013 that reformed student loans to reduce the interest rate for undergraduates by nearly half that year.

In his State of North Carolina there are many of the best universities and 2-year colleges in the country, and I know education has been and is foremost for him.

I look forward to working with him, the members of our committee and every Senator on the floor, as we go through the process with a full and honest debate on important issues using an open amendment process. Then I hope we are able to work with President Obama again this year in the same way we were in 2013 to achieve a result.

A forceful advocate for that result in 2013 was the Senator of Maine who has the advantage of having been a Governor, Senator KING, and we will let him have the final say in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Economic development and jobs is what unites us in this body. That is what we all want. That is what everyone here is striving to achieve—jobs and opportunity for the people of this country.

There are many factors that contribute to that, and we can discuss and debate all of them this year. I suspect that we will. There is infrastructure, tax policy, smart regulation, and regulatory reform. But the one about which there is very little dispute is education.

The single greatest job creation and economic development act in the history of the United States was the GI bill, subsequent to World War II, which opened the doors of college and higher education, to millions of Americans and literally built the middle class in this country. Education is what it is all about and education is even more important now than it was then.

There was a time in this country when you could graduate from high school and get a pretty good job in a mill, make good money, have two cars in the garage, and lead a successful life. That is much more difficult today. Even those jobs in those mills require more education.

In my State of Maine we did a survey a few years ago that showed 70 percent of the jobs had people touching a computer every day. That is what takes an education, and to get an education takes access.

I will share one rather chilling statistic in terms of the competitive nature of the 21st century. We are engaged in competition with the entire world and they want our jobs.

A little statistic is the top 8 percent of high school graduates in China are equal in number to all the high school graduates in the United States. Think about that for a minute—the top 8 percent in China are equal in number to all the high school graduates of the United States.

We are going to have to work to compete, and the only way we are going to be able to do that is if we work smart, and the only way we are going to be able to work smart is with education and expanded opportunity and access to education. Higher education in the 21st century, I would submit, is more important than ever.

There has been attention to this over the years by State governments, local governments, by parents, by students, and by the Federal Government, going back to the midst of the Civil War, when one of the great education bills of all time was passed, the land grant college system in 1864. Support for research at our great universities has been a Federal effort.

Student loans have been a part of what we have tried to contribute to this system for many years. Then, of course, we have Pell grants, which have enabled millions of students to find opportunity in higher education. But, ironically, the very programs that are designed to increase access to higher education have, themselves, become inaccessible.

Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BENNET made a dramatic showing today with these ridiculous forms. When you read the forms the conclusion is: I guess my kid isn't going to go to college.

We have created a system where you need an accountant, a lawyer at your shoulder in order to fill out a form for financial aid, and the people who need it the most are the least likely to have the resources to bring those experts to bear on the process. Programs designed to promote access have themselves become inaccessible.

So that is what today is all about. That is what our discussion is all about. It is about accessibility and simplification. Senators ALEXANDER and BENNET and BOOKER have brilliantly articulated the power of the idea behind the FAST Act: reduce the questions to just a few simple questions to get the necessary information. You don't need 80 pages of instructions to answer two questions. It will open the doors to literally millions of students whom we need. This isn't nice to have; this is need to have. This is an economic security and a national security question. We need these people. The current form is discouraging the

very people we want: those who may or may not take the plunge into higher education. The simple fact is you shouldn't need an accountant to figure out whether you can get financial aid to go to college.

The complementary bill Senator BURR and I are introducing today, along with Senator RUBIO and Senator WARNER, is called the Repay Act. The bill Senator ALEXANDER is speaking to is about accessibility and simplification on the front end. Our bill is accessibility and simplification on the back end, dealing with the issue of repayment. It basically reduces eight current options—and I have a chart that would make Rube Goldberg blush in terms of the complexity of the current options—to two. One is a 10-year fixed repayment plan, which certain students can select if it makes sense for them, and the other is a variable income-driven plan.

As Senator BURR pointed out, the ideas for this bill came from across the spectrum—from students, financial aid offices, financial aid administrators, Republicans, Democrats, and President Obama in his most recent budget.

By the way, one of the groups Senator BURR mentioned is the Young Invincibles. I would like to be a Young Invincible. I would like to see where I can join that group because sometimes I don't exactly feel that way. But this is an idea I think is invincible because it just makes so much common sense.

Borrowers can switch between the fixed payment and the variable payment depending upon their circumstances, but they never pay more than 15 percent of their disposable income.

I think another important provision is if a borrower is totally and permanently disabled and the loan is forgiven, they do not have to pay tax on the loan that is forgiven. Under current law, they have to pay an income tax on the phantom income of the loan that is forgiven.

I particularly thank Senators WARNER and RUBIO for joining us on this bill. They had their own bill on this repayment structure last year, and they have generously decided to join forces with us on this bill, and I believe that will add substantial weight to our work. They have already made contributions to the drafting of the bill, and I think that will help us considerably as we move forward with this legislation.

Quite often around here we talk about things we can't do—we can't do—problems we can't fix. This is something we can do. This is a human problem of our making by layering programs over one another and having the bureaucratic rules build over the years to the point where, as I said, it has created an accessibility problem for the very program designed to give access.

These are important bills. They are not necessarily the bills that are going

to get the headlines or cause all the fights and the friction, but these are the quiet kinds of changes that will change our country. They will provide opportunity for our students, for our families, and for our country. I am proud to join Senator ALEXANDER, the chair of the HELP Committee, and Senator BURR particularly, who has worked so hard on this bill. I think we have a combination of bills that will make a difference in people's lives and in the future of this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as the colloquy is concluding, I want to thank the Senators from Maine and New Jersey for their leadership and the Senator from North Carolina. I can assure them the King-Burr bill, with the support of Senator RUBIO and Senator WARNER, will be combined with our bill and be front and center on the agenda of the HELP Committee as early as we can this year. As far as I am concerned, it is the next priority after we fix No Child Left Behind. I am hopeful we can bring it to the floor by the spring, give the full Senate a chance to consider it, combine it with action of the House and work with the President, just as we did in 2013.

I am going to turn to Senator BENNET for just a minute to let him have a concluding word, but I wanted to say this. As I mentioned, President Obama is going to Tennessee on Friday. He is going to celebrate an initiative Tennessee has taken by itself to say to all high school graduates: Two years of community college education is tuition free. Of course, that is based upon the Pell grant. The State just makes up the difference, which isn't that much.

I am going to have an opportunity to say to the President: Mr. President, the one thing the Federal Government can do to make it easier for more Tennesseans to take advantage of Tennessee Promise is to get rid of the FAFSA. Because the President of Southwest Tennessee Community College in Memphis says 1,500 students a semester are not enrolling in community college, who ought to be going, just because they and their families are intimidated by this form or can't fill it out.

There is no excuse for that, and we are going to fix that. Maybe the solution is three questions, maybe it is four questions, but surely it is not 108 questions, and 70 or 80 pages of instructions, wasting the time of administrators, guidance counselors, parents, accountants, students, and discouraging Americans from taking advantage of education.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a one-page summary of the FAST Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL AID SIMPLIFICATION AND TRANSPARENCY (FAST) ACT

A Bill introduced by Senators Alexander and Bennet to simplify the federal financial aid programs and application process.

What the Bill Does:

Eliminates the Free Application for Financial Student Aid, or FAFSA, by reducing the 10-page form to a postcard that would ask just two questions: What is your family size? And, what was your household income two years ago?

Tells families early in the process what the federal government will provide them in a grant and loan by using earlier tax data and creating a look-up table to allow students in their junior year of high school to see how much in federal aid they are eligible for as they start to look at colleges.

Streamlines the federal grant and loan programs by combining two federal grant programs into one Pell grant program and reducing the six different federal loan programs into three: one undergraduate loan program, one graduate loan program, and one parent loan program, resulting in more access for more students.

Enable students to use Pell grants in a manner that works for them by restoring year-round Pell grant availability and providing flexibility so students can study at their own pace. Both provisions would enable them to complete college sooner.

Discourages over-borrowing by limiting the amount a student is able to borrow based on enrollment. For example, a part-time student would be able to take out a part time loan only.

Simplifies repayment options by streamlining complicated repayment programs and creates two simple plans, an income based plan and a 10-year repayment plan.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Presiding Officer for the time, I thank my fellow Senators, and I yield for the final words of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I again say thank you to the chairman of the HELP Committee for all his leadership and his work dealing with this form. We have been after this for about 1 year.

This might be a quiet bill, as Senator KING said earlier, but in my travels around the State I can't find anybody who is unhappy with this legislation except for the people who have already filled out the form, who are asking: Where were you 5 years ago when I was having to do this for my students or where were you when I was having to fill this out for my college education?

It makes absolutely no sense. I am sure many of these questions are well intentioned, but what we have learned in the hearings we have had, in the testimony, is they are not necessary. If they are not necessary, we shouldn't be asking them. Our students would be a lot better off spending their time figuring out what college they want to attend, figuring out what course of study they want to undertake than spending their time with this bureaucratic nightmare.

I am enormously optimistic that we are going to get this passed with the

chairman's leadership, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on that. I would like to thank the Senator from New Jersey again for signing on as one of the original cosponsors.

With that, I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 21—MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 21

Resolved, That the following be the majority membership on the following committees for the remainder of the 114th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Perdue, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain (Chairman), Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Ms. Ayotte, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Lee, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cruz.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Heller, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski (Chairman), Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Flake, Mr. Daines, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Alexander, Mrs. Capito.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Coats, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Barrasso.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Enzi, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. McCain, Mr.

Johnson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Flake, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Vitter, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Ernst, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Risch.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton.

COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Corker, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Coats, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. DURBIN (for Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 22

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow (Ranking), Mr. Leahy, Mr. Brown, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Casey.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Ms. Mikulski (Ranking), Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Reed, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Coons, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Reid (Ranking), Mr. Nelson, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Manchin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King, Mr. Heinrich.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Brown (Ranking), Mr. Reed, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Tester, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Ms. Warren, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Donnelly.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Nelson (Ranking), Ms. Cantwell, Mrs. McCaskill, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Udall, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Peters.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Cantwell (Ranking), Mr. Wyden, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr.

Franken, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Warren.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mrs. Boxer (Ranking), Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Merkley, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Booker, Mr. Markey.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Wyden (Ranking), Mr. Schumer, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Casey, Mr. Warner.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Menendez (Ranking), Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Udall, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Markey.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mrs. Murray (Ranking), Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Casey, Mr. Franken, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Warren.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Carper (Ranking), Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Tester, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Booker, Mr. Peters.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mrs. Feinstein (Ranking), Mr. Wyden, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Warner, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. King, Ms. Hirono and Mr. Reed (ex officio).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Leahy (Ranking), Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Franken, Mr. Coons, Mr. Blumenthal.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sanders (Ranking), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Schumer (Ranking), Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Udall, Mr. Warner, Mr. Leahy, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. King.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Cardin (Ranking), Ms. Cantwell, Mrs. Shaheen, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Coons, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Peters.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Blumenthal (Ranking), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brown, Mr. Tester, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Manchin.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mrs. McCaskill (Ranking), Mr. Nelson, Mr. Casey, Mr. Whitehouse, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Warren, Mr. Kaine.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Ms. Klobuchar (Ranking), Mr. Casey, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Peters.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mrs. Boxer (Co-Chair), Mr. Coons, and Mr. Schatz.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Tester (Ranking), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Udall, Mr. Franken, Mr. Schatz, and Ms. Heitkamp.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX IS NOT IN THE ECONOMIC INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VITTER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 1

Whereas a carbon tax is regressive in nature and would unfairly burden those vulnerable individuals and families in the United States that are already struggling with increasing electricity rates and a slow economic recovery;

Whereas a carbon tax would increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax would harm the entire United States manufacturing sector;

Whereas European nations that have adopted carbon policies and regulatory regimes have forced energy poverty on their citizens and undermined their economies;

Whereas the increase in production of domestic fossil energy resources on private and State-owned land has created significant job growth and private capital investment; and

Whereas affordable and reliable energy sources are critical to maintaining the United States global competitiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to families and businesses in the United States, and is not in the interest of the United States.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to my science policy fellow, Adria Wilson, through the end of the session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 21, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 21) making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 21) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 21

Resolved, That the following be the majority membership on the following committees for the remainder of the 114th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Perdue, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain (Chairman), Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Ms. Ayotte, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr.

Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Lee, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cruz.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Heller, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski (Chairman), Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Flake, Mr. Daines, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Portman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Alexander, Mrs. Capito.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Coats, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Barrasso.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Enzi, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. McCain, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Hatch, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Flake, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Vitter, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Ernst, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Risch.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Corker, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Coats, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, we are designating the full membership of each committee, plus the chairmen of the Armed

Services and Energy and Natural Resources Committees tonight. We will appoint the rest of the chairmen tomorrow once we have had a quick meeting of the Republican conference to ratify the names.

CONSTITUTING THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 22, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 22), to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 22

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow (Ranking), Mr. Leahy, Mr. Brown, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Bennett, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Casey.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Ms. Mikulski (Ranking), Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Reed, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Coons, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Reed (Ranking), Mr. Nelson, Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Manchin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King, Mr. Heinrich.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Brown (Ranking), Mr. Reed, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Tester, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Ms. Warren, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Donnelly.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Nelson (Ranking), Ms. Cantwell, Mrs. McCaskill, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Udall, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Peters.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Cantwell (Ranking), Mr. Wyden, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Franken, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Warren.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mrs. Boxer (Ranking), Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse,

Mr. Merkley, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Booker, Mr. Markey.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Wyden (Ranking), Mr. Schumer, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Casey, Mr. Warner.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Menendez (Ranking), Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Udall, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Markey.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mrs. Murray (Ranking), Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Casey, Mr. Franken, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Warren.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Carper (Ranking), Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Tester, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Booker, Mr. Peters.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mrs. Feinstein (Ranking), Mr. Wyden, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Warner, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. King, Ms. Hirono and Mr. Reed (ex officio).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Leahy (Ranking), Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Franken, Mr. Coons, Mr. Blumenthal.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sanders (Ranking), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Schumer (Ranking), Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Udall, Mr. Warner, Mr. Leahy, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. King.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Cardin (Ranking), Ms. Cantwell, Mrs. Shaheen, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Coons, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Peters.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Blumenthal (Ranking), Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brown, Mr. Tester, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Manchin.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mrs. McCaskill (Ranking), Mr. Nelson, Mr. Casey, Mr. Whitehouse, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Warren, Mr. Kaine.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Ms. Klobuchar (Ranking), Mr. Casey, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Peters.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mrs. Boxer (Co-Chair), Mr. Coons, and Mr. Schatz.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Tester (Ranking), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Udall, Mr. Franken, Mr. Schatz, and Ms. Heitkamp.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would just say for the RECORD, following the comments of the majority leader, these are the minority committee assignments and ranking member positions for all of the standing committees.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 95-277, as amended by the appropriate provisions of Public Law 102-246, and in consultation with the majority leader, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term: George Marcus of California.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the appointment of

the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: the Honorable Martin Heinrich of New Mexico.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, January 8, 2015; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Tomorrow the energy committee is scheduled to mark up the Keystone bill so that we can move to that bill next week. We anticipate a full and robust debate on that bill, with a fair and open amendment process.

In addition, the House sent us the TRIA bill a few moments ago. That bill passed the House 416 to 5. We will look to vote on it tomorrow and send it to the President for signature as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:56 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 8, 2015, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ASHTON B. CARTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE CHARLES TIMOTHY HAGEL.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

ALLAN R. LONDON, OF UTAH, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2002, VICE SARAH BLOOM RASKIN, RESIGNED.

ALLAN R. LONDON, OF UTAH, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2016. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LORETTA E. LYNCH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.

THE JUDICIARY

JEANNE E. DAVIDSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE DONALD C. POGUE, RETIRED.

ARMANDO OMAR BONILLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT

OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE EDWARD J. DAMICH, TERM EXPIRED.

NANCY B. FIRESTONE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, (REAPPOINTMENT)

THOMAS L. HALKOWSKI, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LYNN JEANNE BUSH, TERM EXPIRED.

PATRICIA M. MCCARTHY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE EMILY CLARK HEWITT, RETIRED.

JERI KAYLENE SOMERS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE GEORGE W. MILLER, RETIRED.

LUIS FELIPE RESTREPO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, VICE ANTHONY J. SCIRICA, RETIRED.

KARA FARNANDEZ STOLL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, VICE RANDALL R. RADER, RETIRED.

ANN DONNELLY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE SANDRA L. TOWNES, RETIRING.

DALE A. DROZD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE ANTHONY W. ISHII, RETIRED.

LASHANN MOUTIQUE DEARCY HALL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS, RETIRED.

GEORGE C. HANKS, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE NANCY FRIEDMAN ATLAS, RETIRED.

ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, VICE GARY A. FENNER, RETIRING.

TRAVIS RANDALL MCDONOUGH, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE CURTIS L. COLLIER, RETIRED.

JOSE ROLANDO OLVERA, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE HILDA G. TAGLE, RETIRED.

JILL N. PARRISH, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, VICE DEE V. BENSON, RETIRED.

ALFRED H. BENNETT, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE KENNETH M. HOYT, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL GRECO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOSEPH R. GUCCIONE, TERM EXPIRED.

RONALD LEE MILLER, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WALTER ROBERT BRADLEY, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL TONY D. BAUERNFEIND
COLONEL VINCENT K. BECKLUND
COLONEL STEVEN J. BLEYMAIER

COLONEL RICHARD A. COE
COLONEL WILLIAM T. COOLEY
COLONEL BARRY R. CORNISH
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER E. CRAIGE
COLONEL ANDREW A. CROFT
COLONEL ALLAN E. DAY
COLONEL TRENT H. EDWARDS
COLONEL ANDREW J. GEBARA
COLONEL GERALD V. GOODFELLOW
COLONEL JOHN R. GORDY II
COLONEL STACEY T. HAWKINS
COLONEL CAMERON G. HOLT
COLONEL KEVIN A. HUYCK
COLONEL JAMES A. JACOBSON
COLONEL DARREN V. JAMES
COLONEL DAVID J. JULAZADEH
COLONEL KEVIN B. KENNEDY
COLONEL CHAD T. MANSKE
COLONEL MICHAEL A. MINIHAN
COLONEL WAYNE R. MONTEITH
COLONEL DANIEL J. ORCUTT
COLONEL LENNY J. RICHOUX
COLONEL CARL E. SCHAEFER
COLONEL JOHN E. SHAW
COLONEL BRAD M. SULLIVAN
COLONEL BILLY D. THOMPSON
COLONEL PAUL A. WELCH
COLONEL WILLIAM P. WEST

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRYAN K. ANDERSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 7, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 7, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GLENN THOMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

POLICY CHANGES TOWARD CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose the December 17 announcement by President Obama on policy changes toward the Cuban Communist regime. The Cuban regime from day one was planning on using Alan Gross as a pawn to receive concessions from the Obama administration, and their strategy worked.

In April 2013, when asked about a possible swap for Mr. Gross, Secretary Kerry testified before Congress that “We have refused to do that because there is no equivalency. Alan Gross is wrongly imprisoned, and we are not going to trade as if it is a spy for a spy.” That turned out to not be true.

President Obama unilaterally pardoned three convicted Cuban spies. These spies were responsible for the deaths of three American citizens and one U.S. resident, Carlos Costa, Armando Alejandro, Mario de la Pena, and Pablo Morales, whose Brothers to the Rescue planes were unjustly shot down over international air space on direct orders of the Castro brothers.

To make matters worse, we learned that the U.S. Government used resources to facilitate the artificial in-semination of one of the wives of the Cuban spies. Good grief. So the White House ignores the fact that these innocent U.S. pilots were not able to have their own families, but rewards one of the persons responsible for their deaths.

Not only did the dictatorship achieve the return of five convicted spies, it was also able to attain major concessions from our President in order to support Cuba’s struggling economy.

Cuba’s largest supporters, Russia and Venezuela, are struggling due to their own fiscal crises, so the Castro brothers needed a bailout from a new source; and, sadly, they found one with President Obama.

By increasing tourism travel on the island, the Obama administration will be injecting millions of dollars into the pockets of the Castro brothers. The Cuban police state runs the hotels.

Let’s examine the President’s announcement very closely. First, the President claims that these new policy changes will empower the Cuban people. Well, the pro-democracy advocates on the island have stated that the changes will help their oppressor, not the people of Cuba.

Second, the issue is not only impacting the people of Cuba, it also poses a greater threat to U.S. national security interests. Cuba is a designated state sponsor of terrorism and is an avowed enemy of the United States.

With these concessions by the administration, the Castro brothers will use some of their new economic stream to invest more funds into their espionage activities, activities that are aimed against our Nation. With the ability to garner more intelligence against the U.S., the Castro brothers are likely to hit the black market and sell this intelligence to the highest bidder. This is not a theory; it is a fact.

One example of this fact is the case of Ana Belen Montes. She was a convicted Cuban spy who worked for our U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, collecting information for Castro so that it can be sold to our enemies.

Third, the human rights situation on the island has not changed one bit. The President says that he got Raul Castro to agree to the release of 53 political prisoners, prisoners who should never have been in jail in the first place, yet the White House will not release the names of these 53 political prisoners. Why not? What do they have to hide?

Plus what good is it for the Castro brothers to release these 53 when he doesn’t stop capturing and detaining other prisoners, which he will?

What has been happening in Cuba lately in these past few weeks? Well, according to reports, more than 80 Cubans have been detained. The Cuban coast guard sank a boat recently in international waters that was carrying over 30 people, causing the deaths of some of them on board. Hezbollah celebrated President Obama’s announcement after a meeting with the Cuban Ambassador to Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, this misguided policy of the President will have serious implications for the United States and sends a signal to our enemies that we will cave and we will surrender at every turn. We in the Congress must do everything we can to prevent this disastrous policy from going into effect.

This is a bad deal for U.S. national security and for the Cuban opposition, and it is a sweetheart deal for the repressive Cuban regime.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is always a great deal of excitement surrounding a new Congress and a new year. One area that has been very encouraging is the focus on rebuilding and renewing America. That was where we left off in the last Congress, frustrated by an inability to produce a 6-year reauthorization, largely because of an inability for Congress to address meaningfully how it would be funded. This continues a struggle of almost two decades, as we have not increased the gas tax or developed a viable, sustainable, adequate alternative.

It is widely recognized that America is falling apart and falling behind. Our infrastructure, once the envy of the world, now has put us at a second-tier status, with America at risk of falling ever further behind.

The deplorable state of our infrastructure is actually costing Americans far more to endure the damage to their cars and the delays to their lives through congestion than simply funding an alternative and fixing it.

It is encouraging that the administration and people in both parties, in both Chambers, might be prepared to address the issue anew. There are some

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

short-term stopgap solutions which would nowhere near solve the problem but nudge us in the right direction.

In the Senate there is bipartisan interest in and openness to a comprehensive solution including the gas tax. Senators BOB CORKER and his partner CHRIS MURPHY have been champions. Senator TOM CARPER continues his leadership and advocacy for the gas tax solution. Senator JOHN THUNE, a key Republican leader, has signaled his openness to the gas tax, which is the simplest, most logical, and most effective solution.

Even the problematic proposal to use dynamic scoring to evaluate budget proposals could make a difference for the prospect of solving this huge problem for America if it would be applied in the spirit of dynamic scoring.

The Standard & Poor's research report, "U.S. Infrastructure Investment: A Chance to Reap More Than We Sow," pointed out the overwhelming economic impact in terms of jobs created, economic benefits that actually exceeded the direct amount invested, and long-term deficit reduction of \$200 million for every \$1.2 billion invested. This should be one of the easiest economic decisions we ever make.

In an era of low interest rates, gasoline prices falling dramatically, when there are still hundreds of thousands of people ready to go to work at family wage jobs rebuilding this country, the economic case has never been stronger.

By all means, let's evaluate all of the proposals. Let's expand the discussion. Let's look at the leadership of States around the country that are stepping up to do their part. State, local, and private investment all have a role to play, to be sure, but recognize that the 25 percent of infrastructure funding that comes from the Federal Government plays a critical role. Let this Congress give America a solution that is sustainable, not one that would put us back in the same fix in a year or two or even sooner.

Let's have a revenue source that is dedicated so that we can begin on longer-term projects that demand multimodal, multistate, multiyear solutions and that is large enough to give us a long overdue 6-year comprehensive reauthorization. Stable, dedicated, big enough to do the job—this is a test that the new Congress and administration should meet to revitalize our economy and rebuild and renew this great country.

At a time of dramatically falling oil and gas prices, when the public is suffering from Congress dithering on our transportation and other infrastructure needs, there will never be a better time to heed the advice of President Ronald Reagan 33 years ago in his Thanksgiving Day radio address to the country to raise the gas tax and put Americans to work fixing the problem that has only gotten worse. It was good advice then. It is good advice today.

MENTAL HEALTH REFORMS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, sadly, each day we read sensationalized headlines that boggle the mind, but here is the rest of the story. In New York, headlines read a 30-year-old man has been charged with killing his father who founded a hedge fund because his allowance had been cut.

The rest of the story? He had been in a mental health decline for years. A friend told the press, clearly their son had serious mental illness. There were stories about strange things that he had been doing in the past few years, really erratic behavior. Another newspaper reports the man was off his medication.

In Florida, headlines read a 22-year-old man cut off his mother's head with an ax last week because of her nagging about daily chores.

The rest of the story? This man had been diagnosed with schizophrenia and had been involuntarily held under the State's civil commitment law but released. Despite his illness and past commitments, he was no longer in treatment because Florida, like most States, requires a person to be imminently homicidal or suicidal for treatment.

In Pennsylvania a former marine killed his ex-wife and five of her family members last month because of "family issues."

The rest of the story? The marine had been evaluated and cleared of having suicidal or homicidal tendencies by a Department of Veterans Affairs psychiatrist just days before, a decision we now see was wrong.

Each week there are half a dozen new reports that demand more than a sensationalized headline because the rest of the story tells the real story. Severe mental illness is a brain disease; it is not an attitude or a lifestyle choice. Psychosis, schizophrenia, and other serious mental illnesses involve disruption in typical brain functioning which translates into a very specific set of disturbing behaviors. This is not a condemnation of the mentally ill nor a criticism of those who have severe brain disorders.

Hallucinations, voices, visions, and paranoia lead to actions that aren't grounded in reasoned choices. For those who don't have a brain disease it is hard to understand, and it is unnerving to think about, but when we understand that behaviors are symptomatic of what is occurring in the brain, we can address them without judgment, just like other medical diseases and other lifesaving treatments.

The distorted reasoning why an individual acts out in a violent manner or

takes the lives of innocent victims on a mass scale are complex and not as simple as a response to a mother's nagging. Sadly, in all cases I mentioned today, the families knew there was something wrong with their mentally ill loved one but they were ignored and frustrated or turned away by a broken system of State and Federal laws that create walls and barriers instead of access to care.

Parents know there is a problem, and even when they have the resources to get a child help, the family efforts are thwarted by this broken system, and they are not getting effective, evidence-based treatment. And communities rarely have the appropriate programs, resources, and doctors to deal with the most severe cases.

In the face of this growing crisis, we must approach serious mental illness as a medical emergency that engages a community and medical response to help people and families trapped in this system that is misguided, in denial, and disconnected.

We can change this tragic pattern, and that is why I will be reintroducing the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act.

□ 1015

My legislation makes sure the most severely mentally ill have access to treatment. It fixes the shortage of psychiatric beds. It clarifies and simplifies HIPAA privacy laws. It reforms Federal programs to focus on programs that research shows work, not feel-good fads. It helps patients who aren't able to understand their need for treatment get meaningful care.

We know that, for example, 50 percent of people with schizophrenia suffer from something called anosognosia—they are not even aware that they have problems—and this leads to noncompliance with treatment and helps to explain why 40 percent of Americans with serious mental illness don't get any treatment.

Anosognosia occurs most frequently when schizophrenia or a bipolar disorder affects portions of the frontal lobe, resulting in impaired executive function. The patients are neurologically unable to comprehend that their delusions or hallucinations are not real.

This is different than denial; this is a change in the wiring of the brain. We need to understand and respect that. The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act also ensures there is accountability for how public health dollars are being spent.

We owe it to the 10 million Americans with a serious mental illness and the 5 million who are not with treatment to take meaningful action to fix the chaotic patchwork of programs and laws that make it impossible to get meaningful medical care until it is too late to do anything beyond mourning.

Each day, I receive countless letters and telephone calls from parents across the country who must courageously battle a broken system when trying to help a loved one in mental health crisis. I admire their courage, their compassion, and their passion. Let their struggles be our motivation to take action of our own now.

As I said, I will soon be reintroducing my Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, and I welcome all Members interested in joining me in this quest to work together as we reintroduce this to make sure we get treatment before tragedy.

STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, as the new Congress begins its work on behalf of the American people, I rise to address my colleagues about an issue of national importance, namely Puerto Rico's quest to discard its status as a U.S. territory and to become a U.S. State.

Puerto Rico has been a territory since 1898. If Puerto Rico does not desire to remain a territory, it can follow one of two paths. The territory can become a State or it can become a sovereign nation, either fully independent from the U.S. or with a compact of free association with the U.S. that either nation can terminate. If Puerto Rico becomes a nation, future generations of island residents would not be American citizens.

My constituents have made countless contributions to the United States in times of peace and war, serving in every military conflict since World War I. They fight today in Afghanistan and other dangerous locations in the same units as young men and women from States such as Florida, Texas, and New Mexico. Many of them have made the ultimate sacrifice in battle. When they do, their casket is flown back to this country draped in the American flag.

It takes a special kind of patriotism to fight for a nation that you love, but one that does not treat you equally. Although Puerto Rico is home to more American citizens than 21 States, my constituents cannot vote for President, are not represented in the Senate, and have one nonvoting delegate in the House. Moreover, territory status gives Congress license to treat Puerto Rico worse than the States, and Congress often uses that license.

Everyone, other than apologists for the status quo, comprehends that territory status is the root cause of the economic crisis in Puerto Rico. As a result of the structural problems this status has created, residents of Puerto Rico are relocating to the States in staggering numbers.

I know it breaks their hearts to leave behind the island they love, but most see no other option; yet through the clouds, a bright sun is emerging. The people of Puerto Rico have finally said, "No more." They have come to the conclusion that they deserve a status that is both democratic and dignified.

They will no longer tolerate being second-class citizens. They do not want special treatment; rather, they demand equal treatment, nothing more but nothing less.

The will of the Puerto Rican people was expressed in a 2012 referendum sponsored by the Puerto Rico Government. There, a majority of my constituents expressed their opposition to territory status.

Statehood received more votes than territory status, and statehood received far more votes than independence or free association, proving that Puerto Rico has no desire to weaken the bonds forged with the United States over nearly 12 decades. In short, statehood is now the predominant force in Puerto Rico.

At my urging and in response to this landmark referendum, the Obama administration proposed and Congress approved an appropriation of \$2.5 million to fund the first federally-sponsored vote in Puerto Rico's history with the stated goal of resolving the status issue.

I have proposed that the funding be used to hold a simple, federally sponsored yes-or-no vote on whether Puerto Rico should be admitted as a State, just as Alaska and Hawaii did. This approach would yield a definitive result that nobody could reasonably question, and it has broad congressional support, since a bill I introduced last Congress that embodies this approach had 131 co-sponsors and led to the filing of an identical Senate companion bill.

All that remains is for the Governor of Puerto Rico to schedule the vote; yet a year has passed, and we have seen only inertia and indecision, all talk and no action.

For my part, I will continue to press for action both in San Juan and in Washington, D.C., using any strategy and technique that will advance the statehood cause.

Since none of my colleagues in this Chamber representing States would accept territory status for their constituents, I know they will understand that I will not accept it for my constituents either.

PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE OF RURAL HEALTH PRESENTS THE 2014 RURAL HEALTH AWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recog-

nize one individual and one organization from Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District that during the past year made substantial contributions to rural health in support of the communities our hospitals and caregivers serve each and every day.

The Pennsylvania Office of Rural Health, which is funded by the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy, the Pennsylvania Department of Health, and the Pennsylvania State University, is a public partnership designed to expand data-driven health care outcomes for rural communities.

Each year, the Pennsylvania Office of Rural Health's "Rural Health Awards" recognize individuals and organizations in the Commonwealth that have gone above and beyond in their respective field or program and made significant improvements towards improving health outcomes.

Mr. Daniel Blough, chief executive officer of the Punxsutawney Area Hospital in Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, received the 2014 State Rural Health Leader of the Year Award. Mr. Blough was recognized for 28 years of dedicated service to the health and well-being of the residents in and around Punxsutawney, which is located in Jefferson County, Pennsylvania.

As a founding Pennsylvania member and president of the Pennsylvania Mountains Healthcare Alliance, a collaboration of 18 rural hospitals, Mr. Blough's leadership served to strengthen clinical outcomes for residents throughout the region.

Additionally, the Total HEALTH Program at the Dickinson Center, Incorporated, in St. Marys, Pennsylvania, which is also located in the Fifth District, received the 2014 Rural Health Program of the Year Award.

The Total HEALTH Program, a regional collaboration of health service providers encompassing Penn Highlands-Elk, Dickinson Center, Incorporated, and an independent physician in Elk County, aims to provide primary and behavioral health care services to individuals with physical, mental, and behavioral health needs.

Total HEALTH received the recognition for innovative programming in Elk, Cameron, and McKean Counties that resulted in both improved patient coordination and clinical outcomes.

Madam Speaker, I offer my thanks, my congratulations, and my praise to Mr. Daniel Blough of the Punxsutawney Area Hospital and the professionals and the staff represented through the Total HEALTH Program for their commitment to strengthening and improving the quality of care in the communities of our region.

THE CONCERNS OF THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am honored to stand here today as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, and I am grateful to my constituents for allowing me to serve in this capacity.

My district is a very diverse one. It contains the greatest medical center in the world, the Houston Medical Center, and it contains the first domed stadium, the Astrodome. We speak more than 80 different languages, and the ballot in the Ninth Congressional District in the State of Texas is printed in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Chinese. We are indeed a very diverse district.

My constituents are constituents not unlike those across the length and breadth of this country. There are issues of concern to them. I want to assure my constituents that as we move into the 114th Congress, I will be pushing legislation that will be important: the LAW Act, the Living American Wage Act. We have filed this bill before, and we will file it again in this Congress.

The LAW Act indexes the minimum wage to poverty. It is our belief that anyone who works full time should not live below the poverty line. People should be able to work their way out of poverty.

The LAW Act indexes the minimum wage to poverty such that when the poverty level rises, the minimum wage will also elevate, such that people who are working for minimum wage will continue to live above the poverty line.

As an aside, I spoke to a person who is working at the wage that is paid to the persons who wait tables, the wait staff, \$2.13 an hour; and one of the things that was called to my attention was that these persons—good people, hardworking people—don't always make a lot with these tips that are supposed to supplement their income.

I have been told that as little as \$8 in one day in tips were being made by one of my constituents, so I am concerned not only about the \$7.25 an hour, the minimum wage, but also about the \$2.13 an hour. I also supported H.R. 1010, which was filed in the last Congress, and it also indexed the minimum wage, not to poverty, but it did index the minimum wage.

I will be concerned about comprehensive immigration reform because in my district, I have a good many persons who are the sons and daughters of immigrants who came here not of their own volition. Many of them came and discovered that they were not American citizens after graduating from high school.

I support what the President has done with his executive order. I have to support what he has done with his executive order, given that I am the beneficiary of the greatest executive order ever written: the Emancipation Proclamation. It did not free the slaves, but

it did pave the way for the passage of the 13th Amendment.

I am honored to say that I support what the President has done, but we still must have comprehensive immigration reform because there is much more to be done. With millions of people living in the shadows, we need to know who is in the country, and we also need to make sure those who are in the country pay their fair share of taxes, that they are a part of the infrastructure that elevates the country—the economic infrastructure—and to do this, we need comprehensive immigration reform.

I am also concerned very much about our veterans. This is why in the last Congress, we passed the language that was in the HAVEN Act in the defense authorization bill.

Senator JACK REED, thank you so much. Senator JACK REED helped to get that through the Senate, and that language got through the Senate because Senator REED was there. Senator REED, we are eternally grateful, and I think a good many veterans are too.

Twenty million dollars was made available to veterans to help those who are low-income veterans who are injured in some way, such that they cannot use their facilities in their homes as they would without that disability. Counters are lowered, bathrooms are made accessible, and ramps are installed.

Senator REED, thank you for helping us to get this \$20 million, which will be matched by NGOs who will perform this service and help our veterans.

Finally, we are concerned about law enforcement. I respect law enforcement. I support law enforcement. What happened to these peace officers in New York was dastardly done. The dastard that did it is a person that we can never ever in any way glorify. The people who commit crimes ought to be punished, and I support punishment for people who commit crimes.

I also support having a system that prevents our law enforcement officers from being falsely accused. I believe that a camera on an officer can make a difference, and I am honored to say that my colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CLEAVER, and I are working together on bills that we have filed to bring them together, so that we can help our law enforcement avoid specious accusations and make sure that they have the evidence of what actually occurred.

God bless my constituents and the United States of America.

□ 1030

SERVING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we come to begin this new opportunity of service to the American people, clearly we want to emphasize to them that we take this responsibility seriously and, as well, that we know that we represent our constituents. These are districts that are between thousands of people that are in our congressional districts, but we realize that the broader sense of what we do is to represent our Nation and the values and needs of the American people.

Over the last 2 days, as we begin this legislative process, I have been concerned about two issues in particular that I believe do not, if you will, provide for the overall sensitivity to the American people. We were discussing a major financial services bill that will be coming up. Many elements are in this bill, but I want our constituents and, more importantly, our colleagues to realize that you have a bill that will diminish what we call the Volcker rule.

What that is is a protection to make sure if banks want to dabble and dabble in risky ventures or risky investments, that they do so with the money that is private and separate from money that is protected by the FDIC. That is your savings accounts. That is the money you socked away. In the instance of this legislation, they want to take that protection away so that banks can dabble and dabble in accounts that are protected by the FDIC, meaning that you pay for mistakes; you pay for collapse; you pay for the wrong decisions that are made; and you lose. I don't want the American people to lose.

It is something that has touched my heart because I represent a vast amount of constituents: those who are quite well-endowed, if you will, quite wealthy, such as major corporations and neighbors and others who are doing quite well; and then, of course, I represent children and widows who are dependent on something called SSI, or those who are disabled who are dependent on SSI. And I cannot, for the life of me, understand why we would pass legislation that would, in essence, indicate that we are not going to continue supporting SSI, in fact, that we may call for either the elimination or the decreasing of benefits under SSI.

Do we realize, does this Republican leadership realize, that those who receive SSI are the most vulnerable, the poorest, the children who are in great need, the sick who are in great need, people who have worked and who have fallen upon times in which they need that kind of support? Why would we, in the thinking of representing the core of American values, lifting all people, believing in the equality of all, why would we do this? And so my voice is going to be heard loudly and clearly. I call upon, as my Democratic colleagues have so aptly noted, that we raise our voices and that we get in the way and that we stop this kind of intrusion on

those who cannot, in some instances, speak for themselves.

I want to rise today as well to acknowledge my deepest sympathy to the people of France for the heinous and tragic incident which has just occurred. When I left, there were 12 dead, including two police officers in the line of duty. We pray for their families, and we stand up against this vile act of franchise terrorism.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am grateful to serve on that committee with the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, and Chairman MCCAUL. I hope that we can work in a bipartisan manner to confront this kind of dangerous terrorism, recognizing that we do not label people by their faith, but we label them by their actions.

Might I also say that I express, again, on the floor, a sympathy for the tragic execution of the NYPD law enforcement officers. We do not stand for that. That individual has been determined to be disturbed, crazed, and does not represent any value of America. We offer our deepest sympathy to those shot recently in the line of duty. Hopefully we will continue working in the Judicial Committee to look at the criminal justice system that really involves a whole number of elements, such as the grand jury system, the special prosecutor system, the constant traffic stops in many instances that are done on a racially profiled scenario, and the uplifting of training and community-oriented policing.

Mr. Speaker, we can do all of these things if we work together, but I did not come to this Congress to undermine the criminal justice system or to undermine people who are in need.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You for the joy, excitement, and ceremony of yesterday when the 114th Congress convened. It was a celebration of the ongoing American experiment of participatory democracy.

Today begins, if not in full force, the work of the Congress when the difficulties facing our Nation, and some communities especially, come into focus. We ask again an abundance of Your wisdom for the Members of the people's House.

May we be forever grateful for the blessings our Nation enjoys and appropriately generous with what we have to help those among us who are in need.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect please present themselves in the well.

Mr. CROWLEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MENG of New York, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. RANGEL of New York, Mr. TONKO of New York, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 114th Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, and Mr. Kirk D. Boyle, Legal Counsel, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 114th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

HIRE OUR HEROES ACT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's takeover of our Nation's health care system burdens small businesses and veterans seeking jobs. ObamaCare's employer mandate hurts small businesses' ability to hire employees while veterans already face a tough job market.

I am grateful the House yesterday passed the Hire More Heroes Act, a bipartisan bill to exempt veterans who already receive health care benefits through the VA and TRICARE from being counted in the number that must receive employer coverage.

This policy change encourages businesses to hire veterans and provides relief to employers to create jobs. I appreciate South Carolina Attorney General Bob Livingston working with Colonel Ronnie Taylor on Operation Palmetto Employment to reduce veteran unemployment from 16 to 3 percent.

Potential for employment should not be restricted by the failures of ObamaCare, and I am grateful one of the first votes of the 114th Congress supports veterans and creates jobs.

Also, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy to America's first ally, France, on the terrorist attack today in Paris.

PORT NEGOTIATIONS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my hopes that the negotiations between the Pacific Maritime Association and our dock workers will improve quickly with the help of a Federal mediator.

Resolving differences between the ILWU and the PMA is essential to the

United States' economy because our west coast ports support 5 million jobs across the country and handle two-thirds of all America's trade. This represents 12.5 percent of our GDP.

Port workers have been without a contract for 7 months under tense and uncertain conditions. Reaching a fair agreement is urgent for workers and their families, for communities, for our businesses that depends on goods moving through these ports, and indeed for our Nation's prosperity.

As cochair of the bipartisan Port Caucus, along with my colleague TED POE, I will do all I can to help our ports operate smoothly and keep Americans working.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. ROUZER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take an accountant to figure out that our path of more spending and more debt must change. Our national debt has increased by more than \$7 trillion over the past 6 years, now totaling more than \$18 trillion.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.J. Res. 1 and H.J. Res. 2. Both of these bills would amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget. Families across North Carolina and America are required to live within their means, and they expect Washington to do the same.

I came here with a clear mission: work to get a balanced budget and do my best to reduce the size and scope of government, so that our small businesses and farm families can grow and create jobs.

On behalf of the fine citizens of the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina, I am proud to be a cosponsor of both of these resolutions, and I encourage my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to join me in this effort.

NEW CONGRESS REPRESENTS A NEW OPPORTUNITY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 114th Congress of the United States convened for the first time. This new Congress represents a new opportunity to get to work on the priorities of the American people.

We have a responsibility over the next 2 years to work together in a bipartisan way to create jobs, grow the economy, expand access to affordable education, and keep our communities safe.

Last night, Democrats offered a new legislative package to grow the economy by creating better infrastructure

and bigger paychecks for hardworking Americans. Unfortunately, House Republicans voted to block action on this important legislation.

I am hopeful that this year we can cast aside partisan differences and work together to expand opportunities for hardworking Americans and their families.

This month, I will be meeting with Rhode Islanders all across my home State to hear about their priorities as I develop my legislative work plan for the 114th Congress.

By working together, I believe we can find common ground to make this Congress more productive than the last, accomplish the work that we were sent here to do, and create a brighter future for the people we serve.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, for generations, the hardworking families of Maine's Second District have balanced their checkbooks at the kitchen table. It is time our Federal Government does the same.

A balanced budget amendment to our Constitution will finally force Washington to live within its means. This discipline will help end wasteful spending and enable our government to start paying down our \$18 trillion national debt.

That will give job creators the confidence to expand their companies and to start new ones. More jobs, more freedom, less government dependency, that is what we all want for our kids.

Amending our Constitution will not be easy or quick, but we can start the process right now. With every Member of Congress supporting this crucial jobs bill, an institutional discipline to spend no more than we collect in taxes from American families is the commonsense, right thing to do. It will help ensure the financial security for our kids and our grandkids, and it will create jobs.

USA WARRIORS ICE HOCKEY PROGRAM

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of my greatest privileges as a Congressman has been spending time with some of our country's wounded veterans through the USA Warriors Ice Hockey program. USA Warriors provides education, training, motivation, and encouragement for U.S. military members who have been injured while serving.

The same qualities that made them successful in the military—teamwork,

perseverance, and determination—make them inspiring competitors on the ice.

Recently, I played with the Warriors and the Chicago Blackhawks at a practice at Nationals Park before the Winter Classic. Last week was particularly moving because the Warriors paid tribute to Clint Reif, Chicago Blackhawks' assistant equipment manager, who passed away on December 21st, by wearing "CR" stickers on their helmets.

Clint was responsible for getting the Warriors new equipment when they skated with the Blackhawks last season at Soldier Field, and many of the Warriors considered Clint an extended member of their team. This simple gesture was a fitting tribute to Clint and an extraordinary testament to these veterans who have given us all so much.

My thoughts and prayers are with the Reif family and the entire Chicago Blackhawks organization during these difficult times.

LAUREN HILL

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor a remarkable young woman from Indiana's Sixth Congressional District, 19-year-old Lauren Hill.

Last year, this Lawrenceburg native was diagnosed with DIPG, a terminal form of brain cancer. Since then, Lauren has become a national symbol of courage and hope for those impacted by this terrible disease.

This selfless young woman inspired the Nation last November by fulfilling her dream of playing in an NCAA basketball game, despite having an inoperable brain tumor. Lauren not only played, but scored 4 points for the Mount St. Joseph's Lions.

She then set an ambitious goal: to raise \$1 million for DIPG research before the end of 2014. During a telethon on Tuesday, December 30th, she surpassed that goal.

I commend Lauren for her continued courage and applaud the steps she has taken to find a cure for pediatric brain cancer.

Lauren, you make your community, your State, and your country proud.

□ 1215

MARRIAGE EQUALITY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Florida became the 36th State to legalize marriage equality. Now more than 70 percent of Americans live in a State where sexual orientation does not dictate who can be married.

Our Nation was founded on basic principles of freedom and equality, and no law should discriminate against individuals on the basis of who they are. We have come a long way since 2004 when Massachusetts became a pioneering State in the fight for marriage equality. But the fight is not over.

I am a proud to be an original co-sponsor of the Respect for Marriage Act, reintroduced in the House yesterday. This legislation will allow same-sex couples to receive equal and fair treatment under Federal law regardless of their State's marriage laws.

As we begin the 114th Congress, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to make sure that we have laws in place to end discrimination toward individuals, regardless of their gender, race, religious background, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

FIRST RESPONDER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this week is Florida's First Responder Appreciation Week. Every day, law enforcement, firefighters, and EMTs put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe.

Sadly, in my district, Tarpon Springs police officer Charles "Charlie K" Kondek was shot and killed right before Christmas as he patrolled the streets on the midnight shift while the rest of us slept securely in our homes.

There is no such thing as a typical day for first responders. On average, an officer dies in the line of duty every 58 hours—150 deaths per year.

This week, and every day, we should be thankful for the first responders serving our communities. Let us never forget the sacrifices of Officer Kondek and others who have fallen in the line of duty. These brave officers and their families are in our prayers. They are remembered.

VOTING RIGHTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in their first votes of the 114th Congress, the majority used their first vote to eliminate the vote in the Committee of the Whole of the residents of your Nation's Capital. That vote on some, but certainly not all, matters had been approved by the Federal courts. The District of Columbia has used this vote in three Congresses, but not when Republicans controlled.

With their large majority, Republicans showed themselves to be small

in principle when they voted to eliminate the vote of D.C. citizens, who pay the highest Federal taxes per capita in the Nation.

HONORING DAVID FRANK GEER

(Mr. DENHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of a beloved leader in the Modesto community. Former Modesto City Council member David "Dave" Frank Geer died at the age of 72 on Sunday, December 28.

He followed in his father's footsteps and became a paratrooper in the United States Army and served for many years in the Reserves after Active Duty. For 27 years, Dave worked at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for the U.S. Department of Energy and the Nuclear Security Administration. He was a Federal security police officer with a Q level security clearance.

In 2009, Dave decided to get more active in politics and ran for the Modesto City Council District Two. He won handily. He was a strong advocate for his largely Latino district, which includes some of Modesto's poorest neighborhoods, which he lived in for more than a quarter century. He understood politics without being political. He did his homework on issues facing the city. And while he treated people with respect, he did not shy away from asking very tough questions.

In addition to serving on the city council, he was involved in many aspects of our community. And he was very involved with many of us in addressing all problems, not just from a city perspective, but from a county, from a State, and from a Federal perspective. Dave Geer was a man who was very involved in his community and wanted to strengthen his Nation. He will be missed. We will miss his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Dave Geer for his unwavering leadership and many accomplishments and contributions. He had a long history of service to his Nation and community, and he had a genuine love for the people, community, and Nation he worked so hard for.

HONORING STEPHANIE RILEY

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Lieutenant Colonel Stephanie Riley of the New Hampshire National Guard, a courageous Granite Stater who recently passed away after a long battle with cancer. In addition to her work as an occupational nurse for the Army and her dedicated service

to the National Guard, Steph touched so many lives with her energy and compassion.

Steph leaves behind a wonderful husband, Shawn, and two terrific kids, Shane and Sammie, as well as countless friends and admirers all across New Hampshire. She was a tireless advocate for veterans, serving as secretary of our State's Veterans Advisory Council. She was devoted to the next generation of leaders.

When Steph was diagnosed with cancer, she refused to be discouraged. She was open about her disease, fighting on behalf of cancer research. I had the honor of walking with her on her team, Steph Strong, in an event to raise cancer awareness. As always, she was kind and vivacious, joking with friends and family. I consider myself very lucky to have been her friend. Steph was a wonderful, brave Granite Stater.

STANDING AGAINST CASTRO REGIME

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's statement that he will reestablish diplomatic relations with the communist regime in Cuba takes away leverage that could have been used once that island nation one day begins to move towards democracy and freedom. But the Castro brothers have taken no such steps, nor will they. Raul Castro already stated that he will not change anything about his regime. That was Castro's official response to President Obama's unilateral concessions.

The U.S. has given away the store, and it has not helped the Cuban opposition at all.

Is there freedom of expression in Cuba now? No.

Are there political parties in Cuba? No, just one party, the Communist Party.

Is there freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, respect for human rights? No, no, and no.

Will President Obama's sellout help bring about such freedoms? No. Quite the opposite, Mr. Speaker. It will provide an economic lifeline to the decrepit regime.

The President has stated that he has asked for an official U.S. Embassy and a U.S. Ambassador to Cuba. This would lend legitimacy to a dictatorship that continues to pose a threat to U.S. national security.

Let's work to stop this reckless and unwarranted action. Let's stand with the Cuban opposition and not with the Castro regime.

CRAIG BIGGIO VOTED INTO BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Houstonians and baseball fans all across the country today are celebrating. The Houston Astros have their first person into the Hall of Fame, Craig Biggio. He is called the greatest Astro because, for his 20-year career, he spent his total time with the Houston Astros. We have a number of other players in the Hall of Fame, but they didn't spend their entire career with the Astros.

The Houston Astro franchise started in 1962, 52 years ago, as the Colt .45s. In 1965, they changed the name to the Houston Astros and played in the Astrodome for many years. Now they play at Minute Maid Park. The famed Astrodome is still there, although we need to refurbish it. But it is historic.

The Astros organization and Houstonians today are celebrating Craig Biggio, who was a great mentor to a lot of baseball players. Mr. Hustle, as he was known in the Houston area, is now a member of the Hall of Fame.

OPPOSING UNILATERAL EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks, many people have expressed genuine concerns about the appropriations bill that passed Congress in December. Unfortunately, many Washington-based special interest groups are confusing the matter with incomplete and sometimes false messages aimed more at fundraising for themselves than uniting behind our shared goal of stopping President Obama's executive overreach on immigration.

I am vehemently opposed to the President's unilateral executive actions granting amnesty to millions of illegal aliens. It is the responsibility of Congress to pursue reforms and ensure that a strong immigration policy is devised.

By extending funding for the Department of Homeland Security only through February 2015, the House and Senate are prepared to confront the President's unparalleled power grab without the threat of a looming, government-wide shutdown, and we will do everything we can to stop his destructive actions.

OUR LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a Democratic legislative agenda that would improve our Nation's infrastructure and focus on job creation and support of the American people.

Instead of taking backward steps and undermining existing law that protects and helps our fellow Americans, we must concentrate on fair wages, scientific advancement, and allowing individuals to access health security. We must begin to work on reauthorizing the highway trust fund immediately, moving beyond the all-too-familiar recurring nightmare of short-term, piecemeal highway reauthorizations.

Instead of providing giveaways to special interest groups, we must strengthen protections in public health, the environment, food safety, and consumer safety for hardworking Americans. We must support access to quality, affordable health insurance for millions of Americans instead of slowly chipping away provisions of the Affordable Care Act. And Congress must think in the long term by leading efforts to curb climate change.

SHARED ENDEAVOR ON COMMON GROUND

(Mr. CONNOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome you and all of our colleagues back for the start of the 114th Congress. I was encouraged by Speaker BOEHNER's remarks yesterday calling for all of us to begin this shared endeavor on common ground. I couldn't agree more. As someone who comes from local government, I know firsthand the music that can be made when elected leaders allow their commitments to improve the quality of life for our neighbors to guide their actions rather than partisan ideology.

My predecessor in this Chamber was also a veteran of local government. And although we had our share of partisan differences, we both like to say that we belong to the same party, the party of getting things done, a moniker to which this new Congress should aspire.

Without question, there will be rigorous battle of ideas, and we should expect nothing less in the arena of elected leadership. But at the end of the day, our constituents expect us to resolve those differences, to accomplish something on their behalf rather than on behalf of our respective parties.

Mr. Speaker, when a final tally is taken of this Congress, I hope we do prove the pessimists wrong and show we were a Congress that got things done.

□ 1230

AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE BEING MISLED AS TO THE CON- SEQUENCES OF COMPANY BO- NUSES

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, from these microphones, there was more than one occasion when my colleagues would argue that somehow giving a bonus of \$1 million to the business owner or a chief executive officer of a company would somehow go untaxed; that because the company got a tax deduction that that somehow spread the burden of that across all of America.

What was left out of the conversation each and every time was the fact that the recipient of that bonus—this individual—actually puts that on their tax return and pays it at a much higher rate. In fact, that \$1 million would probably be taxed at the 43 percent rate—or 39.6, plus the add-ons that are in place.

So, over and over again yesterday the American people were misled as to the consequences of getting bonuses or paying chief executive officers. It does not go untaxed simply because the company gets a tax deduction. That employee has to put that on their tax return and pay the appropriate taxes on that.

I just wanted to set the record straight on yesterday's misguided comments with respect to how individuals who create businesses and grow those businesses are compensated, and the misinformation that that somehow is a negative impact on the rest of us.

BEGINNING OF A NEW CONGRESS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the beginning of a new Congress, and with it comes a new chance to move past the bickering that has characterized the last 2 years. Sadly, the leadership of the House seems poised to let that opportunity go to waste.

Since the election, we have heard that one potential area of agreement would be tax reform. That would be great. I would welcome the chance to improve our deeply flawed Tax Code. And yet, the very first act of this Congress will make it much harder for any reform bill to get bipartisan support.

That is because House leadership has quite literally changed the rules of the game, allowing them to pick and choose which tax bills the congressional budget will be giving favorable treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic that we can move past the dysfunction of the last few years, but changing the rules of the game isn't a signal that we are heading in the right direction.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 26) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 26

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Extension of Terrorism Insurance Program.

Sec. 102. Federal share.

Sec. 103. Program trigger.

Sec. 104. Recoupment of Federal share of compensation under the program.

Sec. 105. Certification of acts of terrorism; consultation with Secretary of Homeland Security.

Sec. 106. Technical amendments.

Sec. 107. Improving the certification process.

Sec. 108. GAO study.

Sec. 109. Membership of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 110. Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms.

Sec. 111. Reporting of terrorism insurance data.

Sec. 112. Annual study of small insurer market competitiveness.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Reestablishment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

TITLE III—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Margin requirements.

Sec. 303. Implementation.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

SEC. 102. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is

amended by inserting “and beginning on January 1, 2016, shall decrease by 1 percentage point per calendar year until equal to 80 percent” after “85 percent”.

SEC. 103. PROGRAM TRIGGER.

Subparagraph (B) of section 103(e)(1) (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(1) by striking “a certified act” and inserting “certified acts”;

(2) by striking “such certified act” and inserting “such certified acts”; and

(3) by striking “exceed” and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting the following: “exceed—

“(i) \$100,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2015;

“(ii) \$120,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2016;

“(iii) \$140,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2017;

“(iv) \$160,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2018;

“(v) \$180,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2019; and

“(vi) \$200,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2020 and any calendar year thereafter.”.

SEC. 104. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) **INSURANCE MARKETPLACE AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of paragraph (7), the insurance marketplace aggregate retention amount shall be the lesser of—

“(i) \$27,500,000,000, as such amount is revised pursuant to this paragraph; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year.

“(B) **REVISION OF INSURANCE MARKETPLACE AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.**—

“(i) **PHASE-IN.**—Beginning in the calendar year of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, the amount set forth under subparagraph (A)(i) shall increase by \$2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to \$37,500,000,000.

“(ii) **FURTHER REVISION.**—Beginning in the calendar year that follows the calendar year in which the amount set forth under subparagraph (A)(i) is equal to \$37,500,000,000, the amount under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be revised to be the amount equal to the annual average of the sum of insurer deductibles for all insurers participating in the Program for the prior 3 calendar years, as such sum is determined by the Secretary under subparagraph (C).

“(C) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall—

“(i) issue final rules for determining the amount of the sum described under subparagraph (B)(ii); and

“(ii) provide a timeline for public notification of such determination.”; and

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “for such period”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) [Reserved.]”;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent” and inserting “, terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 140 percent”; and

(ii) by inserting “as calculated under subparagraph (A)” after “mandatory recoupment amount”; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking “2010” and inserting “2017”; and

(II) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking “2011” and inserting “2018”; and

(II) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(iii) by striking “2017” and inserting “2024”; and

(iv) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(II) by striking “2017” and inserting “2024”.

SEC. 105. CERTIFICATION OF ACTS OF TERRORISM; CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Paragraph (1)(A) of section 102 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “concurrence with the Secretary of State” and inserting “consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 106. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “An entity has” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An entity has”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have ‘control’ over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not, for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having ‘control’ under subparagraph (A).”;

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

“(A) the value of an insurer’s direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year” and inserting “notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year”; and

(II) by striking “Period or Program Year” and inserting “calendar year”;

(C) by striking paragraph (11); and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, purchase,”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, purchase,”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “Program Year” and inserting “calendar year”;

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), as previously amended by section 102—

(I) by striking “the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter” and inserting “each calendar year”;

(II) by striking the comma after “80 percent”; and

(III) by striking “such Transition Period or such Program Year” and inserting “such calendar year”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter” and inserting “a calendar year”; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking “the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year” and inserting “any calendar year”; and

(D) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking “the Transition Period or a Program Year” each place that term appears and inserting “the calendar year”;

(ii) by striking “such period” and inserting “the calendar year”; and

(iii) by striking “that period” and inserting “the calendar year”.

SEC. 107. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “act of terrorism” has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term “certification process” means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process re-

quired under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 107 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including establishing a timeline for which an act is eligible for certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.”.

SEC. 108. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government—

(1) assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Program”), which shall include a comparison of practices in international markets to assess and collect premiums either before or after terrorism losses are incurred; and

(2) creating a capital reserve fund under the Program and requiring insurers participating in the Program to dedicate capital specifically for terrorism losses before such losses are incurred, which shall include a comparison of practices in international markets to establish reserve funds.

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine, but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) UPFRONT PREMIUMS.—With respect to upfront premiums described in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) how the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program;

(B) how the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums;

(C) how the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program;

(D) how the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas;

(E) the effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small;

(F) the effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance; and

(G) the size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their

participation in the Program, taking into account the Program’s current post-event recoupment structure.

(2) CAPITAL RESERVE FUND.—With respect to the capital reserve fund described in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) how the creation of a capital reserve fund would affect the Federal Government’s fiscal exposure under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program and the ability of the Program to meet its statutory purposes;

(B) how a capital reserve fund would impact insurers and reinsurers, including liquidity, insurance pricing, and capacity to provide terrorism risk coverage;

(C) the feasibility of segregating funds attributable to terrorism risk from funds attributable to other insurance lines;

(D) how a capital reserve fund would be viewed and treated under current Financial Accounting Standards Board accounting rules and the tax laws; and

(E) how a capital reserve fund would affect the States’ ability to regulate insurers participating in the Program.

(3) INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES.—With respect to international markets referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), how other countries, if any—

(A) have established terrorism insurance structures;

(B) charge premiums or otherwise collect funds to pay for the costs of terrorism insurance structures, including risk and administrative costs; and

(C) have established capital reserve funds to pay for the costs of terrorism insurance structures.

(c) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

SEC. 109. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: “In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than \$10,000,000,000 in total assets.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

SEC. 110. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of non-governmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the “Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms” (referred to in this subsection as the “Advisory Committee”).

(2) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

SEC. 111. REPORTING OF TERRORISM INSURANCE DATA.

Section 104 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) REPORTING OF TERRORISM INSURANCE DATA.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—During the calendar year beginning on January 1, 2016, and in each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary shall require insurers participating in the Program to submit to the Secretary such information regarding insurance coverage for terrorism losses of such insurers as the Secretary considers appropriate to analyze the effectiveness of the Program, which shall include information regarding—

“(A) lines of insurance with exposure to such losses;

“(B) premiums earned on such coverage;

“(C) geographical location of exposures;

“(D) pricing of such coverage;

“(E) the take-up rate for such coverage;

“(F) the amount of private reinsurance for acts of terrorism purchased; and

“(G) such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) REPORTS.—Not later than June 30, 2016, and every other June 30 thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that includes—

“(A) an analysis of the overall effectiveness of the Program;

“(B) an evaluation of any changes or trends in the data collected under paragraph (1);

“(C) an evaluation of whether any aspects of the Program have the effect of discouraging or impeding insurers from providing commercial property casualty insurance coverage or coverage for acts of terrorism;

“(D) an evaluation of the impact of the Program on workers’ compensation insurers; and

“(E) in the case of the data reported in paragraph (1)(B), an updated estimate of the total amount earned since January 1, 2003.

“(3) PROTECTION OF DATA.—To the extent possible, the Secretary shall contract with an insurance statistical aggregator to collect the information described in paragraph (1), which shall keep any nonpublic information confidential and provide it to the Secretary in an aggregate form or in such other form or manner that does not permit identifica-

tion of the insurer submitting such information.

“(4) ADVANCE COORDINATION.—Before collecting any data or information under paragraph (1) from an insurer, or affiliate of an insurer, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate State insurance regulatory authorities and any relevant government agency or publicly available sources to determine if the information to be collected is available from, and may be obtained in a timely manner by, individually or collectively, such entities. If the Secretary determines that such data or information is available, and may be obtained in a timely manner, from such entities, the Secretary shall obtain the data or information from such entities. If the Secretary determines that such data or information is not so available, the Secretary may collect such data or information from an insurer and affiliates.

“(5) CONFIDENTIALITY.—

“(A) RETENTION OF PRIVILEGE.—The submission of any non-publicly available data and information to the Secretary and the sharing of any non-publicly available data with or by the Secretary among other Federal agencies, the State insurance regulatory authorities, or any other entities under this subsection shall not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise affect, any privilege arising under Federal or State law (including the rules of any Federal or State court) to which the data or information is otherwise subject.

“(B) CONTINUED APPLICATION OF PRIOR CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENTS.—Any requirement under Federal or State law to the extent otherwise applicable, or any requirement pursuant to a written agreement in effect between the original source of any non-publicly available data or information and the source of such data or information to the Secretary, regarding the privacy or confidentiality of any data or information in the possession of the source to the Secretary, shall continue to apply to such data or information after the data or information has been provided pursuant to this subsection.

“(C) INFORMATION-SHARING AGREEMENT.—Any data or information obtained by the Secretary under this subsection may be made available to State insurance regulatory authorities, individually or collectively through an information-sharing agreement that—

“(i) shall comply with applicable Federal law; and

“(ii) shall not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise affect, any privilege under Federal or State law (including any privilege referred to in subparagraph (A) and the rules of any Federal or State court) to which the data or information is otherwise subject.

“(D) AGENCY DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, including any exceptions thereunder, shall apply to any data or information submitted under this subsection to the Secretary by an insurer or affiliate of an insurer.”

SEC. 112. ANNUAL STUDY OF SMALL INSURER MARKET COMPETITIVENESS.

Section 108 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) STUDY OF SMALL INSURER MARKET COMPETITIVENESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 30, 2017, and every other June 30 thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a study of small insurers (as such term is defined by regulation by the Secretary) participating in the Program, and identify any competitive challenges small insurers face in the terrorism risk insurance marketplace, including—

“(A) changes to the market share, premium volume, and policyholder surplus of small insurers relative to large insurers;

“(B) how the property and casualty insurance market for terrorism risk differs between small and large insurers, and whether such a difference exists within other perils;

“(C) the impact of the Program’s mandatory availability requirement under section 103(c) on small insurers;

“(D) the effect of increasing the trigger amount for the Program under section 103(e)(1)(B) on small insurers;

“(E) the availability and cost of private reinsurance for small insurers; and

“(F) the impact that State workers compensation laws have on small insurers and workers compensation carriers in the terrorism risk insurance marketplace.

“(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the findings and conclusions of each study required under paragraph (1).”

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Association’).

“(b) STATUS.—The Association shall—

“(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

“(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

“(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

“(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

“SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other non-resident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

“(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

“(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

“(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

“(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

“(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

“SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

“(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

“(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

“(3) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

“(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

“(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(4) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

“(B) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

“(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(ii) PROCEDURES.—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Board’) shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

“(D) FORM OF REQUEST.—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

“(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Associa-

tion, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other identification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

“(F) LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

“(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

“(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

“(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

“(G) PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than \$50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(H) RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

“(I) FEES.—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

“(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

“(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

“(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

“(K) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

“(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

“(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to contest the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

“(L) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

“(ii) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

“(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

“(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

“(M) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘criminal history record check’ means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may establish separate classes of membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

“(2) BUSINESS ENTITIES.—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, standards, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

“(3) CATEGORIES.—

“(A) SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

“(B) SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No special categories of membership, and no distinct membership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

“(d) MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘NAIC’) Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

“(3) ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

“(B) AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

“(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

“(ii) the Association to receive the information.

“(C) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

“(4) **DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.**—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

“(e) **EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.**—Membership in the Association shall—

“(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

“(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

“(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

“(2) **VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.**—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) **AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.**—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(4) **NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

“(B) **ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.**—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

“(5) **PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effective-

ness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

“(B) **PRESERVED REGULATIONS.**—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

“(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

“(ii) establish consumer protections; or

“(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

“(f) **BIENNIAL RENEWAL.**—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

“(g) **CONTINUING EDUCATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

“(2) **STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.**—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

“(3) **RECIPROCITY.**—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

“(4) **LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.**—The Association shall not directly or indirectly offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

“(h) **PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.**—

“(1) **DISCIPLINARY ACTION.**—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

“(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

“(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

“(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

“(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(2) **VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.**—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

“(3) **REPORTING.**—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

“(i) **CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall—

“(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

“(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

“(2) **TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.**—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

“(3) **FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.**—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other information protected by State law to the Association.

“(j) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—The Association may—

“(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referred to paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

“(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in circumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

“(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

“(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

“(k) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

“(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015; and

“(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

“SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

“(b) **POWERS.**—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

“(c) **COMPOSITION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the

President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

“(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

“(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

“(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

“(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

“(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

“(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

“(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

“(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

“(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State insurance commissioner’ means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

“(d) TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the Presi-

dent at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

“(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

“(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

“(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

“(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

“(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

“(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015.

“(f) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

“(A) at the call of the chairperson;

“(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

“(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

“(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

“(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

“(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

“(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

“(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, include provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

“(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

“(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

“(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

“(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

“(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

“(i) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

“SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

“(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the Association may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

“(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a ‘disciplinary action’) or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

“(2) SUPPORTING STATEMENT.—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

“(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

“(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

“(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

“(3) INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

“(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

“(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

“SEC. 326. POWERS.

“In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

“(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

“(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

“(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

“(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

“(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

“(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

“(7) borrow money; and

“(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

“SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regarding the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

“(b) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

“SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

“(b) LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

“SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

“(a) REMOVAL OF BOARD.—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire

existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

“(b) REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

“(c) SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

“SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

“(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

“(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No State shall—

“(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

“(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

“(2) STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

“(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

“(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

“(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

“(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary

action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

“SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

“The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

“SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

“(a) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

“(b) ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

“SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

“The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

“SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term ‘business entity’ means a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

“(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘depository institution’ has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

“(3) HOME STATE.—The term ‘home State’ means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

“(4) INSURANCE.—The term ‘insurance’ means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

“(5) INSURANCE PRODUCER.—The term ‘insurance producer’ means any insurance agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

“(6) INSURER.—The term ‘insurer’ has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

“(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term ‘principal place of business’ means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

“(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term ‘principal place of residence’ means the

State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

“(9) STATE.—The term ‘State’ includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(10) STATE LAW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘State law’ includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

“(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

“Sec. 322. Purpose.

“Sec. 323. Membership.

“Sec. 324. Board of directors.

“Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.

“Sec. 326. Powers.

“Sec. 327. Report by the Association.

“Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.

“Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.

“Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.

“Sec. 331. Coordination with financial industry regulatory authority.

“Sec. 332. Right of action.

“Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.

“Sec. 334. Definitions.”.

TITLE III—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 302. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o–10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply

to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).”.

SEC. 303. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

(1) without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and

(3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material for the RECORD on H.R. 26, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for those of you watching at home today, this is not a C-SPAN rerun. I stand before you today to discuss the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, a bill that passed this House 417–7 at the end of the previous Congress.

This bill is a result of long and difficult bicameral and bipartisan negotiations. But for whatever reason, the previous Senate decided that it was more important to go home a couple of days earlier rather than reauthorize the TRIA program. As a result, the program expired at the end of the year.

So, today, the House will act on this important piece of legislation once again. Doing so will provide certainty to the terrorism risk insurance market and ensure that the American economy remains resilient against the threat of terrorism.

Congress passed the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 in the aftermath of 9/11. It was intended to provide a 2-year transition period in which the market participants could develop resources that would enable them to offer private terrorism insurance coverage once the program expired. For various reasons, that transition has not taken hold.

Throughout the last 2 years, my subcommittee learned how evolved the terrorism risk insurance marketplace has become since the last reauthorization. Since the advent of TRIA in 2002, markets have stabilized, risk management practices have improved, terrorism risk modeling and underwriting has advanced, and the price of terrorism risk coverage has actually declined by 70 percent.

But we have also learned that this evolution of TRIA has failed to keep up with marketplace realities. In fact, the program remains largely unchanged over the last 12 years. This has hindered the growth of private market participation in terrorism risk insurance and resulted in a bad deal for the taxpayers.

The bill before us today is an effort to recognize and to keep pace with the market developments of the terrorism risk insurance marketplace over the past decade. The bill strengthens taxpayer protections without altering the program's fundamental functions, brings greater certainty and stability to the terrorism risk market, and lays a foundation for a more robust private market for terrorism risk.

With regard to the taxpayer protection, the program's trigger doubles from \$100 million to \$200 million. It also decreases the Federal share of insurers' losses from 85 percent to 80 percent and enhances the taxpayer repayment requirements. And for the first time, we will have meaningful data on the program to increase accountability and transparency.

To provide certainty, the program is extended for 6 years but makes no changes for the first year so that the market will have time to adjust. It also clarifies it streamlines the terrorism certification process so that policyholders are better protected.

Most importantly, the bill today creates a framework that will allow for a more healthy private market terrorism risk over time that slowly replaces taxpayer-funded reinsurance with private sector capital.

Finally, the bill before us today includes some bipartisan reforms that will help boost the economy and job opportunities for all Americans. These Dodd-Frank fixes will help America's hardworking farmers, ranchers, and business owners. They did not cause the financial crisis, and they deserve immediate relief.

I am also proud of the inclusion of the reestablishment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, or NARAB, which is an efficient and effective way to enable insurance agents and brokers to be licensed on a multistate basis while retaining essential State regulatory authority.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING for trusting me to reform this important program, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 26.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 26, the TRIA Reauthorization Act of 2015. This bill passed in the last Congress overwhelmingly 417-7.

I first want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and Leader PELOSI for acting so quickly to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA. Unfortunately, this critical program expired on January 1, and unless Congress swiftly reauthorizes TRIA, our economy will be dangerously exposed if we have another terrorist attack.

In fact, one of the financial rating agencies—Fitch—has said that if Congress doesn't reauthorize TRIA by the end of January, they are going to start downgrading companies and major construction projects, which would hurt the American economy. The other rating agencies have made equally strong statements about the importance to reauthorize TRIA.

Already, companies are having trouble getting terrorism insurance, and many companies that had terrorism insurance have now lost it because there were clauses written into their policies that said if TRIA is not there they do not have the insurance coverage.

I also want to thank very much Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman NEUGEBAUER, as well as Ranking Member WATERS and the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee, for their very hard work on this bill, which represents a true bipartisan compromise. I especially want to thank my colleagues from New York, PETER KING and Senator SCHUMER, who have worked very hard on this bill, which is critical to the State of New York, and I would say every State in our Union.

I believe that this compromise will ensure that terrorism insurance remains available and at affordable prices. This has always been the purpose of TRIA, and I believe that this bill will accomplish that goal.

After the last terrorist attack on our homeland—9/11—insurers realized that they couldn't accurately model for terrorism risk—it was simply too unpredictable—and the market for terrorism insurance completely shut down. Without terrorism insurance, all construction stopped in New York City. We couldn't build anything, and thousands and thousands of jobs were lost.

In response, Congress came together in a bipartisan way and passed TRIA, which provides a government backstop for terrorism insurance. The goal of TRIA was to make terrorism insurance both available and affordable, and that is exactly what it has done. This has come at no additional expense whatsoever or cost to the taxpayer.

Initially, the House TRIA bill raised the trigger for the government's backstop by a whopping 500 percent from

\$100 million to \$500 million. This would have forced small- and medium-sized insurers out of the market entirely and would have actually reduced the amount of terrorism insurance available to American businesses.

I was strongly opposed to increasing the trigger to \$500 million because it would make terrorism insurance unavailable and unaffordable to businesses all across this country.

Fortunately, this compromise bill will only raise the trigger for the government backstop from \$100 million to \$200 million. This modest increase will ensure that small- and medium-sized insurers are not forced out of the market entirely, while also protecting taxpayers, and I fully support this compromise approach.

This bill also slightly increases the amount that the government recoups from the industry after TRIA is triggered, which will ensure that taxpayers are fully repaid for TRIA if it is needed.

Importantly, the compromise does not include the so-called bifurcation proposal, which would have treated nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological attacks differently from other so-called conventional attacks. This made no sense whatsoever, and this compromise sensibly drops this proposal entirely. A terrorist attack is a terrorist attack.

Finally, I am pleased that the bill reauthorizes TRIA for a full 6 years. This will provide much needed certainty to businesses across the country as they expand and create more American jobs. Support for reauthorization of TRIA is deep and it is strong in the business community across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a letter from 28 different business stakeholders strongly supporting the reauthorization and the need for TRIA.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: American businesses strongly support H.R. 26—the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015. This bill is the same as the TRIA legislation that passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 417-7 on December 10, 2014. Our coalition represents a diverse and broad majority of business stakeholders. We urge you to SUPPORT the bill when it is considered under suspension of the rules this week.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act is vital to the millions of businesses, job creators, and workers across the country reliant on TRIA to secure terrorism insurance and protect our economic growth. Following the attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress created TRIA to address a void in the marketplace, foster economic stability, and provide certainty to for-profit and non-profit entities across the country. For the past dozen years, the United States has relied on TRIA as a fiscally responsible terrorism risk management plan to protect taxpayers and our national security and stability.

It is critical that Congress act immediately to keep our terrorism insurance protection program in place. We urge your support of this important bill.

Sincerely,

American Association of Managing General Agents (AAMGA),

American Gaming Association (AGA),
American Hotel & Lodging Association (AH&LA),
American Insurance Association (AIA),
American Land Title Association (ALTA),
American Society of Workers Compensation Professionals (AmCOMP),
Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC),
California Insurance Wholesalers Association (CIWA),
CCIM Institute,
Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism (CIAT),
Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers (CIAB),
CRE Finance Council (CREFC),
Financial Services Roundtable (FSR),
Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America (Big "I"),
Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM),
Mortgage Bankers Association (MBA),
National Apartment Association (NAA),
National Association of Home Builders (NAHB),
National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC),
National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts (NAREIT),
National Association of REALTORS® (NAR),
National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC),
Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI),
Reinsurance Association of America (RAA),
Texas Surplus Lines Association (TSLA),
The Real Estate Roundtable (The Roundtable),
The Risk and Insurance Management Society (RIMS),
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The bill also includes the NARAB bill—the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers—which has passed this Congress multiple times, many, many times, and this would merely recognize insurance brokers and agents licensed in other States across this country, increasing efficiency and saving and reducing costs for these businesses.

I urge my colleagues to vote for TRIA because it is the right thing to do for America, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Financial Services Committee and the House Agriculture Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I am writing concerning H.R. 26, Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015.

As you know, provisions of H.R. 26 are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. In order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Agriculture will forgo action on H.R. 26. Further, the Committee will not oppose the

bill's consideration on the suspension calendar. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 26, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY: Thank you for your letter of even date herewith regarding H.R. 26, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 26 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Agriculture is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in the bill that falls within its jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 26.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), my neighbor to the south, our new committee chairman for the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NEUGEBAUER for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 26, a bill to extend the expiration date of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

I want to thank my good friend and vice chairman of the Agriculture Committee, RANDY NEUGEBAUER, for his work in shepherding this bill to the floor again.

I would also like to thank him and Chairman HENSARLING for fighting hard to include the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act as title III of today's bill. The House Committee on Agriculture, along with the Financial Services Committee, has made moving this legislation a priority.

Despite the lengthy title, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act is not a complicated bill. It fulfills the promise that this body made to our farmers, ranchers, and small businesses when Dodd-Frank was drafted and signed into law that end users would not be treated as financial firms.

□ 1245

Yet regulators have narrowly interpreted the exemptions in the black letter of the law, forcing some businesses to leave capital idle in margin accounts, rather than investing in new production and creating jobs.

Forcing businesses to post margin not only ties up capital, but also makes it more expensive for firms to utilize the risk management tools that they need to protect their businesses from uncertainty.

Today's bill clarifies in statute that Congress meant what it said when it exempted end users from margin and clearing requirements. Specifically, it ensures that those businesses which are exempt from clearing their hedges are also exempt from margining those hedges.

This well-reasoned legislation has broad bipartisan support. As a standalone bill, the House overwhelmingly supported it last year in June by a vote of 411–12. Since then, we have passed it four more times—and if we pass it today, a fifth time—which means we will keep doing it until we get it right.

I am hopeful that with today's vote, we can finally offer farmers, ranchers, and businesses the relief we promised them almost 5 years ago.

Again, I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman NEUGEBAUER for including the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act in today's bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 26.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2014.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to see the inclusion H.R. 634, Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stability Act, from the 113th Congress as Title III of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. This language, which was also included as Subtitle of Title III of H.R. 4413, Customer Protection and End-User Relief Act, from the 113th Congress provides an important protection to end-users from costly margining requirements that will divert much needed capital away from job creation.

In support of this title, I would like to request that the pertinent portions of the Committee on Agriculture report to accompany H.R. 4413 be included in the appropriate place in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

TITLE 3—END USER RELIEF
SUBTITLE A—END-USER EXEMPTION FROM
MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

Section 311—End-user margin requirements

Section 311 amends Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) as added by Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for swap transactions involving end-users that qualify for the clearing exception under 2(h)(7)(A).

“End-users” are thousands of companies across the United States who utilize derivatives to hedge risks associated with their day-to-day operations, such as fluctuations

in the prices of raw materials. Because these businesses do not pose systemic risk, Congress intended that the Dodd-Frank Act provide certain exemptions for end-users to ensure they were not unduly burdened by new margin and capital requirements associated with their derivatives trades that would hamper their ability to expand and create jobs.

Indeed, Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act includes an exemption for non-financial end-users from centrally clearing their derivatives trades. This exemption permits end-users to continue trading directly with a counterparty, (also known as trading “bilaterally,” or over-the-counter (OTC)) which means their swaps are negotiated privately between two parties and they are not executed and cleared using an exchange or clearinghouse. Generally, it is common for non-financial end-users, such as manufacturers, to avoid posting cash margin for their OTC derivative trades. End-users generally will not post margin because they are able to negotiate such terms with their counterparties due to the strength of their own balance sheet or by posting non-cash collateral, such as physical property. End-users typically seek to preserve their cash and liquid assets for reinvestment in their businesses. In recognition of this common practice, the Dodd-Frank Act included an exemption from margin requirements for end-users for OTC trades.

Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act (and Section 764 with respect to security-based swaps) requires margin requirements be applied to swap dealers and major swap participants for swaps that are not centrally cleared. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are banks, the prudential banking regulators (such as the Federal Reserve or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) are required to set the margin requirements. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are not banks, the CFTC is required to set the margin requirements. Both the CFTC and the banking regulators have issued their own rule proposals establishing margin requirements pursuant to Section 731.

Following the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act in July of 2010, uncertainty arose regarding whether this provision permitted the regulators to impose margin requirements on swap dealers when they trade with end-users, which could then result in either a direct or indirect margin requirement on end-users. Subsequently, Senators Blanche Lincoln and Chris Dodd sent a letter to then-Chairmen Barney Frank and Collin Peterson on June 30, 2010, to set forth and clarify congressional intent, stating:

The legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margin on end-users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. If regulators raise the costs of end-user transactions, they may create more risk. It is imperative that the regulators do not unnecessarily divert working capital from our economy into margin accounts, in a way that would discourage hedging by end-users or impair economic growth.

In addition, statements in the legislative history of section 731 (and Section 764) suggests that Congress did not intend, in enacting this section, to impose margin requirements on nonfinancial end-users engaged in hedging activities, even in cases where they entered into swaps with swap entities.

In the CFTC's proposed rule on margin, it does not require margin for uncleared swaps when non-bank swap dealers transact with

non-financial end-users. However, the prudential banking regulators proposed rules would require margin be posted by non-financial end-users above certain established thresholds when they trade with swap dealers that are banks. Many of end-users' transactions occur with swap dealers that are banks, so the banking regulators' proposed rule is most relevant, and therefore of most concern, to end-users.

By the prudential banking regulators' own terms, their proposal to require margin stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. The plain language of section 731 provides that the Agencies adopt rules for covered swap entities imposing margin requirements on all non-cleared swaps. Despite clear congressional intent, those sections do not, by their terms, exclude a swap with a counterparty that is a commercial end-user. By providing an explicit exemption under Title VII through enactment of this provision, the prudential regulators will no longer have a perceived legal obligation and the congressional intent they acknowledge in their proposed rule will be implemented.

The Committee notes that in September of 2013, the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and the Bank of International Settlements published their final recommendations for margin requirements for uncleared derivatives. Representatives from a number of U.S. regulators, including the CFTC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve participated in the development of those margin requirements, which are intended to set baseline international standards for margin requirements. It is the intent of the Committee that any margin requirements promulgated under the authority provided in Section 4s of the Commodity Exchange Act should be generally consistent with the international margin standards established by IOSCO.

On March 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled "Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act," the following testimony was provided to the Committee with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

In approving the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress made clear that end-users were not to be subject to margin requirements. Nonetheless, regulations proposed by the Prudential Banking Regulators could require end-users to post margin. This stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. While the regulations proposed by the CFTC are preferable, they do not provide end-users with the certainty that legislation offers. According to a Coalition for Derivatives End-Users survey, a 3% initial margin requirement could reduce capital spending by as much as \$5.1 to \$6.7 billion among S&P 500 companies alone and cost 100,000 to 130,000 jobs. To shed some light on Honeywell's potential exposure to margin requirements, we had approximately \$2 billion of hedging contracts outstanding at year-end that would be defined as a swap under Dodd-Frank. Applying 3% initial margin and 10% variation margin implies a potential margin requirement of \$260 million. Cash deposited in a margin account cannot be productively deployed in our businesses and therefore detracts from Honeywell's financial performance and ability to promote economic growth and protect American jobs.—Mr. James E. Colby, Assistant Treasurer, Honeywell International Inc.

On May 21, 2013, at a hearing entitled "The Future of the CFTC: Market Perspectives," Mr. Stephen O'Connor, Chairman, ISDA, pro-

vided the following testimony with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

Perhaps most importantly, we do not believe that initial margin will contribute to the shared goal of reducing systemic risk and increasing systemic resilience. When robust variation margin practices are employed, the additional step of imposing initial margin imposes an extremely high cost on both market participants and on systemic resilience with very little countervailing benefit. The Lehman and AIG situations highlight the importance of variation margin. AIG did not follow sound variation margin practices, which resulted in dangerous levels of credit risk building up, ultimately leading to its bailout. Lehman, on the other hand, posted daily variation margin, and while its failure caused shocks in many markets, the variation margin prevented outsized losses in the OTC derivatives markets. While industry and regulators agree on a robust variation margin regime including all appropriate products and counterparties, the further step of moving to mandatory IM [initial margin] does not stand up to any rigorous cost-benefit analysis.

Based on the extensive background that accompanies the statutory change provided explicitly in Section 311, the Committee intends that initial and variation margin requirements cannot be imposed on uncleared swaps entered into by cooperative entities if they similarly qualify for the CFTC's cooperative exemption with respect to cleared swaps. Cooperative entities did not cause the financial crisis and should not be required to incur substantial new costs associated with posting initial and variation margin to counterparties. In the end, these costs will be borne by their members in the form of higher prices and more limited access to credit, especially in underserved markets, such as in rural America. Therefore, the Committee's clear intent when drafting Section 311 was to prohibit the CFTC and prudential regulators, including the Farm Credit Administration, from imposing margin requirements on cooperative entities.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to recognize and appreciate the gentlewoman from Manhattan for the excellent leadership job that she is doing on this.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, TRIA, is so important. It is very important to note that it hasn't cost the taxpayers anything, and it has been very successful where needed; but, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains another very important piece: we affectionately call it NARAB, which is the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers—just think if TRIA and the NARAB portion of this bill had been in place in 1999, before we had the terrorism risk, before we had the terrorist strikes of 9/11, and other terrorist attacks.

But in the middle of all of that, even with the downturn of the economic calamity, standing in the middle of this storm were our insurance agents, the lifeline of the American people. What NARAB is doing here is making sure that we streamline the process and make sure that our insurance agents are able to operate across State lines.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize that insurance is a State-licensed, State-authorized operation. NARAB does not interfere with that. As a matter of fact, all 50 of the insurance agents of our States have all agreed with NARAB.

This is an important bill because our insurance agents, our small businesses, are the lifeline in tragedy and distress. We live in a highly mobile society now. It is very important for our agents to be able to go across State lines with one licensing procedure that is held to the highest standard while at the same time being licensed in their own State.

We have had great cooperation from all of our insurance agents, including the insurance agents' association. Our financial advisers and our brokers all agree.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that many of us on the Financial Services Committee have been working on this measure for 10 years. For 10 years, we have been toiling in the vineyards on this and so have others in the Senate.

Now is the time to give our insurance agents the respect and the nobility of purpose of their very fine profession and at the same time reach our primary goal, which is to give the American insurance consumers the choice, the competition, and the benefits that they need.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his tireless efforts on NARAB. I think we are going to get it done this time. I know he has worked on it a number of years. He and I have worked together to try to get this done. It is a commonsense piece of legislation, and I am hopeful that this will be the time to get it passed.

I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), who has been a tireless advocate for the TRIA program.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NEUGEBAUER for yielding and for all his efforts on this. I also appreciate the fact that he said my efforts were tireless. Chairman HENSARLING, at times, thought they were tiresome.

I want to thank the chairman for putting a good spin on it, but very seriously, I want to thank him for his efforts. This is a bill where a number of us started off from different positions, from different perspectives. In true legislative form, we came together.

This bill that we passed in December was a solid bill. Unfortunately, it was not taken up by the Senate, but it is essential that we pass it today because, as my good friend Mrs. MALONEY said, this could have a devastating effect on the construction industry and on the American economy if it is not renewed as quickly as possible. This has to be reauthorized. It is absolutely essential.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING again for his efforts throughout this. Again, it has been a long process, but we stayed at it, and I thank him for that. Obviously, I thank Mrs. MALONEY and the ranking member, Ms. WATERS. Also, Mr. CAPUANO has been a fighter on this from the start. Again, we came together.

This is a bill that, as I have said a number of times, was absolutely essential after September 11, when terrorism risk insurance could not be obtained. It even became more obvious as time went on how essential it was, how we desperately need it, and we have to preserve it.

Also, not one Federal dollar has been expended on it; yet billions of dollars in revenue, construction projects, jobs, and expansion of the economy has resulted because of it.

We are voting today, in a way, on a bill which, as Mrs. MALONEY said, is going to go on for another 6 years. That gives it permanence and stability. It gives the construction industry, the real estate industry, and the people on the ground who want those construction jobs the ability to go forward. It lets municipalities know there is going to be construction going ahead in their jurisdictions. It is a plus-plus all the way.

The changes that were made, the reforms that were made, I didn't believe they had to be done, but the fact is they are done, and they are not going to change the overall impact. They are not going to have any meaningful determinative effect whatsoever.

Again, I am proud to support this bill in all its aspects. Mr. SCOTT from Georgia had a great concern about the insurers. I share that also. I think it is important that be in this bill. I know that was a bit of an obstacle in the Senate, but it shouldn't be. It had overwhelming support in the House. I know the great majority of the Members in the Senate support it.

Now, we pass this on suspension today, sending a strong signal how we support this bill in its entirety. From my conversations—and I think Mrs. MALONEY has had the same conversations—we feel confident that the Senate is going to pass it.

When they do, it will be a victory for the American people, a victory for American business, a victory for American labor, and a victory for the American people to show that we have fought all the way back from the horrors of 9/11, and we are going to make sure that never again are we put in that position as far as the damage it can have on our economy.

I would end this by saying that when we saw the attack in Paris today, we realized what can happen with a terrorist attack, how it can happen at any moment, and why it is essential this be reauthorized.

Again, I thank the chairman for his efforts and patience over the last several years.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do want to comment that it has been reported in the press that the Senate has announced they will bring up this bill next week, which is very, very important to move it forward.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), who has been a fighter, advocate, and an effective spokesperson.

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my words congratulating everybody for finally getting this done, but I also want to be real clear. I wish we could have done this a year ago, so we could have been working on things that we have some differences on that need to be done.

Where we are today on this bill could have easily been reached in a bipartisan manner with 400-plus Members voting for it over a year ago. I am only aware of two outside groups—both think tanks, not in business, not in labor—that opposed this bill; yet we let them run the agenda here because people couldn't get off the dime.

For me, that is a huge mistake. We are here to make agreements, to make compromise, to get things done. For instance, we are sitting here today with Fannie and Freddie not resolved after all these years because we can't get off the dime of a few ideological disagreements that clearly are not going to be settled, the way they are going.

There is plenty of room for compromise, plenty of room to get together and talk about it and get something done for the American people and the American economy.

That is just one example. We have to get beyond the outside ideological groups telling us what we can and cannot do. Even if we agree with them, we have to understand we are elected to lead, to argue, and then to compromise.

We are here today, finally. Thank you. Let's not get bogged down any further in this new Congress. We will have our differences, and we will have some differences that cannot be resolved. This was never one of them. I think there is plenty of room on Fannie and Freddie. I think there are issues on insurance.

I think there are plenty of issues we can and should work on. We both have our outside groups to deal with. We both have to turn to them with loving attention and tell you: "We love you, we agree with you, but I was elected to move the ball forward."

That is what we are doing here today, and I congratulate those people that have finally done it, including the two people leading this bill, both the chair-

man and the ranking member of the committee, and other members of this committee that have worked on this for so long.

I can't honestly say that I am looking forward to doing this again in 6 years, but I hope that when we get there, we can do it a little bit more quickly than we did this time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I want to tell him how much I enjoyed working with him. He was the ranking member of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee, and we had an opportunity to work together. It was a pleasure to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Terrorism Risk Program Reauthorization Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, as we have all recently seen, terrorism and violence continues to be a threat not only to our friends on the other side of the globe, but also to our homeland. The rise of ISIS has demonstrated that the American people and our interests are constant targets.

Because these dangers continue to grow, it is our job to make sure we are taking the necessary steps to protect ourselves. The terror attacks on September 11, 2001, not only brought a devastating loss of innocent human life, they also wreaked havoc on our economy, costing insurers tens of billions of dollars, taking years to recover.

We have to take the necessary steps to protect and prevent any physical harm to America and make sure we are doing what we can to protect our economic interests. That is what today's legislation is all about.

When first passed in 2002, TRIA provided much-needed stability to ease any economic pain of another attack. Today's reauthorization will continue to provide a necessary backstop and the financial security that will allow major commercial and real estate projects so vital to the economy to move forward.

Reauthorizing this legislation is an opportunity for both parties to stand together in a bipartisan fashion and strengthen our national security.

I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING, Representative NEUGEBAUER, and the rest of the members of the Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this issue. It has taken time to get to this point, but I believe this is a good way for us to start this Congress, working together to pass a bill that is in the best interest of our national security.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding. I appreciate her work. I also appreciate the work of Mr. NEUGEBAUER for bringing this bill to the floor.

This bill could have been—should have been, as Mr. CAPUANO said—passed a long time ago with an overwhelming vote. I brought this up on regular conferences and colloquies that I had with Mr. Cantor and more recently with Mr. MCCARTHY, but it is always timely to do the right thing. Today, we are doing the right thing, and I rise in strong support of the passage of this bill.

Reauthorizing the Terrorism Risk Program Reauthorization Act will provide much-needed certainty to businesses and insurers, certainty that will help our economy and prevent harm to job creation. I believe Congress has the responsibility to reauthorize the TRIA program, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in voting to do so today.

□ 1300

This program expired at the end of 2014, and Congress must take action on TRIA without delay. I would reiterate that this program as incorporated in this piece of legislation has had well over 250 votes for at least the last year and a half, but it is never too late to do the right thing. The longer Congress waits, the worse the effects will be on our economy and job creation.

I want to thank Ranking Member WATERS. I want to thank Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ for her work on this as well and, as I said, the leadership on the majority side that finally got us to a point where we could make an agreement last year.

We passed a bill last year. I regret that the Senate didn't pass it, but I applaud the majority's bringing it to the floor as one of the first pieces of business that we do. All sides deserve, therefore, credit for their efforts to help restore certainty to businesses and protect against the slowdown in job growth that would result from not reauthorizing TRIA.

So, today we do the right thing; we do it in a bipartisan fashion. Let's hope we can continue to do this.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA), a distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 26, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015. As the recent tragic events in Boston have shown, terrorism is still alive, and we must be ever vigilant in the fight against it.

This overwhelmingly bipartisan piece of legislation will ensure market stability for Main Street, businesses, construction projects, public events, and more by maintaining their ability to

access terrorism insurance to keep job-creating businesses and projects moving forward with certainty.

TRIA is an important piece of legislation for protecting taxpayers by requiring insurers to step up and manage more of their own risk. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I ask that the Senate bring up this bill immediately.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend from the great State of New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Today, I call on my colleagues to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, a public-private partnership that is vital to continued economic development across the country.

Following the tragic events of 9/11, terrorism became uninsurable, the marketplace evaporated, and rates skyrocketed. Many businesses were impacted, causing job losses and hindering the recovery effort. To address the growing problem, Congress swiftly passed the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, creating a Federal backstop and restoring coverage.

Today I can say without a doubt, our efforts were successful. I have witnessed firsthand how this program has substantially helped New York City recover and prosper over the past 12 years. The program has also tripled the number of small businesses nationwide that have terrorism protection. As a direct result of TRIA, over 60 percent of small firms carry some form of coverage.

Some stakeholders have already reported disruptions since TRIA lapsed last week, especially in high-risk cities such as New York. It should be noted that the lapse is not only affecting insurance coverage, but also the financing efforts of many job-creating construction projects.

Is this bill perfect? No, but it will restore certainty to the marketplace and prevent a rate spike that could force two-thirds of small businesses out of the market.

Mr. Speaker, acts of terrorism remain too risky to cover for the vast majority of carriers, especially for the small- and medium-sized firms that dominate the insurance industry. As a result, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, which has not cost taxpayers \$1, continues to be a vital component of our economic growth and national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we had other speakers scheduled from New York, but they are not on the floor now, so I would just like to say, in closing, that this is critically important legislation.

I can speak from personal experience, having represented New York during and after 9/11, that after 9/11 you could not even build a hot dog stand. All construction stopped. No one could get any insurance. The only insurance available was from Lloyds of London, and it was incredibly expensive and people could not afford it. We lost thousands and thousands of jobs.

And it happened also, when we came together and started to rebuild not only in New York but the Pentagon and Pennsylvania, I would say, of all the programs that this body put forward—and there were many, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support—I truly believe that this particular one was certainly the most important in helping New York rebuild and rebound.

I want to add that it did not cost our taxpayers one single dime. It is an innovative way to get building and construction happening across this country. So it is tremendously important to the economy. It is an important bill, and I am so pleased that it has been a bipartisan effort.

This body passed the bill. It stalled in the Senate, but we do need to reauthorize it as swiftly and as quickly as possible. I hope it is an example of how this body can work together on legislation that is critical to this country to rebuild and expand the jobs and our economy and to help strengthen our country in other ways.

So again I thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for moving so swiftly to bring it to the floor and, really, to Mr. NEUGEBAUER, who was the point person in many ways in the compromise legislation that moved forward.

I urge my colleagues to vote for it. It is the right thing to do for America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think what you can see by the comments today is that we have a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that passed overwhelmingly in the House in the 113th Congress. Unfortunately, it was not taken up by the Senate.

This is a win-win bill. It does a number of really good things for the country; and, more importantly, for the taxpayers, it begins to bring reform in a program that originally was meant to be a temporary program but somehow has become a permanent program, beginning to stairstep-up the private market participation and stairstep-down the taxpayers' participation. It increases the trigger; it increases the

amount of recovery that the taxpayers would be able to recover in the case of an event.

Another thing you heard many people talk about is this end-user provision that is going to help farmers and ranchers and small businesses not have to put up additional capital so they can use that capital to create jobs for America.

Another provision in this bill is the NARAB II, which is a small business provision allowing your local insurance agent, maybe he or she can sell insurance in multiple States by being a member of NARAB and being able to not have to get a license in each individual State, but if they are licensed and meet the qualifications in that State, that is recognized by other States.

So this is a great bipartisan effort. It has been, as mentioned, a long process, and so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 26.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 26.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 37

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

Sec. 101. Margin requirements.

Sec. 102. Implementation.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 201. Treatment of affiliate transactions.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT

Sec. 301. Registration threshold for savings and loan holding companies.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKER-AGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 401. Registration exemption for merger and acquisition brokers.

Sec. 402. Effective date.

TITLE V—SWAP DATA REPOSITORY AND CLEARINGHOUSE INDEMNIFICATION CORRECTIONS

Sec. 501. Repeal of indemnification requirements.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

Sec. 601. Filing requirement for public filing prior to public offering.

Sec. 602. Grace period for change of status of emerging growth companies.

Sec. 603. Simplified disclosure requirements for emerging growth companies.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 701. Exemption from XBRL requirements for emerging growth companies and other smaller companies.

Sec. 702. Analysis by the SEC.

Sec. 703. Report to Congress.

Sec. 704. Definitions.

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

Sec. 801. Rules of construction relating to collateralized loan obligations.

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT

Sec. 901. Advisers of SBICs and venture capital funds.

Sec. 902. Advisers of SBICs and private funds.

Sec. 903. Relationship to State law.

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 1001. Summary page for form 10-K.

Sec. 1002. Improvement of regulation S-K.

Sec. 1003. Study on modernization and simplification of regulation S-K.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

Sec. 1101. Increased threshold for disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans.

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

SEC. 101. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1)

from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).”.

SEC. 102. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

(1) without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and

(3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under subparagraph (A) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation of such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AMENDMENT.—Section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c-3(g)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under paragraph (1) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the security-based swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT SUPPORT MEASURE REQUIREMENT.—The requirements

in section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a), requiring that a credit support measure or other mechanism be utilized if the transfer of commercial risk referred to in such sections is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant or a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, as appropriate, shall not apply with respect to swaps or security-based swaps, as appropriate, entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT

SEC. 301. REGISTRATION THRESHOLD FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 12(g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after “is a bank” the following: “, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act),”; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “case of a bank” the following: “, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act),”; and

(2) in section 15(d), by striking “case of a bank” and inserting the following: “case of a bank, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act),”.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 401. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

“(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

“(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

“(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) CONTROL.—The term ‘control’ means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

“(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

“(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

“(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

“(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term ‘eligible privately held company’ means a company that meets both of the following conditions:

“(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

“(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than \$25,000,000.

“(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than \$250,000,000.

“(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term ‘M&A broker’ means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

“(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

“(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent year-end balance sheet, income statement, statement of changes in financial position, and statement of owner’s equity of the issuer of the securities offered in exchange, and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, the related report of the independent auditor, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

“(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

“(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is

being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2014; and

“(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

“(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.”.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—SWAP DATA REPOSITORY AND CLEARINGHOUSE INDEMNIFICATION CORRECTIONS

SEC. 501. REPEAL OF INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DERIVATIVES CLEARING ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 5b(k)(5) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-1(k)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the Commission may share information with any entity described in paragraph (4), the Commission shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(b) SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.—Section 21(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 24a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subsection (c)(7), the swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(c) SECURITY-BASED SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.—Section 13(n)(5)(H) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(n)(5)(H)) is amended to read as follows:

“(H) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the security-based swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subparagraph (G), the security-based swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 24 relating to the information on security-based swap transactions that is provided.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203) on July 21, 2010.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

SEC. 601. FILING REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC FILING PRIOR TO PUBLIC OFFERING.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is amended by striking “21 days” and inserting “15 days”.

SEC. 602. GRACE PERIOD FOR CHANGE OF STATUS OF EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is further amended by adding at the end the following: “An issuer that was an emerging growth company at the time it submitted a confidential registration statement or, in lieu thereof, a publicly filed registration statement for review under this subsection but ceases to be an emerging growth company thereafter shall continue to be treated as an emerging market growth company for the purposes of this

subsection through the earlier of the date on which the issuer consummates its initial public offering pursuant to such registration statement or the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date the company ceases to be an emerging growth company.”.

SEC. 603. SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 102 of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act (Public Law 112–106) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**—With respect to an emerging growth company (as such term is defined under section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933):

“(1) **REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE NOTICE ON FORM S-1.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise its general instructions on Form S-1 to indicate that a registration statement filed (or submitted for confidential review) by an issuer prior to an initial public offering may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S-X (17 C.F.R. 210.1–01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

“(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S-1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

“(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S-X at the date of such amendment.

“(2) **RELIANCE BY ISSUERS.**—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, an issuer filing a registration statement (or submitting the statement for confidential review) on Form S-1 may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S-X (17 C.F.R. 210.1–01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

“(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S-1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

“(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S-X at the date of such amendment.”.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 701. EXEMPTION FROM XBRL REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES AND OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.

(a) **EXEMPTION FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.**—Emerging growth companies are exempted from the requirements to use Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such companies may elect to use XBRL for such reporting.

(b) **EXEMPTION FOR OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.**—Issuers with total annual gross revenues of less than \$250,000,000 are exempt from the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such issuers may elect to use XBRL for such reporting. An exemp-

tion under this subsection shall continue in effect until—

(1) the date that is five years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is two years after a determination by the Commission, by order after conducting the analysis required by section 702, that the benefits of such requirements to such issuers outweigh the costs, but no earlier than three years after enactment of this Act.

(c) **MODIFICATIONS TO REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise its regulations under parts 229, 230, 232, 239, 240, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to reflect the exemptions set forth in subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 702. ANALYSIS BY THE SEC.

The Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits to issuers described in section 701(b) of the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such analysis shall include an assessment of—

(1) how such costs and benefits may differ from the costs and benefits identified by the Commission in the order relating to interactive data to improve financial reporting (dated January 30, 2009; 74 Fed. Reg. 6776) because of the size of such issuers;

(2) the effects on efficiency, competition, capital formation, and financing and on analyst coverage of such issuers (including any such effects resulting from use of XBRL by investors);

(3) the costs to such issuers of—

(A) submitting data to the Commission in XBRL;

(B) posting data on the website of the issuer in XBRL;

(C) software necessary to prepare, submit, or post data in XBRL; and

(D) any additional consulting services or filing agent services;

(4) the benefits to the Commission in terms of improved ability to monitor securities markets, assess the potential outcomes of regulatory alternatives, and enhance investor participation in corporate governance and promote capital formation; and

(5) the effectiveness of standards in the United States for interactive filing data relative to the standards of international counterparts.

SEC. 703. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall provide the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report regarding—

(1) the progress in implementing XBRL reporting within the Commission;

(2) the use of XBRL data by Commission officials;

(3) the use of XBRL data by investors;

(4) the results of the analysis required by section 702; and

(5) any additional information the Commission considers relevant for increasing transparency, decreasing costs, and increasing efficiency of regulatory filings with the Commission.

SEC. 704. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title, the terms “Commission”, “emerging growth company”, “issuer”, and “securities laws” have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

SEC. 801. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(c)(2) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “A banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board” and inserting the following:

“(A) **GENERAL CONFORMANCE PERIOD.**—A banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CONFORMANCE PERIOD FOR CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board shall bring its activities related to or investments in a debt security of a collateralized loan obligation issued before January 31, 2014, into compliance with the requirements of subsection (a)(1)(B) and any applicable rules relating to subsection (a)(1)(B) not later than July 21, 2019.

“(ii) **COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.**—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘collateralized loan obligation’ means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.”.

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT

SEC. 901. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.

Section 203(l) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No investment adviser” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No investment adviser”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **ADVISERS OF SBICS.**—For purposes of this subsection, a venture capital fund includes an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940).”.

SEC. 902. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND PRIVATE FUNDS.

Section 203(m) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ADVISERS OF SBICS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the assets under management of a private fund that is an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940) shall be excluded from the limit set forth in paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 903. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Section 203A(b)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b–3a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) that is not registered under section 203 because that person is exempt from registration as provided in subsection (b)(7) of such section, or is a supervised person of such person.”.

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 1001. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10-K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10-K to which such item relates.

SEC. 1002. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S-K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S-K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 1003 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S-K.

SEC. 1003. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S-K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S-K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the rec-

ommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S-K by the Commission under section 1002 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

SEC. 1101. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COMPENSATORY BENEFIT PLANS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 37, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time and for the opportunity to again bring this bill before the House as a piece of a larger strategy that will bring greater jobs and more opportunity to the American people and to American families.

I am proud to once again sponsor the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, a bill which includes the language of pro-growth measures debated and passed last Congress in the Financial Services Committee and in the Agriculture Committee.

While these proposals aren't flashy, they represent bipartisan efforts to remove the burdensome weight of one-size-fits-all regulation that has, sadly, become the norm for Washington. While often well-intentioned, many of these top-down regulations hurt small businesses and emerging businesses in critical sectors like biotechnology.

As the Representative of one of the Nation's fastest-growing biotech regions just outside Philadelphia, I have

experienced firsthand the impact of this vibrant industry in southeastern Pennsylvania. Employing thousands of hardworking men and women, this sector harnesses the best of our STEM community and what it has to offer in our efforts to create treatments and cures for devastating diseases from diabetes and Alzheimer's to cancer and HIV/AIDS.

For these businesses, government overregulation often treats the little guy the same as big multinational corporations, tying them in costly red tape at the expense of their ability to research, to develop, to innovate, and to hire.

This bill takes a meaningful step toward ensuring smarter, tailored regulations which unleash businesses, like biotech companies in my district, to invest in themselves and in their workers. But biotech workers wouldn't be the only ones to benefit. So would employees at retailers like grocery chain Wegmans.

Employing 44,000 people, including 8,200 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Wegmans is constantly ranked among the Nation's best places to work by Fortune magazine, a grade they attribute to their employee ownership opportunities, which allow their workers to have a stake in the business that they work for.

However, a little-known piece of regulatory overreach is hamstringing these opportunities, an overreach recognized and adjusted by this legislation. By creating a more realistic regulatory environment, this bill provides relief to businesses looking to retain their best employees, while allowing workers to invest in the company and in their own futures.

In lieu of the failed Washington efforts of the past which tried to simply legislate more jobs into existence, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act is very much a jobs bill because it addresses these job-creating needs. By reining in government's heavyhanded approach to regulating the economy, we can provide a bipartisan path toward getting people back to work, helping businesses grow, and ensuring hardworking Americans keep more of their hard-earned money.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, the challenges facing our economy are steep. However, they are no more daunting than the challenges we have overcome in the past in the way that Americans have always approached adversity: head on, with American ingenuity, practicality, and a commitment of leaders on both sides of the aisle to act in the best interests of the working men and women we represent.

The ushering in of this new Congress gives us the perfect opportunity for Members of both parties to unite

around efforts to put the American worker back in the driver's seat and to establish a bipartisan playbook for advancing common goals. Now is the time, and the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act is an important part of that process. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I am writing concerning H.R. 37, "Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act."

As you know, provisions of H.R. 37 are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. In order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Agriculture will forgo action on H.R. 37. Further, the Committee will not oppose the bill's consideration on the suspension calendar. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 37, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Long-
worth House Office Building, Washington,
DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY: Thank you for your letter of even date herewith regarding H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 37 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Agriculture is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in the bill that falls within its jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 37.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

What is before us today is a mini omnibus bill that contains, actually, 11 separate pieces of legislation, some of which may not be controversial but some of which are incredibly controversial and do not belong in this legislation. This is not an emergency. We

have a new Congress. This bill should go through the regular order. Unlike the TRIA bill we just talked about, this bill is a bill which should and must go through the regular order, and it is absolutely inappropriate for the suspension calendar.

Our Republican friends would have us believe that this is just some benign piece of legislation, yet this bill contains not only procedural problems but substantive problems which have never seen the light of day in any committee. Some of the legislation has only been public for about 24 hours, and what is particularly frightening is that the text of the bill has changed at least three times since Tuesday. We just got started yesterday in talking about the importance of regular order, and we are already violating those claims and promises.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives should return to regular order with this piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to reject it. Regular order, whereby legislation is debated at a hearing, marked up by a committee, and then finally considered by the whole House, is the process by which we vet legislation. That is not going on right here and right now, and there is no good reason for it. We do this to ensure that we fully understand the changing law. Nevertheless, Republicans have come here to suspend the rules and to consider a package of 11 bills which will ease the oversight of Wall Street firms, large banks, multinational corporations, and certain brokers.

It should be pointed out right now that the ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee, MAXINE WATERS, who is unable to be in Washington due to personal matters she has to address, has issued a call to reject this piece of legislation for many of the reasons I am articulating now.

I think it is also important to point out that there are 52 Members of Congress who were sworn in yesterday and who represent more than 30 million Americans who will have to vote on bills affecting a collateral firm's pledge, when they borrow money, affecting what information must be disclosed about certain brokers and financial statements of firms, without the opportunity to offer changes. This is the absolute antithesis of regular order, and this bill is not appropriate. We urge a "no."

I would like to talk a little bit about the specific reasons this bill is bad. Members should know that this is not the identical bill that came through in the fall. It has very important changes. If you voted for it last fall, that is no reason to vote for this bill now.

First, the Volcker rule. This bill undercuts an important part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The Volcker rule was intended to prevent deposit-

taking banks—banks that use money insured by the Federal Government, the people's money—from making bets and using taxpayer-insured funds. The Federal Reserve went out of its way to try to ease the transition to a safer system, but this bill would give megabanks an additional 2 years, totaling 5 years, to sell off certain securities in which they retain ownership rights—5 more years of risk, 5 more years of massive profit-taking. This provision, which almost certainly juices the profits of big, megabanks like Citigroup and JPMorgan, has never been vetted. The public has not even had a day to review the text. It is wrong that bills that help Wall Street and multinational corporations get fast-tracked on day 2 of this Congress while bills that help working families get slowed up for years, literally.

Just last month, Republicans successfully handed Citigroup and other megabanks a multibillion-dollar gift by repealing another reform measure, known as the "swaps push-out," which was intended to prevent another Great Recession. The repeal of that provision allowed the megabanks to continue to borrow money from the Federal Reserve lending window, which is currently at about zero percent interest, to finance their risky derivatives. Experts have weighed in. Let me read for the RECORD the statement by the CEO of Better Markets:

"It's all about the bonus pool," said Dennis Kelleher, president and CEO of Better Markets, a financial reform nonprofit. "The attack on the Volcker rule has been nonstop because proprietary trading is about big-time bets that result in big-time bonuses. Wall Street has been fighting it from day one, and they're not going to stop."

If you believe that there are things in this mini omnibus, or this megabill, that might be worth your support, understand that this particular provision has not been vetted anywhere. For that reason alone they are literally trying to sneak it in, and you should vote against it.

Also, this particular bill includes three other provisions that weaken the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. These provisions take away the authority of regulators who are charged with ensuring that everybody plays by the same rules so that, if at some point in the future, we find out that our financial system is threatened, our regulators will be unable to take decisive action to fix the problems that they can fix today.

After witnessing the effect that one type of derivative—the credit default swap—had in spreading losses from the subprime mortgage market around the world, I would like to know why our first order of business in this Congress is to roll back the financial reforms that this Congress deliberated on and passed over an 18-month period following the 2008 financial crisis.

This bill undermines investor protections. It includes three provisions that

have the potential to leave investors worse off than they are today. As we proclaim small investors and workers and all of these things, why are we undermining investor protections? In one instance, the bill exempts individuals who would broker a merger of a privately owned company to be exempt from SEC regulations. Since this legislation passed in a previous Congress, the SEC has taken action to make this unnecessary. However, if we pass this bill today, we will undermine a few basic investor protections that the SEC has retained.

For example, the SEC determined that bad actors, such as convicted securities fraudsters, should not be able to take advantage of a carve-out. However, by voting “yes,” you are saying that it is okay for people convicted of fraud to sell other things, like franchises or the restaurant down the street. Another provision would allow 75 percent of all public companies to no longer report their financial statements in computer readable formats. When everything is online today and when investors rely on computers to crunch the financials of various companies, this bill comes across as a huge step backwards.

My colleagues want to address this bill, and I think it is important that they do. So, at this point, I am going to urge a “no” vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), who is the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for allowing me to speak on his bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act.

I am especially proud of and would like to highlight the past work of the Agriculture Committee on the three titles of this bill under its jurisdiction: the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act; a provision on the treatment of affiliate transactions; and a provision regarding swap data repository and clearinghouse indemnification correction.

As I noted in the debate earlier today on TRIA, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act is legislation to clarify Congress’ intent to exempt non-financial businesses from a misguided regulatory requirement to post margin requirements on their hedging activities. Clearing and margining, while appropriate for some transactions, are not appropriate for end users hedging real-world commercial risks. Their hedging activities are not large enough to present a systemic risk, and a margin requirement represents a significant and needless expense with little value to the overall financial system.

Title I puts in statute protections for American businesses. To grow our economy, businesses should use their scarce capital to buy new equipment, to hire more workers, to build new facilities, and to invest in the future. They cannot do that if they are required to hold money in margin accounts to fulfill a misguided regulation.

Similarly, title II, regarding the treatment of interaffiliate transactions, was also passed by the House multiple times in the 113th Congress, and it will provide additional certainty to American businesses. It will do so by preventing the redundant regulation of harmless interaffiliate transactions that would unnecessarily tie up the working capital of companies, with no added protections for the market or benefits to our consumers. Today, businesses across the Nation rely on the ability to centralize their hedging activities. This consolidation of a hedging portfolio across a corporate group allows businesses to reduce costs, to simplify their financial dealings, and to reduce their counterparty credit risk. Title II of this bill will allow American businesses to continue utilizing this efficient, time-tested model.

Finally, title V of H.R. 37 provides much-needed corrections to the swap data repository and clearinghouse indemnification requirements of Dodd-Frank. Currently, Dodd-Frank requires a foreign regulator requesting information from a U.S. swap data repository or derivatives clearing organization to provide a written agreement stating it will abide by certain confidentiality requirements and will indemnify the U.S. Commissions for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for that information.

The concept of indemnification—requiring a party to contractually agree to pay for another party’s possible litigation expenses—is established within U.S. tort law and does not exist in many foreign jurisdictions. Thus, it is not possible for some foreign regulators to agree to these indemnification requirements. This requirement threatens to make data-sharing arrangements with foreign regulators unworkable.

H.R. 37 mitigates this problem by simply removing the indemnification provisions in Dodd-Frank while maintaining the prerequisite written agreement requiring certain confidentiality obligations will be met. So, rather than stripping down Dodd-Frank, as we are so often accused of doing, this change would actually serve to enhance market transparency and risk mitigation by ensuring that regulators and market participants have access to a global set of swap market data.

As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and as a cosponsor of each of these three bills in the 113th Congress, I appreciate Mr.

FITZPATRICK’s work in bringing these provisions together in a package that reduces the regulatory burdens and that promotes economic growth. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to see three bills that the House Committee on Agriculture passed in the 113th Congress included as Titles I, II, and V of H.R. 37, “Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act.”

H.R. 634, H.R. 5471, and H.R. 742, which were also included as Subtitles A, B, and C of Title III of H.R. 4413, “Customer Protection and End-User Relief Act,” from the 113th Congress, provide important protections to end-users from costly margining requirements and needless regulatory burdens; as well as correct an unworkable provision in Dodd-Frank which required foreign regulators to break their local laws in order to access the market data they needed to enforce their laws.

In support of these titles, I would like to request that the pertinent portions of the Committee on Agriculture report to accompany H.R. 4413 in the 113th Congress be included in the appropriate place in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

TITLE 3—END-USER RELIEF

SUBTITLE A—END-USER EXEMPTION FROM MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

Section 311—End-user margin requirements

Section 311 amends Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) as added by Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for swap transactions involving end-users that qualify for the clearing exception under 2(h)(7)(A).

“End-users” are thousands of companies across the United States who utilize derivatives to hedge risks associated with their day-to-day operations, such as fluctuations in the prices of raw materials. Because these businesses do not pose systemic risk, Congress intended that the Dodd-Frank Act provide certain exemptions for end-users to ensure they were not unduly burdened by new margin and capital requirements associated with their derivatives trades that would hamper their ability to expand and create jobs.

Indeed, Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act includes an exemption for non-financial end-users from centrally clearing their derivatives trades. This exemption permits end-users to continue trading directly with a counterparty, (also known as trading “bilaterally,” or over-the-counter (OTC)) which means their swaps are negotiated privately between two parties and they are not executed and cleared using an exchange or clearinghouse. Generally, it is common for non-financial end-users, such as manufacturers, to avoid posting cash margin for their OTC derivative trades. End-users generally will not post margin because they are able to negotiate such terms with their counterparties due to the strength of their own balance sheet or by posting non-cash collateral, such as physical property. End-users typically seek to preserve their cash and liquid assets for reinvestment in their businesses. In recognition of this common practice, the Dodd-

Frank Act included an exemption from margin requirements for end-users for OTC trades.

Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act (and Section 764 with respect to security-based swaps) requires margin requirements be applied to swap dealers and major swap participants for swaps that are not centrally cleared. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are banks, the prudential banking regulators (such as the Federal Reserve or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) are required to set the margin requirements. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are not banks, the CFTC is required to set the margin requirements. Both the CFTC and the banking regulators have issued their own rule proposals establishing margin requirements pursuant to Section 731.

Following the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act in July of 2010, uncertainty arose regarding whether this provision permitted the regulators to impose margin requirements on swap dealers when they trade with end-users, which could then result in either a direct or indirect margin requirement on end-users. Subsequently, Senators Blanche Lincoln and Chris Dodd sent a letter to then-Chairmen Barney Frank and Collin Peterson on June 30, 2010, to set forth and clarify congressional intent, stating:

The legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margin on end-users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. If regulators raise the costs of end-user transactions, they may create more risk. It is imperative that the regulators do not unnecessarily divert working capital from our economy into margin accounts, in a way that would discourage hedging by end-users or impair economic growth.

In addition, statements in the legislative history of section 731 (and Section 764) suggests that Congress did not intend, in enacting this section, to impose margin requirements on nonfinancial end-users engaged in hedging activities, even in cases where they entered into swaps with swap entities.

In the CFTC's proposed rule on margin, it does not require margin for un-cleared swaps when non-bank swap dealers transact with non-financial end-users. However, the prudential banking regulators proposed rules would require margin be posted by non-financial end-users above certain established thresholds when they trade with swap dealers that are banks. Many of end-users' transactions occur with swap dealers that are banks, so the banking regulators' proposed rule is most relevant, and therefore of most concern, to end-users.

By the prudential banking regulators' own terms, their proposal to require margin stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. The plain language of section 731 provides that the Agencies adopt rules for covered swap entities imposing margin requirements on all non-cleared swaps. Despite clear congressional intent, those sections do not, by their terms, exclude a swap with a counterparty, that is a commercial end-user. By providing an explicit exemption under Title VII through enactment of this provision, the prudential regulators will no longer have a perceived legal obligation, and the congressional intent they acknowledge in their proposed rule will be implemented.

The Committee notes that in September of 2013, the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and the Bank of International Settlements published their

final recommendations for margin requirements for uncleared derivatives. Representatives from a number of U.S. regulators, including the CFTC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve participated in the development of those margin requirements, which are intended to set baseline international standards for margin requirements. It is the intent of the Committee that any margin requirements promulgated under the authority provided in Section 4s of the Commodity Exchange Act should be generally consistent with the international margin standards established by IOSCO.

On March 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled "Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act," the following testimony was provided to the Committee with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

In approving the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress made clear that end-users were not to be subject to margin requirements. Nonetheless, regulations proposed by the Prudential Banking Regulators could require end-users to post margin. This stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. While the regulations proposed by the CFTC are preferable, they do not provide end-users with the certainty that legislation offers. According to a Coalition for Derivatives End-Users survey, a 3% initial margin requirement could reduce capital spending by as much as \$5.1 to \$6.7 billion among S&P 500 companies alone and cost 100,000 to 130,000 jobs. To shed some light on Honeywell's potential exposure to margin requirements, we had approximately \$2 billion of hedging contracts outstanding at year-end that would be defined as a swap under Dodd-Frank. Applying 3% initial margin and 10% variation margin implies a potential margin requirement of \$260 million. Cash deposited in a margin account cannot be productively deployed in our businesses and therefore detracts from Honeywell's financial performance and ability to promote economic growth and protect American jobs.—Mr. James E. Colby, Assistant Treasurer, Honeywell International Inc.

On May 21, 2013, at a hearing entitled "The Future of the CFTC: Market Perspectives," Mr. Stephen O'Connor, Chairman, ISDA, provided the following testimony with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

Perhaps most importantly, we do not believe that initial margin will contribute to the shared goal of reducing systemic risk and increasing systemic resilience. When robust variation margin practices are employed, the additional step of imposing initial margin imposes an extremely high cost on both market participants and on systemic resilience with very little countervailing benefit. The Lehman and AIG situations highlight the importance of variation margin. AIG did not follow sound variation margin practices, which resulted in dangerous levels of credit risk building up, ultimately leading to its bailout. Lehman, on the other hand, posted daily variation margin, and while its failure caused shocks in many markets, the variation margin prevented outsized losses in the OTC derivatives markets. While industry and regulators agree on a robust variation margin regime including all appropriate products and counterparties, the further step of moving to mandatory IM [initial margin] does not stand up to any rigorous cost-benefit analysis.

Based on the extensive background that accompanies the statutory change provided explicitly in Section 311, the Committee intends that initial and variation margin re-

quirements cannot be imposed on uncleared swaps entered into by cooperative entities if they similarly qualify for the CFTC's cooperative exemption with respect to cleared swaps. Cooperative entities did not cause the financial crisis and should not be required to incur substantial new costs associated with posting initial and variation margin to counterparties. In the end, these costs will be borne by their members in the form of higher prices and more limited access to credit, especially in underserved markets, such as in rural America. Therefore, the Committee's clear intent when drafting Section 311 was to prohibit the CFTC and prudential regulators, including the Farm Credit Administration, from imposing margin requirements on cooperative entities.

SUBTITLE B—INTER-AFFILIATE SWAPS

Sec. 321—Treatment of affiliate transactions

"Inter-affiliate" swaps are contracts executed between entities under common corporate ownership. Section 321 would amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide an exemption for inter-affiliate swaps from the clearing and execution requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act so long as the swap transaction hedges or mitigates the commercial risk of an entity that is not a financial entity. The section also requires that an "appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism" be utilized between the entity seeking to hedge against commercial risk if it transacts with a swap dealer or major swap participant, but this credit support measure requirement is effective prospectively from the date H.R. 4413 is enacted into law.

Importantly, with respect to Section 321's use of the phrase "credit support measure or other mechanism," the Committee unequivocally does not intend for the CFTC to interpret this statutory language as a mandate to require initial or variation margin for swap transactions. The Committee intends for the CFTC to recognize that credit support measures and other mechanisms have been in use between counterparties and affiliates engaged in swap transactions for many years in different formats, and therefore, there is no need to engage in a rulemaking to define such broad terminology.

Section 321 originated from the need to provide relief for a parent company that has multiple affiliates within a single corporate group. Individually, these affiliates may seek to offset their business risks through swaps. However, rather than having each affiliate separately go to the market to engage in a swap with a dealer counterparty, many companies will employ a business model in which only a single or limited number of entities, such as a treasury hedging center, face swap dealers. These designated external facing entities will then allocate the transaction and its risk mitigating benefits to the affiliate seeking to mitigate its underlying risk.

Companies that use this business model argue that it reduces the overall credit risk a corporate group poses to the market because they can net their positions across affiliates, reducing the number of external facing transactions overall. In addition, it permits a company to enhance its efficiency by centralizing its risk management expertise in a single or limited number of affiliates.

Should these inter-affiliate transactions be treated as all other swaps, they could be subject to clearing, execution and margin requirements. Companies that use inter-affiliate swaps are concerned that this could substantially increase their costs, without any real reduction in risk in light of the fact that these swaps are purely for internal use.

For example, these swaps could be “double-margined”—when the centralized entity faces an external swap dealer, and then again when the same transaction is allocated internally to the affiliate that sought to hedge the risk.

The uncertainty that exists regarding the treatment of inter-affiliate swaps spans multiple rulemakings that have been proposed or that will be proposed pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act. Section 321 provides certainty and clarity as to what inter-affiliate transactions are and how they are not to be regulated as swaps when the parties to the transaction are under common control.

On March, 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act,” the following testimony was provided with respect to efforts to address the problem with inter-affiliate swaps:

[I]nter-affiliate swaps provide important benefits to corporate groups by enabling centralized management of market, liquidity, capital and other risks inherent in their businesses and allowing these groups to realize hedging efficiencies. Since the swaps are between affiliates, rather than with external counterparties, they pose no systemic risk and therefore there are no significant gains to be achieved by requiring them to be cleared or subjecting them to margin posting requirements. In addition, these swaps are not market transactions and, as a result, requiring market participants to report them or trade them on an exchange or swap execution facility provides no transparency benefits to the market—if anything, it would introduce useless noise that would make Dodd-Frank’s transparency rules less helpful.—Hon. Kenneth E. Bentsen, Acting President and CEO, SIFMA

This legislation would ensure that inter-affiliate derivatives trades, which take place between affiliated entities within a corporate group, do not face the same demanding regulatory requirements as market-facing swaps. The legislation would also ensure that end-users are not penalized for using central hedging centers to manage their commercial risk. There are two serious problems facing end-users that need addressing. First, under the CFTC’s proposed inter-affiliate swap rule, financial end-users would have to clear purely internal trades between affiliates unless they posted variation margin between the affiliates or met specific requirements for an exception [i]f these end-users have to post variation margin, there is little point to exempting inter-affiliate trades from clearing requirements, as the costs could be similar. And let’s not forget the larger point—internal end-user trades do not create systemic risk and, hence, should not be regulated the same as those trades that do. Second, many end-users—approximately one-quarter of those we surveyed—execute swaps through an affiliate. This of course makes sense, as many companies find it more efficient to manage their risk centrally, to have one affiliate trading in the open market, instead of dozens or hundreds of affiliates making trades in an uncoordinated fashion. Using this type of hedging unit centralizes expertise, allows companies to reduce the number of trades with the street and improves pricing. These advantages led me to centralize the treasury function at Westinghouse while I was there. However, the regulators’ interpretation of the Dodd-Frank Act confronts non-financial end-users with a choice: either dismantle their central hedging centers and find a new way to manage risk, or clear all of their trades.

Stated another way, this problem threatens to deny the end-user clearing exception to those end-users who have chosen to hedge their risk in an efficient, highly-effective and risk-reducing way. It is difficult to believe that this is the result Congress hoped to achieve.—Ms. Marie N. Hollein, C.T.P., President and CEO, Financial Executives International, on behalf of the Coalition for Derivatives End-Users

SUBTITLE C—INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES

Section 331—Indemnification requirements

Section 331 strikes the indemnification requirements found in “Sections 725 and 728 of the Dodd-Frank Act related to swap data gathered by swap data repositories (SDRs) and derivatives clearing organizations (DCOs). The section does maintain, however, that before an SDR, DCO, or the CFTC shares information with domestic or international regulators, they have to receive a written agreement stating that the regulator will abide by certain confidentiality agreements.

Swap data repositories serve as electronic warehouses for data and information regarding swap transactions. Historically, SDRs have regularly shared information with foreign regulators as a means to cooperate, exchange views and share information related to OTC derivatives CCPs and trade repositories. Prior to Dodd-Frank, international guidelines required regulators to maintain the confidentiality of information obtained from SDRs, which facilitated global information sharing that is critical to international regulators’ ability to monitor for systemic risk.

Under Sections 725 and 728 of the Dodd-Frank Act, when a foreign regulator requests information from a U.S. registered SDR or DCO, the SDR or DCO is required to receive a written agreement from the foreign regulator stating that it will abide by certain confidentiality requirements and will “indemnify” the Commissions for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for information. In short, the concept of “indemnification”—requiring a party to contractually agree to pay for another party’s possible litigation expenses—is only well established in U.S. tort law, and does not exist in practice or in legal concept in foreign jurisdictions.

These indemnification provisions—which were not included in the financial reform bill passed by the House of Representatives in December 2009—threaten to make data sharing arrangements with foreign regulators unworkable. Foreign regulators will most likely refuse to indemnify U.S. regulators for litigation expenses in exchange for access to data. As a result, foreign regulators may establish their own data repositories and clearing organizations to ensure they have access to data they need to perform their supervisory duties. This would lead to the creation of multiple databases, needlessly duplicative data collection efforts, and the possibility of inconsistent or incomplete data being collected and maintained across multiple jurisdictions.

In testimony before the House Committee on Financial Services in March of 2012, the then-Director of International Affairs for the SEC, Mr. Ethiopis Tafara, endorsed a legislative solution to the problem, stating that:

The SEC recommends that Congress consider removing the indemnification requirement added by the Dodd-Frank Act . . . the indemnification requirement interferes with access to essential information, including information about the cross-border OTC de-

rivatives markets. In removing the indemnification requirement, Congress would assist the SEC, as well as other U.S. regulators, in securing the access it needs to data held in global trade repositories. Removing the indemnification requirement would address a significant issue of contention with our foreign counterparts . . .

At the same hearing, the then-General Counsel for the CFTC, Mr. Dan Berkovitz, acknowledged that they too have received growing concerns from foreign regulators, but that they intend to issue interpretive guidance, stating that “access to swap data reported to a trade repository that is registered with the CFTC will not be subject to the indemnification provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act if such trade repository is regulated pursuant to foreign law and the applicable requested data is reported to the trade repository pursuant to foreign law.”

To provide clarity to the marketplace and remove any legal barriers to swap data being easily shared with various domestic and foreign regulatory agencies, this section would remove the indemnification requirements found in Sections 725 and 728 of the Dodd-Frank Act related to swap data gathered by SDRs and DCOs.

On March 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act,” Mr. Larry Thompson, Managing Director and General Counsel, the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation, provided the following testimony with respect to provisions of H.R. 742, which were included in Section 331:

The Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013 would make U.S. law consistent with existing international standards by removing the indemnification provisions from sections 728 and 763 of Dodd-Frank. DTCC strongly supports this legislation, which we believe represents the only viable solution to the unintended consequences of indemnification. H.R. 742 is necessary because the statutory language in Dodd-Frank leaves little room for regulators to act without U.S. Congressional intervention. This point was reinforced in the CFTC/SEC January 2012 Joint Report on International Swap Regulation, which noted that the Commissions “are working to develop solutions that provide access to foreign regulators in a manner consistent with the DFA and to ensure access to foreign-based information.” It indicates legislation is needed, saying that “Congress may determine that a legislative amendment to the indemnification provision is appropriate.” H.R. 742 would send a clear message to the international community that the United States is strongly committed to global data sharing and determined to avoid fragmenting the current global data set for over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives. By amending and passing this legislation to ensure that technical corrections to indemnification are addressed, Congress will help create the proper environment for the development of a global trade repository system to support systemic risk management and oversight.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and an active participant on that committee.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we are on the second day of the 114th Congress. It has

not yet been 24 hours since Members of this Congress were sworn in. What we have before us is a package of 11 complex bills with significant implications for our financial system—and I want to make this very clear, as my friend pointed out—some of which have not gone through the process of scrutiny by the Financial Services Committee or the regular legislative process. Some of it has and some of it has not, but it has not been at all by this Congress. This is not an emergency. Unlike TRIA, which expired before we left, there is not a time-sensitive nature of this question.

It is really important to me—and especially as now a second-term Member—to remember what it was like to show up here and to have things put in front of us that we had not really had a chance to fully and thoroughly vet.

□ 1330

The regular order—as was spoken about yesterday—it is critical for the minority to have access to the process, and it is only done through the regular legislative process.

This legislation just continues to give and give and give to Wall Street.

Despite the fact that my principal objection is with the lack of adherence to regular order and the process of legislating, substantively, there are problems with this legislation. Wall Street banks, whose banks and traders recklessly drove this country into a financial crisis, are being rewarded yet again, and I can't accept it. I can't support it.

What is really interesting to me is that here we are, less than 24 hours since we have been in Congress, yet in the last Congress, when Main Street had its needs, when unemployed people couldn't get Federal unemployment benefits, we couldn't get a hearing; we couldn't get a vote on the floor of the House for legislation that was bipartisan, that had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans supporting it.

When Wall Street asks, we suspend the rules in less than a day without taking a breath and move to fit their needs into our schedule. But when Main Street needs help, Congress didn't give an answer. This is not right.

We have got to get back to regular order. We talk about it all the time. We hear it on both sides. This is not a good start for the 114th Congress, to suspend the rules and deal with new language that many of us have just seen this morning, to pass legislation that is a gift-wrapped present to Wall Street. I can't support it. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Promoting Job

Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. I would like to thank Mr. FITZPATRICK and Chairmen HENSARLING and GARRETT for their leadership on increasing access to capital for small businesses.

As we begin a new Congress, I am glad to see that the House will continue its laser focus on enacting policies to help spur job creation throughout the country. Even though we have seen modest economic growth, I continue to hear from my constituents about the impacts of unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations on job creation, especially regulations that disproportionately affect smaller public companies and those considering accessing capital in the public markets.

One such requirement is related to the use of eXtensible Business Reporting Language, XBRL, which was mandated by the SEC in 2009. While the SEC's rule is well intended, this requirement has become another example of a regulation where the costs outweigh the potential benefits. These small companies expend tens of thousands of dollars or more complying with the regulation, yet there is evidence that less than 10 percent of investors actually use XBRL, further diminishing its potential benefits.

That is why last Congress, the gentlewoman from Alabama, Representative SEWELL, and I authored the bipartisan Small Company Disclosure Simplification Act, which is incorporated into title VII of H.R. 37. I would like to thank Representative SEWELL for her diligent work on this legislation, which passed the Financial Services Committee last Congress with bipartisan support.

This provision will provide an optional exemption for emerging growth companies and smaller public companies from the requirement to file their information in XBRL with the SEC, in addition to the information that they already file.

Additionally, this title requires the SEC to perform a cost-benefit analysis on the rule's impact on smaller public companies, something it failed to adequately address in the original rule, and also to provide additional information to Congress on how the SEC and the market are using XBRL.

Whether a supporter or a sceptic of XBRL, these provisions will help provide a pathway for the SEC to focus on developing a system of disclosure for smaller companies that eliminates unnecessary costs while achieving greater benefits.

I believe H.R. 37 offers a practical step forward on these regulatory requirements in line with the intent of the original JOBS Act, ensuring that our regulatory structure is not disproportionately burdening smaller companies and disincentivizing innovative startups from accessing the public markets.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 37 so that we can continue to promote capital access in the public markets and spur job growth in communities all across this great country.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who is the former subcommittee ranking member on the Oversight Committee and is an active member on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to just amplify some of the concerns raised by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) in his remarks about the fact that here we are, just the second day of this Congress, and we have a group of 11 bills that have been rolled up. There are many new provisions here that have never seen a hearing, unfortunately. This is not the open process that we had hoped for and had spoken about just yesterday.

We have had very limited opportunity to review some of these new sections. Again, they have not had a hearing. They have not gone through regular order.

H.R. 37 contains 11 separate bills, some of which I support, but some of which I oppose strongly. Portions of H.R. 37 have entirely new provisions that most Members have not had the opportunity to thoroughly analyze.

For example, title XI of this bill modifies SEC rule 701 on stock-sharing. It allows private companies to compensate their employees up to \$10 million in company stock without having to provide the employees with certain basic financial disclosures about the company. I voted against a similar bill, H.R. 4571, in the last Congress when it was marked up.

But I also want to point out, that while I strongly support employees receiving equity benefits from the firms in which they work, those benefits should be tangible and real. We all remember Enron and WorldCom, where the company, as compensation to those employees, actually pressured them into buying company stock and did not provide full information to them. And eventually, those shares were worthless. So you had thousands of workers being partly compensated in company stock, and the stock was worth zero.

Now we are going to expand this opportunity from \$5 million to \$10 million a year that each company will be able to pay their employees with company stock, and they don't have any obligation because part of this bill does not require them to make any type of a disclosure, Mr. Speaker. And there is no opportunity for those employees to get accurate financial information about whether the stock that they are being paid with is worth anything. It is just a bad road to go down.

In closing, this bill uses the veneer of job creation to provide special treatments for the well-connected corporations, mergers and acquisition advisers, and financial institutions while doing very little to address the needs of those workers.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for his leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 37 and would particularly like to comment on title V. In order to provide market transparency, the Dodd-Frank law requires post-trade reporting to Swap Data Repositories, or SDRs, as they are called, so that regulators and market participants have access to realtime market data that help identify systemic risk in the financial system. So far, we have made great strides in reaching this goal, but unfortunately, a provision in the law threatens to undermine our progress unless we fix it.

Currently, Dodd-Frank includes a provision requiring a foreign regulator to indemnify a U.S.-based SDR for any expenses arising from litigation relating to a request for market data. Unlike the rest of the world, though, the concept of indemnification is only established within U.S. tort law. As a result, foreign regulators have been reluctant to comply with this provision, and international regulatory coordination is being thwarted.

While the intent of the provision was to protect market confidentiality, in practice, it threatens to fragment global data on swap markets. Without effective coordination between international regulators and SDRs, monitoring and mitigating global systemic risk is severely limited.

H.R. 37 fixes this problem by removing the indemnification provisions in Dodd-Frank. This has broad bipartisan support, and a separate bill to do this was unanimously approved last year by the House Ag Committee and the House Financial Services Committee. Additionally, last year, the SEC testified to the Financial Services Committee that a legislative solution was needed, saying: “In removing the indemnification requirement, Congress would assist the SEC, as well as other regulators, in securing the access it needs to data held in global trade repositories.”

If left unresolved, the indemnification provision in Dodd-Frank has the potential to effectively reduce transparency and undo the great progress already being made through the cooperative efforts of more than 50 regulators worldwide. In passing this legislation, we will ensure that regulators will

have access to a global set of swap market data, which is essential to maintaining the highest degree of market transparency and risk mitigation. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, how much time does the Democratic side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), who was the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee for the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance.

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on the last bill, the TRIA bill, when we were still arguing about it, some people on the other side accused people like me, who support the TRIA bill, of being in favor of corporate welfare. Now, as a liberal on most issues, I don't think many people would confuse me with someone who was generally in favor of corporate welfare, but I will take it.

On this bill—because I am going to oppose it on one basic provision—I am going to be called “against jobs.”

Rhetoric is cheap. Titles of bills don't mean anything. And in this bill, particularly the provision that was just spoken about, title V—there are plenty of things in this bill that I like that I would be happy to vote for. Bring them up separately, and I will. There are a couple of things here that I don't like too much, but we can find common ground on it. But all of that pales when you look at one provision in here that guts the Volcker rule.

It is simple: in 2006, collateralized debt obligations pretty much brought the world economy to its knees and hurt not just Wall Street, but hurt me, hurt my neighbors, hurt my family, and hurt a lot of average Americans because we allowed our financial service industry to gamble with somebody else's money.

And of course they gambled. They won a lot of money. And then when they lost, they didn't lose their money. They lost our money, and we had to come in with a bailout.

This is a corporate bailout—not with taxpayer money, but with depositor money, depositors who are not interested in giving their money to an institution so that they can gamble it on risky items that they will see no benefit from. That is what the Volcker rule says: if you want to gamble, use your money. Good luck. Don't gamble with my money unless I say so.

That is all the Volcker rule says. It has worked pretty well. The economy is recovering. Everybody knows that. Everybody agrees with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CAPUANO. This bill will allow three, only three of our Wall Street institutions—which control 70 percent of the collateralized loan obligation business; three of them control 70 percent of the business—to gamble with depositors' money again without those depositors having a say in it.

When they collapse and depositors lose their money, those of you who vote for this bill will have to explain it to them. This is unnecessary. It is inappropriate. And we should not be voting for this bill, mostly because of that single provision.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the provision that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) is referring to was heard in committee. The title of the bill passed in the committee with well over 50 votes. It passed unanimously on the floor of the House by voice vote, and not a single Democrat rose to object to the bill, but that was last year.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for bringing this collection of bills to the House floor.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Representatives HIMES, DELANEY, and WAGNER for working with me on one of the underlying bills, the bipartisan H.R. 801, in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in this new Congress, adding jobs to our economy is a top priority. And passing the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act is an opportunity for us to create a better environment for private sector growth and job creation.

□ 1345

Title III, also known as H.R. 801, is no exception, and I am proud to rise in support of its passage.

A year ago this month, I came to this floor to speak on the underlying bill which passed overwhelmingly in this Chamber 417-4. While it is unfortunate the bill was never considered by the Senate, it is clear today that in the 114th Congress, its prospects are better.

Small financial institutions are essential to the communities they serve. They have a deep and abiding love for the towns they serve because these towns are their towns, and our constituents—small business owners, farmers, hardworking Americans—rely on these institutions to meet payroll, to purchase equipment, or to buy a car or home.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these financial institutions have come under fire from Washington because of its regulatory overreach, forcing them to spend increasing shares of their resources to comply with onerous regulations—requirements intended for larger

banks—instead of having the flexibility they need to serve their communities.

Let's be clear: small community banks and savings and loan holding companies were not the cause of the financial crisis, and I don't believe they should be treated as though they were the cause. I am not alone. In the 112th Congress, the House and Senate acted to eliminate some of these unnecessary burdens by passing the JOBS Act.

Among other things, the bill raised the registration threshold for bank holding companies from 500 to 2,000 shareholders and increased the deregistration threshold from 300 to 1,200 shareholders, better positioning these banks to increase small business lending and, in turn, promote economic growth in our communities; but due to an oversight in the JOBS Act, it did not explicitly extend these new thresholds to savings and loan holding companies as well.

As a cosponsor of the JOBS Act, I can say with absolute certainty that wasn't our intent, and I subsequently supported report language in the approps bill of Financial Services to clarify and ensure that savings and loan holding companies should be treated in the same manner as bank and bank holding companies. Additionally, Representative HIMES and I have written to the FCC and asked that they use their authority to carry out our original intent.

In spite of these actions and the House passage of H.R. 801 last Congress, we are still without successful resolution to the problem. Today's vote can change that, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the overall legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, H.R. 4167 passed. I voted against it, but it is not the same as the language in title VIII which is in this bill today, which extends by 2 years the delay we requested, totaling 5 years. It is not the same legislation. This bill, title VIII, has not passed before. It is new.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable TED POE, will recognize this name. The Honorable Lee Duggan, a district court judge in Houston, Texas, reminded young lawyers that we live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right, they must also look right, and this bill doesn't look right. It doesn't look right when you combine 11 bills into one overnight and then present that to the floor without any amendments being available to the bill.

We should not allow a poison-pill process to develop at the genesis of this Congress. If we do it now, we will continue to do it. I think we have to concern ourselves not only with these 11 bills, but with the many other bills that are to follow. We can never allow

this to start the new Congress. We should prevent it.

I would also add this. I am all for doing a lot of things with a hurry-up process. I would like to see us do something about minimum wage; we are not doing anything about minimum wage at all thus far. I would like to see us do something about comprehensive immigration reform; that will be a piece-meal deal if it ever becomes a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with those who believe that the process ought to be fair. It ought to favor the openness that allows for amendments. I say to you that this is not right, and it doesn't even look right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of last year, over my strenuous objections, we wrapped up a big present for Wall Street. We put taxpayers back on the hook for losses that are connected to certain derivatives trading, among the riskiest bets that banks make.

Well, Christmas is over, and Hanukkah is over, but the gifts keep on coming for Wall Street. Within this bill is another provision that cuts at the heart of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform legislation. It delays a portion of the Volcker rule, which bans federally insured banks from making those risky bets or investing in risky funds, including packages known as collateralized loan obligations, or CLOs.

Mortgage-backed securities brought our economy almost crumbling to the ground in 2008, and we are still recovering. Taxpayers bailed out the big banks; yet for millions of homeowners who were forced from their homes and millions of others who are still under water, there hasn't been any assistance. People are right to be angry about this, and they are right to object to this new giveaway to Wall Street interests.

CLOs are similar to toxic mortgage-backed securities. The only difference is that instead of bad mortgages, these packages involve junk-rated corporate loans and a mix of other risky assets.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency said last month that the corporate debt market is overheating and becoming increasingly dangerous, and CLOs are the big reason why. This has all the markings of another economy-crushing disaster.

Who gets the upside if Wall Street is able to continue packaging and selling CLOs with taxpayer backing? Wall Street. Who loses if and when those bets go wrong? The rest of us. It is heads, Wall Street wins; tails, everybody else loses.

Mr. Speaker, as Dennis Kelleher of Better Markets said, "The attack on the Volcker rule has been nonstop."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the American people deserve better, and we are tired of really bad Wall Street giveaways being tacked on to other legislation. This looks like a Republican strategy to put Wall Street over Main Street.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this big bill may have some things that are not bad, but it also contains a bill that delays protection of our economy and families from Wall Street gambling, and it should be voted down.

We urge a very strong "no" on this bill. Go back, do it right, follow the process, regular order, and maybe we could make some progress here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill before us today is here on the same procedure the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act reauthorization was here; we just debated that bill on the floor. They are both coming up under a suspension of the rules, and TRIA reauthorization last term, like these bills, were debated either in committee or on the floor in the full House.

The distinguished minority whip, in speaking about the TRIA bill, said that it is always the right time to do the right thing. In addition, he decried the process that delayed the reauthorization of TRIA—I agree with him on that—and he said there were well over 250 votes for the last year and a half for the reauthorization of TRIA.

I would submit and ask the RECORD to reflect, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill, and we have heard about the 11 provisions, all of which went through the committee or the full House.

Title I amends Dodd-Frank and passed the House 411-12. It was introduced as a bipartisan bill, went through the committee, had a committee hearing, both sides had witnesses, and all the questions were asked. There was a markup. At the markup, there were amendments. The bill passed the committee. It came to the floor of the House and passed 411-12.

Title II passed the committee 50-10. Title III passed on the full House after passing the committee 417-4. Title IV passed the House 422-0. Each one of these provisions were bipartisan, and they passed in a strong fashion on a vote either in the committee or the House.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday, we were sent back here. We took the oath of office, sent by our constituents to do the right thing, to work together where we can, to identify problems, to address

those problems, and to get stuff done, especially when it regards the American economy, small businesses, and the ability to get people to work to create jobs.

Each one of these titles in this bill identifies a problem in the economy, addresses it in a bipartisan way, and the time is now to pass this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 37, pass the bill and send it to the Senate. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 37, The Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act of 2015.

This Trojan Horse legislation is actually a combination of eleven separate bills, ten of which were authored by Republican members of the Committee.

I believe that Members should be afforded the opportunity to offer amendments and have a full and fair debate on these bills. However, by considering this package under Suspension of the Rules, Republicans begin the new year by denying Members the opportunity to thoroughly debate a measure that will have far-reaching impact.

Let's be clear: regulators have made tremendous progress in implementing the Dodd-Frank Act. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has already returned \$4.6 billion to 15 million consumers who have been subjected to unfair and deceptive practices, some of whom live in my Congressional District in Houston.

The CFPB has established a qualified mortgage rule, ensuring that borrowers who are extended mortgage credit actually have the ability to repay the loan, and has established new rules-of-the-road for mortgage servicers.

In addition, the CFPB has worked with the Department of Defense to develop financial protections for service members and veterans, and established a national database to aide consumers with complaints about debt collectors, credit card companies, and credit rating agencies, among others. Let us not turn back the clock on American consumers who already have seen the benefits of the CFPB's efforts.

The Volcker Rule has forced banks to sell-off their standalone proprietary trading desks, and banks have shifted away from speculative trading to investments in the real economy. Shareholders of U.S. corporations now have the ability to have a “say-on-pay,” voting to approve or disapprove executive compensation.

In addition Mr. Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has recovered more than \$9.3 billion in civil fines and penalties since 2011, leveraging enhanced authorities provided by Dodd-Frank. The SEC has also established an Office of the Whistleblower to aid them in policing securities market violations, which has already received more than 6,573 tips from 68 countries. Further, private funds are making systemic risk reports to regulators, helping them to understand previously opaque risks.

To implement the Dodd-Frank Act, the CFTC has completed 65 final rules, orders, and guidance documents resulting in the registration and enhanced oversight of 102 Swap

Dealers, two Major Swap Participants, 22 Swap Execution Facilities, and four Swap Data Repositories. In addition, the CFTC has established rules governing mandatory clearing, exchange trading, and reporting of the entire \$400 trillion notional swaps market.

It should also be noted that since Dodd-Frank's passage, stability in the market has led to significant economic growth. Nearly 9.7 million private sector payroll jobs have been created since February 2010.

There are now nearly 900,000 more workers employed in the private sector than before recession-related job losses began in early 2008. The unemployment rate has fallen by 3.9 percentage points since its peak of 10.0 percent in October 2009 and currently stands at 6.1 percent—its lowest level since September 2008. Real GDP has grown 10.2 percent since its trough in 2009, and now stands 5.5 percent higher than its pre-recession peak in late 2007. That in and of itself is news that the media should be discussing.

Moreover, the housing market is recovering, with home prices rising, negative equity falling dramatically, and measures of mortgage distress improving. The S&P 500 has risen by 85 percent since July 21, 2010 and has recently reached new peaks.

However, this progress has been regularly stymied by a concerted effort by the Majority to underfund regulators' operations, relentlessly pressure them to weaken regulations, and otherwise erect roadblocks to implementation. As a result, the progress regulators have made to implement the law remains precarious.

I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation and have a full debate on its merits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 37.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LOW-DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 35) to increase the understanding of the health effects of low doses of ionizing radiation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 35

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. LOW DOSE RADIATION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Department of Energy Office of Science shall

carry out a research program on low dose radiation. The purpose of the program is to enhance the scientific understanding of and reduce uncertainties associated with the effects of exposure to low dose radiation in order to inform improved risk management methods.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies to conduct a study assessing the current status and development of a long-term strategy for low dose radiation research. Such study shall be completed not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. The study shall be conducted in coordination with Federal agencies that perform ionizing radiation effects research and shall leverage the most current studies in this field. Such study shall—

(1) identify current scientific challenges for understanding the long-term effects of ionizing radiation;

(2) assess the status of current low dose radiation research in the United States and internationally;

(3) formulate overall scientific goals for the future of low-dose radiation research in the United States;

(4) recommend a long-term strategic and prioritized research agenda to address scientific research goals for overcoming the identified scientific challenges in coordination with other research efforts;

(5) define the essential components of a research program that would address this research agenda within the universities and the National Laboratories; and

(6) assess the cost-benefit effectiveness of such a program.

(c) RESEARCH PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of the study performed under subsection (b) the Secretary of Energy shall deliver to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a 5-year research plan that responds to the study's findings and recommendations and identifies and prioritizes research needs.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “low dose radiation” means a radiation dose of less than 100 millisieverts.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to subject any research carried out by the Director under the research program under this Act to any limitations described in section 977(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16317(e)).

(f) FUNDING.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated under this section. This Act shall be carried out using funds otherwise appropriated by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 35, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 35, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2015, will increase our understanding of low-dose radiation. This research is critical for physicians and decisionmakers to more accurately assess potential health risks in this area.

I want to thank my friend, Mr. HULTGREN, for introducing this legislation along with Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois. A virtually identical bill passed the House by a voice vote this past November in the previous Congress.

Many Americans are exposed to a broad range of low doses of ionizing radiation. These range from cosmic background radiation to medically-based procedures which include x rays and CT scans. However, our current approach of radiation safety relies on an outmoded assumption that because high doses of radiation are harmful, it necessarily follows that much lower radiation doses are also harmful.

This assumption is not based on a reliable scientific foundation, prevents patients from making informed decisions about diagnostic exams, and can lead to overly restrictive regulations.

The Department of Energy's Low Dose Radiation Research Program within the Office of Science focuses on the health effects of ionizing radiation and helps to resolve the uncertainties in this area that currently exist. Unfortunately, this program has not been a priority at DOE over recent years and has seen systematic de-emphasis. H.R. 35 ensures the continuance and enhancement of this important research program.

This legislation also directs the National Academies to formulate a long-term strategy to resolve uncertainties surrounding whether and to what extent low-dose radiation may pose health risks to humans. The bill stipulates that the academies must consider the most up-to-date studies in this field of research.

□ 1400

Finally, the bill requires the Department of Energy to develop a 5-year research plan that responds to the Academies' recommendations. I again thank the gentlemen from Illinois, Representatives HULTGREN and LIPINSKI, for their leadership on this issue. I also want to commend Congressmen SENSENBRENNER, POSEY, BUSHON, and CRAMER for joining me in cosponsoring this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 35, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2015. I would like to begin by thanking my

colleagues from Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. LIPINSKI, for introducing this bipartisan legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

H.R. 35 authorizes an important research program carried out by the Department of Energy's Office of Science to examine the health impacts of exposure to low doses of radiation, such as doses resulting from certain medical tests, nuclear waste cleanup activities, or even terrorism events like dirty bombs. This program builds on the Department of Energy's unique biological research expertise and capabilities, which led to the establishment of the successful Human Genome Project that paved the way for important breakthroughs in modern medicine.

This bill authorizes a National Academies study to identify current scientific challenges in this area and to help guide the program's long-term research agenda well into the next decade. A similar bill passed the House late last Congress with overwhelming support, and it is my hope that this will again pass and move to the Senate for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), the lead sponsor of this bill, and also a distinguished member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for H.R. 35, the Low-Dose Radiation Research Act, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Chairman SMITH, for helping me to bring this legislation to the floor.

While it may sound scary, we come in contact with small amounts of radiation every day from the cosmic background which many Americans are probably unaware of. Of course, radiation has been a useful tool which has led to innovation for medical imaging, like x rays and treatments. Numerous processes used by manufacturers in my home State of Illinois, for instance, include low-dose radiation to carry out precise and accurate measurements. But it is time that the regulatory structure surrounding exposure to low-dose radiation relies on sound science.

Currently, the assumption is that because high doses of radiation are harmful to human health, lower doses must be, too. This is similar to saying that jumping down one step in a flight of stairs is harmful to your health because we already know that it is harmful to jump down an entire flight of stairs at one time.

While there is little doubt that there is a threshold above which humans should avoid exposure to radiation, this legislation will ensure that the Department of Energy's Office of Science prioritizes the research necessary to

understand what that level actually is. My bill directs the agency to work with the National Academies to formulate a long-term research plan to do this work.

As I continue to represent my constituents of the 14th Congressional District of Illinois, I will always champion the things we are doing right in Illinois. Our State has a long history of innovation in this space. For many years we have led the Nation in nuclear power generation, and the work we continue to do in our national labs is pushing the boundaries in our frontiers of knowledge.

Fermilab, in my district, helped establish neutron therapy as a viable radiation treatment for many difficult-to-treat cancers. Harnessing the continued benefits of radiation requires that we clarify what the potential harms are. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no other individuals who wish to comment on this bill, so we are prepared to close when my friend is prepared to close as well.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. SMITH, and the ranking member, Ms. JOHNSON, and the sponsors of this bill, Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. LIPINSKI.

The bill before us today represents a true bipartisan effort and will help protect the health of our constituents. Passage of this bill is a positive way to start this new Congress, and I urge its adoption.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for her comments, and I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 35.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 23) to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 23

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

(a) **DIRECTOR.**—Section 203(1) of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15702(1)) is amended by striking “Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy” and inserting “Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology”.

(b) **LIFELINES.**—Section 203 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15702) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) **LIFELINES.**—The term ‘lifelines’ means public works and utilities, including transportation facilities and infrastructure, oil and gas pipelines, electrical power and communication facilities and infrastructure, and water supply and sewage treatment facilities.”.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

Section 204 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15703) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, the purpose of which is to achieve major measurable reductions in the losses of life and property from windstorms through a coordinated Federal effort, in cooperation with other levels of government, academia, and the private sector, aimed at improving the understanding of windstorms and their impacts and developing and encouraging the implementation of cost-effective mitigation measures to reduce those impacts.

“(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROGRAM AGENCIES.**—

“(1) **LEAD AGENCY.**—The National Institute of Standards and Technology shall have the primary responsibility for planning and coordinating the Program. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director shall—

“(A) ensure that the Program includes the necessary components to promote the implementation of windstorm risk reduction measures by Federal, State, and local governments, national standards and model building code organizations, architects and engineers, and others with a role in planning and constructing buildings and lifelines;

“(B) support the development of performance-based engineering tools, and work with appropriate groups to promote the commercial application of such tools, including through wind-related model building codes, voluntary standards, and construction best practices;

“(C) request the assistance of Federal agencies other than the Program agencies, as necessary to assist in carrying out this Act;

“(D) coordinate all Federal post-windstorm investigations; and

“(E) when warranted by research or investigative findings, issue recommendations to assist in informing the development of model codes, and provide information to Congress on the use of such recommendations.

“(2) **NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.**—In addition to the lead agency responsibilities described under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall be responsible for carrying

out research and development to improve model building codes, voluntary standards, and best practices for the design, construction, and retrofit of buildings, structures, and lifelines.

“(3) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.**—The National Science Foundation shall support research in—

“(A) engineering and the atmospheric sciences to improve the understanding of the behavior of windstorms and their impact on buildings, structures, and lifelines; and

“(B) economic and social factors influencing windstorm risk reduction measures.

“(4) **NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.**—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall support atmospheric sciences research to improve the understanding of the behavior of windstorms and their impact on buildings, structures, and lifelines.

“(5) **FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.**—The Federal Emergency Management Agency shall—

“(A) support—

“(i) the development of risk assessment tools and effective mitigation techniques;

“(ii) windstorm-related data collection and analysis;

“(iii) public outreach and information dissemination; and

“(iv) promotion of the adoption of windstorm preparedness and mitigation measures, including for households, businesses, and communities, consistent with the Agency’s all-hazards approach; and

“(B) work closely with national standards and model building code organizations, in conjunction with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to promote the implementation of research results and promote better building practices within the building design and construction industry, including architects, engineers, contractors, builders, and inspectors.”.

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c), and by striking subsections (e) and (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

“(d) **BUDGET ACTIVITIES.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall each include in their agency’s annual budget request to Congress a description of their agency’s projected activities under the Program for the fiscal year covered by the budget request, along with an assessment of what they plan to spend on those activities for that fiscal year.

“(e) **INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction, chaired by the Director.

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—In addition to the chair, the Committee shall be composed of—

“(A) the heads of—

“(i) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

“(ii) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

“(iii) the National Science Foundation;

“(iv) the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and

“(v) the Office of Management and Budget; and

“(B) the head of any other Federal agency the chair considers appropriate.

“(3) **MEETINGS.**—The Committee shall meet not less than 2 times a year at the call of the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

“(4) **GENERAL PURPOSE AND DUTIES.**—The Committee shall oversee the planning and coordination of the Program.

“(5) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—The Committee shall develop and submit to Congress, not later than one year after the date of enactment of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015, a Strategic Plan for the Program that includes—

“(A) prioritized goals for the Program that will mitigate against the loss of life and property from future windstorms;

“(B) short-term, mid-term, and long-term research objectives to achieve those goals;

“(C) a description of the role of each Program agency in achieving the prioritized goals;

“(D) the methods by which progress towards the goals will be assessed; and

“(E) an explanation of how the Program will foster the transfer of research results into outcomes, such as improved model building codes.

“(6) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015, the Committee shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress of the Program that includes—

“(A) a description of the activities funded under the Program, a description of how these activities align with the prioritized goals and research objectives established in the Strategic Plan, and the budgets, per agency, for these activities;

“(B) the outcomes achieved by the Program for each of the goals identified in the Strategic Plan;

“(C) a description of any recommendations made to change existing building codes that were the result of Program activities; and

“(D) a description of the extent to which the Program has incorporated recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction.

“(7) **COORDINATED BUDGET.**—The Committee shall develop a coordinated budget for the Program, which shall be submitted to the Congress at the time of the President’s budget submission for each fiscal year.”.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.

Section 205 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15704) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 205. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish an Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction, which shall be composed of at least 7 members, none of whom may be employees of the Federal Government, including representatives of research and academic institutions, industry standards development organizations, emergency management agencies, State and local government, and business communities who are qualified to provide advice on windstorm impact reduction and represent all related scientific, architectural, and engineering disciplines. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be considered by Federal agencies in implementing the Program.

“(b) **ASSESSMENTS.**—The Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction shall offer assessments on—

“(1) trends and developments in the natural, engineering, and social sciences and practices of windstorm impact mitigation;

“(2) the priorities of the Program’s Strategic Plan;

“(3) the coordination of the Program; and

“(4) any revisions to the Program which may be necessary.

“(c) COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee established under this section shall serve without compensation.

“(d) REPORTS.—At least every 2 years, the Advisory Committee shall report to the Director on the assessments carried out under subsection (b) and its recommendations for ways to improve the Program.

“(e) CHARTER.—Notwithstanding section 14(b)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Advisory Committee shall not be required to file a charter subsequent to its initial charter, filed under section 9(c) of such Act, before the termination date specified in subsection (f) of this section.

“(f) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Committee shall terminate on September 30, 2017.

“(g) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—An Advisory Committee member shall recuse himself from any Advisory Committee activity in which he has an actual pecuniary interest.”

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15706) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$5,332,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$5,332,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$5,332,000 for fiscal year 2017.

“(b) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2017.

“(c) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2017.

“(d) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2017.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 23, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 23, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015, reauthorizes the activities of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program through 2017.

Representative RANDY NEUGEBAUER, my Texas colleague, has championed this program for over a decade. In the last Congress, he and Representative FREDERICA WILSON’s bipartisan efforts helped move this legislation through the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and to successfully pass the House. It is because of their past work that we are able to bring this bill to the House floor so early in this Congress.

The National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program supports Federal research and development efforts to help mitigate the loss of life and property due to wind-related hazards. Millions of Americans live in areas vulnerable to hurricanes, tornadoes, and other windstorms. The National Weather Service reported 91 deaths and 892 injuries in 2013 due to tornadoes, thunderstorm wind, and high wind.

We all remember that in 2011 that was the year marred by loss due to windstorms. According to the National Science and Technology Council’s biennial report to Congress, in 2011 only, windstorms in the United States took nearly 700 lives, injured nearly 7,000 people, and caused an estimated \$11 billion in total direct property losses.

In Texas, we are all too familiar with the harm that excess wind can cause. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Storm Prediction Center, 128 tornadoes and 1,366 windstorms were reported in Texas in the last 2 years. The effects of these disasters can be felt for a long time.

Initially established in 2004, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program supports activities to improve our understanding of windstorms and their impacts and helps to develop and encourage the implementation of cost-effective mitigation measures.

H.R. 23 establishes the National Institute of Standards and Technology as the lead agency for the program, improves coordination and planning of agency activities in a fiscally responsible manner, and improves transparency for how much money is being spent on windstorm research.

I want to thank Representative NEUGEBAUER for his continued efforts to support this program. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 23, the National Windstorm Impact Re-

duction Act Reauthorization of 2015. Thank you for working with us to incorporate mutually agreeable provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite the House’s consideration of H.R. 23, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and would request that you insert our exchange of letters on this matter into the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.

Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 23, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 23 at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Transportation Committee as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 23, legislation to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

First I want to thank Representatives NEUGEBAUER and WILSON for their hard work on this important legislation that will benefit our constituents.

Americans face significant exposure to windstorms. According to the National Weather Service, between the years of 2003 and 2013, thousands of Americans lost their lives from the impacts of windstorms. Along with the

loss of life, windstorms during that time caused billions of dollars of damage to property, including a severely negative impact on agricultural crops.

Although we cannot stop a windstorm from happening, there is much we can do to save both lives and property when windstorms and other natural disasters do happen. In addition to responding quickly and with sufficient resources in the aftermath of a natural disaster, we must also invest in preparedness and resilience.

Studies of FEMA's Pre-Disaster Mitigation program have shown that for every dollar invested in mitigation activities, \$3 to \$4 in recovery costs can be saved.

The National Windstorm Reduction Program Act is primarily a mitigation program. It has the potential to lessen the loss of life and economic damage by supporting research and development on windstorms and their impacts and helping to ensure that this research is translated into improving building codes and emergency planning, but this program needs robust investment to achieve that result.

The bill today includes a lower total authorization level than was authorized for this program in fiscal year 2008. We can and we should do better than that. One of our responsibilities as a government should be to assist our constituents with disaster mitigation and response and preparedness, and that means investing in programs we already have in place to carry out these responsibilities. Nevertheless, I understand the need to reauthorize this important program, and I thank my colleagues for agreeing to maintain the authorization levels negotiated last Congress.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), who is the lead sponsor of this legislation and also a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act, H.R. 23. I also want to thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership on this issue, and I appreciate him agreeing to bring this back up early in the 114th Congress.

I think we have already heard of a number of people quote a lot of statistics about the amount of damage that occurs from windstorms in this country and the loss of lives. You know, particularly 2011 was a very bad year. As it was pointed out, we had a number of people that were killed that year and over \$28 billion in damage to property alone.

What is happening is the risk is growing because our population centers are growing. You know, a tornado that

goes through a town center does a lot more damage than one that goes through an empty prairie. As these storms are getting costlier over time, at a time where we are \$18 trillion in debt, it is important that we utilize the taxpayers' resources in an effective way. This particular program, as it was mentioned, is reauthorized at a fixed level, the level from previous reauthorization, but also it is designed to make the program more efficient and effective in the future.

When a family loses a home, you know, they don't have to just rebuild the house; they have to rebuild their lives. We know a lot of people have either experienced losses of property or life, loved ones, or they know people that have.

In particular, it is a personal thing for me because, on May 11th of 1970, I had just taken my last final for that semester at Texas Tech University, and 3 hours or 4 hours later, a major tornado ripped through Lubbock, Texas, and killed 26 people, including destroying the apartment complex that I lived in.

I was fortunately unharmed in that event, but what I did get to witness is the tremendous amount of damage that can happen from these storms and the loss of life. You saw things that you didn't think were possible—cars in parking lots that were rolled up and swirled up like an ice cream cone.

So one of the things that later on, to me, in the building business, one of the things that we began to learn is, from important research that was done, that we were able to use certain building techniques that made houses more wind resistant, made buildings more wind resistant, and that is exactly what this bill, NWIRP, does. It takes these four agencies that currently have jurisdiction over that—and those include NOAA, the National Science Foundation, FEMA, and NIST—and makes sure that they are using those funds appropriately and that there is not a lot of duplication in the research going on. Each one of them has an area of expertise. We want to do a better job of predicting these storms. We want to do a better job of learning how we can mitigate the damage from those.

One of the things that happened right after the May 11 tornado in Lubbock is that Texas Tech University began doing research on windstorms and the effects of different materials, and later on they founded the National Wind Institute, which is doing important research on simulating cyclones and different kinds of wind events and the impact that they have on materials and certain building techniques. Certainly that will be important to our country as we move forward.

What does that do for the taxpayers? Well, obviously if we can learn more about predicting the outcomes, we can make our buildings stronger, but, more

importantly, save lives. And one of the things I know from a lot of the research that has been going on right now, that designs are being incorporated in a lot of buildings.

□ 1415

Recently I was at a new elementary school in my district, and one of the things that we learned is that they incorporated certain building techniques within the cafeteria of that new elementary. Basically, the cafeteria became a storm shelter for the students going to that elementary. Those are the kind of things that will be beneficial from this.

I urge my colleagues to help me reauthorize H.R. 23.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), who is a cosponsor of the bill, and also a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 23. This legislation would reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, or NWIRP.

The Federal Government has an important role in helping Americans prepare for and recover from natural hazards. H.R. 23 directs four Federal agencies—NIST, NSF, NOAA, and FEMA—to conduct coordinated research and development on the nature of windstorms, their effects, and on ways to mitigate their impact. The legislation also ensures that this research is translated into practice through improved building codes and emergency planning.

I was born and raised in south Florida, and I am a survivor of Hurricane Andrew, so I have seen my share of severe weather. I know firsthand that natural hazards are a leading threat to American lives and America's economy.

While we cannot stop a hurricane or tornado from happening, this Congress can act to make sure our communities have the tools they need to respond and recover from these disasters.

We must begin by investing in preparedness and resilience. Studies of FEMA's pre-disaster mitigation program have shown that for every dollar we invest in mitigation activities we save \$3 to \$4 in recovery costs.

I was pleased that this bill was considered in the Science Committee last Congress, and we worked in a bipartisan manner to make several improvements to the bill. I want to thank my colleagues, Chairman SMITH and Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for working across the aisle in a smooth and productive process.

We worked together to increase the authorization for FEMA, the NWIRP agency tasked with taking the research conducted at other agencies and developing mitigation techniques and public

outreach. Mr. NEUGEBAUER was the lead, and I appreciate his inclusion.

Additionally, we added several social science-related provisions to the bill. We cannot design effective disaster strategies without knowing how people make decisions and respond to disaster warnings.

Often in a compromise, like this one, you do not get everything you would like. I would have liked to see increases in the authorization levels across the board. Unfortunately, this bill includes a lower total authorization level than what was authorized for this program in fiscal year 2008.

When the last few years have been devastating years for windstorms, including Superstorm Sandy and the tornado outbreak last May, it is difficult to understand why we would cut the total authorization level for this important program.

I do hope that if this bill moves forward, we will continue our bipartisan efforts and work with the Senate to perfect this bill. Nevertheless, I understand the need to reauthorize this important program that can help minimize the number of Americans who are harmed or killed by windstorm disasters and reduce the costs associated with disaster recovery.

I support H.R. 23 and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other Members who wish to be heard on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and so in closing, we must help our constituents prepare for and mitigate the impacts of severe weather events, such as windstorms, that threaten their lives and property. This bill takes an important step in that direction, and I urge its adoption.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 23, legislation that would reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program—or NWIRP.

The last few years have been devastating years for natural disasters across the country. There were massive tornadoes across the Midwest that resulted in loss of life and significant economic damages. In addition, Hurricane Irene in 2011 and Superstorm Sandy in 2012 caused widespread destruction and death along the Eastern seaboard.

H.R. 23 directs NIST, NSF, NOAA, and FEMA to support activities to improve the understanding of windstorms and their impacts. We can use that knowledge to reduce the vulnerability of our communities to natural disasters. The NWIRP program helps our federal agencies and communities across the nation develop and implement many measures that help minimize the loss of life and property dur-

ing windstorms and to rebuild effectively and safely after such storms.

I was pleased that when this bill was considered by the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee last Congress, we worked in a bipartisan manner and made several improvements to the bill.

We worked together to increase the authorization for FEMA, the agency tasked with implementing the research conducted by the other NWIRP agencies. Additionally, we added several social science-related provisions to the bill. We cannot design effective disaster preparation strategies without understanding how people make decisions and respond to disaster warnings.

This is a compromise bill and so it doesn't contain as much as I think should be done. In particular, I wish this bill included authorization increases for the NWIRP agencies—increases that are justified by the important activities those agencies carry out. However, it is still a good bill and an important bill for us to act on.

I want to thank my fellow Texans—Chairman SMITH and Mr. NEUGEBAUER—for working across the aisle on this bill and for bringing it to the floor today. And I want to thank Ms. WILSON for her efforts on this legislation. It was good to see Members of the Committee coming together, working out their differences, compromising, and ending up with a bill with bipartisan support.

I support the bill and urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 23.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 34) to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 34

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or re-

peal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF PURPOSES OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 3202) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “research,” after “warnings,”;

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) to enhance and modernize the existing United States Tsunami Warning System to increase the accuracy of forecasts and warnings, to maintain full coverage of tsunami detection assets, and to reduce false alarms;”;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) to improve and develop standards and guidelines for mapping, modeling, and assessment efforts to improve tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) to improve research efforts related to improving tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery;”;

(6) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “and increase” and inserting “, increase, and develop uniform standards and guidelines for”; and

(B) by inserting “, including the warning signs of locally generated tsunami” after “approaching”;

(7) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking “, including the Indian Ocean; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6), as so redesignated, the following:

“(7) to foster resilient communities in the face of tsunami and other coastal hazards; and”.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI FORECASTING AND WARNING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203) is amended by striking “Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico region” and inserting “Atlantic Ocean region, including the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico”.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Subsection (b) of such section 4 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “established” and inserting “supported or maintained”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and safeguarding port and harbor operations” after “communities”;

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting “, including graphical warning products,” after “warnings”;

(B) by inserting “, territories,” after “States”; and

(C) by inserting “and Wireless Emergency Alerts” after “Hazards Program”; and

(4) in paragraph (8), by inserting “and commercial and Federal undersea communications cables” after “observing technologies”.

(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—Subsection (c) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The program under this section shall operate a tsunami warning system that—

“(1) is capable of forecasting tsunami, including forecasting tsunami arrival time and

inundation estimates, anywhere in the Pacific and Arctic Ocean regions and providing adequate warnings;

“(2) is capable of forecasting and providing adequate warnings in areas of the Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, that are determined—

“(A) to be geologically active, or to have significant potential for geological activity; and

“(B) to pose significant risks of tsunami for States along the coastal areas of the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, or Gulf of Mexico; and

“(3) supports other international tsunami forecasting and warning efforts.”

(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—Subsection (d) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support or maintain centers to support the tsunami warning system required by subsection (c). The Centers shall include—

“(A) the National Tsunami Warning Center, located in Alaska, which is primarily responsible for Alaska and the continental United States;

“(B) the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, located in Hawaii, which is primarily responsible for Hawaii, the Caribbean, and other areas of the Pacific not covered by the National Center; and

“(C) any additional forecast and warning centers determined by the National Weather Service to be necessary.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) Continuously monitoring data from seismological, deep ocean, coastal sea level, and tidal monitoring stations and other data sources as may be developed and deployed.

“(B) Evaluating earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions that have the potential to generate tsunami.

“(C) Evaluating deep ocean buoy data and tidal monitoring stations for indications of tsunami resulting from earthquakes and other sources.

“(D) To the extent practicable, utilizing a range of models to predict tsunami arrival times and flooding estimates.

“(E) Disseminating forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins to Federal, State, and local government officials and the public.

“(F) Coordinating with the tsunami hazard mitigation program conducted under section 5 to ensure ongoing sharing of information between forecasters and emergency management officials.

“(G) Making data gathered under this Act and post-warning analyses conducted by the National Weather Service or other relevant Administration offices available to researchers.

“(3) FAIL-SAFE WARNING CAPABILITY.—The tsunami warning centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall maintain a fail-safe warning capability and ability to perform back-up duties for each other.

“(4) COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.—The National Weather Service shall coordinate with the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) to ensure that regional and local forecast offices—

“(A) have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings for the communities they serve; and

“(B) leverage connections with local emergency management officials for optimally disseminating tsunami warnings and forecasts.

“(5) UNIFORM OPERATING PROCEDURES.—The Administrator shall—

“(A) develop uniform operational procedures for the centers supported or maintained pursuant to paragraph (1), including the use of software applications, checklists, decision support tools, and tsunami warning products that have been standardized across the program supported under this section;

“(B) ensure that processes and products of the warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c)—

“(i) reflect industry best practices;

“(ii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with internationally recognized standards for information technology; and

“(iii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with other warning products and practices of the National Weather Service;

“(C) ensure that future adjustments to operational protocols, processes, and warning products—

“(i) are made consistently across the warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c); and

“(ii) are applied in a uniform manner across such warning system; and

“(D) disseminate guidelines and metrics for evaluating and improving tsunami forecast models.

“(6) AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—The Administrator, through the National Weather Service, shall ensure that resources are available to fulfill the obligations of this Act. This includes ensuring supercomputing resources are available to run such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated pursuant to subsection (c).”

(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—Subsection (e) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) develop requirements for the equipment used to forecast tsunami, including—

“(A) provisions for multipurpose detection platforms;

“(B) reliability and performance metrics; and

“(C) to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for the integration of equipment with other United States and global ocean and coastal observation systems, the global Earth observing system of systems, the global seismic networks, and the Advanced National Seismic System;

“(2) develop and execute a plan for the transfer of technology from ongoing research conducted as part of the program supported or maintained under section 6 into the program under this section; and

“(3) ensure that the Administration’s operational tsunami detection equipment is properly maintained.”

(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—Subsection (f) of such section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—When deploying and maintaining tsunami detection technologies under the program under this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) identify which assets of other Federal agencies are necessary to support such program; and

“(2) work with each agency identified under paragraph (1)—

“(A) to acquire the agency’s assistance; and

“(B) to prioritize the necessary assets.”

(g) UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS.—Such section 4 is further amended by striking subsections (g) through (k).

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (33 U.S.C. 3204) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (d) and inserting the following:

“(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, shall conduct a community-based tsunami hazard mitigation program to improve tsunami preparedness and resiliency of at-risk areas in the United States and the territories of the United States.

“(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Program conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Technical and financial assistance to coastal States, territories, tribes, and local governments to develop and implement activities under this section.

“(2) Integration of tsunami preparedness and mitigation programs into ongoing State-based hazard warning, resilience planning, and risk management activities, including predisaster planning, emergency response, evacuation planning, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development and redevelopment programs in affected areas.

“(3) Activities to promote the adoption of tsunami resilience, preparedness, warning, and mitigation measures by Federal, State, territorial, tribal, and local governments and nongovernmental entities, including educational and risk communication programs to discourage development in high-risk areas.

“(4) Activities to support the development of regional tsunami hazard and risk assessments, using inundation models that meet programmatic standards for accuracy. Such regional risk assessments may include the following:

“(A) The sources, sizes, and histories of tsunami in that region.

“(B) Inundation models and maps of critical infrastructure and socioeconomic vulnerability in areas subject to tsunami inundation.

“(C) Maps of evacuation areas and evacuation routes.

“(D) Evaluations of the size of populations that will require evacuation, including populations with special evacuation needs.

“(5) Activities to support the development of community-based outreach and education programs to ensure community readiness and resilience, including the following:

“(A) The development, implementation, and assessment of technical training and public education programs, including education programs that address unique characteristics of distant and near-field tsunami.

“(B) The development of decision support tools.

“(C) The incorporation of social science research into community readiness and resilience efforts.

“(D) The development of evidence-based education guidelines.

“(6) Dissemination of guidelines and standards for community planning, education, and training products, programs, and tools, including standards for—

“(A) mapping products;

“(B) inundation models; and

“(C) effective emergency exercises.

“(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to activities conducted under subsection (b), the program conducted pursuant to subsection (a) may include the following:

“(1) Multidisciplinary vulnerability assessment research, education, and training to

help integrate risk management and resilience objectives with community development planning and policies.

“(2) Risk management training for local officials and community organizations to enhance understanding and preparedness.

“(3) Development of practical applications for existing or emerging technologies, such as modeling, remote sensing, geospatial technology, engineering, and observing systems.

“(4) Risk management, risk assessment, and resilience data and information services, including—

“(A) access to data and products derived from observing and detection systems; and

“(B) development and maintenance of new integrated data products to support risk management, risk assessment, and resilience programs.

“(5) Risk notification systems that coordinate with and build upon existing systems and actively engage decisionmakers, local and State government agencies, business communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the media.

“(d) NO PREEMPTION.—

“(1) DESIGNATION OF AT-RISK AREAS.—The establishment of national standards for inundation models under this section shall not prevent States, territories, tribes, and local governments from designating additional areas as being at risk based on knowledge of local conditions.

“(2) NO NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed as establishing new regulatory authority for any Federal agency.”.

(b) REPORT ON ACCREDITATION OF TSUNAMIREADY PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on which authorities and activities would be needed to have the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program.

SEC. 6. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 3205) is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “The Administrator shall” and all that follows through “establish or maintain” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with such other Federal agencies, State and territorial governments, and academic institutions as the Administrator considers appropriate, the coordinating committee under section 11(b), and the panel under section 8(a), support or maintain”;

(2) by striking “and assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling. Such research program shall—” and inserting the following: “assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling, and standards development.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The research program supported or maintained pursuant to subsection (a) shall—”;

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) consider other appropriate research to mitigate the impact of tsunami, including the improvement of near-field tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities, which

may include use of new generation Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration supercomputer capacity to develop a rapid tsunami forecast for all United States coastlines;”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “include” and inserting “conduct”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) develop the technical basis for validation of tsunami maps, numerical tsunami models, digital elevation models, and forecasts; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PILOT PROJECT.—The Administrator may, pursuant to subsection (b), develop a pilot project for near-field tsunami forecast development for the Cascadia region along the west coast of the United States using new generation Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis, upcoming and existing cable networks, and new National Centers for Environmental Protection modeling capability.”.

SEC. 7. GLOBAL TSUNAMI WARNING AND MITIGATION NETWORK.

Section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, provide technical assistance and training to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization of the United Nations, and such other international entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, as part of the international efforts to develop a fully functional global tsunami forecast and warning system comprised of regional tsunami warning networks.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “establish” and inserting “support”; and

(ii) by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”.

SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (33 U.S.C. 3207) as section 9; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) the following:

“SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate an existing working group within the Science Advisory Board of the Administration to serve as the Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel to provide advice to the Administrator on matters regarding tsunami science, technology, and regional preparedness.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—The working group designated under subsection (a) shall be composed of no fewer than 7 members selected by the Administrator from among individuals

from academia or State agencies who have academic or practical expertise in physical sciences, social sciences, information technology, coastal resilience, emergency management, or such other disciplines as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—No member of the working group designated pursuant to subsection (a) may be a Federal employee.

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the working group designated under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) review the activities of the Administration, and other Federal activities as appropriate, relating to tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation; and

“(2) submit to the Administrator and such others as the Administrator considers appropriate—

“(A) the findings of the working group with respect to the most recent review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1); and

“(B) such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the working group considers appropriate to improve Federal tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings and recommendations received by the Administrator under subsection (c)(2).”.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A detailed description of the progress made in implementing sections 4(d)(6), 5(b)(6), and 6(b)(4) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

(2) A description of the ways that tsunami warnings and warning products issued by the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program established under section 4 of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203) can be standardized and streamlined with warnings and warning products for hurricanes, coastal storms, and other coastal flooding events.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 of the Act, as redesignated by section 8(a)(1) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this Act \$27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, of which—

“(1) not less than 27 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for activities under the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program under section 5; and

“(2) not less than 8 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for the Tsunami Research Program under section 6.”.

SEC. 11. OUTREACH RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with State and local emergency managers, shall develop and

carry out formal outreach activities to improve tsunami education and awareness and foster the development of resilient communities. Outreach activities may include—

(1) the development of outreach plans to ensure the close integration of tsunami warning centers supported or maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) with local Weather Forecast Offices of the National Weather Service and emergency managers;

(2) working with appropriate local Weather Forecast Offices to ensure they have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings to the communities they serve; and

(3) evaluating the effectiveness of warnings and of coordination with local Weather Forecast Offices after significant tsunami events.

(b) COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall convene a coordinating committee to assist the Administrator in the conduct of the program required by section 5(a) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3204(a)).

(2) COMPOSITION.—The coordinating committee shall be composed of members from each of the States at risk from tsunami, and any other such representatives as the Administrator considers appropriate to represent Federal, State, tribal, territorial, and local governments.

(3) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Administrator may approve the formation of subcommittees to address specific program components or regional issues.

(4) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The coordinating committee shall—

(A) provide feedback on how funds should be prioritized to carry out the program required by section 5(a) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3204(a));

(B) ensure that areas described in section 4(c) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(c)) in the United States and its territories have the opportunity to participate in the program;

(C) provide recommendations to the Administrator on how to improve and continuously advance the TsunamiReady program, particularly on ways to make communities more tsunami resilient through the use of inundation maps and models and other hazard mitigation practices; and

(D) ensure that all components of the program required by section 5(a) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3204(a)) are integrated with ongoing State-based hazard warning, risk management, and resilience activities, including—

(i) integrating activities with emergency response plans, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development programs in affected areas; and

(ii) integrating information to assist in tsunami evacuation route planning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their re-

marks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 34, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 34, the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015, amends and strengthens the Tsunami Warning and Education Act of 2006. It reauthorizes important work at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and refocuses the program on tsunami detection, forecasts, and research.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for their bipartisan work on this bill. A virtually identical bill passed the House by a voice vote this past September in the previous Congress.

I now join the ranking member of the Science Committee, Ms. JOHNSON, in cosponsoring the bill before us today.

Despite the recent absence of tsunami disasters here in the U.S., the threat is still very real. The massive destruction from the tsunami caused by the 2011 earthquake in Japan is a vivid reminder of the need for enhanced early warning capabilities.

We face a similar threat here at home. Tsunamis have the ability to injure Americans, damage property, and harm the economy.

This bill updates the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program operated by NOAA. It will enhance the accuracy of forecasts, modernize and improve the standards and guidelines for mapping and modeling tsunamis, and support enhanced research efforts related to tsunami science.

H.R. 34 also requires the NOAA Administrator to coordinate with State and local emergency managers to improve tsunami education and awareness in our coastal communities. This will help develop effective response and resilience in the face of tsunamis and other coastal hazards.

This bill prioritizes fundamental scientific research on these phenomena, strengthens outreach programs, and advances technological forecasts to better understand and predict disasters.

I again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and Ms. BONAMICI for their work on this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I would like to recognize our general counsel, Katy Flynn, sitting to my left, for her great service to the Science Committee. She will be taking her talents to the Homeland Security Committee next week to provide counsel for my friend and Texas colleague, Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 34, the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015. As you are aware, there are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 34, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and would request that you insert our exchange of letters on this matter into the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 34, the "Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015". I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 34 at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Transportation Committee as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 34, the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015.

I want to thank Mr. ROHRABACHER for working with me to advance this bipartisan legislation. I also thank the chairman and ranking member of the Science Committee, Mr. SMITH and Ms. JOHNSON, for their support in making this bill an early priority in the 114th Congress. I would also like to thank the State and local emergency management officials, coastal zone managers, and the many scientists and other experts who lent their expertise and experience to the development of this bill. Coastal community groups and emergency planners in my district are working hard to prepare their communities for earthquake and tsunami events, and I am grateful that they took some time to provide their input on this legislation.

Last month marked the 10th anniversary of the Sumatra-Andaman earthquake in Southeast Asia. That earthquake triggered a tsunami event that claimed the lives of more than 200,000 people from Indonesia to Madagascar. Following that tragic event, Congress enacted the Tsunami Warning and Education Act to begin preparing our communities for the considerable threat posed by such an event. We were again reminded of the severe dangers that a tsunami represents for our coastal communities almost 4 years ago when the Tohoku earthquake near Japan created a devastating tsunami that resulted in the tragic loss of human lives and billions of dollars in economic damage, damage that reached as far as the west coast of the United States.

The events in Indonesia and Japan underscore the importance of this legislation, which reauthorizes and extends U.S. efforts to prepare and protect our coastal communities from similar events.

Our ability to prepare, respond to, and recover from a tsunami depends in large part on the hard work done at the local level. The Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act will support local efforts, and it is an important step toward making sure our constituents are ready to face the dangers posed by tsunami threats.

Maritime commerce, vibrant tourism, and more than 120 million Americans are all part of the rich coastal U.S. economy, an economy that contributes significantly to the U.S. GDP. The commercial fishing industry alone supports about 1 million jobs, and the international trade associated with coastal and marine fisheries contributes close to \$70 billion annually to the U.S. economy. Ensuring that coastal communities, big and small, have the resources and knowledge necessary to protect these critical assets from the threat of tsunami and be prepared should it occur is simply good and prudent policy.

My coastal constituents are keenly aware of the threat that a tsunami poses to their communities, and cities up and down coasts have responded by installing warning sirens and developing evacuation routes. But as we learn more about which areas will be hardest hit and which technologies can provide the most accurate warning, a coordinated effort is required to update preparation and response.

In Tillamook County, Oregon, for example, just outside my district, they recently decided they are going to be using social media and phones to warn residents. Seaside, a small coastal town in my district, has been identified as the most vulnerable community to tsunami on the Oregon coast, and local leaders and organizations there are proactively educating residents and visitors about tsunami evacuation routes, storage supply locations, and emergency communication systems.

At the Federal level, we must do our part to help communities understand the risks and seriousness of the threats they face, and work with them to be prepared, which is why I sponsored this bill along with my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

In Oregon, we know that a catastrophic earthquake and tsunami will occur some day in the Cascadia subduction zone. The question is not a matter of if, but when. Although no one can predict when the Cascadia fault will rupture, we can and we must prepare.

This legislation will help to ensure that local and regional decision-makers have the tools and information they need to develop mitigation and response plans to this ever present threat, and to communicate these plans to the public in an effective and efficient manner.

For distant tsunami events, this bill will advance research efforts related to improving forecasting, detection, and notification. It adds port and harbor operations as entities to be safeguarded by tsunami forecasting capabilities.

□ 1430

This bill will also support research needed to improve our understanding of local tsunami events. A local tsunami—one that is generated just off the coast—has a travel time of less than 30 minutes. This is the kind of tsunami most likely to have widespread and devastating impacts on the U.S. coast and on the Caribbean.

In the 10 years since tragedy struck in the Indian Ocean region, we have made significant strides in our understanding of how to prepare for, mitigate, and respond to a tsunami.

I have no doubt that the progress we have made, in large part through NOAA's efforts under the Tsunami Warning and Education Act, has enhanced the safety of our community and has the potential to save lives.

This good work must be continued, and our bipartisan bill will provide ongoing assistance to protect our coastal communities from the impact of a tsunami.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), an original cosponsor of this legislation and a senior member of the Science Committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 34, the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015. I would like to thank my fellow partner in this endeavor, Representative SUZANNE BONAMICI, for her tireless work on this. She has done a great job. She has done her constituents and our committee proud for the hard work that she has put into this.

In the end, if indeed we succeed and this bill becomes law and the things we are trying to do are accomplished and hundreds of lives are saved, we can sit back and say: "It was a job well done. We have saved Americans and some lives overseas. That is what God wanted us to do with our time here in Washington, D.C." Thank you for letting me be part of your effort to accomplish this.

I would also like to thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH and Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Chairman LAMAR SMITH has been a wonderful leader who has demonstrated the type of bipartisan effort that can really get things accomplished, and I am proud to be on his team as well.

We have seen time and time again what tsunamis can do. That is what this legislation is all about. We need to learn more about them. We need to be more accurate in forecasting and reducing the impacts on our communities.

This legislation will help us make sure that all of our coastal communities—especially those in my district in California, which are some of the best coastal beaches in all of the United States of America—are adequately prepared and properly warned about this danger.

H.R. 34 will strengthen our tsunami warning system's ability to forecast a tsunami arrival, thus bringing damages down. It will establish a working group to provide advice on tsunami science and technology. This legislation does all of this in a fiscally responsible manner, and I am proud to ask my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who also represents some coastline in our great State.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman. I also congratulate the chair,

the ranking member, and others who support this needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will bring new focus to NOAA's ongoing efforts on deploying early detection systems, research, and working with potentially affected communities, better educating the public and designating evacuation routes and putting other measures in place that can mitigate damage or loss of life in the case of a tsunami.

The Cascadia Subduction fault is not as well known to most Americans as the San Andreas in California, but the Cascadia Subduction fault, which starts just south of my district off of northern California has the potential for an even more devastating earthquake and much more probability of a devastating tsunami than anything caused by the San Andreas and other major faults.

This bill is good in the focus it brings. The gentleman who spoke before me from California said it does it in a fiscally responsible way. Well, I would only disagree with that in that it is not fiscally responsible to underfund these efforts at NOAA.

We should be moving forward with all dispatch to use existing technology which is on the shelf and being deployed by Japan, Southeast Asia, off of South America, and being used on land in Mexico and places like Romania for early detection systems.

We are researching and thinking about what we want to do. There are off-the-shelf technologies that will work for remote sensing. What will that mean? If you have remote sensors off the southern Oregon coast close to this fault, that means in the case of a major earthquake—which could be Category 9—you would have a warning further and further up the coast, a longer warning.

For people immediately adjacent or in the mid-Oregon coast, it could definitely save lives and give people more time to get to high ground by using known evacuation routes.

The further you move north, say to the city of Portland, a major quake will have a major impact, but the shock waves would take 8 to 10 minutes or more to travel there. You could get people off the bridges. You could shut down the light rail system. People with critical manufacturing undertakings could shut down their lines, so they would have less economic loss.

In my district, schools could be evacuated. We have many schools that don't meet earthquake standards that will collapse. Given 3 to 5 minutes that we could have in Eugene, you could save the lives of hundreds and hundreds of kids.

But we are the United States of America. We can't afford it. Under the budget priorities of the Republican Party, we can't afford to deploy an early warning system off the United States of America. Now, Mexico can af-

ford it. Chile can afford it. Malaysia and Indonesia can afford it. Japan can afford it. Romania and Mexico can afford it. We can't.

Well, it is time to stop dragging our feet. This bill brings the focus to NOAA, but it also brings focus on the fact that we aren't giving them the money they need.

It brings focus to NOAA that will hopefully urge them to move more quickly and not mess around trying to develop new technologies or thinking about it, like some of our Federal agencies do. Use known, off-the-shelf technologies that work and is being deployed elsewhere in the world, and it is up to Congress to give them a budget adequate to do this.

I hope we act soon. This bill today is the first step.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to again thank and acknowledge my cosponsor, Mr. ROHRBACHER from California, and the chairman and ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for bringing this bill forward.

I want to again recognize that 10 years have passed since the tragedy that befell the Indian Ocean region and also take a moment to remember the devastating 2011 earthquake and tsunami in Japan, a tsunami whose effects were felt on the western coast of the United States.

We must be mindful of those lessons learned from past disasters and give our constituents the necessary tools to prepare for future tsunami events.

In Seaside, Oregon, the schools are in the tsunami inundation zone. We must do what we can to support the vital research and advancements in forecasting that will give local communities the resources they need to prepare and be more resilient.

I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 34, the "Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015".

First, I want to thank the Ranking Member of the Environment Subcommittee, Ms. BONAMICI, for her work on this legislation and her commitment to maintaining the health and vitality of the Nation's oceans and coastal communities. I would also like to thank Mr. ROHRBACHER for joining her in this bipartisan effort, and Mr. SMITH, the Chairman of the Science Committee, for starting the 114th Congress with a good bipartisan bill.

Over 120 million Americans call the United States coastline their home. These coastal communities—from major cities to small towns—play a vital role in sustaining the American economy. In fact, approximately one-third of the U.S. gross domestic product has its origins in coastal areas. That is why

the bill we are considering today is so important. It would allow the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to continue to protect Americans and our coastal economies from the threat of tsunamis.

This legislation is a perfect example of a familiar saying: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Our tsunami warning program has increased in effectiveness over the last decade, but we must remain vigilant in our preparedness and continue to invest in the research and development, and education and outreach, necessary to improve the resiliency of our coastal communities to these destructive waves. We were reminded in 2004 in Sumatra, and again in 2011 in Japan, of the devastation that can be caused by a tsunami. Billions and billions of dollars in economic damages and countless lives are at risk if we do not maintain, and improve, our tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities. Today's legislation advances NOAA's research efforts to do just that and may ultimately add minutes of critical response time to tsunami warnings. The bill also recognizes that the results of NOAA's research must be translated into outreach and education activities at the state and local level. The effective and timely communication of threats is critical in mitigating the impacts of a natural disaster. In addition, increased warning times are only effective if people know how to respond. I am pleased that this legislation emphasizes and supports local community preparedness.

Resiliency to natural disasters is an important part of strengthening the nation's economic security. I want to ensure that our coastal communities have the resources and tools they need to minimize the loss of life and property caused by a tsunami. Reauthorizing NOAA's tsunami activities is a key step in helping our communities continue to make progress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 34.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 26, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 37, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 23, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 26) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 5, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]
YEAS—416

Abraham	Coffman	Fudge
Adams	Cohen	Gabbard
Aderholt	Cole	Garamendi
Aguilar	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Amodel	Comstock	Gibson
Ashford	Conaway	Gohmert
Babin	Connolly	Goodlatte
Barletta	Conyers	Gosar
Barr	Cook	Gowdy
Barton	Cooper	Graham
Bass	Costello (PA)	Granger
Beatty	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Becerra	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Benishek	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Bera	Crenshaw	Grayson
Beyer	Crowley	Green, Al
Bilirakis	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Culberson	Griffith
Bishop (MI)	Cummings	Grijalva
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Black	Davis (CA)	Guinta
Blackburn	Davis, Danny	Guthrie
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hahn
Bonamici	DeGette	Hanna
Bost	Delaney	Hardy
Boustany	DeLauro	Harper
Boyle (PA)	DelBene	Harris
Brady (PA)	Denham	Hartzler
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hastings
Brat	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	DeSaulnier	Heck (WA)
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Deuth	Herrera Beutler
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Hice (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Higgins
Buchanan	Dold	Hill
Buck	Doyle (PA)	Himes
Bucshon	Duffy	Hinojosa
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Bustos	Duncan (TN)	Honda
Butterfield	Edwards	Hoyer
Byrne	Ellison	Hudson
Calvert	Ellmers	Huelskamp
Capps	Emmer	Huffman
Capuano	Engel	Huizenga (MI)
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Hultgren
Carney	Esty	Hunter
Carson (IN)	Farenthold	Hurd (TX)
Carter (GA)	Farr	Hurt (VA)
Cartwright	Fattah	Israel
Castor (FL)	Fincher	Issa
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Jackson Lee
Chabot	Fleischmann	Jeffries
Chaffetz	Fleming	Jenkins (KS)
Chu (CA)	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Cicilline	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Foster	Johnson, E. B.
Clawson (FL)	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Clay	Frankel (FL)	Jolly
Cleaver	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Joyce

Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Schrader
Katko	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Keating	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Scott, Austin
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Scott, David
Kennedy	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kildee	Newhouse	Sessions
Kilmer	Noem	Sewell (AL)
Kind	Norcross	Sherman
King (IA)	Nugent	Shimkus
King (NY)	Nunes	Shuster
Kinzinger (IL)	O'Rourke	Simpson
Kirkpatrick	Olson	Sinema
Kline	Palazzo	Sires
Knight	Pallone	Smith (MO)
Kuster	Palmer	Smith (NE)
Labrador	Pascrell	Smith (NJ)
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Lamborn	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lance	Pearce	Speier
Langevin	Pelosi	Stefanik
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Stewart
Latta	Perry	Stivers
Lawrence	Peters	Stutzman
Lee	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Pingree	Takai
Lewis	Pittenger	Takano
Lieu (CA)	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Loeback	Poliquin	Thornberry
Lofgren	Polis	Tiberi
Long	Pompeo	Tipton
Loudermilk	Posey	Titus
Love	Price (GA)	Tonko
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Torres
Lowe	Quigley	Trott
Lucas	Rangel	Tsongas
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Turner
Lujan Grisham	Reed	Upton
(NM)	Reichert	Valadao
Luján, Ben Ray	Renacci	Van Hollen
(NM)	Ribble	Vargas
Lummis	Rice (NY)	Veasey
Lynch	Rice (SC)	Vela
MacArthur	Richmond	Velázquez
Maloney,	Rigell	Visclosky
Carolyn	Roby	Wagner
Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walder
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Walker
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Walorski
McCarthy	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Walz
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson Coleman
McDermott	Roskam	Weber (TX)
McGovern	Ross	Webster (FL)
McHenry	Rothfus	Welch
McKinley	Rouzer	Wenstrup
McMorris	Roybal-Allard	Westerman
Rodgers	Royce	Westmoreland
McNerney	Ruiz	Whitfield
McSally	Ruppersberger	Williams
Meadows	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Meehan	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Wittman
Meng	Ryan (WI)	Womack
Messer	Salmon	Woodall
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
Miller (FL)	T.	Yoder
Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Yoho
Moolenaar	Sanford	Young (IA)
Mooney (WV)	Sarbanes	Young (IN)
Moore	Scalise	Zeldin
Moulton	Schakowsky	Zinke
Mullin	Schiff	
Mulvaney	Schock	

NAYS—5

Amash	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Jones	McClintock	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—5

Dingell	Gallgo	Wasserman
Duckworth	Larson (CT)	Schultz

□ 1507

Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 146, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]
YEAS—276

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Aderholt	Cramer	Guinta
Allen	Crawford	Guthrie
Amash	Crenshaw	Hanna
Amodel	Cuellar	Hardy
Ashford	Culberson	Harper
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Harris
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Barr	Delaney	Heck (NV)
Barton	DelBene	Hensarling
Benishek	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Bera	Dent	Hice (GA)
Beyer	DeSantis	Hill
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Bishop (MI)	Dold	Hudson
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Huelskamp
Black	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Blum	Ellmers	Hunter
Bost	Emmer	Hurd (TX)
Boustany	Esty	Hurt (VA)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Issa
Brat	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Johnson (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brownley (CA)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Forbes	Jolly
Buck	Fortenberry	Jordan
Bucshon	Foster	Joyce
Burgess	Fox	Katko
Bustos	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	Kilmer
Calvert	Garamendi	Kind
Carney	Garrett	King (IA)
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	King (NY)
Chabot	Gibson	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Gohmert	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte	Knight
Coffman	Gosar	Labrador
Cole	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Graham	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Granger	Lance
Comstock	Graves (GA)	Larsen (WA)
Conaway	Graves (LA)	Latta
Connolly	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Cook	Griffith	LoBiondo

Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polls
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—146

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks

Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Sherman
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takan
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz

Watson Coleman
Welch

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1523

Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TORRES, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. CÁRDENAS, AGUILAR, MEEKS, and SWALWELL of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 23) to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 39, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—381

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas

Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham

Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foss
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polls
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NAYS—39

Allen
Amash
Brat
Buck
Carter (GA)
Collins (GA)
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Emmer
Franks (AZ)
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Hice (GA)
Huelskamp

Jones
Jordan
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Loudermilk
Lummis

Massie
McClintock
Mulvaney
Palmer
Perry

Ratcliffe
Ribble
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Stutzman

Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Yoder
Yoho
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Babin
Dingell
Duckworth

Gallego
Larson (CT)
Nugent

Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1532

Mr. YOHO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 10 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 2015—I was not present for rollcall votes 8–10. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: “aye” on rollcall vote 8—H.R. 26; “nay” on rollcall vote 9—H.R. 37; “aye” on rollcall vote 10—H.R. 23.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3, KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 30, SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-1) on the resolution (H. Res. 19) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. BRADY, Texas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair an-

nounces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to Members-elect, the whole number of the House is 428.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, on a prior rollcall vote on H.R. 37, I inadvertently voted “aye,” and I would like to be recorded as voting “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's rollcall votes, I was absent because of my attendance at the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York.

Had I been present, however, on rollcall No. 1, I would have voted “present.”

On rollcall No. 2, I would have proudly voted for Representative PELOSI for Speaker.

On rollcall No. 3, I would have voted “nay.”

On rollcall No. 4, I would have voted “nay.”

On rollcall No. 5, I would have voted “yea.”

On rollcall No. 6, I would have voted “nay.”

On rollcall No. 7, I would have voted “yea.”

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE HERBERT HARRIS

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise with the members of the Virginia delegation to inform our colleagues of the passing of one of our colleagues, former Member of this Chamber, Herbert Harris. Herb died at the age of 88 on Christmas Eve at his home in the Mount Vernon district of Fairfax County.

He served three terms in this body, from 1974 to 1980, representing what was then Virginia's Eighth Congressional District.

Like his predecessor Stan Parris, my predecessor Tom Davis, and myself, Herb served on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors prior to his election to Congress, and that experience served him well here in the House.

He was a champion for the region, helping secure the necessary Federal funds to complete construction of the Metro system here in the Nation's Capital and to expand the Manassas National Battlefield Park for Civil War preservation. He returned to private law practice after leaving the House.

Our former colleagues, Representatives Moran, Davis, and Wolf, collaborated in 2001 on a bipartisan basis to honor Herb by naming a new post office in the Mount Vernon district in his honor.

Many of us attended funeral services for Herb earlier this week, and flags

were flown at half-mast throughout Fairfax County and at the capitol in Richmond.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask my colleagues to join all of us in extending our gratitude for his public service and our sympathy to his family and friends by standing with us at this moment to observe a moment of silence in Herb Harris' memory.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ADMINISTER THE OATH OF OFFICE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 20

Resolved, Whereas, Alan Nunnelee, a Representative-elect from the First District of the State of Mississippi, has been unable from illness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, is hereby authorized to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Alan Nunnelee at Tupelo, Mississippi and that such oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the Honorable Alan Nunnelee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. MICHAEL MILLS TO ADMINISTER OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. ALAN NUNNELEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 20, 114th Congress, the Chair appoints the Honorable Judge Michael Mills of the Northern District of Mississippi, United States District Court, to administer the oath of office to the Honorable ALAN NUNNELEE.

BIPARTISAN JOBS BILLS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past three terms, the House has acted to grow our economy, control spending, and limit the abusive Federal regulations that are harming small businesses and making it harder for American families to make ends meet.

Despite some progress, a large portion of this agenda was denied consideration in the Senate.

As we begin this new Congress, we face new opportunities and challenges, but what is certain, Mr. Speaker, is the American people sent a clear message: they have called on Washington to put forward solutions and solve the problems that they face.

This week, we begin on that path with consideration of several legislative measures designed to grow the economy and create jobs, including the Hire More Heroes Act, the Save American Workers Act, and approval of the Keystone XL pipeline.

These are several of the many jobs bills that have received broad bipartisan support; yet for one reason or another, they have been denied consideration under the previous Senate majority.

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker, and more gridlock is not the option.

THE SEPARATION OF POWERS ACT

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress has been sworn into office. We all took an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution.

The Constitution, however, is under attack by the policies of the administration. The administration has unconstitutionally, illegally, and unwisely issued a decree that, in essence, grants amnesty to about 5 million people.

The real issue is not an immigration issue because we need immigration reform, but it is a constitutional issue. The Constitution has been bruised by the improper act of the President.

All Members who support the Constitution and constitutional government, rather than a government run by one person, should oppose the illegal action memo of the administration.

Along with Representative BLACK of Tennessee, I have introduced the Separation of Powers Act. This bill will prohibit taxpayer funds to be used or appropriated for the recent illegal actions of the administration's granting amnesty.

The President also has been sworn to support the Constitution, and it is Congress' duty to make the laws, whether the administration likes it or not. The Constitution is not a mere suggestion. It is the law of the land.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1545

FIGHTING TERRORISM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of days, we have seen tragic incidents occurring against innocent people, today in particular, the tragic killing of journalists and police officers in Paris, France, terrorist acts against innocent persons and persons who we know in the United States have the right to the First Amendment and

freedom of expression that is the very core of the principles of this Nation of which we value and which our soldiers have gone to faraway wars to fight for.

At the same time, Boko Haram, a terrorist group that has plagued the African continent, mainly in Nigeria, Chad, Cameroon, and around the areas of Niger, have taken a city near Lake Chad. They have seized that city. They have taken over the military base. They are continuing to kill thousands and causing 1.5 million to be displaced.

Again, we have to fight terrorism in a universal manner, both in terms of our attitudes and values, but more importantly, in the organizing of African nations to stand up against these heinous terrorists, who have stolen children, 300 girls and boys, and taken them from their families and lives. Boko Haram cannot be in control. We must, in a united way, stand against them and provide for the peace and tranquility of the people of the continent where they are.

AMERICA'S NEW CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABRAHAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, since I was first elected to Congress in 2004, I have heard from thousands of constituents across North Carolina's Fifth District. In recent years, there has been an understandable note of frustration in their voices over the direction that our country is headed.

These folks know all too well the struggle to find a job and pay the bills. They are angry that it takes an average 111 days just to make enough money to pay the government before starting to keep what they earn for the year. They have watched an oppressive government intrusion into health care make it far too difficult and expensive for many to do business. They are discouraged by an uncertain regulatory environment that is wreaking havoc on both employers and employees. They are outraged at the President's unprecedented attempt to grant amnesty to millions of illegal aliens when there are so many individuals who have waited years for the opportunity to come to this country the right way.

Over the last 4 years, the U.S. House of Representatives has done everything in our power to put this Nation on a better path. We have passed numerous pieces of legislation to encourage job growth and strengthen America's standing in the global economy. We have also passed bills that would decrease energy costs, allow workers to have more flexibility to spend time with their families, and increase transparency in how tax dollars are spent. However, we were stymied again and again by Democrats in the Senate.

Despite the short time we have had, the obstacles we have faced and the enormity of our task, House Republicans have still managed a number of conservative victories. For example, this summer legislation I authored was signed into law to streamline the Federal workforce development system, including the elimination of 15 duplicative programs. Last month we passed legislation that has since been signed into law to allow families of a severely disabled child to save for their child's long-term disability expenses in the same way that many families currently save for college through popular 529 investment plans, encouraging personal responsibility instead of increasing dependency on the government.

We all wish we could have done more, much more; however, we will have greater opportunities over the next 2 years with a Republican-led House and Senate. The 114th Congress offers new chances to pass legislation that will take the country down a road of economic recovery that results in lower unemployment, a fair Tax Code, and opportunity for all. We will work to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government, protect against executive overreach, reform Federal spending, and keep America strong.

My priorities for this year include continuing efforts to increase transparency and accountability in government. That is why H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, which we call UMITA, is the first bill I introduced in the 114th Congress. This legislation would improve transparency and public disclosure of the true cost—in dollars and in jobs—that Federal dictates pose to the economy. I have offered this legislation in the past four Congresses, and it has successfully passed the House with bipartisan support on three separate occasions, only to be ignored by the Senate. My hope is that this year will be different.

Congress will also face off against the White House this year over President Obama's attempts to short-circuit the American immigration process. By extending funding for the Department of Homeland Security only through February 2015, the House and Senate are prepared to confront the President's unparalleled power grab without the threat of a looming government-wide shutdown, and we will do everything we can to stop his destructive actions.

Congress will be addressing the American people's greatest priorities in the 114th Congress, and we will work hard to build a better future for American families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

UNITED STATES-CUBAN RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I stand with my colleagues to discuss an issue that is very important to this country, and that is our country's relations with Cuba. It has been 50 years—five decades—of a failed policy. Our wrongheaded policy toward Cuba, born of cold war tensions, has failed. Our policies have been in dire need of updating ever since. This island nation, which lies just 90 miles from our shores, one of our closest neighbors, should be a partner in our hemisphere, not an estranged country or enemy. Along with many of my congressional colleagues, many of whom are gathered here tonight, we have been fighting to make that a reality for decades.

I would now like to move toward and talk a little bit about some of the issues that many of us have been involved in, and then I will yield to my colleagues.

In the past, addressing our failed policies toward Cuba really had strong and clear bipartisan support in Congress. Recent polling shows it has bipartisan support amongst the American people. According to a 2014 survey commissioned by the Atlantic Council, more than 60 percent of Americans support lifting the travel and economic restrictions on Cuba, and 56 percent of Americans support changing overall United States policy towards Cuba. That includes 63 percent of Floridians, 62 percent of Latinos, and 52 percent of Republicans.

Thanks to recent, very bold actions from President Obama, we have finally made some headway in this fight. We have started down the long and hard road towards ending our failed policies and establishing policies that promote the freedoms of Americans and Cubans, encourage trade and job creation here in the United States, and support the open exchange of critical medical development and research to treat diseases that afflict many Americans.

In December, the President announced that the United States will reestablish diplomatic ties, facilitate travel, improve commercial exchanges and telecommunications and a variety of other policies. This is a welcomed and long-overdue response to our calls and the calls of many advocates both in this body and outside, from Cuba, the United States, and around the world.

Today we come to the floor first to thank President Obama for his leader-

ship and to discuss the important changes he has brought about through his action; but at the same time, we are here to call on this Congress to act to end the outdated embargo while maintaining our Nation's unwavering commitment to human rights and democracy.

I personally began my efforts to end the embargo when I was a congressional staffer for my predecessor and mentor, Congressman Ron Dellums, in 1977. Since then, I have traveled to Cuba more than 20 times and have led several congressional delegations to that island. Quite frankly, each time I am there, I am struck by how much both of our nations would benefit from improved relations. Over the years, many Members have been proud of their young people who have received their medical education at the Latin American medical school, ELAM, which allows students from low-income and disadvantaged backgrounds to study medicine in Cuba for free, returning to the United States to practice in underserved areas.

When I was chair of the Congressional Black Caucus in the 112th Congress, I was honored to lead a delegation to talk with Cuban officials, including President Raul Castro, to determine their willingness to engage in dialogue with no preconditions in an effort to move toward normalization of relations.

Recently, we led a bipartisan delegation to examine a new treatment for diabetic foot ulcers that afflict millions of Americans every year. Tragically, this condition often ends in amputations and sometimes death for patients. This new treatment has been developed. It is highly effective. Hopefully Americans can benefit from this treatment if we end the embargo.

So I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that this development and other areas of common interest to the American and Cuban people are pursued and developed, which I will review later in my closing statement.

Now I yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), who has visited Cuba and really understands the trade and business aspects and the job-creation aspects of why we need to move forward to end this failed policy.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady very much.

I rise in support of President Obama's recent announcement that updates our diplomatic policy approach to Cuba. I am very pleased to see that our outdated approach to U.S.-Cuban relations will end and we will begin to normalize our relationship with Cuba. Not only does the Obama administration's announcement reestablish positive diplomatic ties with Cuba, it also helps to empower the Cuban people by

updating travel restrictions, remittance policies, and quality of life.

One of the most positive outcomes of the updated policy announcement is the lifting of many trade restrictions between the United States and Cuba. In my home State of Texas, the Texas Farm Bureau has long supported improved trade policies with Cuba because of the potential to export Texas farm products. This provision not only serves the U.S. economy positively, but it is also very meaningful to the Cuban policy, which has struggled tremendously in the past.

While trade provisions and helping to improve the livelihood of Cuban people by allowing the Cuban economy to build are constructive measures, we must focus on additional viable resources Cuba could provide to the United States. For instance, with the opening of diplomatic ties, I sincerely hope that our State medical boards in the United States will consider the educational value that Cuban medical schools provide to future health professionals who wish to practice medicine in the United States. I have had students from my district attend medical school in Cuba. I am aware that Cuba has offered nurses and physicians around the world in needy countries where needed.

The aforementioned examples are only a few of the many ways that opening our diplomatic relations with Cuba will be positive for our country, and I urge my colleagues to support the Obama administration's decision to update our relationship with our neighbor and future ally.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who represents Tampa and has certainly been a bold leader and understands clearly the economic benefits in her district as they relate to ending the embargo.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from California for her longstanding leadership, her commitment to human rights and change in a positive way for the relationship between the United States of America and Cuba.

I also would be remiss if I didn't recognize some of my other colleagues who have been in this, have encouraged a change in policy for many, many years, if not decades: Congressman FARR, Congresswoman DELAUNO, Congressman MCGOVERN, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, Congressman POLIS, Congressman MEEKS, and many others who have taken it upon themselves to visit the island of Cuba, like the average American is not allowed to do, and learn about the real situation on the ground there.

□ 1600

I also commend the Obama administration and the President for his bold move in finally moving this outdated,

anachronistic policy towards Cuba into a positive direction. Because just think about this: since the embargo has been in place and our policy of isolation has been in place, we had a war with Vietnam, but we have come to reconcile with the Vietnamese, and now the Vietnamese people have seen great economic reforms because America was engaged. Even after World War II, when we had a world war against Germany, you have to turn the page and move on in human history, and we were able to do that with one of our closest allies now with Germany. So why not Cuba?

In the Tampa Bay area I represent a lot of Cuban-American families. In fact, the bulk of my constituent work often involves family unification. It is not uncommon every week to have a situation where there is a dying grandmother in the United States and her grandchildren in Cuba would like to come and visit. And yet over the past years, they have been subjected to the worst kind of bureaucratic red tape that has not allowed them to travel freely to America, and the same for American citizens.

Did you know that Americans are not allowed to travel freely to Cuba? Many people don't know that Cuba is really one of the only nations in the entire world where our constitutional rights to travel are restricted. And we think now with the Obama administration's move we will begin to open the door to greater travel, in recognition of our own human rights and constitutional rights.

But I think it is really for our families to be able to unify them. It is only a 1-hour flight from Tampa to Havana. It is less than that, and it is a beautiful flight. And yet it has been off limits for so long. So thank you to the Obama administration for beginning to take the steps to open this up.

I want folks to know Cuba is changing. Just like the Congresswoman who has traveled there multiple times, I traveled on a fact-finding mission not too long ago. There are meaningful economic reforms under way. America needs to be there to encourage it, to move it along faster and farther.

People now in Cuba can own some private property. There are new small businesses and entrepreneurs that have the ability to step away from government control and take control of their own lives. There is decentralization of power. But unless America is engaged, we are not going to be able to continue those economic reforms and press for improvements in human rights.

This is also an important time for America to capitalize on the changes in the world economy. Remember for a long time it was the Soviet Union that supported Cuba, or it was Venezuela. Well, now with the energy revolution in America, there has never been a better time for America to use its influence in the world, its economic power,

its pressing for human rights, as Venezuela doesn't carry the day anymore. Their economy is in turmoil. The same for Russia. The economic conditions now play to our advantage, and we need to use it to improve human rights on the island, to improve family unification, and begin to establish those all important diplomatic ties.

In my hometown of Tampa, they have led the way. My Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce has traveled a number of times. They would like to reestablish trade ties. There have been enormous numbers of cultural exchanges. The Florida Orchestra had a multiyear exchange with the Orchestra of Cuba. Ybor City businessmen have instituted art celebrations with the Cuban people right in the heart of Tampa. The University of Tampa's baseball team went and played the Cuban national team. Yes, and the University of Tampa did prevail, much to the chagrin of the Cubans.

But these are the ways that you build a relationship, a greater foundation for economic reform and human rights reform. In fact, it is the Saint Lawrence Catholic Church in Tampa that is going to fund the first Catholic parish on the island of Cuba in the coming years. If we cannot stand as leaders in the Western Hemisphere for religious freedom, for human rights, for economic engagement and improvement, who will? It is our time. I thank the leaders in this Congress that have pressed for this change, I commend President Obama for taking this bold move, and I encourage all Members of Congress to travel there and listen to the people, listen to their cries for positive change. We have it within our power to lift the embargo and begin to press on these issues, and I hope that we will.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentlewoman for laying out just really a glimpse of the possibilities, and again, thank you for your leadership.

Now I would like to yield to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE from Texas, who has been a longtime supporter and advocate for ending the embargo, who also, I was reminded earlier, in her role as the Immigration Subcommittee ranking member, she was very instrumental in the Elian Gonzalez case and was able to really help forge a path forward to return Elian to Cuba.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as you notice, Members who are on the floor today have come from a variety of States, a variety of political philosophies and positions. I think it is appropriate to acknowledge Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for galvanizing Members on both sides of the aisle on an important and enormous leap of change that we have made over the years by her determination and persistence and knowledge. So I thank her very much for that kind of leadership, allowing

many of us to travel to Cuba on any number of occasions, meeting with Fidel Castro, speaking about issues of government and the needs of the Cuban people and the needs of the American people.

To my colleagues, everyone who has visited, they have found the Cuban people hospitable and friendly, desiring peace, and respecting America. If there is ever one impression that you have when you leave Cuba, it is the desire for strong relationships and the connectedness between Cubans, Cuban-Americans, and Americans.

As a Representative from Texas, I can assure you that over the years I have heard often from members of my agricultural community about their desire to begin engaging with trade in Cuba. And they do so as proud Americans, as Americans who have sent young men and now young women to faraway shores in military uniform to defend this Nation.

What they see in Cuba, as has been indicated, is a friend with which we had disagreements, but a friend with which we now can find a pathway forward. As was mentioned, we had engaged in a war in Vietnam, we have engaged in a war in Iraq and Afghanistan, soldiers coming home now with few soldiers left behind. And, Mr. Speaker, we are engaging in diplomatic relations with Iraq, Afghanistan, and certainly Vietnam. How in the world can an island 90 miles away be held in such contempt that we cannot find a pathway forward.

So I strongly support the executive order of this President, and I will tell you why in just a few minutes of the time that I have remaining. I serve on the Homeland Security Committee, and previously on Judiciary, on which I continue. My colleague is correct. At the time of the young boy by the name of Elian Gonzalez, who was found near the shores of our great Nation, his mother deceased trying to escape, of course, from Cuba with a number of others, there was this custody fight, if you will, about whether or not his relatives here or his father should have custody over him, his father being in Cuba. What a sensitive question for a very young boy who could not make a decision on his own. What a traumatic experience in those difficult waters watching his mother not survive.

So as a member of that committee, working with my fellow colleagues and working then with the Clinton administration and then Attorney General Janet Reno, though it was not, if I might say, a clear and pretty scene, we knew that in the best interest of the child the parent was the best custodian or guardian, whether or not that child was, in fact, having to go to Cuba.

But as I said earlier, the Cuban people are peaceful people. Every country has had a revolutionary path, and Cuba has as well. But it was a right decision

for Elian, who is now a young man, and to all accounts is performing his duties as a responsible adult. But that was a very tough incident in our political life, if you will, to see a child snatched by officials of this government to take him home to Cuba. Maybe that was, in fact, the first statement of an altered policy.

Let me close by saying why I believe the President's executive order is legitimate in the context of his legal authority, and I am excited about the beginning of the change in diplomatic relationships between Cuba and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, would you not want to know who is 90 miles away from you in this time of franchise terrorism? Wouldn't we want to know who our allies are in the Caribbean, or who our allies are in fighting horrific drug trafficking? Well, I think we can find that in the entity of the Cuban government. We know that we have not seen a terrorist incident in that particular country. That is why we need to normalize relations.

I am grateful for Mr. Gross' return, who was brought out by many Members of Congress, including my colleagues here, including Congresswoman LEE, and as well some of the other political prisoners who have been released, including some in recent days.

And then lastly let me say, let us celebrate the Cuban people for the magnificent export that they have: medicine, medical research, and physicians. Everyone knows that in the Ebola fight, the largest contingent, or one of the largest contingents of medical professionals, doctors fighting against Ebola on the continent of Africa, is and has been Cuban doctors alongside of the international workforce of medical professionals, Good Samaritans who sacrifice their lives to fight this deadly disease. But every single medical crisis in the world, you can count on Cuban doctors being there, as well as in conflicts and wars, such as over in the Mideast, Cuban doctors go to save lives.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for this Special Order. I look forward to joining her in further codels to visit and to be part of the continued normalization. I say this not out of disrespect of the feelings of others who have experienced a crisis in their relationship with Cuba, but only to say that now may be the time for peaceful reconciliation, for families to be reconciled and for us to begin this peaceful journey with the nation of Cuba. Let me thank you, thank President Obama, and thank those who are very much a part of this.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, for being with us here tonight and reminding us of much of the history that cannot be forgotten as we move toward normal relations with Cuba.

Also with regard to Alan Gross. Yesterday, Alan and his wife, Judy, they were with us, and we all were so thrilled to see Alan Gross, and we are pleased that the President's action actually resulted in the long overdue return of our friend Mr. Gross.

Every time that many of us went to Cuba we wanted to meet with Alan. It was important to learn more about his case, but more importantly to do what we could do to help with humanitarian relief and to encourage and lift his spirits.

One of those individuals who has been so key in this is Congressman GREGORY MEEKS from New York, who has consistently talked about the importance of normalized relations with Cuba in the context of Latin American policies, our policy role in the Western Hemisphere.

□ 1615

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank BARBARA LEE for her steadfastness, for her tenacity, for her consistency in trying to bring a change in a policy that has been faulty, for it has been the policy that we have been doing over and over and over again, we have had over and over again and getting the same results: zero.

I want to thank BARBARA for her hard work on this. I look forward to continuing to work with her as the President has opened up the opportunity for diplomatic relations with Cuba again, but we know that we still have a lot of work to do, and I look forward to working side by side with her until we have the kind of relationship and we have the kind of movement in this Congress where we really end the embargo, so that we can come together and make sure that change has happened within our relationships.

I want to thank President Obama for his bold move, for indeed the camera of history is rolling and has brought us to this historic point which will take the United States of America and Cuba in a new and more positive direction after over five decades of severed diplomatic relations.

American policy towards Cuba since 1961 has left our Nation out of sync with our neighbors in the Americas—for that matter, out of sync with our friends and allies all over the world.

Our outdated policy, highlighted by our trade embargo, which has lasted for over half a century, has not only been ineffective but has blocked investment and trade opportunities for U.S. businessmen and farmers, it has kept families apart, and has done virtually nothing to change Cuba's policies.

In fact, just 90 miles away, if we had these trade agreements, if we were able to trade and bring markets and food to the shores of Cuba, it would be the humanitarian thing to do because people are starving simply because they don't have that opportunity on the island of Cuba.

Clearly, when you think about the world which is smaller now—and one of the things that we should have learned by now is that unilateral sanctions don't work; if anything, they have further isolated us from the global community. We have got to work collectively with others, not just doing something out on our own. It has not worked. It does not work.

As mentioned, denying American citizens the freedom to travel to Cuba to visit its many historic and cultural attractions, to meet its people, has been a stain on our democracy. I think the gentlelady from Florida talked about where we, as Members of Congress, have opportunities to go when we have travel.

I can recall traveling, for example, not only to Havana, but Santiago de Cuba, and feeling the rich heritage and culture and looking at the people in Santiago who were poor, but I saw something when I looked in their faces: they were poor, but they were not hopeless. They were not destitute.

They welcomed us into their homes to see how they were living. They had music playing, and they had hope for a better tomorrow and a better relationship with the United States of America. In fact, they scratched their heads, did not understand why they didn't have this better relationship with the United States of America, so I say that so that they want us to come. Others are going; we should permit our citizens to do the same.

Now, the question is what is happening here in America. Well, a December 17 through 21 ABC News and Washington Post poll of adults nationwide showed that 64 percent of Americans supported establishing diplomatic relations with Cuba, with 31 percent opposed; 68 percent supported ending the trade embargo, while 74 percent supported ending restrictions on travel to Cuba. Americans support the President's actions to normalize relations with Cuba.

The United States International Trade Commission has concluded that if U.S. restrictions on financing and travel to Cuba were lifted in 2008, U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba would have increased between \$216 million and \$478 million, and the U.S. share of Cuba's agricultural imports would have increased from 38 percent to 49 and 64 percent, which also would prevent some of the hunger that is taking place in Cuba.

U.S. wheat, rice, soy, and meat producers have said that their industries will benefit from normalized relations with Cuba, now that trade financing restrictions are to be alleviated. President Obama's plan to establish relations and facilitate trade and commerce is a major market opportunity.

It is good for Cubans, but it is also good for Americans because when you do that, you are also creating jobs for

Americans right here in the United States, so it is a win-win because we are all about creating jobs in the United States. We are all about that commerce.

We are also all about making sure that trade facilitation helps us in America, but it also can help people who have a great need on that island called Cuba.

President Obama's actions to open the relationship and reestablish diplomatic relations with Cuba will bring us closer, as BARBARA LEE indicated, to our allies in the region who have pursued more open relationship with Cuba while we have not.

I serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee; I sit on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. I have had the opportunity to have dialogue and conversations with heads of states from throughout the hemisphere.

For example, one of our closest allies, Colombia, one of our strongest partners, they are negotiating with the FARC on the island of Cuba; and when I talk to many of their individuals, they said the one thing that they think could help the entire hemisphere is for the United States to change its relationship with Cuba.

Now, Colombia is one of our strongest, one of our most reliable allies, but they, too, have engaged with Cuba and are asking and looking and saying that our engagement with Cuba will change and help the hemisphere.

Panama has invited President Castro to the Summit of the Americas, and the rest of our hemisphere wants this change, and our antiquated policy has been holding us back and hampering our ability to cooperate with countries in the region on a wide range of issues.

Let me begin to conclude by saying this: the President's historic announcement has been universally well received by the region, which is heralding it as a major step forward in regional integration.

The Presidents of Brazil, Argentina, and—as I said—Colombia and Mexico have praised President Obama's announcement. The announcement has also been applauded by regional organizations, including the Union of South American Nations and the Organization of American States.

I conclude by saying that I have visited Cuba many times. I have worked tirelessly throughout my years in Congress to foster an improved relationship between United States and Cuba, and I believe the President's actions are good for both our countries and our hemisphere.

American businesses will benefit, U.S. citizens will be able to travel to Cuba on a more regular basis and send remittances to their relatives by reopening our Embassy in Havana. We will be a safer place, and finally—finally—the world often looks to the United States to be a leader militarily.

We should be proud that the world can also look at us as champions of diplomacy.

Through our President's new Cuba policy, we have shown our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere—and indeed the rest of the world—that we are committed to building new partnerships and that we will not be beholden to antiquated policies and that we are optimistic about what is possible through dialogue and diplomacy, and I thank the chairman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his very comprehensive statement and overview, but also for his tremendous leadership and key policy initiatives on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere; and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, you are so critical in this overall movement for us, so thank you again for being here tonight.

I want to yield to Congresswoman JACKSON LEE who wants to say something before I yield to Congressman POLIS.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Having written a letter to join with other colleagues for the release of Alan Gross, I want to make sure the record said Alan Gross and not Alan Grossman. Best to his wife and him at this time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). 24 minutes.

Ms. LEE. I now yield to someone who has been very interested in and a tremendous leader on this whole issue of trade and ending the embargo, the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS. Thank you again.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LEE for her constant leadership on this issue.

When I was born in 1975, the embargo with Cuba was already more than a decade old. I never knew a time when Americans could go to Cuba or legally import goods and products from Cuba.

Growing up, I remember the end of the cold war, when the Soviet Union fell. The last real excuse for the treatment of Cuba was that they were allied with the Soviet Union during the cold war.

Well, the Soviet Union fell, Soviet subsidies and support for Cuba ended, and I really began to wonder why we continued this failed cold war policy of an embargo—travel embargo and trade embargo against Cuba. Presumably, it was designed to bring Fidel Castro's regime down.

Now, again, this policy predates my birth by 10 years. It actually means that he is the longest-serving head of state in the entire world. Obviously, it didn't work. It didn't work. Are we going to keep doing the same thing? Maybe a different path would have worked, and that is what the President has now proposed.

For more than 50 years, we have isolated our southern neighbor, restricting trade, travel, commerce, as well as the flow of ideas, discussion, cultural exchange, the very things that can lead to a change and more support for human rights within Cuba.

It really defies logic to expect that the status quo that has led to Fidel Castro being the longest regime and head of state in the world will somehow lead to the end of the very regime that it has actually helped to preserve.

Unfortunately, the sanctions have hurt everyday Cubans without mobilizing political change or expanding their freedoms. Our policy of isolation was counterproductive, and it only prolonged the suffering and lack of freedom of the Cuban people. Our present landscape is particularly promising for restoring the U.S.-Cuba relationship.

Now, let me be clear. Just as there are many countries that we have normal relations with that we continue to make sure we are outspoken about any human rights violations, of course, if there are political dissidents or others that are improperly jailed in Cuba, you will hear Members of this body, including myself, speaking out, just as we do for the oppression of Tibetans in China, while we continue to support ongoing normalized relationships with China, just as we do in countries where we want stronger labor laws or stronger anti-child labor laws, yet continue to have a basic trade and travel relationship.

Cuba can do better. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, America can do better with regard to human rights, and we discussed that in different contexts about expanding civil liberties for all Americans; but, yes, Cuba should do better.

Guess what? The way to help show and lead Cuba to the promised lands of human rights and democracy is by engaging the Cuban people and by engaging the regime and showing them the many benefits that dealing with their neighbor to the north can bring.

Now, let us make sure we are not mistaken here; the President's actions don't end the embargo. That requires congressional action, as outlined in the Helms-Burton Act of 1996. What President Obama did is he exercised his legal right to establish diplomatic relations and expand travel, facilitate remittances, and promote commerce.

Congress does need to act. The President's step alone is a great step in the right direction, but to fully normalize our relationship with Cuba, Congress will need to act, and I continue to sponsor legislation that will help that occur.

Of course, we should continue to call for transparency with regard to Cuba's human rights record, to speak out for political dissidents, just as we do in dozens and hundreds of countries that we have normal trade and diplomatic relations with.

I was proud to sign a letter authored by our great leader, BARBARA LEE, on this issue, encouraging President Obama to use the 2015 summit as a platform for stimulating this type of productive, regional dialogue.

Now, decades of adversity between the United States and Cuba cannot be wiped away with a stroke of the pen. It will take time.

□ 1630

But together we can build bonds of trust between the Cuban people and ourselves, and we can overcome the decades of mistrust and propaganda on both sides to lead to the betterment of the relationship between the Cuban people and the American people and the greater prosperity to both peoples through trade and commerce.

I strongly support continuing to move forward to engage with Cuba and will continue to support the President's actions and similar legislative action here.

Welcome to our new Cuban friends—bienvenidos a nuestros amigos nuevos Cubanos.

Ms. LEE. Thank you—muchas gracias. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for that very succinct and clear statement and for your continuing leadership for a policy that really is in the United States' best interest. So thank you again.

I now yield to my friend from California, Congressman SAM FARR, who has really forged a path toward where we are today for many, many years with the administration as it relates to establishing diplomatic relations, someone who has visited Cuba, who has the respect of the Cuban people, but also the respect of our own administration, and someone who continues to plug away each and every day for normal relations with Cuba and ending the embargo.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, my dear colleague from California and our distinguished Member of Congress, BARBARA LEE. And I can't think of any other Member who has made more trips and taken more people and influenced this change of policy in the United States Congress than BARBARA LEE.

I have had the pleasure of traveling to Cuba on six different mission trips and each one of them has been very interesting, one with my constituents in Santa Cruz, California, who have a sister city relationship with an area called Guama, and it looks much like the California coastline, and a very interesting area of trying to help rural people with a better connection by learning about their rural delivery of medicine, which far exceeds the way we treat rural people in this country, and learning from them how we might be doing a better job, at the same time improving the facilities they have, and things like that, just a cultural exchange.

I find that every time I am there, whether it is Havana or other parts of Cuba, that there is always kind of a curiosity of learning about another country, a very well-educated country, a sophisticated country, yet a very, very poor country.

I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America, in Colombia. I lived in barrios without water and without lights. People in Cuba might have access to water and lights, but the living conditions that they live in are really restricted, and some of the conditions in Havana are the greatest poverty I have seen in the world.

So this will change when you get people that are well-educated and get an economy growing. I think that the action of President Obama is absolutely awesome. It is real diplomatic leadership. It is the ability to change the United States' isolated, backward, close-the-door policy to opening it up with all the other Presidents of this hemisphere.

As we prepare to go to Panama in the spring, President Obama now will be joining every President of this hemisphere, 36 different countries in the Western Hemisphere, all of whom have diplomatic relationships, travel relationships, normal relationships with Cuba, except the United States of America, and he is going to be applauded for his leadership in joining the hemispheric unity.

When you think about the opportunities of this hemisphere, we can get along in this hemisphere in three languages: Spanish, English, and Portuguese, a little bit of French. We are not at war with anybody. This is a magnificent hemisphere to unify, and to be isolated from that unification by having this archaic policy towards Cuba is just wrong.

So, Mr. President, you are a hero, and I look forward to you being welcomed as a hero at the hemispheric summit this spring.

I would also like to say, I am ranking member on the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations, and this is an opportunity for 11 million people living in Cuba and hungry, and really hungry. Cuba has to import almost everything. They have trade importations from the United States, so buying agriculture products isn't new. What is going to be new is the ability to trade in normal functions, in using the financial instruments that all trade negotiators have.

It is very difficult to export to Cuba because of the requirements that we make in the United States. We are not allowed, as Americans, to use credit cards or to get credit. All the other countries can. So what happens is these other countries are taking away market share where we could be in there with our products.

I am very proud, in agriculture, to see the leadership of our States, our

agricultural States, the Governors—bipartisan. This is not Democratic. This is a bipartisan, sort of the American outreach, and we have formed a coalition of agricultural groups to work on, really, opening up the trade.

I am very proud to say that the International Dairy—I am going to read off this list. The International Dairy Foods Association, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Barley Growers, National Chicken Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Milk Producers Federation, National Turkey Federation, North American Meat Institute, the U.S. Dairy Export Council, the U.S. Wheat Associates, the USA Rice Federation, et cetera, et cetera, are all interested in helping promote our relationship with Cuba.

So congratulations, President Obama. You are a true leader in this hemisphere.

Thank you, BARBARA LEE, for setting aside this time for us to discuss it.

I want to personally thank BARBARA LEE for inviting Alan Gross to be here yesterday when we were sworn in. I was fortunate to be able to meet with Alan Gross when he was incarcerated in Cuba. I brought him salami from the Eastern Market here and he just loved that. So last night he gave me a bracelet that he made when he was incarcerated. It is so nice to see him back in the United States in the Halls of the United States Congress.

America is changing, and this is a big step.

Thank you.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank you, Congressman FARR, for that really very positive, upbeat statement, also for your leadership on so many issues.

I just want to remind this body that Cuba still finds itself on the list of state-sponsored terror countries, and Congressman FARR along with other Members have really led in trying to get our administration to really understand, as William Cohen issued a white paper in 1998 saying that there is no conventional threat by the Cuban military—that has decreased; there is none—and this should be lifted very quickly.

So thank you, Congressman FARR.

I now yield to Congressman COHEN from Tennessee, who understands very clearly the importance of lifting the embargo not only for our foreign policy goals, but also in terms of his constituents and in terms of the benefits to American businesses and the efforts in our job creation and economic revitalization efforts.

Thank you again for being here with us.

Mr. COHEN. You are very welcome, Representative LEE, and I thank you for bringing this Special Order. You have indeed, as people have said, been

the leader on this issue for many years, and I appreciate that and so many other issues you have been a leader on, but this in particular.

Also, Mr. RANGEL has been an important leader on this issue, as have Mr. MEEKS and others.

I had written the President and talked to Valerie Jarrett about what I considered the three Cs that he could engage in with executive authority, one of which was Cuba, and I commend him for taking this leadership role; the second of which was commutations, which he has not done nearly enough to commute unjust sentences here in this country; and the third is cannabis, which should be rescheduled to a schedule III drug so we could do research on medical marijuana and Charlotte's Web, that can help children with epilepsy who otherwise are either dying are not being treated.

But I commend the President for his actions toward Cuba. This is a policy that many have mentioned has been a failed policy for over 50 years. We do have engagements and diplomatic relations with China, where the Maoists are getting more and more power, with Vietnam and with Russia. Why should we not have relations with Cuba? There was no reason. The only reason was Florida and electoral votes. So I commend the President for rising above politics and doing the right thing for human beings and for Americans.

As Representative CASTOR said, so many Americans want to travel to Cuba; and for many years I thought it was absurd that I couldn't travel to Cuba, because I wanted to and I couldn't because my country was stopping me from doing it.

People were going through Canada or going through Mexico and other countries and getting in and subverting the law, but that wasn't right. If you were going to follow the laws of your country, you couldn't go and you didn't go. It was wrong.

I did have the opportunity to visit Cuba as a Member, and I found the Cuban people very, very, very friendly. As I was walking around Havana, I thought: This is so strange. I am supposed to think that these people aren't going to like me, that this is our enemy. They are on the terrorist list. I should be concerned.

But I felt as safe as I was anyplace in the United States or anyplace in the world, and people were very friendly and very nice. It was no different than being anywhere else in the hemisphere.

I really like the old cars, the old fifties cars that are all over Havana, and they are kind of part of the culture now. While I like them because I remember as a child those cars and my parents having them and seeing them and thinking fondly upon them, I also thought about AutoZone in my district and all the parts they could be selling in Havana to make those cars work

more efficiently and maybe have less impact on the environment.

I also thought about Federal Express and how many packages that might be shipped in and out of Cuba by America's number one and the world's number one carrier of products. I thought about the hotel industry that is located in my community—we used to have Holiday Inn; we have still got Hilton—and the hotels that could be built there. Other countries—mostly, I think, Spain and Sweden and Canada and even Israel—had hotels and restaurants and businesses, but not America. So it made no sense.

I remember Katrina and the great tragedy just south of Memphis in New Orleans and when Cuba offered medical aid, doctors and medical aid, and we turned it down. How foolish of us to turn down an offer of humanitarian aid, but we did. And they offered aid after 9/11 as well.

Now, my appreciation for Cuba goes back to my childhood. In 1955, I was befriended by a baseball player whose name was Minnie Minoso. His real name was Aurelio Saturnino Armas Minoso, the Cuban Comet, number 9 with the White Sox, with the Indians, a little bit later with the Cardinals and the Washington Senators. Minnie befriended me and gave me a baseball when I was just 5 years of age. It was in the segregated Memphis, Tennessee, so the player who gave me the baseball originally was a White player named Tom Poholsky. I guess I didn't have to say he was White when his name was Tom Poholsky, but he was.

I went to thank him. I had crutches at the time. I had just gotten out of the hospital some months earlier from polio and had a White Sox T-shirt and cap—it was an exhibition game—and thanked him. He said: You don't need to thank me. You should thank number 9 over there, the darkest player on the field.

And so Minoso came over and we thanked him.

What it was is he was kind of inhibited from the segregation laws in the South of being the nicest guy on the baseball field and coming up and giving me a ball. He became my buddy. I have known Minnie Minoso ever since. He is my nom de plume on some email sites and some phone books and some other things where I need kind of an alias, and he has been my friend and we have visited back and forth.

He was a Cuban player who was beloved in Chicago, and I think is the most beloved player in Chicago today. A lot of Cuban players have gone to play in Chicago, and they play great baseball. We could have a great baseball relationship with Cuba, a great tourism relationship, a great cultural relationship and medical care.

In traveling to Latin America as a Congressman, I have been told the biggest impediment to our relations with

Latin American countries is our treatment of Cuba. The President, by starting to formalize relations with Cuba, has helped America in Latin America, which is our number one—South America, Central America—our number one trading partner. It makes a lot of sense economically as well as humanely.

I look forward to the time when all Americans can visit Cuba, the great culture, and exchange good wishes. They are our friends.

Thank you, Representative LEE, for having this session on this program which shows President Obama's leadership.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for being with us this evening and really laying out many of the benefits to your constituents, to America, as they relate to ending the embargo against Cuba, but also just for being here and kind of sharing your stories, because I think it is very important that we hear the stories of Americans who have had relationships with Cuban people who really don't and can't figure out why everyone can't have these normal relations with the people of Cuba as we do with people around the world. So thank you again very much.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Congresswoman DELAURO, who has visited Cuba several times, who really has been very focused on the business aspects, the agricultural benefits to our own country and to Cuba as they relate to ending the embargo, also on women's issues and so many issues that really require us to normalize relations with Cuba. She has been in this fight a long time and still continues each and every day to move us forward.

I really thank you again for your leadership, for being here and for being with some of us when we have been in Cuba and really raising these issues to a level that really, I think the Cuban people understand that Americans are spirited and they really want to be there and to help move Cuba forward as well as our own country forward. So thank you again.

□ 1645

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank the gentlewoman, first and foremost, for her leadership. This is not an issue for the faint of heart or for people who want to say, "Oh, my gosh. If we don't see success immediately, then we will wash our hands and go off and do some other thing." This has required tenacity and courage and passion and deep concern. We are grateful to you for your leadership in this area, and it has been a pleasure for me to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, we are no fans of the Castro regime. This is not about the regime. It is about the Cuban people and what we can do to help our near neighbors realize their

aspirations for freedom and prosperity. Judged against that worthy goal, our policy for the last 54 years has been a dismal failure. It has not helped ordinary Cubans one bit. In fact, the sanctions have harmed them and us by holding back Cuba's democratic and economic development.

Back in 2007, I had the opportunity to chair the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. At that time, I led a bipartisan group of Members on a trip to Cuba. On that trip, it was so interesting to me that one of the things that one or two of my colleagues—and, again, in a bipartisan way—wanted to do was to go to the port and see the offloading of rice. The fact of the matter is that, instead of getting their rice from the United States, which Cuba could do, they are getting their rice from Malaysia. Imagine if we could make an economic difference for our rice farmers, for our agricultural community, and because of a policy that has been so shortsighted, we are putting our own economic interests aside.

I had the honor of taking part in another delegation to the island last year, led by our colleague BARBARA LEE. What we saw on the visit was an immense and an untapped potential. It was at that time as well that I accompanied Congresswoman LEE to visit with Alan Gross and to understand his plight. He was arrested and put in prison for 15 years, having served 5 years. What destruction it was doing to him physically and mentally, and unnecessarily so. We were so excited yesterday, when we were sworn in as newly elected or just elected Members of Congress, that Alan Gross and his wife, Judy, were in the audience to see it—back home, here, in the United States, with family, and enjoying all of the freedom that he deserves. Again, the immense benefits, the untapped potential.

We also saw and met—and my colleague BARBARA LEE will bear this out—with entrepreneurs. There are many young women who have opened stores; they have opened restaurants; they have opened other small businesses. We spoke with people who are finding innovative ways to improve their lives and the lives of their families; yet, because of a lack of a financial infrastructure or the ability of U.S. banks to participate in Cuba, they are held to a modicum of what they can do.

There is palpable hunger for change in Cuba. We need to do our best to support it. Opening the economy will help to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of the Cuban people. We have engaged with the Soviet Union and Communist China, both of which pose potentially severe threats to our country. Cuba poses no such threat.

I applaud the President for his historic first step to normalize relations between the United States and Cuba. We must stop persevering in a senseless

cold war policy. This Congress must act to end this embargo.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I am no fan of the Castro regime. But this is not about the regime. It is about the Cuban people, and what we can do to help our near neighbors realize their aspirations for freedom and prosperity.

Judged against that worthy goal, our policy of the last fifty-four years has been a dismal failure. It has not helped ordinary Cubans one bit. In fact, the sanctions have harmed them—and us—by holding back Cuba's democratic and economic development.

Back in 2007, when I chaired the Agriculture appropriations subcommittee, I led a bipartisan group of members on a trip to Cuba. This year, I took part in another delegation to the island. What we saw on both visits was immense untapped potential.

I met entrepreneurs who have opened stores, restaurants, and other small businesses. I spoke with people finding innovative ways to improve their lives and the lives of their families.

There is a palpable hunger for change in Cuba. We should do our best to support it. Opening the economy will help unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of the Cuban people.

We engaged with the Soviet Union and Communist China, both of which posed potentially severe threats to our country. Cuba poses no such threat. Stonewalling the Cuban government only backs up the regime's claim that the United States is the enemy. By contrast, engaging diplomatically gives us the openings we need to address important issues like democracy and human rights, as we have done with China and many other countries.

So I applaud the President for his historic first step to normalize relations between the United States and Cuba. This new direction will benefit both nations. The President has done a great deal, within the confines of his available powers, to reestablish diplomatic relations, increase commerce, and advance shared humanitarian interests.

There is more he can do: for example, he should do away with a Bush Administration policy that drains Cuban talent by encouraging doctors to defect.

But lifting the embargo itself will require Congress to act. I have been arguing for an end to sanctions for many years. The Cuban people have suffered needlessly for too long. We ought to free them to join the international community and participate in the global economy. For our own businesses, lifting the embargo would ensure access to new markets just 90 miles from our shores.

I am in favor of re-establishing formal diplomatic relations with Cuba. But our best ambassadors would be the American people themselves. Every American should have the right to travel freely to Cuba. The resulting flood of contact would give Cubans access to America's most valuable export: our nation's ideals and values. That is the surest path to freedom for the Cuban people.

We must stop persevering this senseless Cold War policy. Congress must act to end this embargo.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by saluting Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for hosting this Special Order, as well as her three decades of advocating for the normalization of relations between the U.S. and Cuba; and to Congressman SAM FARR for devoting years of service to this issue, and working with so many individuals and organizations to bring down the walls of division between the two countries.

On December 17, 2014, President Obama announced a major prisoner exchange with the Cuban government. Alan Gross, a USAID contractor who had been held captive for five years was finally reunited with his family, as were three Cuban intelligence agents who had been imprisoned in the U.S. since 1998. Rolando Sarraff Trujillo, a cryptographer in Cuba's Directorate of Intelligence who reportedly provided information to the FBI, was also freed in the prisoner exchange.

This announcement was highly significant and it is historic as well.

In a televised address that followed the exchange, the President announced a major shift in U.S. policy toward Cuba: the reestablishment of diplomatic relations that were severed in 1961, thus drawing a curtain on many of the provisions of the longest standing embargo in U.S. history. The President stated that while the embargo was rooted in the "best intentions," it ultimately failed in its goal to incite change in the communist government and has only served to isolate and hurt the Cuban people.

I continue to harbor deep concerns about the reported human rights abuses in Cuba and limitations of speech and political expression, but it is clear that our current policy has failed to end these practices.

So just how will these policy changes positively affect the Cuban people and the United States?

Remittances from the U.S. are a vital resource to millions of Cubans and to humanitarian projects in Cuba. Between \$1.4 and \$2 billion in remittances are transferred from the U.S. to Cuba each year, often from Cubans who immigrated to the U.S. to seek new opportunity. Cubans rely on this money to pay for food, monthly electricity bills, or for the daily expenses of life. And humanitarian projects receiving this aid provide food, clean water, essential infrastructure and education to Cubans. When the average monthly salary in Cuba is a mere \$20, the significance of this transfer of money comes into full view. Limits on remittances have stifled real progress, and raising these limits from \$500 to \$2,000 per quarter will usher in a new wave of much needed aid to counter the Cuban government's infliction of serious harm to the well-being of its people.

Despite harsh government regulations, Cuba does have a nascent burgeoning private sector economy. I saw this firsthand last year when I visited Cuba as part of a Congressional delegation. During the trip, I participated in a roundtable with a number of Cuban female entrepreneurs to hear their concerns and discuss what can be done to support their efforts to create new business. I believe this shift in U.S.-Cuba relations will act as a healthy seed for entrepreneurial growth in Cuba. From authorizing expanded commercial

sales and exports, to facilitating an expansion of travel to Cuba from the U.S., we will do more to empower the Cuban people than we have in the over 50-year embargo.

Today, Cuba imports approximately 80 percent of its food, a stunning statistic. American agriculture has long supported an opening of relations and now Cuba's economy will be bolstered and this in turn will bring enormous value to American farmers.

Even more empowering is an emboldening tool of democratization, the Internet. As we've seen in countless other countries around the world, the Internet is an individual's megaphone. It is the place for discourse. For collaboration. For free speech. For democracy! By extending telecommunications and technology services to Cuba, the Cuban people will have access to a tremendous exchange of knowledge and ideas with unparalleled power to inspire change.

These efforts by the U.S. are not exhaustive. Only our vigilance and continued assessment of our relations with Cuba will provoke lasting change for Cubans. But it is also imperative for Latin American countries to reinvigorate their ties with Cuba's civil and political leaders. Democratic Latin American countries, such as Mexico and Brazil, can send a strong signal of support to the Cuban Democratic movement by reinvigorating their relations with Cuba, just as the U.S. is doing.

I have supported a change in U.S.-Cuba policy since I was elected to Congress in 1992, and I welcome and celebrate the decision of the President to make this a reality. It's very exciting to look forward to heralding a new era of opportunity and democratic values for Cuba, a pragmatic partnership with the U.S., support from other Latin American countries, and the abandonment of oppression of the Cuban people by the U.S. embargo, as well as the Cuban government itself.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 8, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act Annual Report for 2014, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 20301 to 20311; to the Committee on House Administration.

5. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Changes to Employee Plans Determination Letter Processing (Announcement 2015-1) received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed pursuant to clause 1(d), Rule XI]

[Omitted from the Record of January 2, 2015]

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Activities of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress (Rept. 113-734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Submitted on January 7, 2015]

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 19. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours (Rept. 114-1). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 181. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COOK, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 182. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit the centralized reporting of veteran enrollment by certain groups, districts, and consortiums of educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 183. A bill to provide for the periodic review of the efficiency and public need for Federal agencies, to establish a commission for the purpose of reviewing the efficiency and public need of such agencies, and to provide for the abolishment of agencies for which a public need does not exist; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 184. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 185. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 186. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BERA, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COOK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PETERS,

Mr. PERRY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 187. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 188. A bill to phase out special wage certificates under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 under which individuals with disabilities may be employed at subminimum wage rates; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 189. A bill to extend foreclosure and eviction protections for servicemembers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 190. A bill to make foreclosure and eviction protections for servicemembers permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADERHOLT (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 191. A bill to repeal executive immigration overreach, to clarify that the proper constitutional authority for immigration policy belongs to the legislative branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the refundable portion of the child tax credit to individuals who are not authorized to be employed in the United States and to terminate the use of certifying acceptance agents to facilitate the application process for ITINs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 193. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for State accountability in the provision of access to the core resources for learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 194. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Medgar Wiley Evers, in recognition of his contributions and ultimate sacrifice in the fight for racial equality in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 195. A bill to terminate the Election Assistance Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 196. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that prohibit certain preferential treatment or prioritization of Internet traffic; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. POSTER, Mr. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRAMMER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPIERER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 197. A bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 198. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to establish national policies and programs to strengthen freight-related infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 199. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish a pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure credit assistance pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 200. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, with respect to congestion mitigation and metropolitan transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 201. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a program enabling communities to better leverage resources to address health, economic development, and conservation concerns through needed investments in parks,

recreational areas, facilities, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 202. A bill to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 203. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. Res. 18. A resolution expressing support for designation of January 7, 2015, as "National Be Active at Work Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 20. A resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 21. A resolution directing the House of Representatives to bring a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge certain policies and actions taken by the executive branch relating to immigration; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H. Res. 22. A resolution expressing the sense of the House that a Contract with America should restore American competitiveness; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

OR

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 states: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 to 17, and Section 9, Clauses 1 to 2, 4, and 7 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by those sections, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;" and Article III, Section 1, Clause 1, Sentence 1, Section 2, Clause 1, and Section 2, Clause 2, Sentence 2, of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Enumerated Powers of Congress. Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization." The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954) "that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and the right to remain here] is entrusted to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government."

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce clause.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution granting Congress the authority to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of holding Federal elections

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 10.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District

of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 27: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 30: Mr. BOST, Mr. DENT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 34: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 37: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 90: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 140: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 154: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 156: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 160: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 167: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 173: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. BUCHSON.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 11: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. BRAT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY Mr. PRICE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROCEDURES FOR THE USE OF
STAFF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3(b)(2) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and section 4(c)(5)(B) of House Resolution 567, 113th Congress, I hereby submit the following regulations regarding the conduct of depositions by committee and select committee staff for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

1. Notice for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time, and place of examination (if other than within the committee offices). Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths.

2. Consultation with the ranking minority member shall include three business days' notice before any deposition is taken. All members of the committee shall also receive three-business days notice that a deposition has been scheduled.

3. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their rights. No one may be present at depositions except members, committee staff designated by the chair or ranking minority member, an official reporter, the witness, and the witness's counsel. Observers or counsel for other persons, or for agencies under investigation, may not attend.

4. At least one member of the committee shall be present at each deposition taken by the committee, unless the witness to be deposed agrees in writing to waive this requirement.

5. A deposition shall be conducted by any member or staff attorney designated by the chair or ranking minority member. When depositions are conducted by committee staff attorneys, there shall be no more than two committee staff attorneys permitted to question a witness per round. One of the committee staff attorneys shall be designated by the chair and the other by the ranking minority member. Other committee staff members designated by the chair or ranking minority member may attend, but may not pose questions to the witness.

6. Questions in the deposition shall be propounded in rounds, alternating between the majority and minority. A single round shall not exceed 60 minutes per side, unless the members or staff attorneys conducting the deposition agree to a different length of questioning. In each round, a member or committee staff attorney designated by the chair shall ask questions first, and the member or committee staff attorney designated by the ranking minority member shall ask questions second.

7. Any objection made during a deposition must be stated concisely and in a non-argu-

mentative and non-suggestive manner. The witness may refuse to answer a question only to preserve a privilege. When the witness has objected and refused to answer a question to preserve a privilege, the chair of the committee may rule on any such objection after the deposition has adjourned. If the chair overrules any such objection and thereby orders a witness to answer any question to which a privilege objection was lodged, such ruling shall be filed with the clerk of the committee and shall be provided to the members and the witness no less than three days before the reconvened deposition. If a member of the committee appeals in writing the ruling of the chair, the appeal shall be preserved for committee consideration. A deponent who refuses to answer a question after being directed to answer by the chair in writing may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the chair is reversed on appeal.

8. Committee staff shall ensure that the testimony is either transcribed or electronically recorded or both. If a witness's testimony is transcribed, the witness or the witness's counsel shall be afforded an opportunity to review a copy. No later than five days thereafter, the witness may submit suggested changes to the chair. Committee staff may make any typographical and technical changes. Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by the witness must be accompanied by a letter signed by the witness requesting the changes and a statement of the witness's reasons for each proposed change. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon the witness signing the transcript.

9. The individual administering the oath, if other than a member, shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall be filed, together with any electronic recording, with the clerk of the committee in Washington, DC. Depositions shall be considered to have been taken in Washington, DC, as well as the location actually taken once filed there with the clerk of the committee for the committee's use. The chair and the ranking minority member shall be provided with a copy of the transcripts of the deposition at the same time.

10. The chair and ranking minority member shall consult regarding the release of depositions. If either objects in writing to a proposed release of a deposition or a portion thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the committee for resolution.

11. A witness shall not be required to testify unless the witness has been provided with a copy of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and these procedures.

HONORING BOB WIECKOWSKI

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor California State Senator Bob Wieckowski. On January 11, 2015, State Senator Wieckowski will be honored for his support of the arts in the Tri-City area during Come Embark on Noah's Ark, a benefit for the Fremont Opera. It is appropriate to extend him the gratitude of the Tri-City arts community and the public.

State Senator Wieckowski has been a generous and continuous supporter of the arts community. For many years, State Senator Wieckowski has, through his advice, service, advocacy, and performance, assisted many arts organizations in the Tri-City area, including the Fremont Cultural Arts Council, the Fremont Opera, the Fremont Symphony Orchestra, Music at the Mission, the StarStruck Theater, and Yoko's Academy of Dance & Performing Arts.

State Senator Wieckowski has even appeared on stage in essential roles in the Fremont Opera's productions of La Boheme, The Barber of Seville, and La Traviata, delighting audiences with his varied and ingenious characterizations. Every year since 2005, State Senator Wieckowski has appeared in Yoko's Academy of Dance & Performing Arts' production of Tchaikovsky's The Nutcracker. His work as the lead role of Drosselmeyer in The Nutcracker ballet is an eagerly-anticipated annual treat for Tri-City audiences of all ages.

State Senator Bob Wieckowski's energy, enthusiasm, and dedicated work in support of the arts has deeply enriched the communities in which he serves.

Mr. Speaker, I commend State Senator Bob Wieckowski for all that he has done to champion the arts in the Tri-City area, and I am confident that his efforts will continue to support the arts for many more years to come.

SUPPORT FOR MINORITY LEADER
NANCY PELOSI

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI to continue her leadership in the 114th Congress. As the Democratic leader of the U.S. House of Representatives since 2002, Leader PELOSI has led our caucus with exceptional resolve and integrity. Her commitment to Democratic values is evident in her focus on expanding the middle class, growing

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the economy, expanding affordable access to education, and empowering America's women and families.

From 2007 to 2011 Leader PELOSI served as Speaker of the House and under her leadership the 111th Congress was hailed as "one of the most productive Congresses in history."

Among her many accomplishments, Leader PELOSI shepherded passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to create and save millions of American jobs; historic health care reform to expand coverage and lower health care costs for millions of Americans; and strong Wall Street reforms to protect consumers and rein in the big banks. She has also fought discrimination in the workplace and passed into law the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and stands for progressive policies that support child nutrition, energy efficiency, transparency in government, affordable housing and veterans.

Leader PELOSI is an extraordinary public servant and tested leader. I am proud to support her as leader of the Democratic Caucus and look forward to serving the American people alongside her in the 114th Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended the funeral of the former Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo, in New York City. Consequently I missed several votes in the House of Representatives.

I would like to submit how I intended to vote on these roll call votes had I been present:

On Roll Call 1, the Quorum Call of the House, I would have voted PRESENT.

On Roll Call 2, the Election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I would have voted for Representative NANCY PELOSI of California.

On Roll Call 3, to Table the Motion to Refer H. Res. 5, Adopting rules for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, I would have voted NAY.

On Roll Call 4, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 5, I would have voted NAY.

On Roll Call 5, the Motion to Recommit H. Res. 5 with Instructions, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call 6, Agreeing to H. Res. 5, I would have voted NAY.

On Roll Call 7, the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 22, I would have voted YEA.

RECOGNIZING GWEN BENSON-WALKER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in recognizing Gwen Benson-Walker, who has served as my Chief of

Staff for three years and has been a valuable member of my staff for most of my service in Congress. On December 31, 2014, Gwen transitioned from my office to a well-deserved retirement. Gwen's strong work ethic, intelligence, and enthusiastic personality will surely be missed by her colleagues in the House, the residents of the District of Columbia, and especially my office.

Gwen was not born into the advantages offered to many in our society. Instead, she has always worked her way to success. Aside from her work in my office, Gwen has owned and operated several business ventures. She is a highly-regarded public speaker and a published author.

Gwen Benson-Walker performed with excellence and energy whatever work she was asked to do in my office. She served as a caseworker, and her capacity for hard work and her wise head, led her to roles as scheduler/executive assistant and finally as chief of staff. Even when Gwen moved away from the District of Columbia, she has always returned to our staff upon her return. When not on staff, Gwen was the enthusiastic volunteer coordinator for the annual Children's Christmas Party in the Capitol, lavishing love on the city's low-income children. Most recently, Gwen served as my Chief of Staff, a position in which she flourished, skillfully organizing and running a busy congressional office.

Gwen was a confidant to whom I turned to for advice and a friend and a mentor to staff. She led by example in her professionalism and insistence on excellence, her dedication, generosity, collegiality and good humor. Gwen is off to retirement in Spain, but she leaves too many family members and friends not to return often to her native land. Gwen now becomes a treasured life member of Team Norton.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Gwen Benson-Walker for outstanding service to the House of Representatives and my office, and to the residents of the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

RECOGNIZING THE JAMESTOWN HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Jamestown High School varsity football team on winning the

2014 New York State Public High School Athletic Association championship.

Led by head coach Tom Langworthy, Jamestown claimed the Class AA title by defeating Newburgh Free Academy 41-20 in front of a raucous crowd at the Carrier Dome in Syracuse, New York. This marks the fourth time since 1994 that Jamestown High School has captured the state football championship.

The Red Raiders put on an impressive performance and excelled in all facets of the game. Quarterback Nikkolas Holland led the offense by accounting for four touchdowns. Running back Devan Jackson contributed on both sides of the ball, by rushing for a touchdown and returning a fumble for a touchdown. Senior captain Zack Panebianco was named Most Valuable Player after scoring a touchdown, kicking five extra-points, and making several outstanding defensive plays. Jamestown's defense continued its season-long run of dominance by forcing turnovers and containing Newburgh's high-powered offense.

Although football is a team game, I would like to recognize a few notable awards received by individual Jamestown players. Stephen Carlson was named the 2014 Connolly Cup winner, awarded to Western New York's top scholastic football player. Stephen was also named the Section 6 Class AA Defensive Player of the Year. Zack Panebianco was named Offensive Player of the year. Joe Mistretta was named winner of the Trench Trophy, awarded annually to the top lineman in Western New York. Tom Langworthy was named Buffalo Bills/NFL Coach of the Year after guiding his team to an outstanding regular season, winning 12 games and finishing undefeated in their division.

The hard work and dedication displayed by these young men is truly inspiring. The team is a source of pride within Chautauqua County and across New York's 23rd Congressional District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FORMER NEW YORK GOV. MARIO CUOMO

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Governor Mario Cuomo, who passed away on January 1, 2015 at the age of 82. A highly respected public servant and brilliant orator, Mario Cuomo

served as Governor of New York State for three terms, from 1983 to 1994.

Governor Cuomo was born on June 15, 1932, in his beloved Borough of Queens. Hailing from a family of Italian immigrants, he worked in the family's grocery store in South Jamaica growing up. The governor graduated from St. John's Preparatory School, and went on to play baseball on the freshman team at St. John's University. An aggressive player, he showed great talent and promise. Indeed, he was signed as a prospect in the Pittsburgh Pirates organization, earning a signing bonus that exceeded that of a contemporary prospect—Mickey Mantle—that was later the subject of joking between the two men.

Shortly after beginning to play for the Class D Brunswick Pirates in Georgia, the young future Governor Cuomo was struck in the head by a fastball, forcing his retirement from baseball. He then returned to St. John's University, graduating in 1953. There he met his wife, a fellow student, Matilda Raffa Cuomo. Together they had five children: Andrew Cuomo, the current Governor of New York, Dr. Margaret I. Cuomo, Maria Cuomo Cole, Madeline Cuomo O'Donohue and Christopher Cuomo, a journalist at CNN; and fourteen grandchildren.

Upon graduation, Cuomo enrolled in St. John's Law School on scholarship, where he graduated at the top of his class. Cuomo experienced success in his law career early on, often fighting on behalf of many blue-collar and middle class families like his own.

His success did not go unnoticed, and in 1974 he was the Democratic Party's choice for Lieutenant Governor of New York. Although he lost the primary election, newly elected Governor Hugh Carey named him New York's Secretary of State. In 1978, Governor Carey asked Cuomo to be his running mate as Lieutenant Governor, and the pair won the election handily.

In 1982, when Carey did not run for re-election, Cuomo sought and won the office of Governor of New York. In his inaugural speech, Cuomo called on the state government to be "a positive source for good," espousing an energetic optimism and true belief in government. An elegant spokesman for liberal politics, his keynote address at the 1984 Democratic National Convention is widely regarded as one of the finest political speeches of our time.

Gov. Cuomo served proudly as New York's 52nd Governor for three terms, leading the state with a philosophy of "progressive pragmatism" that resulted in fiscal and ethics reforms for the state, and a broader economic reach for the state in the global marketplace. At his lead, New York became renowned for passing more "first in the nation" types of legislation than any other state. From automobile safety to education reforms to public safety, Mario Cuomo's leadership, more than anyone else's, succeeded in ensuring New York's rightful place at the Empire State.

On a personal level, I was always an admirer of Governor Mario Cuomo, from his first election right up until his unfortunate passing. Shortly after my initial election to Congress in 2004, I made an appointment to meet with Gov. Cuomo at his New York law office. Scheduled as I was for a brief meeting, I was surprised to spend nearly two hours in the

Governor's office, absorbing his advice and hearing of his many experiences in government and private life. To this day, to gain inspiration and to learn more about how to say what is on my mind, I consult many of Gov. Cuomo's writings. His voice still teaches and his message still resonates all these many years later.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor the life of Governor Mario Cuomo. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest condolences to the Cuomo family, and our most sincere gratitude for his dedication to creating a better state and nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I missed the vote yesterday. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING MR. JEREMY M. JACOBS FOR HIS OUTSTANDING BUSINESS AND PHILANTHROPIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Jeremy M. Jacobs, an outstanding businessman and philanthropist from East Aurora, New York. Mr. Jacobs will step aside as CEO of Delaware North, a global food service and hospitality company headquartered in Buffalo, New York, where he has worked since 1968.

Mr. Jacobs took over what was then called Sportservice, at the age of 28, after the death of his father who helped start the company in 1915. During his time as CEO, Mr. Jacobs transformed the company from selling popcorn at local movie theaters into a business with over \$3 billion in annual revenue. Delaware North currently ranks number 169th on the Forbes list of largest privately held companies in the United States.

Mr. Jacobs is also recognized by Forbes for his philanthropic endeavors working with the United Way, the Boys and Girls Clubs of

America, and is an active member of the Jeremiah Milbank Society. In 2008, he generously donated \$10 million to the University at Buffalo associated with the Gates Vascular Institute to support research on the causes, treatment, and prevention of heart and vascular diseases.

Mr. Jacobs' contributions to Western New York have had an everlasting impact on the region and I look forward to seeing what endeavors Mr. Jacobs undertakes next.

RECOGNIZING HARRY C. McLAUGHLIN ON HIS NINETY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Harry C. McLaughlin, a distinguished member of the Western New York community, on his ninety-fifth birthday.

Mr. McLaughlin was born in Salamanca, New York on December 31st, 1919. After marrying his beloved wife Marjorie, he enlisted in the United States Armed Services.

A member of the 17th Airborne Division, he served as a Cook, a Motor Sergeant, and a Sergeant Major. His position as a Motor Sergeant was especially notable; in charge of a Motor Pool containing one hundred fifty-four assorted vehicles, Mr. McLaughlin personally performed difficult repairs such as engine overhauls, transmissions, transfer cases, differentials, relined brakes, and aligned wheels. His respectable service and loyalty to the military earned him a certificate of thanks from President Harry S. Truman, citing his "heartfelt thanks" for McLaughlin's "fortitude, resourcefulness and calm judgment."

Unfortunately his wife Marjorie passed away at a young age due to an illness. In 1960, Mr. McLaughlin married Mary, moved to Eden, New York and adopted eight children: James J., James H., Dan, Harry Jr., Debby, Judith, Maria, and Michael. Four were Mary's, while the other four were foster children. For over twenty-five years, the couple continued to take in and raise foster children. This honorable endeavor provided emotional and physical safety, as well as a loving, stable home for many children in need.

Mr. McLaughlin joined the East Eden Fire Department until his retirement in 1981 and practiced carpentry. He was also an active member of the American Legion Post 880 in Eden.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate the life and numerous accomplishments of Harry C. McLaughlin. I ask you to join me in wishing Mr. McLaughlin a very happy birthday and congratulate him for reaching such an exciting milestone.

HONORING SPRING AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING NAMED A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Spring Avenue Elementary School for receiving the prestigious 2014 U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School Award.

In 1982, The Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize public and private schools boasting high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify aspects of thriving American schools in order to replicate their success. I am proud that Spring Avenue Elementary School in La Grange has been honored as one of those exceptional schools.

Led by Principal Elizabeth Webb Peterman, the mission of Spring Avenue School is to empower students to pursue their interests and dreams. The teachers support and nurture the students while they work to empower these talented students to achieve their highest potential in every area. Each student at Spring Avenue School feels that they are a valued member of the school community and will be prepared for their future academic and career success. With the help of the community, the faculty and staff work to create a positive difference for each student.

The key to Spring Avenue School's success is their goal-based school improvement plan. Their professional development is focused around how to help each and every child advance at the expected rate of improvement and beyond. Together with the community, the faculty is helping create a safe, advanced learning environment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Spring Avenue Elementary School for this significant achievement and congratulating the staff, parents, students, and community.

HONORING SHARON JOSEPHSON ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedicated service of my long time district staff assistant, Sharon Josephson.

After 24 years of service to me and the constituents of Minnesota's Seventh District, Sharon retired at the end of the 113th Congress.

Sharon began working for me when I was elected to Congress in 1990, and very ably served the people of Minnesota's Seventh District, handling nearly every issue and concern that our office faced. Over the years, Sharon drove countless miles through a geographically large and rural district to help constituents, communities and businesses navigate federal issues.

In the wake of severe flooding events, Sharon worked with community leaders throughout the Red River Valley as they dealt with the challenges of clean up, recovery and mitigation of future events. She was a steady presence at meetings of watershed districts, the Red River Basin Commission, the Fargo/Moorhead Diversion, the Red River Retention Authority and many others.

As a former educator, Sharon enjoyed speaking to classrooms around the district about the workings of Congress and the political process. She also coordinated the Military Academy nominations process, helping many high school students achieve their dreams of attending places like West Point, the Air Force Academy, and the Naval Academy.

Sharon was a trusted advisor that I called on for advice on a regular basis. It will be difficult to see her leave and she will be missed by so many.

After many years of dedicated public service, Sharon will now be able to enjoy more time with her husband Roger, children Sarah, Dan, and Martha, granddaughter Sophia, and another grandchild who will be born later this month.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Sharon's service to the House of Representatives and her dedication to Minnesota's Seventh District. I wish her all the best in her retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York. Had I been present, I would have voted "present."

HONORING THE LIFE OF LEON HARE, SR.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Leon Hare, Sr., who recently passed away at the age of 92.

A distinguished World War II veteran, Mr. Hare was born in Buffalo, New York to William and Lillie Hare on January 10, 1923. In his youth, he was an accomplished basketball player during his time as a student at Hutchinson Central High School.

In 1942, Mr. Hare was drafted into the United States Army, serving with distinction in Italy and Germany. He later returned to the U.S. and married Margaret Eileen Sealy, and began a career as a steelworker. He and Margaret had three children, Frances, L. Nathan, and Lorna.

Mr. Hare was an avid bowler as well. He worked at Ellicott Lanes, managing and administering the business, and becoming a father figure to thousands of young men and

women, teaching and mentoring them not just in bowling, but also in life.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to take the time to honor the life of Leon Hare, Sr., and I ask that my colleagues join me in offering our deepest condolences to the Hare family.

HONORING JUDGE STELLA HARTMAN SAXON

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional career of Judge Stella Hartman Saxon of Karnes City, Texas.

Judge Saxon was born in 1948 in El Paso, Texas, to parents Pete and Helen Hartman. The eldest of six children, she graduated from the University of Texas with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Government, and subsequently earned her law degree from the University of Houston.

Prior to becoming the 218th Judicial District Judge, Stella Hartman Saxon worked as an Assistant District Attorney. During that time, she was selected as the Aeri Jernigan Law Enforcement Officer of the Year for her successful prosecution of cases from a large undercover operation. Judge Saxon was first elected as District Judge in 1990, and has served admirably for over two decades, boldly advocating for the citizens and employees of Atascosa, Frio, Karnes, LaSalle and Wilson Counties. Throughout her career, she has been a shining example of kindness and fairness and an ever-present role model to those around her.

In addition to her exemplary career, Judge Saxon is a committed wife, mother, grandmother, Girl Scout leader, and breast cancer survivor.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Judge Stella Hartman Saxon. Her dedication to the citizens of Texas has truly made her community a better place to live and work.

HONORING SEVENTH AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING NAMED A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Seventh Avenue Elementary School for receiving the prestigious 2014 U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School Award.

In 1982, The Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize public and private schools boasting high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify aspects of thriving American schools in order to replicate their success. I am proud that

Seventh Avenue Elementary School in La Grange has been honored as one of those exceptional schools.

Principal Erin Hall is committed to ensuring success for her students. This begins at the start of the school year with fall tours of the school which give students and parents the opportunity to meet their new teachers. Students and teachers develop a mutual respect for one another which continues to develop until the 6th Grade Farewell event in which the community comes together to celebrate the year at an all-school picnic with families in the park. These and other events, such as service learning opportunities during the first few months of school, bring together students across all grades and backgrounds.

At Seventh Avenue School teachers are encouraged to use individual student data to create instructional groups in reading and math so that each student's needs are met. Students are pushed to think critically and overcome academic challenges through problem solving. Parents are thanked for their support and presence and encouraged to participate in assemblies, classroom presentations, and parent conferences. Ms. Hall recognizes that the Blue Ribbon award is due to the successes of the staff, students, and parents and would not be possible without any of them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Seventh Avenue Elementary School for this significant achievement and congratulating the staff, parents, students, and community.

HONORING GREGORY P. MONTANARO

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor The Union League of Philadelphia and the 69th President of this patriotic organization, Hon. Gregory P. Montanaro.

Founded in 1862, the Union League has been one of the leading supporters of our nation and of our Constitution.

Its 3,600 members pledge "support of the United States Constitution", and are leaders in business, education, medicine and the arts. The Foundations of the Union League, three non-profit charities that provide constitutional and leadership education, college scholarships, and the opportunity to research and explore one of the most important Civil War collections in the United States.

In December of 2014, the League elected my friend Gregory P. Montanaro as its 69th President. Mr. Montanaro embodies the qualities that the League stands for today: leadership, patriotism, service to the community, and a dedication to preserving the promise of liberty and freedom embodied in our constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring The Union League of Philadelphia and its president Mr. Gregory P. Montanaro for its 153 years of service to the United States of America.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FRANK CIMINELLI

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Frank L. Ciminelli, who passed away on December 26, 2014 at the age of 80. A highly respected member of Western New York's business and construction community, Mr. Ciminelli's contributions to our region were many and varied.

Mr. Ciminelli was born in Buffalo, New York on October 6, 1934, and grew up on the city's East Side. As a curious young man, he would assist with his father's concrete business, learning the trade as he was completing high school. Mr. Ciminelli graduated from Erie County Technical Institute in 1954.

An extraordinary businessman, Mr. Ciminelli started his own concrete company in 1960, the Frank L. Ciminelli Construction Co., which grew steadily and ultimately became the largest general contractor & construction firm in Western New York. This company was sold to his son Louis in 1987 and is now known as LPCiminelli. Like his father, Louis continues to expand the company based on the values of honesty, integrity, and commitment to excellence.

In 1981, Mr. Ciminelli founded a real estate company, the Ciminelli Real Estate Corp, which expanded to four states and manages over 12 million square feet of real estate. The company is now owned by his son Paul, who was inspired by his father's business acumen, and possesses similar strengths as a business leader within our community.

Mr. Ciminelli was a dynamic figure in the region, dedicated to his business, and behind many well-known construction projects including expansion projects at Millard Fillmore Suburban Hospital and Roswell Park Cancer Institute, the General Motors Tonawanda Engine Plant, the Ford Motor and the Natural Sciences Building on the North Campus of the University of Buffalo, as well as numerous others.

An active philanthropist, Mr. Ciminelli was also involved with the Roswell Park Alliance, the Sisters Hospital Foundation, Catholic Charities, the University at Buffalo Foundation, St. Luke's Mission of Mercy, Business Backs the Bills, and countless other causes.

Mr. Ciminelli was a hardworking and loyal family man, and he leaves behind his loving wife, Rosalie G. Savarino Ciminelli, his six children, Louis, Gary, Paul, John, Susan, and Mary, eleven grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren, as well as a host of friends and associates.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor Mr. Frank Ciminelli. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest condolences to the Ciminelli family and our gratitude for their contributions to Western New York.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I was unable to attend the opening session of the 114th Congress yesterday, January 6, as I joined many of my colleagues and friends to memorialize the life of former New York Governor Mario Cuomo.

Had I been present at the opening session, I would have voted for my friend and colleague from California, Rep. NANCY PELOSI, to serve as Speaker of the House.

As the Speaker in the 110th and 111th Congresses, and the first woman to hold this position, Rep. PELOSI accumulated an unparalleled record of accomplishments to support the middle class and hardworking American families, and I would have been proud to support her election to a third term as Speaker.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF FORMER REP. HERBERT HARRIS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise with the members of the Virginia delegation to inform our colleagues of the passing of a former Member of this Chamber, Herbert Harris.

Herb died at the age of 88 on Christmas Eve at his home in the Mount Vernon neighborhood of Fairfax County.

He served three terms in the House from 1974 to 1980, representing what was then Virginia's 8th District.

Like his predecessor, Stan Parris, my predecessor, Tom Davis, and me, Herb served on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors prior to his election to Congress, and that experience served him well here. He was a champion for the region, helping secure the necessary federal funds to complete construction of the Metro system and to expand the Manassas National Battlefield Park.

He stood out as an outspoken liberal at a time when most of Virginia, even Northern Virginia, was still largely conservative. During his tenure on the Fairfax County Board, he fought for community infrastructure investments, particularly for transportation and sewer system modernization. He also helped with Inova Health System's expansion to Mount Vernon. It was during these years that he served on regional transportation boards, including the Metro Board of Directors, and became one of its chief regional advocates.

Upon his election to Congress, he pushed to secure the necessary federal funds to complete the regional Metro system, and he was an early proponent for expanding the system further into Virginia to reach Dulles International Airport and other communities. A veteran of the Navy, Herb fought the Carter Administration on proposed cuts in national defense and military pay. And based on his experience in local government, he became an

advocate for granting full voting representation in the House for the District of Columbia. After narrowly losing his bid for re-election in 1980 and then a rematch in 1982, Herb put his political career aside, telling one confidant that the time required by today's Members to raise campaign funds put too much emphasis on chasing money rather than exchanging ideas.

He returned to private law practice after leaving the House.

Our former colleagues, Representatives Moran, Davis, and Wolf collaborated in 2001 to name a new Post Office building in the Mount Vernon area to honor Herb's service.

Many of us attended funeral services for Herb yesterday, and flags were flown at half-mast at the Fairfax Government Center and the capitol in Richmond.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in extending our gratitude for his public service and sympathy on his passing to Herb's family and friends by standing with us to observe a moment of silence.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO DENY THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE NOT AUTHORIZED TO BE EMPLOYED IN THE UNITED STATES AND TO TERMINATE THE USE OF CERTIFYING ACCEPTANCE AGENTS TO FACILITATE THE APPLICATION PROCESS FOR ITINS

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to prevent illegal immigrants from claiming the refundable portion of the child tax credit. The refundable child tax credit provides cash payment to low-income families who pay no income tax. The program was intended to be an additional cash benefit for families who receive the earned-income tax credit. While administered through the tax code, it is a means-tested welfare expenditure. Since Social Security numbers are issued only to those who have the legal right to work in the United States, illegal immigrants use Individual Taxpayer Identification Numbers (ITIN), which are issued by the IRS regardless of legal status. ITINs allow a person to file a tax return and thus claim the tax credit. The Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) Certifying Agent Program, which allows a person to apply for an ITIN on behalf of an individual with no verification of their immigration status, has compounded the abuse of ITINs for fraudulent tax claims. With no verification of a person's status on their tax return or at the issuance of an ITIN, the system has a significant fault, which allows taxpayer dollars to go to those who are not eligible.

The Treasury Department's Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) has reported that illegal immigrants claimed \$4.2 billion through this child tax credit in 2010. With the federal government borrowing heavily to fi-

nance deficits of nearly \$1 trillion, we need to ensure federal benefits are only going to law-abiding citizens.

We must take steps to solve this waste of taxpayer money by ending this gap in the tax code. If enacted, this legislation would require those claiming the tax credit to list their social security number or other proof of lawful immigration status on their tax return. It would also require the IRS to verify the proper documentation before issuing ITINs. The TIGTA has estimated this legislation would reduce federal spending by \$8.4 billion over two years.

At a time when the federal government is operating under significant deficits, we must ensure scarce taxpayer dollars are used responsibly. Allowing them to go to those who are in this country illegally is grossly irresponsible. This simple and common sense measure will ensure better accountability to all taxpayers, while also saving money.

In short, this legislation will ensure this welfare program is only available to its intended recipients, ensuring those who follow the law can continue to receive this assistance. I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this legislation through Congress.

IN HONOR OF THOMAS J. HAMMER, JR.

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise in honor of Thomas J. Hammer, Jr. who passed away at the beginning of December in Sacramento. With Tom's passing, our country has lost a true leader, philanthropist and family man who has left an indelible mark on the Sacramento region, our state, and our nation.

Tom's life is an American success story. Born in 1932 in Birmingham, Alabama, he and his family moved to Sacramento when he was 12. A graduate of McClatchy High School, Tom went on to earn a bachelor's degree and a law degree from the University of California, Berkeley. He also spent two years as an Army counterintelligence officer. Tom married Phyllis MacAulay, and they raised four remarkable daughters, Dayna Joonas, Noel Richardson, Katie Brown and Tanis McGregor. Phyllis and Tom have twelve grandchildren and one stepchild.

Almost 50 years ago, Tom and his brother-in-law, Gordon T. MacAulay, purchased Shasta Linen Supply in Sacramento. For the first twenty-five years of operating the company, Tom also practiced law. Over the years, Shasta Linen Supply has grown to be a leading supplier of linens and uniforms for restaurants and medical institutions, and importantly it has always remained a family run business.

Beyond his successful business endeavors, Tom's philanthropic efforts were immense. Bob and I had the pleasure of serving with him in a number of capacities and he also held leadership positions with the Downtown Rotary Club of Sacramento, Mercy Foundation, Teichert Foundation, and the Sac-

ramento-Yolo Port District, among many other organizations. Tom was also fascinated by, and loved, California's rich cultural history and the majestic beauty that defines our state. In order to preserve our state's history, he was active in the California Historical Society, the Sacramento Trust for Historic Preservation and the Sacramento History Museum, and the California Railroad Museum.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in paying honor to Thomas J. Hammer, Jr. for his exemplary service to those of us in Sacramento and across the nation. His life and legacy—as a husband, father, friend, leader and philanthropist—is an inspiration to us all. I ask that we take a moment and extend our utmost respect and condolences to his family.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO TED EDLICH

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to express my gratitude to Ted Edlich of Roanoke, Virginia, for his 40-year commitment and service to Total Action for Progress (TAP).

For Ted, this year brings to a close four decades at the helm of TAP. His tremendous career has been dedicated to this organization and the goal of serving others in need. It has been a highlight of my service as the U.S. Representative for Virginia's Sixth District to have worked with Ted to help preserve the community action mission set out by the organization's founder, Cabell Brand.

Through Ted's hard work, he has helped to transform TAP into a trusted place that the men, women, and children in poverty in the Roanoke Valley can turn to in their hours of need. As TAP's Executive Director, Ted has been determined to not allow them to be forgotten and he has succeeded by providing methods of care that are a model for similar organizations around America that provide a hand up to a better life.

In life, we are called on to adhere to the Golden Rule, which Ted clearly took to heart thanks in part to his roots in the ministry. The Roanoke Valley is forever thankful that Ted followed a calling. TAP's umbrella is a wide one—from the Food Bank to the Child Health Investment Partnership, from This Valley Works to the Dumas Center, from Head Start and the Terrace Apartments to Virginia CARES and Project Discovery. The commitment of everyone who has worked with Ted under that sheltering umbrella is very evident, thanks in part to his leadership in constructing a path to a brighter future for so many people.

As Ted closes this chapter at TAP, he can be certain that the steadfastness he has demonstrated has prepared those following in his footsteps to continue carrying out the organization's mission. I wish to express my deepest appreciation to Ted Edlich for sharing so much of himself with those fortunate to have been able to work beside him and for all of his work on behalf of those in the Roanoke Valley.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 2, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York.

Had I been present, I would have voted for Ms. PELOSI.

HONORING OGDEN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING NAMED A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ogden Avenue Elementary School for receiving the prestigious 2014 U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School Award.

In 1982, the Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize public and private schools boasting high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify aspects of thriving American schools in order to replicate their success. I am proud that Ogden Avenue Elementary School in La Grange has been honored as one of those exceptional schools.

Ogden Avenue School's mission statement is "we build bridges to the future by inspiring one another to succeed." Principal Pattii Waldo does an outstanding job perpetuating this motto by encouraging students to help one another and building a foundation of respectful relationships.

The school features a nurturing environment with a social-emotional learning curriculum which provides for high academic standards. The school's belief is that social-emotional growth is interwoven into academic learning. Also, partnering with parents and the community are essential to the growth of students and the school as a whole.

Ogden Avenue School hosts a cross-grade Buddy program as well as various other programs to enrich students' lives and provide for a better school experience. I commend the school for going above and beyond with their offerings for students and hope that other schools use Ogden Avenue School as an outstanding example to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ogden Avenue Elementary School for this significant achievement and congratulating the staff, parents, students, and community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,091,316,602.62. We've added \$7,464,332,689.54 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I remained in New York yesterday to attend the funeral of former Governor Mario Cuomo. Had I been present, I would have voted for The Honorable NANCY PELOSI for Speaker of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015 I missed recorded votes #1-7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to submit how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted no.

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted no.

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted yes.

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted no.

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 3, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

RECOGNIZING THE RANDOLPH HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Randolph High School varsity football team on winning the 2014 New York State Public High School Athletic Association championship.

Led by head coach Brent Brown, Randolph claimed the Class D title by defeating Chester Academy 48-41 in front of a raucous crowd at the Carrier Dome in Syracuse, New York. Randolph won the state championship for the third straight year, becoming the first school from Section 6 to ever win three consecutive state titles.

The Cardinals put on an impressive offensive performance on the strength of their ground game. Quarterback Bryce Morrison rushed for 175 yards and five touchdowns; running back Devyn Nelsen rushed for 289 yards and one touchdown. Before hoisting the championship trophy, Randolph had to overcome a large deficit. The team trailed 27-6 at halftime before scoring on all of their second-half possessions, including 28 consecutive points. In a game that featured two high-powered offenses and 89 total points, the defining moment was an outstanding defensive play. With less than 30 seconds remaining in the game, Bryce Morrison intercepted a pass to complete the comeback and secure Randolph's third straight state championship.

Although football is a team game, I would like to recognize a few notable accomplishments by individual Randolph players. Bryce Morrison was named Section 6 Class D Co-Offensive Player of the Year. In addition, Morrison, Devyn Nelsen, Mason Bosley, Michael Bowers, Jeff Andrews, and Tyler Stahley were named "First Team All-Stars."

The hard work and dedication displayed by these young men is truly inspiring. The team is a source of pride within Cattaraugus County and across New York's 23rd Congressional District.

HONORING ST. CLETUS SCHOOL FOR RECEIVING THE NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL AWARD

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Cletus Elementary School, an exemplary Catholic school in La Grange, Illinois, for receiving the prestigious 2014 U.S. Department of Education National Blue Ribbon School Award.

In 1982, The Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize public and private schools boasting high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify aspects of thriving American schools in order

to replicate their success. Only 50 private schools across the country were awarded Blue Ribbons in 2014.

Led by Principal Margaret Hayes, the mission of St. Cletus School is "to focus on faith, family, and future." In addition, "The Catholic formation of students is strengthened through academic excellence. Self-worth and individuality are respected." Since September 1953, the school has offered a rigorous and engaging curriculum. The core academic program is supplemented with instruction in art, music, physical education, hands-on science lab activities, technology, and Spanish classes. This prestigious elementary school offers an integrated curriculum to motivate students to understand the connection between the classroom and the student's call to faith. St. Cletus School has made a rigorous effort to improve student performance, while also creating a strong partnership between parents and teachers.

I am delighted that the exemplary work of the teachers and support staff at St. Cletus School, as well as that of the parents and students, has been acknowledged on a national stage. I also want to congratulate and acknowledge the work of the priests of St. Cletus Parish, Pastor Bob Clark and Associate Pastors Ken Baker and Edgar Rodriguez.

Please join me in celebrating the accomplishments of St. Cletus School. Their pursuit of academic excellence is inspiring, and I hope that their success can be replicated across the nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted on rollcall No. 2 for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 4, I was absent while attending the funeral of Governor Mario M. Cuomo in New York. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. TONY BARBA

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Tony Barba on his retirement after 20 years of dedicated service to the people of Kings County, California.

Mr. Barba was born on June 13, 1935 in Hanford, California. He spent his entire youth in Hanford, where he attended local schools. He attended College of the Sequoias and later joined the U.S. Army.

In 1964, after completing his service in the U.S. Army, Mr. Barba began his career with the California Highway Patrol (CHP). Mr. Barba was initially assigned to the Baldwin Park area, however, in 1965 he was transferred back to his hometown of Hanford, where he was the first Latino CHP officer. He would serve the Hanford community as a CHP officer for the rest of his 26 year career with the patrol.

Mr. Barba was elected to represent District Four on the King County Board of Supervisors in 1994. He was the first Latino to serve on the Kings County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Barba has been reelected to serve on the board five times and is the longest serving District Four Supervisor.

After completing his fifth term, Mr. Barba is retiring on December 31, 2014.

District Four and the entire Kings County community have been extremely fortunate to

have a dedicated representative such as Mr. Barba to ensure the wellbeing of their community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Tony Barba for his 20 years of dedicated public service in Kings County and congratulating him on his recent retirement.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 8, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 13

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine articulating the case for American leadership in the world, focusing on the national interest.

SD-419

SENATE—Thursday, January 8, 2015

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we thank You and praise Your Name because of Your goodness and mercy to us and our Nation. You are robed in majesty, and we look to You to establish us and keep us strong.

Today, provide our lawmakers with Your guidance so that they will accomplish Your will. May they never presume upon Your generous provisions or live as if they are independent of You. Lord, infuse them with Your love, wisdom, and power as they seek to speak words of healing and hope.

Today we ask You to extend Your mercy to the people of France as they deal with the tragic terror attack.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

**KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT—
MOTION TO PROCEED**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 26

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 26, the House-passed TRIA bill; further, that the only amendment in order be an amendment to be proposed by Senator WARREN, which is at the desk, with the time until 1:45 p.m. equally divided in the usual form. I further ask that no other amendments or motions be in order, aside from budget points of order, if ap-

plicable, and that if a point of order is raised, the motion to waive be considered made. I further ask that following the use or yielding back of time and the disposition of any pending motions to waive, the Senate vote on adoption of the Warren amendment, the bill then be read a third time, followed by a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; and the votes on the Warren amendment and passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, be at a 60-vote affirmative threshold.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. No objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, with this agreement we are able to complete some unfinished business from last Congress and reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program. These votes will occur this afternoon at 1:45. The Energy Committee is meeting this morning to report out the Keystone bill. We will begin processing that bill next week. Those with amendments to Keystone should be working with Chairman MURKOWSKI and Ranking Member CANTWELL to schedule a time to come and offer them. I hope that our colleagues on the Democratic side will allow us to get on the bill and start with a fair and open amendment process on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. President, the new Republican majority has pledged to run the Senate differently and to stop protecting the President from good ideas. That is why we look forward to the Senate beginning consideration of a bipartisan job-creating infrastructure project, the Keystone XL Pipeline. Right now the Keystone jobs bill is being considered by the committee. The Keystone jobs bill will then be subject to real debate and amendment on the floor of the Senate. Then we plan to send the Senate Keystone jobs bill to the President's desk with bipartisan support.

That may be a departure from what Senators have become used to, but for Members on both sides, I think the change will certainly be welcome. I think Senators in both parties are ready to have their voices and the voices of their constituents heard in the Senate. Senators understand that Keystone presents a real opportunity for Washington to finally prove to America that it can prioritize jobs for them over the demand of powerful special interests. That is what the voters told us they wanted just last Novem-

ber, and that is just exactly what Washington should aim for now by passing this bipartisan, job-creating infrastructure project.

As we consider the Keystone jobs bill, let's keep focused on the real issues at hand, such as jobs for the middle class and reliable energy costs for families. Let's also acknowledge that this is not really a debate about the environment. President Obama's own State Department has previously said that Keystone's impact on the environment would basically be negligible. So let's maintain our focus. Let's keep the voters in mind who sent us here and let's remember what they told us just last November.

One of the things they told us is they would like to see more team work across the aisle. So for a President who said he would like to see more bipartisan cooperation, this, my colleagues, is a perfect opportunity.

A number of the many Democratic supporters of this bill have already written to the President urging him to choose jobs, economic development, and American energy security and approve this pipeline. We are asking the President again today to do that by working with us to end the gridlock and get this job-creating infrastructure project moving. Keystone has been studied endlessly from almost every possible angle, and the same basic conclusion seems to be coming back. The conclusion is: Build it. Build it. Keystone construction could support thousands of jobs. It could invest billions in our economy. That is why Democrats say build it, Republicans say build it, prominent labor unions say build it, and most importantly, the American people say build it.

The President has called for Congress to send him infrastructure projects to sign. Keystone is the largest shovel-ready infrastructure project in the country that makes sense. So we are going to send it to him, and we hope he will sign it. He may ultimately veto an infrastructure project that would increase workers' wages by \$2 billion, a project whose construction alone could, according to the President's own State Department, support many thousands of jobs. He may. Or he may decide to try and make divided government work. Either way, this Congress is determined to do what we can to pass bipartisan jobs legislation. That is what the American people asked us to do, and that is just what we are going to do.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The assistant Democratic lead-

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the majority leader has stated this morning that we have to stop protecting the President from good ideas and use this as his exhibit A—the Keystone Pipeline bill—which is likely to come up for debate before the Senate the beginning of next week. It is an important measure, an important issue that has been talked about over a long period of time, and the actual debate on the Senate floor will commence the beginning of next week.

The majority leader has moved a bill through the rule XIV process, which under the Senate rules is an effort to bring a bill directly to the floor and not through the committee. At the same time there is a parallel effort under way in the newly formed energy committee of the Senate—formed as of yesterday, I might add—to consider this bill, as well, to mark it up. So I am not sure which bill will come to the floor. Perhaps the effort will be merged at some point. But there is no delay from our point of view from any of the motions or objections that we have raised. We ask only that the committee structures be established so that the bill could go through the orderly process of committee. That happened yesterday and now it is in the hands of the energy committee. If their markup is going to be perhaps later this week or next week, then we will be prepared to bring this measure to the floor after the regular order process of committee consideration of this bill.

This bill, of course, is going to be subject to the new approach of the new majority—amendments on the floor. I welcome that. I have been looking forward to that and a return to that for a long time. We have already said that although we plan on being in the minority for a short period of time, while in the minority we will not be obstructionist. We are going to do our best to work in a constructive fashion toward bipartisan solutions. There will come moments of disagreement, and Members will assert their rights and privileges as Members of the Senate and will follow the traditions in the rules of the Senate in that regard.

I will state that when this measure comes to the floor, there are some important questions that need to be answered. I listened to Republican Senators BLUNT and THUNE yesterday come to the floor and say something which puzzled me. I thought there was a question—at least a question was raised earlier—as to whether the oil that is flowing through this pipeline is ever going to be sold as a product in the United States. I don't know the answer to that as I stand here.

For the longest time, the companies that wanted to develop this pipeline and the refinery have not agreed that their product would be sold in the United States. Yet I have heard Sen-

ator after Senator come to the floor and say we have to have more oil in the United States.

Initially, as I understand it, this pipeline was to end at a refinery in Texas where it could be exported overseas, meaning that the actual oil product may not benefit American consumers of gasoline and diesel fuel.

So during the course of this debate on this Keystone Pipeline, amendments are going to be offered to give Members an opportunity to go on the record as to whether the ultimate product from the Keystone Pipeline is going to be sold in the United States and ultimately whether there will be jobs created in the United States as a result of it. These are worthy policy questions, and I think they will come up during the course of our amendments.

I also take exception to the majority leader's suggestion that this particular measure, the Keystone Pipeline, has been studied endlessly and stranded because of the efforts of the President. Let me say, as we stand here today discussing the Keystone Pipeline, the court system in the State of Nebraska is still trying to resolve some questions about the location of this pipeline—sensitive questions to our environment.

There is an aquifer in this area that they don't want to jeopardize by placing the pipeline in the wrong location. They are fighting it out in the courts of Nebraska as to the right location and the authority of officials in Nebraska to choose that location. That goes on as we debate it on the Senate floor. So to suggest that this is so-called shovel ready and all we need is a green light from Congress and the President to move forward oversimplifies and overstates the case. I wanted to clarify that for the record.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. President, there is an effort under way in the House of Representatives today to amend the Affordable Care Act. For those of us who voted for it and proudly support the Affordable Care Act, this is no surprise. Many of the people who did not vote for it and those on the other side of the aisle have opposed the Affordable Care Act since it was signed into law by President Obama. Some believe that opposition is grounded in this notion that this is President Obama's Affordable Care Act, the so-called ObamaCare. I would say that opposition is not grounded in the reality of what has happened since we passed the Affordable Care Act.

There are Members of the Senate—Republican Members—who have said they want to veto and eliminate every single word of the Affordable Care Act—every single word. One of the Senators from Texas on the Republican side said that the other day. Well, if they do this, it will be disastrous.

Let me state the record of the Affordable Care Act to date. The Affordable

Care Act has given millions of Americans access to health insurance—many of them for the first time in their lives. I have met them in the city of Chicago and around my State. At the same time it has reined in insurance companies and has lowered health care cost increases. Because of this law a person no longer needs to stay in a job simply to have health insurance or be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition.

Who among us does not have a family member or friend with a preexisting condition? Almost anything qualifies as a preexisting condition under the old law. Under the Affordable Care Act you cannot be discriminated against because of a preexisting condition that you suffered from or someone in your family did. When the Republican Senator from Texas says he wants to repeal every single word of the Affordable Care Act, he is repealing the protection of those with preexisting conditions and families with children with preexisting conditions from having access to health insurance they can afford.

That was the reality of the situation facing America before the passage of this bill.

I might add that because of the Affordable Care Act, preventive care is free and the cost of prescription drugs for senior citizens is substantially lower. Those who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act are really putting at risk preventive care, which eliminates some of the worst and most expensive medical conditions, and at the same time, they are suggesting that we ought to say to seniors: Pay more for your prescriptions.

If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, you will be repealing provisions that help make seniors' prescription drugs affordable.

Out of the gate, House Republicans are pursuing an extreme bill that they are considering this week that undermines the Affordable Care Act and that is likely to come to the Senate soon and we are told is a high priority by the new majority in the Senate.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the House Republican bill would increase our Nation's deficit by \$45 billion. What happened to all these deficit hawks who have been preaching to us day after day and week after week about our Nation's deficit? Apparently, when it comes to the Affordable Care Act, they are going to ignore the reality that the bill being considered by the House will add \$45 billion to the Nation's deficit.

That bill would also cause 1 million people in America to lose their employer-based health insurance. The purpose of this effort on the Affordable Care Act was to give more people insurance coverage. The first action by the Republican Congress is to take up to 1 million people off of health care coverage from their own employers.

This action by House Republicans—soon to be brought to the floor of the Senate—would increase Medicaid and CHIP enrollment by 500,000 to 1 million people. It will take people off of their coverage where they work and move them into government health insurance programs. Does that sound consistent with what we are told over and over is the Republican philosophy? I don't think so.

We have had 8 million Americans enroll in private health insurance plans since October 1. That is the enrollment. Over 9 million people have gained coverage through Medicaid and CHIP. In Illinois more than 800,000 people now have health insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. Over 217,000 people purchased plans through the Illinois marketplace. My wife and I purchased our plan through a marketplace that was created by the Affordable Care Act. An additional 530,000 people have enrolled in Medicaid in my State.

In Illinois, 125,000 young adults have been able to join their parents' plan. Any parent with a child in college who is about to graduate knows that this change in the law is dramatic and helpful. Those of us who have had kids graduate from college and have worried about their health insurance coverage once they were out of school—this Affordable Care Act says these young people can stay on their parents' health insurance policy until they reach the age of 26. While they are looking for a job—internships, travel, part-time jobs—they are covered by their parents. It is peace of mind for parents. When Republican Senators say they want to repeal every single word of the Affordable Care Act, they want to repeal this provision, which in my State is providing coverage for 125,000 young people who can stay under their parents' plan.

According to a Gallup poll released yesterday, the uninsured rate has dropped over 4 points since the Affordable Care Act went into effect a year ago. That was our goal—more and more people with health insurance coverage. The uninsured rate that they now report is 12.9 percent. That is the lowest point since Gallup began to track this measure of health insurance coverage.

The Affordable Care Act includes several changes that are meant to help slow the growth of health care costs, and they are working. Instead of paying hospitals for the services they provide—the old fee-for-service program—hospitals are paid on the basis of making patients better. If their patients have to go back into the hospital, the hospitals are paid less. There is an incentive to take care of people and to make sure that when they are finally released, they are ready to go home and not likely to return. Despite climbing readmission rates since 2007, those hospital readmission rates are now falling since the passage of the Affordable

Care Act and our change in outlook when it comes to health care. Hospitals are responding in a positive way to the incentives in the Affordable Care Act, and more of their patients are going home in better and stronger condition and staying at home.

Health care spending per enrollee has slowed in the private insurance market, in Medicare, and in Medicaid. For the first time in years we are seeing the rate of growth in health care costs slow down. That is a dramatic increase in opportunity, not just for individuals and businesses that pay health insurance premiums, but it means less expense for our government. It helps to reduce our deficit.

The solvency of the Medicare Part A trust fund is now 13 years longer than it was prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, which the trustees in 2010 said had substantially improved the financial status of the trust fund.

As I mentioned earlier, the law is also helping seniors with the cost of their prescription drugs by closing the so-called doughnut hole. Remember that crazy provision? It said that if you are getting prescription drugs as a senior under Medicare, it would cover the purchase of drugs up to a certain point and then you had to pay out-of-pocket for a certain period of time and then it came back and covered again. We closed the so-called doughnut hole with the Affordable Care Act. The Republican Senators, who have vowed to repeal every single word of the Affordable Care Act, are going to reopen that doughnut hole, which means seniors will have more out-of-pocket expenses for prescription drugs.

Despite all of the successes, some Governors have decided not to expand Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act, thereby denying health insurance coverage for millions of people in their States. The Affordable Care Act has already given about 9 million Americans access to Medicaid. By not expanding Medicaid in these other States, these Governors are leaving billions of dollars on the table that could be used to cover people in their States, dollars that could be used for health care for people who need it the most. I met those people. One of them is Ray Romanowski—a great Chicago name. He is a big, barrel-chested Polish musician who has played at wedding receptions and different events with his band all of his life. That is what he has done for a living. Until now he has never ever had health insurance. He qualifies for Medicaid. He has that coverage and carries it in his pocket proudly, and at age 62 he is glad to have it so he can deal with some of the issues that folks face as they get a little older.

Unfortunately, when these Governors decide not to expand Medicaid to cover people in their States, everybody pays. People who would otherwise qualify for

Medicaid still need health care. They still get sick, they still show up in the emergency room, and basically they get the services at the hospital and the rest of us pay for it. Isn't it more responsible to say that individuals should have their own responsibility to have their own insurance and show up for preventive care to avoid terrible medical conditions?

One of the things I worry about is that the proposal before us, which Senator MCCONNELL has said is a high priority, will address one of the issues regarding when employers have to provide health insurance coverage. It is an issue which was addressed in the bill but has been controversial.

Senator MCCONNELL said: "Making the switch from 30 to 40 hours is at the top of the GOP's Obamacare priorities." This is a provision being considered by the House of Representatives now, and it is one we ought to reflect on for a moment. It may seem simple to some that if you raise the requirement to 40 hours of work before the employer has to pay for health insurance, that it will mean fewer people are going to be disadvantaged. Exactly the opposite is true. The workweek bill affects how many people are covered by the employer mandate—the requirement that an employer pay for health insurance which went into effect January 1 for businesses with 50 workers or more. These businesses with more than 50 workers have to offer insurance to 70 percent of their full-time workforce this year or pay penalties. Under the law, full time is defined as 30 hours.

Critics of this 30-hour rule say it will force employers to slash workers' hours to escape the penalties. Many Democrats and even some prominent conservative policy experts say that the change being considered by the House of Representatives now will do more harm than good. Millions more people work a traditional 40-hour workweek than a 30-hour workweek, so putting the cutoff at 40 hours gives employers an incentive to game the hours of their workers—a much larger group of workers. In other words, if you are not required to provide health insurance unless an employee is working 40 hours, the House action creates an incentive for employers to avoid the mandate by reducing the hours worked by those who are currently working 40 hours.

The Cato Institute is no liberal think tank; it is one of the most conservative. Cato Institute scholar Michael Cannon wrote Wednesday that the bill now being considered by the House might lighten ObamaCare's business burden but drive up government spending by making more people eligible for health care subsidies. He wrote, "How is that a policy victory?" and added that it is a wrongheaded strategy. He said, "This proposed change would actually do a lot of harm, not just to the

Affordable Care Act but to a substantial number of people across the country.”

Our leader on this issue is Senator PATTY MURRAY. Senator MURRAY is the ranking member of the Senate HELP Committee, and she issued a statement this week which really is spot-on when it comes to the wrongheaded approach being considered by House Republicans and soon to be brought up here. The Senate HELP Committee may take up the bill as soon as the end of this month.

The Senate HELP Committee ranking Democrat, PATTY MURRAY, pledged to fight the change. Here is what she said:

It's deeply disappointing that as one of their first priorities, Republicans are putting forward a proposal that would not only hurt workers by denying them the health care coverage they depend on, but would actually encourage companies to cut many workers' hours across the country.

The independent Congressional Budget Office said Wednesday that the House bill would add \$53.2 billion to our Nation's deficit from 2015 to 2025 because fewer businesses would pay the fines and because some of the employees who would have been covered at work are now going to be covered by government programs. The CBO estimates that 1 million Americans would lose the health care coverage they currently have at work if the Republicans proposal prevails and up to 1 million will end up on government programs as result of it. This is the wrong approach.

I say to my friends in the retail and restaurant industry, the offer that I made and that I am sure many others have made is still there. Let's sit down on a bipartisan basis and find the right solution. This effort to stop the progress of the Affordable Care Act, increase the deficit, push more people into government coverage, and eliminate health coverage for millions of Americans across the country is the wrong way to approach it at this point.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 26, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 26) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:45 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The President pro tempore.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, to urge the swift passage of a bill in the Senate that would create jobs, strengthen our economy, and put more money in Americans' pocketbooks—the bipartisan Hoeven-Manchin bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline. I will talk about that for a few minutes, and then I might have some remarks about what the assistant minority leader has said.

I wish to address the Keystone Pipeline project and why it is important, but first I will focus on how the Keystone debate reflects on the state of the Senate and on good governance more broadly. After all, this project is now in its sixth year of limbo, waiting for a single permit to be issued. This debate has gone on longer than an entire term of the Senate.

My colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, recently commented that the American public no longer has confidence that the Federal Government works anymore. He is right, and the American people are justified in their skepticism. He is right. This project is a perfect example of why.

A debate over the merits of and drawbacks to the pipeline—a debate that centers upon sound science and agreed-upon ground rules—is long overdue.

Such a debate represents the best traditions of the Senate—a meeting of minds where respect and tolerance shape the contours of debate. Such a debate is particularly valuable because a commonsense regulatory process is integral to a sound economy and the rule of law.

Time and again, President Obama has suggested that an issue such as this is too important to get bogged down in politics and that we should trust in the integrity of the regulatory process. To this I have two replies.

First, this is exactly the sort of debate we should be having in the Senate. This is the body that is supposed to debate the important issues of the day. When a project as important as this is stalled without meaningful justification for so long, our investment and involvement is even more important. In this case, we have sought to legislate according to the best traditions of this body, reaching across the aisle and taking all voices into account.

Second, curtailing debate on this issue has only had the result of turning the construction of what should be a commonsense infrastructure project into an abstraction, a political symbol that has little to do with the actual proposal under consideration. Without discussion of facts and evidence in this Chamber—all of which I believe coun-

sel in favor of approving the project—the opposition has been able to obfuscate the facts and avoid having to defend their position. The Senate is a place where we can best accomplish good policymaking, not political grandstanding, especially on an issue of such importance as the Keystone Pipeline.

I was encouraged by yesterday's colloquy on the resolution to allow the Keystone Pipeline to move forward because it represents a return to the way we should talk about serious issues; that is, through actual debate. But that colloquy and the work we are doing today has been met with further resistance from the White House. Even before we consider any number of amendments from both sides of the aisle, the President has already threatened to veto our legislation calling for pipeline construction to move forward. This is an unfortunate way for any President to begin work with a new Congress.

Our country and North American energy security will greatly benefit from this project. It improves efficiency and energy infrastructure. It takes pressure off of moving oil by rail. It will increase our GDP by approximately \$3.4 billion annually. The State Department, which has provided clear-headed analysis of the benefits of this project, has found that Keystone will support roughly 42,000 jobs during the construction phase alone. It will provide refineries with up to 830,000 barrels a day of North American oil.

The Keystone Pipeline is an environmentally sound way to transport this oil. In fact, the State Department's extensive environmental impact statement concluded that building the pipeline would actually be better for the environment than not. We have to be clear: The oil is going to go to market no matter what—by truck or rail, if not by pipeline. Building this pipeline takes this oil off of the tracks, off of the roads, and transports it in a way that is safer, more efficient, more environmentally sound, and better for creating good-paying American jobs.

At the end of the day, the Keystone Pipeline and so many other bureaucratic failures demonstrate that the regulatory process is broken. It should not take years and years navigating the Federal bureaucracy only to have the Federal Government decide not to make a decision. In this new Congress we are focused on helping to create jobs and getting our economy back on the right track, which is why regulatory reform will be a key part of our agenda over the next 2 years. I hope the President will change his mind and join us not only in approving this important project but also in preventing similar abuses from occurring in the future.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. President, having said that, I wish to make a few remarks about

what the distinguished assistant minority leader had to say this morning about the Affordable Care Act. I have a great deal of admiration for him and his abilities, especially to articulate matters. I have to disagree with him on this issue, because after all of this hoopla, after all of the problems, after all of the costs, after all of the rising costs, after all of the many problems with the Affordable Care Act, we are still going to have about 30 million people who don't have insurance.

Think about it. That is why we passed the Affordable Care Act—or why the Democrats passed the Affordable Care Act—was to take care of those people. We have a great many people covered, but there is still going to be almost the same amount of people without health insurance that existed before.

A number of the provisions he finds so good about the health care bill, we would have included in a health care bill ourselves. Yes, there were needed changes, such as this business of putting children on the parents' policy until age 26 and some of the other provisions the distinguished Senator spoke to.

I have a great deal of admiration for the distinguished Senator from Illinois. He is a very bright guy. He is one of the most articulate Senators in this body. Having said that, I was a little disappointed in some of the statements he made.

Just this week Harvard University—these are professors who are pretty well paid—yes, it is an expensive jurisdiction, I know, because I have some family there. The fact is that at Harvard these professors are upset because their costs are going up, which they will have to pay out of their own pockets. My goodness gracious. If they think they are being hurt, with their high salaries—and most of it is covered by their insurance from Harvard—can we imagine how the average person is going to feel. They are going to have a rough time because they have held off on a lot of the Affordable Care Act—I should say “Affordable Care Act”—they held off on this until after the election that just occurred, knowing the costs are going to continue to escalate and rise in ways that we can't even take care of them. If we don't do something about it now, it is going to be a doggone mess in this country that nobody—nobody—not my friends on the other side who voted for it or Republicans or anybody else can truly contemplate.

All I can say is that it is a mess. Most people are admitting it is a mess, except those who want to take us down this social path toward having the government control every aspect of our lives in health care. To be honest, I could talk all day on this issue, but we are on the Keystone Pipeline. I have to say, as somebody who helped put

through some of the most important health care bills in history, ranging from the orphan drug bill to the Children's Health Insurance Program, many pharmaceutical bills and others as well, I have always been willing to sit down and try and work these matters out. I have to say that my dear colleague from Illinois, having chosen one Senator's comments about every word, doesn't represent everybody on this side. Any Senator is entitled to their viewpoint and opinion, but a lot of us believe there is a great deal of work that has to be done if we are going to have health care truly improve in this country and work the way it should work.

I could go on and on, but I just wanted to make a few of those comments. Even with the so-called 8 million they claim have health care—I don't know that that is true.

They have problems in every step of this program, and the reason is because it is a poorly written program that was forced through in ways that didn't allow the real process in the Senate to work. Whenever we have a bill that is that high off the floor, passed by only one side—in both Houses by only one side—we know it is a lousy bill. There is nothing that costs as much as this bill is going to cost.

I would challenge my friends on the other side—especially my friend from Illinois—to acknowledge that we need to work together to solve these problems because they are not going to go away. That bill is one of the loudest pieces of legislation I have seen in the whole time I have been here, and that is why it was only supported in a totally partisan way.

I have talked long enough on this. I don't want to take more time away from the Keystone Pipeline because that also is extremely important. Right now we are down to 50 bucks a barrel or even below, but that isn't going to last a long time. The fact that we have oil now, that we are discovering oil now—something that wasn't allowed in years past—the fact that we are working to have this country be totally oil independent is terrific, and the Keystone Pipeline will help us in that regard. It is hard for me to understand why my friends on the other side or at least some of them—and maybe the President, who has issued a veto threat which I found profoundly disappointing—continue to argue the way they do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, just for clarification, it is my understanding that H.R. 26 has been reported on the floor and we now have 2 hours of debate equally divided; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 1:45 p.m. is equally divided.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to rise to speak in favor of

H.R. 26, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act or what is more popularly known as the TRIA legislation.

During the last Congress my colleagues and I worked hard to put together a bipartisan bill that gained wide support. However, literally in the waning hours of the session, we were unable to complete our work at the end of the last Congress. I am very glad to see that this legislation has now been moved promptly by the House of Representatives and again promptly today in the Senate toward finalization and passage.

I particularly wish to thank the majority leader for bringing this bill to the floor so quickly because reauthorization of the TRIA Program is essential for the certainty we need in our insurance marketplace and for other important functions in our markets. I also wish to recognize some of the Senators who have been very heavily involved in this process in the past. There are many who could be named, but in particular I think we need to recognize Senator KIRK and Senator HELLER on the Republican side and Senator SCHUMER and Senator REED on the Democratic side, as well as Senator BROWN, our new ranking member on the Democratic side, and many others who have worked to help us move this legislation forward.

Additionally, I wish to give thanks to the former chairman of the banking committee, Senator JOHNSON and his staff, who deserve a great amount of thanks as they have worked with us very closely in moving this bill forward, and of course my own staff on the Republican side who have put in so much time and effort to make sure we got this important legislation moved over the finish line. Working together we developed a bill that was supported unanimously out of the banking committee in what was a very partisan environment that we can all recall from last Congress. We then approved it in the Senate by a vote of 93 to 4, showing the broad, bipartisan support that has been developed for this legislation.

Building on the Senate's framework, the House passed their own version of TRIA last Congress by an overwhelming vote of 417 to 7. Yesterday in this new Congress the House again voted by a margin of 416 to 5 to extend the program another 6 years—the legislation that is currently before us in the Senate. These strong votes demonstrate the importance of this program.

Chairman HENSARLING, Representative NEUGEBAUER, Senator SCHUMER, and others deserve our thanks for bringing the differences to a focus and getting us to this point.

This bill requires the private insurance industry to absorb and cover the losses for all but the largest acts of terror—ones in which the Federal Government would almost certainly be forced

to step in if this program were not in place.

The bill increases the insurance industry's aggregate retention level and the company coinsurance level, meaning that it increases the participation of the private sector in responding to the insurance issues created by an act of terrorism in the United States but still provides the stability the market needs to assure there is coverage and protection. Once it reaches that level, the recoupment will be indexed to the amount of insurer deductibles for all insurers participating in the program. This is a significant reduction in the potential exposure and cost to taxpayers.

Under this bill each company will take on a greater portion of losses above their deductible. This is done by increasing the coinsurance level from 15 percent to 20 percent and raising the level at which the program is triggered from \$100 million to \$200 million. As these levels are increased, the Federal share is reduced.

This bill maintains the amendment offered by Senator FLAKE to create an advisory committee focused on finding additional private sector solutions to lowering the Federal exposure to loss from a catastrophic terrorist incident in the United States. Getting terrorism risk insurance right is important in order to protect taxpayers and to limit the economic and physical impact of any future terrorist attack on the United States.

This bill will help us maintain a properly balanced terrorism risk insurance program that increases the Nation's economic resilience to terrorism.

The bill also includes separate legislation that will establish the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers or what is commonly known as NARAB. I have been an original cosponsor of this legislation in the past because it simplifies the process of agent licensing across State lines while preserving States rights—specifically, the authority of state insurance regulators.

The bill has broad support from the insurance community, including the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors, and the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers.

By reducing costs and increasing competition among insurance producers, we will generate lower costs and better service for consumers.

Importantly, NARAB II, this legislation, deals specifically with marketplace entry and would not impact the States' day-to-day authority over the insurance marketplaces. State regulators will serve on the board of NARAB with the same objectives they have as insurance commissions—to protect the public interest by pro-

moting the fair and equitable treatment of insurance consumers. The idea for NARAB is now 14 years old, and I am very glad to see we are now going to get it across the finish line.

The final TRIA bill includes the Vitter amendment that was added in the Senate to require that the Federal Reserve Board have at least one member with experience working in or supervising community banks.

Finally, the bill also includes a very critical reform to the Dodd-Frank financial legislation. This commonly has been referred to as the end user amendment issue—a piece of legislation that historically has also received wide bipartisan support. This is a targeted fix I have been pushing for over 4 years. Ever since the Dodd-Frank conference, there has been a debate regarding whether nonfinancial end users were exempt from margin requirements. Most Americans won't really understand the details of these kinds of transactions if they aren't involved in the derivatives industry. But it is critical that we allow end users, those who produce products or provide services—those are the ones who are using the financial system and the benefits it can provide to provide productive additions to our economy—that they not be subjected to the rigorous requirements that were put into place to control financial sector dealings in derivatives.

Then-Chairman Dodd and Senator Lincoln acknowledged that the language for end users was not perfect and tried to clarify the intent of their language with a joint letter. In the letter, they stated:

The legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margins on end-users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. If regulators raise the costs of end-user transactions, they may create more risk. It is imperative that the regulators do not unnecessarily divert working capital from our economy into margin accounts, in a way that would discourage hedging by end-users or impair economic growth.

I might add to that quote from these Senators that it would also increase costs in the marketplace to consumers.

Stand-alone legislation passed the House to fix this problem last Congress with 411 votes—broad bipartisan support. In the Senate, legislation to deal with the end-user program was introduced originally by a bipartisan group of six Democrats and six Republicans. Congressional intent was to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for nonfinancial end users that qualify for the clearing exemption, which this language accomplishes.

Unless Congress acts, the new regulations will make it more expensive for farmers, manufacturers, energy producers, and many small business owners across this country to manage their own unique business risks associated with their daily operations—an unin-

tended and harmful consequence of the language in the Dodd-Frank legislation.

I mentioned in my earlier statement that this bill had the support of 93 Senators in the last Congress. The final bill before us today passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 5.

Again, I encourage all of the Senators to vote for the legislation we have before us today and help this first piece of legislation in the Senate in this Congress get a quick resolution so we can resolve one—in fact, two or three—of the critical issues facing our economy today, help strengthen our economy, promote jobs, and increase our movement along the pathway toward economic recovery.

Again, I thank Senator SCHUMER, Senator REED, Senator KIRK, and Senator HELLER for their partnership in bringing this bill forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on H.R. 26, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program. I thank Senator CRAPO, and I appreciate and enjoy the relationship we have had over the last 8 years since I joined the banking committee. He was already a relatively veteran member of that committee and very knowledgeable and very straightforward and fair. I appreciate his work, especially on this legislation.

I support the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, and I did not want it to expire in December. Many of us on both sides of the aisle in the Senate worked to try to get this reenacted in December. Unfortunately, because of partisan games in the House of Representatives, it didn't happen. But that is why I voted for TRIA reauthorization, S. 2244, in the banking committee last June. I supported the bill that the full Senate passed in July by a strong vote of 93 to 4. S. 2244 made important reforms to TRIA in order to gain bipartisan support, but it still provided long-term certainty in the marketplace.

What was unfortunate was that last fall the House Republicans were unable to embrace the Senate bill—similar to immigration, if you will—that had broad bipartisan support. They waited until the last days of the last Congress to engage the Senate in an effort to reauthorize TRIA. The situation could be dangerous if it is unauthorized. Fortunately, we will be able to move today and get this to the President pretty quickly and at least protect our cities and our communities and our people.

While the TRIA provisions the House and Senate eventually agreed on went further than I would have liked, they represent a compromise—something we obviously don't see enough around here these days. Ultimately, though, the swap end-user provision that was added

by House leadership to the TRIA bill at the last moment was not a compromise. It was moving in a different direction. It was a weakening of Dodd-Frank. It was not the way this Congress or any Congress should enact legislation and should proceed. That end-user provision did not go through regular order in the Senate. The committee held no hearings and no mark-ups to consider its merits or its demerits. This bill was never brought to the Senate floor to be debated.

That is what people, whether in Florida or Idaho or Ohio, are unhappy about—legislation that needs to pass, things for which there is strong, bipartisan, across-the-board, almost unanimous support, and then special interest groups get provisions in that don't belong there that were not debated and never discussed.

Unlike TRIA, the swap end-user provision is controversial and overrides regulators' proposed rules. It prevents future regulatory flexibility. It allows another avenue for derivatives risk to build up in the financial system.

These actions of inserting this provision in legislation with overwhelming, almost unanimous support—adding these kinds of provisions simply doesn't work for our system. It is not the way we should be legislating. It begs the question, Did we learn nothing less than a decade ago? We know what happened to our financial system. The greed on Wall Street and the pain it caused on Main Street in Boise, Pocatello, Columbus, and Cleveland was pretty hard to measure.

The financial crisis exposed risks in all areas of the market, and the provisions in Wall Street reform target dangerous exposure in the system by strengthening protections using clearing and margin requirements.

Under Wall Street Reform, commercial end users are exempt from clearing requirements, and regulators have provided them with accommodations from margin requirements, recognizing the business-related need of the companies.

The end-user legislation added to the TRIA bill goes above and beyond the existing law and the existing rule-making and could tie regulators' hands in the future if excessive risks were to develop, thus exposing the financial system and taxpayers to more harm.

In just one example that this end-user provision could cut both ways, 2 days before Christmas Reuters reported that "major U.S. airlines including Delta and Southwest are rushing to finance losing bets on oil and revamp fuel hedges as tumbling crude prices leave them with billions of dollars in losses, according to people familiar with the hedging schemes."

We know most of us are thrilled with the price of gasoline at the pump going significantly below \$2 a gallon. We know there are other people who are a little bit less thrilled, as this story il-

lustrates with Delta and Southwest. We know the economy of Texas and North Dakota have had problems because oil revenues declined. We know all of that, but we also know that when you enact provisions such as this that aren't debated and aren't discussed, that haven't had hearings, there could be unforeseen consequences.

Less than 7 years after the financial crisis, we shouldn't forget the risks involved. Let's not forget the impact of the financial crisis on consumers, investors, taxpayers, and the financial system as a whole. What we do here has impact in Omaha and in Cleveland, and it is important that we really understand what we are doing by going through regular orders. Slipping this provision in the TRIA bill is just the latest Republican effort to roll back Wall Street reform.

In December, we know the same cast of characters attached an effective repeal of section 716, the Lincoln amendment, to the end-of-the-year spending bill. Yesterday they tried—and thankfully failed—to pass a bill consisting of 11 smaller bills that included attempts to weaken a number of important Dodd-Frank provisions.

I don't like the way this has been done today. I want to see TRIA pass. We have seen this movie before. We will keep seeing it over and over again. This seems to be the new Wall Street playbook. It seems to be the new Republican playbook. I hope it is not the Senate leadership's playbook, where you take a bill that most people like, that has pretty much overwhelming support, is a must-pass bill, and you help Wall Street and Wall Street lobbyists get provisions in, and they can weaken consumer protections. Consumer protections rules on Wall Street will keep Wall Street safer so we don't have to have another Federal bailout.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I wish to thank my colleagues who were here today. This is Senator BROWN's first—just a day into the session as ranking member, and it is clear to all of us in the caucus that he is going to be a hard-working, conscientious ranking member, and I look forward to working with him and congratulate him on his new position. I thank my good friend Senator CRAPO, who will be leaving as ranking member. We have the new ranking member and the former ranking member. I wish that were not the case but so be it. Senator CRAPO has been a pleasure to work with on this bill and on so many other bills. I appreciate his hard work as well.

I rise today in support of reauthorizing the terrorism insurance program—a purpose that has brought me to the floor of this body several times in the last year. We all know what a

crucial piece of legislation TRIA is for our country. It should be reauthorized and reauthorized without political jockeying and attempts at point-scoring that we have seen through several months. But the good news is that TRIA will pass today and millions of Americans can breathe a sigh of relief, not just those who insure buildings and build buildings but people who work in buildings, office workers, restaurant workers, those who work at shopping centers, sports fans, those who care about having new stadiums. All of those depend on terrorism risk insurance.

We all know the history. After 9/11, when my city was devastated, people could not get financing to build new buildings. Insurance said the damage from terrorism, both loss of life and property damage, is so great that they were not going to insure without a Federal backstop.

In a bipartisan way we came together in 2002 and passed the TRIA bill. It helped propel the economy for the last decade. Because some on the other side are not sure this should be a government function, we could not make it permanent. It would be a lot better if we could, but we extended it for periods of years. It came to pass that it expired on December 31 of this last year, 2014.

In the Senate the bill I was proud to sponsor, helped by my cosponsors, Senators MURPHY, JACK REED, Tim Johnson, MENENDEZ, KIRK, HELLER, CRAPO, BLUNT, and Johanns, we anticipated no problem. The bill passed 93 to 4. Senators from BERNIE SANDERS to TED CRUZ voted for it.

Everyone thought it worked. It has not cost the government a nickel. It will pass easily. But unfortunately it got caught up in the machinations of the House. There were some on the House side who did not want terrorism insurance at all and some who were extremely reluctant. I will say this: I believe Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader MCCARTHY understood the importance of this. I worked with them in the latter months of last year to try and get a bill done. At the end of the day I was able to negotiate a bill with the chairman of the House banking committee who was at best a reluctant supporter of terrorism insurance and came up with a proposal that made some changes but kept the program intact.

It was a good compromise. It is the compromise that is before us today. It is a little different than the original bill. Instead of 7 years, it extends us for 6 years. The \$100 million limit has been raised to 200. But still, the program can function very well under these proposals. I am very glad we have brought it to the floor very early in this session. I am glad it passed the House. I am glad that hopefully by the end of today it will be moving to the President's desk.

But there is one sour note in all of this; that is, the attempt—and I agree completely with my colleague from Ohio, the ranking member, Mr. BROWN, that the idea to add extraneous measures to this provision is a wrong one. In my view, Dodd-Frank has strengthened the financial system, the banking system, and this country. The loose regulatory regime that was in place before, everyone agreed, helped cause the worst financial collapse we have had since the Great Depression.

There are some on the other side I understand who disagree with that view. That is something that will obviously be subject to debate. But to attach a provision at the last minute, which is what the House did at the end of last year, put it on the bill and said take it or leave it, is wrong and unfair. I think every fairminded person, whatever their view of Dodd-Frank is, would feel that we should debate an important amendment, any amendment, that would roll back parts of Dodd-Frank, given the fact that most everyone who has looked at it has thought it has been a success.

So that, plus a change in the NARAB provision, which my colleagues have mentioned, led to some problems. We on this Democratic side, while we do not like the rollback of Dodd-Frank in the end user provision, even last year were not prepared to stop the bill from going forward.

But the change our House Republican colleagues made was blocked by a Republican, Senator Coburn, and at the last minute, in the waning hours of the session, it was stymied. Today Senator Coburn, my dear friend whom I miss—and I wish him the best of health—is not here. He will not be here. He will not be here to object to the unanimous consent request that was made in a bipartisan way. So we were voting on this bill.

But the bottom line is simple. Republicans monkeyed around with the bipartisan compromise to earn a pound of flesh in what they knew was a must-pass piece of legislation. I am glad it will not kill the bill, but it never should have been there to begin with. The amendment that will be proposed will allow many on this side of the aisle who believe in TRIA but did not want to see at the last minute a rollback of Dodd-Frank, albeit one of the smaller rollbacks that has been proposed, to ride on the back of the important antiterrorism proposal.

Using must-pass unrelated legislation to chip away at Dodd-Frank piece by piece, even small pieces such as the end user provision, without debate or even in the committee process, is not how we should go about the business of considering important regulations on financial services. I join Ranking Member BROWN in saying that should not happen in the future, and we should do everything to stop it from happening.

The good news is in this new session there were attempts by some on the Republican side to dilute the TRIA provisions further. From what I am told, Chairman HENSARLING wanted to dilute it further, despite the negotiations we had. I thank our Republican leadership for not allowing that to happen, the Republican leadership in the House. So the same basic compromise that Chairman HENSARLING and I negotiated in the wee hours of the last year's session will be on the floor today. TRIA will not be weakened any further. I am proud of the compromise Congressman HENSARLING and I reached on the substance of TRIA. I am hopeful we can pass a bill without extraneous issues. I certainly believe TRIA should be signed into law as quickly as possible, because we all know that if we do not have terrorism insurance, it is going to greatly hurt our economy.

The damage has been minimized because most of the insurance clauses have 30- and 60-day notice provisions, so there has been no effect up to now. But if we dither any further, it will have serious effects on our rebounding economy, effects that I think no one who cares about jobs, who cares about working people, who cares about new construction in America would want to count.

I am glad TRIA will pass today. Our country needs it. I thank again all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Houses who worked hard to do this. I hope we will not find what happened today happening again, which is adding extraneous rollbacks to Dodd-Frank, without debate, without discussion, to future legislation.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I do not see another speaker on our side so I would like to take a few minutes and just respond to some of the remarks of my colleagues.

First of all, let me say I am very pleased to see that we have strong support across the aisle on a bipartisan basis for two of the three key parts of this legislation, the reauthorization of TRIA—or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program—and the NARAB provision for the insurance industry. It appears that the focus of the debate between us or disagreement between us is going to come down to that part of the bill that deals with the end user exemption under the Dodd-Frank legislation. So I would like to talk about that for a little bit, because in some of the arguments about this provision there

has been the implication that this is an effort to help strengthen Wall Street at the expense of Main Street. The reality is just the reverse. This is an opportunity to try to stop unintended and bad legislative language from hammering Main Street under the guise that it was to protect us against Wall Street.

Let me explain what I mean. Derivatives are—I am reading right now from the summary of the House bill, which is the version of the language we are going to be voting on today. I will be reading and summarizing some. But derivatives are contracts whose value is linked to changes in another variable, such as the price of a physical commodity.

My colleague from Ohio, Senator BROWN, referenced Delta Airlines, which buys contracts for fuel for their airplanes. They do this in order to hedge the risk on the price of fuel. It is a critical part of their risk management for their business. Other businesses, farmers in Idaho, hedge their risks in their farming and ranching operations in the same way, by trying to make sure they have protected the price of certain commodities they need to utilize in the conduct of their business.

Derivatives have historically been used by large businesses, such as Delta, and small, such as the Idaho farmer, and everything in between, to manage the risk of their business. End users trade in derivatives to hedge business and economic risk. That is very important to understand because over time derivatives have grown and the use of an investment in derivatives has grown. Instead of just end users trying to manage risks in commodities for their products and for their physical needs and business needs, many derivatives, in fact probably most of the many—more than a majority of the derivatives that are invested in today are no longer based on a physical commodity but are linked to variables such as interest rates or stock prices or currency valuations or other factors such as that.

The market in derivatives has moved into areas that are similar to investments such as in the stock market. Because of that, Dodd-Frank sought to—and one of those kinds of activities was one of the big problems in the financial collapse. So Dodd-Frank tried to address that abuse of derivatives that was found during the time of the financial collapse.

But it was never intended to deal with the original utilization of the derivatives by end users—again, as I said earlier, those who produce a product such as a farmer or deliver a service such as airline transportation similar to Delta Airlines or others, those who utilize derivatives in their business to hedge a business risk and economic risk as opposed to those who invest in

derivatives for speculation in a market. That distinction was very important.

I was on the conference committee when we did the conference committee on Dodd-Frank. We discussed this then. Everyone, literally all of us, including the two sponsors of the bill, Senator Dodd and Representative Frank, agreed that end users were not intended to be covered.

In fact, I will quote again the language that Dodd—after the passage of Dodd-Frank—put into a letter along with his then-colleague Senator Lincoln. This is Senator Dodd's language:

The legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margins on end users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. If regulators raise the cost of end user transactions, they may create more risk.

I am still quoting Senator Dodd—continuing: “It is imperative that the regulators do not unnecessarily divert working capital from our economy into margin accounts, in a way that would discourage hedging by end users or impair economic growth.”

So it was not the intent, although it was a concern at the time that the language may have gone too far. But clearly the sponsors of the amendment—and I don't have the language in front of me, but Representative Frank has made similar comments that it was not intended for this to be covered by the legislation. But the language actually did go so far as to cover end users.

Now the regulators, in hearings before the banking committee, have uniformly told us they feel their hands are tied and that following the language of Dodd-Frank they have to start imposing margin requirements on end users, which will cause the kind of economic harm which I have discussed earlier. So it is necessary for Congress to respond and clarify that this exemption exists for end users in our financial system.

Now, one of the arguments that has been made—actually, before I move on to that, let me go back and give a couple of examples. This is, I believe, from testimony that was given in the House, where hearings have been held multiple times on this issue. It is true we haven't been able to get hearings in the Senate on this issue, but it doesn't mean the issue hasn't been raised in the Senate.

I personally, in 2011, brought an amendment to an appropriations bill to make this exemption part of the law and was stopped by the then-majority, who said they would not allow either a vote or a hearing on the issue. So it is true that we have not been able to engage in hearings or votes in the Senate on this issue, but it is not true that we have not been engaging in trying to get to this issue in the Senate.

In the House they were able to hold hearings. I wish to quote a couple of examples of testimony that were made

in the House. This first one is from the CEO of MillerCoors, Craig Reiners, who gave this testimony said:

MillerCoors uses derivatives for the sole purpose of reducing commercial risk associated with our business. At MillerCoors, we brew beer, and our commitment to our customers is to produce the best beer in the United States and to deliver it at a competitive price. In order to achieve these goals, we must find a way to mitigate and prudently manage our inherent commodity risks.

This is what the end users do. The other example is Ball Corporation, which is a supplier of metal and plastic packaging to the beverage and food industries. In testimony in the House, the CFO of Ball stated:

A requirement for end-users to post margin would have a serious impact on our ability to invest in and grow our business. For example, Ball is currently investing significant amounts of capital in plant expansions in Texas, Indiana, California, and Colorado, totaling well in excess of \$150 million, and adding several hundred jobs when complete. Tying up capital for initial and variation margin could put those types of projects at risk at a time when our economy can ill afford it. The impact of posting initial margin for us can easily exceed \$100 million, while the change in value on our trades over time could easily surpass \$300 million. Diverting more than \$400 million of working capital into margin accounts would have a direct and adverse impact on our ability to grow our business and create and maintain jobs.

Again, my point is the end-user exemption must distinguish between those who invest in derivatives for speculation and those who invest in derivatives in order to control and hedge risk in their business—a critical distinction. Economists, experts, and regulators alike have said that imposing those extra margin requirements on the end user will have negative economic effects and not positive stabilizing economic effects.

Having said that, I want to move forward. Again, going back to the House report—and I am almost done—it says:

However, derivative end-users, the firms trying to manage their risk, rather than speculate for profits, do not pose a systemic risk. Furthermore, forcing end-users to post margin in the form of cash or government securities could cause harmful effects for the economy and consumers. If end-users are posting a margin, those funds are unavailable for investment in jobs and expansion.

That means we are pulling capital out of our economy unnecessarily and in a harmful way, in the very arena—not Wall Street but Main Street—the very arena where we need capital formation and need the kind of growth in our economy that would then cause us to generate greater jobs, strength, and stability.

The examples I have used were examples of companies that were dealing in hundreds of millions of dollars of issues. But as I said earlier, this is not just that. Small businesses, ranchers, farmers, and others, all utilize this in order to hedge their commodity risks and their business risks in our economy.

I want to reinforce the point and make it clear that this is something that was never intended to be in the law and that our regulators have said they have to do. In hearings before the Senate banking committee I have asked our regulators about this. In fact, frankly, that reminds me that we have actually had testimony in the Senate on this issue because I have raised it in multiple banking hearings with our financial regulators.

They have told us they believe this fix is a prudent fix. We have our regulators telling us they have to issue regulations they don't feel are needed or necessary and that a congressional fix would be helpful to our financial markets and to our business productivity in America.

We have those being regulated as end users pleading for relief from this harmful statutory language, and we have an opportunity today to correct that problem. I encourage all Senators to recognize the critical need to move forward rapidly on fixing this end-user exemption just as we need to move forward rapidly on reauthorizing TRIA and passing the NARAB legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I will be no more than 3 minutes.

I wish to make a short response to my friend from Idaho that the issue here is more about process than substance. We have slight disagreement on substance, partly from the delta issue. I understand the farmer and rancher in Idaho and the farmer in Ohio and the importance of managing risks.

I was also a bit amused by the examples he used of manufacturers, those same manufacturers who came in front of our committee that produce beer or soft drinks that were paying more for their metals, for their aluminum cans because of the overreach in some commodities from some Wall Street firms. But this is not the time to debate that.

The issue is really the process of this change. I was part of legislation with Senator COLLINS and with Senator JOHANNIS in the last session. It was a lengthy process. Senator CRAPO supported our efforts in committee and beyond.

It was a slight change to Dodd-Frank. It was a change that we did cautiously. We made agreements and compromises. We brought in Sheila Bair, who had helped in some of the crafting of the language with the Collins amendment.

We worked with her, we worked with Senator COLLINS, we worked with Senator JOHANNIS, and I started the process. Senator COLLINS became the lead sponsor of it—the compromise through hearings in both Houses and hearings in the Senate banking committee. There were discussions in both Houses. We eventually came to that agreement with a free-standing bill.

That is the way this should be done. I would be happy to have a debate on the end-user provision with Senator CRAPO, Senator SHELBY, and the rest of us. Then we come to a conclusion, we get compromise, and we move forward.

The lesson, before Senator COATS gives his comments, is let's do this in the future the way we did—Senator COLLINS, Senator BROWN, and Senator JOHANNIS last year, and do this right so all sides can be represented, we come to a compromise, and the stand-alone bill goes to the President.

That is the way this should have been done, and I am hopeful that is the way it will be done in the future.

I yield the floor to Senator CRAPO and Senator COATS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I yield 15 minutes or such time as he may consume to Senator COATS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Senator from Idaho for yielding time. I don't anticipate using that much time.

I apologize to my colleague from Ohio whom I didn't see standing before I rose for recognition.

I very much appreciate comments made that support the legislation that is before us.

However, I wish to make a few remarks relative to the start of a new Congress and a new Senate in this new cycle.

This is a fresh start for us and an opportunity to reverse course after a very frustrating period of time of dysfunction in the Senate.

I am hopeful and I am optimistic that all of us—colleagues, both new and old, Republican and Democrat—will be able to work together to achieve serious and positive results on the many issues before our country that we face.

We have to put the days behind us when Congress careened from one cliff to the next, from one crisis to another, and fail to successfully bring forward positive legislation that addresses the problems we face. There are threats to our national security—including radical extremism such as ISIS, terrorists such as those responsible for the horrendous murders in Paris yesterday, cyber attacks, and inadequate border security. There are a number of foreign policy issues that also threaten the security of the United States.

Unfortunately, many of the administration's responses to these challenges have fallen short of what is needed to successfully address these threats.

Therefore, addressing these issues and protecting our homeland is paramount in this critical time. Congress has an important role to play in 2015. I want Hoosiers whom I represent to know that I will continue to engage fully in what I believe is this essential

priority. Here on the home front, the 114th Congress must prioritize legislation that sets the conditions for economic growth. I consistently hear from Hoosiers at home who tell me that Washington needs to focus on building an economic climate that encourages job creation and expands opportunity for all who seek to work.

We have staggered through a very difficult period of time. I believe, personally—and I think it has been demonstrated by the results—that the policies of this administration have not successfully addressed this problem, falling far short of what is needed. These concerns must be addressed. They must be addressed now. There are several areas where Republicans can work with the President and work with our colleagues to grow our economy if the President is willing to work with us.

Many of these issues have bipartisan support in this Congress—items that we will be taking up very shortly, such as the Keystone Pipeline. Unfortunately, the President has already issued a slap in the face to those of us who simply want to bring up something that is supported by nearly 70 percent of the American public and has been cleared of any kind of negative environmental impact. But it has been resisted over and over with less feeble and more and more feeble excuses from our President as to why we can't go forward.

Repealing the excise tax for medical devices is something with very significant bipartisan support. Seventy-nine Members of this body in the last cycle voted for repeal of this egregious tax on gross sales that has hampered growth of one of the most dynamic industries in our country and something that provides exports, revenue, and high-paying jobs that put people back to work and give them a good income.

Reforming Federal regulations, that are currently preventing businesses in my State from hiring and growing, opening more markets to American-made products, and reforming our Tax Code are just a few of the issues that have bipartisan support and can be addressed in this Senate. Hopefully the President will join us in that effort.

In addition to what I have listed, there are many other issues the 114th Congress must tackle. For example, just last week an employer survey revealed a majority of small businesses say Obamacare has reduced their profits, causing many of them to freeze or cut workers' wages or reduce other benefits. This survey affirms the constant flow of letters and emails I receive from Hoosiers who have seen their premiums and deductibles rise because of Obamacare.

We were promised by the President that premiums would not rise—not a penny, he said.

That has obviously not been the case. We have seen egregious and crippling

increases in deductibles and premiums as a result of Obamacare.

Now, with a divided Federal Government and in order to achieve needed results, we have no other option but to work together on responsible legislative solutions to grow our economy, tackle our debt and deficit, and keep America's homeland safe from terrorist threats. That is the challenge that is before us. That is the challenge the American people want us to address.

So I look forward to rolling up my sleeves, redoubling my efforts, and getting to work on behalf of Hoosiers and the Nation, and I trust my colleagues will join in that effort and we can move forward in a way we haven't in the last few years.

With that, I thank my colleague for the time, and I yield back whatever time may be remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. I yield 10 minutes or such time as he may consume to Senator HELLER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I rise to speak on TRIA, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program. Before I get started with my remarks, I thank my friend from Idaho for his hard work and efforts on behalf of all of America on this issue. I think his efforts to educate us in our conference and others on both sides of the aisle speak volumes to his ability to lead on an issue such as this. As a member of the banking committee and a coauthor of the Senate TRIA reauthorization bill, this is a critical issue I have worked on closely with my colleagues for nearly 1 year.

Terrorism is a real threat to both rural and urban areas, whether it is north, south, east or west, and that is why I have been so involved with trying to get TRIA extended. When we think of terrorism, we think of Los Angeles, we think of New York, we think of Chicago, and some of these bigger cities. But as I have said before, and I will say again, in my home State Las Vegas is considered to be one of the leading international business and visitor destination cities in the world. Southern Nevada welcomes 40 million visitors annually and has a population of nearly 2 million people. We have 35 major hotels along the Las Vegas strip, many of which have 15,000 occupants at once. If a terrorist attack were to occur in Las Vegas, our entire State economy would be devastated without TRIA.

But it is not just about Las Vegas. In northern Nevada our visitor and gaming industry is one of the largest employers in Washoe County, which includes the city of Reno. They know unless they have access to affordable terrorism coverage they will have difficulty starting new capital projects and creating new jobs. TRIA has helped

many hotels, helped hospitals. It has helped office complexes, shopping centers. Colleges and universities have access to terrorism insurance coverage, and I want that to continue.

While I was disappointed we could not reach agreement before TRIA expired at the end of 2014, I am pleased this legislation has been brought to the floor so quickly by the majority leader. This bill before us is a good bill. Yesterday it passed the House with 416 votes. Let me repeat that: 416 Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, supported this legislation.

I strongly support this bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent that during the quorum calls all time that elapses be allocated equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDING POPE FRANCIS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, a little over 5 years ago a USAID worker named Alan Gross—a contractor with USAID—went to Havana, Cuba. He took with him some Internet equipment he was going to leave at a small synagogue that has survived for decades in Havana, Cuba. He checked in at the airport when he arrived, took all of the equipment he had brought and put it right through Customs for inspection by the Cuban Government. Shortly thereafter he was arrested and charged with spy activities and the like and imprisoned for 5 years—Alan Gross of Maryland.

I am happy to report that just before we adjourned for the holiday recess we were greeted with the great news that Alan Gross, who had been jailed in Cuba for 5 years, was finally on his way home.

I met with Alan in Havana at his holding area in a prison hospital several years ago. I couldn't understand

how this man could survive day after weary day of being imprisoned for trumped-up charges that truly bore no relationship to reality. He was given a 15-year sentence for simply bringing Internet equipment to the Cuban people.

When I saw Alan, he had lost more than 100 pounds and had been unable to visit back home with his mother, who later passed away. Amid their own enormous pain, the Gross family remained tirelessly committed to ensuring his well-being and return to the United States.

Many Members of the Senate and House of Representatives visited him in Havana, when they had the chance, to keep his spirits up. We tried everything imaginable with the Cuban Government and with our own government and others to secure his release. Tragically, Alan's detention was yet another obstacle in trying to turn the page on what I considered a decades-old failed foreign policy toward Cuba.

Many people helped make Alan's joyous homecoming a reality; notably, President Barack Obama and many Members of the Senate. Senators MIKULSKI and CARDIN, from his home State of Maryland, helped to lead our efforts; CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Congressman from the State of Maryland as well; and I can't leave out Senator PAT LEAHY, who truly took a personal interest, as his staff did, in trying to help.

President Obama was the one who helped to finally engineer his release, but I think the President would be the first to say he could not have achieved this goal without the able assistance of an amazing man, who has millions of fans around the world, named Pope Francis.

Pope Francis urged both sides—the United States and Cuba—to meet and talk with one another, to work to find a solution for the release of Alan Gross and try to resolve other humanitarian issues between our two nations. Writing personally to both President Obama and Cuban President Raul Castro, Pope Francis played an important role in finally bringing these sides together after decades of separation.

Over 18 months quiet talks moved forward, including a critical one late last year hosted by the Vatican. Pope Francis said to a group of new Vatican Ambassadors the day after the release of Alan Gross:

The work of an ambassador lies in small steps, small things, but they always end up making peace, bringing closer the hearts of people, sowing brotherhood among people. . . . And today we're happy because we saw how two peoples, who had been apart for so many years, took a step closer yesterday.

What wise and beautiful words from this impressive new Pope Francis—the first Pope from Latin America and one widely recognized for his humility, his dedication to the poor, and his commit-

ment to dialogue and reconciliation. He is clearly continuing the role of the Vatican in pursuing peace and freedom, whether it be the role of Pope Paul II in helping to encourage the Solidarity movement in Poland or the Vatican's help in diffusing a border standoff between Chile and Argentina in the 1970s and a 2007 dispute between Britain and Iran over hostages.

That is why Senators LEAHY, FLAKE, CARDIN, MIKULSKI, ENZI, COLLINS, UDALL, and BROWN will join me in submitting a resolution that praises Pope Francis's role in securing Alan Gross's release and fostering dialogue between the United States and Cuba.

The resolution's message is simple and straightforward. It extends its gratitude to Pope Francis for his extraordinary efforts in helping to secure the release of Alan Gross; it commends His Holiness for his role in encouraging improved relationships between the United States and Cuba; and it warmly welcomes home Alan Gross to the United States.

I know that Cuba itself elicits many strong and passionate political feelings here in the Senate and across America. I respect the differences many of us have on this issue. I am certainly no fan of the Castro regime, neither Fidel nor Raul, and I have pursued accountability and progress on human rights violations on that island, including the suspicious death of Cuban patriot and democracy activist Oswaldo Paya.

While many of us may disagree on the best path forward in seeing democratic change in Cuba, I think and I hope we can all agree that Pope Francis deserves special thanks and praise for his role in bringing Alan Gross home.

I will submit this resolution. I ask any of my colleagues of either party who would like to join in cosponsoring it—if they would like to, I would be honored to have them. I will try to move this resolution in a timely fashion, but I hope we can at least go on record in the Senate commending the Pope's efforts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank the Democratic whip for his comments. I was part of a group, with Senator LEAHY, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator FLAKE, who worked on this. The credit overwhelmingly goes to Congressman VAN HOLLEN and Senator DURBIN and Senator LEAHY in the negotiations and discussions the administration had. It was so important.

I also appreciate the opportunity to be a cosponsor of Senator DURBIN's resolution. I mentioned to him that one of the most intriguing and most admirable things Pope Francis has said as he travels the world and ministers to the poor and talks to his flock—one day he exhorted his parish priests to go

out and smell like the flock—a good admonition to all of us to make sure to go out and know how people live their lives so that we can minister to them and govern this country better. So I appreciate Senator DURBIN's words.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would yield for a moment, I failed to mention Congressman JIM MCGOVERN. Congressman VAN HOLLEN and Congressman JIM MCGOVERN were both very committed to Alan Gross's release.

Mr. BROWN. Senator DURBIN is right about that.

Madam President, before putting us in a quorum call, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING REVEREND MICHAEL C. MURPHY

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today to pay special tribute to Rev. Michael C. Murphy, a dear friend of mine, a man of great faith who for decades inspired the people in Lansing, MI, and who passed away recently in Washington, DC, a city where he had only just begun to make his mark.

Reverend Murphy talked often about being called—being called in the spiritual sense—into service. In the spiritual sense of the word, he followed that calling at pivotal moments in his life, and we are all better for it. For instance, even though he was born and grew up in Chicago, Reverend Murphy felt a calling not long after he arrived in Mid-Michigan. While enrolled at Michigan State University in pursuit of a master's degree in counseling, he got a job at the Michigan Consumers Council. As he learned about the legislative process and how public policy affects families and individuals and communities, he decided he wanted to devote himself to that kind of important work. Yet at the same time he felt a spiritual call to the ministry, which led him back to a seminary in Chicago. For some time he drove back and forth from Lansing to Chicago, balancing a public service mission with a mission that was more personal and spiritual.

Ultimately, in 1987 my friend Mike Murphy, as a recently ordained minister, founded St. Stephen's Community Church in Lansing. It would belong to the United Church of Christ, a denomination that appealed to Reverend Murphy because it was multicultural, committed to social justice and human rights, just like Reverend Mike Murphy himself. For the next 22 years

these causes were consistent themes of Reverend Murphy's sermons.

Even as the minister of a growing congregation, however, Reverend Murphy felt the calling to serve a broader public, a broader community beyond his church. In the mid-1990s he won election to the Lansing City Council, and then in 2000 he won a seat in the Michigan Legislature. I was honored that year to be on the ballot with Reverend Murphy, as I came to the U.S. Senate at the same time.

During Reverend Murphy's three terms in the Michigan house, he was a champion for improving education, enhancing access to health care for all citizens, and policies that would promote job growth in his great district and all across Michigan.

More than anything, though, Reverend Murphy's constituents knew that when times were tough, he would be their champion. In May 2003 a 13-year-old middle school student named Jasmine Miles was struck by a car and killed. She was walking home from school on a road that didn't even have sidewalks. Reverend Murphy decided that the best way to help Jasmine's family was to prevent any other family from being devastated in the same way, so he gave Jasmine's family a role in the bill he sponsored in the Michigan house to require crossing guards, skywalks, and other safety enhancements at crossings used by schoolchildren. Since the Jasmine Miles School Children Safety Act became law—and with his leadership, it is law—there is no telling how many young lives have been saved. That was one of so many ways his actions impacted the people in Lansing and in Michigan.

Even after he stepped down due to term limits, he continued working with the State as an activist who offered tips on how transportation officials could improve the safety of walking routes for children across Michigan. He also continued to be a force for bringing neighbors closer together.

Lansing never felt more vibrant than it did on the day of the Capital City African American Parade—a great celebration, an annual event Reverend Murphy founded. There were marching bands, floats, delicious foods, music, and dancing.

About 5 years ago Reverend Murphy was called again, and this time he was called to come to Washington, DC, where he would become pastor of the Peoples Congregational United Church of Christ.

We tend to find comfort in knowing that a person we loved passed away while doing the thing he or she was most passionate about, and that is certainly most true about Reverend Murphy. He spent his final moments in prayer preparing for one of those wonderful sermons he always gave that were uplifting to everyone who was for-

tunate enough to listen. He brought his spirituality into his service to the community, and his service to the community is what strengthened his spirituality. He was a wonderful man who touched so many lives, including mine, in very powerful ways.

To Reverend Murphy's son Brandon, his daughter Rachel, and all of his family, we will keep you in our thoughts and prayers. We are grateful to you for sharing your father's gifts with us, and we will dearly miss him.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Nebraska.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE HYBL

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, if I may, I would like to begin my remarks by expressing my deep gratitude to a hard-working public servant and loyal friend, Mike Hybl. Mike and I have known each other for more than 10 years. I was so grateful that after I was elected to the Senate his wife Chris gave her blessing so he could come to Washington to serve as my chief of staff.

Mike has had a long career of public service working for his fellow Nebraskans, including two decades in the Nebraska legislature, where he provided policy and legal advice to a number of our State's top leaders. In this role and in the private sector, Mike has brought a wealth of experience on a range of issues. Before coming to the Senate, he also served as executive director of the Nebraska Public Service Commission for nearly 6 years. When I chaired the Nebraska Legislature's Transportation and Telecommunications Committee, I had the chance to work closely with Mike to improve infrastructure across our State. When the time came for me to choose a chief of staff, I had exactly one name in mind, and that was Mike Hybl. His integrity, his level head, and his tireless work have served him well in Washington.

Anyone who has ever opened a Senate office from the ground up appreciates the unique challenges that come with being a chief of staff and being a chief of staff for a freshman Senator. A wide range of skills are required to hire staff, establish operations, and even to pick out paint samples. Through it all Mike was patient, he was persistent, and he worked closely with me to always ensure that the interests of Nebraskans were and remain the top priority.

He never lost his sense of purpose. He always kept us laughing with those deadpan one-liners.

After 2 years on the job, Mike will be returning home to God's country, the State of Nebraska, which we both love so much.

I have no doubt that in whatever path Mike chooses next, he will continue to work for the people of Nebraska. I thank his family, his wife Chris, his son Patrick, his daughter

Emma, for letting me have him and letting the State have him here for 2 more years. I know they are looking forward to spending more time with Mike as he moves back home in the coming weeks.

On behalf of all Nebraskans, I do thank Mike Hybl for his many years of service to our State and for his leadership as my chief of staff for the last 2 years. I thank him for his counsel, his candor, and his leadership.

Mike, you are going to be missed, but know you have made a difference.

WELCOMING NEW COLLEAGUES

Mr. President, I would also like to welcome our new colleagues to a new year and a new Congress and to the Presiding Officer as well.

GREAT CHALLENGES FOR OUR NATION

Our Nation is facing many great challenges from threats to our national security to a languishing economy that is starting to show signs of revival. We have been granted a sacred trust by the people we represent to decrease barriers to opportunity and growth, and we have been entrusted by voters to alleviate the burdens that misguided policies have placed on the backs of hardworking American families. I have been honored to serve as the voice for Nebraska in the Senate for the past 2 years, and I am excited to take on the important issues we face in this new Congress.

As we begin this new year, I wish to share some of the priorities I am going to be focusing on. Congress's first duty is to defend this Nation. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am committed to working to neutralize the growing threats to our homeland, to our allies, and to destroy our enemies. We must maintain our presence as a powerful force for good. Peace through strength is a proven strategy. However, it also requires us to meet the changing demands and needs of our military, including the need for a more robust strategy to counter increased cyber warfare.

At the same time, providing for a strong defense abroad also requires a robust economy here at home. In my home State of Nebraska people have faced an onslaught of Washington red tape—from middle-class families struggling with Obamacare's broken promises to community banks that are forced to meet impossible new standards. Moreover each new day seems to bring about costly new Federal regulations from agencies such as EPA.

Washington's invasive reach is unending. Now we have bureaucracies at the EPA attempting to regulate everything from farm ditches to backyard ponds. This overregulation is killing jobs, driving up consumer costs, and disproportionately hurting families who still feel too much economic pain. Far too often we focus on complex terms and big picture policies without looking at people and families

and how they are impacted. From a mother working multiple jobs to put her children through school to a young woman who is a college graduate hoping to start a career, millions of people are being impacted by policies that are hampering our growth and our potential.

Similar to most Nebraskans, I believe we need to do more to promote innovation and economic growth so there are more opportunities and greater options. That means a simpler, fairer Tax Code, more regulatory certainty for job creators and modern rules for new technology. We must help and not hold back innovators and small businesses so they can grow, expand, and invest in the people who make them great. Tackling any of these problems must begin by shining the light on the waste, fraud, and abuse occurring in our Federal Government.

The American people have sent a clear message to Washington this past November. They have had enough. They have had enough of a do-nothing Senate. They have had enough of the White House side-stepping Congress and running roughshod with Executive orders.

The American people are demanding accountability and now with this Congress that is going to happen. There is much to be done and it starts with keeping the priorities of our middle class at the forefront. I for one am excited to face these challenges each and every day in 2015, and I thank Nebraskans for the privilege of serving as their voice in the Senate.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I will speak for the last time on this bill, but I wish to also speak about an amendment that I expect will be brought forward by the Senator from Massachusetts in a few minutes. Because we are running out of time, I will respond to her amendment before she actually offers it, and then I expect she will offer it in the next few minutes.

Senator WARREN I expect will offer an amendment to strike the end-user provisions of the legislation before us today, and I have already discussed those to some extent so I will not get into too much detail about it, but I do wish to respond once again on the importance of keeping this end-user exemption in this legislation.

For those who did not hear the earlier debate, this provision would enable nonfinancial end users—these are orga-

nizations that are trying to manage their own economic risk in their businesses. This is not Wall Street. This is Main Street. These are farmers, ranchers, small businesses, and large businesses across this country. It would allow them to keep their limited funds and capital in play for their use for investment, growth, and for expansion and job development in our economy.

In recent months there has been an increased discussion by both sides of the aisle about the issues relating to the Dodd-Frank legislation and the need for fixes. Some of these fixes should not be controversial or political. There is bipartisan agreement that the Dodd-Frank rules go too far, and some of them need fixed, such as fixing the end-user exemption that is before us.

I have just been notified that there is only 5 minutes remaining. I expect I will only use about 5 minutes, but if I go longer, I ask unanimous consent to extend my time for a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. The architects of the Dodd-Frank legislation itself—Senators Lincoln and Dodd on the Senate side—stated their intent to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for nonfinancial end users. I know that is a complicated issue to explain. I have explained it in detail already, so I will not do that again now. But acknowledging that the language for end users in the draft of Dodd-Frank was not perfect, they sent a letter, which I quoted from earlier, to then-Chairmen Frank and Peterson, stating that “[T]he legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margins on end-users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk.”

Despite the clarity of their intent, Dodd-Frank was not fixed in conference and regulators had interpreted that in fact the statutory language does contain an ambiguity which they interpret requires them to impose margin requirements. It is not just current or former Senators who have advocated for this clarity. Regulators have spoken out about it as well.

As I mentioned earlier, in February 2013 at a Humphrey-Hawkins hearing, then-Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, identified the end-user exemption as one of the specific Dodd-Frank provisions that Congress should reconsider. I specifically asked him about it.

I asked:

If we were able to achieve some bipartisan consensus on steps to improve Dodd-Frank, what are some of the provisions that you think need clarification, or improvement for reconsideration?

An end-user legislation reform was one of those he identified. I also asked

former Chairman Bernanke about the role of end users in our economy and whether they posed a systemic risk.

He stated:

I certainly agree that nonfinancial end-users benefit, and that the economy benefits, from the use of derivatives. It seems to be the sense of a large portion of Congress that that [end-user] exemption should be made explicit. And speaking for the Federal Reserve, we're very comfortable with that proposal.

We attempted to address this issue in the last Congress. We introduced a Senate bill with six Republican and six Democratic sponsors, which ultimately grew to 20 sponsors, but were unable to get any consideration of it in this Congress.

Unless Congress acts, regulations based on the current statute will go into place which will make it more expensive for farmers, manufacturers, energy producers, and many small business owners across this country to manage their risks. There are many examples of other Members of Congress in the House and Senate, Republican and Democratic, who have spoken about the need for certainty and exemptions with respect to this provision.

I will conclude by reading from a letter sent out by a coalition of end users. These are businesses, as I said, large and small across this country, that are alarmed at the damage this current statutory language will do to their business operation. I gave several specific examples of this earlier in our debate.

The end-user coalition has said in a letter it sent to Congress that they represent hundreds of end-user companies that employ derivatives to manage their business risks; in other words, not to speculate in markets but to manage their business risks and that they strongly support this language.

Their point is that this language "would not help financial companies. It would not create any systemic risk. It would not reverse any regulatory policy. And it would not create an exemption that Congress did not intend. In fact, it fulfills the commitments made on the record to end-users by the committee chairs and sponsors of the Dodd-Frank Act at the time of its passage. The end-user language simply would protect main street companies"—and I emphasize Main Street; we are not talking about Wall Street—"from harmful and unnecessary margin requirements and preserve jobs."

A Coalition survey of chief financial officers and corporate treasurers released earlier this year underscores the need. . . .

Eighty-six percent of the survey of these companies responded "that fully collateralizing over-the-counter derivatives would adversely impact business investment, acquisitions, research & development and job creation. Another Coalition survey found that a 3% ini-

tial margin requirement could reduce capital spending by as much as \$5.1 to \$6.7 billion . . . and cost 100,000 to 130,000 jobs."

The issue is not just fixing an issue because it is going to have a huge, damaging impact on companies across this country that need it for their business risk management, it is an issue for developing more robust economic development and jobs in our economy which badly needs it.

The idea for providing clarity to end users and regulators precedes the passage of Dodd-Frank, and I am hopeful that now we can get it across the finish line.

Including the end-user fix provides certainty for Main Street businesses that played no role in the financial crisis by establishing a clear exemption for excessive margin requirements on our economy.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

This bill will ensure that communities and businesses will continue to have the insurance protection they need to quickly recover after major terrorist attacks.

You see, the September 11, 2001 attacks resulted in approximately \$32.5 billion in claims paid by insurers to terrorism risk insurance policyholders, which makes the deadly terrorist attack the second most costly insurance event in the history of the Nation.

Due to the catastrophic damage, the record breaking insurance payout, and the threat of future attacks, the private insurance industry stopped offering terrorism risk insurance. The aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks sent a shockwave through the insurance industry and the lack of the availability of terrorism risk insurance contributed to the economic recession that followed the attacks.

To address the issue, Congress established the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program in 2002. The program is federally backed so private insurers can continue to offer terrorism risk insurance. The Federal Government only pays out when damage from a terrorist attack exceeds \$100 million. The program is also designed so the Federal Government recoups any funds that it pays out. I also want to note that the Federal Government has not paid out a single dollar since the creation of the program in 2002.

Congress has created other federally backed insurance programs to address market failures where the risk of damage due to a disaster is so large it makes insurance unaffordable. The best example of this being done at the national level is the National Flood Insurance Program. At a State level, California created a State-backed program for earthquake insurance.

Since 2002, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program has worked well to make

sure the Nation, and California, is prepared to rebuild in the aftermath of a major terrorism attack.

Terrorism insurance is particularly important for California, due to my State's many large metropolitan areas, its public transit systems, and its many public events. The program makes sure communities and businesses across California are resilient and are prepared for the risk of a terrorist attack.

The recent World Series held in California, which drew over 40,000 fans to each game at the AT&T Park in San Francisco, is a prime example of how terrorism risk insurance works to protect California. The U.S. Bank Tower in Los Angeles, the tallest building west of the Mississippi River, is protected by the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program. Terrorism risk insurance provides workers' compensation protection to many of the 14.6 million members of California's labor force. California is also home to many major airports, tourist attractions, and sporting venues that all benefit from the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

The math is simple: terrorism risk insurance means businesses and local governments will have the resources to repair and rebuild should another major terrorist attack occur in the United States.

I also want to point out several positive changes in the reauthorization being considered on the floor today. First, this legislation will gradually increase the ceiling at which the Federal Government would provide payments after a terrorist attack from \$100 million to \$200 million. It will also increase the amount of money the Federal Government would recoup after any payout from 133 percent to 135 percent.

These smart reforms gradually place more risk in the hands of the private market. Due to these changes, the Congressional Budget Office actually estimates that the reauthorization of the program will save the government \$450 million over the next 10 years.

I do want to express my disappointment that a provision was included in the House-passed bill which would make changes to Dodd-Frank's approach to the regulation of the swaps market. Swaps, a kind of derivative instrument, played a key role in the financial crisis and we should tread carefully when considering any revisions to our swaps regulatory regime.

The provision in question prevents regulators like the Commodities Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission from imposing collateral requirements on counterparties to swaps transactions with commercial end users. While I am sympathetic to the concerns of commercial end users, preventing regulators from acting to impose collateral requirements on their

counterparties could result in more costly risks building up in our financial system. This is the wrong approach.

However, terrorism risk insurance is critically important to California and to the Nation. As such, I urge all of my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent that all future quorum calls, in terms of time, be equally allocated between the two parties and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts, [Ms. WARREN], for herself and Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 1.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, after 9/11, Congress passed TRIA, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, to make sure commercial developers could afford the high costs of insuring their properties against the possibility of a devastating terrorist attack.

This is a bill for the people who own the tallest buildings in the world. TRIA is a critical program that helps drive economic development and create jobs.

Last July Senate Democrats were united in support of a bill that would reauthorize TRIA and establish a National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, called NARAB.

The bill passed with 93 votes. Senate negotiators then reached a compromise with the House on both TRIA and NARAB, but at the eleventh hour House Republicans tacked on a provision that would roll back an unrelated provision in Dodd-Frank, and then they left town for the year, knowing the Senate would either have to swallow the change or let TRIA expire.

That same bill, the TRIA compromise with the extra Dodd-Frank change attached to it, is currently being debated by the Senate.

We have seen this movie before. At the end of the last Congress, House Republicans tacked a rollback of a "no bailouts" provision in Dodd-Frank on to the must-pass funding bill. That

rollback, which was literally written by lobbyists for the giant bank Citigroup, was a Wall Street giveaway—plain and simple. It made our financial system less safe, and it increased the chances of another taxpayer bailout—all so the biggest banks in the country could rake in more profits. But it passed the House and then the House left town, and the only way to stop it here in the Senate would have been to shut the government down.

Now, once again, the House has attached a Dodd-Frank change to a must-pass piece of legislation. Whatever one's views are on the substance of that provision, none of us should endorse the tactics House Republicans have used to try to achieve this change. While some might find this particular Dodd-Frank change desirable or unobjectionable, that may not be the case with other changes that Republicans decide to strap on to important, must-pass bills. If we fail to challenge this cynical strategy now, it will only encourage Republicans to pull our financial regulations apart piece by piece.

Just over 4 years ago, every Democrat voted for Dodd-Frank as a necessary response to the worst financial crisis in generations. Republicans have not hidden their intention to try to undo these basic financial reforms. If Republicans want to try to roll back financial reforms, let's have that debate on the merits of each proposal. But we cannot have that debate if we permit Republicans to attach financial reform rollbacks to must-pass pieces of legislation such as government funding bills and the TRIA reauthorization bill.

That is why Senator SCHUMER and I are offering a substitute amendment that reflects the original compromise between the House and the Senate—an amendment that includes the compromise language on TRIA and NARAB but omits the Dodd-Frank change.

A vote for this amendment is fully consistent with the vote that 93 Senators took last July—a vote in favor of a clean reauthorization of TRIA and establishment of NARAB. For that reason, I am hopeful it will pass, we can send the President a clean TRIA bill, and we can debate this Dodd-Frank provision separately.

I am also hopeful Senate Democrats in particular will support it on the principle that the Senate expects the House to honor the results of good-faith negotiations and will not support procedural tricks to tack on Dodd-Frank changes to unrelated, must-pass bills—no matter what those changes might be.

The Treasury Department supports this amendment. Here is what they said:

We support a long-term renewal of TRIA, given the important role it plays to our national security and economy, while making

sensible reforms to further reduce taxpayer exposure. It is unfortunate that some are attempting to use TRIA legislation to modify the Wall Street Reform Act. We support the Warren substitute amendment which represents the bicameral, bipartisan TRIA compromise from last year that would have averted any lapse in the program.

I agree with the President.

I voted for TRIA in the banking committee, and I was one of 93 Senators who voted for it on the Senate floor. But I cannot support Wall Street reform rollbacks through these hostage tactics. So if we are unable to pass a clean TRIA amendment, then I will also vote no on the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, which I strongly support. As I have emphasized in the past, reauthorizing TRIA is vital. In addition to serving on the Banking Committee, I also now serve as the Ranking Member on the Armed Services Committee, and it is through this dual perspective, and from what we know of the significant terrorist threats our Nation still faces, that I am convinced that there is value in reauthorizing TRIA.

We must keep markets effectively operating in light of these threats. We must continue to have policies in place to make sure our economy stays on track in the event of another attack on our nation. In short, reauthorizing TRIA is not only a matter of economic security, it is also a matter of national security.

I believe most of my colleagues share this view, and it is one of the many reasons why the Senate in the last Congress was able to pass a TRIA reauthorization bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis by a vote of 93 to 4 in July of last year. This did not happen by accident but through a concerted bipartisan effort in the Senate to steer clear of controversial and ideological demands on both sides of the aisle in an earnest attempt to work together in defense of our country and our economy.

We are here today because the House of Representatives did not abide by these same principles and insisted on including in the reauthorization bill an unrelated provision that would weaken the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act. This provision effectively prevents the banking regulators, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, from calling for margin or collateral protections if they happen to notice excessive risk in derivatives transactions with commercial end users. In short, this bill would prevent our financial regulators from utilizing this tool to protect our markets.

Especially in the wake of the financial crisis, it would seem that we should be providing our regulators with all the necessary tools to limit excessive risk instead of limiting their ability to protect our markets. Indeed, the

financial regulators have already been exercising the discretion we gave them in Dodd-Frank to exempt commercial end users from having to post margin through a proposed rule. But by passing this provision today, we eliminate this discretion to protect our markets through this particular tool even when the facts on the ground may call for its use in the name of market integrity.

For example, in December of last year, Reuters published an article that explained the unexpected risks that certain commercial end users are facing in light of falling oil prices. The article noted, "with oil prices tumbling faster and further than anyone had anticipated, the collar hedges left the airlines with insurance against high costs they no longer need and on the hook for protection they sold against a further slide, with potential liabilities on the rise." In short, even commercial end users face risks, both expected and unexpected, in their derivatives transactions, and if the circumstances call for it, we should be giving our regulators the necessary tools to police and protect our markets; not further restricting them.

All of this goes back to the need for considering these very complicated and consequential bills that impact our financial markets in a deliberative manner, not through attaching them at the last minute to unrelated and must pass bills. I voted against the Omnibus Appropriations bill in the last Congress, in part, because it repealed section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act, which sought to prevent bank subsidiaries that are covered by federal deposit insurance or that take advantage of Federal Reserve lending programs from engaging in the riskiest derivatives trades. In essence, the riskiest derivatives trades would have been pushed out from these subsidiaries in an effort to reduce systemic risk and provide greater assurances that Wall Street gambles would not be subsidized by taxpayers. Unfortunately, this provision was repealed before it even had the chance to be fully implemented by the regulators.

During my tenure as the then-chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment, I spent many hours working on a bipartisan basis with Senator Gregg of New Hampshire to thoughtfully and carefully develop a derivatives compromise. While our effort was transformed during the conference on the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act, I am keenly aware of just how complicated derivatives can be, and I have come to see that even the most seemingly innocuous provisions can have devastating and unintended consequences.

Everyone should understand by now that the last thing Congress should be doing is passing derivatives legislation with little deliberation as part of any

must pass legislation. This assault, bit by bit, on the Dodd-Frank Act must stop. It is a disservice to the seriousness of this issue, to our constituents, and to our economy. Lately, my Republican colleagues have called for working cooperatively through the committee process, and I welcome this opportunity. While this did not happen with this particular derivatives provision, I hope my Republican colleagues will do so in the future.

For these reasons, I support the Warren amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am in strong support of Senator WARREN's amendment to strike the unrelated swaps provision from this very important TRIA legislation.

While I am sympathetic to the concerns of commercial end users about increased transactions costs, it is simply the wrong approach to prevent regulators from acting, if needed, to protect our financial system from risky transactions.

We must afford our financial regulators with sufficient discretion to act to prevent more financial crises. The financial market regulators have already acted to provide relief for counterparties to swaps transactions with commercial end users. That makes the inclusion of this swaps provision in the TRIA legislation unnecessary. Senator WARREN's amendment would preserve the current regulatory approach to uncleared swaps transactions with commercial end users, while also allowing for sufficient regulatory discretion to impose margin requirements on the counter parties to these transactions in the future should it become necessary to protect our financial system.

The inclusion of the swaps provision in this critically important terrorism risk insurance bill is a part of a disturbing trend. Some policymakers believe that Dodd-Frank should be undone. They believe that the derivatives reforms which for the first time regulated a market that contributed to the financial crisis should be dismantled piece by piece. Just last month, a major reform was repealed in a must pass appropriations bill, despite being an objectionable policy which would not have passed were it considered on its own merits. This is a troubling trend because the derivatives reforms are in place to protect our financial markets and protect the taxpayer.

Title VII of Dodd-Frank introduced historic reforms of the derivatives market establishing transparency and accountability. Those who would dismantle Dodd-Frank's derivatives reforms should explain to the American people why they should once again be on the hook for deep systemic losses caused in part by these high risk financial products. It does not make sense to undo this important set of reforms. I am pleased to stand with Senator

WARREN and with any other Senator on either side of the aisle to defend these important reforms and defend the taxpayer.

Dodd-Frank's swaps reforms are critically important to addressing the regulatory gaps in the swaps markets which contributed to the magnitude of the crisis and the costs of the response to it. We should not roll back these needed reforms. Regulators have already provided sufficient relief to counterparties on this matter and moving forward with the provision, as it is creates new risks that are unnecessary and which we may one day regret. There is no need to tie their hands on this point.

I firmly support Senator WARREN's important amendment because it protects the critical swaps reforms made by Dodd-Frank at a time when financial stability is important in our economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, how much time is left on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 5½ minutes remaining, and the majority has none.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York. I thank him for his leadership for a number of years on this bill and the hard work he did leading up to December to try to get this passed before the unfortunate response of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives, and I thank him for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me congratulate my friend from Ohio on his ascending to the ranking membership of the banking committee. I know he will do a very outstanding job there and we look forward to it.

Before we vote on the amendment before us, which I urge my colleagues to support, I wish to reiterate the importance of reauthorizing the TRIA program.

Undoubtedly, TRIA is a national priority, but it is particularly important to my home State of New York, one of the world's most targeted cities. After 9/11, I helped introduce and pass the program as a solution to what was a vexing problem in the insurance industry—how to calculate the risks associated with a terrorist attack. It was an issue we never had to deal with before. Construction and economic growth did not depend on whether developers

could ensure their property against a terrorist attack. But, of course, 9/11 changed that as it changed so many things that day.

TRIA emerged as a responsible partnership between the public and private sector, with the government providing a backstop for private insurers. As far as new programs go, it has been extraordinarily successful.

Over the past decade, TRIA fueled the rebirth of Lower Manhattan. I see it every time I drive through it. One only needs to look at the skyline because we now have a new World Trade Center which has emerged from the shadow of the old towers. One need only ask the construction workers who have helped rebuild the area or look at the tens of thousands of jobs that came back after we rebuilt. The redevelopment of Lower Manhattan is first and foremost a symbol of our city and our Nation's resilience, but it is also a testament to how effective TRIA insurance has been at creating the right conditions for growing our economy and creating jobs in our cities. Passing TRIA today will keep the program alive and continue the remarkable growth we have seen in New York over the past several years. It will do the same for the skyscraper in Los Angeles, the stadium in Nebraska, the shopping center in Tennessee. So this program affects the whole country. Any large project depends on terrorism insurance.

I know there are some of my colleagues, particularly those in the House, who say this isn't the government's role. Well, government hasn't spent one nickel on this program. It has been fully reimbursed, and it is the government's role to foster jobs, to foster economic development, to step in not when the private sector can do the job well but when the private sector can't do the job. After 9/11 people weren't building, construction wasn't going forward not only in New York but in the country, because people could not get terrorism insurance. That is why I am glad TRIA will pass today so we can put the temporary expiration of the program behind us.

I am proud to say that attempts by the other body to either not pass the program or so limit it that it would be ineffective, which happened as recently as within the last few days, have failed. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I thank MIKE CRAPO who was the ranking member of the banking committee, and I thank Speaker BOEHNER and Leader MCCARTHY for understanding the importance of passing this legislation. The negotiated bill between Chairman HENSARLING and me preserves the terrorism insurance program largely intact—just about fully intact—to what it was before and has successfully worked. We did not back off on what we had to do.

As I have said before, it is regrettable that extraneous measures were at-

tached. They should be openly debated. That is why I will be fully supporting the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. But terrorism insurance will be renewed, and I am very glad for that.

I thank Senator JOHNSON, the former chairman; I thank Senator BROWN, the present ranking member, and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly those who voted yes—from BERNIE SANDERS to TED CRUZ—who saw the worthiness and the necessity of this program, which will now go forward.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 1 offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, Ms. WARREN.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 66, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 1 Leg.)

YEAS—31

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

Hirono
Kaine
Leahy
Markey
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Reed

Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—66

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Bennet
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Corker

Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Donnelly
Enzi
Ernst
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hatch

Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Lankford
Lee
Manchin
McCain

McCaskill
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Peters
Portman

Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby

Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer

Capito

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of the amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 2 Leg.)

YEAS—93

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boozman
Brown
Burr
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer

Flake
Franken
Gardner
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Lankford
Leahy
Lee
Manchin
Markey
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran

Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Paul
Perdue
Peters
Portman
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Sasse
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Sessions
Shaheen
Shelby
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Udall
Vitter
Warner
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—4

Cantwell
Rubio

Sanders
Warren

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer

Capito

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill (H.R. 26) is passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. on Monday, January 12, the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone Pipeline, be agreed to, and that Senator MURKOWSKI be recognized to offer a substitute amendment that is the text of the committee-reported bill.

Before the Chair rules, for the information of all Senators, it is the intention of the chairman and the leadership on this side of the aisle to ask that the two bill managers or their designees offer amendments in an alternating fashion to allow for an open amendment process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to S. 1.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending motion to proceed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, Tim Scott, John Boozman, Ron Johnson, Lindsey Graham, James Lankford, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Rand Paul, Kelly Ayotte, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, David Vitter, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the mandatory quorum be waived and the vote on the motion to invoke cloture occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, January 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, we had hoped to begin working on the bipartisan Hoeven Keystone jobs and infrastructure bill today. We had hoped to continue offering amendments tomorrow. Unfortunately, some of our colleagues across the aisle ob-

jected to proceeding to this bipartisan legislation so that forces a few changes to the schedule.

First, it means we will have to file cloture on the motion to proceed, which I just did; and then, as a result, it means under the rules of the Senate we won't be able to begin offering amendments until next week.

Frankly, it is unfortunate. Many Senators on both sides had hoped to use tomorrow to work on the bill, and I did as well. But we will work through this because we are determined to get bipartisan jobs legislation on the President's desk as soon as we can.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I know we are all concerned right now with the progress that is going to be made on the pipeline, and I would like to make a few comments about it.

I have three charts. Let us look at this one from Oklahoma. I want to remind everyone that we had a visitor to the State of Oklahoma—the only time, I understand, the President has been in Oklahoma. President Obama came to Cushing, OK.

Let me explain where Cushing, OK, is. It is in the central part of the State, and it is the hub of all the pipelines—all the way from Canada down to New Mexico. Of course this is the pipeline in question here that we have been talking about over and over now for months and months and months, and it is one we understand just how great it would be. So the President, knowing this is very popular—and this trip was, in fact, actually before the election—made a trip to Oklahoma and talked about how good—well, I will actually read the quote. Keep in mind this was in Cushing, OK, right in the middle of the hub of the pipelines going through. The President said he was directing his administration “to make this project a priority, to go ahead and get it done.”

That sounded real good. The problem was everyone in Oklahoma knew he wasn't telling the truth. I don't like to stand here and use the “L” word, because nothing really gets done by it, but he has done everything since that time to destroy the pipeline.

The President was making the statement then that he was not going to stand in the way of furthering the production of this pipeline to go down south through Texas. Well, there is good reason for that, because he couldn't do anything about it. It doesn't go across any international borders. But where he has blocked this

is where he can do so, because it crosses the international border between Canada and the United States.

I want to mention that there is a person who has been very active in the political realm. His name is Tom Steyer. He has been very much involved. Quite frankly, I don't object to people who are right forward and honest about what their intentions are. This is the man—Tom Steyer, who is a billionaire—and he has had several meetings and said that he was going to put up \$50 million of his own money and raise an additional \$50 million—that is \$100 million—to put in races in the coming election, meaning this last November.

It is my understanding that, in the final analysis, he wasn't able to raise the extra money, but of his own money—and these are his words, not mine—he put in \$70 million. Mr. Steyer said:

It is true we expect to be heavily involved in the midterm elections . . . we are looking at a bunch of . . . races My guess is that we'll end up being involved in 8 or even more races.

So we are talking about some \$70 million that was going to be involved, and I would say that wasn't a real good investment because he didn't win any of those 8 races and actually netted out a loss of 9 races.

So again, he has a stated goal to try to do two things with his influence and his money. Again, I don't criticize him for this. He believes in his cause. His two causes are No. 1, to try to stop any further development on Federal land—in other words, to try to do what he can with some of the suggested pollution and all these things that are supposed to go with it—and another thing is to stop the pipeline.

Again, he was the one who made the statement. He also has been very influential in this administration. It has been reported—this was about 2 weeks ago—that he had visited the Obama White House some 14 times, which led a member of the watchdog group Public Citizen to say: “Tom Steyer has not just got the ear of the President, but he clearly has the President's attention.”

Now, these White House meetings were often with President Obama's counselor and chief environmental adviser John Podesta. We all know John Podesta. We have known his background for a long time. Personally, I have known him. He has lobbied for Mr. Steyer to be the U.S. Secretary of Energy, saying, “I think he would be a fabulous choice for energy secretary, and I've let my friends in the administration know that.” The reports also show that Mr. Steyer and Mr. Podesta have met with George Soros, one of the liberal billionaires.

So this effort is going on, and I think it is necessary to remind the American people because it has probably been about 6 months since anyone has even

talked about some of the obstacles we can look forward to that are in the way of getting the things done that need to be done.

The President tries to downplay the job numbers. We talk about the 42,000 jobs. The President said a couple days ago: Wait, those are just temporary jobs. Well, all jobs are temporary, but these jobs will be there for a number of years and will lead to others.

The President tries to downplay the numbers by using rhetoric that has earned his statements multiple Pinocchios. The Washington Post has a program where they check the facts, and several times he has been the recipient of these Pinocchio awards.

Unfortunately, his attitude toward construction and manufacturing jobs is one that would stop jobs for hard-working Americans.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and this is very significant. We are talking about jobs. We are talking about important jobs. We are talking about high-paying jobs. I am a little biased because in Cushing, OK, we are the hub of these pipelines going through America. So what is going to positively affect our economy nationwide will probably be even more in my State of Oklahoma.

The President has done a lot of talking about the transportation infrastructure. Of course, this pipeline is part of it. We think about transportation infrastructure as roads, highways, and bridges. I applaud every time I hear him saying we need to do something about our transportation infrastructure. Unfortunately, it is always just words. He never follows through. He had a program on two different occasions that was going to be very ambitious and was going to start constructing new highways. He was very specific about where they were going to go. But then that was the end of it. He got the word out there, and everyone heard about it and agreed that he must be for highways, but then he forgot about it.

I am pretty biased here because I chair the Environment and Public Works Committee that deals with all the infrastructure. I would say this: We are embarking on a very ambitious transportation reauthorization bill, and it is one that is going to include lots of modes of transportation. Of course, it would all be a part of this pipeline and the benefits that are coming through it. So I would say he does a lot of talking about that, but we are going to really have to get down and do it.

I often wonder what could have happened 6 years ago. Just to refresh our memories, the first thing this President did was his \$825 billion stimulus bill. How better could you stimulate the economy than having an ambitious transportation bill? I remember my colleague on the other side of the aisle,

BARBARA BOXER, and I offered amendments on this amount. I, of course, vigorously opposed the \$825 billion—that was a checkbook given to the President in the opening months of his office. But the fact was that it was going to pass, and we knew they had the votes to pass it right down party lines—which it did—and then he was going to be in a position to say: We are now going to be doing these things. So BARBARA BOXER and I thought, well, let's get a percentage. I think our amendment was 8 percent would be reserved—a modest amount—for highways. If we really want to stimulate the economy, there is no better way to do it than that way.

That is kind of a background of what has been happening.

I really believe, now that we have a majority, that we are going to get busy and try to get this done and will be successful in doing it. We have a lot of critical infrastructure projects. This is supported by the chamber of commerce and by labor unions. Almost everyone out there is in support of this.

Yesterday, I think it was, in one of the committee hearings—I wanted to make sure this was properly answered in the committee hearing because it was in a committee that I am not on, the energy committee.

One of my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle made the statement: We are very proud of the President because our production has dramatically increased during the 6 years he has been President of the United States.

Yes, that is true, but it has been in spite of the President. Let me give a couple statistics that people are not aware of. In the shale revolution taking place in this country, we have increased, during that period of time, our production—we are really talking about shale production—by 61 percent. So 61 percent in 5 years. That is what it has been. But all 61 percent of that has been on private and State land. On Federal land—over which President Obama has jurisdiction and can stop it—while the rest has increased by 61 percent, it has decreased by 6 percent.

I think we need to make sure to remind people because we don't want the public thinking that somehow the President is not involved in a war on fossil fuels. He is definitely involved in a war on fossil fuels.

Let me mention one other thing about the shale revolution. Because of the Marcellus, what is happening back East—people have always historically thought about the West and the State of Oklahoma as being kind of where all the oil is and where the production is. That really was true for a long period of time, but with the Marcellus coming in, Pennsylvania, New York—the Northeast has been a heavy production area. In fact, I have heard figures that in Pennsylvania, the second largest employer right now is people involved

in the shale production that is taking place there. I don't know that it is the second largest, but that has not yet been refuted.

So very important things are happening there, but the key to making all of this happen is the pipeline. We know that eventually we are going to be there, but there has already been a veto threat. We are going to pass a bill. I know we are going to pass a bill. It is going to pass the House and the Senate. The President will probably veto it. He said he would. I am inclined to think that a lot of my friends on the Democratic side are going to stop and think "Wait a minute, this is good for everyone," and there will be a bunch of people overriding a veto. I really believe something like that is going to happen, this is so significant.

People have said: The reason we don't want this is because it is dirty. This is up in Alberta, Canada. This is going to affect the environment.

First of all, it won't. People understand that is just not a true statement. But if it were true, it is something that is ridiculous because China is already making their deal. It has been made public that China wants to have transportation across Canada that would go to the west coast and be able to be sent over to China. If that should happen, in terms of the pollution, since they don't have any safeguards over there, that would result in increasing, not decreasing, any pollution that would be associated with this production.

I know a lot of people want to talk about this. To give an idea of what all is there in moving this production around, this is a very significant chart because it shows what is out there today and what can be produced. A minute ago I talked about the Northeast. That is the Marcellus we are talking about. It is a huge benefit out there. Yet a lot of the people who represent that part of America are not even aware that this is not just the Western United States. Just look at that, and we can see.

We have an opportunity here. I feel very strongly that our friends up there with the pipeline coming down—everyone is going to benefit. We have seen the charts. Certainly the Presiding Officer has many times pulled out the charts that show the great benefits that are going to be there for the entire country, along with our rapid path to be totally independent of any other country in our ability to produce our own energy.

This is a win-win situation. We are eventually going to get it but the sooner the better. I applaud the Chair and others involved in the legislation we are going to be considering.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we have begun the new year of the 114th Congress with a Republican majority and a fresh commitment to get Congress working again.

Overwhelmingly, Americans supported the progrowth ideas of the Republican Party in the polls in the November election, sending a strong message about their frustration with the gridlock we have experienced in the Democratic-led Senate.

So it is time to get to work, time to return to regular order and to debate openly legislation, to move bills through committee, to allow Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments, and to get the Senate back on track passing bills the way it should be. The American people deserve a Senate that works, and the new Republican majority intends to deliver.

That is why it is so disappointing that President Obama would threaten to veto the very first bill Republicans plan to bring to the Senate floor for a vote—a bipartisan vote to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline, a bill that was introduced here in the Senate with 60 cosponsors.

The Keystone XL Pipeline enjoys widespread public support, and that is not surprising. Polls have demonstrated that the American people are concerned about jobs and the economy, and they want to get the country working again and to strengthen our energy independence. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help do just that. Yet President Obama would rather hold the economy hostage to the far leftwing of his party than put American workers first. His war on energy runs counter to what this country needs—jobs and the affordable energy that will support them.

I have shared time and time again on the Senate floor what President Obama's own State Department has said about the project. The State Department has concluded the pipeline will not only support 42,000 jobs during construction, but it will do so without significant impact on the environment—and, I might add, without spending a cent of taxpayer money.

The Keystone XL Pipeline has been stuck in limbo for over 6 years and has become more than just an energy issue. In my own State of South Dakota, rail backlogs have caused tremendous delays for farmers trying to get their harvests to market. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help alleviate this backlog by taking 100,000 barrels of Montana and North Dakota oil off the rails, freeing up nearly two unit-trains per day of capacity that is sorely needed by other rail shippers.

The pipeline will also bring tax revenue to South Dakota. The State Department estimates that in my home State of South Dakota alone, the construction of the pipeline will support 3,000 to 4,000 jobs during construction and generate well over \$100 million in earnings. It will bring more than \$20 million in annual property taxes to South Dakota counties. Places like Jones County, where I grew up, could greatly benefit by having this added tax revenue for their schools.

The Keystone XL Pipeline will also decrease our reliance on oil from dangerous countries such as Venezuela. Yet President Obama and some Democrats continue to downplay all these benefits. They say the jobs are mostly temporary. Well, construction jobs are temporary by nature, but that doesn't mean they don't matter. Rather, it means we need to keep new projects such as Keystone XL coming to spur growth and to develop new infrastructure. By shutting down what would be a routine energy infrastructure project, President Obama is creating a difficult environment for future development and projects.

The far leftwing of the President's party claim the pipeline will increase greenhouse gases, but reports from the President's own State Department undermine his claim. In its final supplemental environmental impact statement, the President's State Department noted that the Keystone XL Pipeline is "unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States."

In other words, the emissions associated with the oil sands extractions will not change whether or not the pipeline is built. While oil prices may impact the production rate of oil sands, the State Department also found that "the dominant drivers of oil sands development are more global than any single infrastructure project" and that "the industry's rate of expansion should not be conflated with the more limited effects of individual pipelines." And mind you, this is again from one of the five exhaustive reports we have seen from the State Department about this project.

In fact, the State Department's final environmental impact statement also compared the operational greenhouse emissions that would result from the pipeline to those that would result from various transportation alternatives such as rail, rail and pipeline, and rail and tanker. The report found that the annual emissions from these alternative transportation modes would be anywhere from 28 percent to 42 percent greater than if the oil were shipped through the pipeline. Plus, a pipeline is safer than truck or rail.

The American people have been clear on their feelings about this project.

Poll after poll has shown their strong support for it. Republicans support the pipeline, Democrats in both Houses of Congress support the pipeline, and unions support the pipeline. The only people who seem to oppose it are President Obama and members of the far leftwing of the Democratic Party.

After the Senate passes the bill, it will have one final hurdle to clear—the President of the United States. I very much hope he will reconsider his veto threat and listen to the voices of American workers and the bipartisan majority in both Houses of Congress.

If the pipeline's economic benefits, the support of the American people, and five successful environmental reviews have not yet convinced the President to approve this project, I am pretty skeptical that he ever will approve it, but I hope I am wrong.

I hope even more Democrats here in the Senate will join us and send a message about their readiness to work with Republicans in this 114th Congress.

My colleagues can help show the American people that Congress has heard their demands for change in Washington and that their economic priorities will be addressed.

I am sorry American workers have had to wait years for this project, but I am hopeful we can resolve this issue once and for all. The new Republican Senate majority is about creating jobs and economic opportunities for the American people, and it starts right here, right now with the Keystone XL Pipeline.

We hope Democrats and the President will join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, even during moments of intense polarization here in Washington, especially over the past 6 years, it is really kind of refreshing to find a topic—maybe a handful of topics—on which there appears to be bipartisan consensus, and that includes the topic du jour, the Keystone XL Pipeline. I wish to share a few reasons why I believe that is the case.

First, the Keystone XL Pipeline will be good for our economy, and it will be good because it will create jobs. I know there is some hairsplitting out there. Some people say: Well, these are not really good jobs; they are only temporary jobs or some such thing. But the truth is—I will tell you what the President's own administration said about that.

The State Department—President Obama's State Department—said that roughly 42,000 American jobs would be created directly and indirectly from the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Now, it is true that some of these would be temporary construction positions, but by their nature, construction

positions are such that you go to work on one job, finish that job, and move on to the next job. If the President has a problem with that, I am not sure what he or anybody else can do about it. There are also other permanent jobs that will be created by this Keystone XL Pipeline related to refining and transporting this oil, and many of them will be in Texas.

As a matter of fact, this pipeline—which will go from Canada into North Dakota and across the United States—will end in southeast Texas, where we have most of our refining capacity here in the United States. It will then be refined into gasoline and other types of fuel.

By the way, one of the blessings of having a plentiful supply of oil as a result of what has happened here in the United States is lower gasoline prices. Boy, those came just in time for the Christmas holidays and put money in people's pockets. It was like a pay raise for hard-working American taxpayers.

The President has also tried to downplay the job-creation impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline by saying it would have a "nominal" impact on consumers and the Nation. I am curious. At a time when the national labor participation rate is hovering at its lowest point in three decades and we are coming off of the financial crisis that we have had since 2008—which has finally, after all of these years, recovered many of the lost jobs that were lost as result of that crisis—does the President truly feel that any additional jobs—especially 42,000 additional jobs—are just nominal and not worth the candle? Well, for those people who don't work and are now able to find work, those jobs are not nominal. For the people who are working part time and want to work full time, those jobs will not be nominal. When we need to grow the economy so we create more opportunity for more hard-working taxpayers, no job, in my view, should be deprecated as just a nominal job and not worth having. That is what the President is saying.

I would also ask that the President visit the Texas leg of this pipeline. As a matter of fact, the President did go to Cushing, OK. The irony of that is, once again, the President seems to be taking credit for something he didn't have anything to do with because this domestic portion of the pipeline from Cushing, OK, down to southeast Texas didn't require his approval at all. But what does he do? He holds a press conference there. It is just like the President taking credit for this renaissance of American energy. He has had absolutely nothing to do with it. All of that has happened as a result of private investment on private lands and not on public lands.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government continues to make it harder and harder to produce more American

energy, which, again, according to the laws of supply and demand, as we have seen, will bring down gasoline prices for American consumers. At a time when wages have been stagnant for so long as a result of the policies of this administration, why wouldn't we do something to put more money into the pockets of hard-working American families? Why wouldn't we do that?

Well, I would ask the President to visit the Texas leg of the pipeline, which was constructed and went operational about a year ago this month and is already transporting about 400,000 barrels of oil a day to gulf coast refineries. Of course, again, this does not require his approval, but that didn't stop him from claiming credit for it. I think he would find it edifying and educational to go there.

In Texas alone more than 4,800 jobs were created to construct that gulf coast portion of the pipeline. That includes heavy equipment operators, welders, laborers, transportation operators, and supervisory personnel. When our friends across the aisle spend so much time and effort trying to argue for a minimum wage increase, they turn around at the same time and deny hard-working Americans from earning these high-paying wages and these high-paying jobs.

I was reading an article today about a welder in Texas who went to school to learn how to be a welder. Now, it was not a 4-year liberal arts education such as many of us have had. He didn't go to law school or medical school, but he is earning \$140,000 a year as a welder. Those are good jobs. Those are the kinds of jobs we ought to encourage, and they are the kinds of jobs that the Keystone XL Pipeline would help pay for.

Well, perhaps these kinds of jobs don't count in the President's book because they are not funded by the taxpayer. In other words, they are not a result of stimulus funds. The President seems to believe that the only jobs worth having are those that are paid for by borrowing money, increasing the debt, and having the Federal Government pay for them. We have recently been down that road once before when we had the nearly \$1 trillion stimulus package. Remember that? The President said these were shovel-ready jobs.

I remember at the time Speaker PELOSI said they were targeted, temporary, and timely. I think it was. It was the three t's. The President came back later on—when the stimulus did not have the desired effect and the \$1 trillion of borrowed money, including interest, didn't create the kind of economic recovery he had hoped for—and said: Well, I guess shovel ready didn't really mean shovel ready, as if it were a joke.

Well, this Keystone XL Pipeline is paid for as a result of private investment and not as a result of tax dol-

lars—your money and my money going into this pipeline. The Texas portion of the pipeline was a \$2.3 billion private sector investment. The taxpayer funded infrastructure project seemed to be the only kind of investment the President actually wants to see and encourage. There are many examples, and perhaps the most notorious of which was Solyndra, where the Federal taxpayer was asked to sink a bunch of money into a project that basically flopped because there was no market for what they were making. It was not economically viable. But that is the kind of investment the President wants to encourage while discouraging private investment that creates jobs.

Now, in Texas we are proud of that portion of the Keystone XL Pipeline, and like so much of what makes my State successful, it was not built by the government. I am proud of the fact that my State is doing better than the rest of the country. I wish the rest of the country would do as well when it comes to job creation and opportunity because I worry, as I think many parents worry, that we are somehow losing the hope and the aspiration for the American dream. When young men and women graduate from college and can't find jobs so they end up living with their parents, we here in Washington say, that is OK, because we will let your parents keep you on their health insurance coverage until you are 26, as if that is supposed to be some kind of answer to their inability to find work commensurate with their education and training.

Well, this is not a government solution. Of course, we all remember the President notoriously said to the private sector: Well, you didn't build that. That certainly doesn't apply here because the private sector did build the Texas portion, and what we would like to do is complete the Canadian-U.S. portion so we can get even more of this oil down to Texas and refine it into gasoline so it is available to consumers here in the United States.

The President acts as though if we don't complete this pipeline, this oil is not going to be produced. That is malarkey. We know that China is starved for natural resources, and Canada is not just going to sit on this valuable natural resource. They are going to build a pipeline to the Pacific Ocean, put it on a tanker, and send it to China or other countries that need those natural resources.

Well, I am beginning to think the one reason why the Texas leg of the Keystone XL Pipeline was so successful is because the Federal Government didn't have anything to do with it. That seems to be the test. If the Federal Government has something to do with it, it ends up not delivering as promised. But if the private sector does it, it has the potential of living up to expectations.

Well, we all know the President has continued to delay making a final decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline. I know last year the distinguished Presiding Officer sponsored the bill in the House that approved the Keystone XL Pipeline. Over here in the Senate, I remember the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. Landrieu, was urging—in almost desperate terms—that Senator HARRY REID allow a vote on the Keystone XL Pipeline after denying it for many months, even years.

Well, we know what happened. It failed because very few Democrats on that side of the aisle decided to support the Keystone XL Pipeline. Perhaps it was because even at that time the President said he was undecided whether to sign it or to veto it. There have been times when the President has said—of course, he says lots of things, but I have learned one thing around Washington, DC: We can't just listen to what people say, we have to watch what they do. The President indicated, with the start of this new Congress following the November 4 election, that he was looking forward to working with the new Congress in a constructive way. I just have to ask you, Mr. President: Is it constructive to issue a veto threat on a piece of legislation before it is even voted out of the energy committee and isn't even on the floor for consideration by the Senate?

The majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, the senior Senator from Kentucky, has said we are going to have an open amendment process, a procedure many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and actually many on this side of the aisle, haven't experienced under the former majority leader—an open amendment process. I anticipate there are going to be a number of amendments offered, some of which will succeed and some of which will not succeed. I don't know anybody who can tell us right now exactly how this bill will leave the Senate, although I am confident it will pass since there are at least 63 Senators, on a bipartisan basis, who said they will vote for it. As we know, 60 is the magic number in the Senate, so we have a pretty good idea it will pass. But we don't know what other measures will be attached to it, some of which may command more Democratic votes, some of which may make the President more interested in taking another look at this legislation. So to prematurely issue a veto threat before the Keystone XL Pipeline is even voted out of committee, much less comes to the Senate floor, does not strike me as wanting to work with the Congress; just the opposite.

I say enough is enough. That is what we heard from the voters on November 4: Enough is enough. They are sick and tired of the dysfunction in Washington, DC. I heard that story daily back in Texas and around the country as I traveled: Enough is enough. We want

Congress to function. We want our elected representatives to work together to find solutions to the problems facing our country, and the No. 1 problem is not enough jobs. There are not enough good jobs for hard-working Americans.

So now the President has, in spite of this, said: I am not going to sign that legislation once it reaches my desk. He said this before the Senate has even acted on it. It is just breathtaking. Is that within the President's authority under the Constitution? Yes, it is. The President can either sign legislation or he can veto legislation. The Constitution gives him that authority. But I think the President ought to have to explain to the American people his reasons for saying he will not sign this legislation. Again, this is the same project his own State Department said would create 42,000 jobs, again at a time when the percentage of people in the workforce is at a 30-year low. While unemployment is coming down, unfortunately a lot of it has to do with the fact that people are not looking for work and have dropped out of the workforce. They have given up. Hopefully, in spite of the Federal Government—and I say it is in spite of the Federal Government—the economy seems to be strong enough to be growing, finally, but we need to continue to have our economy grow. We need to continue to let this American economy create jobs for hard-working American taxpayers.

I say in closing that I hope the President makes his decision not wearing ideological blinders, not just listening to the hard left base of the Democratic Party that thinks we can somehow survive and prosper with only wind turbines and solar panels. By the way, Texas actually produces more electricity on wind energy than any other State in the Nation. We do believe in an “all of the above” policy. The President says he does but apparently does not, at least his actions would so indicate.

So we are missing out on a golden opportunity to further enhance North American energy security with one of our strongest allies, and that is another very important reason for this. Why in the world would we continue to import oil from Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Middle East that have their own problems, in an unstable region of the world, when we could import that oil from our best ally and next-door neighbor, Canada, and in a way that benefits our economy and creates jobs.

I believe what the American people said on November 4 is they want effective, efficient, and accountable government and one that benefits all hard-working Americans and especially hard-working American taxpayers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO JEANNE ATKINS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Jeanne Atkins, my Oregon State director, who is retiring from team Merkley this month. Jeanne is a long-serving member of my team, and she is an outstanding public servant, an individual who has dedicated her life to making the world a better place.

Jeanne Atkins and I first began working together a decade ago after I took up the post of Democratic leader in the Oregon State House. It was a challenging but exciting time as my leadership team worked to build our policy agenda and get our caucus operations up to speed. A key component of that effort, of course, was to hire a superb caucus director. Thus, it came to pass that four members of my leadership team were seated in the Old Wives' Tale restaurant brainstorming over candidates for the position. That group consisted, in addition to myself, of Diane Rosenbaum, who is now majority leader of the Oregon Senate; Dave Hunt, who became majority leader of the house and then speaker of the Oregon House; and Brad Avakian, who is now Oregon's labor commissioner. As we were brainstorming, Diane spoke up and said: I know someone who would be tremendous, but I am sure she would never take the position. Dave Hunt encouraged Diane to put the name forward anyway, and when Diane said the person is Jeanne Atkins, Brad Avakian responded: Jeanne? I know her, and she would be great.

We immediately called Jeanne, and by that evening I was sitting in her living room attempting to persuade her that she would be just the right person for the position and that, moreover, she would enjoy the challenge. Fortunately for us, Jeanne did take the position, and thus began a decade of close collaboration.

The leadership, conviction, and hard work Jeanne Atkins brought to our team allowed us to make a big impact as the minority party during the legislature and an even bigger impact when we won the majority 2 years later. At that point I became speaker of the Oregon House and Jeanne became my chief of staff.

Few legislative sessions in Oregon history have seen the passage of as many major bills as that 2007 session, and no individual was more important to the success of that session than Jeanne Atkins.

We passed domestic partnerships and a broad-based civil rights bill that outlawed discrimination against LGBT Oregonians in employment, in housing, and in public accommodations.

We passed legislation setting ambitious renewable energy standards and making Oregon a national leader in the transition to green energy. We cracked down on predatory payday lenders that were bankrupting our working families. We passed the Access to Birth

Control Act requiring insurance plans in Oregon to cover contraceptives just as they do other medication, a law that is now helping to shield Oregon women from the misguided Hobby Lobby decision.

Through this all, we worked across the aisle, encouraging bipartisan cooperation, and were able to put together a session that a major newspaper, *The Oregonian*, deemed the most productive in a generation.

After I was elected to the U.S. Senate and took that office in January of 2009, Jeanne stayed on in the Oregon House as chief of staff to the new speaker, Dave Hunt, who had helped to hire her 6 years earlier. In that role, Jeanne played a pivotal role in expanding health care to Oregon children. As Dave relates, after Oregonians rejected a ballot measure in 2008 that would have raised the cigarette tax to expand health care to low-income children, the Oregon Legislature was seeking an alternative strategy to fund that expansion. Jeanne was the key staff member who brought a contentious dialogue among legislators to a compromise funding strategy that was successfully passed into law. That achievement brought health care to an additional 90,000 children per year. Well done, Jeanne. That was an extraordinary accomplishment.

After the completion of that Oregon legislative session, I was hoping I would have the opportunity to bring Jeanne back onto team Merkley. The stars aligned and she became my Oregon State director in August of 2009.

Oregon's House loss was the U.S. Senate's gain. In her more than 5 years as State director, Jeanne has overseen hundreds of townhalls, thousands of meetings, and has made sure the millions of Americans who call Oregon home have a voice in the U.S. Senate. I wrote the day I hired her as Oregon State director that "Jeanne is greatly respected by Oregonians of all political stripes for her hard work and her dedication to this State." Today, that statement is even more true than 5 years ago.

Jeanne is known across the State as an honest broker who works hard to bring the voices of all Oregonians into our office. She is a tough advocate for our State and has never hesitated to stand up for what she thinks is right and what she thinks is best for Oregon.

Of course, over the last 5 years, we have also had the chance to get into a few adventures—and a few misadventures—traveling around the State. On one memorable townhall swing, we were on our way between rural townhalls when I suggested an impromptu revision of our route. I thought it would be interesting to take a shortcut via a minor semipaved road. That road turned out to have been abandoned so long ago that after a few miles it was no longer even visible. So there we

were traveling off-road in a van that was not designed for off-road navigation, wondering if we were choosing the right path through the field or between the trees. To make matters worse, we quickly lost cell phone communication and couldn't alert the advance team that we were going to be late to the townhall. In fact, we were wondering whether we might be out there in the woods for a night or two as we worked to walk our way out should we break an axle or blow a tire.

Through this all, though I could tell Jeanne's blood pressure and distress were elevating, she displayed the same unflappable demeanor that made her so effective in contentious policy dialogues with overwrought legislators. In that moment and in so many others, Jeanne was grace under pressure personified.

Jeanne is not someone who got into politics to be important or powerful. She got into policy and politics because she believed in public service and she believed that each person has the power to make a difference. It is one of the attributes I most value about having her on my team. It is an attribute that has allowed her to make a huge impact in many of the different positions she has held.

Today, as Jeanne looks forward to the next chapter of her life in retirement, it seems only appropriate to reflect back and look at the huge difference Jeanne has made not just in our office but over the course of her career. She has been a longtime advocate for women's rights. This comes from her childhood growing up in Bremerton, WA, in the 1960s. Her own experiences also shaped Jeanne's steadfast determination for equality.

She told me a story about her first job out of college as a bank teller in Seattle, WA. During that first job, the women in the bank, regardless of their position, were required to take turns making lunch for the entire bank every Friday. Jeanne worked hard to shine at this task, just as she worked hard to shine at all her other tasks, but she knew it was wrong that all the women in the office were treated differently than the men, and she carried her passion for that throughout her career.

Jeanne went to work for the Women's Equity Action League here in Washington, DC, and when she and her husband John went back to Oregon she worked for the Oregon Women's Rights Coalition, the United Way of the Columbia/Willamette, Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette, and then as manager of the Women's and Reproductive Health Section of the Department of Human Services. Her long and storied career has been powerfully connected to equality and an unshakable commitment to women's health.

Along the way, Jeanne also engaged in electoral politics. She ran for the

Oregon house twice in the early 1990s, narrowly losing against a well-established incumbent in her second race. As Brad Avakian relates, in the process, she restored door-to-door canvassing and relationship building in Washington County as a political art form.

Jeanne Atkins is an Oregon gem. I wish her the best in retirement and know that she has many more adventures ahead and many more contributions to make.

Thank you, Jeanne, for working hard to make Oregon, our Nation, and our world a better place. We will miss you.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today at the start of this new year and this new Congress to speak about how we can and why we must work together to improve the Affordable Care Act.

Since work on health care reform really began in earnest in 2009, debate in this Chamber and across this country has too often been defined by fantastic claims and fearmongering. In the midst of this division, I believe that too often the experiences of real people have been lost. While politicians on both sides cling to their sacred cows, too many Americans become casualties of our divided politics.

On few issues has this been more true than on health care. Critics of the Affordable Care Act seem locked into the belief that it will bring about America's demise—despite little evidence to support them. Too often they have been unable or unwilling to grapple with the reality of those whose lives the law has forever changed for the better.

Now, on the other side of the aisle, we—mostly Democrats—have often shied away from acknowledging some of the law's weaknesses. I know many of my colleagues have been eager and have offered fixes to the law. But without willing Republican partners, we have not made enough progress.

As I have spent time in my home State of Delaware in recent months listening to families and other folks who have been affected by the law—for better or for worse—it has become clear to me that this stalemate is unsustainable. On many days, I have met Delawareans who love the Affordable Care Act, whose lives have literally been saved by it. But in between those encounters, I have also met many, small business owners in particular, who want to offer health insurance to their workers and are struggling to afford it.

This much has become clear to me: No conversation about the Affordable Care Act and how to improve it can be complete without reconciling the reality of the millions of Americans it has helped and the many others for whom it falls short.

Michelle Reed is the Delawarean whom I have come to know and admire with breast cancer and who contacted me first about this issue last fall. She is an example of why the Affordable Care Act is so important. Michelle was first diagnosed with cancer back in 2008 and went through month after painful month of chemo and radiation therapy as well as surgery.

Over the next few years since her cancer nightmare began she faced problems that were sadly typical of how our health insurance system used to work. At the time she was first diagnosed, she and her husband received health insurance through her husband's employer. Her husband is an auto mechanic and worked for a small auto body shop. But though the insurance he got through his work was helpful for routine minor health care needs, it was a barebones insurance policy, as she explained it to me.

It left her and her husband with extremely high copays, straining their family budget. Naturally her husband began looking for a new job to provide better health insurance. But this ended up being much more difficult than it seemed, because transitioning to a new job often required accepting a large 3-month gap in coverage, a gap Michelle just could not afford, as insurance companies would then deny her care considering her cancer a preexisting condition.

At one point during Michelle's years of treatment, her husband's employer switched health care plans and in the process missed one premium payment. Suddenly, after months of having had steady, positive progress in her care, without any warning or notification, Michelle started getting bills—not just small bills but huge bills, a bill for \$23,000 for radiation.

It took her months of going back and forth between employer and insurance company, all the while as she is also trying to overcome her disease, before Michelle and her husband got a straight answer about why they were suddenly facing these huge costs.

Now, let's step back for a second. Just imagine where she was. Michelle has cancer. She is shuttling from chemo to radiation. Her husband is working constantly to try to cover the high premiums, trying to get all of the overtime he can. During this, they are also going back and forth between employer and insurance company, trying to figure out where this new high charge they cannot afford had come from.

Meanwhile, Michelle's husband was out looking for a new job with better

insurance, struggling to find one because Michelle would face discrimination and could not get coverage. The emotional strain on a family and a loved one battling cancer is enormous, almost unimaginable. But if you add to that the financial and the emotional stress caused by our relic of a health care insurance system of that time, that is unimaginable.

Yet this is the reality that Michelle and her family faced. Unfortunately, it is the reality that millions of Americans used to face before the Affordable Care Act. These problems all changed last year when the ACA exchanges came on line. As Michelle wrote to me: The ACA open enrollment began and we could not get signed up quick enough, although it did take her a little while because the administration's Web site had some problems. She persevered. As she said to me in her note: We have no problems now. We have what we need, and we need what we have.

People like Michelle are why Democrats passed the Affordable Care Act in the first place. It is because of the law that millions of Americans now have access to quality and affordable health insurance that was once desperately out of reach for them.

But the story is not complete, unless we are clear-eyed about where this law also falls short. As the President and many have recognized, any significant reform such as the Affordable Care Act is going to have weaknesses and unintended consequences that only become apparent after the law is being implemented. This has been true throughout our history with every major event, and health care reform is no different.

In Delaware, among the many whom the law has helped, I have also seen how some of those reforms in the costs they have incurred have hurt small business. To the small business owners with whom I have sat down and listened to, their employees are not labor costs or rows on a balance sheet. They are family. They have worked together for years and owners provide health insurance because they believe it is the right thing to do for the workers who help their business grow.

Many of the folks I have sat down and visited with are not required to provide insurance because they have fewer than 50 full-time workers. They still want to do so because it is the right thing to do. It helps them incentivize and support their best employees. Many, though, are struggling today because of higher costs and the challenges that come with navigating a changed insurance market.

This year the biggest issue they face is how higher quality standards have also caused premiums to increase—often to unaffordable levels. This has been especially true for a small State such as like Delaware, where there is not a lot of competition in the provi-

sion of health care or in our insurance market. Unfortunately, some of the increases are also due to insurance companies using the health care law as an excuse to charge more.

Some of this is simply the result of plans that now cover more are costing more. For the most part, that is not a bad thing. But the Affordable Care Act was designed to compensate for increased quality with financial assistance to those who cannot afford it. In Michelle Reed's case, this increased quality was great—almost literally life saving. For people such as her, those insurance plans now need to meet certain standards, and in particular, that they can no longer discriminate against preexisting conditions.

But we have also seen that even though there is assistance to many, some individuals and some small businesses have fallen into gaps where they have to deal with higher costs and they are not getting the help they deserve.

Here is where we are. The Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans. It also can be improved to help many more. When we talk about health care, it is simply dishonest to leave one side out when talking about others.

In this new Congress, I know many of my Republican colleagues are eager to continue the efforts of their colleagues in the House. In their majority, I know many will seek an opportunity to vote on repealing or dismantling the Affordable Care Act. But I ask them for an answer to Michelle Reed and to the many Americans such as her who have had their lives changed or even saved by this law.

I know many of my Democratic colleagues are as well eager to work together to improve our health care system, to ensure small businesses do the right thing and can be successful and to ensure that no American gets left behind. We know this is possible. There is no reason to believe that we as a body lack the creativity, the drive, and the ability to work together across the aisle on these important issues.

Surely there is much we can do to reduce the costs through more competition, to develop new and more efficient delivery systems and innovative payment models. The Affordable Care Act took critical steps to move forward in each of these areas. Millions more have health insurance and costs across our health care system have actually increased at the slowest rate in decades. For most, costs have been manageable or even decreasing. But critical work remains. We now have the opportunity, to take the next step to build a health care system that works for every American. It is my sincere hope that we can come together and seize that opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URGENT PRIORITIES

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, these will be my first remarks of the 114th Congress. I am encouraged by the commitment of many of my colleagues, including the majority leader, to restoring the Senate as one of America's great institutions. It is time for us to get to work. We begin this Congress with a number of urgent priorities—not the least of which is job creation.

More than 9 million Americans are still unemployed. More significantly, perhaps, millions more have given up looking for work. The latest jobs report from the Department of Labor shows that the labor force participation rate is only 62.8 percent—one of the lowest levels in 36 years. This number matters because it reflects the size of the U.S. workforce. It reflects how many working-age Americans have a job or are actively looking for one.

Now, some people have suggested we should take heart in the latest job figures, that this points to an improving economy. I disagree with that. I am not at all satisfied with these employment numbers, particularly with the fact that only 62 percent of eligible members of the labor force actually are choosing to participate.

To me, a shrinking workforce points to a weak economy. Boosting the job market is important to boosting future economic growth. I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance job-creating legislation that has a positive impact on American's daily lives. Fortunately, dozens of job bills were passed during the last term of Congress by the House of Representatives.

These ideas deserve consideration and debate in this Chamber. I think in the new Congress, these ideas will receive that consideration. I am aware that there is likely to be disagreement about the details, disagreement about the merits of some of the progrowth ideas that have come over to us from the House of Representatives, as well as proposals concerning energy and health care, to name a few. But resolving our differences is part of what make this Chamber and our country unique. In a floor speech early last year, Leader McCONNELL said: I am certain of one thing. The Senate can be better.

I think that is one of the messages from the American people in last November and last December's election. The American people believe the Senate can be better. We each have a responsibility and a role in making the Senate better. We could start by legislating through the committee process. We have begun doing that already. Instead of backroom deals, pushed through at the last minute, which has

been the order of the day in past years, bills should be thoroughly debated and vetted—first in committee and then on the Senate floor.

The issues of our day deserve that attention. Forging consensus takes effort, but that is how the Senate is supposed to work. Our consideration next week will demonstrate that this is a new day in the Senate. I look forward to being a part of the debate and the amendment process on the Keystone XL Pipeline proposal.

Offering amendments is a way in which each of us can have input on the legislation at hand—input on behalf of our constituents, the people who sent us here. For too long the amendment tree has been filled by the majority leader, essentially limiting the right of every Member to voice the concerns and opinions of the people they represent, essentially limiting the our right to represent the people of our States who sent us here.

Instead of a series of continuing resolutions, we should return to the process of 12 separate appropriations bills. In doing so, we could carefully assess Federal spending and reduce waste, and I think the American people sent that message to us also in November and December. The Federal debt has reached unprecedented levels, forcing us to make tough decisions on how to do more with less.

With regard to national defense, I look forward, during the 114th Congress, to serving as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower. Our subcommittee has a wide range of oversight responsibilities, including the procurement, sustainment, and research and development needs of the Navy and Marine Corps.

From classified briefings and other hearings with senior officials in the Navy and intelligence community, I am well aware of the imminent and emerging threats facing our sea services. America should maintain its ability to project power around the world while upholding our obligations to our friends and allies.

Our Navy is now the smallest it has been since World War I, demanding, I believe, a robust investment in sea power.

In the coming weeks the Seapower Subcommittee will hold hearings to determine whether the President's budget proposals for the Department of the Navy are sufficient to meet our national security requirements. Following these hearings, we will draft the Defense authorization bill to deliver important capabilities and support for our sailors and marines. This support includes funding for construction of various types and classes of ships, such as aircraft carriers, amphibious ships, submarines, and large and small surface combatants.

I wish to note that supporting the Department of Defense is best done

when Congress legislates under regular order. The Republican-led Senate should take up a defense authorization bill and a defense appropriations bill, and we are committed to doing so. Regular order will help provide our military planners with valuable budget predictability—something they have suffered without in past years.

I was very pleased to learn this week that Chairman McCain plans for the Armed Services Committee to mark up a defense authorization bill before Memorial Day. Our committee did that under the leadership of Senator Levin last year, but where this Senate fell down on its responsibility is that we didn't get the bill to the floor until December, and then it was in a rushed and unamendable form.

Our goal under regular order is for us to take up the bill on the floor this summer and have a conference report between the House and the Senate reported before August. I am heartened that Chairman McCain intends to do this. I am heartened by the commitment of the distinguished majority leader that we will indeed take up that legislation before the end of the fiscal year.

I should also observe that, absent congressional action, budget sequestration will return to the Defense Department in October of this year. Sequestration remains one of the greatest challenges facing our military. Unless we take action, the ability of our military and our industrial base to react to unforeseen contingencies will be severely eroded, and there will undoubtedly be unforeseen contingencies. There are always unforeseen contingencies, and we will be unprepared for them unless we take action to prevent sequestration.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Budget Committee, I will work to help forge a bipartisan path so we can avert a return to the across-the-board defense cuts under sequestration. I am so pleased that a bipartisan task force within the Armed Services Committee is already taking shape to discuss this issue. We will begin to have discussions beginning Monday and Tuesday of next week.

With regard to commerce, I also look forward to assuming the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet. My chief focus will continue to be the deployment and adoption of broadband in rural America—something I am interested in as a Senator from Mississippi and something the distinguished Presiding Officer is interested in as a Senator from Louisiana.

Broadband has become a vital economic engine in this country and around the world. In many ways, the proliferation of the Internet is like the construction of the Interstate Highway System in the 1950s. We need to ensure that people in rural areas have the

same quality broadband as those in urban areas. To that end, our committee will continue to examine ways to foster broadband growth and development. We also need to find ways to make more spectrum available for wireless, which can help spur innovation and economic growth in the mobile broadband space.

I also expect the Senate this year to deal with legislation regarding the Environmental Protection Agency and the Obama administration's environmental executive overreach. The administration has proposed a litany of costly environmental rules, targeting everything from coal-fired powerplants, to small streams, to small ponds. Many would cause significant economic harm, while providing little or no help to the environment—no help to the environment but significant economic harm. By EPA's own estimates, its recently proposed ground-level ozone rules could cost taxpayers as much as \$44 billion per year, making it the most expensive rulemaking to date. Meanwhile, EPA's clean powerplant rule could lead to a loss of 224,000 jobs each year. These costs are staggering.

I am pleased that the final omnibus appropriations bill for fiscal year 2015, which was passed in December, included limits on the controversial waters of the United States proposal, which regulates small ponds, streams, and puddles. However, I remain committed to ensuring that this rule will not be implemented at all. By broadening the definition of "waters of the United States," Washington bureaucrats would potentially regulate puddles and ditches on farms and in backyards. Is this really what is necessary to protect the environment? Is this really what the American people require?

These regulations would have significant impact on the State of Mississippi. Our economic growth depends on agriculture, and it depends on manufacturing and other energy-intensive industries.

With each new environmental regulation, the administration is compounding the financial burden on the American people without delivering any environmental benefits. We can have clean air and we can have clean water without losing 224,000 jobs. We can have clean air and water without the cost of \$44 billion per year for one single regulation.

Low-cost and reliable energy is at the core of economic growth. Economic gains from the abundance of affordable energy could be lost if these rules are allowed to be put into place. In an economy desperate for growth, a regulatory onslaught is the worst way to encourage jobs and investment.

The American people also want us to address the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. I was particularly interested in the thoughtful remarks of the

Senator from Delaware, who spoke immediately before me. The remarks of my distinguished colleague suggests that Members on both sides of the aisle heard the message from the American people in November and December in the elections. I think both sides recognize that the Affordable Care Act is not affordable and as a matter of fact is causing great hardship and pain to the majority of the American people. So I am pleased to hear Members on the other side of the aisle at least acknowledge that many major, significant changes need to be made to ObamaCare.

Overall disapproval of the President's health care law is at an all-time high of 56 percent. Americans are suffering under the law's mandates and taxes. Many are faced with the financial burden of higher copays and higher deductibles. This is a reality.

I must say that I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York recently when he acknowledged that passing ObamaCare in the way previous Congresses did was a mistake, that most Americans were satisfied with their coverage and it was a mistake to turn that entire system on its head to solve a problem which we very much needed to solve with regard to the uninsured and underinsured.

There was a better way to provide health insurance to those individuals without disadvantaging the vast majority of people who were satisfied with their health care and who now find themselves in a much worse position.

Congress has the responsibility to ease the burden of ObamaCare by repealing the law's most onerous provisions. I would like to repeal the entire act and start over with some good aspects that we could incorporate into a better bill but also start off with a better way to provide health care for Americans and provide those who were uninsured with the opportunity to get insurance.

At the very least, we should pass legislation restoring the 40-hour workweek. I hope this is one of the things my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about. I note that the President of the United States has threatened to veto Affordable Care Act amendments that would restore something that has become very traditional in the United States—the 40-hour workweek. It is very surprising to me that it would be on that proposal that the President of the United States would say: No, I will not even sign legislation to restore something as traditional as the 40-hour workweek.

We need to repeal the medical device tax, and clearly there are well over 60 votes in this body today to do just that. We need to exempt veterans from the employer mandate, to provide relief to rural hospitals, and we need to repeal the health insurance tax. I hope

we can do that, and I hope the sounds I hear from the other side of the aisle indicate that we can reach bipartisan consensus and send legislation to the President persuading him that there is such broad support for that and he should sign it.

We can do better for the American people than the higher copays, the higher deductibles, and the broken promises they received under the ACA. Americans were flatly told: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. That turned out to be a promise the administration could not or would not keep. They were told: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. It turned out the administration was not able to make good on that promise. We can do better.

With regard to the Federal budget, the national debt now exceeds \$18 trillion. During the next 10 years, interest payments on the debt will be the fastest growing budget expenditure. Interest on the debt will be the fastest growing expenditure, more than tripling to \$800 billion. Put in perspective, one out of every seven tax dollars taken in by the government will be used to service the Federal debt.

Why is regular order important in this regard? In returning to regular order, the Senate Republicans will enact a budget resolution each year as required by law. We haven't done this. The law requires it, but somehow Congress has waived this requirement for themselves. This contrasts sharply with the past 5 years, during which the Democratic-led Senate passed only one budget. As a result, Congress has not adopted a joint budget resolution since 2009. This will change in this new day of Congress.

Under the previous majority, spending bills were not brought to the floor to be debated. Budget laws were routinely waived or ignored, and there has been no plan whatever for finally bringing the Federal budget under control. These are facts. We need to change that, and I hope we will do so in this Congress.

In conclusion, we have plenty of work to do. People in my State of Mississippi, like most Americans, expect results from this Congress. The challenges of our economy, the importance of our national defense, and the negative impact of intrusive executive overreach are too great not to address. We need to meet the expectations of the American people in this regard.

The distinguished majority leader reminded us earlier this week that Americans want a government that works, one that functions with efficiency and accountability, competence and purpose.

I believe we can do that, but it will take a return to regular order. It will take faith in the committee process. It will take faith in returning this institution to functioning the way the

Founders intended. And it will take meaningful legislation. It is time to put the priorities of the American people first.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH KENNEY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, when Sarah Kenney decided to volunteer with the Women's Rape Crisis Center in Burlington, VT, in 1997, she may not have realized just how that experience would shape nearly two decades of her life. There, in cramped offices furnished with old futons, she recalls, "I fell in love with the passion of the place."

That passion led Sarah to the Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, where she has spent the past 13 years advocating to end such violence and to raise public awareness about the abhorrent crimes that account for roughly half of all homicides in Vermont in any given year.

Over the years, Sarah has been a trusted and valuable partner in my work to strengthen support for survivors of domestic and sexual violence, including the successful reauthorization and expansion of the Violence Against Women Act so that it better protects all survivors. Her understanding of the legislative process, combined with her ability to work with all sides, have been the hallmark of her effective advocacy. Sarah has also spent much time at the Vermont State House, testifying on legislation to strengthen protections against victims of crime across our State.

Sarah will be leaving her post as the Vermont Network's Associate Director of Public Policy this month, to take on a new advocacy role as Deputy Director at Let's Grow Kids in Burlington, where she will use her tremendous skills on behalf of bettering children's lives.

I am proud to note that Sarah holds a bachelor's degree in political science from my alma mater, St. Michael's College. Her contributions are too

many to list here, but her work in shaping policy has undoubtedly resulted in stronger protections for women and families in Vermont and across the Nation. In my 40 years in the U.S. Senate, I have worked with many advocates who are passionate about the work they do. I can say that Sarah's passion and commitment make her one of the best. She is superbly effective in turning advocacy into action.

In Vermont, we are fortunate to have an organization such as the Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, and even more fortunate to have someone of Sarah's talents advocating on behalf of victims. It has been an honor to work with someone whose commitment to a cause is so distilled and focused. The Vermont Network will miss Sarah's many talents, but Vermont's children have just gained a passionate advocate.

I wish Sarah and her family all the best in her new role.

TRIBUTE TO STEWART HOLMES

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I want to express my gratitude for the service of my long-time aide, Stewart Holmes, who is leaving the U.S. Senate to pursue a new career. Stewart has served the Senate in different capacities over the past 17 years in a manner that reflects credit on the institution and our Nation. During this time, I have valued Stewart as a trusted and loyal advisor with sound judgment on complex national security issues. More broadly, his public service on Capitol Hill has contributed to the safety of the American people and our Nation.

Stewart's sense of service, responsibility, and dedication to the United States is closely linked to his own 22-year military service career. He enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1979, and was appointed a 2nd Lieutenant in 1986. He was deployed during Operation Desert Storm. While in the military, he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from the Citadel in South Carolina and a Master of Arts degree in Financial Management from the U.S. Naval Post Graduate School. In 1997, he became the first military fellow to serve in my Senate office, a position that preceded his becoming the Marine Corps Appropriations Liaison.

In 2001, Stewart Holmes retired from the Marine Corps as a major and joined my staff as a military legislative assistant. In 2005, he joined the Senate Committee on Appropriations and served as an intelligence and military advisor to me. He became minority clerk of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in 2009.

Throughout my association with Stewart, he has been a hard worker. He has demonstrated consummate professionalism, attention to detail, and dedication to the Senate as an institu-

tion. These qualities have served him well as the Defense Subcommittee has worked to overcome the fiscal and political challenges inherent in funding our national security priorities. I appreciate his work on various issues of importance to our national interests and to my State of Mississippi, including shipbuilding, supercomputers, next generation technology, shipbuilding, NASA and others.

As Stewart moves on with the next chapter of his career, I wish him, his wife, Maren, and their children every success and happiness. We will miss him here in the Senate. I am pleased to extend my thanks to him for the great job he has done in the Senate.●

TRIBUTE TO SHEILA DWYER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, as the 114th Congress begins, I would like to pay tribute to a Connecticut native who retired at the end of the last session. Sheila Dwyer, who served as Assistant Secretary of the Senate since 2007, will be deeply missed by many. She worked closely with former Majority Leader HARRY REID and with current Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, who had passionate, strong praise for Sheila's dedication and devotion to this institution. Both recognized that she became known as the "Mayor of Capitol Hill" for the skill and poise she consistently demonstrated in handling the needs of 100 Senators at a time.

Sheila was born in Waterbury, CT, and she has remained very proud of her roots in our great State throughout her career. While still in high school, she served a semester as a Senate Page, and she later returned to spend her career here. After working for such luminaries as Senator Chuck Robb of Virginia, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York, and Senator Fritz Hollings of South Carolina, she joined Senator REID's office.

Along the way, Sheila amassed an impressive record of accomplishments that included overseeing logistics for two national Democratic conventions, assisting in Presidential inaugurations and countless ceremonial events, and coordinating the myriad departments and behind-the-scenes operations that keep the Senate running. Throughout, she has built and maintained friendships with Senators and staff from all corners of the Capitol and the country. Leader REID spoke quite movingly about how, in addition to her professional achievements, she has been a strong source of personal support for his family and others.

My wife Cynthia and I are honored to know Sheila, and we wish her all the best as she begins the next chapter of her life. I know that all of Connecticut joins me in congratulating her on her exemplary achievements here in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING FATHER LOUIS LOHAN

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to congratulate the Reverend Louis Lohan who is retiring after more than 40 years of distinguished service as a Roman Catholic priest serving the Diocese of Biloxi in Mississippi.

Born in Ireland, Father Lohan attended schools there and graduated from St. Patrick's College in Carlow, Ireland. He became an ordained priest for the Catholic Diocese of Biloxi in June of 1971 and moved to the United States shortly thereafter.

Father Lohan served at several different ministry locations, such as Our Lady of Victories in Pascagoula, Mission in Saltillo, Mexico, Our Lady of the Gulf in Bay St. Louis, Sacred Heart in D'Iberville, and at the churches in Wiggins, Lucedale, and Leakesville for 9 years.

In 1993, Father Lohan began service as pastor of St. Thomas the Apostle Catholic Church in Long Beach, MS, where he remained for the next 21 years. In 2005, he participated in the rebuilding effort of the church, community center, office complex, and elementary school after they were destroyed by Hurricane Katrina.

Father Louis Lohan has diligently served the Diocese of Biloxi, and I am pleased to congratulate and thank him for his many years of devoted service to the people of the Mississippi Gulf Coast.●

RECOGNIZING HENDERSON VETERANS TREATMENT COURT

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the Henderson Veterans Treatment Court Program for its commitment and dedication to providing our veterans with vital services that range from job placement to suicide prevention. Located in Henderson, NV, this unique program assists our Nation's bravest as they return from the battlefield and readjust to life in their communities.

The brave men and women who served the United States and fought to protect our freedom have often come home to a struggling economy. All too often, returning veterans are unable to find a job or afford to buy or rent a home. As the demographics of our Armed Forces have changed throughout the years, so, too, have the needs of our Nation's heroes. The Henderson Veterans Treatment Court, founded in 2011 by Henderson Chief Judge Mark Stevens, received national recognition and is illustrative of how the program should be implemented. With 53 graduates and 41 active participants, this program is a shining example of the type of initiatives that will help get our veterans back on their feet. Al-

though there is no way to ever adequately thank the men and women that lay down their lives for our freedoms, the Henderson Veterans Treatment Court acts as a one-stop solution for veterans who find themselves in a position of need.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know the struggles that our veterans face after returning home from the battlefield. Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals but also to ensure they receive the quality care they have earned and deserve. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and service-members in Nevada and throughout the Nation. I am very pleased that veterans service organizations like the Henderson Veterans Treatment Court are committed to ensuring that the needs of our veterans are being met.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing the Henderson Veterans Treatment Court, a program with a mission that is both noble and necessary. I am honored to acknowledge the Henderson Veterans Treatment Court and its tireless efforts to put veterans back on their feet in Nevada and throughout the United States. Their duty to provide veterans with the skills that will allow them the opportunity to change their circumstances is admirable, and I wish the program the best of luck in all of its future endeavors.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 34. An act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 35. An act to increase the understanding of the health effects of low doses of ionizing radiation.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 22. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 34. An act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 35. An act to increase the understanding of the health effects of low doses of ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-68. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Importation of Plants for Planting" ((RIN0579-AD47) (Docket No. APHIS-2008-0071)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 17, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-69. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program" (RIN0560-AI20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-70. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0057; FV14-987-3 FIR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-71. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Interim Report to Congress on Endangered Species Act Implementation in Pesticide Evaluation Programs"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-72. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Single

Family Housing Loans and Grants" (RIN0575-AD01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-73. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beauveria bassiana strain ANT-03; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9918-65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-74. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Zeta-cypermethrin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9920-23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-75. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export; Clarification of Requirements" ((RIN2070-AJ53) (FRL No. 9919-63)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-76. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tobacco mild green mosaic tobamovirus strain U2; Amendment to an Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9919-26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-77. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Listing of Five Species of Sawfish under the Endangered Species Act" (RIN0648-XZ50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-78. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Fish and Wildlife Service on reasonably identifiable expenditures for the conservation of endangered and threatened species for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-79. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9920-63)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-80. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benzidine-Based Chemical Substances; Di-n-pentyl Phthalate (DnPP); and Alkanes, C12-13, Chloro; Significant New Use Rule" ((RIN2070-AJ73) (FRL No. 9915-60)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-81. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas; Alabama; Redesignation of the Alabama Portion of the Chatanooga, 1997 PM2.5 Nonattainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9920-61-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-82. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Ozone and PM2.5 Standards" (FRL No. 9920-47-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-83. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas; Georgia; Redesignation of the Georgia Portion of the Chatanooga, 1997 PM2.5 Nonattainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9920-60-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-84. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rulemaking on the Definition of Solid Waste" ((RIN2050-AG62) (FRL No. 9728-5-OSWER)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-85. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Reconsideration of Additional Provisions of New Source Performance Standards" ((RIN2060-AR75) (FRL No. 9921-03-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-86. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particle (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)" ((RIN2060-AR95) (FRL No. 9921-00-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-87. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Identification of Nonattainment Classification and Deadlines for Submission of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Provisions for the 1997 Fine Particle (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS; Correcting Amendment" (FRL No. 9920-83-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-88. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Pennsylvania; Determination of Attainment for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Lyons Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9920-68-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-89. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program: Addition of Global Warming Potentials to the General Provisions and Amendments and Confidentiality Determinations for Fluorinated Gas Production; Correction" ((RIN2060-AR78) (FRL No. 9920-59-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-90. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the Department of the Navy and was assigned Navy case number 13-01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-91. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of select reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-92. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, for a period not to exceed 14 days before assuming the duties of the position for which the higher grade is authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-93. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of a completion date of May 2015 for a report relative to the Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-94. A communication from the Principal Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary (Research, Development and Acquisition), Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification that the Navy proposes to donate the historic destroyer ex-CHARLES F. ADAMS (DDG 2) to the Jacksonville Historic Naval Ship Association; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-95. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation as an emergency requirements all

funding so designated by the Congress in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for certain accounts, including accounts to implement a comprehensive strategy to contain and end the Ebola epidemic and to enhance domestic preparedness; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-96. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of funding for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-97. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-98. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on the Effect the Low Enriched Uranium Delivered Under the Highly Enriched Uranium Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Russian Federation had on the Domestic Uranium Mining, Conversion, and Enrichment Industries and the Operation of the Gaseous Diffusion Plant During 2012"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-99. A communication from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-100. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-101. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the Department in the position of Assistant Secretary for Housing/Federal Housing Commissioner, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-102. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expansion of the Microprocessor Military End-Use and End-User Control" (RIN0694-AG27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-103. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-104. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-105. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-106. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Temporary Rule Regarding Principal Trades with Certain Advisory Clients" (RIN3235-AL56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-107. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was originally declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-108. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Annual Stress Test—Schedule Shift and Adjustments to Regulatory Capital Projections" (RIN1557-AD85) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-109. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-110. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to blocking property of the Government of the Russian Federation relating to the disposition of highly enriched uranium extracted from nuclear weapons that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-111. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-112. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursu-

ant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-113. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 100th Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-114. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit Risk Retention" (RIN2501-AD53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-115. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-116. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consumer Leasing (Regulation M)" (RIN7100-ZA09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-117. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z)" ((RIN7100-ZA08) (12 CFR Part 1026)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-118. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold Adjustment—Final Rule" ((RIN3170-AA11) (12 CFR Part 1026)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-119. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold" (12 CFR Part 1003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-120. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption

Threshold" (12 CFR Part 1026) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-121. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-8363)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-122. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Section 232 Healthcare Facility Insurance Program—Aligning Operator Financial Reports With HUD's Uniform Financial Reporting Standards" (RIN2502-AJ25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-123. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the Export Administration Regulations: Controls on Electronic Commodities; Exports and Reexports to Hong Kong" (RIN0694-AG33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-124. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defining Larger Participants of the International Money Transfer Market" ((RIN3170-AA25) (Docket No. CFPB-2014-0003)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-125. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E)" ((RIN3170-AA45) (Docket No. CFPB-2014-0008)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-126. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Corrections and Clarifications to the Export Administration Regulations" (RIN0694-AG34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-127. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit Risk Retention" (RIN2590-AA43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-128. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to the Congress: Impact of Home Health Payment Rebased on Beneficiary Access to and Quality of Care"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-129. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation: Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-130. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Physician Compare Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-131. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Genitourinary Disorders" (RIN0960-AH03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 24, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-132. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 Semiannual Report to Congress on the Softwood Lumber Act of 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-133. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Task Force on the Prohibition of Importation of Products of Forced or Prison Labor from the People's Republic of China (PRC): October 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-134. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Administration's fiscal year 2014 Competitive Sourcing efforts; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-135. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2015 Standard Mileage Rates" (Notice 2014-79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-136. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Rev. Proc. 2012-24, Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations" (Rev. Proc. 2014-64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-137. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reporting of Specified Foreign Financial Assets" ((RIN1545-BJ69) (TD 9706)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-138. A communication from the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments

Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-139. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-140. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Policy, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-141. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-142. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-143. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-144. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department of State's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-145. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Update on Integrated Scanning System Operations; Fiscal Year 2014 Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-146. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's fiscal year 2014 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-147. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Automated Commercial Environment; Fourth Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014 (July-September 2014)"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-148. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-149. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the

Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014 and the Semi-Annual Report of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-150. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-151. A communication from the Director, Policy and Planning Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Employees Health Benefits Program Miscellaneous Changes: Medically Underserved Areas" (RIN3206-AN03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-152. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office 2014 Annual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-153. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-154. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-155. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-156. A communication from the Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2014; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-157. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Device Classification Procedures; Reclassification Petition: Content and Form; Technical Amendment" (Docket No. FDA-2013-N-1529) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-158. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Con-

sumption; Advantame" (Docket No. FDA-2009-F-0303) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-159. A communication from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-160. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-161. A communication from the Director of the Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations" (RIN0583-AD05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-162. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-2025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-163. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2014-2026); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-164. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0015); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-165. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and the Environment, U.S. Agency for International Development, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-166. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-125); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-167. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution (P.L. 102-1) for the June 15, 2014-August 14, 2014 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-168. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: United States Munitions List Category XI (Military Electronics), Correction, and Other Changes" (RIN1400-AD25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-169. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-104); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-170. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0177-2014-0179); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-171. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period August 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 119. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 120. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to authorize the Central Everglades Planning Project, Florida; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 121. A bill to establish a certification process for opting out of the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 122. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 123. A bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 124. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to deauthorize the Ten Mile Creek Water Preserve Area Critical Restoration Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 125. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 126. A bill to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 127. A bill to prohibit Federal funding for motorcycle checkpoints, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 128. A bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 129. A bill to repeal executive immigration overreach, to clarify that the proper constitutional authority for immigration policy belongs to the legislative branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 130. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 131. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that valid generic drugs may enter the market; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 132. A bill to improve timber management on Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 133. A bill to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 134. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 135. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from mandating the deployment of vulnerabilities in data security technologies; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 136. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers

of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 137. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive to individuals teaching in elementary and secondary schools located in rural or high unemployment areas and to individuals who achieve certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 139. A bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 140. A bill to combat human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 141. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 142. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 23. A resolution making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. Res. 24. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of Bowie State University; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER,

Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. Res. 25. A resolution commemorating 50 years since the creation of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. Con. Res. 2. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 28

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to limit the use of cluster munitions.

S. 29

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 29, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S. 38

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 38, a bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health care coverage mandate.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 125. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015. Once enacted, this legislation will continue for another five years the immensely successful grant program that provides matching funds for State and local law enforcement agencies to purchase protective vests for officers serving in the field.

Our Nation needs no additional reminders of the dangers faced by law enforcement officers each and every day. Far too often we have grieved as officers are killed in the line of duty. In 2014 alone, 126 men and women serving in law enforcement lost their lives. Although protective vests cannot save every officer, they have already saved the lives of more than 3,000 law enforcement officers since 1987. Vests dramatically increase the chance of survival when tragedy occurs. I have met personally with police officers who are living today because of a bulletproof vest, and they will attest to the fact that the vests provided through this program are worth every penny.

No officer should have to serve without a protective vest. Yet we know that, for far too many jurisdictions, vests can cost too much and wear out too soon. The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program helps to fill the gap. Since it was first authorized in 1999, it has enabled more than 13,000 State and local law enforcement agencies to purchase more than one million bulletproof vests, including more than 4,000 vests for officers in Vermont. As these officers have helped to protect our communities, these grants have helped to protect them. Unfortunately the authorization for this grant program lapsed in 2012. We must not delay any longer in reauthorizing this program.

This bill also contains a number of improvements to the grant program. It provides incentives for agencies to provide uniquely fitted vests for female officers and others. It also codifies existing Justice Department policies that grantee law enforcement agencies cannot use other Federal grant funds to satisfy the matching fund requirement, and they must also have mandatory wear policies to ensure the vests are used regularly.

Protecting those who serve has historically been a bipartisan effort in Congress. Republican Senator Ben Nighthorse-Campbell and I worked together to create this program more than 15 years ago. It was so successful that, in the past, it was reauthorized with a voice vote. It was the right

thing to do, it saved lives, and that was enough for both Democrats and Republicans. This is not a partisan issue, and I am pleased that Senator GRAHAM is the lead cosponsor of this measure. Senators COONS and BLUNT are also original cosponsors of this bill.

The law enforcement community speaks with a single voice on this issue. And I am proud that this bill is supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, National Sheriffs' Association, Major County Sheriffs' Association, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, National Tactical Officers Association, and Sergeants Benevolent Association.

There are very few bills that can so directly affect and improve the safety of those who serve and protect our communities. This program saves lives, and I am hopeful that all Senators—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike—will join us now to ensure its swift reauthorization.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 132. A bill to improve timber management on Oregon and California Railroad and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I reintroduce a bill that will end the gridlock on the Oregon and California, O&C, lands found in my home State. I am pleased that my colleague Senator MERKLEY is joining me in this effort. Last Congress, I introduced this legislation, which went on to be reported out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee after continued work with stakeholders and resulting modifications. I feel that a great deal of progress was made in the last Congress to find a solution for these lands in Oregon, but Congress ran out of time to complete work on this bill. That's why I am back at it here today. The bill I introduce today is intended to advance the progress made, adopting the modifications from the bill that was reported out of Committee, and paving the way to pass legislation regarding management of these lands.

My legislation will end decades of uncertainty and broken forest policy with a science-driven solution that moves past the decades old timber wars. It does this by using science to guide management of the O&C lands while upholding bedrock federal environmental laws. This bill provides the jobs that Oregonians need, certainty of timber supply that timber companies require, and continued environmental protections that our treasures deserve.

First, my legislation divides the O&C lands, with roughly half set aside for forestry emphasis and the other half

for conservation emphasis, to put a stop to the uncertainty and conflicting priorities that have contributed to federal management failure on these lands and produce wins on both sides of the historic timber conflict. The forestry emphasis lands will employ proven forestry practices, known as "ecological forestry," to mimic natural processes and create healthier, more diverse forests. Modeling using Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service analysis confirms that ecological forestry will more than double the harvest on O&C lands, producing approximately 400 mmbf on the landscape covered by this bill.

On the conservation side, my bill provides permanent protections for approximately 1.35 million acres of land, while designating wilderness lands, wild and scenic rivers, and other special areas. It creates 87,000 acres of wilderness and 252 miles of wild and scenic rivers. All told, this would be the single biggest increase in Oregon's conservation lands in decades. That includes special areas protected for recreation, which is an increasingly important part of our rural economy, and is responsible for 141,000 jobs in Oregon alone. Perhaps the most important conservation win in the bill is the first-ever legislative protection for old growth on O&C lands and the designation of Late Successional Old-growth Forest Heritage Reserves.

The approach of dividing the lands into conservation and timber emphasis and protecting old growth will provide clear management direction for the landscape and take the most controversial harvests off the table. Significantly, the bill streamlines and front loads environmental analysis into two large scale environmental impact statements—one each for moist and dry forests—that will study 5 years of work in the woods, rather than a single project. It does this while upholding the Endangered Species Act and other bedrock environmental laws.

Critical to the bill is the belief that forest policy should be dictated by science, not lawyers. The forestry principles used in this bill are based on the work of Drs. Norm Johnson and Jerry Franklin, two respected Northwest forestry scientists, and built off of forestry approaches used around the globe. The bill also establishes the first ever legislative protections for O&C streams thanks in large part to the work of one of the Northwest's foremost water resources experts, Dr. Gordon Reeves. The Northwest Forest Plan's stream protections are extended to key watersheds and four drinking water emphasis areas, with additional lands designated for conservation, to protect drinking water. Science also guides how the agency can treat trees near streams and a scientific committee will evaluate stream buffers and reserves in areas dedicated to timber

harvests, increasing or decreasing the boundaries as needed to address the ecological importance of streams. This acknowledges that one size does not fit all.

Most important is the fact that I will continue to advance efforts to secure a new future for the O&C lands. My bill certainly doesn't provide everything all sides want, but it can get everyone what they need. I look forward to working with Congressmen DEFAZIO, WALDEN and SCHRADER and our colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives to pass an O&C solution into law.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 133. A bill to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to reintroduce a bill that would authorize the implementation of three landmark agreements that settle some of our country's most complex and contentious water allocation and species preservation issues. Water management crises this century have plagued the Klamath Basin, leading to devastating water years for communities throughout the Basin. Overcoming that adversity, stakeholders including State and Federal agencies, tribes, farmers and ranchers, and environmental groups, have spent years coming together to hammer out solutions. They swallowed hard and worked together to bring costs down and deliver economic certainty and stability for the Basin in the name of the greater good.

Last year, I introduced the Klamath Basin Water Recovery and Economic Restoration Act of 2014 to finally authorize the three historic agreements reached by Basin partners—the Klamath Basin Restoration Agreement, the Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement, and the Upper Basin Agreement. I was deeply disappointed that the bill did not get passed into law last Congress, delaying the implementation of these important agreements and creating even more uncertainty and anxiety for stakeholders in the Basin.

Inspired by the perseverance and dedication demonstrated by the stakeholders, today I once again bring forward this bill, the Klamath Basin Water Recovery and Economic Restoration Act of 2015, to put a rubber stamp on the historic agreements and finally help heal the Klamath Basin. With this bill, the Basin will no longer be known for persistent drought, water disputes, and conflict, but rather for

the dedicated and enduring collaborative efforts that have honed in on a sustainable and more economically certain future; an example that other regions can emulate for their watershed challenges. I continue to express my gratitude to the interested groups who came to the table and formed partnerships, engaged in conversations, made agreements and concessions, and ultimately found a path forward.

I'm pleased to be joined by my colleagues Senators MERKLEY, BOXER and FEINSTEIN on this bill. Senator MERKLEY has worked tirelessly to encourage and support the years of conversations and collaborative efforts of the countless stakeholders who have committed to finding a balanced solution. Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN have provided unwavering support for the communities impacted by unprecedented drought in the Klamath Basin, which spans Oregon and California, while also reaffirming the need to support fish and wildlife. Together, we are committed to working with our colleagues in the Senate and House to advance this bill and get it signed by the President.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 134. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be joined by Senators MERKLEY, MCCONNELL, and PAUL in introducing the Industrial Hemp Farming Act of 2015.

I introduced this bill during the 113th Congress with these same colleagues to amend a regulation that is holding America's economy back. I am committed to empowering American farmers and increasing domestic economic activity, and that is exactly what this bill will do.

The United States is the world's largest consumer of hemp products, yet it remains the only major industrialized country that bans hemp farming. As the United States imports millions of dollars of hemp products, such as textiles, foods, paper products and construction materials, American farmers who could grow hemp right here at home are unable to profit from this growing market. This is an outrageous restriction on free enterprise and does nothing but hurt economic growth and job creation.

The Industrial Hemp Farming Act of 2015 would amend the definition of "marijuana" in the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp, allowing American farmers to produce domestically the hemp we already use. Industrial hemp is a safe, profitable commodity in many other countries, and I've long said that if you can buy

it at the local supermarket, American farmers should be able to grow it. This commonsense bill would end the burdensome restrictions on industrial hemp and is pro-environment, pro-business, and pro-farmer.

I encourage my colleagues to take the time to learn about the great potential for farming industrial hemp in the United States, and to understand the real differences between industrial hemp and marijuana. Under our bill, industrial hemp is defined as having extremely low THC levels: it has to be 0.3 percent or less. The lowest commercial grade marijuana typically has 5 percent THC content. The bottom line is that no one is going to get high on industrial hemp. And to guarantee that won't be the case, our legislation allows the U.S. Attorney General to take action if a state law allows commercial hemp to exceed the maximum 0.3 percent THC level.

I urge my colleagues to join Senators MERKLEY, MCCONNELL, PAUL, and me by cosponsoring and ultimately passing this important bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 134

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Industrial Hemp Farming Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP FROM DEFINITION OF MARIJUANA.

Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16)—
(A) by striking "(16) The" and inserting "(16)(A) The"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:
"(B) The term 'marijuana' does not include industrial hemp."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:
"(57) The term 'industrial hemp' means the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. and any part of such plant, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis."

SEC. 3. INDUSTRIAL HEMP DETERMINATION BY STATES.

Section 201 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) INDUSTRIAL HEMP DETERMINATION.—If a person grows or processes *Cannabis sativa* L. for purposes of making industrial hemp in accordance with State law, the *Cannabis sativa* L. shall be deemed to meet the concentration limitation under section 102(57), unless the Attorney General determines that the State law is not reasonably calculated to comply with section 102(57)."

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 135. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from mandating the deployment of vulnerabilities in data security technologies; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation that I introduced at the end of the last Congress along with a bipartisan group of colleagues in the House of Representatives. We call it the Secure Data Act, because it is designed to help protect the sensitive data of American citizens and businesses from being compromised by foreign hackers. And I believe it will also help protect and promote the American digital economy at a time when growing the number of family-wage jobs is so important both to Oregonians and to people across the country.

Hardly a week goes by without a new report of a massive data theft by computer hackers, often involving trade secrets, consumers' financial information, or sensitive government records. It is well known that the best defense against these attacks is strong data encryption and more secure technology systems.

This is why I and many others have been troubled by suggestions from senior officials that computer hardware and software manufacturers should be required to intentionally create security holes, often referred to as back doors, to enable the government to access data on every American's cell phone and computer, even if that data is protected by strong encryption. The problem with this proposal is that there is no such thing as a magic key that can only be used by good people for worthwhile reasons. There is only strong security or weak security.

Americans are rightly demanding stronger security for their personal data. And requiring companies to build back doors into their products would mean deliberately creating weaknesses that hackers and unscrupulous foreign governments could exploit. The results of this approach can be seen elsewhere—in 2005, citizens of Greece discovered that dozens of their senior government officials' phones had been under surveillance for nearly a year. The eavesdropper was never identified, but the vulnerability was—it was built-in wiretapping features intended to be accessible only to government agencies following a legal process.

Mandating back doors would also remove incentives for innovation. If you're required to build a wall with a hole in it, you aren't going to invest a lot of money in developing better locks. And these mandates could also do enormous harm to U.S. technology companies that are working hard to overcome the damage that has been done by recklessly broad surveillance policies and years of deceptive statements by senior government officials.

This legislation would expressly prohibit the government from mandating that tech companies build security weaknesses into their products. I would note that similar legislation from Representatives MASSIE and LOFGREN

passed the House of Representatives on a bipartisan vote of 293–123 in June of last year. So, I look forward to working with colleagues on a bipartisan basis to advance this bill, and to receiving feedback and input from colleagues and interested stakeholders, so that it can be further improved as it moves forward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Secure Data Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON DATA SECURITY VULNERABILITY MANDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no agency may mandate that a manufacturer, developer, or seller of covered products design or alter the security functions in its product or service to allow the surveillance of any user of such product or service, or to allow the physical search of such product, by any agency.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to mandates authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(2) the term “covered product” means any computer hardware, computer software, or electronic device that is made available to the general public.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 136. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, our country has asked a lot of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines throughout its history and it will continue to do so as long as the world looks to America for leadership in crises. These brave men and women don't join the military looking for public accolades and all they ask in return for their many sacrifices is for the government to honor its commitments to them—something I have certainly always tried to do.

Of course our men and women in uniform and our veterans aren't the only folks who make sacrifices in the name of national security. From child care, to household repairs and bills, to legal issues, our military families are called on to provide support in innumerable ways as their loved ones serve and deploy. While we hope and pray that all

those sent abroad return safely to the arms of their loved ones, we know that this isn't always the case. When servicemembers return home wounded or weakened as a result of combat, it is our military families who step up to take care of their son or daughter, husband or wife. When servicemembers do not return, it is our military families who endure that searing pain that comes with such a terrible loss.

It is an understatement to say that government cannot take away that pain; but what government can, and must, do is honor that sacrifice. One way we do that is by extending certain benefits to the families of those who are killed or permanently and totally disabled in action. Today, along with Senator BROWN, I am introducing the Gold Star Fathers Act to update one of those benefits.

The Office of Personnel Management currently allows unmarried mothers of fallen soldiers to claim a 10-point veterans' preference when applying for Federal jobs. Our legislation would simply extend this preference to unmarried fathers of fallen soldiers. Updating this preference is about fairness and recognizing that fathers, too, share in the sacrifice that their family has made for this country. Updating this preference will also expand opportunities for Gold Star families to bring their dedication and compassion into the federal government, where it can be put to great use.

Gold Star Mothers and Gold Star Fathers have incurred a debt that Congress cannot ever hope to repay. All we can hope to do is ensure that these sacrifices are acknowledged and honored. It is my hope that the Senate will pass this legislation swiftly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Gold Star Fathers Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE TREATMENT FOR FATHERS OF CERTAIN PERMANENTLY DISABLED OR DECEASED VETERANS.

Section 2108(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (F) and (G) and inserting the following:

“(F) the parent of an individual who lost his or her life under honorable conditions while serving in the armed forces during a period named by paragraph (1)(A) of this section, if—

“(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

“(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse;

“(G) the parent of a service-connected permanently and totally disabled veteran, if—

“(i) the spouse of that parent is totally and permanently disabled; or

“(ii) that parent, when preference is claimed, is unmarried or, if married, legally separated from his or her spouse; and”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 137. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, if you go to get your hair cut, your barber or stylist must be licensed. If you need to get the locks on your home repaired or replaced, the locksmith needs a license. But if you have someone prepare your tax return, there is no requirement that the preparer meet any minimum competency standard. It is time for that to change so taxpayers are protected when they file their taxes.

On April 8 of last year, the Senate Finance Committee held a hearing to discuss ways to protect taxpayers from incompetent, unethical and fraudulent tax return preparers. There is no question the tax code is overly complex and confusing. For that reason among others, more than 80 million Americans pay someone else to prepare their income tax return each year.

That's why it was so alarming to learn that most paid tax return preparers don't have to meet even basic standards of proficiency or competence to prepare someone else's tax return.

A series of investigations by the GAO and Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, TIGTA, illustrated some of the problems with incompetent tax return preparers. As a consequence, the IRS took steps to require paid tax return preparers to demonstrate they have the know-how to provide the taxpayer with a service he or she can reasonably rely upon.

I am proud to say my home state gets this issue right. Tax preparers in Oregon study, pass an exam and keep up with the changing landscape of the tax code in order to maintain their licenses, and those standards work. The GAO took a look at the system a few years ago and found that tax returns from Oregon were 72 percent likelier to be accurate than returns from the rest of the country. That puts fewer Oregonians at the mercy of unscrupulous preparers and reduces the risk of the dreaded audit.

These independent analyses, combined with too many taxpayer horror stories of identity theft, refund and liability errors, and audit challenges, demonstrated clearly that a lack of basic tax return preparer competency standards is a serious consumer protection issue. Today, I am introducing legislation that will help restore standards to protect American taxpayers.

This legislation, the Taxpayer Protection and Preparer Proficiency Act of 2015, which I am pleased to introduce with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN—will grant the IRS the ability to move forward with the type of education and examination program contemplated under the 2011 Circular 230 program, specifically, the Registered Tax Return Preparer, RTRP, Program.

Testing and minimum competency requirements have been clearly shown to be effective at reducing error, fraud and tax preparer incompetence.

We need to protect American taxpayers, and this bill helps do just that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 137

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Taxpayer Protection and Preparer Proficiency Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF TAX RETURN PREPARERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 330 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) regulate—

“(A) the practice of representatives of persons before the Department of the Treasury; and

“(B) the practice of tax return preparers; and”, and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “or tax return preparer” after “representative” each place it appears, and

(B) by inserting “or in preparing their tax returns, claims for refund, or documents in connection with tax returns or claims for refund” after “cases” in subparagraph (D).

(b) AUTHORITY TO SANCTION REGULATED TAX RETURN PREPARERS.—Subsection (b) of section 330 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “before the Department”,

(2) by inserting “or tax return preparer” after “representative” each place it appears, and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “misleads or threatens” and all that follows and inserting “misleads or threatens—

“(A) any person being represented or any prospective person being represented; or

“(B) any person or prospective person whose tax return, claim for refund, or document in connection with a tax return or claim for refund, is being or may be prepared.”.

(c) TAX RETURN PREPARER DEFINED.—Section 330 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) TAX RETURN PREPARER.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘tax return preparer’ has the meaning given such term under section 7701(a)(36) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(2) TAX RETURN.—The term ‘tax return’ has the meaning given to the term ‘return’

under section 6696(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(3) CLAIM FOR REFUND.—The term ‘claim for refund’ has the meaning given such term under section 6696(e)(2) of such Code.”.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive to individuals teaching in elementary and secondary schools located in rural or high unemployment areas and to individuals who achieve certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Incentives to Educate American Children, the “I Teach” Act, which would provide a \$1,000 refundable tax credit to elementary and secondary school teachers who teach in schools located in rural or impoverished areas. It would also provide a \$1,000 credit to teachers who achieve National Board certification, and provide National Board certified teachers serving in rural or impoverished schools a \$2,000 credit. It was previously introduced in the 113th Congress by Senator Rockefeller.

U.S. classrooms are increasingly filled with less experienced teachers, as older teachers retire and the retention rate among young teachers continues to decline. According to the most recent data, 1.7 million teachers, representing 45 percent of the workforce, had less than 10 years of experience. Policy makers need to take steps to ensure that students have the most qualified and best trained teachers possible.

Nearly a third of public schools in the United States are in rural areas. And rural schools often face challenges that others don't, like smaller tax bases and higher recruitment costs, which means they often have less money for classroom materials and salaries. Department of Education data show that rural school districts have the lowest base salaries for starting teachers, a trend that continues even as teachers move to the top of the local salary range. Rural schools face these challenges across the country.

The most recent study by the Education Trust found that high schools with high poverty rates are twice as likely to have teachers who are not certified in their fields than high schools with low poverty rates. The same study found that schools serving impoverished areas have a higher percentage of first year teachers. Rural schools face similar problems.

According to the Department of Education, Oregon faces a shortage of certified teachers for the 2014–15 school year in subject areas such as math, science, Spanish, special education, English as a second language, and bilingual education. A major deterrent to pursuing a master's degree in teaching is the soaring cost of tuition, which,

especially for those candidates with strong science and math backgrounds, drives them into other fields instead of educating the next generation of scientists and researchers.

In other words, due to the high cost of education and teachers' salaries which have failed to keep pace, additional incentives through the tax code could encourage highly qualified individuals to look to or continue to pursue teaching as a viable profession. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 138

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Incentives to Educate American Children Act of 2015" or the "I Teach Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT FOR INDIVIDUALS TEACHING IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS LOCATED IN HIGH POVERTY OR RURAL AREAS AND CERTIFIED TEACHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

"SEC. 36C. TAX CREDIT FOR INDIVIDUALS TEACHING IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS LOCATED IN HIGH POVERTY OR RURAL AREAS AND CERTIFIED TEACHERS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an eligible teacher, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to the applicable amount for the eligible academic year ending during such taxable year.

"(b) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS IN RURAL AREAS OR SCHOOLS WITH HIGH POVERTY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an eligible teacher who performs services in a public kindergarten or a public elementary or secondary school described in subparagraph (B) during the eligible academic year, the applicable amount is \$1,000.

"(B) SCHOOL DESCRIBED.—A public kindergarten or a public elementary or secondary school is described in this subparagraph if—

"(i) at least 75 percent of the students attending such kindergarten or school receive free or reduced-cost lunches under the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or

"(ii) such kindergarten or school has a School Locale Code of 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary of Education.

"(2) CERTIFIED TEACHERS.—In the case of an eligible teacher who is certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards for the eligible academic year, the applicable amount is \$1,000.

"(3) CERTIFIED TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS IN RURAL AREAS OR SCHOOLS WITH HIGH POVERTY.—In the case of an eligible teacher described in both paragraphs (1) and (2), the applicable amount is \$2,000.

"(c) ELIGIBLE TEACHER.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible teacher' means, for any eligible academic year, an in-

dividual who is a kindergarten through grade 12 classroom teacher or instructor in a public kindergarten or a public elementary or secondary school on a full-time basis for such eligible academic year.

"(d) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—The terms 'elementary school' and 'secondary school' have the respective meanings given such terms by section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(2) ELIGIBLE ACADEMIC YEAR.—The term 'eligible academic year' means any academic year ending in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2015."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting "36C" after "36B".

(2) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

"Sec. 36C. Tax credit for individuals teaching in elementary and secondary schools located in high poverty or rural areas and certified teachers."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to academic years ending in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 139. A bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the bipartisan Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act of 2015. I would like to begin by thanking Senators HATCH and MARKEY for joining me in cosponsoring this legislation. I would also like to thank the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation for working with me on this important issue since 2010.

This bill is simple: it would remove a sunset that exists for a law we passed in 2010 making it easier—and more likely—for people receiving Supplemental Security Income and Medicaid to participate in rare disease clinical trials. As I explained in 2010, we wanted to proceed carefully when altering how compensation for participating in clinical trials is treated for SSI and Medicaid purposes. That is why we included a 5 year sunset and asked GAO to report on how the law is working. Five years have passed and GAO has issued its report.

GAO's frank assessment is that not a lot is known about how the law may or may not have affected the decisions an SSI recipient makes about participating in clinical trials. At the same time, GAO provided important context about factors affecting a decision to participate, such as time and travel. The GAO report suggests that the law

has removed a barrier to participation for the individuals that rely on SSI and Medicaid's safety net, and GAO's consultation with the National Institutes of Health, the National Organization of Rare Diseases, and the Social Security Administration did not identify any negative aspects from the change in the law.

That is comforting and important, and it is reason enough to make this law permanent. We all know what's at stake and how it's often difficult to find participants for rare disease clinical trials. This law has helped increase the number of people who can participate and, hopefully, be a part of the effort to improve treatments and find cures.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that recipients of SSI and Medicaid can have the same opportunity to participate in clinical trials as individuals who do not rely on these important safety net programs. I look forward to working with my colleagues on passing this bill soon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Access to Clinical Trials Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF SUNSET PROVISION.

Effective as if included in the enactment of the Improving Access to Clinical Trials Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-255, 124 Stat. 2640), section 3 of that Act is amended by striking subsection (e).

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 140. A bill to combat human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to re-introduce, along with Senator PORTMAN, the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015.

Human trafficking is estimated to be a \$32 billion criminal enterprise, making it the second largest criminal industry in the world, behind the drug trade. Many steps need to be taken to combat this problem. But we cannot escape this simple truth: without demand for the services performed by trafficking victims, the problem would not exist.

The bill we are introducing today would reduce the demand for human trafficking, particularly the commercial sexual exploitation of children, by holding buyers accountable and making it easier for law enforcement to investigate and prosecute all persons who participate in sex trafficking.

Sex trafficking is not a victimless crime. In the United States, the average age that a person is first trafficked

is between 12 and 14. Many of these children continue to be exploited into adulthood. A study of women and girls involved in street prostitution in my hometown of San Francisco found that 82 percent had been physically assaulted, 83 percent were threatened with a weapon, and 68 percent were raped. The overwhelming majority of sex trafficking victims in the United States are American citizens—83 percent by one estimate from the Department of Justice.

I am encouraged that Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies are taking steps to combat human trafficking. Between January and June of last year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation recovered 168 trafficking victims and arrested 281 sex traffickers in “Operation Cross Country.”

I commend these efforts, but more needs to be done to target the perpetrators who are fueling demand for trafficking crimes—the buyers of sex acts from trafficking victims. Many buyers of sex are “hobbyists” who purchase sex repeatedly. Because buyers are rarely arrested, much less prosecuted, the demand for commercial sex continues unabated.

Without buyers, sex trafficking would cease to exist. As Luis CdeBaca, the U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, noted, “[n]o girl or woman would be a victim of sex trafficking if there were no profits to be made from their exploitation.”

The Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015 would address this problem by incentivizing Federal and State law enforcement officers to target buyers and providing new authorities to prosecute all who engage in the crime of sex trafficking.

First, the bill would clarify that buyers of sex acts from trafficking victims can be prosecuted under the Federal commercial sex trafficking statute. This provision would codify the Eighth Circuit’s decision in *United States v. Jungers*, which held that this statute encompasses buyers, in addition to sellers. Despite this favorable ruling, there is no guarantee that other courts will follow this precedent.

Second, the bill would hold buyers and sellers of child sex acts accountable for their actions, even if they claim they were unaware of the age of a minor victim. At times, it can be difficult for a prosecutor to prove that a buyer was aware of the victim’s age. Successful cases can require the child victim to testify to this fact, subjecting the victim to re-traumatization. The bill would draw a clear line: if you purchase sex from an underage child, you can be prosecuted. Period.

Third, the bill would grant judges greater flexibility to impose an appropriate term of supervised release on sex traffickers. Current law contains an

anomaly: a person convicted of violating the commercial sex trafficking statute or attempting to violate the statute may be subject to a longer term of supervised release than a person who is convicted of conspiring to violate the statute. Conspiring to traffic underage children is as serious as attempting to commit this crime and should be punished the same.

Fourth, the bill would require the Bureau of Justice Statistics to prepare annual reports on the number of arrests, prosecutions, and convictions of sex traffickers and buyers of sex from trafficked victims in the state court system. Very little data is available on the prosecutions made under anti-trafficking laws. This provision would provide additional data and encourage State and local governments to increase enforcement against sellers and buyers of sex from trafficked victims.

Fifth, the Combat Human Trafficking Act would strengthen training programs operated by the Department of Justice for Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who investigate and prosecute sex trafficking offenses. Under the bill, such training programs must include components on effective methods to target and prosecute the buyers of sex acts from trafficked victims. This would equip prosecutors with the tools they need to target buyers, encouraging prosecution of these perpetrators. Training programs must also train law enforcement in connecting trafficking victims with health care providers, so that victims receive the health care services they need to recover.

In addition, the bill requires that training programs for federal prosecutors include components on seeking restitution for victims of sex trafficking. An October 2014 study by The Human Trafficking Pro Bono Legal Center found that federal prosecutors did not seek restitution in 37 percent of qualifying human trafficking cases brought between 2009 and 2012, even though restitution for trafficking victims is mandatory under federal law. When the prosecutor did not seek restitution, it was granted in only 10 percent of cases.

These results make clear that prosecutors play a critical role in providing justice for trafficking victims. Our bill would ensure that prosecutors are specifically trained to seek restitution for victims.

The bill would also require the Federal Judicial Center to provide training to judges on ordering restitution for human trafficking victims, so that judges are fully aware that federal law mandates that restitution be ordered for these victims. Overall, restitution was awarded in only 36 percent of qualifying human trafficking cases brought between 2009 and 2012, according to The Human Trafficking Pro Bono Legal Center’s study. Too many

trafficking victims are not receiving the compensation they need to rebuild their lives and to which they are entitled under the law.

Sixth, the bill would authorize federal and state officials to seek a wiretap to investigate and prosecute any human trafficking-related offense. Under current law, a federal law enforcement officer may seek a wiretap in an investigation under the commercial sex trafficking statute, but not under a number of other statutes that address human trafficking-related offenses, such as forced labor and involuntary servitude. Similarly, a state law enforcement officer may seek a wiretap to investigate a kidnapping offense, but not an offense for human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, or child pornography production. Our bill would fix those omissions.

Finally, this legislation would strengthen the rights of crime victims. The bill would amend the Crime Victims’ Rights Act to provide victims with the right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea agreement or deferred prosecution agreement. The exclusion of victims in these early stages of a criminal case profoundly impairs victims’ rights because, by the nature of these events, there often is no later proceeding in which victims can exercise their rights.

The bill would also ensure that crime victims have access to appellate review when their rights are denied in the lower court. Regrettably, six appellate courts have mis-applied the Crime Victims’ Rights Act by imposing an especially high standard for reviewing appeals by victims, requiring them to show “clear and indisputable error”. Three other circuits have applied the correct standard: the ordinary appellate standard of legal error or abuse of discretion. This bill resolves the issue, setting a uniform standard for victims in all circuits by codifying the more victim-protecting rule, that the appellate court “shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”

I am pleased that this bill has the support of numerous law enforcement and anti-trafficking organizations: the Fraternal Order of Police, Shared Hope International, ECPAT-USA, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, CATW, Human Rights Project for Girls, Survivors for Solutions, Sanctuary For Families, World Hope International, Prostitution Research & Education, MISSEY, Breaking Free, Equality Now, National Organization for Victim Assistance, Seraphim Global, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, City of Oakland, Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Bilateral Safety Corridor Coalition, and Casa Cornelia Law Center. These groups are on the forefront in the fight against sex trafficking, and I am proud to have their support.

Many of the provisions in the Combat Human Trafficking Act were included

in the substitute amendment to the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, S. 2646, 113th Congress, which passed the Senate Judiciary Committee last September. However, that bill was not enacted into law before Congress adjourned. I am hopeful that we can pass the bipartisan Combat Human Trafficking in this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator PORTMAN in supporting this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 140

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING; LOWER MENS REA FOR SEX TRAFFICKING OF UNDERAGE VICTIMS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF RANGE OF CONDUCT PUNISHED AS SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “or maintains” and inserting “maintains, patronizes, or solicits”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”;

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) In a prosecution under subsection (a)(1), the Government need not prove that the defendant knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person recruited, enticed, harbored, transported, provided, obtained, maintained, patronized, or solicited had not attained the age of 18 years.”.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDED.—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking “or obtaining” and inserting “obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting”.

(c) MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “1594(c),” after “1591.”.

SEC. 3. BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF SEX TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “commercial sex act”, “severe forms of trafficking in persons”, “State”, and “Task Force” have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(2) the term “covered offense” means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons; and

(3) the term “State law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise

the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(b) REPORT.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(1) prepare an annual report on—

(A) the rates of—

(i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;

(ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Task Force;

(D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and

(E) the Attorney General.

SEC. 4. LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, PROSECUTORS, AND JUDGES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “commercial sex act”, “severe forms of trafficking in persons”, and “State” have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(2) the term “covered offender” means an individual who obtains, patronizes, or solicits a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons;

(3) the term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code;

(4) the term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law; and

(5) the term “State law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(b) TRAINING.—

(1) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on—

(A) effective methods for investigating and prosecuting covered offenders; and

(B) facilitating the provision of physical and mental health services by health care providers to persons subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(2) FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice for United States attorneys or other Federal prosecutors includes training on seeking restitution for offenses under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that each United States attorney or other Federal prosecutor, upon obtaining a conviction for such an offense, requests a specific amount of restitution for each victim of the offense without regard to whether the victim requests restitution.

(3) JUDGES.—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide training to judges relating to the application of section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to ordering restitution for victims of offenses under chapter 77 of such title.

(c) POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of covered offenders.

SEC. 5. WIRETAP AUTHORITY FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING VIOLATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(c)—

(A) by inserting before “section 1591” the following: “section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),”; and

(B) by inserting before “section 1751” the following: “section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,” after “kidnapping.”.

SEC. 6. STRENGTHENING CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.

(a) NOTIFICATION OF PLEA AGREEMENT OR OTHER AGREEMENT.—Section 3771(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea agreement or deferred prosecution agreement.”.

(b) APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 141. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 141

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 142. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we all recognize the danger that many hazardous chemicals and over-the-counter drugs pose to children. That’s why we require child-resistant packaging for these substances to prevent accidental poisonings that could result in serious injury or death.

Unfortunately, there is no child-resistant packaging required for concentrated liquid nicotine, which can be toxic if ingested or even absorbed through the skin. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, AAP, some of these small bottles of liquid nicotine contain a concentrated and deadly amount of the substance. The AAP notes that this small bottle contains enough nicotine to kill four small children. Just a few drops of the liquid splashed on a child’s skin can make the child very ill.

The American Association of Poison Control Centers reports that poison control centers received 3,957 calls in 2014 related to liquid nicotine exposure. This is more than twice as many calls as in 2013, when AAPCC reported 1,543 calls related to liquid nicotine exposure.

Sadly, it was only a matter of time before one of these accidental nicotine poisonings resulted in death. This past December, a 1-year-old boy in New York State died after ingesting liquid nicotine in his home.

We have to do more to protect children from deadly accidents like this.

Today I am reintroducing the Child Nicotine Poisoning Prevention Act with Senators AYOTTE, BENNET, BLUMENTHAL, BOXER, BROWN, DURBIN, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, MARKEY, MERKLEY, REED, SCHATZ, and SCHUMER

to prevent these unnecessary tragedies. This common-sense legislation gives the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, authority and direction to issue rules requiring safer, child-resistant packaging for liquid nicotine products within 1 year of passage.

The CPSC already requires child-resistant packaging for many household products, including over-the-counter medicines and cleaning agents. These rules have prevented countless injuries and deaths to children. There is no reason why bottles of liquid nicotine should not be required to have child-resistant packaging as well.

I invite my colleagues to join us to support the Child Nicotine Poisoning Prevention Act. Last Congress, this legislation was reported out of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee by voice vote. Continuing our work together this Congress, we can pass this bipartisan legislation and help prevent accidental child nicotine poisonings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Child Nicotine Poisoning Prevention Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. CHILD SAFETY PACKAGING FOR LIQUID NICOTINE CONTAINERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

(2) LIQUID NICOTINE CONTAINER.—The term “liquid nicotine container” means a consumer product, as defined in section 3(a)(5) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(5)) notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of such section, that consists of a container that—

(A) has an opening from which nicotine in a solution or other form is accessible and can flow freely through normal and foreseeable use by a consumer; and

(B) is used to hold soluble nicotine in any concentration.

(3) NICOTINE.—The term “nicotine” means any form of the chemical nicotine, including any salt or complex, regardless of whether the chemical is naturally or synthetically derived.

(4) SPECIAL PACKAGING.—The term “special packaging” has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 1471).

(b) REQUIRED USE OF SPECIAL PACKAGING FOR LIQUID NICOTINE CONTAINERS.—

(1) RULEMAKING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3(a)(5)(B) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(5)(B)) or section 2(f)(2) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(2)), not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate a rule requiring special packaging for liquid nicotine containers.

(B) AMENDMENTS.—The Commission may promulgate such amendments to the rule promulgated under subparagraph (A) as the Commission considers appropriate.

(2) EXPEDITED PROCESS.—The Commission shall promulgate the rules under paragraph (1) in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—The following provisions shall not apply to a rulemaking under paragraph (1):

(A) Sections 7 and 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 and 2058).

(B) Section 3 of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1262).

(C) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 1472).

(4) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or diminish the authority of the Food and Drug Administration to regulate the manufacture, marketing, sale, or distribution of liquid nicotine, liquid nicotine containers, electronic cigarettes, or similar products that contain or dispense liquid nicotine.

(5) ENFORCEMENT.—A rule promulgated under paragraph (1) shall be treated as a standard applicable to a household substance established under section 3(a) of the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 1472(a)).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS**SENATE RESOLUTION 23—MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS**

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 23

Resolved, That the following be the majority membership on the following committees for the remainder of the 114th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts (Chairman), Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Perdue, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran (Chairman), Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby (Chairman), Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET: Mr. Enzi (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune (Chairman), Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Heller, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe (Chairman), Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Coats, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Barrasso.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Alexander (Chairman), Mr. Enzi, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson (Chairman), Mr. McCain, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Grassley (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Flake, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Blunt (Chairman), Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Vitter (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Ernst, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Barrasso (Chairman), Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Roberts, Mr. Risch.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton.

COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Corker, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24—RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 24

Whereas on January 9, 2015, Bowie State University, located in Bowie, Maryland, will celebrate the founding of the university on January 9, 1865;

Whereas Bowie State University is the oldest historically black institution of higher education in the State of Maryland, and 1 of the 10 oldest in the United States;

Whereas in 1864 the Baltimore Association began fundraising to open and support schools for African-Americans, and established 7 schools, the second of which, known as the "Normal School" (referred to in this preamble as the "School"), was the forerunner of Bowie State University;

Whereas the School began by educating approximately 370 students in the African Baptist Church in the Crane's Building on the northeast corner of Calvert and Saratoga Streets in Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas in 1867 the School purchased the Friends' Meeting House at the corner of

Courtland and Saratoga Streets in Baltimore, Maryland, to use for the School;

Whereas during the earliest years of the School, the school received financial support from the City Council of Baltimore, the Freedmen's Bureau, several northern relief societies, and the estate of Nelson Wells;

Whereas in 1893 the name of the School was changed to the "Baltimore Colored Normal School";

Whereas in 1908 the General Assembly of Maryland approved legislation that allowed the trustees of the School to donate assets of the trustees to the State of Maryland in return for a \$5,000 annual appropriation to maintain a permanent normal school for the training of black teachers;

Whereas in 1908 the General Assembly of Maryland changed the name of the School to "Baltimore Normal School No. 3";

Whereas in 1910 the State of Maryland purchased 187 acres of land formerly known as "Jericho Farms" to relocate the School;

Whereas in September 1911 the new location of the School opened with 50 students enrolled;

Whereas in 1935 the School began operating as a 4-year program for training elementary school teachers and was renamed the "Maryland Teachers College at Bowie";

Whereas in 1954, when the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education was formed, the education program of the School was among the first to receive national accreditation and that distinction has been continuously reaffirmed;

Whereas in 1963 the School began a liberal arts and teacher training program for secondary education and the institution was renamed "Bowie State College";

Whereas in 1988 the School, which offered several master's degree programs, joined the University System of Maryland and was finally renamed "Bowie State University";

Whereas in 1995 Bowie State University became 1 of only 6 Model Institutions for Excellence in science, engineering, and mathematics in the United States with support from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

Whereas as of January 2015, Bowie State University serves approximately 5,600 students annually with challenging and rewarding academic programs and individual support to prepare attendees with the skills needed to compete and succeed in a changing world;

Whereas Bowie State University was listed as 1 of "America's Top Colleges" by Forbes magazine from 2011 to 2013, and ranked among the top 25 historically black colleges and universities by U.S. News & World Report;

Whereas Bowie State University has been recognized as a leader in training African-American professionals in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics ("STEM") fields;

Whereas Bowie State University was named a National Center for Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education by the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security; and

Whereas Bowie State University continues to be committed to enhancing academic opportunities for students at the university, many of whom may be the first in their families attending college, and producing graduates who better strengthen the entire State of Maryland and the modern technology-driven economy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Bowie State University on the 150th anniversary of the founding of the university;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the administrators, professors, students, and various staff who have contributed to the success of Bowie State University; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the president of Bowie State University; and

(B) the provost and vice president for academic affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 25—COMMEMORATING 50 YEARS SINCE THE CREATION OF THE MEDICARE AND MEDICAID PROGRAMS

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 25

Whereas on January 7, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson called on Congress to provide health insurance for the elderly and most vulnerable;

Whereas over the past 50 years, Congress has strengthened Medicare and Medicaid with improvements to, and expansion of, health care benefits;

Whereas today, as a result of President Johnson's call to action and Congress' bipartisan initiative that created the Medicare program, 54,000,000 seniors and people with disabilities have access to guaranteed health care benefits;

Whereas today, 68,000,000 Americans, including children, pregnant women, individuals with disabilities, elderly who are poor and frail, and low income adults and parents have access to health care through Medicaid;

Whereas Medicare and Medicaid have been leaders in improving the quality of care delivered to the Nation, resulting in 1,300,000 fewer infections, accidents or other adverse events and avoiding 150,000 unnecessary hospital readmissions;

Whereas Medicare has been an innovator in developing alternative ways to pay for health care that emphasize care coordination across all health care providers and settings;

Whereas Medicare provides access to needed care, including primary and specialty care, free preventative services, and prescription drugs;

Whereas the creation of a prescription drug benefit in 2003 has ensured that nearly 90 percent of Medicare beneficiaries have prescription drug coverage, and since 2010, over 8,200,000 seniors have saved more than \$11,500,000,000 on their prescription drugs as a

result of closing the Medicare Part D coverage gap;

Whereas in 2013, an estimated 37,200,000 people with Medicare took advantage of at least one preventative service with no cost sharing;

Whereas Medicaid is a critical source of comprehensive, affordable health coverage for millions of otherwise uninsured low-income adults and parents, including millions of nonelderly low income adults in states that expanded their Medicaid programs as part of health reform;

Whereas Medicaid ensures access to long-term services and supports for vulnerable low income seniors and persons with disabilities by covering 60 percent of nursing home residents, picking up 40 percent of the Nation's long-term care costs, and allowing loved ones to live with health and dignity in their own homes and communities;

Whereas Medicaid provides early comprehensive childhood screening, diagnosis, and treatment for 32,000,000 of the Nation's children, including half of all low-income children; and

Whereas Medicaid provides crucial services for pregnant women and babies in that Medicaid covers 45 percent of births nationwide, 53 percent of hospital stays for infants born prematurely or with a low birth weight, and 45 percent of hospital stays for infants with birth defects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) all efforts to improve Medicare and Medicaid must support and build upon President Johnson's vision "to assure the availability of and accessibility to the best healthcare to all Americans, regardless of age or geography or economic status";

(2) Medicare's guaranteed benefit is a lifeline to millions of Americans and must remain intact for this and future generations;

(3) Medicare should not be transformed into a voucher program, leaving seniors and people with disabilities vulnerable to higher out-of-pocket costs;

(4) with the strong support of the Federal Government, Medicaid continues to serve as a safety net for vulnerable children, pregnant women, persons with disabilities, elderly who are poor and frail, and other low income adults; and

(5) Medicaid should not be dismantled through block grants, per-capita caps, or by other policies that slash funding, shift cost to states, reduce benefits, and erode the safety net relied on by over 68,000,000 Americans.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to highlight a Presidential message that was delivered to Congress 50 years ago today.

But before I reiterate the importance of Medicare and Medicaid—facts that I think my colleagues and I can all agree to I would like to look back at where we have been, to recall what life was like for so many people who were poor and disabled, uninsured or unlucky before these vital safety net programs were here.

Those were the days of the "poor farm" and the "almshouse," places the poor and uninsured would go for care. It wasn't a happy choice and more often than not, it was the only choice. These places provided care, often rudimentary, and often carried a stigma. Accommodations were sparse at best. In return for health care and housing,

residents were expected to work in the adjoining farm or do housework or other menial labor to offset the cost of their stay.

This was the primary option for someone whose extended family couldn't provide help or didn't want to—right here in the USA. Few Americans today remember those days.

When President Johnson submitted his message to Congress 50 years ago today, fewer than half of America's elderly even had health insurance. In that era, and it wasn't that long ago, it wasn't uncommon for the sick elderly to be treated like second class citizens, and as a result, many aging Americans without family to care for them ended up destitute, without necessary health care, or on the street.

It was a time no one wants to revisit, a time that one sociologist said was "another America" where "40 to 50 million citizens were poor, who lacked adequate medical care, and who were 'socially invisible' to the majority of the population."

It is worth remembering how far we have come. Today, I ask my colleagues to use this anniversary as a vivid reminder of the difference Medicare and Medicaid make in the daily lives of Americans, and also the health care advances that have occurred as a result.

A couple facts to highlight for my colleagues:

Today, with rock-solid essential health services, 54 million Americans—nearly every senior and person with disabilities—has access to Medicare's guarantee.

Meanwhile, Medicaid has made a critical difference for 68 million of the Nation's most vulnerable, including more than 32 million children, 6 million seniors, and 10 million persons with disabilities. Because Medicare and Medicaid made health care possible for millions of people, they have also been the catalyst for innovations in treatment that benefit people of all ages. Here's one example:

In the first 30 years of Medicare alone, deaths from heart disease dropped by a third for people over age 65. By providing coverage and access for millions, these programs became catalysts for changes in how medicine is practiced and paid for, while finding the root causes of disease and perfecting better therapies to treat them.

As time has marched on, these programs evolved and improved, and the rest of the health care system followed.

In 1967, Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment, EPSDT, comprehensive health services benefit for all Medicaid children under age 21 was created—helping improve the health of our Nation's kids.

In 1981, home and community-based waivers were established so that states could provide services in a community setting, allowing individuals to remain in their home for as long as possible.

Every state now uses this option to facilitate better care and services to their Medicaid population.

In 1983, Medicare took one of many legs away from fee-for-service with the advent of the hospital prospective payment system, a system that pays hospitals based on a patient's illness, and how serious it was, not based solely on how much it cost to treat them. This change, once considered drastic, has become common place and accepted.

In 2003, the prescription drug coverage was added to Medicare's benefit, providing access to necessary medications for those most likely to need them. As a result of greater access to prescription drugs, beneficiaries' health have dramatically improved.

In 2010, as a result of health reform, preventive services became free to patients, prescription drugs became cheaper for those beneficiaries who fell in the donut hole, Medicare began to move away from purely volume-driven care, and on to paying for quality and value, and the life of the Medicare trust fund was extended.

Finally, in 2012, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid began releasing loads of claims data for the public to use. Access to this information has been game-changing in understanding the cost of care and variations in the way medicine is practiced across the country.

Today, any of these examples are easy to forget because they are commonplace. But that makes them no less remarkable.

I will close by noting something else, just as striking about Medicare and Medicaid: It was a bipartisan effort. The enactment of these programs shows that Congress can craft bipartisan solutions to very complex and politically difficult problems. That's what happened in 1965 when the Senate passed the legislation creating Medicare and Medicaid by a 68-32 vote after the House approved it three months earlier on a robust 313-115.

As the 114th Congress gets underway, my colleagues and I could all take a page from President Johnson's playbook: Congress shouldn't use partisan tactics when the solutions can be bipartisan.

And there's the lesson; that despite sharp differences and partisanship, the Congress of Johnson's day was able to rise above that culture and those challenges to find agreement and make America a much better place. As this new Congress begins, I hope we can use that 50-year-old spirit to strengthen, protect and improve Medicare and Medicaid to keep the guarantee strong and ensure health care to those who need it most.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FIRST SPECIAL SERVICE FORCE, IN RECOGNITION OF ITS SUPERIOR SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. TESTER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 2

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO FIRST SPECIAL SERVICE FORCE.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on February 3, 2015, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force collectively, in recognition of its superior service during World War II. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 26, to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1. Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 26, to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Extension of Terrorism Insurance Program.

Sec. 102. Federal share.

Sec. 103. Program trigger.

Sec. 104. Recoupment of Federal share of compensation under the program.

Sec. 105. Certification of acts of terrorism; consultation with Secretary of Homeland Security.

Sec. 106. Technical amendments.

Sec. 107. Improving the certification process.

Sec. 108. GAO study.

Sec. 109. Membership of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 110. Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms.

Sec. 111. Reporting of terrorism insurance data.

Sec. 112. Annual study of small insurer market competitiveness.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Reestablishment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

SEC. 102. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by inserting “and beginning on January 1, 2016, shall decrease by 1 percentage point per calendar year until equal to 80 percent” after “85 percent”.

SEC. 103. PROGRAM TRIGGER.

Subparagraph (B) of section 103(e)(1) (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(1) by striking “a certified act” and inserting “certified acts”;

(2) by striking “such certified act” and inserting “such certified acts”;

(3) by striking “exceed” and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting the following: “exceed—

“(i) \$100,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2015;

“(ii) \$120,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2016;

“(iii) \$140,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2017;

“(iv) \$160,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2018;

“(v) \$180,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2019;

and

“(vi) \$200,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2020 and any calendar year thereafter.”.

SEC. 104. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) **INSURANCE MARKETPLACE AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of paragraph (7), the insurance marketplace aggregate retention amount shall be the lesser of—

“(i) \$27,500,000,000, as such amount is revised pursuant to this paragraph; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year.

“(B) **REVISION OF INSURANCE MARKETPLACE AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.**—

“(i) **PHASE-IN.**—Beginning in the calendar year of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, the amount set forth under subparagraph (A)(i) shall increase by \$2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to \$37,500,000,000.

“(ii) **FURTHER REVISION.**—Beginning in the calendar year that follows the calendar year in which the amount set forth under subparagraph (A)(i) is equal to \$37,500,000,000,

the amount under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be revised to be the amount equal to the annual average of the sum of insurer deductibles for all insurers participating in the Program for the prior 3 calendar years, as such sum is determined by the Secretary under subparagraph (C).

“(C) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Secretary shall—

“(i) issue final rules for determining the amount of the sum described under subparagraph (B)(ii); and

“(ii) provide a timeline for public notification of such determination.”; and

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “for such period”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) [Reserved.]”;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent” and inserting “, terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 140 percent”; and

(ii) by inserting “as calculated under subparagraph (A)” after “mandatory recoupment amount”; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking “2010” and inserting “2017”; and

(II) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking “2011” and inserting “2018”; and

(II) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(III) by striking “2017” and inserting “2024”; and

(iii) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(II) by striking “2017” and inserting “2024”.

SEC. 105. CERTIFICATION OF ACTS OF TERRORISM; CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Paragraph (1)(A) of section 102 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “concurrence with the Secretary of State” and inserting “consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 106. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “An entity has” and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An entity has”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have ‘control’ over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not,

for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having ‘control’ under subparagraph (A).”;

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

“(A) the value of an insurer’s direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year” and inserting “notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year”; and

(II) by striking “Period or Program Year” and inserting “calendar year”;

(C) by striking paragraph (11); and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, purchase,”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, purchase,”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “Program Year” and inserting “calendar year”;

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), as previously amended by section 102—

(I) by striking “the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter” and inserting “each calendar year”;

(II) by striking the comma after “80 percent”; and

(III) by striking “such Transition Period or such Program Year” and inserting “such calendar year”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter” and inserting “a calendar year”; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking “the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year” and inserting “any calendar year”; and

(D) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking “the Transition Period or a Program Year” each place that term appears and inserting “the calendar year”;

(ii) by striking “such period” and inserting “the calendar year”; and

(iii) by striking “that period” and inserting “the calendar year”.

SEC. 107. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “act of terrorism” has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term “certification process” means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process required under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 107 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including establishing a timeline for which an act is eligible for certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.”.

SEC. 108. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government—

(1) assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Program”), which shall include a comparison of practices in international markets to assess and collect premiums either before or after terrorism losses are incurred; and

(2) creating a capital reserve fund under the Program and requiring insurers participating in the Program to dedicate capital specifically for terrorism losses before such losses are incurred, which shall include a comparison of practices in international markets to establish reserve funds.

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine, but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) UPFRONT PREMIUMS.—With respect to upfront premiums described in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) how the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program;

(B) how the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums;

(C) how the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program;

(D) how the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas;

(E) the effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small;

(F) the effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance; and

(G) the size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their participation in the Program, taking into account the Program’s current post-event recoupment structure.

(2) CAPITAL RESERVE FUND.—With respect to the capital reserve fund described in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) how the creation of a capital reserve fund would affect the Federal Government’s fiscal exposure under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program and the ability of the Program to meet its statutory purposes;

(B) how a capital reserve fund would impact insurers and reinsurers, including liquidity, insurance pricing, and capacity to provide terrorism risk coverage;

(C) the feasibility of segregating funds attributable to terrorism risk from funds attributable to other insurance lines;

(D) how a capital reserve fund would be viewed and treated under current Financial Accounting Standards Board accounting rules and the tax laws; and

(E) how a capital reserve fund would affect the States’ ability to regulate insurers participating in the Program.

(3) INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES.—With respect to international markets referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), how other countries, if any—

(A) have established terrorism insurance structures;

(B) charge premiums or otherwise collect funds to pay for the costs of terrorism insurance structures, including risk and administrative costs; and

(C) have established capital reserve funds to pay for the costs of terrorism insurance structures.

(c) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

SEC. 109. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: “In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than \$10,000,000,000 in total assets.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

SEC. 110. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) **FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the “Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms” (referred to in this subsection as the “Advisory Committee”).

(2) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

SEC. 111. REPORTING OF TERRORISM INSURANCE DATA.

Section 104 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **REPORTING OF TERRORISM INSURANCE DATA.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY.**—During the calendar year beginning on January 1, 2016, and in each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary shall require insurers participating in the Program to submit to the Secretary such information regarding insurance coverage for terrorism losses of such insurers as the Secretary considers appropriate to analyze the effectiveness of the Program, which shall include information regarding—

“(A) lines of insurance with exposure to such losses;

“(B) premiums earned on such coverage;

“(C) geographical location of exposures;

“(D) pricing of such coverage;

“(E) the take-up rate for such coverage;

“(F) the amount of private reinsurance for acts of terrorism purchased; and

“(G) such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than June 30, 2016, and every other June 30 thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that includes—

“(A) an analysis of the overall effectiveness of the Program;

“(B) an evaluation of any changes or trends in the data collected under paragraph (1);

“(C) an evaluation of whether any aspects of the Program have the effect of discouraging or impeding insurers from providing commercial property casualty insurance coverage or coverage for acts of terrorism;

“(D) an evaluation of the impact of the Program on workers’ compensation insurers; and

“(E) in the case of the data reported in paragraph (1)(B), an updated estimate of the total amount earned since January 1, 2003.

“(3) **PROTECTION OF DATA.**—To the extent possible, the Secretary shall contract with an insurance statistical aggregator to collect the information described in paragraph (1), which shall keep any nonpublic information confidential and provide it to the Secretary in an aggregate form or in such other form or manner that does not permit identification of the insurer submitting such information.

“(4) **ADVANCE COORDINATION.**—Before collecting any data or information under paragraph (1) from an insurer, or affiliate of an insurer, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate State insurance regulatory authorities and any relevant government agency or publicly available sources to determine if the information to be collected is available from, and may be obtained in a timely manner by, individually or collectively, such entities. If the Secretary determines that such data or information is available, and may be obtained in a timely matter, from such entities, the Secretary shall obtain the data or information from such entities. If the Secretary determines that such data or information is not so available, the Secretary may collect such data or information from an insurer and affiliates.

“(5) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—

“(A) **RETENTION OF PRIVILEGE.**—The submission of any non-publicly available data and information to the Secretary and the sharing of any non-publicly available data with or by the Secretary among other Federal agencies, the State insurance regulatory authorities, or any other entities under this subsection shall not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise affect, any privilege arising under Federal or State law (including the rules of any Federal or State court) to which the data or information is otherwise subject.

“(B) **CONTINUED APPLICATION OF PRIOR CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENTS.**—Any requirement under Federal or State law to the extent otherwise applicable, or any requirement pursuant to a written agreement in effect between the original source of any non-publicly available data or information and the source of such data or information to the Secretary, regarding the privacy or confidentiality of any data or information in the possession of the source to the Secretary, shall continue to apply to such data or information after the data or information has been provided pursuant to this subsection.

“(C) **INFORMATION-SHARING AGREEMENT.**—Any data or information obtained by the Secretary under this subsection may be made available to State insurance regulatory authorities, individually or collectively through an information-sharing agreement that—

“(i) shall comply with applicable Federal law; and

“(ii) shall not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise affect, any privilege under Federal or State law (including any privilege referred to in subparagraph (A) and the rules of any Federal or State court) to which the data or information is otherwise subject.

“(D) **AGENCY DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, including any exceptions thereunder, shall apply to any data or information submitted under this subsection to the Secretary by an insurer or affiliate of an insurer.”

SEC. 112. ANNUAL STUDY OF SMALL INSURER MARKET COMPETITIVENESS.

Section 108 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **STUDY OF SMALL INSURER MARKET COMPETITIVENESS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than June 30, 2017, and every other June 30 thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a study of small insurers (as such term is defined by regulation by the Secretary) participating in the Program, and identify any competitive challenges small insurers face in the terrorism risk insurance marketplace, including—

“(A) changes to the market share, premium volume, and policyholder surplus of small insurers relative to large insurers;

“(B) how the property and casualty insurance market for terrorism risk differs between small and large insurers, and whether such a difference exists within other perils;

“(C) the impact of the Program’s mandatory availability requirement under section 103(c) on small insurers;

“(D) the effect of increasing the trigger amount for the Program under section 103(e)(1)(B) on small insurers;

“(E) the availability and cost of private reinsurance for small insurers; and

“(F) the impact that State workers compensation laws have on small insurers and workers compensation carriers in the terrorism risk insurance marketplace.

“(2) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the findings and conclusions of each study required under paragraph (1).”

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Association’).

“(b) **STATUS.**—The Association shall—

“(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

“(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

“(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

“(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

“SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other non-resident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted

and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

“(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

“(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

“(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

“(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

“(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

“SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

“(a) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

“(2) **INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.**—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

“(3) **RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.**—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

“(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

“(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(4) **CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

“(B) **CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.**—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

“(C) **CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(ii) **PROCEDURES.**—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Board’) shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in

connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

“(D) **FORM OF REQUEST.**—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

“(E) **PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Association, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other identification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

“(F) **LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.**—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

“(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

“(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

“(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

“(G) **PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.**—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than \$50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(H) **RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.**—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

“(I) **FEES.**—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

“(J) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

“(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

“(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

“(K) **REGULATIONS.**—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

“(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

“(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to con-

test the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

“(L) **INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

“(ii) **RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.**—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

“(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

“(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

“(M) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘criminal history record check’ means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(b) **AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.**—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

“(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(1) **CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.**—The Association may establish separate classes of membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

“(2) **BUSINESS ENTITIES.**—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, standards, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

“(3) **CATEGORIES.**—

“(A) **SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.**—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

“(B) **SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.**—No special categories of membership, and no distinct membership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

“(d) **MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

“(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the

National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the 'NAIC') Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

“(3) ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

“(B) AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

“(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

“(ii) the Association to receive the information.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

“(4) DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

“(e) EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.—Membership in the Association shall—

“(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

“(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

“(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

“(2) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(4) NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including

State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

“(B) ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

“(5) PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effectiveness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

“(B) PRESERVED REGULATIONS.—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

“(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

“(ii) establish consumer protections; or

“(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

“(f) BIENNIAL RENEWAL.—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

“(g) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

“(2) STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

“(3) RECIPROCITY.—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

“(4) LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.—The Association shall not directly or indirectly offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

“(h) PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.—

“(1) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

“(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

“(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

“(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

“(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(2) VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

“(3) REPORTING.—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

“(i) CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall—

“(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

“(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

“(2) TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

“(3) FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other information protected by State law to the Association.

“(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Association may—

“(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referred to paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

“(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in circumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

“(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

“(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the

collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

“(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

“(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015; and

“(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

“SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

“(b) POWERS.—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

“(c) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

“(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

“(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

“(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

“(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

“(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

“(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

“(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the

Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

“(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

“(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State insurance commissioner’ means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

“(d) TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the President at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

“(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

“(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

“(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

“(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

“(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

“(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2015.

“(f) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

“(A) at the call of the chairperson;

“(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

“(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

“(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

“(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

“(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

“(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

“(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, in-

clude provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

“(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

“(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

“(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

“(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

“(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

“(i) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

“SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

“(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the Association may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

“(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a ‘disciplinary action’) or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association

shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

“(2) **SUPPORTING STATEMENT.**—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

“(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

“(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

“(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

“(3) **INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.**—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

“(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

“(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

“SEC. 326. POWERS.

“In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

“(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

“(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

“(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

“(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

“(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

“(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

“(7) borrow money; and

“(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

“SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regarding the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

“(b) **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

“SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State

law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

“(b) **LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.**—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

“SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

“(a) **REMOVAL OF BOARD.**—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

“(b) **REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.**—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

“(c) **SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.**—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

“SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

“(a) **PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.**—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

“(b) **PROHIBITED ACTIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No State shall—

“(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

“(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

“(2) **STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.**—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

“(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

“(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

“(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

“(3) **PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

“SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

“The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

“SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

“(a) **RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

“(b) **ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.**—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

“SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

“The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

“SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) **BUSINESS ENTITY.**—The term ‘business entity’ means a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

“(2) **DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term ‘depository institution’ has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

“(3) **HOME STATE.**—The term ‘home State’ means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

“(4) **INSURANCE.**—The term ‘insurance’ means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

“(5) **INSURANCE PRODUCER.**—The term ‘insurance producer’ means any insurance

agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

“(6) INSURER.—The term ‘insurer’ has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

“(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term ‘principal place of business’ means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

“(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term ‘principal place of residence’ means the State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

“(9) STATE.—The term ‘State’ includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(10) STATE LAW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘State law’ includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

“(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

“Sec. 322. Purpose.

“Sec. 323. Membership.

“Sec. 324. Board of directors.

“Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.

“Sec. 326. Powers.

“Sec. 327. Report by the Association.

“Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.

“Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.

“Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.

“Sec. 331. Coordination with financial industry regulatory authority.

“Sec. 332. Right of action.

“Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.

“Sec. 334. Definitions.”.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jane Sarnecky, a Coast Guard fellow in my office, and Rongalett Green, a Marine Corps fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during the first session of this 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 2, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 23, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 23) making majority party appointments for the 114th Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 23) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 23

Resolved, That the following be the majority membership on the following committees for the remainder of the 114th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts (Chairman), Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Perdue, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran (Chairman), Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Shelby (Chairman), Mr. Crapo, Mr. Corker, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Enzi (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune (Chairman), Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Heller, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Inhofe (Chairman), Mr. Vitter, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Coats, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Mr. Barrasso.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Alexander (Chairman), Mr. Enzi, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson (Chairman), Mr. McCain, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Grassley (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Vitter, Mr. Flake, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Blunt (Chairman), Mr. Alexander, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Vitter (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Ernst, Ms. Ayotte, Mr. Enzi.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Barrasso (Chairman), Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Roberts, Mr. Risch.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Coats, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton.

COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Corker, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sasse.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOWIE STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 24) recognizing the 150th anniversary of Bowie State University.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, January 9, 2015; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:12 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 9, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

WALTER HOOD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2020, VICE BARBARA ERNST PREY, TERM EXPIRED.

DIANE HELEN RODRIGUEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2018, VICE JOAN ISRAELITE, TERM EXPIRED.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

PATRICIA D. CAHILL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

KRISTEN JOAN SARRI, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE RHEA S. SUH, RESIGNED.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

KRISTEN MARIE KULINOWSKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE BETH J. ROSENBERG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SALLY QUILLIAN YATES, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE JAMES MICHAEL COLE, RESIGNING.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RAFAEL J. LOPEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE BRYAN HAYES SAMUELS, RESIGNED.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

TODD A. FISHER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2016, VICE JAMES A. TORREY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEVEN J. PAREKH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2016, VICE KATHERINE M. GEHL, RESIGNED.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

ROMONIA S. DIXON, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2018, VICE MATTHEW FRANCIS MCCABE, TERM EXPIRED.

VICTORIA ANN HUGHES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2016, VICE JAMES PALMER, TERM EXPIRED.

ERIC P. LIU, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 27, 2017, VICE LAYSHAE WARD, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD

MICHAEL D. KENNEDY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DAVID AVREN JONES, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 11, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

JEFFERY S. HALL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 13, 2018, VICE LELAND A. STROM, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

THERESE W. MCMILLAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATOR, VICE PETER M. ROGOFF, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

THO DINH-ZARR, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018, VICE DEBORAH HERSMAN, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

DAVA J. NEWMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, VICE LORI GARVER, RESIGNED.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

MARK SCARANO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION, VICE SANDFORD BLITZ, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MARISA LAGO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE MIRIAM E. SAPIRO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHELE THOREN BOND, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERV-

ICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS), VICE JANICE L. JACOBS, RESIGNED.

PAUL A. FOLMSBEE, OF OKLAHOMA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALI.

JENNIFER ANN HAVERKAMP, OF INDIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS, VICE KERRI-ANN JONES, RESIGNED.

AZITA RAJI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SWEDEN.

PEACE CORPS

CARLOS J. TORRES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, VICE CAROLYN HESSLER RADELET, RESIGNED.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

WALTER A. BARROWS, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICES

ALLISON BECK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR, VICE GEORGE H. COHEN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

ADRI DAVIN JAYARATNE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE BRIAN VINCENT KENNEDY.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MARY LUCILLE JORDAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

MICHAEL YOUNG, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RUSSELL C. DEYO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RAFAEL BORRAS, RESIGNED.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

EARL L. GAY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE CHRISTINE M. GRIFFIN.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

DAVID S. SHAPIRA, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2019, VICE DENNIS J. TONER, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE TRACIE STEVENS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL P. BOTTICELLI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, VICE R. GIL KERLIKOWSKIE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICHELLE K. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, VICE DAVID J. KAPPOS, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DANIEL HENRY MARTI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE VICTORIA ANGELICA ESPINEL, RESIGNED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

GILBERTO DE JESUS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 8, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, if you live in Rhode Island, Texas, New York, New Jersey, or Florida, I am looking forward to seeing you in the coming weeks, and my friends in North Carolina and South Carolina, too.

When I am not here or in my district in Chicago, I have half a dozen events lined up over the next few weeks, and I am going to be going from town to town, State to State, talking with people about the President's immigration executive actions and what it means for them, their families, and their communities.

In congregations and community centers and schools, and with local elected officials, I am going to be doing outreach to educate the community of immigrants and also to mobilize the multitude of allies at the State and local level who will help millions of our immigrant neighbors come forward and register with the government.

I will not be alone in this effort. Next week I will be with the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, DAVID

CICILLINE, and with his mayor in Providence holding an event to get people the information they need so they can get ready to sign up with the government.

From Charlotte to Houston to Los Angeles, my colleagues here in the House are pulling together events to educate their own communities, and I hope to attend as many as I can.

Evangelical congregations across the Nation, the Catholic Church, and my own archdiocese in Chicago are stepping up to organize and host events and begin laying the groundwork for millions of people who work and live and raise families in the U.S. to come forward and pay to be temporarily spared from deportation.

Labor unions, corporations, small businesses that want to help families remain together, hey, they are preparing, too, and mayors, lots of mayors across the country. Apparently when Mayor Rahm Emanuel from the city of Chicago steps forward to say he will help facilitate the enrollment of families and individuals with the Federal Government, other mayors say, "Me, too," and good for them.

We can all help by playing a role in implementing the immigration executive actions taken by the President that will help millions of people. Congress refuses to pass laws that channel people into legal immigration with visas, and Congress refuses to address millions of people who have lived and worked here for a decade or more, and they refuse to address any meaningful enforcement like E-Verify or at the borders and ports of entry because they would rather play politics and play to the talk radio audience.

But at the White House and on our side of the aisle, we are actually taking steps on immigration that will address the anxieties of the talk radio audience and not just inflame their frustration with the current mess. Remember, not doing anything, the Republican strategy, that is amnesty.

We are going to make sure that millions of American citizens can live with their family members and that we not place American citizen children in foster care by the thousands because we are deporting their parents.

We are going to make sure that more of the employment and tax base of the country is on the books, working legitimately for employers who have to follow the rules, and that employers will not get to pick between a legal job market and an illegal one that is not protected by labor laws, wage protec-

tion, safety regulations, and, yes, tax compliance.

We are getting accurate information out to people to tell them that what the President announced is not immigration reform, it is not a permanent but a small step in the right direction within the confines of current law.

As I said during the last Congress—and I am repeating it again today—I will work with anyone in either party who has a legitimate idea on how to make our immigration system more secure, more legal, more orderly. Most of my fellow lawmakers in this body support legal immigration, and to make progress we need to break with the group opposing legal immigration.

We need a modern visa system that takes America beyond the current system crafted in the 1980s and 1990s. We need a modern enforcement with an electronic verification system that replaces a paper-based system of documentation. We need modern border security that works hand in hand with modern visa and enforcement systems so that we channel traffic through ports of entry where commodities, cargo, and people are inspected efficiently.

More militarization, more deportation, and narrower legal immigration channels have not given us greater control over the immigration process and have led us to a number of problems.

If you are serious about border security, legalization enforcement, legal immigration, then my door is always open. Tell me what you need to move forward. Do you need more fences? More high tech visas? More immigration judges? Tell me what it will take to get this Congress out of the current rut.

In the meantime, I and a lot of my colleagues are going to be out there around the country protecting American families from destruction and protecting millions from deportation.

AMERICA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent concessions by President Obama to the Castro regime mark a drastic departure from one of the most consistent tenets of United States foreign policy and traditional American values, and sets a dangerous precedent for other rogue regimes to emulate.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The pardoning of convicted Cuban spies follows an ill-advised exchange with the Taliban in which the rhetoric emerging from the White House to justify its actions has been unnervingly similar. As predicted, the course of policy by this administration on caving to terrorist demands makes the United States more vulnerable.

We see those repercussions manifest themselves across the globe. Just recently, Venezuela's thug Nicolas Maduro jumped at the opportunity to request an exchange of a convicted criminal in the United States for the freedom of pro-democracy leader Leopoldo Lopez, whom Maduro has jailed in Venezuela.

This is not the way to protect U.S. national security interests throughout the world; this is a way of putting them in jeopardy.

When we equate unjustly imprisoned Americans to battle-hardened terrorists or convicted spies, we set a dangerous precedent for the world to follow.

The Cuban regime has already signaled strongly that it will not unclench its fist, despite recent developments.

On December 30, just 13 days after President Obama's announcement, the Cuban regime arrested nearly 60 activists seeking to express themselves freely—this in addition to the arrest of more than 200 activists on Human Rights Day—ha, that is rich—just 7 days before the announcement normalizing relations.

Yet the administration proudly and openly touts the promised but yet unproven release of 53 dissidents as a major breakthrough when in reality the net result will mean hundreds more in Castro's gulags. Raul Castro will free 53 and arrest 60 more in the next months.

This shows the failure of the administration's argument and proves that there is no intention by the Castros to move in the direction of reform or freedom. Instead, President Obama has created an atmosphere that emboldens the regime to continue its violent tactics with no concern about consequences from this White House.

We must not forget that Cuba not only poses a threat to its people but also threatens us here at home. Cuba must remain a state sponsor of terrorism because it has not changed its terrorist ways.

For example, in the year 2013 Cuba was caught helping another dangerous regime, North Korea, evade U.N. Security Council resolutions of sanctions by shipping arms and munitions to the Kim Jong-un regime. At a time when many in Congress and even the White House are trying to punish the North Korean regime for its cyber attacks against the U.S., we cannot forget that those rogue regimes helped North Korea—like the one in Cuba.

The Castro regime continues to thumb its nose at the U.S. by harboring fugitives such as New Jersey State trooper killer Joanne Chesimard, by harboring Puerto Rican terrorist William Guillermo Morales and bank robber Victor Gerena and many others who have fled U.S. justice for the shores of Cuba.

These are just a few of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the administration must reexamine its relationship with Castro and impose strict sanctions against the thugs, not offer it concessions for all of these transgressions. Just like a zebra cannot change its stripes, the Castro regime cannot and will not change its anti-freedom, terrorist ways.

It is our duty to support democracy and be a voice for those 11 million Cubans oppressed throughout the island. By appeasing dictators, we have disappointed people all over the world who are struggling to achieve freedom, and the White House has betrayed core American values and principles: the respect for human rights and the right for people to choose their own destiny.

As the first Cuban American-born Member of Congress who went from being a political refugee, fleeing the oppressive and brutal Castro regime, to a senior Member of this hallowed and cherished body, I will fight tooth and nail to ensure that the cause for freedom and democracy in Cuba is not forgotten. Until the oppressive yoke of tyranny installed by the Castro brothers has been lifted and the regime has been replaced by a representative democracy like the one we have here in our cherished Nation, I have a moral obligation to freedom-loving people everywhere, and I will not ever forget that responsibility.

BIPARTISANSHIP AND END OF LIFE CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the new Congress, America sees the two parties in both the House and the Senate, along with the White House, making statements that establish positions that distinguish one from another.

But what if we started not by defining our differences but with efforts that would bring us together?

We ended the last Congress with the passage of the Paul Simon Water for the World Act, something I have worked on with my friend and partner from Texas, TED POE, for years here in the House. There was extraordinary bipartisan leadership demonstrated by Congressmen CHARLIE DENT, AARON SCHOCK, Senator DICK DURBIN. It did take 6 years, but this bipartisan effort for a humanitarian cause, especially

benefiting women and girls around the globe, was worth the time and effort.

The legislation focused and enhanced American efforts dealing with international water and sanitation. Today 152 million hours will be spent by women and girls traveling to get water, often dirty water, to meet the needs of their families in some of the poorest regions of the planet.

This legislation created more focused American leadership, and it was backed up by unprecedented increases in American aid for water and sanitation. It will pay benefits for generations to come for millions, making friends for America while it allows children to live longer and makes the lives of women and girls more bearable. And we did it together.

Are there other such candidates for legislation that will bring us together? Dr. PHIL ROE and I have been working on the Personalize Your Care Act with medical groups, advocacy organizations, experts in palliative care, hospitals, the community of faith.

This is an effort to make sure that at the end of life for our loved ones, they actually get the treatment they want, not health care on autopilot.

We have had tragic stories about how medical decisions by reflex and default have put people in isolated ICUs in painful and foreign settings when actually most of them, and in fact most of us, would rather be comfortable at home, surrounded by our loved ones.

□ 1015

There has been a brilliant and exhaustive report by the Institute of Medicine that deals with the problems and concerns and how we can do better. Dr. Atul Gawande's bestselling book, "Being Mortal," makes it clear that there are crying needs and simple, commonsense compassionate solutions.

There is a revolution taking place in health care today. What if, as part of that revolution, Congress started the new year with our bipartisan legislation, the Personalize Your Care Act, to make sure those families understand their choices, that their choices are known, and—most important—their choices are respected?

We had dozens of cosponsors and broad support across the medical establishment and the community of faith. Maybe we can pick up where we left off and have this legislation bring us together to protect our families and start the year on a united front, giving families the protection they want for the care they need.

There is no reason we in Congress need to spin our wheels and shout at and past each other. Mr. Speaker, I could have made this same presentation not about the water and sanitation, but about how this Congress came together in the final hours to help save the lives of Afghans and Iraqis who are now at risk from the tender mercies of

the Taliban and al Qaeda because they helped Americans as guides and interpreters when we needed them.

These are some of my examples of bipartisan cooperation that are important which we have done in the past. I would invite my colleagues to share their agenda of bipartisan, low or no-cost legislation that allows us to work together.

It is not too late to start the year and this Congress right.

THE SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, and to urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this important initiative.

I have heard from many people across northern Michigan—from working moms and dads and small business owners to county government—that the President's health care law is stifling economic growth, job creation, and hours of work.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most burdensome and baffling regulations imposed by the President's health care law was the reclassification of what constitutes a full-time employee.

The Save American Workers Act will get rid of this rule, helping employees in Michigan and around the country create more opportunities in our area. This simple and commonsense fix will be a good first step towards restoring the true definition of full-time employment and increasing jobs in northern Michigan.

I have joined with 147 of my colleagues—more than one-third of the entire House—in being an original cosponsor of this legislation. I am happy that this is one of the first bills that the House of Representatives will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a new Congress, but the sights are familiar: the same rhetoric with no regard for the truth.

Ahead of another ill-advised vote to approve the Keystone pipeline, the same myths are being spread pitting environmental protection against job creation.

Winston Churchill once said:

The truth is incontrovertible. Malice may attack it, ignorance may deride it, but in the end, there it is.

Let us separate myths from reality. It is time to decide: truth or scare. Ap-

proval of the Keystone pipeline will have very little impact in the way of job creation but a detrimental impact on the environment and hinder our promise of a clean energy future. That is the truth.

My question is: Why are we ignoring these facts and voting once again to approve the Keystone pipeline, which would carry one of the dirtiest energy sources on the planet? Perhaps it has something to do with the many myths associated with this project. Pipeline proponents are quick to point to the creation of jobs as the primary reason for the project's approval; however, the facts don't match up.

According to the only independent analysis by Cornell University's Global Labor Institute, these claims are not accurate. TransCanada's job claims are complete fabrications. The Cornell report concludes that Keystone will not be a major source of jobs, nor will it play any substantial role at all in putting Americans back to work.

The State Department says Keystone would only create 35 permanent jobs and 1,950 construction jobs for 2 years. Most of those jobs created by this project will be nonlocal and temporary.

In reality, we can and should be creating jobs by improving our existing infrastructure and investing in clean energy, education, and research. In fact, Keystone would make it much harder for the United States to invest in clean energy jobs and address global climate change. Our best bet at a clean energy economy lies far, far away from tar sands. That is the truth.

Proponents of the pipeline claim that Keystone will bring down gas prices for Americans, but in reality, prices at Midwestern pumps could actually increase. According to its own documents, TransCanada expects the pipeline to increase gas prices in the Midwest up to 15 cents per gallon.

Currently, a surplus of gas in the region means that our prices stay stable. If the pipeline is built, oil companies will be able to send their product to the gulf coast for export, which will reduce the surplus and drive up costs for Midwestern consumers. That is the truth.

On top of all this, let's not forget TransCanada is the same company that operates the existing Keystone pipeline which spilled a dozen times in the first year of operation. The twelfth spill released 21,000 gallons of oil in North Dakota, contaminating the soil and water.

Across the country, about 3.2 million gallons of oil spill from pipelines every year. These spills pose a great threat to American drinking water, especially when you consider the proposed project route would cross 1,073 surface water bodies and affect 383 acres of wetlands.

Most Americans understand that oil spills in the past have had severe environmental impacts, but any Keystone

spill would be truly catastrophic. That is the truth.

In the end, Keystone brings a whole lot of environmental risk and very little reward. It is time we stopped perpetuating the myths. It is time we heed the warnings. It is time we decide: truth or scare.

MOBILE COOPER RIVERSIDE PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, in Mobile's Cooper Riverside Park, there stands a statue of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville, the French founder of Mobile, a statue which is identical to another statue located in Havana, Cuba.

This statue is just one example of the robust ties between the city of Mobile, located in my Congressional district, and Cuba. These ties go all the way back to Spanish colonization in the 18th century.

It is safe to say that I represent a district that stands to benefit from improved relationships with Cuba. In fact, the Port of Mobile is a straight shot to Cuba and could be an important economic hub, just as it was going back to the 18th century.

Under the right circumstances, I would gladly support lifting the trade embargo with Cuba and improving diplomatic relations. Unfortunately, now is not that time. The economic benefits should not come at the cost of enabling a ruthless regime that is unwilling to change.

Once again, the President seems to be more interested in a publicity stunt than in a substantive solution. The White House will tell you that this action is no different from previous efforts to improve relations with other communist countries like Vietnam or China.

Here is the problem with that premise. In each of those cases, the President engaged with Congress in a serious conversation and debate about the best path forward. A plan was developed, serious concessions were agreed to, and each nation mutually benefited from these meaningful actions.

Unfortunately, in the case of Cuba, President Obama has again decided to cut Congress out of the process and act alone with no real plan to accomplish his stated goal. This approach is the wrong way for our government to operate, and it has once again resulted in a bad deal.

Columnist Charles Krauthammer put it best when he said:

Do you know how to achieve a breakthrough in tough negotiations? Give everything away.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but ask what reforms Cuba will make as a result of this deal. Let's not forget that this is the same Cuba, under the same

regime, who during the Cold War had nuclear missiles on their soil aimed at the United States of America.

This is the same Cuba that refuses to let the church operate freely. This is the same Cuba that worked with Venezuela and North Korea against the interests of the United States. This is the same Cuba that has been accused again and again of egregious human rights violations. Nothing has changed in those areas at all, and the Castro brothers are still in power.

Now, there is a path forward for improved diplomatic relations and ending the trade embargo. The Castro regime must go. Political activity must be legalized. Public commitments to free and fair elections must be made. An independent judiciary must be established. Rights to free speech and freedom of the press must be guaranteed.

Cuba must renounce the policy of being a staging area against the United States. Political prisoners must be freed, and the Cuban citizens must be treated with respect and dignity and be provided with the basic freedoms we often take for granted here in the U.S.

Under those conditions and with a President willing to work with Congress, the embargo could be lifted and progress could truly begin.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself once again coming to this floor to implore President Obama to abandon his ill-conceived, independent executive action and, instead, come to the Capitol, work with this Congress, share ideas, and collaborate; and together, we can make a real, positive impact on behalf of the American people.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the Congress' attention to what I think is our most important issue we face as a Congress and as a people, and that is preserving America's greatest asset, which is the health and lives of our citizens.

In doing so, I request, as I have done on many occasions, that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in adequately funding our Nation's other department of defense—coequally important—the National Institutes of Health.

Yes, the Department of Defense is important, and we fund it more than adequately, more than they even ask for, and it protects us from ISIS and others that caused the great tragedy in Paris and has caused terror and havoc in Great Britain, Australia, and Canada and that I am sure will come to our shores sooner than we expect, but the National Institutes of Health protects us from disease, disease that threatens every American and every American's loved one.

The sequestration has cut billions from NIH's budget, and that is our country's foremost medical research center. It has helped billions of people across the country and across the world who suffer from heart disease, cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, you name it, but we have inadequately funded the NIH.

It has not kept up with the level of inflation over the last decade. Based on that level of inflation, the funding we have given the NIH has resulted in a 10 percent diminution in funding on the purchasing power of the National Institutes of Health.

The likelihood of any one of us dying from a terrorist attack or from some weapon fired from North Korea or Russia or Iran is very slim, but the odds of us suffering from the diseases which I have mentioned previously is likely in our loved ones. We need to fight those diseases. We can do it, and we can successfully come up with treatments and cures if we fund the National Institutes of Health.

Supporting the NIH used to be a bipartisan commitment, especially seeing that every dollar invested results in about \$2.21 in economic growth. I hope that this new American Congress will see that and that my Republican colleagues will agree with me that we need to put a focus on our individual capital, the personal capital of people, their health and their well-being.

I talked to Representative MARINO recently, and he is going to join me in founding an NIH caucus. I think there is nothing more important. In the past, many times, when I have brought up funding for the NIH, friends on the other side have said: "Well, we will have to pay for it. If we put more money in it, then our children and grandchildren will be paying for the debt for years to come."

That may be true, but nevertheless, the children and the grandchildren will be receiving the benefits of the treatments and cures more likely than any of us will, for research takes a long time.

We also need to change our course in stem cell research. We have had problems with allowing scientists to use this opportunity to come through with great medical breakthroughs.

Federal funding is currently prohibited by the 1996 Dickey amendment to the appropriations bill that funds the NIH, but researchers around the world have dived headfirst into the field using stem cells and producing incredible findings and progress.

In 2010, a gentleman named Darek Fidyka, a Polish man, was stabbed multiple times in a knife attack, and he was paralyzed from the chest down, but thanks to stem cell research in Poland, in collaboration with researchers and doctors there and in the United Kingdom, Darek can now walk again with the help of a walker.

Dr. Geoff Raisman, the chair of neurological regeneration at University College London's Institute of Neurology called this development—and I agree with him—"more impressive than man walking on the Moon."

□ 1030

We allowed a man who couldn't walk, couldn't stand to walk, and more will come from that research on stem cells and other scientific research. Darek otherwise would have been paralyzed for life, and now he is walking again thanks to private investment in stem cell research, but the government needs to participate.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to adequately fund the National Institutes of Health, recognize its importance to our constituents who are important to us, and whose lives and health are the most important things that we can provide for them. It is time this country no longer turns a blind eye to research, and to stem cell research in particular. I urge my colleagues to seize the opportunities offered by this new Congress and join me in the efforts to fund the National Institutes of Health and to join the National Institutes of Health Caucus.

FIXING THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is an exciting honor to address the people's House for the first time.

The 114th Congress carries with it a great opportunity to address the challenges our Nation faces. One priority of the new American Congress is fixing our broken health care system. We have all heard from small businesses and companies who have been forced to lay off workers due to the President's health care law, consequently slowing innovation that drives our Nation and slowing the pace at which that innovation can improve public health outcomes for all Americans.

This week I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 160 that will repeal the medical device tax. In southeastern Pennsylvania, innovation, investment, and jobs at companies such as Neuronetics and Fujirebio Diagnostics are at risk because of this nearly \$30 billion tax hike. There are almost 600 medical device companies that employ over 20,000 Pennsylvanians in good, high-paying jobs. Due to this excise tax, we have seen thousands of jobs lost nationwide. If we fail to act, we are on track to see thousands more lost.

With my colleagues, I look forward to passing this legislation with bipartisan support.

ISSUES CONFRONTING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues that are confronting this Congress as it returns to serve the American people here in the United States Capital. What a wonderful place of democracy and freedom. It gives me a sense of ownership on these values on behalf of my constituents in celebration that we live in a nation that admires and respects and finds a way to disagree without being disagreeable but, more importantly, that we understand that violence against one another is not the solution.

Tragically, I stand to mourn with the people of France as they have experienced a heinous terrorist act, the first, I believe, in a decade that follows the tragedies in Canada and Australia. So we have to define ourselves in somewhat of a different way. The commentary indicated, How would we know?

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I challenge all of us to say we have to know. We must find a way to balance our civil liberties and the respect for our Constitution with protecting the American people, and in a two-road process, try to hinder those who would come to do this violent harm on our soil. But more importantly, we have to begin in a societal confrontation through diplomacy on stopping the radicalization of young people using sources such as the Internet. It is real and we must address it. I look forward as a member of the Homeland Security Committee to begin looking legislatively and pointedly at how we address this question to protect the American people.

I want to step aside for a moment and just speak on two local issues.

RIVERSIDE HOSPITAL, HOUSTON

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Riverside Hospital, Houston, quite different from my earlier comments, is a local hospital in my community founded by the family of a deceased World War I veteran. It has a special place in the hearts of African Americans because it was the only hospital where Negroes could go in the 20th century. It has fallen on difficult challenges.

And so my question and my inquiry is to the new, incoming Governor for the State of Texas, Governor Abbott, to find value in this medical facility because of its historic relationship. It once housed the only outside posttraumatic stress disorder center in Houston outside of the veterans hospital system. It was well attended by veterans who loved the idea of a center that was away from the massive hospital system. It serves people who are poor in the neighborhood and seniors. It has helped those who suffer from substance abuse, and I believe that it needs and desires and deserves a new start.

I will be working with a variety of agencies to do that, and will not be ashamed that unfortunately tragic or, let me say, misbehavior of some caused this unfortunate turn in this hospital. Its history is worth saving. I thank the Cullinan family, whose son died in World War II, for providing the initial funds for us to be able to have this Negro hospital.

SALUTING WHEATLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, then I want to salute Wheatley High School and those who have attended it. It was named after Phillis Wheatley. It was an African American high school in the great city of Houston in the fifth ward. Two of its many graduates were the late Congressman Mickey Leland and late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, and obviously many other great Americans who went to that high school.

Unfortunately, the original Wheatley High School—over the valiant efforts of Wheatley graduates because “everything new” seems to be the direction we want to go—was torn down. But I believe there is a way to find common ground, and I am going to encourage HISD to meet with these valiant former alumni to find a common path of preserving that history in the new school and bringing the community together.

We look forward to meetings forthcoming, for HISD to lend a hand out to people who want to preserve history, to tell the story of a school that was built in 1927 out of a material that in fact actually lasted. And when African Americans could not go to any other school, when those who went off to World War II and Vietnam couldn't go elsewhere, they had the Wheatley High School that sits proudly in the fifth ward. There is a Wheatley High School that was modernized, but the original building of terra-cotta material—so beautiful if you had seen it—could have been restored.

I would like to stand here and say don't condemn those who wanted to hold that piece of history alongside of educating children today and give them the kind of technology they needed. We can do this together. I want to salute those who fought hard, and we can find a common path by working together.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our Nation's law enforcement professionals—the first responders, the Capitol Police here in the Nation's Capital who keep us safe here, and those who answer the call of duty to serve and protect, fami-

lies and friends throughout our great Nation.

Just after 7 p.m. on Sunday, December 14, Baltimore police officer Andrew Groman and his partner made a routine traffic stop outside a west Baltimore gas station. Moments later, three shots were fired from the backseat of the car, one striking Officer Groman in the abdomen, just below his bulletproof vest.

As other officers chased the suspect, Officer Groman's partner rushed him to the hospital where he was forced into emergency surgery. His family was called in from Pennsylvania to be by his side. You see, Officer Groman is a Bucks County native. His family still lives in my congressional district. A former Bucks County volunteer firefighter, Officer Groman had moved to Maryland to continue his service, this time in law enforcement.

While I am happy to tell you he is recovering well, it is terrible to think that he just as easily might have been killed in the line of duty, attacked while performing his duty, which was his passion to serve and protect, conjuring names from our area like Daniel Faulkner, Brian Gregg, and Brad Fox, who also gave the ultimate sacrifice.

While Andrew's Bucks County roots bring the story close to home for many in my district, the sad truth is that we know the service and sacrifice of law enforcement officers is a dangerous, and sometimes deadly, job and one that, sadly, often goes underappreciated.

Our Nation's blue line, the first responders, local, State, and Federal police and law enforcement professionals, often represent the height of both heroism and humbleness. While I take every opportunity I can to meet with and to hear from those who protect the communities in which we live, I am always left wishing that there is more to be said than a “thank you.”

This week we are proud to participate in Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, the effort of a number of partnering organizations committed to raising awareness and showing appreciation for the more than 780,000 officers who serve and protect our neighborhoods, friends, and families nationwide. This week, on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, there is opportunity for all of us to show our support for those who wear blue and to recommit ourselves to the ideals and laws of our Nation that they are tasked to uphold. Together we can address the challenges our Nation faces head-on without partisanship, division, or hate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House, who are settling into new spaces and committees here on Capitol Hill.

As the new session begins, help them and indeed help us all to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive and ready to serve You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. ADAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ADAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect please present themselves in the well.

Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota and Mr. COSTA of California appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 114th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Minnesota, the whole number of the House is now 430.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GRANITEVILLE TRAIN WRECK 10TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday marked the 10th anniversary of the catastrophic train wreck in Graniteville, South Carolina, which sadly is remembered for the death of nine citizens and over 250 persons injured.

I appreciate the first responders of Aiken County and the State for their courageous efforts to help those in need. I commend Steve Seeling, who has promoted train safety after his son, Chris, died in the incident. I also appreciate the continued efforts in leadership of Phil Napier, the GVW volunteer fire chief and now Aiken County Council member.

This disaster had devastating impacts on Graniteville, including the closing of a major employer, Avondale Mills. However, new businesses have emerged, and the expansion of Bridgestone Corporation with the establishment of MTU America has created nearly 1,500 jobs.

While we are grateful for the new jobs in Graniteville and look forward to its continued growth, we will never forget those lost in the railroad tragedy 10 years ago.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. As an American grateful for French heritage, our prayers are with the people of France fighting terrorism.

PROVIDING FUNDING FOR BORDER CROSSINGS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, there are 329 ports of entry across the United States, four of which are located in my district of western New York. These border crossings provide opportunity for trade and commerce, require sufficient levels of security, and provide enormous economic benefits to our Nation.

Today, I asked the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations to include funding for the programs necessary to ensure the free flow of people and goods at the northern border.

Specifically, funding is needed to sustain the recent increase in Customs and Border Protection officer staffing levels. This increase offers significant economic benefits by reducing wait times.

Also, I asked for funding to support the Preinspection Pilot program, which will expedite the flow of traffic by moving primary cargo inspections to Canada at crossings in Buffalo, New York, and Blaine, Washington.

Madam Speaker, I will continue to push for these and other measures to integrate the economies of our border communities with our Canadian neighbors. I urge the committee to support them as well.

IN MEMORY OF KETA SODREL

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Keta Sodrel.

Keta, who passed away 1 week ago today, was married for 47 years to Congressman Mike Sodrel, who represented Indiana's Ninth Congressional District for several years. I know I speak for countless Hoosiers in paying our respects to Keta and offering our thoughts and prayers to Mike and his family.

If you talk to anyone who knew them, you will quickly learn that Mike was able to serve our district with distinction because of the love and support of his wife. Keta, I am told, was a model congressional spouse because she loved southern Indiana, she loved the Lord, and she loved Mike deeply.

Most of us who serve in this body are only able to do so because of the same sort of love and support from our own spouses. As we all remember the Sodrel family during their time of loss, may Keta remind us of the loving, loyal, and invaluable service and sacrifice our spouses make for our Nation.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, now that you have yielded me time, I can say anything I want. I can offer any idea and I can criticize anything. No police force, not the greatest military in the world can stop me from speaking my mind.

This is true not because I am a particularly regular source of good ideas

or because we are particularly gracious to one another around here; it is true because we are humble about what we know for sure.

We used to know for sure in this Chamber that women should not vote and that racial discrimination was okay. Opposing those ideas used to be offensive and provocative.

In Paris yesterday, several courageous journalists were murdered because their ideas were provocative to some. They were murdered by cowards who know that their ideas and visions would and will be rejected by civilized humans everywhere. There is no courage in killing the unarmed.

To those who committed these atrocities yesterday: bring your ideas to a forum like this one or to forums like this one all over the democratic world, bring your ideas to be examined and debated—that is the path of courage and honor.

HOW OBAMACARE AFFECTS CARDIACASSIST

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tell a story about lost opportunity.

Pennsylvania is the country's fourth highest producer of medical devices. One company in my district, CardiacAssist, makes devices that treat heart failure and employs over 40 people.

CardiacAssist's devices improve quality of life, and they significantly reduce the cost of care for cardiac patients. The company's mission is to develop products that are both easier to use and less expensive to make, but ObamaCare's onerous medical device tax is stifling growth at CardiacAssist.

Since this \$30 billion tax took effect, CardiacAssist has backed off from hiring five new employees to just one. It has also reduced its research and development efforts.

When we tax the very innovation that is the solution to the cost crisis in this country, it directly affects how quickly CardiacAssist gets its affordable therapies out to the world. Sadly, it also costs jobs and, in this case, four jobs at a company trying to grow in western Pennsylvania.

The Protect Medical Innovation Act repeals this tax and allows companies like CardiacAssist to get back to growing and creating jobs. I am a proud co-sponsor of this legislation and look forward to its passage.

BARBARA BOXER WILL RETIRE IN 2016

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I learned just a few minutes ago that my wonderful Senator from the State of California, Senator BARBARA BOXER, will not be seeking reelection in 2016, and although we do have this wonderful Senator for 2 more years, I just wanted to say a few words about my great admiration for Senator BOXER.

I have been a great admirer of her since the 1980s when she was in the House. I helped to work when she ran for the United States Senate in 1992.

She has been a great leader. She has been a champion voice for the environment. She spoke out about climate change before anyone else spoke out about it. She was one of the first to really speak out for all progressive causes. She has fought for workers.

I want her to know that California will miss her. We will count on her leadership for the next 2 years here in Congress, and then after that, I just want to say it will be a great loss. I will miss her greatly.

TARGETED SPENDING CUTS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I am rising today in support of H.R. 39. This is a bill I filed yesterday, and it calls for a 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction for all discretionary spending except for Homeland Security, Defense, and Veterans Affairs. That is 1 percent out of the 2015 budget.

The Federal Government is over \$18 trillion in debt. That is why I filed this bill, because it is not fair to hard-working taxpayers and to future generations to be saddled with this debt.

Do you know, right now, \$56,600 is each individual's share of the debt? I have a nephew who just recently turned 1 year old; Worth Hunter has \$56,600 worth of debt. Is that fair? No, indeed, it is not.

It is important that we begin to cut that 1 penny out of every dollar in discretionary spending to get our fiscal house in order. I urge consideration of H.R. 39.

HONORING SHANDA LAVIE MCALLISTER

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the U.S. House today to pay tribute to the memory of Shanda LaVie McAllister, a native North Carolinian, admired daughter, sister, and friend who departed this life suddenly on December 12, 2014, in Cumberland County, where she lived and worked as a teacher.

Shanda was an outstanding educator of more than 20 years, a well-respected

advocate for children, a leader in her church and community, and someone who valued all people.

Genuinely concerned for the welfare of each student, she truly believed that if given the opportunity and resources, every child could succeed. She had a good heart, glowing personality, and she left an indelible impression on her community and her State.

For her many tireless efforts on behalf of children, I join with her parents, Freddie and former State Representative Mary McAllister, and all the citizens of our State in honoring Shanda's memory and her legacy.

TERROR ATTACK IN PARIS

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, today, I stand in solidarity with the people of France, and my thoughts and prayers go out to the families of the victims of the ruthless terrorist attack that happened in Paris yesterday.

This rampage was perpetrated by terrorists who seek nothing but death and destruction for all of us who embrace something as basic as the freedom of speech. While we did not need it, this only reinforces and strengthens our resolve in the fight to defend our freedoms and our way of life.

It may be an uncomfortable truth, but the reality is that we cannot stick our heads in the sand and hope that threats from radical extremists will go away on their own.

Nowhere are the stakes bigger today, Madam Speaker, than in Iran. Iran and its nuclear weapons program, I believe, pose the number one threat to our national security.

Our resolve in confronting the Iranian challenge must never waver, and I call on this new Congress to act right away in ratcheting up pressure and sanctions on Iran. This is not a left versus right issue. This is a right versus wrong issue.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, as a newly elected Congressman from the State of Washington, I rise to mark the 50th anniversary of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in my congressional district. I congratulate all current and former lab workers and their families. Their commitment to excellence is apparent from the contributions the lab has made both to the local community and to our Nation.

This world-class facility is key to the long-term growth of the Tri-Cities because of the leading role the lab plays in national security, clean renewable American energy, efforts to clean up our Nation's defense nuclear waste, chemistry, and more.

Originally created for the Manhattan Project, the lab has adapted to address our Nation's most pressing needs. I look forward to visiting the lab in the coming weeks to congratulate them in person, and I am committed to providing the support the lab needs to continue serving our Nation for another 50 years.

Congratulations to the PNNL family.

CONGRATULATING BISHOP GUILFOYLE HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, today I recognize the Bishop Guilfoyle Marauder football team, who capped off an undefeated season, beating the Clairton Bears in the Pennsylvania Division A State championship.

Led by Coach Wheeler, BG's offense plowed through their opponents, posting 715 points this season. While I don't hold it against them, it became obvious that BG was destined for a championship when I watched them defeat my nephew, Michael Shuster, and the Camp Hill Lions.

But defense wins championships, and in the final minutes of the State championship, BG's defense held the goal line, defending multiple Clairton scoring attempts, securing a 1-point lead, a 19-18 victory to the title.

The character displayed by these young men gives us another reason to be proud of the central Pennsylvania that we call home.

I would like to recognize the seniors who played their last games: Berger, Chadbourn, Gormley, Kitt, Livoti, Luther, McCloskey, Miller, Price, and Wolf, and especially the Marauder's honorary captain, who truly exemplifies the spirit of BG football, Jorden McClure.

Congratulations to Coach Wheeler and all of Bishop Guilfoyle for bringing home the State championship. If you are watching today, take notice; I have the team colors on.

MAINTAINING SSI BENEFITS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as I come to the floor—I had been on the floor earlier today—I offer again my deepest sympathy to the people of France and mourn with them for the heinous tragedy yesterday, and I know all Americans also do so.

I come, however, to talk about an issue that will draw bipartisan recogni-

tion of the importance of ensuring the support in the lack of reductions of SSI benefits. There are 300-million-plus Americans in this country. Madam Speaker, 5.81 million Americans receive SSI; 4.6 million of them are disabled, and 1.3 million are children.

My office is in the Federal building in Houston, Texas. I watch individuals come to our Social Security office. They don't look rich. They don't look fraudulent. They don't look like they are trying to take advantage of the system of help that America is giving them.

I am sending out an SOS alert to all the families who have loved ones on SSI or the children who are receiving death benefits because their parents are dead. I am asking that we commit to ensuring and providing the support for the SSI account, not reducing it, not reducing benefits, because these are the neediest Americans who I would be in utter shame to point out that they are fraudulent.

We will be having a teach-in in my district. We will ask them to come and tell their stories because I am insisting and refusing to allow their benefits to be cut.

HONORING NEW HAMPSHIRE NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 3rd Battalion, 197th Field Artillery Regiment of the New Hampshire Army National Guard. This week, they deploy to the Central Command area of responsibility in support of Operation Spartan Shield.

To the 370-some Granite Staters who are deploying, and also your families who are constantly supporting you, thank you for your service, your commitment, and your sacrifice.

As the first Army National Guard unit to support this artillery mission, you carry forward the National Guard's mantra, "Always Ready, Always There."

As my two children, Colby and Jack, join me on the House floor, I am reminded of how grateful I am to you—and the rest of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines—for protecting our country, our safety, and our liberties. You are the very best our Nation has to offer. The Granite State and our Nation are forever indebted to you.

REFORM BLOATED CORPORATE TAX CODE

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, should we reward American companies and en-

trepreneurs for their hard work and productivity, or should we reward them for having the best lobbyists in Washington? Well, unfortunately today, with our bloated corporate Tax Code full of special interest loopholes, we effectively reward companies that have the best lobbyists in Washington rather than corporations that are creating jobs or profits for their shareholders. That is why we need to work together, Republicans and Democrats, with the administration to reform our bloated corporate Tax Code, eliminating loopholes in tax expenditures and bringing down the rates.

Did you know, Madam Speaker, we have the highest nominal corporate tax rate of the industrialized countries in the world at 35 percent? We can work together to bring that down to 28 percent, maybe even 25 percent, in a revenue-neutral basis by getting rid of special interest provisions that lobbyists have inserted in the Tax Code and finally rewarding Americans for hard work and productivity rather than simply being good at working Congress to get a special interest advantage.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, last week on the evening of New Year's Day, I had the honor and privilege of being invited to attend the Fallen Officers Memorial in Chico, California, where I joined members of our community in paying tribute to members of our law enforcement who had made the ultimate sacrifice in the previous year.

In the U.S., we lost 118 officers nationwide, 14 in California. We are still mourning and feeling the sting of the loss of Officer Davis and Officer Oliver in a horrific crime spree in Placer County in northern California.

Yet what we hear in the news isn't really consistent with how we value our law enforcement—at least, how we should. Nearly 50,000 officers in 2013 were physically assaulted in the line of duty, but all we hear about is the other way. Madam Speaker, less than 1 in 1,000 contacts officers have result in any kind of physical need with the public. Indeed, that is less than half of 1 percent of an estimated 44 million contacts our officers have.

Now, in light of what we saw in Paris yesterday where their officers, in many cases, are disarmed, and what it looks like is happening in America, we are disarming the confidence in our officers and our law enforcement, we better change our attitude really quickly and value what our men and women in blue do for us so we don't have a worsening situation like we see going on around the world.

I stand today in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in law enforcement

and ask that all Americans do the same as we do our business.

SUPPORTING KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone pipeline and on behalf of the people of Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. I am honored and I would like to thank my constituents for the opportunity to serve as their representative.

I am a proud supporter of the Keystone XL pipeline, which will be an efficient and safe means of transporting up to 830,000 barrels of crude oil from Canada to the United States daily. The construction of this pipeline will support thousands of jobs and increase our GDP by nearly \$3.4 billion. Keystone will continue to reduce our dependence on Mideast oil. In the fastest growing region of Minnesota, this pipeline will alleviate rail and road congestion currently plaguing cities like Anoka and Elk River. This pipeline will also bring stability to our energy system and help stimulate growth in our economy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 8, 2015 at 9:24 a.m.:

That the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 19, relative to the death of Edward W. Brooke, III.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3, KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 30, SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 19 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 19

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 30) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 19 provides for the consideration of two important pieces of legislation to help the American economy, both of which passed in the 113th Congress with bipartisan support. H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, is designed to address a critical flaw in the Affordable Care Act which is causing workers to lose hours at their jobs and, thus, lose wages—those wages that help put food on their tables, those wages that help feed their families, pay their utility bills, heat their homes during the winter, and cool their homes during the summer. H.R. 30 fixes this flaw by changing the newly created labor rule in the Affordable Care Act which defines full-time work at 30 hours a week and places that definition back where the American public has believed it to be for the last 100 years, that is, at 40 hours.

The second bill contained in today's rule is H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and that would put an end to what has been a 6-year process for approving a pipeline that should have simply been common sense for America's economy a long time ago.

□ 1230

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the bills. This allows the House to fully debate these crucial issues. These bills are targeted pieces of legislation dealing with one single provision in the Affordable Care Act and one single pipeline, respectively. No one is trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act today. For that, stay tuned. But I have no doubt that Members of the minority will claim that this bill is an attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But, in fact, it simply makes changes to a definition and interpretation by the Department of Labor in the bill. As always, the minority is also afforded the customary motion to recommit on each of the bills.

Madam Speaker, as a result of the Affordable Care Act's requirement that businesses with 50 or more employees provide health insurance coverage to those employees working 30 hours per week, employers across the Nation—from schools to universities to municipalities to restaurants—are being forced to cut workers' hours or face unsustainable employment costs to their businesses and to their organizations. As a result, we are seeing—and this is what Republicans predicted prior to the controversial and contentious passage of the Affordable Care Act—but what we are seeing is the bill has fundamentally changed labor law in this country, creating a new, standard 30-hour workweek. As a result, workers' hours are being cut, and productivity in this country—a country that has always prided itself on the work ethic of its citizens—will decrease over time. This is what onerous government regulations do—suppress innovation and hamper businesses.

Many Members of the Democratic Party have been outspoken in clamoring for an extension to long-term unemployment benefits, which would extend government assistance to all unemployed Americans well beyond a year's worth of benefits. Yet there is something that can be done now, there is something that can be done today, which will have an actual, practical effect of putting more money in more people's pockets.

We have heard story after story from every State in the Union that employers are dropping workers' hours from less than 39 hours a week to perhaps less than 29 hours or fewer—potentially 10 work hours a week that workers won't see in their paychecks, which could mean hundreds of dollars that men and women won't have to feed

their families and pay their bills. Increasing workers' hours increases money that people have to spend.

The Affordable Care Act fundamentally changed labor law in this country, and the repercussions of this may not be felt for years to come. This is a dangerous, slippery slope. What other labor laws will be reinterpreted now to define "full-time employment" as 30 hours per week? Do people intend to impose overtime rules on employers who employ people for over 30 hours per week? This is yet another regulation which would only result in businesses cutting more hours. What will the National Labor Relations Board reinterpret, knowing that the very fabric of labor law is now based on a 30-hour workweek instead of the 100-year standard of the 40-hour workweek?

Prior to the Affordable Care Act, employers were already overwhelmingly providing health insurance to their employees working 40 hours per week. Making the change contained in Mr. YOUNG's legislation will cause the least amount of disruption to the labor market, and that is an important thing.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Affordable Care Act will reduce the total number of hours worked, on net, by about 1.5 percent during the period from 2017 to 2024, almost entirely because workers will choose to supply less labor. Because of this, the Congressional Budget Office projects a decline in the number of workers of about 2 million in 2017, rising to 2.5 million in 2024, as a result of the Affordable Care Act. The latest Congressional Budget Office figures show that the Affordable Care Act will increase spending by almost \$2 trillion, double the estimate from 5 years ago. And the Joint Committee on Taxation says that taxpayers will be on the hook for over another \$1 trillion over the next decade. Americans earning as little as \$25,000 annually will pay more because of the law, even after accounting for the \$1 trillion in premium cost-sharing subsidies.

H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, is an issue that Congress and the American people have been supportive of for the past several years. It has now been over 6 years since TransCanada first submitted its application for a Presidential permit to cross the United States-Canadian border with a pipeline bringing oil to refineries in Houston, Texas. The President's own State Department, in a several thousand-page document, stated that the pipeline would be cleaner and more environmentally friendly. It is a way to transport oil than other means, namely, with trucks, trains, and ships. This is common sense. The issue has been debated here in the House I don't know how many times over the past several years. Enough is enough. It is time to approve this application and put men and women to work who will be building this pipeline.

Madam Speaker, let us be clear about what is happening today. We are not repealing the Affordable Care Act. We are not undermining the Affordable Care Act. The bill does not take health insurance from a single person in this country. It is a fix to a fatal flaw in the legislation, a fix similar to the seven other fixes that have passed both Houses of Congress and, in fact, been signed by the President. It is similar to the 37 unilateral fixes that the President and his Secretary of Health and Human Services have made on their own. This is a fix to stop this legislation from resulting in people losing work. If Democrats can't agree to fix a provision in the Affordable Care Act that is preventing people from working, then it is simply empty rhetoric to claim that they are interested in any fixes at all.

I will encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and both of the underlying bills. Let's talk a little bit about how these bills got before us, what the process of this body is, as well as the content of these two bills.

I ask my colleague from Texas: Did either of these bills go through committee here in this 114th Congress, this new Congress?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS. Both bills were before the Committee on Rules yesterday, and you were present.

Mr. POLIS. Let's talk a little bit about what that means. The Rules Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction for these bills. Now, that sounds complicated, but what does that mean? We have specialists here in Congress, specialized staff, Members who really roll up their sleeves and get to know about natural resources: what is this pipeline, what does it do about health care. They know far more than I might know or Mr. BURGESS might know or you might know, Madam Speaker, on a particular topic. We all try to learn about those in our committees.

The Rules Committee simply packages these bills for the floor. All the Rules Committee did yesterday was say no one can amend these bills. That is this rule that is before us. The Rules Committee simply said: These bills—which nobody who has any expertise actually got to vote on in committee, they just appeared—the Rules Committee said—and, by the way, no Republican or Democrat can even try to improve these bills, even Republicans and Democrats who serve on the committees of jurisdiction.

Now, we are supposed to have something called regular order around here. What does that mean? It means a bill, somebody has an idea. Let's have an idea: 40 hours, 30 hours—let's have an idea. Let's talk about whether this pipeline should be built or where it should be built. Okay. Well, that goes to a committee, which has Democrats and Republicans on it. They have the chance to amend that bill, to change that bill. They report out that bill.

Then it is supposed to go to the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee hopefully will say: By the way, we want other good ideas from other Members of Congress that aren't on that committee. Let's allow a discussion on this amendment and that amendment. Mr. COURTNEY had a great amendment that he offered yesterday. Rules Committee said: No, we can't even vote on it here on the floor of the House. It doesn't mean it will pass, but it means that Members have the opportunity to offer new ideas to improve legislation.

Well, guess what? Guess what, Madam Speaker? This bill didn't have any hearing or markup in any of the committees of jurisdiction—neither of them: Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Transportation—all bypassed for this bill that then went directly to Rules Committee. And the Rules Committee said: By the way, nobody can change these bills that no committee has even looked at.

So that is how we got to where we are today. That is the wrong process. A vote against this rule today is a vote for regular order, a vote for making sure that Members of this body—Democrats and Republicans—both on the committees of jurisdiction and in the general body can have their say on bills. That is why it is so important to defeat this very first rule here today.

Because if this passes, it is very dangerous. It can become the precedent for all the bills this Congress. This starts with an innocuous bill. This is the 50th-something repeal of ObamaCare. I don't know how many times the Keystone pipeline has been passed. So it seems innocuous. I am not for the policies. We will talk about them in a minute. Some people are. There is nothing new under the Earth here. We have seen these are in different forms, different versions, but they haven't passed through committee.

But the procedure here is saying: Guess what? No committee of jurisdiction can look at these bills. Rules Committee is not going to allow any amendments from Democrats or Republicans. If this rule passes, that has the danger of becoming the precedent for this entire Congress. The committees of jurisdiction will be avoided and overruled and gone around, and Members will have no opportunity to even offer their ideas here on the floor of the House to improve bills.

Now, let's talk a little bit about the content of these two bills before us today.

First, the so-called Save American Workers Act. Mr. BURGESS says that it changes labor law in this country, somehow defines full-time workers and full-time work, and that is simply not what it does. It simply addresses the benefits and whom companies will need to provide benefits to.

And, frankly, if this bill were to be the law, a company could very easily say: By the way, Mr. or Ms. full-time worker who works 40 hours a week, you now get off Friday at 4 o'clock. Sorry, you are 39 hours a week, you don't get any health care. And they are going to do it. That is why some companies want this to pass. Most companies provide benefits to all their employees, and it is not an issue.

But the folks that might be lobbying Members of Congress about it, of course that is their intention. They want to cut people from 40 hours a week to 39 hours a week and not give them health care benefits. Ask them questions, Democrats or Republicans. If you are thinking of voting for this, ask them why they want it. That is why, of course, they want this bill. Right now, they would have to cut them all the way down to 30 hours, which is a much more complicated endeavor, because they probably would have to add new employees and have to manage that from an HR perspective. It is probably just worth it to let people continue working 40 hours and give them their benefits.

But if this very dangerous provision were to become law, many, many Americans would find themselves cut from 40 to 39 hours, 39½ hours, go home at 4:30 on Friday. Sorry, no health care. Sorry, no health care.

Now, look, if there is a real discussion about how to improve health care in this country, Democrats and Republicans, we are happy to be part of that. Let's talk about what health care should look like. When we have an idea to change something, to remove part of the Affordable Care Act, let's talk about what replaces it. This is simply a bad idea. It is a disincentive for companies to even provide health care to their employees.

Not only that, it is a deficit buster. It increases the deficit by \$53 billion. Is the first bill that we are looking to pass under a rule a bill that didn't even come through a committee, that no Member of Congress can even offer a pay-for or on? If we allowed an open rule here, I would love to offer a pay-for for that. How are we going to pay for this \$53 billion that this costs?

If you want to do this bad policy, that is one thing. I don't think we should do it. But if you want to do this policy and risk having companies cut their employees from 40 hours to 39 hours, if it is going to cost \$53 billion,

I want to know how we are going to pay for it. I don't think that we should go to our Federal deficit and debt and leave that to the next generation to pay for. How many times does Congress do that? Oh, we will just have somebody else pay for it. Our kids will pay for it, our grandkids will pay for it. That is exactly what is going to happen with this bill, like so many others.

Several third-party economic analyses have found that five times as many employees would be at risk of having their hours reduced to part-time status under this bill than under current law. That is right. Five times as many are at risk of being cut from 40 to 39 hours than are currently at risk of being cut from 40 to 30 hours. Oh, so endanger the benefits of more employees—that is exactly what this bill does.

This bill is no way to create jobs. It is a way to prevent many Americans from having the health care through their employer that they already enjoy, forcing them to get taxpayer subsidized health care through the exchange instead.

□ 1245

That is why it costs money. That is what the \$53 billion is. It is a fact that what Republicans are saying is: Sorry, I don't think you should pay for your own health care. I think taxpayers should pay for it. They are trying to force you and me to pay for your health care, rather than getting your own health care, paying your employees' share.

It is simply bad for the country, bad for the deficit, bad for the next generation, and as I said, just as importantly, a bad precedent for the way that this Congress works.

Let's talk about the Keystone pipeline. This is really a phantom pipeline because yesterday in committee I asked, "Does anybody actually want to finance or build this pipeline?" I haven't seen any evidence that there is, at the current rate of oil.

Mr. BURGESS, have you heard? Yesterday, I asked in committee if anybody had any evidence that could go out on the floor that anybody wanted to pay for or build this pipeline. Have you had the opportunity to hear if anybody wants to build a pipeline?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS. The pipeline, in fact, exists between Cushing, Oklahoma, and Houston, Texas, this very day.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, if it exists already, I don't know why you are passing this bill. The truth is it does not exist to move the oil from the tar sands of Canada to our ports for export. That is what we are talking about here.

As far as I can tell, there is nobody who wants to pay to build it because it doesn't make economic sense with oil at \$52 a barrel. It might be a different

discussion when oil is \$110, \$100, or even \$90 a barrel.

We had statistics that about 90 percent of the tar sands production requires oil at \$75 a barrel and about 100 percent of it requires oil at \$65 a barrel. When oil is about \$52 a barrel, nobody is going to pay for this pipeline.

It is a phantom pipeline. We are talking about issues that might have made sense to talk about if somebody actually wanted to do this pipeline, but before we waste the deliberative efforts of this body on a topic like this, we would like to see some evidence that somebody actually wants to build a pipeline there in the first place, not to mention that the other reason it is a phantom is nobody knows what the routing is going to be.

It is still in flux. There is a lawsuit. Where is the final routing going to be? Not only are there serious doubts about who will finance the pipeline, but in addition, we don't even know where it is going to be.

By the way, the costs of the pipeline have gone up. Transcorp says the pipeline will cost \$8 billion—up from their estimates of \$5.4 billion just a couple of years ago—not to mention that we are being asked to approve a pipeline that we don't even know the final routing of.

Again, as one of the very first bills that bypasses committee, that nobody can amend here on the floor, we are asked to encourage employers to cut their employees from 40 hours to 39 hours, so they can eliminate their benefits and force taxpayers to pay for it to the tune of \$53 billion over 10 years.

We are being asked to approve a phantom pipeline that nobody wants to pay for and nobody knows where it is going to go. What a way to start a Congress. Let's do better. Let's defeat this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill should pass. If the underlying bill doesn't pass or gets vetoed, the Canadians will sell their product someplace else. That is what the choice is.

The Canadians want to sell their product to us and to use this pipeline to connect the product with the refineries along the gulf coast. If they can't do that because the pipeline isn't built because of political arguments—not economic arguments—then what will happen is the Canadians will build their own pipeline across the mountains to a port in Canada on the Pacific Ocean.

Where will that oil go? That oil will go straight to China, so that they can use that oil to compete against us, to undersell us, and to take American jobs away.

The XL pipeline is a job-creator both for American workers in building the

pipeline, as well as American workers who will be utilizing the oil that comes through the pipeline. We should not listen to what we hear on the other side of the aisle, which will end up being a huge job-outsourcing bill to China. We have done enough of that in the past. We shouldn't do any more of that in the future.

I urge the passage of the rule and passage of the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it appears that the more things change, the more they stay the same. The Republican majority talks a good game. They talk about an open process, but when push comes to shove, they fall back on the same old tired, closed, heavy-handed, undemocratic business as usual.

If you believe their speeches, you would think they believe in regular order. You would think that they believe that all Members, Republicans and Democrats, deserve to be heard and that a fair and substantive process will be the practice of this body. But actions speak louder than words, Madam Speaker, and if the American people judge us by our actions, as they should, the House is off to a very, very bad start.

Just look at the rule before us today. On two incredibly important and controversial issues, the Keystone pipeline and making major changes to the Affordable Care Act, the Republican majority has decided to shut the House down, to say to every single member of this House, "Take it or leave it."

Do you believe that the Keystone pipeline won't actually do much to move the United States toward energy dependence or might harm our environment? Too bad, your amendment won't be made in order.

Do you believe that the 54th vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act is a waste of time? Too bad, the Republican leadership doesn't want to hear about it.

Are you a duly-elected Member of the House of Representatives with an interesting and substantive idea about how to change the underlying legislation? Too bad, according to the Republican leadership, your voice doesn't matter.

It is no wonder that an almost unprecedented number of Republican Members voted against the current leadership. They are fed up, and I don't blame them. That is where we are in the House of Representatives.

What about the Senate? According to Jennifer Rubin of The Washington Post, a Republican spokesman for Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said:

Restoring the Senate to a place where legislation is debated and voted on, rather than

simply using it as a campaign studio, is a priority for Senator McConnell.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, given MITCH MCCONNELL's past record, I will believe it when I see it, but at least he is saying something constructive. Unfortunately, here in the House, we have the same old-same old: a completely closed process that denies all Members the opportunity to be heard.

If this week is any indication, it is clear that the Republican leadership will keep using the House of Representatives as a campaign studio. They will continue to bring legislation to the floor that the President will veto, with no chance of amendments.

What a waste of time, what a squandered opportunity—but I have got an idea. This is a radical idea. Let's restore the House of Representatives to a place where substantive issues are debated and considered and voted on. My friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk about democracy. Let's restore a little bit of democracy in the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the temptation to close this process down. I urge them to vote "no" on rules like this one that are closed for no good reason.

Let me just say to my Republican colleagues: this is a lousy way to start the new Congress.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) who, by the way, had an idea to try to improve one of these bills, and his idea is not even allowed to be discussed or debated or voted on here on the floor of the House.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and both underlying bills, particularly the misnamed Save American Workers Act.

I would like to just cite very quickly from the Congressional Research Service, which is one of the gems of quality, neutral, nonpartisan analysis for this body, which took a look at this bill and said very clearly:

Changing the cutoff from 30 hours per week to 40 hours per week would not eliminate the incentive for employers to shift more workers to part-time status and could actually provide a greater incentive for firms not to offer health insurance to their employees.

In theory, changing the definition of a full-time worker to 40 hours a week would shift, not eliminate, the incentive for employers to reduce workers' hours. Additionally, more employers could be inclined to shift more workers to "part-time" status under a 40-hour definition because the disruption to their workforce is smaller from 40 to 39 hours per week than 40 to 29 hours per week.

I will submit this report for the RECORD.

CHANGE THE DEFINITION OF "FULL-TIME" TO 40 HOURS PER WEEK

Multiple bills introduced in the 113th Congress propose changing ACA's definition of "full-time" from 30 hours per week to 40

hours per week. Proponents of this revision argue that the current, 30-hour per-week definition is unusually low compared with "traditional standards" of a full-time worker in many industries, thus increasing employer's calculations and compliance costs. In addition, proponents of the revision argue that the 30-hour definition encourages employers to reduce the number of hours allotted to each worker (thereby reducing their pay) in order to reduce the number of "full-time" workers and reduce their compliance costs with ACA (or the size of their employer penalty, because the penalty is only based on full-time workers). Note, as discussed below, that the incentive for firms paying the penalty could be eliminated by imposing the penalty to apply to FTEs.

As shown in Table 3, 2012 Census data indicates that the majority (67.8%) of workers usually work 40 hours or more per week. The average work week for people who typically work "full-time" is 42.5 hours per week—more than the 30-hour definition of an "FTE" in ACA. However, the data in Table 3 does not provide much behavioral insight into the responses of firms to ACA, as they were collected prior to the initial measurement period for ACA's employer penalty that began in January 2013.

TABLE 3. PERSONS AT WORK, BY AVERAGE HOURS WORKED PER WEEK, 2012

Hours of work	Distribution of workers across all industries
1 to 14	5.0%
15 to 29	12.5%
30 to 34	7.6%
35 to 39	7.1%
40	42.8%
41+	25.0%
Average Hours, Total at Work	38.5 hours
Average Hours, Persons Who Usually Work "Full Time" ^a	42.5 hours

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 Current Population Survey, "Household Data—Annual Averages—19. Persons at work in agricultural and non-agricultural industries by hours of work," <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat19.htm>.

^a The Census Bureau defines a "full-time worker" as someone working 35 hours or more per week.

Several employer surveys indicate that most respondents are not reducing their employees' hours in response to ACA's definition of a full-time worker. According to a 2013 survey conducted by the International Foundation of Employee Benefits Plans, a non-profit foundation, 16% of the 966 employers surveyed said they have adjusted or plan to adjust hours so that fewer employees qualify for full-time. According to a 2012 survey of 1,203 employers conducted by Mercer, a global business consulting firm, 68% of survey respondents indicated that they will begin offering health coverage to all employees working 30 or more hours per week. Other surveys with fewer respondents support these findings.

In addition to surveys (which could or could not be representative of the firms that could be affected by the employer penalty), some researchers have conducted empirical analysis of broad, public-use data. A 2013 study conducted by the U.C. Berkeley Labor Center estimated that approximately 2.3 million workers in firms with 100 or more employees (representing 3.1% of all workers) were most vulnerable to a reduction in their payroll hours from above 30 hours per week to below 30 hours per week. These workers were mostly concentrated in the restaurant industry. In contrast, a 2013 study conducted by Helen Jorgensen and Dean Baker of the Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) found that less than 1% of all workers in 2013 fall just below ACA's full-time threshold (26–29 hours per week). Jorgensen

and Baker's study uses more recent data and is probably a more reliable study to forecast future conditions. Unlike the U.C. Berkeley Labor Center's study, Jorgensen and Baker's study likely captured any initial employers' responses to shifting workers below the 30 hour per week cutoff because, according to ACA, the baseline measurement period for measuring a firm's FTE employees begins in 2013. Also, Jorgensen and Baker's study better captures more recent improvements in the labor market; there are likely to be more "underemployed" workers (working under 40 hours) in the older data because the macroeconomy was in an earlier stage of recovery.

Changing the cutoff from 30 hours per week to 40 hours per week would not eliminate the incentive for employers to shift more workers to part-time status, and could actually provide a greater incentive for firms not to offer health insurance to their employees. In theory, changing the definition of a full-time worker to 40 hours per week would shift, not eliminate, the incentive for employers to reduce workers' hours. Additionally, more employers could be inclined to shift more workers to "part-time" status (in terms of the ACA) under a 40-hour definition, because the disruption to their workforce is smaller from 40 to 39 hours than 40 to 29 hours. If the incentive to retain their workers on full-time status is diminished, then fewer firms could be compelled by the employer penalty to offer health care coverage relative to current law. As shown in Table 3, more workers are also clustered around the 40-hour per-week threshold than the 30-hour threshold.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I had an amendment, which is being shut off today, which I think actually really addresses the problem. Under the structure of the employer mandate that came out of the Senate, when an employer goes from 49 to 50 employees, the employer is taxed for 20 employees. Again, that is a cliff. There is just no denying that fact.

When the House passed the Affordable Care Act, we had a smooth, gradual, incremental increase based on payroll which, again, did not create a cliff. My amendment would simply say that the exempt number of employees before the tax kicked in would be raised from 30 to 49, so that when an additional employee was hired above the 50 threshold, there would be a tax, there still would be an incentive, but there would not be a cliff.

Unbelievably, the committee just totally refused to allow this amendment to be considered. It was a strike-everything substitute amendment because the underlying bill does not accomplish the ends that its sponsors claim—and the CRS has verified that—but in fact, the Small Business Majority, which represents a large contingent of small employers across the country, endorsed my amendment.

Madam Speaker, sadly, under this rule—which, again, just completely shuts off any ability for Members to do their job, represent their district, come up with ideas that are well-founded in independent analysis—we are not going to have that opportunity.

I will submit a copy of the amendment which is not going to be discussed

and the statement of support from the Small Business Majority in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. _____

OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Eliminate the Small Employer Tax Cliff Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN REDUCTION IN DETERMINING APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER SIZE TO ASSESSABLE PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 4980H(c)(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "30" and inserting "49".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the reduction in determining the application of employer size to assessable penalties under the employer mandate.".

[From Small Business Majority]

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE ELIMINATE THE SMALL EMPLOYER TAX CLIFF ACT

(Statement from John Arensmeyer, Founder & CEO of Small Business Majority)

Small Business Majority supports Congressman Courtney's amendment to increase the cliff of the employer penalty in the Affordable Care Act from 30 to 49 employees because it will provide small business owners with more flexibility and can relieve some of the burden on those few who have more than 50 employees but do not provide health insurance.

Ninety-six percent of businesses in this country have fewer than 50 employees. For larger businesses with more than 50 employees, 96% already offer insurance. Only the 4% of larger employers that do not offer health insurance are impacted by the penalty.

However, the Congressman's amendment will mean fewer small business owners with more than 50 employees will have to pay a penalty if they do not offer insurance.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, I wonder: Does anyone know who Lisa Gray is? Or the many Lisa Grays across America? Lisa Gray is a woman who, as a small business owner, admitted that if it had not been for the Affordable Care Act, she would not have been able to get the chemo treatment for her leukemia.

Just think of the workers who are now getting affordable care access. Now, with this legislation, they will be cut to 39 or 38 or 32 hours, so as not to have the employee-mandated and responsible way of treating their health insurance.

This bill that is on the floor today will give us a \$53 billion deficit. It will result in 1 million people losing their employee-sponsored coverage like Lisa Gray or families that I saw coming for enrollment in Texas.

It will increase the number of people obtaining coverage through Medicaid, CHIP, and the health insurance marketplace between 500,000 and 1 million and increase the number of uninsured by upwards of 500,000.

Do we realize what we have gained through the Affordable Care Act? According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, the average annual premium for employer-sponsored family health insurance rose just 3 percent. That is far different from 7.9 percent before the Affordable Care Act. Where is all this noise that our insurance premiums are going up?

I will tell you what will be going up: it will cause an additional 6.5 million workers to find that their employers have cut their hours, and it will result in \$19.6 billion in additional costs to the Federal health care program.

Are we talking about deficit? I am talking about lives, Madam Speaker, and I am talking about the ability to save lives. This legislation is not interested in doing so.

What about my State of Texas? We have not opted in to the expanded Medicaid. Twenty-three States—what will that do to individuals below 100 percent of the Federal poverty line if they had any ability to access the marketplace? They won't have the ability to access the marketplace because they will be in those who are cut down.

Let me just say that we have the ability to realize and do better. Let me stop people from saying there is no Federal law that requires employers, Madam Speaker, to cover employees. You won't face penalties.

You can do better. I believe this bill does not answer our concerns. I don't want Lisa Gray to lose her insurance.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 30, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2014," which is the latest attempt by the House Republican majority to impede the implementation of the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans the security that comes from having access to affordable, high-quality health care.

At the start of the new Congress the American people expect the "People's House" to take up matters of central concern to their lives: jobs, affordable education; and initiatives to close the income gap.

I oppose this bill because its effect would be to deny employer provided health insurance to hard working employees who work more than 30 hours but less than 40 hours per week.

The majority is bringing before the House of Representatives a bill that was brought before the last Congress, and the Obama Administration said that it would be vetoed.

The majority has attempted over 50 times to end the Affordable Care Act with no hope of accomplishing their goal. Today's vote is no

different from past attempts to take away Americans' right to affordable health care insurance.

Further, should the Republican majority in the Senate decide to take up this bill—they do not have the 60 votes to bring H.R. 30 before the Senate for a final vote.

If they could get H.R. 30 out of the Senate the President would veto the bill and neither the House nor the Senate has the two-thirds majority necessary to overcome a veto.

This is a waste of limited legislative days for 2015, and a poor start to the 114th Congress.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act would: Increase the federal deficit by \$53 billion over the next decade; Result in one million people losing sponsoring coverage; Increase the number of people obtaining coverage through Medicaid, CHIP, and the Health Insurance Marketplaces by between 500,000 and one million people; and Increase the number of uninsured by up to 500,000.

Since 2013, over 10 million Americans now have health insurance because they took advantage of the Affordable Care Act.

An independent analysis conducted by the University of California Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education found that increasing the threshold from 30 to 40 hours would result in nearly three times as many workers, about 6.5 million in total, being vulnerable to hour reductions than under current law.

Premiums for employer-sponsored insurance grew in 2014 at the lowest rate on record back to 1999, tied with 2010. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation data, the average annual premium for employer-sponsored family health insurance coverage rose just 3.0 percent (1.2 percent adjusted for inflation) to \$16,834 in 2014, far below the 7.9 percent (5.6 percent adjusted for inflation) rate seen from 2000–2010.

Our nation has taken a momentous step in creating a mindset that health insurance is a personal responsibility with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. The law did not automatically enroll all citizens into the program because it was specifically designed to be an opt-in process.

This nation because of the Affordable Care Act has 7.3 million people signed up for Marketplace plans, paid their premiums, and accessed quality, affordable coverage.

An additionally, 8 million individuals enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP since the beginning 2015 Open Enrollment—that's an increase of nearly 14 percent compared to average monthly signups before this year's enrollment period began.

Millions of young adults have gotten covered on their parent's plan, because the law says they can now do so until they turn 26.

An article in the New England Journal of Medicine found that 10.3 million uninsured Americans have gotten since the start of Open Enrollment.

In just one year (since the start of Open Enrollment), we've reduced the number of uninsured adults by 26 percent.

Americans have more choices. During Open Enrollment 2014, consumers could choose from an average of 47 plans. Contrast that to before the Affordable Care Act when many consumers had few, if any, real choices.

Today, we're able to announce that in 2015 there is a 25 percent increase in the total number of insurers selling health insurance plans in the Marketplace in 44 states.

Seventy-six million Americans with private health insurance can finally get preventive services such as vaccines, cancer screenings, and yearly wellness visits without cost sharing, because the law says your insurance company must provide you with these services with no copay or other out-of-pocket expense.

This includes nearly 30 million women and over 18 million children. Millions of families have real financial security because insurance companies can no longer deny them coverage because of a preexisting condition or because they reach an annual or lifetime limit in coverage. Insurance companies must include things like prescription drugs and hospital stays in their coverage. And being a woman is no longer a preexisting condition.

H.R. 30 proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code by redefining a full time employee for purposes of providing health insurance to only those workers who work a 40-hour workweek.

The bill would redefine "full-time employee," for purposes of determining which employees an employer must provide health insurance coverage to only those hourly workers who work 40 hours a week. The Affordable Care Act for the purpose of employers providing health care to workers defined a full time employee as any worker who works 30 hours a week or more.

Few hourly workers in low-wage jobs work a 40-hour workweek. These employees often rely on government assistance, which amounts to a hidden tax break to employers. Low wage workers often rely upon public housing assistance, SNAP, WIC or Medicaid to make ends meet.

If the 115th Congress wants to help Americans with access to affordable health care insurance they would address the issue of states that are not participating in the Medicaid expansion in states like the state of Texas where millions of uninsured low wage workers do not have access to health care insurance.

Health insurance should not be used as a status symbol, but a basic right for people who live in the world's most prosperous nation. I know that many predicted that the Affordable Care Act would cause havoc on the nation's health care system, but it is not the ACA that is causing havoc—it is a small vocal minority within the majority party that is causing headaches and heartaches to doctors and their patients.

I ask that my Colleagues vote against the rule for H.R. 30.

[From The Ledger.com, Jan. 8, 2015]

STORIES BEHIND THE LEGISLATION: WOMAN—OBAMA'S HEALTH COVERAGE SAVED ME

(By Noam N. Levey)

ALEXANDRIA, VA.—Like many working Americans, Lisa Gray thought she had good health insurance.

That was until she was diagnosed with leukemia in mid-2013, and the self-employed businesswoman made a startling discovery: Her health plan didn't cover the chemotherapy she needed. "I thought I was going to die," Gray, 62, said recently, recalling her desperate scramble to get lifesaving drugs.

Through a mix of temporary measures, doctors and patient advocates managed to keep Gray stable for a few months.

But it was a new health plan through the Affordable Care Act that Gray credits with saving her life. The plan, which started Jan. 1, 2014, gave her access to the recommended chemotherapy. Her cancer went into remission in the fall.

It's been one year since the federal law began guaranteeing coverage to most Americans for the first time, even if they are sick.

Some consumers pay more for insurance. Some pay less. Doctors, hospitals and businesses are laboring to keep up with new requirements. And across the country, "Obamacare" remains a polarizing political issue.

For many Americans like Gray—who were stuck in plans that didn't cover vital services or who couldn't get insurance because of a pre-existing medical condition—the law has had a personal, even life-changing impact.

"A couple years earlier, I think I would have been done," Gray said.

Even the law's supporters concede more must be done to control health care costs and ensure access to care.

But the insurance guarantee—which includes billions of dollars in aid to low- and middle-income Americans—has extended coverage to about 10 million people who previously had no insurance, surveys indicate.

That cut the nation's uninsured rate more than 20 percent last year, the largest drop in half a century.

The law also changed coverage for millions more people who were in plans like Gray's that capped or excluded benefits.

Gray thought little of these potential changes when President Barack Obama signed the health law in the spring of 2010. She'd had health insurance for decades.

With a monthly \$1,095 premium, the Kaiser Permanente plan that she had gotten through her husband's employer wasn't cheap.

But it was her only option. As a breast cancer survivor, Gray probably wouldn't have been able to find a new plan.

On the morning of May 20, 2013, Gray skidded off the road driving to her vacation condominium on Maryland's Eastern Shore. Aside from a few bruises, she was unhurt.

But she had a bigger surprise at the emergency room. A routine blood test showed an unusually high white blood cell count.

Gray had chronic myeloid leukemia, a relatively uncommon form of cancer that starts in the bone marrow and leads to the production of abnormal blood cells.

The disease is now considered highly treatable. Gray's oncologist at Kaiser prescribed the standard oral chemotherapy, a medication known as Gleevec.

Gray called her pharmacy to pick up the prescription.

There was a pause on the line. The pharmacist asked Gray whether she knew the drug would cost \$6,809 per month.

"I freaked out," she recalled. "Why would they even make this drug if people can't afford it?"

Neither Gray nor her doctor realized her Kaiser plan covered only \$1,500 worth of prescription drugs a year, a provision spelled out in small type in Appendix B of her 80-page plan brochure.

Gray's family explored going to Canada, where pharmaceuticals are often less expensive. They finally found a clinical trial closer to home at the University of Maryland, Baltimore, where researchers were testing an alternative to Gleevec called ponatinib.

Gray's cancer quickly responded. The relief was only temporary, however. The next month, Gray had to stop the ponatinib. Without access to either drug, she was again scrambling.

Bristol-Myers Squibb, which provides cancer patients with a temporary insurance card for a 30-day supply of yet another cancer drug, seemed to offer hope. But the card wasn't accepted at the Kaiser pharmacy where Gray had to get her prescriptions.

American Cancer Society advocate Brandon Costantino persuaded a company sales representative to give Gray a month's supply anyway.

Even the promise of a new insurance plan under the Affordable Care Act seemed elusive at first. Gray, like others, battled through the problems that hobbled HealthCare.gov after it opened.

Finally, on Dec. 2, 2013, she selected a new Kaiser Permanente health plan for \$780 per month. That was \$315 less than her current plan. Most important, the plan covered Gleevec for a \$30-a-month co-pay.

Gray broke down in the pharmacy when she picked up her first prescription.

She admits she's "kind of a crier."

Nine months later, a bone marrow biopsy showed no further sign of leukemia.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on so many issues.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, in strong opposition to this rule and to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and H.R. 30, the so-called Save American Workers Act of 2015.

Madam Speaker, both of these bills are damaging to the health of Americans, with one aimed at denying access to affordable health care and the other designed to strike a blow to our environment.

Madam Speaker, approval of Keystone XL would worsen climate change by expanding the extraction of the dirtiest oil on the planet. Emissions from extracting the dirty tar sands oil that would flow through the Keystone XL pipeline would be equal to the tailpipe emissions from 5.7 million cars. That is not the air that we want to breathe.

We must reject this assault on our environment, especially at a time when so many communities across our country are experiencing the impacts of climate change through severe weather, coastal storms, and crippling droughts.

Let me turn quickly to H.R. 30, the so-called "Save Health Care for Working Families Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Sadly, this bill is nothing more than the latest Republican attack on the Affordable Care Act and

would result in an estimated 1 million people losing access to their health care coverage. This is unacceptable.

We should be in the business of providing hardworking Americans access to affordable health care, not taking it away.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this rule and these damaging bills.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chairwoman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the combined rule, but specifically I want to talk in favor of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, which will finally approve this very, very long overdue project. The act that we are going to be passing will certainly show this House's intent to pass it, and I do believe that now the Senate will pass the Keystone Pipeline project as well.

There are just so many reasons—so many reasons—to vote in favor of this bill:

First of all, tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, American jobs, at zero cost to the American taxpayers.

Greater American access to safe and reliable North American energy resources, because certainly getting more energy from our close friends, our neighbors, our closest ally, the Canadians, makes perfect sense.

Reduced energy costs for American families. How important is that?

Enhanced American energy security. And in today's modern world, more than ever, energy independence and energy security equals national security.

So no wonder, Madam Speaker, that this project is supported by so many groups from all across the spectrum: labor organizations, so many labor organizations are supportive of this because of the jobs that it will bring; so many business organizations because of what it is going to do to help turbocharge our economy; and certainly the vast majority of American people, in poll after poll after poll, have demonstrated that they want this project to happen. They are totally cognizant, very aware of what this project means, again, to reducing our reliance that we have currently on fossil fuel from foreign sources, some countries that are not particularly favorable to American values and our way of life, and the American people are very, very supportive of this project.

I say now, Madam Speaker, that it is time to turn away from the extreme environmentalists and work toward the priorities of the American people. The time to act is now.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, today the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 30, which is really more properly called the "Sabotage American Workers Act," a bill to provide a major change in ACA's requirement that larger employers offer health coverage to employees who work 30 or more hours a week or face a penalty, raising the threshold to 40 hours instead.

The GOP claims the 30-hour threshold is a destructive barrier to more hours for workers. However, in reality, this GOP bill would lead to fewer hours and more part-time workers, the exact opposite of what the Republican rhetoric about restoring the 40-hour workweek implies.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Urban Institute have found no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of ObamaCare. H.R. 30 would lead to more part-time work, since large employers could avoid providing health care coverage by reducing employees' work schedules by even just an hour.

Even conservative analysts agree. Yuval Levin recently wrote in the National Review that changing the definition to 40 hours "would likely put far, far more people at risk of having their hours cut" and "would make for a worse effect on workers."

Unfortunately, Congressional Republicans remain unmoved by the facts, choosing instead to launch yet another attack on working families.

According to the CBO, this bill would increase the Federal deficit by \$53 billion over the next decade. So I would urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and then "no" on H.R. 30.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition both to the rule and also to the underlying legislation, Save American Workers Act of 2015.

To paraphrase President Reagan: There you go again. This bill is another effort to undermine the Affordable Care Act, and, even worse, this significantly makes the problem worse. Raising the threshold for full-time employees from 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week would result in lost work hours for 6.5 million people. This essentially guts the employer responsibility requirement at the direct expense of the hardworking employees and of the taxpayers who end up subsidizing these employees' health care coverage.

According to the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, the misnamed Save American Workers Act will cause 1 million people to lose their employer-based health insurance coverage, increase the

number of uninsured Americans by 500,000, and add \$74 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. It will make shifts toward part-time employment more likely rather than less.

Starting the 114th Congress with the 54th attempt to undermine or repeal the Affordable Care Act is disappointing, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman POLIS.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have said all along that we understand that when you have a bill that is this wide in scope, whether it is hundreds of pages or thousands of pages, regardless of the subject matter, whether it is health care or education or banking or anything else, that it is likely not going to be perfect, that we are always willing to come back and look at making reasonable changes and tweaking it to make it better, and that we would be willing to work with Republicans to do it. We demonstrated that a few days ago when Congressman DAVIS received overwhelming support from both Republicans and Democrats to make sure that employers don't have to count folks who are receiving coverage through the VA or through some other VA-related health care coverage.

This, however, is unreasonable. This action, this bill, would mean that a million Americans would lose health care coverage—a million Americans. We are expecting, because the ACA has been so successful, that 9 million Americans will enroll by the end of this enrollment period.

Now, at the beginning, Republicans were saying that this would be the biggest job killer there was, that the economy would suffer, that businesses would be cutting employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Those predictions have turned out to be completely misguided and false.

This country is going through an incredible economic expansion, almost 5 percent. The unemployment rate is below 6 percent. And so, as we go through this debate, I hope that we will keep those considerations in mind.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a fellow member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend.

This is a debate that we shouldn't even have to have had since this should have been approved 6 years ago. If you understand how Keystone was supposed to happen, all it took was the President and, really, his Cabinet, Secretary of State, to approve the cross-border passage 6 years ago. But because of politics and the President making a decision—we thought this was going to be done 6 years ago, hence, the legislative body getting involved.

And what has happened over the past 6 years? Fifteen hearings, four mark-ups. This is our 10th vote, and it is time to move on.

Moving liquid crude by pipeline is the safest way to move product—the safest. In the Energy and Commerce Committee, people have no understanding how many pipelines we have in this country—thousands of miles and multiple cross-border. The only reason this got involved in a political debate is the whole debate on climate change and fossil fuel. That is the debate.

Now, you put more bulk crude product on the world market, that lowers the prices for all Americans. Why are we seeing low gasoline prices today? It is because there is a glut of crude oil on the entire world market. Moving Keystone XL allows even more bulk crude oil to get on the world market. Most of that would be refined in our country.

Major refiners have done billions of dollars of investments—next to my district in Ohio, up in Chicagoland—to be prepared to refine this type of crude oil, so this is, unfortunately, a problem that we need to move and fix.

I appreciate the rule, and I look forward to debating the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Illinois that, yes, this is politicized all right, and now we have got Congress in the business of permitting. And if we are going to go down that route, I have a 7-Eleven in my home county that can't get a permit. Maybe I will bring it to Congress.

This is not the way to solve environmental problems, and this oil is for export from Port Arthur, Texas. It is not designed to help domestic supply in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle have now tried more than 54 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act in some fashion. Today they are at it once again, offering the so-called, Orwellian-named Save American Workers Act.

I am still trying to figure out what they are trying to save the American workers from. Good health care? Doctors? Nurses? Free preventative check-ups? The denial of insurance based on a preexisting condition?

Exactly what are you trying to save them from?

Despite the repeated distortions and assaults, the Affordable Care Act is working. In the most recent open enrollment, more than 6.5 million people have registered for or renewed their health insurance coverage through the marketplace exchange, and open enrollment will continue through February 15 of this year.

Just this week, new data show the uninsured rate has sunk to 12.9 percent, a 4-point drop in the past year, and one of the lowest in decades. Many of these are our constituents who, without the Affordable Care Act, would not have health insurance. They are realizing the benefits of a patient-centered insurance model in which their coverage cannot be rescinded or denied because of a preexisting condition and does not put them at risk of bankruptcy in the event of an emergency.

But my friends on the other side will not be deterred in their zeal to repeal, at any cost, no matter who it hurts, even if it means abandoning their own professed principles.

The Congressional Budget Office says this bill would increase the Federal deficit by at least \$53.2 billion over the next 10 years. I thought my colleagues wanted to reduce the deficit, which is exactly what the Affordable Care Act does do, to the tune of \$109 billion over the same period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CONNOLLY. But rather than save workers, as its title would suggest, this bill will actually sabotage them. Again, CBO says 1 million people who currently have insurance will lose it under the Republican plan today, half of whom will have to go to Medicaid, and the other half will just be left on the street.

Mr. Speaker, American workers need the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying H.R. 30.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for his very first speech here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the rule.

With my brother, I have owned and managed a small business for 40 years, and I know well that the most important asset of any business is its workers.

H.R. 30 creates perverse incentives to cut employee hours and to eliminate the health care benefits entitled to full-time workers. It would allow employers like me to easily cut back full-time employees from the usual 40 hours to 39 hours, just so we don't have to

offer health care coverage. Work 12 minutes fewer a day and have no health insurance coverage.

This bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It doesn't save American workers. It does just the opposite.

Forty-four percent of all American workers will be at risk of losing their health care benefits, and at least a half a million will be forced onto public welfare rolls.

□ 1315

According to the CBO, we hear it will increase the budget deficit by \$53.2 billion over the next 10 years. You don't have to have a background in business to know that doesn't make good business sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule. This is not a job-creating bill—it is a job-destroying bill—and that is not why we are here.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker. We have two bills that didn't go through any committee and that no Member of this body, Democrat or Republican, had a chance to amend. They went to the Rules Committee. No Members are allowed to amend them on the floor of the House, and they have to vote for them.

One of those bills is for a phantom pipeline. We don't even know if anybody wants to build it, and we don't know where it is going to go. We don't even know whether this right of eminent domain might be given to a private company over this so that a company can condemn private property of a private landowner's and take it away. Those are some of the things that are being fought out in court and in law in States like Nebraska. Without even knowing where it is going to go or if anybody wants to pay for it or build it, somehow we are engaged with a permitting process. Let's go ahead and approve a 7-Eleven in GERRY CONNOLLY's district. I would like a hotel at the corner of 29th and Arapahoe in my district, if we can do that, too.

What are we doing—seizing all control here in Washington and taking it away from States and local governments and individual landowners, who normally have a say in these matters?

Of course, there is the other bill that we have here. Again, it didn't go through committee. Nobody could amend it. It is a bill that increases the deficit by \$52 billion by forcing Americans to take taxpayer subsidies for their health care rather than buying it themselves with their employee's share and their employer's share. It is a bill that encourages companies to cut their employees from 40 hours a week to 39 hours a week. It is a bill that will lead hundreds of thousands or millions of Americans to lose their health care and

have to take taxpayer subsidies through the exchange to be able to even have any kind of health care.

Look, instead of rehashing proposals that we voted on I don't even know how many times—in fact, we voted on this phantom pipeline when it was a little less phantom. I think there were actually people who wanted to build it when oil was \$110 a barrel. Guess what? The costs of the pipeline have gone up by about 30 percent, and as far as we can tell, there has been no evidence presented, either in the Rules Committee or here on the floor, that anybody wants to build it. By the way, that is what congressional hearings are about in normal regular order, where there would be somebody to testify: "Well, yes, we can build it at \$70 a barrel. No, we can't build it at \$70 a barrel." We don't even have that information. I have seen an independent report that said that the tar sands are not profitable at anything less than \$65 a barrel. We are at \$52 a barrel now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and of the two underlying bills, one of which is H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, which comes into my district.

I thank Congressman CRAMER for introducing legislation approving this project and for the leadership in making it a priority at the beginning of this Congress.

It has been 2,302 days since the first permit application was filed for Keystone XL. Now, folks, that is before the Apple iPad was released 6 years ago. The State Department's exhaustive study of this project has led many to conclude that the Keystone XL is the most studied pipeline in history. It looks like the only job this has produced has been for those who are studying it. The Department has concluded that this pipeline will be safe and environmentally sound. Despite this favorable review, the administration has failed to make a decision on a project that will strengthen our relationship with an important ally and create American jobs—40,000, to use their number.

In addition to Canadian oil, this pipeline will also transport American oil from North Dakota and Montana. This will make our roads and communities safer as fewer trucks and fewer railcars will be needed to transport oil to energy-hungry communities all across our great country. The Keystone pipeline is supported by over 70 percent of the American people, and there is no further reason for any kind of delay for this project.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 35 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

By cutting full-time workers from 40 hours per week to 39, an employer could escape having to pay for health care. This bill would put millions of workers at risk of losing both wages and health care. It is wrong for our country, wrong for public health, and it is wrong for the middle class. It leaves the American people worse off, with smaller paychecks and with bigger insurance bills. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. POLIS. We are prepared to close if the gentleman from Texas is prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I have no additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bills—no committee hearings, no committee markup, no amendments on the floor of the House, a phantom pipeline, job-destroying, deficit-busting.

I yield half the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It has been an interesting afternoon, and we have heard a lot of discussion. The first week of a new Congress is a little bit different from other times. None of our committees have been constituted. Yet, in this Congress—in this historic Congress—we have been left an enormous amount of work by the previous Congress, not because the House wouldn't do its work. Republicans and Democrats showed up and passed bills and sent them over to the Senate, and there they languished. Well over 300 bills are stacked up on the former majority leader's desk. I stress the word "former" in that statement, and I believe that is why he is the former majority leader.

Now it is a new day and a new Congress. No, the committees have not yet been constituted, but there is an enormous amount of work—there is an enormous body of work—that has already been accomplished by the House of Representatives that now needs to move forward on behalf of the American people, on behalf of our economy, on behalf of our jobs, on behalf of heating our homes. Look, I am old enough to remember when the Democrats assumed power in 2007, in the 110th Congress. It was kind of an unusual time for me because I had been in the majority previously, and I didn't know what

it was like to be in the minority, but let me just take everyone back for a moment.

The rules package that the Democrats passed in the 110th Congress—their first year of the majority—provided for the consideration of five measures. I never quite understood that because the Democrats ran on “six for ‘06.” Nevertheless, five measures were included in their rules package. They went directly to the floor with these bills, with no committee consideration, not even the consideration of a hearing in the House Rules Committee, which they controlled at the time. So it is a little disingenuous to say, “Oh, we are rushing things. Oh, we have not had adequate consideration.” You heard the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) describe the number of hearings and markups that have been done on just the Keystone pipeline.

In the time I have been sitting here I have heard discussions that there is nothing in the Affordable Care Act that actually cuts a worker's hours, but a plain reading of the legislation—of section 1513, page 158, paragraph four, for those who are keeping score at home—reads:

A full-time employee, section A, in general: The term “full-time employee” means, with respect to any month, an employee who is employed at least 30 hours of service per week.

That seems pretty straightforward.

What has happened as a result of that very plain language even before the Department of Labor issued its rules, which were even more restrictive, is employers made the decision of: Do you know what? We are not going to employ anyone over 29 hours because we don't want to run the risk of invoking this employer mandate.

Now, it is true enough that the administration did delay the mandate. Yes, we are criticized for passing things that are restrictive on the Affordable Care Act. The administration has done so so many times—30, 35—I don't even remember how many. One of the things they delayed was the employer mandate. In fact, later on, in this very section, section 1513, it states:

On the effective date of the employer mandate, the amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

That is in the past.

It is important to bring this up. It is not part of our discussion today on the rules, but it is for employers—for small businesses—in this country to recognize, with the delay of the employer mandate—actually, it started last week, January 1 of 2015—no taxes for calendar year 2015 will be paid until next year. So the fines under the Affordable Care Act will, in fact, not start until next year, but the reporting requirements started 7 days ago. Big

companies understand this. Big companies get this. Big companies have got lots of lawyers on retainer who are working on this every day. It is the small employers with 50 employees back home in our districts who need to understand that they have to be keeping these records today so that they will be able to go back and verify the statements on their tax bills next year.

Mr. SHIMKUS said it very well. On the Keystone pipeline, there have been 15 hearings in the House and Senate, four markups, 10 votes—10 votes on the Keystone pipeline. Tell me we haven't studied this situation.

We heard discussion from the other side that this was a phantom pipeline, that no one is even interested in building it anymore, and that the price of gas is so low that no one would be interested in building the Keystone pipeline. In fact, the president and CEO of TransCanada, in a statement yesterday, said that Keystone XL is a project that was needed when oil prices were less than \$40 a barrel.

That was in 2008 that it was less than \$40 a barrel. It is a project that was needed when oil prices were less than \$40 a barrel. It was needed when prices were over \$100 a barrel, and it is certainly needed when prices are \$50 a barrel, as they are today.

He went on to say that the review process for the Keystone XL has been anything but a well-established process. For decades, the normal process to review and make a decision on an infrastructure project like Keystone would take 2 years. He went on to say that we are well over the 6-year mark in reviewing the final phase of Keystone with, seemingly, no end in sight. The bar continues to move again and again.

What business can function like that, Mr. Speaker?

TransCanada has patiently and diligently worked since 2008 to comply with every twist and turn in this unparalleled process. We have done this to ensure that the Keystone XL is built and operated safely. The State Department has concluded this to be the case time and time again, and it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would just submit that that does not sound like a CEO who is not willing to invest his money. We are not even talking about government money here. We are talking about private money. This private investment, indeed, is going forward. I would just submit again, from Cushing, Oklahoma, to Port Arthur, Texas, the pipeline is actually in the ground and exists today—far from a phantom pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of important bills pertaining to health care and energy—the two very centers of excellence within the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I applaud Mr. YOUNG and Mr. CRAMER for their thoughtful pieces of legislation. I applaud them for working across the aisle to offer bills that both Republicans and Democrats have publicly supported. Over two-dozen Democrats voted for the 40-hour workweek the last time it came to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

For that reason, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 180, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—240

Abraham	Duffy	Jordan
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Katko
Amash	Ellmers	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Emmer	King (IA)
Babin	Farenthold	King (NY)
Barletta	Fincher	Kinzinger (IL)
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Barton	Fleischmann	Knight
Benishek	Flores	Labrador
Bilirakis	Forbes	LaMalfa
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lance
Black	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Blum	Garrett	Long
Bost	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Boustany	Gibson	Love
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Lucas
Brat	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Bridenstine	Gowdy	Lummis
Brooks (AL)	Granger	MacArthur
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	Marino
Buck	Graves (MO)	Massie
Bucshon	Griffith	McCarthy
Burgess	Grothman	McCaul
Byrne	Guinta	McClintock
Calvert	Guthrie	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Hanna	McKinley
Chabot	Hardy	McMorris
Chaffetz	Harper	Rodgers
Clawson (FL)	Harris	McSally
Coffman	Hartzler	Meadows
Cole	Heck (NV)	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Messer
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Comstock	Hice (GA)	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Hill	Miller (MI)
Cook	Holding	Moolenaar
Costa	Hudson	Mooney (WV)
Costello (PA)	Huelskamp	Mullin
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney
Crawford	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Crenshaw	Hunter	Neugebauer
Culberson	Hurd (TX)	Newhouse
Curbelo (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Noem
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Nugent
Denham	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
Dent	Jenkins (WV)	Olson
DeSantis	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Palmer
Diaz-Balart	Jolly	Paulsen
Dold	Jones	Pearce

Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

NAYS—180

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Duckworth
Fleming
Gallego
Gosar
O'Rourke
Rush
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Stivers

□ 1353

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015 and H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE ON TUCSON SHOOTINGS' 4-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lead my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in a moment of silence to honor the victims of the Tucson, Arizona, mass shooting that took place 4 years ago today.

On that bright winter day, a gunman struck directly at a cornerstone of American democracy by murdering six innocent people and wounding 13 others during a Congress on Your Corner event. Among the injured were our dear colleague and friend, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, and her aide and future colleague, Ron Barber.

In spite of her near-fatal wounds and with the memory of her constituents and staff whom she lost that day guiding her, Gabby has moved this Congress, this Nation, and arguably the world with her remarkable recovery, her poignance, and her passion.

She has also channeled her poise, her strength, and her determination into an effort with her husband, Mark, by her side to ensure that similar episodes of violence do not befall other mothers, fathers, husbands, sisters, daughters, sons, friends, and neighbors. How very extraordinary, how very bold, and how very Gabby.

It is not easy work, and we all have our differences. Mr. Speaker, I know I am joined by so many of you in asking, hoping, and praying in Gabby's name that we can set aside some of our deeply-held differences and find a way to work together on this very challenging and difficult subject of gun violence and keeping people safe and make a commitment this Congress to find common ground finally.

In doing so, we will be more pragmatic, more thoughtful, and more engaged citizens in this great and enduring experiment that we call American democracy. It would be a fitting tribute to those individuals whose lives were lost and irreparably altered that Saturday in Tucson.

In that spirit, in the spirit of working together, in the spirit of reaffirm-

ing our commitment to American representative democracy, and defying against violence against this great institution, I ask you to please rise and join me for a moment of silence to honor the lives of Gabe Zimmerman, Dorwan Stoddard, Phyllis Schneek, Judge John Roll, Dot Morris, and Christina-Taylor Green.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer

Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight

Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth
Gallego

Gosar
O'Rourke

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 30) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 30

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Save American Workers Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF 30-HOUR THRESHOLD FOR CLASSIFICATION AS FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE FOR PURPOSES OF THE EMPLOYER MANDATE IN THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND REPLACEMENT WITH 40 HOURS.

(a) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by repealing subparagraph (E), and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS TREATED AS FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Solely for purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer under this paragraph, an employer shall, in addition to the number of full-time employees for any month otherwise determined, include for such month a number of full-time employees determined by dividing the aggregate number of hours of service of employees who are not full-time employees for the month by 174.”.

(b) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by repealing subparagraph (A), and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘full-time employee’ means, with respect to any month, an employee who is employed on average at least 40 hours of service per week.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the first firm step on the ladder of opportunity is a full-time job, and for too many Americans, this first step is moving out of reach thanks to ObamaCare. Right now, the law says that every large employer must give health insurance to its full-time employees. Here is the catch: it defines full time as 30 hours or more.

So guess what is happening—businesses are cutting workers’ hours. They are keeping them below 30 hours to avoid the penalty. It is commonly known as the ObamaCare 29ers. And what is more, community colleges are laying off their professors and they are cutting their hours, so they have to cut their class offerings as well. In other words, the law is making it much harder to learn new skills and to find a better paying job. I can’t think of a worse way to support working families: taking opportunities away from them, cutting paychecks, cutting hours.

Who are the people who are most at risk with this 30-hour rule? Well, by and large, it is young people in low-paying jobs—probably their first jobs. One study said that over half of them have, at most, a high school degree.

□ 1415

These are the people who are just getting started in life, who need those extra hours, who want to move up the ladder of economic opportunity. ObamaCare is holding these people down. That is why we are here today.

This bill changes the law’s definition of full time to 40 hours a week. That is the way most people define full time. That is the way it has been done for decades in other parts of law. That way, businesses will no longer fear letting their employees work a full workweek. That way, people can get the experience they need. That way, we can get people working again and build a healthy economy.

Mr. Speaker, it is really clear. There are so many parts of this law that are holding back the country, that are raising health care costs, that are putting us further behind and deeper in the hole on fiscal responsibility. But this rule is costing people jobs; this rule is knocking people out of full-time work. It is no wonder that CBO is telling us the equivalent of over 2 million people will not work because of this law.

I urge adoption of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Republicans say that with this bill they are trying to help or, as they put it, save workers. But their legislation will lead to many times more workers becoming part time, losing millions of hours of work.

The Republicans constantly talk about the threat of increased budget deficits, but their bill would increase the deficit by over \$50 billion. The Republicans like to say they care about the taxes people pay, but this bill would substantially shift responsibility for paying for health insurance from employers to taxpayers.

These are indisputable facts based on yesterday's analysis from the non-partisan CBO and Joint Committee on Taxation. This chart helps to illustrate what this is really all about. Today, 7 percent, more or less, of workers work between 30 and 34 hours, while close to half work 40 hours. As you can see, the number working 40 hours overshadows dramatically those who are working less. This is the key point. So if you shift the basis of employer responsibility for health care to begin at 40 hours instead of 30 hours, the result will be a dramatic increase in the number of workers whose hours of employment will be reduced to less than 40 hours per week. You will be creating hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of 39ers.

CBO and Joint Task conclude, therefore, that 1 million workers will lose their employer-based health insurance, with half of them shifting to insurance through the health exchanges or through Medicaid—by the way, with some taxpayer support—and the other half—listen to this—losing health insurance coverage completely.

So when you take off the label of this Republican bill and look at the contents in the package, this is a bad deal, highlighting the need for a truth in labeling requirement for this Congress. When you go beyond the benign Republican rhetoric, this is a bad deal for American workers and the middle class and taxpayers. That has led even a conservative like Yuval Levin to say that today's bill "is worse than doing nothing."

This bill is brought up today without any committee consideration or discussion with Democrats—the minority leader is here, the minority whip—not a single minute of discussion. Unfortunately, contrary to the rhetoric we heard yesterday—again, from the majority—about the need to look for common ground, on this issue the Republican approach is scorched earth.

I urge a strong negative vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds simply to say that the gentleman's criticism basically makes our point. The average workweek is 34.6 hours. So if you go to 30 hours, you are cutting people's hours. If you go to 39, you are not. We

don't want to cut people's hours. We don't want people to work less. We want people to work more.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the author of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to elaborate on the chairman's retort to what we just heard about criticisms pertaining to this law.

Number one, this law is inherently unfair. Trying to finance health insurance for some Americans by cutting hours and wages for other Americans is just, frankly, not what we should be doing as a country. The Save American Workers Act would actually save most workers from a potentially massive loss in hours and wages, and I will walk the gentleman through that momentarily. It will also cause fewer workers to be directly impacted by this employer mandate.

Very briefly, let us start with saving most workers from a potentially massive cut in hours. Under current law, if you work between 40 to, say, 45 hours and your employer happens to not offer you employer-sponsored health insurance, you are in the minority. An employer is incentivized to offer these typically higher-wage, higher-skilled workers employer-sponsored health insurance, and that is why so many do. It is part of our normal functioning labor market.

So if one were to be moved hypothetically from 40 hours down to 29 hours, they would lose roughly \$270 a week or \$14,000 a year, according to the American Action Forum.

Under the Save American Workers Act, these 40- to 45-hour workweek individuals would no longer be at risk of such a massive cut in their wages or their hours.

Let's take someone working 30 to 35 hours, just above that new full-time employment threshold in ObamaCare. They tend to be lower-wage hourly workers, according to the Hoover Institution, and let's assume they had no employer-sponsored health insurance. There are 9.8 million Americans who fall into this category. They are vulnerable to a cut in their hours and wages.

Were one to move from 35 hours a week down to 29, they would lose on average \$148 per week, or \$7,694 a year—again, according to the American Action Forum.

Under the Save American Workers Act, these individuals, 30 to 35 hours a week, would no longer lose any hours or wages, just reinforcing the point that the good chairman made.

Well, this is why I introduced the Save American Workers Act. Let's restore the 40-hour workweek that so many people worked so hard to put in place, that has long been understood to be the gold standard of the workweek in this country.

Over the past few years, I have witnessed a strange phenomenon in our country. In Indiana, we have seen local school corporations announce they will limit the hours of substitute teachers, classroom assistants, cafeteria workers, custodians. We have seen retailers limit the hours of their cashiers. The list goes on and on, from hotels to manufacturers to colleges and universities.

I guarantee that every Member of this body back in their district has heard similar stories. This is happening because of the new 30-hour definition of full-time employment.

Now, there is no good reason to do this, other than, perhaps, to arbitrarily set this new definition of full-time employment to fund the massive cost of this national health care bill. It has ignored decades of practice in the labor market reality of our 40-hour workweek. It has distorted that market.

As a result, the Hoover Institution estimates that as many as 2.6 million American workers are at risk for lost hours.

Now, it is not just the lost hours that should concern us. Again, it is the lost wages. An employee losing 10 hours a week is also losing an entire week's paycheck each month. An employee going from 35 to 29 hours is seeing a 17 percent pay cut, courtesy of ObamaCare.

The people most affected by this provision are the people who can least afford it—89 percent of them do not have college degrees, 63 percent of them are women. Perhaps, ironically, it sounds a lot like the people ObamaCare was supposed to help.

CBO analysis indicates that it comes at the expense of up to \$105 billion in cash wages. Now, I defy anyone to say that it is fair to expand coverage to a half-million people—that number from the CBO—on the backs of 2.5 million people who can't afford it. How fundamentally inefficient is the health care system that potentially requires the loss of over \$200,000 in cash wages for each person it insures.

I authored H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, to help these hard-working Americans. And I introduced this bill jointly with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who happens to be a Democrat. He, too, realizes that ObamaCare is littered with serious unintended consequences that need to be addressed.

In the Senate, we have seen a similar version of this bill introduced in a bipartisan manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Now, this isn't a Republican or a Democrat issue; this is a serious solution to a very real problem facing American workers.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Save American Workers Act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

To say this restores the 40-hour week is pure sophistry. What it does is undermine it for hundreds of thousands of workers in this country. That is the basis of the Joint Tax Committee report. It is pure sophistry to say otherwise.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Save American workers. Make sure they don't lose purchasing power. Let's make sure that those at the bottom end of the employment spectrum are saved. That is the message.

I presume the minimum wage bill will be on the floor next week. Perhaps you are going to want to extend unemployment insurance next week. Perhaps you are going to really want to do something that will save the workers and give them the purchasing power they had in 1968.

The chairman said it well: We go from creating 29ers to 39ers. This bill will allow you to work 10 more hours without health care. Isn't that wonderful? I am sure every American worker is saying: Thank God the Republicans are going to have me work 10 more hours before I can get health insurance. Aren't you generous?

The American worker needs help, not to be misled by a rhetoric which pretends to do something for them but leaves them stuck, not just for 5 years, but for 10, 15, 20 years, as those at the top of the ring get better and better off—and we are among most of those 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the first days of the new Congress, with an opportunity to turn the page and write a new chapter of bipartisanship and cooperation. We are not doing it today.

It is unfortunate that the Republican majority has instead chosen to replay the highlight reel from the last Congress by bringing back to the floor a piece of partisan legislation that would undermine the Affordable Care Act and cause approximately 1 million Americans to lose their employer-sponsored insurance coverage. Not something that Mr. YOUNG says may happen or is extrapolated to happen, but there is no doubt that this would happen—1 million people.

Well, so what? This bill is a solution without a problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

□ 1430

Mr. HOYER. As of this time, without being timed, I really miss my magic minute; I want to tell you that, Mr. Speaker.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, 10.8 million new jobs have

been created in the private sector, and it has not led to a shift to part-time work. That is what the statistics tell us.

You want to save the worker, but under your economic policies in the last decade, we had the worst loss of jobs in this country in my lifetime. In fact, part-time workers, as a share of all workers in our economy, have fallen—have fallen—have decreased, are less since the enactment of the health care reform bill.

Unfortunately, this bill's sponsors have chosen to ignore these facts because they don't support their argument. Their legislation would allow employers to deny health care reach to those working even as many, as I have said, as 39 hours.

That means the slightest reduction in hours could be used to deny employees the coverage they ought to be earning through their work, so the rest of us do not have to pay their bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. As a result, up to half a million Americans would become uninsured, and this bill would increase the deficit by \$53 billion.

There is not enough time to really explain all the nuances of the adverse consequences of this bill. I ask my colleagues: let's have a decent and honest debate, let's have an honest debate and honest discussion so that, yes, Mr. YOUNG, we can protect those workers that we all should be able to protect, and then I will expect that to be accompanied with a minimum wage bill and the unemployment insurance extension.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire about the distribution of time, the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 22¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, wish the chair happy birthday, and I would like to honor the Congressman from Indiana, Congressman YOUNG, for his leadership on this important issue.

This effort to change the employer mandate definition of a full-time employee as one who only works 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week is a priority for folks all across the country, and it is appropriate that the House is taking action on H.R. 30 on this, only the third day of the 114th Congress.

I have heard from employees and employers alike about the negative con-

sequences of the employer mandate penalty. The most complicating factor that I hear about is the definition of a full-time employee as someone who works only 30 hours or fewer per week.

This rule, which is not based in reality, and goes against every traditional measure of a full-time workweek, results in fewer jobs, reduced hours, and less opportunity for millions of working-class Americans. It effectively is a regressive tax on the folks who can least afford to have their hours cut.

The sticks that are used in the President's health care law to force employees into health care plans are hurting employees and employers, and unfortunately, the result is reduced hours and opportunity for hardworking Americans trying to support their families.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair say again how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 22¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2½ minutes at the most to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the minority whip. He gave you all the facts and figures.

Let me tell you what this is really about. This is the 54th time that the Republicans have come out here to end the Affordable Care Act. This one is an assault on the employer mandate. You cannot have a bill without an employer mandate.

Now, we had to pick a time. Lots of employers in this country right now without any Federal law are giving insurance to their people down to 30 hours. So we said, "All right, let's make that full time." What the business community said they were supporting, they really weren't supporting, and they are in here to get rid of it.

This bill is the blueprint for business to shift all their employees on to the government, very simply. Close the building at 4 p.m. Now, everybody has only worked 39 hours, right? Go home.

Now, the office doesn't have to offer them any health insurance under the law. They have to go over to the exchange, get involved in Medicaid, get involved in the exchanges and getting subsidies and all of that, which you are going to pay for. You are going to pay for that by letting the employers get out from under paying it and shifting it on to the Federal Government. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. RYAN for his generous step toward a single-payer system. When the American people find out that their business can now take their insurance away if

they don't work 40 hours, they are going to say to themselves, "Well, then I am in this Federal Government thing. Why isn't everybody in that?"

You are heading down the road of a single-payer system because if you don't have a mandate for employers to cover their workers, you are simply saying, "Well, the employers don't have to care anymore." Who is going to care? Well, the Republicans certainly aren't going to care. You all know that without being told.

Ultimately, politically, this is going to come to bite you because what you are doing is excluding and telling big business, "You don't have to follow an employer mandate."

It is a bad bill. Vote "No."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, it has been demonstrated many times over that ObamaCare is a broken law. For example, under the law, full-time employment is classified at 30 hours a week, requiring these businesses to provide insurance to these employees.

Now, what is the consequence? This creates an incentive to limit hours. This will disproportionately affect 2.3 million low-income workers. It puts our economy in danger of creating a class of part-time employees where having two or three jobs is the norm. That is just unacceptable. That is not the answer for America.

Even major unions like the Teamsters say this law will destroy the very health and well-being of working families. That is not the promise of America. That is not the America we all aspire to. We should be encouraging businesses to hire more, to offer more pay, not to limit growth and employment. That is not the answer.

Today, the House is taking action to save the American worker by lifting this threshold to a more realistic 40 hours a week.

I could tell you real-life experience. Having talked to companies, they are going to be pushing more and more of these workers into part-time employment. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to talk to businesses in their districts and understand what is really happening as a consequence.

That is why we should pass this legislation. I encourage all Members to please support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend of many years for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, down the same unnecessary road. This bill is a deliberate and systematic attempt to

undermine the Affordable Care Act. We are supposed to be here to help people and not to hurt people. So what is this all about?

This bill, call it what you may, would roll back protection for Americans who work at or near 40 hours a week. Before the Affordable Care Act, it was easy to discriminate against the sick, the elderly, and those who had lost their jobs through no fault of their own, but those days are over. We have come too far. We made too much progress to go back, and we will not go back.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no," so we can go forward and continue to provide comprehensive health care for all of our citizens. This is the right thing to do. It is the responsible thing to do. It is the fair thing to do.

Just vote "no." Just say "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1938, it was Franklin Roosevelt who signed the Fair Labor Standards Act, establishing full-time work as 40 hours, so for more than 70 years, that has been the accepted definition for government, for corporations, for small business; but in 2010, the President's health care law threw 70 years of precedent completely out the window.

This new 30-hour rule is forcing companies to scale back hours, with more part-time jobs and less full-time jobs, so now, many employees that were working full time—good full-time jobs—have seen their paychecks cut up to 25 percent.

One study recently found that regulations in the President's new health care law, like the 30-hour rule, are reducing small business wages to workers every year by \$22 billion and that employment in small businesses has been reduced by 350,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want more full-time opportunities, and they should get to choose to pursue those opportunities, not have their employers force to reduce them to part-time work. America's workers deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from The Associated General Contractors of America supporting this legislation by Mr. YOUNG.

THE ASSOCIATED
GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, January 7, 2015.

Re Support H.R. 30, The Saving American Workers Act of 2015.

Hon. TODD YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I am writing in support of the Saving American Workers Act of 2015, H.R. 30. The bill would repeal the 30-hour definition of "full-time employment" in the Af-

fordable Care Act (ACA) by replacing it with the more traditional 40-hour definition.

The construction industry is typically project-based, transitory and seasonal, which distinguishes it from other professional industries with more predictable hours. As a result, many construction employers rely on part-time, seasonal and variable-hour employees. In addition, the construction industry consists of many smaller employers with limited human resource and administrative staff. These two issues alone add layers of difficulty for a construction firm that is required to use the complex formulas in the ACA to determine whether or not it is considered a large employer under the law.

Despite prior delay of the reporting and enforcement provisions of the ACA, the law continues to be an administrative burden for employers. Replacing the definition of a full-time employee to the more commonly accepted 40 hours per week will, at the very least, reduce some of the complexity associated with the ACA.

AGC hopes you will support H.R. 30 and provide some relief for construction employers across the country.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
Senior Executive Director,
Government Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another active member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, America's middle class is facing a crisis. Despite the fact that productivity has soared and profits have increased, these gains are not flowing to the vast majority of Americans.

In 81 percent of America's counties, median income today is lower than it was 15 years ago. After adjusting for inflation, today's average hourly wage has the same purchasing power as it did in 1979, this despite the fact that American workers are producing far more. Productivity has increased 74 percent since 1973.

There is a reason why the wealth is concentrated at the top. There are a myriad of tiny little changes that have a cumulative effect on the vast majority of American workers. Refusing to raise the minimum wage, attacking the right to unionize, special tax benefits for a few, and today's legislation are all examples.

No doubt changing the definition of 40 hours for purposes of the Affordable Care Act will benefit a few businesses, but there are far more employees who work 40 hours a week or more than who work 30 to 40 hours, and as has been pointed out by the conservatives at the National Review and The Weekly Standard, it is easier to drop employees to 39 hours a week than to 29 hours a week. This meaning this proposal is going to reduce far more hours of work and wages for whom it matters the most.

Wages aren't the only benefit at stake. As has been pointed out, according to the CBO, a million workers will lose health insurance through their employer, half of whom will lose it altogether. The other half will be shifted

to the government through Medicaid, increasing spending by more than \$50 billion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, this would be one of the myriad of policies that further disadvantages America's middle class. This is another step by my Republican friends to deny more people the benefits of that work, widen the divide, and disadvantage not only families today but far into the future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman RYAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 30. It was noted not long ago that the President's health care law will "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class."

Those aren't my words, of course, Mr. Speaker. Instead, those are the words expressed by leaders of some of the Nation's largest labor unions, including the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Echoing these concerns, members of the AFL-CIO endorsed a resolution that warned ObamaCare will lead to a "new underclass of less-than-30-hour workers."

We have all seen the headlines in recent years, headlines describing how employers are left with practically no choice but to cut workers' hours in order to avoid the health care law's punitive employer mandate. Put simply, the law punishes employers who provide workers with full-time jobs.

□ 1445

A small business owner and constituent of mine from Savage, Minnesota, wrote earlier this week that the President's health care law is "wreaking havoc on the American workplace." No doubt many Americans agree.

Unfortunately, the law is wreaking havoc in schools as well. According to a recent report, Louisiana school administrators are being forced to cut staff hours and hire more part-time teachers to avoid Federal penalties. Schools in New Jersey and elsewhere are facing similar tough choices. One superintendent described the costs associated with the health care law's mandates as "an unbelievable drain on school systems."

Don't America's teachers and students deserve better?

Mr. Speaker, let's tell our Nation's school leaders that we won't sit idly by while ObamaCare makes it more difficult to provide students the quality education they deserve. Let's tell our small business owners that we want to help make it easier, not harder, to create full-time jobs. Let's tell the country's union leaders that we share your

concerns and are prepared to do something about it. And finally, let's tell workers that we won't let a flawed law deny them the wages that they need to provide for their families.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people by supporting this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me make sure I have got this straight. We have got a bill before us today, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that will increase our budget deficit by \$53 billion because there are no offsets or pay-fors in this legislation; it will reduce the number of people receiving employment-based health care coverage by about 1 million workers; it will increase the number of people in Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, the health insurance exchanges, by more than 500,000 people; and it will increase the number of uninsured in our country by another 500,000 people—all at the same time when, again, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found in a recent analysis: "There is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the Affordable Care Act."

What's not to like?

Happy New Year, American workers.

My good friend from Wisconsin recently said during the debate that he can't find a worse way to hurt working families. Well, you did with this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished House majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the employer mandate has resulted in lost wages and jobs in America. That point is just not debatable anymore. Numerous studies have said so and the Congressional Budget Office. Businesses are now reacting to ObamaCare's perverse incentive and scaling down.

But the impact of this mandate isn't on paper; it is in the people across this country in each and every district who feel the pain of ObamaCare. In my district, Kern County, firefighters, Department of Mental Health, probation facilities have been forced to reduce hours of extra-help employees, and that is just in county government.

But you know who the employer mandate hurts most of all? Women, small business owners, low-income and unskilled workers. But we have an opportunity today to do something about it, passing Representative TODD YOUNG's Save the American Workers Act.

This bill is common sense. It is bipartisan. But the President has already threatened to veto it. The American people don't want that. They want to see solutions, not obstruction.

So, Mr. President, you say you care about those who have fallen on hard times. Show it; sign this bill.

You say you care about the youth of this country struggling with the debt and unable to find jobs. Show it; sign this bill.

You care about the low-income workers, about working women and small businesses. Show it, and sign this bill. Actions speak louder than words.

The employer mandate and ObamaCare as a whole are hurting the job market and are hurting America. Only a full repeal of this law will solve the problem. But this bill helps, and the President should sign it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another active member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the Save American Workers Act. Look, we will not recognize the fact that in 1960 to 2013, this is the lowest increase in health care costs in the last 50, 60 years.

They don't want to admit it. You can't admit one positive thing about the ACA. But I want you to tell the people who you throw off health care insurance, I want them, through the Speaker, to tell them that no longer are you going to be covered if you have preconditions. You do it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than a tool for large employers to avoid providing their employees with health insurance, despite the fact they can afford to do so.

Now, look, this is not a perfect piece of legislation. We have never passed a perfect piece of legislation. Only God is perfect.

The bill will reduce the number of people receiving insurance through their employers. Simple fact. Been codified. Increase the number of people getting insurance through the Affordable Care Act. Put more burden on the Treasury and increase the number of people who will end up with no insurance.

Studies have shown that raising the threshold to 40 hours would nearly triple the number of workers at risk of having their hours just slightly reduced by firms looking to avoid requirements to provide their employees with health insurance.

My Republican colleagues love to extol the virtues of fiscal responsibility, so it is good to know that those concerns can be so easily cast aside for bills like this that not only add to the deficit, but also achieve their noble goal of resulting in more Americans going without health insurance.

Through the Speaker, I would like to give the manager 30 days to change his

thoughts that were extended this week in the newspaper when he said that this bill will give more people more full-time work. Show us. Show us, please.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand here in support of the Save American Workers Act, legislation that helps my constituents in Michigan who are struggling under the President's health care law, regardless of the sophistry from the other side.

While Michigan has been hard-hit over the past few years for many reasons, the negative effects of the President's health care law have only amplified our struggles by eroding full-time work opportunities for hourly workers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply committed to safeguarding workers and businesses from ObamaCare's damaging consequences. Restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek is an important reform that will protect employees and provide certainty for employers.

We need effective solutions that focus on getting people back to work rather than forcing people from their jobs, like Janet from Jackson, Michigan, who called my office in tears last September.

This 56-year-old single mother of three had just been told that morning by her employer that her home health care job was being moved from 36 hours to 28 hours because of the new requirements under ObamaCare. She asked: How am I going to pay my mortgage and insurance with only 28 hours?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WALBERG. Let's give Janet the opportunity to save her 36 hours, have it back, by passing the Save American Workers Act. Like Janet, everyone should have the chance to work, to succeed and prosper and be in control of their own health care issues.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 30, the so-labeled Save American Workers Act, which I call the "Sabotage the Affordable Health Care Act," and that is because the bill before us will help to do just that—sabotage affordable health care for millions of Americans.

It would make it easier for employers to not participate in providing health care assistance to their employees. It would drive low- and moderate-income workers back to the emergency rooms of public hospitals and clinics.

The CBO has said that passage of this measure would raise the deficit by \$53

billion over a 10-year period and put a million people in government-sponsored health insurance, Medicaid, CHIP, and the exchanges. It would promote episodic care and take us back to yesteryears in health care delivery.

The Affordable Care Act is already working—and working well. On a daily basis, it is taking people off the uninsured rolls.

H.R. 30 is a step backwards. It is not good for workers; it is not good for health care delivery; and it is not good for America.

I would urge a "no" vote for H.R. 30. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. In fact, just this morning I was reading your op-ed from USA Today in which you make a great point. This law cannot be fixed. It is beyond repair. No quick legislative fix can fix this law and make it work for the countless American families who have already been negatively impacted, including people in my district.

Last November, the American people spoke loud and clear. They want to see bold legislative action that pushes back against the failed policies of this President.

I support this bill, but I want to do more, and we must do more. I look forward to working with the chairman and leadership of this House to move forward with the full repeal of this law.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD the position statement favoring this bill from the National Federation of Independent Business, the voice of small business of America.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I am writing in support of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015. H.R. 30 will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 114th Congress.

This legislation would replace the new 30-hour per week full-time or full-time equivalent (FTE) employee definition created by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) with a 40-hour per week definition. The ACA defines full-time employee for the purpose of the employer mandate as an employee who works an average of 30-hours per week (130-hours per month). The employer mandate is a requirement that businesses with 100 or more full-time or FTE employees offer qualified, "affordable" health insurance to 70 percent of full-time employees or pay costly penalties beginning in 2015. In 2016, businesses with 50 or more full-time or FTE employees must offer qualified, "affordable" health insurance to 95 percent of full-time employees and their dependents or pay costly penalties.

In early 2013, NFIB testified before the House Committee on Small Business that the new definition is "one of the most dan-

gerous parts in the law." The ACA marks the first time that "full-time" is expressly defined in federal law. Prior to the ACA's enactment, the determination was left up to the employer.¹ Similarly, the Fair Labor Standards Act has long dictated that overtime pay starts after 40-hours per week.² Thus, employers and employees have long understood "full-time" to be equivalent to 40-hours per week.

The 30-hour full-time definition is already resulting in less opportunities, fewer hours and lower incomes for employees. Small businesses are already being forced to shrink their workforce below and restricting workforce growth above the 50 FTE employee threshold in preparation for the costly mandate.

H.R. 30 would provide some immediate relief for small-business owners and employees. The bill would reduce taxes on employers by tens of billions of dollars. For employees, the bill would prevent decreases in take home pay.

NFIB supports H.R. 30 and will consider it an NFIB Key Vote for the 114th Congress. We look forward to working with you to protect small business as the 114th Congress moves forward.

Sincerely,

AMANDA AUSTIN,
Vice President,
Public Policy.

ENDNOTES

1 <http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/workhours/full-time.htm>

2 http://www.dol.gov/whd/overtime_payt.htm

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask you for the available time now on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 11¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Save American Workers Act of 2015 and would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for reintroducing this important legislation.

I have only been a Member of Congress for 2 days now, but passing bills to help American workers and those who employ them, especially so early in the year, is exactly what our constituents sent us to Washington to accomplish.

The purpose of this legislation is simple: to increase the threshold of classifying a full-time worker under the Affordable Care Act from 30 hours to 40 hours a week.

Back in my south Florida district, I constantly hear from families who are frustrated by the burdens of the Affordable Care Act. The 30-hour workweek provision has limited the incomes of many Americans and their potential to grow in their jobs.

Defining 40 hours as a full workweek will provide relief to many families who are unfairly getting caught in these growth-crushing regulations.

Working Americans want to get ahead and work as many hours as possible to provide for their families. The 30-hour workweek is limiting their ability to do so.

So, again, I want to reiterate my support for this bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find common ground where we can make changes in the Affordable Care Act that will benefit our neighbors back home.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see not the last speaker but the previous Republican speaker—I think he was the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE)—actually say that he wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act because that is what this is all about.

I guess I could take some happiness in the fact that we are not having an outright repeal of the Affordable Care Act on the floor today, but I know that this effort is really about repealing the bill. It is a piece-by-piece approach, where the Republicans want to basically tear down what—in my opinion, and when I go home my constituents say—is an excellent program.

More and more people are signing up for the Affordable Care Act. More and more people are getting insurance at an affordable price with subsidies and the expansion of Medicaid. The Republicans know that they can't repeal it outright, so now, they are trying to do it piece by piece.

There is no kidding ourselves as to what this bill will do. It is going to increase the deficit, adding \$53 billion to our debt. It is going to increase the number of uninsured. It will shift more people onto public programs, and it will cause workers who are currently receiving employer-sponsored health coverage to lose that coverage.

My Republican colleagues claim this bill is necessary to protect jobs, but the fact of the matter is that the Affordable Care Act has strengthened the job market. Our economy and workforce are stronger now than before the law was passed.

Basically, what is happening here is if you are a large employer with more than 50 full-time workers—in other words, 96 percent of employers are unaffected by the law—for those 4 percent of larger employers who have the means, the law says they need to do right by their full-time workers and offer them health insurance.

The Republicans don't think businesses owe their employees anything at all. They think that bigger businesses should have the right to deny their

workers health insurance. Even though the ACA says that that is what they should do—give them health insurance—they say, “No, they shouldn't have to do that.”

The bill the Republicans have presented today would say that big businesses could deny health coverage to someone working 39 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. That is not a part-time worker. Their employers should provide them with health coverage. That is all that we are asking.

Giving big businesses a green light to drop coverage for their workers is not the way to move the country forward. Workers have the right to decent health care, and businesses should help them get it. That is the fair thing. That is the right thing.

This bill simply takes us in the wrong direction. I keep hearing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as to how terrible the Affordable Care Act is. The fact of the matter is it is working and it is working for working people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 30.

I am amazed as to how many times we let politics interfere with policy. I want to tell you who you are really hurting. You are not hurting the Republican Party by your remarks. What you are doing is hurting the American people by your remarks.

This is America's Congress. It is not a Republican Congress, and it is not a Democrat Congress. It is America's Congress. Who have you hurt the most with this policy? Women. Lower-income people and lower middle-income people have suffered greatly.

How do I know that? It is because I am actually in the job market. I have actually hired people. I know the dignity of labor, and I know the harm that is being done by this care act that is totally unaffordable and uncaring.

It is unbelievable that we would come to the floor of this House and somehow make the other political party look bad and turn our backs on the people who sent us. It is not working, gentlemen. We don't have to dismantle it. It is falling apart on its own.

In fact, it is so bad that the President won't even enforce the full law until after an election. Please tell me politics didn't have anything to do with that. Let's do what is right for the American people for a change and quit trying to posture on some kind of a political stance that is just based on fantasy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is now the rank-

ing member on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle have already voted over 50 times to roll back the Affordable Care Act. This is one more attempt.

More than 150 million Americans get their health coverage through their jobs or through a family member's job. As for the Affordable Care Act, when we passed it, at that time, 96 percent of all businesses with over 50 employees provided health insurance for their full-time employees.

So that we wouldn't dismantle the President's system—rather, that we would build on it—we established a mandate. Those employers—those businesses—with over 50 employees would be mandated to provide insurance for their full-time employees. Ninety-six percent were already doing it without a mandate, and those with under 50 employees weren't subject to the mandate.

This bill would change the ACA's definition of “full-time employee” for somebody who works 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week. That puts a lot of Americans at risk of having their hours cut to just under the 40-hour threshold, so that a few employers—just a few, as 96 percent were already doing it—can escape their responsibility of providing the insurance.

They are less likely to suffer a job loss today because most people work a 40-hour week. Cutting below 30 is very unlikely because people would start quitting. Ninety-six percent were already being provided their insurance.

Now, if you are working from 9 to 5, with an hour off for lunch, suddenly, you are no longer a full-time employee. That is only 35 hours. If the employer sends everybody home at 4 on Fridays, that is 39 hours. You are no longer a full-time employee.

As a result, many people—those currently working between 30 and 40 and those who will have their hours cut—will suddenly be part-time employees, not entitled to employer-provided health insurance. According to the Congressional Budget Office, that is about a million people who will lose their employer-based health coverage.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another attack on the health security of American families. It is an attack that families do not want, but it will help that handful of businesses that just wants to deny hardworking employees their health insurance.

I want to put one thing on the record. We have had more consecutive months of 200,000-plus job growth than anytime in recent history, so the job-killing aspect of it can't be doing too badly—a lot more than there were under the previous administration.

We ought to be building on the ACA, not diminishing it. We ought to be

working to strengthen it, including fully expanding Medicaid to all 50 States. We can do better. This hurts families.

It might help a few businesses that want to deny hardworking Americans their health coverage that has been mandated, although 96 percent of businesses already were doing it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire as to the time distributions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Save American Workers Act. I am pleased that the first vote we are going to do is a bipartisan bill of the 114th Congress.

Everywhere I go, I hear concerns about the lack of jobs and the need for job creation. Tennessee's unemployment rate is far too high at 6.8 percent. We have got to do everything we possibly can to encourage employers not only to create jobs but to maintain the jobs they currently offer.

Employers are already struggling to make their budgets work in an uncertain economy, and we know that these employers will have to respond one of two ways, either by cutting hours or by hiring fewer workers. It is already happening. Public school systems in my State and community colleges across the country are cutting hours or are reducing class sizes taught.

I have spent my entire adult life as a physician, taking care of people from all walks of life. I want every American, including those with preexisting conditions, to have access to affordable medical care.

That is why I have worked in Congress to develop patient-centered solutions that help people afford health care, like the American Health Care Reform Act. In the meantime, we must do what we can to protect the American people from the unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman has 11 minutes remaining. Is that where we are right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 10¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the disastrous effects of the President's health care law, from the increased premiums and deductibles to workers' hours being reduced.

While the President refuses to make commonsense changes to this health care law that is destroying opportunities for work in this country, my colleagues and I in Congress have been committed to taking action.

I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill before us, and I look forward to restoring the ability for working students, single parents, single mothers, women, and other Americans desiring to log more hours to do just that, to work more hours.

Mr. Speaker, hard work is a cherished value in North Carolina. Let's pass the Save American Workers Act today to protect workers' hours and their wages.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, restoring the 40-hour workweek is an important reform that will provide relief and certainty for employers in my district, and it will help protect their hardworking employees.

The ACA's unprecedented modification from 40 to 30 hours has forced many jobs creators to scale back business growth, to force them to cut employee hours, and/or to reduce the take-home wages of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let's focus on what this legislation is designed to do and who it is designed to help. Those making under \$30,000 a year, disproportionately women and young Americans, who need the hours and jobs the most, are the ones most at risk of having their hours and wages cut under existing law.

Small businesses and restaurants in my district, such as Victory Brewing Company in Downingtown, Pennsylvania, have suffered. For example, Victory has faced difficult decisions about employee hours and has been plagued with chronic underemployment just to make ends meet.

I am proud to cosponsor the Save American Workers Act. This will help so many businesses not just in southeastern Pennsylvania, but across the Nation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, there is an opportunity here for us to do a good thing, and that is to take a law that was well-intentioned but poorly executed and fix it and make some improvements. There has been all kinds of discussion over the past couple of months—highly-charged political discussion, really, on both sides, that makes false claims about different people's motives.

I will tell you the motive of the sponsor of this bill, Mr. YOUNG from Indiana, is to do this: to lift a burden off of people who find themselves not served by a law that they were told was going to serve them.

They were told: "Oh, this is going to be great. There is going to be no adverse effect on your job opportunities. In fact, it is all going to be terrific. Just sign up for it."

As it turns out, Mr. YOUNG recognized that that wasn't working out for people who were at the lower end of the economic spectrum, Mr. Speaker, so he decided to do something about it. He decided to introduce this bill.

What it does is simply lifts a burden. It says we are not going to create a downward pressure on jobs. Instead, we are going to create an environment in which jobs are more buoyant, and they are more abundant, and there is more of them.

Enough with the false claims and the straw man argument that this is somehow insidious and is taking something away. No, no, no. This isn't taking away. This is adding, and this is empowering, and this is life-giving, and we ought to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a distinguished member of Energy and Commerce.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, this bill purports to solve a problem that does not exist.

The Republicans keep claiming that this provision of the Affordable Care Act is affecting workers' hours, but despite these claims and despite a lot of anecdotal evidence that I have heard from the business community, the labor and employment experts have detected no such impact.

In fact, our economy has created 10.8 million new jobs since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Almost 10 million of those jobs are full-time jobs.

What this proposal would actually do is put more workers into the kind of jeopardy that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they are trying to prevent.

Only 7 percent of Americans work in jobs that place them close to the current 30-hour-a-week threshold. Far more Americans—about 44 percent of them—actually work 40 hours a week, so even slight changes to their work schedules are going to deny them access to the health insurance that they so desperately need.

I have been sitting here. I am really touched by the concern that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have for women and for young people, people who really are at the lower end of the employment spectrum and who the Republicans say are going to be harmed by this.

Let me tell you, for the 4 percent of the large corporations that are subject to these provisions of the Affordable Care Act—people who have 50 employees or more—here is the way it is going to work for the young people and for the women.

□ 1515

These people are going to be people working for large corporations, making just barely above minimum wage. If they work 40 hours a week, they get insurance.

Under this proposal, all their employer has to do is cut 1 hour a week out of that—39 hours a week—and suddenly they lose their health insurance. And that is what is going to put those people at risk. Those women in clerical jobs, women with little kids, those young people in their twenties coming into the job market, trying to do the right thing and have health insurance, now they are going to have to pay for that insurance out of their own pockets, and for no reason.

The consequences of this misguided proposal don't stop there. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 30 would raise the deficit by \$53 billion in the next decade while also keeping a million American workers from getting health insurance through their jobs.

I actually agree with my friend from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM). I think the intentions behind this bill are good intentions. But I think the effect of this bill is going to be to deny insurance for a whole lot of Americans who are at risk—women and young people, exactly the people we should be giving insurance to.

Vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

There are a couple of points I would like to make. I have been listening to this debate. I think what is happening here is that it is the fantasy land of ObamaCare.

The proponents of the ObamaCare law, on the other side of the aisle, speaker after speaker are coming to the well with this fantasy of what ObamaCare ought to be, what they think it is. It is this mythical idea in their minds, which was all the rhetoric that was used to sell the law in the first place on all these good things it is going to do. The problem is: reality. Look at what is actually happening in the real world.

This is the problem with ObamaCare, when the myth of ObamaCare clashes with the reality of what is going on in

America. People are losing their hours. People are getting jobs cut back. It is not big corporations; it is small businesses.

Look, I talked to a retailer in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin who was telling me—tears coming down her face—of how she had to cut back hours, about how she had to take all of her full-time employees at her retail business and knock them down to part time. Why? Because her competitors are doing the same thing.

This is happening throughout America. The last speaker basically proved the point by saying, if you go to 40, they will go down to 39. Well, 39 is a lot better than 29. And guess what? The majority of Americans are at 34 hours. Going to 40 puts them above that; going to 30 puts them below that, putting people out of work.

The fantasy land of ObamaCare, the fatal conceit of the central planning behind this law is that, in reality, it just doesn't work. Let's give people relief.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am pleased to stand here today to support the Save American Workers Act.

I also want to thank my colleague and fellow Hoosier, Representative TODD YOUNG, for sponsoring this bill.

This bipartisan legislation would restore the traditional 40-hour workweek and help employers and employees. Right now, the Affordable Care Act defines full-time employees as those who work 30 hours or more a week, not the standard, more traditional 40 hours.

My district is the RV capital of the world. Businesses are ripe for growth. Expansion is on the horizon. They are afraid to hire and be forced to lay off if this 30-hour definition is not changed.

Our businesses, like the School City of Mishawaka that educates kids, need permanent relief from the burdensome and costly requirements of ObamaCare.

The Save American Workers Act will create jobs in my State and in my district for Hoosiers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a letter of support from the Precision Machined Products Association, which employs many machinists in my district—real jobs for real people.

PRECISION MACHINED
PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,
January 6, 2015.

Hon. TODD YOUNG,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: On behalf of the Precision Machined Products Association (PMPA), our members and the roughly 100,000 employees nationwide in our industry, thank you for your introduction of H.R. 30, the Saving American Workers Act, and your continued efforts to address the issues facing businesses manufacturing in America.

Like many other manufacturers and small businesses across the country, we are concerned about the potential negative impacts caused by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act's 30-hour threshold for full-time employee classification.

Manufacturing businesses, especially companies with fewer than 500 employees, already face significant disadvantages when competing with foreign manufacturers in the global market and this "30-hour rule" is counter-productive to the goal of expanding access to affordable healthcare for employees of small businesses. Rather than providing additional employees with healthcare, the 30-hour rule will force employers to cut their part-time employees' hours in order to prevent their healthcare costs from skyrocketing.

Your leadership and efforts to repeal the 30-hour rule and standardize the definition of a "full-time" employee to 40 hours per week would save manufacturers like us from having to reduce their employees' hours and, rather, would allow them to invest in more employees and grow their businesses. At such a crucial time in our nation's economic recovery, the Affordable Care Act's incentive for businesses to cut their employees' hours to avoid the "full-time" classification and dramatic increases in healthcare costs will be damaging to small businesses and to the employees it purports to help.

Thank you for your consideration and your leadership on this issue on behalf of the metalworking industry.

Sincerely,

MILES FREE,
Co-interim Executive Director,
PMPA.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will first enter into the RECORD a letter from the Illinois Restaurant Association in support of the Save American Workers Act.

ILLINOIS RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, January 7, 2015.

Hon. DAN LIPINSKI,
Congressman, Illinois 3rd Congressional District,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: I am writing you on behalf of the Illinois Restaurant Association to express my full support of your efforts to restore the traditional definition of full-time employee to 40 hours per week with your sponsorship of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015. This legislation will encourage a business environment where employers in the restaurant and hospitality can focus on creating more jobs, expanding their businesses, and contributing to a robust economy.

The restaurant and hospitality industry is the largest private sector employer in the state of Illinois, employing over 517,000 people. As President & CEO of the Illinois Restaurant Association, I represent over 25,000 restaurants operating in the state who have expressed the urgent need to redefine the full-time work week definition of 30-hour-per-week.

Because of the Affordable Care Act's arbitrary 30-hour-per-week definition of a full-time employee, restaurants are being forced to restructure their workforce by reducing their employees' hours. Employees are losing

the mobility and flexibility in their schedules they normally would enjoy when working at a restaurant. Opportunities are decreasing for young and inexperienced workers to gain entry-level employment and advance into a fulfilling career in the restaurant and hospitality industry.

The implications of this issue cannot be overstated. Nationally, restaurants employ over 13.5 million people, and our industry is a major driver of the economic recovery. If Congress does not act to address this issue, thousands of jobs will be lost and businesses will suffer. I encourage you and your colleagues in Congress to pass the Save American Workers Act of 2015, a piece of common sense legislation that will protect jobs and strengthen the American economy.

Sincerely,

SAM TOIA,
President & CEO,
Illinois Restaurant Association.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Save American Workers Act, which I join the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) in introducing again this year.

I have not supported and I do not support the repeal of the ACA, but some commonsense changes need to be made. The administration has already acknowledged difficulties in implementing the employer mandate by instituting delays and substantial administrative changes.

One problem is that the ACA defines full-time work as 30 hours a week, causing small businesses, local governments, and schools to cut the hours of workers and limit workers' scheduling flexibility. The CBO has confirmed that shifting to a 40-hour full-time definition—Americans' common understanding of full-time work—would lead to some workers seeing an increase in their take-home pay.

Even the President's former senior adviser, David Axelrod, has suggested that the President consider this change. So let's do right by America's part-time workers, family businesses, local governments, and schools. Let's pass this bill and fix this broken part of the ACA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I also am proud to co-sponsor this bill and thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for his hard work on it.

I think it is fascinating that we hear from my colleagues from the other side that they are so interested in how much money the Federal Government would lose—the Federal Government. I wonder who they came here to work for. Are they interested in how many dollars their hardworking taxpayers are losing by the implementation of this ill-founded law?

I just got off of the phone with one of my employers in the district who has about 500 employees. It is a good, hard-working, family-run business, and he

tells me, the number one issue that he is dealing with is poring over spreadsheets day in and day out, trying to figure out how he can put one employee in a place where that employee wants to work in his business because that employee might want more hours because he wants to make his own or her own choice about health care or how much money he or she has. Maybe that employee is retired, their husband or wife is retired, and they just need the extra hours, want the extra hours, but he can't provide them.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that some folks on the other side said, just help us fix it. Yet when we try to fix it, they say, no, it is fine; it is perfect the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, central planning did not work in the USSR. It does not work in Cuba. And I wish you would quit trying to place it in the United States.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, there has been some discussion here. The gentleman from Illinois said there isn't anything being taken away. That is simply not true. The basis for the Joint Tax and CBO estimate is that there will be the loss of hours for hundreds of thousands of people. And as a result, 1 million people will no longer be enrolled in employment-based coverage, and of those, 500,000 will have no insurance. So that statement is not correct.

And, if I might say so, when the chairman said the House will take up a bill to define full time as 40 hours per week so more people can work full time, the basis of the CBO estimate is that fewer people will be working 40 hours or more. That is the basis for their conclusions.

So let me just, if I might, emphasize what has been said by a conservative, Yuval Levin—not related:

Putting the cutoff for the employer mandate at 40 hours would likely put far, far more people at risk of having their hours cut than leaving it at 30 hours. That would make for a worse effect on workers and on the economy.

That is just a fact.

The ACA has eliminated discrimination in terms of preexisting conditions. It has dramatically reduced the uninsured rate—now 12.9 percent, the lowest since that began to be tracked. It has increased Medicare benefits, and it has held health care cost growth to record lows.

If you don't like the ACA despite all of these achievements, continue to try to repeal it. But don't punish people who are working 40 hours or more with this bill. That is what this does. And it leaves 500,000 with no insurance whatsoever. This is worse than a terrible bill.

And I will now enter into the RECORD letters of opposition from the Consumers Union, the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, and the Teamsters.

CONSUMERS UNION,
January 6, 2015.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Consumers Union urges you to oppose changing the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) definition of full time work from a 30-hour per week threshold to 40 hours. The Affordable Care Act's current 30-hour threshold for classification as full-time employee for purposes of the employer "mandate" in the ACA discourages employers from easily circumventing penalties that incentivize employers to provide health insurance coverage to their workers. Raising the full-time threshold to 40 hours per week would reduce access to employer-provided insurance coverage.

Under the ACA, employers with at least 50 full-time equivalent employees who do not provide health insurance to their full-time workers must pay a penalty. This makes it fairer for employers who do provide insurance and have to figure that into their costs. More importantly, it helps reduce the cost of providing care to the uninsured that would otherwise be picked up by public programs, such as Medicaid, and, hence, ultimately passed on to taxpayers. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation estimate that changing the threshold to 40 hours would increase budget deficits by \$25.4 billion over the 2015–2019 period and by \$73.7 billion over the 2015–2024 period.

Currently the ACA penalty is applied to employers who do not offer insurance to full-time employees defined as those who work at least 30 hours a week. Raising the threshold to 40 hours per week would make it much easier for employers to avoid covering millions of Americans who work between 30 and 40 hours a week by cutting their hours slightly. Thus, raising the threshold to 40 hours will jeopardize access to employer coverage for many people who get their insurance through an employer.

Consumers Union strongly supports retaining the current 30-hour threshold and urges you to oppose efforts to increase it.

Sincerely,
DEANN FRIEDHOLM,
Director of Health Care Reform.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I urge you to vote against the misnamed Save American Workers Act. This bill will result in lost work hours for 6.5 million workers, and it will cause many to lose their employment-based insurance coverage, resulting in higher costs for government-subsidized health coverage.

When the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) scored this legislation in July 2014, they found it would increase budget deficits by \$45.7 billion due to a decrease in employer penalty collections and an increase in government-funded health coverage. CBO and JCT found that reductions in employment-based coverage would increase spending for marketplace premium subsidies by \$12.7 billion and for Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program coverage by \$6.9 billion.

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) extends coverage to the uninsured by allocating responsibility for the costs among individuals,

employers, and government. Under this shared responsibility framework, employers with 50 or more full-time equivalent employees must pay their fair share by offering health care coverage to employees who work 30 or more hours a week or paying a penalty if these workers access exchange subsidies instead. To ensure the success of the ACA, an employer responsibility requirement is needed to preserve current levels of employer-based coverage. However, the 30-hour “cliff” created by the law has motivated some employers to reduce workers’ hours to avoid providing coverage. This has been a particular problem for workers employed at retailers, restaurants, public schools, and institutions of higher learning.

Proponents of the Save American Workers Act claim they want to help part-time workers by moving the threshold for employer penalties from 30 to 40 hours. But raising the threshold will only move the cliff and actually increase employers’ incentive to reduce workers’ hours. According to experts at the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, moving the threshold to 40 hours will result in lost work hours for 6.5 million workers. That is nearly three times the number that are vulnerable to employers cutting their hours under the current threshold (2.3 million). The researchers also found that the policy would essentially eliminate the employer responsibility requirement, since employers’ costs in moving workers from 40 to 39 hours per week are negligible compared to the costs of offering coverage or paying the employer responsibility penalty.

Congress should strengthen the employer shared responsibility requirement and eliminate the hours cliff, not simply move it. The employer responsibility requirement should be strengthened by lowering the threshold, requiring employers to provide coverage for workers who work 20 hours a week or more or risk a penalty, and by applying a pro rata penalty if workers with fewer than 20 hours are not offered coverage. This is the only way to protect groups of workers that will lose wages under the existing incentive to reduce hours.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Save American Workers Act (H.R. 30), scheduled for a vote in the House on Thursday. Rather than building upon the employer-based system, the bill would undermine it. Despite claims that the bill would restore the 40-hour work week, it would put millions of workers at risk of a reduction in hours below the 40-hour threshold.

Under the Affordable Care Act, large and mid-size employers are required to provide coverage to employees who work 30 or more hours per week. Employers who do not provide coverage must pay a penalty when a full-time worker obtains a tax credit through a health insurance exchange. H.R. 30 would raise the threshold, from 30 to 40 hours, at which point employers are required to either offer coverage or pay a penalty. According to an analysis by researchers at the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, moving the threshold from 30 to 40 hours would result in lost work hours for 6.5 million workers, nearly three times the number vulnerable to losing their hours under the current 30-hour threshold (2.3 million).

In addition to causing a loss of work, H.R. 30 would cause a loss of employer-sponsored health coverage and increase the federal deficit. In a report issued today, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that one million people would lose employer-sponsored health coverage under this bill. While some would remain uninsured, the CBO estimates that at least 500,000 would obtain coverage through Medicaid, the Children’s Health Insurance Program or health insurance exchanges. Coupled with the loss of penalty revenue, this increased spending would increase the federal deficit by \$53.2 billion over 10 years.

H.R. 30 would effectively eliminate the employer responsibility requirements of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), shifting costs onto workers and to taxpayers. Rather than weakening the employer-based health care system, AFSCME encourages Congress to strengthen it by asking employers to do more of their share, not less.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) strongly opposes H.R. 30, the supposed Save American Workers Act of 2015. Under current law, large employers must provide health coverage to all full-time employees, defined as those employees who work an average of 30 hours or more per week. H.R. 30 would increase the “hours threshold” used to determine full-time employment for ACA purposes from 30 to 40 hours—and, in so doing, hurt working families by putting their benefits and wages at risk.

This bill would jeopardize more workers’ full-time status, allow businesses to shift the costs of healthcare to taxpayers and the government, and reduce the availability of employer-sponsored coverage overall. Contrary to proponents’ claims, raising the ACA’s threshold for full-time work from 30 hours a week to 40 would make a shift towards part-time employment much more likely—not less so. An independent analysis conducted by the University of California Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education found that increasing the threshold from 30 to 40 hours would result in nearly three times as many workers, about 6.5 million in total, being vulnerable to hour reductions than under current law.

This ill-conceived bill not only worsens the situation it purports to solve, but will increase costs to the government. As a result of about 1 million workers losing employer-sponsored coverage, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that changing the hours threshold would increase the deficit by \$53.2 billion. This bill will allow more businesses to evade their responsibility to provide health insurance, forcing taxpayers and the government to make up the difference.

Finally, while forcing workers from full-time to part-time work is a serious issue, the Affordable Care Act is not the cause. Recent research has shown that transitioning workers to part-time follows historical trends that preceded the ACA and that the transition from part-time back to full-time is slow due to the ongoing recovery from the great recession.

We can work together to improve the law and find policies that help protect working people while ensuring everyone has access to quality, affordable healthcare. However,

rather than improving the law, H.R. 30, only serves to undermine the ACA by making a complicated situation worse. For these reasons, SEIU urges you to vote no on H.R. 30, and will include this vote on our Legislative Scorecard, located at www.seiu.org. If you have any questions, contact Ilene Stein, Assistant Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The International Brotherhood of Teamsters opposes H.R. 30, the so-called “Save American Workers Act.” We urge you to vote against H.R. 30 when it comes to the House floor this week. This legislation will cause millions of workers to lose work hours and it will cause many employees to lose their employment-based health insurance coverage.

The Affordable Care Act requires employers (with 50 or more full-time equivalents) to either offer healthcare coverage to employees who work more than 30 hours a week or to pay a penalty if those workers get healthcare coverage via exchange subsidies. H.R. 30 would raise that threshold (or “cliff”) from 30 hours to 40 hours. However, the current 30 hour threshold created by the law has motivated some employers to reduce workers’ hours to avoid providing coverage.

Proponents of the bill claim they want to help part-time workers by moving the threshold for employer penalties. However, raising the threshold will increase employers’ incentive to reduce workers hours. It will result in nearly tripling (from 2.3 million to 6.5 million) the number of workers vulnerable to having their hours cut, according to experts at UC Berkeley. Researchers have also found that the cost to employers in moving workers from 40 hours (the proposed threshold under H.R. 30) to 39 hours per week are negligible compared to the costs of offering coverage or paying the employer responsibility penalty. Thus, this policy would essentially eliminate the employer responsibility requirement.

Proponents of this legislation claim that they want to help part-time workers. However, the bill would exacerbate the problem it purports to solve. The “Save American Workers Act” will actually hurt millions of workers and the U.S. economy. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to vote no on H.R. 30.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for the closing on his legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you so much for this opportunity to try to advance legislation to improve the Nation’s health care law in a bipartisan fashion.

You know, I don't understand the visceral resistance to trying to lighten the load on our Nation's hourly workers. The wage earners, the people who need it most—our cafeteria workers, our substitute teachers, our people at retail centers all across the country—they are the ones during this still-recovering, seemingly dormant recovery for so many of my constituents, they are the ones who are demanding these sorts of changes.

Much has been made of the evidence here. There is plenty of evidence in every congressional district across the country that people are hurting on account of this 30 hours is full time provision in the Affordable Care Act. And this all comes before the employer mandate had kicked in, and it has followed in the recent days since it officially kicked in on January 1.

This was just implemented. It will be amazing to see the evidence come in, should we not change the definition of full-time employment up to 40 hours, once people figure out that they are going to be paying a big old tax for not buying every single employee above that 30-hour threshold government-sanctioned health insurance.

More evidence: there are over 300 groups that have associated themselves with this legislation and ask that we pass it. Among those groups is the More Time for Full Time coalition, which includes such groups as the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Grocery and Convenience Store Association, Indiana Restaurant & Lodging Association, the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, the Michigan Grocers Association, the Michigan Lodging and Tourism Association, the Michigan Restaurant Association.

For more examples, I will enter this document into the RECORD.

MORE TIME FOR FULL TIME,
January 6, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL: The More Time for Full-Time Coalition (www.moretimeforfulltime.org) greatly appreciates your steadfast support for restoring the traditional definition of full-time employee to 40 hours per week and urges you to move Senate consideration of legislation to do so as early as possible in the 114th Congress.

Many employees are being hurt by lost wages and hours because the 30-hour-per-week definition in the Affordable Care Act is forcing employers to restructure their workforce by reducing their employees' hours to alleviate the burden of compliance. Harmonizing the definition of full-time employee in the ACA with the traditional 40-hour definition would benefit both employees through more hours and income, and employers now able to focus on growing their business and creating jobs rather than restructuring their workforce.

In this is not addressed soon, our country will experience significant workforce disruptions and individuals as well as companies will lose valued workforce flexibility. We urge you to work in a bipartisan way to re-

store the traditional definition of full-time employment by changing the Affordable Care Act's 30-hour-per-week definition.

Many Americans are drawn to part-time jobs with flexible hours to suit their personal needs. Further, employers with variable-hour workforces and flexible scheduling have been appealing and critical for students, single parents, and other individuals struggling to balance various obligations and commitments. This critical flexibility will be lost if employers are forced to abandon current practices in order to avoid significant financial penalties.

Aligning the law's definition of full-time employee status with current levels would help avoid any unnecessary disruptions to employees' wages and hours, and would provide significant relief.

Thank you for considering our concerns and for your leadership in addressing a fundamental challenge employees and businesses face in implementing this law.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS: American Hotel & Lodging Association, American Rental Association, Asian American Hotel Owners Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, College & University Professional Association for Human Resources, International Franchise Association, National Association of Convenience Stores, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Theatre Owners, National Association of Truck Stop Operators, National Club Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Grocers Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, Society for Human Resource Management, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

STATE AND LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS: Adirondack Regional Chamber Commerce (NY), Alabama Grocers Association, Alabama Restaurant & Hospitality Alliance, Alaska Chamber (AK), Alaska Hotel & Lodging Association, Alaska Restaurant & Hospitality Alliance, Albany-Colonie Regional Chamber (NY), Alexander City Chamber of Commerce (AL), Ames Chamber of Commerce (IA), Angel Fire Chamber of Commerce (NM), ARA of Alabama, ARA of Arizona, ARA of Arkansas, ARA of California, ARA of Colorado, ARA of Connecticut, ARA of Florida, ARA of Georgia, ARA of Idaho, ARA of Illinois, ARA of Indiana, ARA of Iowa, ARA of Kentucky, ARA of Louisiana, ARA of Maine, ARA of Maryland, ARA of Massachusetts, ARA of Michigan, ARA of Montana, ARA of Nebraska, ARA of New Jersey, ARA of New York, ARA of North Carolina, ARA of Ohio, ARA of Oklahoma, ARA of Oregon, ARA of Pennsylvania, ARA of Tennessee, ARA of Vermont, ARA of Virginia;

ARA of Washington, ARA of Wisconsin, Arizona Food Marketing Alliance, Arizona Lodging & Tourism Association, Arkansas Grocers and Retail Merchants Association, Arkansas Hospitality Association, Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce (AK), Ashland Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Associated Industries of Massachusetts, Inc. (MA), Baltimore Washington Corridor Chamber of Commerce (MD), Bangor Region Chamber of Commerce (ME), Barrow County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Beaver Dam Chamber of Commerce (WI), Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (FL), Brownsville Chamber of Commerce (TX), California Grocers Association, California Hotel & Lodging Association, California Restaurant Association, Campbell County Chamber of Commerce (WY), Cape May County Chamber of Commerce (NJ);

Carolinas Food Industry Council, Catawba County Chamber of Commerce (NC), Central

Chamber of Commerce (LA), Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce (DE), Chester County Chamber of Business and Industry (PA), Clearwater Regional Chamber of Commerce (FL), Cobb Chamber of Commerce (GA), Colorado Hotel & Lodging Association, Colorado Restaurant Association, Committee of 100 Louisiana (LA), Connecticut Food Association, Connecticut Lodging Association, Corning Area Chamber of Commerce (NY), Council Bluffs Area Chamber of Commerce (IA), Dakota County Regional Chamber of Commerce (MN), Delaware Restaurant Association, Delaware State Chamber of Commerce (DE), Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce (CO), Des Plaines Chamber of Commerce & Industry (IL), Dublin-Laurens County Chamber of Commerce (GA);

Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce (VA), Florida Chamber of Commerce (FL), Florida Restaurant & Lodging Association, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce (WI), Fresno Chamber of Commerce (CA), Fullerton Chamber of Commerce (CA), Galesburg Area Chamber of Commerce (IL), Garrett County Chamber of Commerce (MD), Georgia Food Industry Association, Georgia Hotel & Lodging Association, Georgia Restaurant Association, Glendale Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Goshen Chamber of Commerce (IN), Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce (CO), Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Grapevine Chamber of Commerce (TX), Greater Burlington Partnership (IA), Greater Durham Chamber of Commerce (NC), Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Green Bay Chamber (WI);

Greater Louisville, Inc. (KY), Greater North Dakota Chamber of Commerce (ND), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce (RI), Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (VA), Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce (KS), Greece Chamber of Commerce (NY), Hardy County Chamber of Commerce (WV), Harford County Chamber (MD), Harlan County Chamber of Commerce (KY), Harrisburg Regional Chamber & CREDC (PA), Hawaii Lodging & Tourism Association, Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., Hotel Association of Washington DC, Hueneme Chamber of Commerce (CA), Idaho Lodging & Restaurant Association, Idaho Retailers Association, Illinois Chamber of Commerce (IL), Illinois Food Retailers Association;

Illinois Hotel & Lodging Association, Illinois Restaurant Association, Indiana Chamber of Commerce (IN), Indiana Grocery and Convenience Store Association, Indiana Restaurant & Lodging Association, Iowa Chamber Alliance (IA), Iowa Chamber Alliance (IA), Iowa Grocery Industry Association, Iowa Restaurant Association, Irving Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (TX), Jacksonville-Onslow Chamber of Commerce (NC), Jefferson Chamber of Commerce (LA), Kansas Food Dealers Association, Kansas Restaurant & Hospitality Association, Kentucky Association of Convenience Stores, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce (KY), Kentucky Grocers Association, Kentucky Restaurant Association, Lemoore Chamber of Commerce (CA), Licking County Chamber of Commerce (OH);

Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce (VA), Louisiana Association of Business and Industry (LA), Louisiana Hotel & Lodging Association, Louisiana Restaurant Association, Louisiana Retailers Association, Lubbock Chamber of Commerce (TX),

Maine Innkeepers Association, Maine Restaurant Association, Maine State Chamber of Commerce (ME), Marshall Area Chamber of Commerce (MN), Maryland Chamber of Commerce (MD), Maryland Hotel & Lodging Association, Maryland Retailers Association, Massachusetts Food Association, Massachusetts Lodging Association, Michigan Chamber of Commerce (MI), Michigan Grocers Association, Michigan Lodging and Tourism Association, Michigan Restaurant Association;

Mid-America Grocers Association, Mid-Atlantic Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (MD), Minnesota Grocers Association, Minnesota Lodging Association, Minnesota Rental Association, Minnesota Restaurant Association, Miramar Pembroke Pines Regional Chamber of Commerce (FL), Mississippi Hospitality and Restaurant Association, Missouri Grocers Association, Missouri Restaurant Association, Mobile (AL) Area Chamber of Commerce, Monroe Chamber of Commerce (LA), Montana Chamber of Commerce (MT), Montana Lodging & Hospitality Association, Montana Manufacturing Council (MT), Murphysboro Chamber of Commerce (IL), Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (SC), Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry (NE), Nebraska Grocery Industry Association, Nebraska Hotel & Motel Association;

Nevada Restaurant Association, Nevada Hotel & Lodging Association, New Hampshire Equipment Rental Association, New Hampshire Lodging & Restaurant Association, New Hampshire Restaurant & Lodging Association, New Jersey Food Council, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce (NJ), New Mexico Restaurant Association, New York Hospitality & Tourism Association, New York State Food Merchants Association, New York State Restaurant Association, Newberry County Chamber of Commerce (SC), Nome Chamber of Commerce (AK), North Carolina Chamber (NC), North Carolina Restaurant & Lodging Association, North Carolina Retail Merchants Association, North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Dakota Grocers Association, North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce (SC), North Shore Chamber of Commerce (MA);

Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce (KY), Ohio Chamber of Commerce (OH), Ohio Grocers Association, Ohio Hotel & Lodging Association, Ohio Restaurant Association, Oklahoma Grocers Association, Oklahoma Hotel & Lodging Association, Oklahoma Restaurant Association, Orange County Business Council (CA), Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association, Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce (WI), Overland Park Chamber of Commerce (KS), Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), Ozark Empire Grocers Association, Palm Desert Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), PennSuburban Chamber of Greater Montgomery County (PA), Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry (PA), Pennsylvania Food Merchants Association, Pennsylvania Restaurant & Lodging Association, Portland Chamber of Commerce (TX);

Rathdrum Chamber of Commerce (ID), Rensselaer County Regional Chamber of Commerce (NY), Retail Grocers of Greater Kansas City, Rhode Island Hospitality Association, Rochester Business Alliance (NY), Rocky Mountain Food Industry Association (CO/WY), Rome Area Chamber of Commerce (NY), Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce (OR), Rowan County Chamber of Commerce (NC), Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce (UT), Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce & Con-

vention—Visitor's Bureau (CA), Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), South Baldwin Chamber of Commerce (AL), South Carolina Restaurant & Lodging Association, South Carolina Retail Association, South Dakota Retailers Association Restaurant Division, South Padre Island Chamber of Commerce (TX), Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce (MO);

State Chamber of Oklahoma (OK), Tempe Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Tennessee Grocers & Convenience Store Association, Tennessee Hospitality Association, Texas Association of Business (TX), Texas Food & Fuel Association, Texas Hotel & Lodging Association, Texas Rental Association, Texas Restaurant Association, Texas Retailers Association, The Business Council of New York State, Inc. (NY), The Chamber of Reno, Sparks, and Northern Nevada (NV), The Greater Cedar Valley Alliance & Chamber (IA), The Greater Hartsville Chamber of Commerce (SC), Thibodaux Chamber of Commerce (LA), Tucson Metro Chamber (AZ), Upper Tampa Bay Chamber of Commerce (FL), Utah Food Industry Association, Utah Hotel & Lodging Association, Utah Retail Merchants Association;

Valley Industry & Commerce Association (CA), Vermont Chamber of Commerce, Vermont Retail and Grocers Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce (VA), Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association, Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association, Virginia Retail Merchants Association, Washington Food Industry Association, Washington Lodging Association, West Chambers County Chamber of Commerce (TX), West Virginia Chamber of Commerce (WV), West Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association, West Virginia Oil Marketers and Grocers Association, Western DuPage Chamber of Commerce (IL), Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce (KS), Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce (OR), Wisconsin Grocers Association, Wisconsin Hotel & Lodging Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce (WI), Wisconsin Restaurant Association, Wyoming Lodging & Restaurant Association, Wyoming Restaurant & Lodging Association, Yuba-Sutter Chamber of Commerce (CA).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Why wait? We know we are headed off a cliff here. This is a fiscally irresponsible provision within the Affordable Care Act. Who would imagine that we would try to insure 500,000 additional new workers at the expense of up to \$105 billion in cash wages? It is unfair. We ought not try to finance health insurance for some Americans at the cost of hours and wages for other Americans.

And finally, the Save American Workers Act will remedy these defects in the current law, resulting in zero workers who work 40 or more hours being put at risk of a possible massive cut in their hours and wages down to 29 hours. And it will enable those who work 30 to 35 hours to no longer be at risk of cuts in their much-needed hours and wages.

□ 1530

For those reasons and so many others, I just encourage my colleagues to have an open mind here and work with us for the good of the country to improve our Nation's health care laws.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to oppose H.R. 30, the highly irresponsible Save American Workers Act. This legislation weakens employees' access to health insurance, threatens employer based insurance coverage, and increases the budget deficit by 45.7 billion dollars due in part to the resulting increase in the number of uninsured.

I have always believed that access to quality healthcare is a right, not a privilege! The Affordable Care Act's current 30-hours per week threshold for classification as a full-time employee was designed to discourage employers from circumventing penalties that support the successful implementation of the law. Raising the threshold to 40 hours per week would limit access to employer-provided insurance coverage, and thereby impede a person's right to access healthcare.

Some businesses argue that the Affordable Care Act's classification of a full-time employee adversely impacts a business' hiring and its ability to offer other employee benefits. However, the facts just don't bear this out.

According to the San Francisco Federal Reserve, when the Affordable Care Act's provisions are fully implemented, the overall increase in the incidence of part-time work is likely to be "small, on the order of a 1 to 2 percentage point increase or less." Other organizations' analyses have also found little evidence that health reform has increased part-time work. In fact, since President Obama took office, the overall full-time employment rate has consistently increased, so much so that the current U.S. unemployment rate is 5.8 percent.

The Republican majority is offering the American people a solution in search of a problem. This bill does not save American jobs, nor does it help the American worker. Rather, this bill relegates American workers to the second class status of the "uninsured" and in doing so denies them, what I believe, is their right to affordable, quality healthcare, which is something that all Americans deserve.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, nearly 160 million Americans receive health insurance coverage from their employers. Before Obamacare, employers were free to tailor their benefit plans to meet the needs of their workers. Once Obamacare was enacted, however, employers with more than 50 full-time employees were required to offer government-mandated plans to their employees or face steep tax penalties. In many cases, this penalty could range from \$2,000 to \$3,000 per employee.

Obamacare mandated that a "full-time employee" is someone who is employed an average of 30 hours per week. As the administration has written new regulations to implement Obamacare's mandates, the costly administrative complexities have forced many employers to shift more workers to part-time status. According to a 2013 study by the University of California, Berkeley, as many as 2.3 million workers—or roughly 2 percent of the American workforce—are "vulnerable" to lost employment and reduced wages due to Obamacare's mandate. In Illinois, an employee earning the state's minimum wage of \$8.25 an hour

stands to lose up to \$330 a month if the definition of full-time employment remains at 30 hours.

Additionally, Obamacare's 30-hour rule has caused great harm to school districts, colleges and universities. As many as 225,000 workers in the education sector are at risk of seeing their hours cut, hitting bus drivers, teachers' aides and cafeteria workers the most. Meanwhile, the rule creates a new burden for institutions of higher learning that seek to hire adjunct faculty to meet the demands of their students' course requirements. Not only will these additional burdens place limits on the services that institutions of higher learning offer to their students, but in many cases will cause the schools to dramatically raise tuition.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 30, the so-called Save American Workers Act. I continue to have high hopes for bipartisanship and working across the aisle, but am very disappointed that the Republican majority brought up another partisan bill to undermine the Affordable Care Act, just when this landmark law is finally delivering for Americans. In fact, we just saw real evidence of the success of the law—the uninsured rate dropped to 12.9 percent in the fourth quarter of 2014, down from 17.1 percent in 2013.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but H.R. 30 is not the way to fix it. While it might seem like common sense idea to raise the threshold for ACA employer coverage to 40 hours a week from 30 hours a week, this misguided legislation would give employers a greater incentive to cut workers hours. Experts at UC Berkeley estimate that this policy would result in 6.5 million workers being vulnerable to cuts in their work hours. Furthermore, this legislation would increase the deficit by \$45.7 billion. We need to build off the successes of the Affordable Care Act, not roll them back.

I hope the 114th Congress can come back soon to consider real reforms to our health care system that increases access to care, reduces costs, and decreases the deficit. H.R. 30 does none of those things, so I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 30, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2015." Republicans claim this bill is a fix to the Affordable Care Act and vital to protecting American jobs. But that's simply not true. According to the non-partisan CBO, raising the threshold for employers to provide coverage from 30 hours per week to 40 could lead them to shift more employees to part-time work, end employer-sponsored coverage for one million people, and leave up to half a million completely uninsured. Even conservative analyst Tuval Levin agreed, writing recently in the National Review, "Putting the cutoff for the employer mandate at 40 hours would put far, far more people at risk of having their hours cut than leaving it at 30 hours." On top of the assaults on workers' hours and benefits, CBO estimates the bill would increase the federal deficit by \$53 billion over the next decade.

Republicans have brought this irresponsible bill to the floor on the heels of more news that the Affordable Care is working. Yesterday, Gallup released data showing the percentage of uninsured Americans is declining steeply and HHS announced that nearly 6.6 million

Americans selected plans or were re-enrolled in the federal exchange since open enrollment began.

As I have said before, I am more than willing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make genuine, reasonable improvements to the Affordable Care Act. Along these lines, I want to commend Congressman JOE COURTNEY for bringing an alternative proposal to the Rules Committee yesterday. Unfortunately, today's bill does not meet the definition of a genuine, reasonable improvement.

Finally Mr. Speaker, if Republicans were really serious about helping employees they would support the CEO/Employee Paycheck Fairness Act. The bill is simple. It says if corporations want to be able to deduct the bonuses and compensation for their CEOs and other executives over \$1 million, they better be giving their employees a fair shake. I urge my colleagues to reject the 40-hour bill and join me in a real effort to support American workers.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I vehemently oppose H.R. 30, wrongfully named the Save American Workers Act of 2015. H.R. 30 does not "save" American workers, rather it endangers the health insurance of up to a million American workers. H.R. 30 would eviscerate and emasculate the Affordable Care Act: It raises the threshold of hours employees must work before they are eligible for employee-based health insurance from 30 to 40.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would we choose to weaken the Affordable Care Act when Gallup reported, on January 7, 2015, that in the last quarter of 2014 the uninsured rate dropped to a record low of 12.9%? The Affordable Care Act is working as it was intended to work, and the 114th Congress should be working to strengthen and improve it rather than weaken and repeal it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, passing the Affordable Care Act was the right thing to do in 2010 and standing up to defend it is the right thing to do today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BECERRA. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Becerra moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 30, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 2 shall not take effect if they could be expected to result in any of the following:

(1) PROHIBITION ON LOSS OF WORK HOURS OR WAGES.—A reduction in hours worked, and subsequent loss of wages, in order to skirt requirements to help pay for employee health care costs.

(2) ENSURING FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND A LOWER DEFICIT.—Any increase in the Federal deficit.

(b) PROTECTING HEALTH INSURANCE FOR VETERANS AND WOUNDED WARRIORS.—The amendments made by section 2 shall not apply to veterans or their families.

(c) BEING A WOMAN MUST NOT BE A PRE-EXISTING CONDITION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an employer to—

(1) eliminate, weaken, or reduce health coverage benefits for current employees;

(2) increase premiums or out-of-pocket costs;

(3) deny coverage based on pre-existing conditions; or

(4) discriminate against women in health insurance coverage, including by—

(A) charging women more for their health care than men;

(B) limiting coverage for pregnancy and post-natal care; or

(C) restricting coverage of preventive health services, such as mammograms and contraception.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, H.R. 30. This amendment will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, H.R. 30 is nothing more than a sucker punch to the middle class. People who live off of their inheritance aren't hurt by H.R. 30. People who live off of their investments aren't hurt by H.R. 30. Even people who are destitute and need our help to make it through the day aren't hurt by H.R. 30. The only people who are hurt are workers who earn a paycheck. They are the losers under H.R. 30.

Now, it wouldn't surprise me one bit if you have been watching or listening to this debate to say to yourself, I don't understand a thing that went on. One said orange, one said apple. One said tomato, one said tomato. One said it helps, one said it hurts.

That is what the debates are all about: Americans get to make decisions. We start this new Congress having made decisions as American voters, and you would think that we would then come to Congress as representatives of the people to try to now move forward together. If we can't agree it is an orange or an apple, let's figure out what we can agree with.

Whom do we typically turn to to tell us what we should at least agree with if we still think it is an apple or an orange? We typically turn to the non-partisan, neutral body that guides this

Congress that is named the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office doesn't represent Democrats and it doesn't represent Republicans. It represents the American people and is here to guide Congress, this House, to make sure we are making decisions based on the facts.

What are the facts according to the Congressional Budget Office—not Republicans, not Democrats? According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would increase the taxpayers' burden by \$53 billion over the next decade because this bill is unpaid for. This bill would result in 1 million Americans losing their employer-sponsored coverage. That is not Democrats saying that or Republicans. That is the Congressional Budget Office.

This bill would increase the number of people who obtain their coverage by government-sponsored health care because they would have lost their employer-sponsored health care. And that is why the American taxpayer would have to foot the bill of close to \$53 billion.

This bill would also, according to the Congressional Budget Office, increase the number of Americans who end up with no health insurance up to 500,000. That is not my number; that is CBO's. I think it is higher, but CBO says 500,000. I will be guided by CBO.

CBO tells us as well that there are some five to six times as many American workers who are at the 40-hour-a-week threshold than there are Americans who work at about 30 hours. So when this bill says that now the threshold will be 40 hours, any employer who decides to cut 1 hour—the time of this debate, 1 hour—from the paycheck of an American worker has escaped responsibility to provide health insurance for all those workers under their employ—1 hour. Six times more American workers are working 40 hours a week than 30 hours a week. That is why H.R. 30 costs the American taxpayer money. That is why it is bad for Americans and their paychecks.

Now, Americans really don't care much about these debates. At the end of the day, they want to know we are doing something and getting something done. They want to know we are working together to solve some problems. They want us to boost job growth. They want us to boost an economy that works for all Americans, not just the privileged few. We have some pretty good news for them over the last few years. Nearly 11 million new jobs, 57 consecutive months of job growth, the longest streak in our country's history. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act which is being debated today, 10 million more Americans today have health insurance, and that means health security that they didn't have before.

The deficit has been cut by two-thirds, gas prices cut by half—good

news. So you are probably not surprised to learn a couple of other things. During that same time, the economy has grown 12 percent, corporate profits have grown 46 percent, and the stock market 92 percent. What is the missing element in all of that growth? Paychecks. The paychecks of the average American worker have stagnated over that time. Everybody else is doing well at the top, but the guys at the middle, they are hurting.

What does H.R. 30 do? It sucker punches that same American worker who has to earn a paycheck—not the guy who has an inheritance, not the guy who has investments to live off of—the guy who lives off of a paycheck.

My motion to recommit says stop that. We have our final chance to do that. Vote for the motion to recommit. Vote against H.R. 30, and let's work on behalf of Americans and their paychecks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what to say. Paychecks. Guess what. It is happening across America today. Even before the employer mandate kicked in, businesses across America are cutting workers' hours down to 29. That doesn't help a paycheck.

So think about what is going on in America today and look at what has already been happening, and this is before this costly employer mandate even took place. It is happening in every congressional district. We heard about cafeteria workers, firefighters, teachers, community colleges, retailers, restaurateurs, all of them being forced to cut the hours of their employees down to part-time work. If you want to help a person's paycheck, give them the opportunity to have a full-time job. That is what this does.

It is really kind of amazing. I hear a lot of talk about the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation and the costs and the costs of this bill. Here is the bulk of the costs. What we are saying is don't impose these costly, punitive mandate taxes on hardworking taxpayers.

So by removing these mandate taxes, yes, I suppose it costs the government some money. It puts that money back into the paychecks and back into the pockets of the hardworking taxpayers who give us the money in the first place. It says to businesses: Go ahead and hire, add hours, and increase wages. That is the so-called cost of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we want more people working. We want the people who are in 30- to 40-hour jobs, hourly wages, high school educations, just getting started in life, we want them to keep climbing that ladder of life. This law puts a huge roadblock in front of people working. What this motion to recommit does is it is just designed to kill the bill.

With respect to the veterans issue, we solved that yesterday with our Hire More Heroes Act, which we passed in a big, bipartisan vote. So make no mistake. This recommit is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to simply kill this bill.

Look, if you want to impose this mandate, if you want to knock people into part-time work, and if you love ObamaCare, then vote against the bill. But if you want more jobs, if you want more hours, if you want more people working, if you want more people having better opportunities, and if you want to give some relief on these mandate taxes, then vote for this bill.

This bill is the right way to go. And I have just got to tell you that, at the end of the day, we haven't even seen the full force of this punitive move because the employer mandate is just beginning to kick in. All of these things have happened in anticipation of this new mandate. We haven't even seen the worst of it yet. That is why we should pass this now and prevent this from happening and getting worse before this mandate kicks in.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 244, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—179

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Bustos	Clay
Ashford	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bass	Capps	Clyburn
Beatty	Capuano	Cohen
Becerra	Cárdenas	Connolly
Bera	Carney	Conyers
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Costa
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Boyle (PA)	Chu (CA)	Cuellar
Brady (PA)	Cicilline	Cummings
Brown (FL)	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

NAYS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Paulsen
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey

Duckworth
Gallego

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1607

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, FRELING-HUYSEN, MCHENRY, REED, WALKER, STUTZMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. PALAZZO and EMMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BEYER, ISRAEL, CARNEY, GRIJALVA, ASHFORD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SERRANO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 172, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—252

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Gosar
Gutiérrez

O'Rourke
Whitfield

Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed

NOES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Doyle (PA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Grayson	Lowey	Rush
Green, Al	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)
Green, Gene	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Grijalva	Luján, Ben Ray	T.
Gutiérrez	(NM)	Sánchez, Loretta
Hahn	Lynch	Sarbanes
Hastings	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Heck (WA)	Carolyn	Schiff
Higgins	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)
Himes	Matsui	Scott, David
Hinojosa	McCollum	Serrano
Honda	McDermott	Sewell (AL)
Hoyer	McGovern	Sherman
Huffman	McNerney	Sires
Israel	Meeks	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Meng	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Moore	Speier
Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Takai
Kaptur	Napolitano	Takano
Keating	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Norcross	Titus
Kildee	Pallone	Tonko
Kilmer	Pascarell	Torres
Kind	Payne	Tsongas
Kirkpatrick	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kuster	Perlmutter	Vargas
Langevin	Pingree	Veasey
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Vela
Larson (CT)	Polis	Velázquez
Lawrence	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Lee	Quigley	Walz
Levin	Rangel	Wasserman
Lewis	Rice (NY)	Schultz
Lieu (CA)	Richmond	Watson Coleman
Loeback	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lofgren	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Duckworth	Gosar	Whitfield
Gallego	O'Rourke	

□ 1616

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE TUCSON VICTIMS

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, our community was shaken to its core by an act of senseless violence that took the lives of six of our own and wounded 13 others. They were our friends, neighbors, and loved ones. Our community still carries the enduring pain of their loss but also the bright recollection of their lives and memories.

We remember the victims and what they came to do that day: speak with their elected Representative. We remember the selfless acts of bravery and love by those who put themselves in harm's way, even giving their own lives to save others. We remember how the city of Tucson came together, in grief and consolation, to move forward with a spirit of compassion and strength that was felt across the Nation.

Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families and loved ones of those lost or wounded who carry the pain of what happened on that quiet Saturday each and every day. We are inspired by their courage. We are made stronger by their strength.

Today, as the bells rang out from the University of Arizona and during that moment of silence that followed, our community, united and strong, proclaimed with one voice that we will never forget those we lost: Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, Judge John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabriel "Gabe" Zimmerman.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the House of Representatives on unanimously passing its first piece of legislation yesterday to prioritize employment opportunities for veterans and reservists. This is particularly important to me as I proudly represent Fort Bragg and over 100,000 veterans, servicemembers, and their spouses.

Recently, I held a military roundtable in Fayetteville, North Carolina. As you can imagine, the number one concern for military spouses and veterans was unemployment.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare's employer mandate has made employment opportunities for veterans scarcer than ever before. However, the Hire More Heroes Act is a step in the right direction in improving veterans' transition into the civilian workforce.

This commonsense legislation is to be held up and applauded. I am proud to have been an original cosponsor, and I look forward to do more for our veterans every day.

CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to President Obama's latest actions designed to seek closer ties to rogue regimes and terrorist groups across the world, these entities now have the blueprint on how to obtain concessions from the United States: hold innocent American citizens hostage and demand the release of convicted terrorists or spies in return.

The Castro regime has always and will always continue to perpetrate the most heinous of human rights violations in order to remain in control over the millions of Cubans yearning for freedom. What does that say about us as a Nation when we are willing to cave to the demands of these thugs and terrorists and abandon our ideals and our policies?

We must uphold the American values of freedom, democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law, and stand in solidarity with all people who crave these fundamental rights.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS IN PARIS, FRANCE

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I know at some point the House will take more official and formal notice of what happened in Paris as we awakened early yesterday morning. It was such a tragic terrorist act not only upon freedom of the press, but upon freedom of expression and life in a civil society.

In this Chamber, there are two paintings, as you know, Mr. Speaker. One is of our patriarch, George Washington, and the other is of the Marquis de Lafayette. After 9/11, the French newspaper *Le Monde* said, "We are all Americans." Last night, we heard, "Je suis Charlie." People all over the world were saying, "I am Charlie," referencing Charlie Hebdo, the publication that was assaulted.

I am certain the Speaker is putting together a formal moment of silence, but I didn't want the day to go by without acknowledging the tragedy that befell our friends in France. They were with us to help the founding of our country, hence the Marquis de Lafayette painting in this Chamber, along with our own patriarch, George Washington.

My thoughts and prayers and those of our Members are with the families of those who lost their lives in this terrible terrorist act and also with the people of France as they mourn their loss.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. WITTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for increased accountability in Congress. The American public has signaled time and time again that it is frustrated with the dysfunction in Washington.

For far too long, Congress has failed to fund the government on schedule and has fallen into a cycle of crisis management with shortsighted, temporary budget measures. To fix this, I have introduced a bill and a resolution that can help prove to the American people that Congress is here to do its duty.

First, the No Budget, No Pay Act would prohibit Members of the House or Senate from receiving a paycheck if their respective Chamber fails to pass a budget by April 15. H. Res. 17, the Stay on Schedule resolution, prohibits the House from adjourning for an August recess unless we have passed all of our appropriations bills by July 31.

These are commonsense initiatives that will restore regular budget order and provide certainty to our communities. I ask my colleagues to join me

in fixing the dysfunction in Congress by cosponsoring the No Budget, No Pay Act and the Stay on Schedule resolution.

PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 99th annual Pennsylvania Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania hosts the largest indoor agriculture exposition in the Nation with nearly 6,000 animals, 10,000 competitive exhibits, and 300 commercial exhibits. The Farm Show showcases Pennsylvania agriculture, an industry exceeding \$7.5 billion in annual cash receipts. Pennsylvania has 62,000 farm families, stewards of more than 7.7 million acres of farmland.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show features the full spectrum of Pennsylvania-preferred food and products. It is only possible through the hard work of staff of the Pennsylvania Farm Show Complex, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, and hundreds of volunteers.

Special thanks to Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture George Greig and one of my favorite Pennsylvania agriculture ambassadors, Mike Firestine, for their leadership.

I encourage all Pennsylvanians to attend the 99th Pennsylvania Farm Show and to celebrate Pennsylvania's affordable, high-quality, and safe food.

COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate and celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans. A lot of celebrations are going on about this important, decisive victory that helped America expand West and establish the Port of New Orleans, but there has also been such a great collaboration with the British Government.

In fact, the British Government has been working with the National Park Service and the Battle of New Orleans Commission to not only commemorate this occasion, but also to remember those who died on both the American and British sides.

They are working together again to forge that great relationship that we have always had. In fact, this was the last time that the United States and Great Britain were on the opposite sides of a war.

While we appreciate that great relationship we have with Great Britain,

we are also celebrating that important moment in the history of the United States: the 200th anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans.

□ 1630

HONORING THE WORK OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to honor the dedication and commitment of the men and women who protect us all as members of the law enforcement community.

Every day police officers throughout the country wear the uniform with pride and understand the tremendous responsibility that comes with it, putting the safety of others before the safety of themselves.

Unfortunately, over the last few months, we have been reminded of the danger that police officers face every day in keeping our neighborhoods safe. The recent tragic murder of two police officers in New York serves as a stark reminder that officers put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

In the coming weeks, I will be reintroducing legislation to make sure that the families of those officers who gave the ultimate sacrifice receive the benefits that they are promised without being subject to the burdens of Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, all of us should be honoring the work that all of our police officers and law enforcement do, the sacrifices that they make every day to keep us safe.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUM). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. SCHIFF, California

THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus in our Special Order hour where we want to share with the American public our concerns about a trade deal that we think will be coming through Congress in the first few months or first half of this session.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is the biggest and the baddest of the trade deals that we have seen come before this country. It represents a dozen countries. From Chile to Japan, almost 800 million people are represented by countries that would be included within the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and it represents 40 percent of the world's economy.

Yet the trade agreement has been drafted largely in secret. No one from the public has seen it. Quite honestly, Members of Congress haven't seen it. But about 600 people in this country are involved with the drafting of this trade deal. It has great ramifications that go beyond trade, the 29 chapters that make up the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We anticipate there also could be a move from leadership to introduce legislation to Fast Track the trade deal. What that means to Fast Track it is to really take away the public's ability, through their elected Members of Congress, to have a say, to be able to debate and to amend the trade deal.

We anticipate that could be one of the first votes that would come to us this Congress about trade. We at the Progressive Caucus want to share with the public the various concerns that we may have about this very, very large, all-encompassing trade deal that could affect American jobs, could affect food safety, could affect environmental concerns, could affect things like buy American laws, currency policy, and many, many more issues.

I am joined by a number of Members of Congress today who would like to take part in this, and I would like to, at this time, yield to my colleague from the great State of New York, who has put a number of efforts towards this in working very strongly to make sure the public knows what is in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I would like to yield to Mr. PAUL TONKO from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative POCAN. It is great to join him in this hour of discussion about the Fast Track method that has been associated with trade negotiations and with fair trade/free trade concepts alike.

I represent a district in upstate New York, the 20th Congressional District, which is primarily the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk River Valleys, and it was there that we became the donor area to the Erie Canal that gave birth to westward movement for this Nation and sparked an industrial revolution. It was there that we saw the development of a necklace of communities, dubbed mill towns, that then rose as the epicenters of invention and innovation that saw manufacturing booming as we went forward as a nation.

Many an immigrant called that their new home, that region their new home,

and they tethered their American Dream to the prosperity that was continuing to grow in the region. I think back to the manufacturing sector and all that it meant to my ancestors, all it meant to me and the opportunities that came into my life, and it was that empowerment that came through the availability of work, the dignity of work, the opportunity to earn a paycheck that really made a difference.

I think of those same towns today having really lost millions of jobs across America. We are reflective of all those towns that became those manufacturing centers, that enabled people again to engage in meaningful employment and to be able to have those dreams, those American Dreams fully, fully strengthened by the opportunity for work.

When I see the reduction of standards, of environmental standards, where we are willing to have our children exploited by the ugly sins of the past with concerns for child labor laws that might erode, when we think about some of the inequities that are brought to bear with the denial of collective bargaining, all of these items have snuck into trade negotiations. There is an importance for Congress to be able to provide the oversight and the assessment of these various negotiations, where we can look at these trade deals and suggest amendments or have sound debate.

We not only have a right as Members of Congress, I think the public that we represent has a need for Congress to review these documents and to suggest improvements. So I look forward to this hour of discussion where you and I and our several colleagues will join together in speaking to the wisdom, or lack thereof, of some of the processes that have followed this entire trade discussion.

We are talking about a trade deficit now that has ballooned beyond belief, to record proportions, and where we are putting our economy and that American Dream at risk and where we are denying meaningful employment to those whom we represent here in Washington.

I thank you for leading us in this hour of discussion, and I know that the information that we will exchange will be very critical and important to people who will be airing into this discussion and allowing them to trade those, exchange those ideas with their given elected representatives.

With that, I thank you for leading us in this important discussion.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TONKO. As you mentioned, one of the concerns we have, not only in your region but in my district, is the loss of jobs that we have had because of some of these past trade deals that haven't quite gone as promised.

It has been estimated we have lost 4 million U.S. jobs due to just three

trade deals, and three-quarters of those jobs lost were in the manufacturing sector.

I had mentioned earlier today at a press conference in Rock County, Wisconsin, a county that I share with Representative PAUL RYAN, we used to have Parker Pen, made good American-made quality pens. A thousand jobs at one time were in that community working at Parker Pen. In early 2010, the final jobs had moved to Mexico. That is just one example of the number of jobs that we lost just in south central Wisconsin, much less Flint, Michigan, and Los Angeles, California, and other parts of the country. So we appreciate your efforts and your comments.

I would like to also yield to another colleague of mine from the great State of California, someone who has been a strong member of our Progressive Caucus. I would like to yield to Representative JANICE HAHN of the great State of California.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in solidarity today with millions of American working families who are deeply concerned about the impact that harmful trade deals have on our Nation. I am proud to join with my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus in explaining why we oppose this so-called Fast Track authority for international trade deals.

Let me be clear. I am very much pro-trade. Trade is essential to the economy of my district, and I am proud to represent the Port of Los Angeles, the largest container port in the country. Trade is essential to our economy in my district, but it is essential to the economy of the whole State of California—and of course, dare I say, the whole Nation—the many wonderful and diverse exports we do promote in our State: films, creative content made in Hollywood, the fruits and vegetables grown in Central Valley, the wines from Sonoma and Napa, the innovative products developed in our Silicon Valley, or the goods that are manufactured in California factories.

Trade is essential to our entire U.S. economy. Trade creates and sustains American jobs, not only at our ports in this country, but throughout the entire supply chain. Trade helps American businesses reach new markets, grow, prosper.

Trade helps American consumers gain access to many products that we value, and trade is not an exclusive Democratic issue or Republican issue. Everyone who wants our Nation to prosper understands the importance and value of engaging in trade and being globally competitive and connected.

That is why I am proud that as a progressive Democrat I was able to join with a conservative Republican, TED POE, and we have worked together to cochair our Congressional PORTS Cau-

cus. We now have about 90 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, coming together over the issue of investing in and sustaining and making competitive our Nation's seaports. We might disagree on other policy issues, but we have a common understanding of the economic benefits of trade, especially trade passing through our ports. So I want to say it again, and I hope it is clear that I strongly support trade.

However, I am opposed to trade deals with other countries that have harmful consequences on our American workers and deals that give unfair advantages to those who exploit workers and destroy the environment. That is why I oppose Fast Track.

I believe with all my heart that Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee trade agreements, but Fast Track takes away our authority to regulate trade and to be involved in these negotiations. Under Fast Track, we would only be able to vote for or against a deal that has been negotiated without us, and we would not even have the opportunity to amend it. That sounds like a recipe for a raw deal, not a good deal.

I am honored to hold public office and to have earned the support and the trust of those who depend on me to stand up for them and what is best for them. I take my responsibility very seriously to represent them and act in their interests, as I think every Member of Congress does, and I think our constituents are counting on us to make trade deals that are fair and beneficial.

I think Fast Track undercuts our authority and our ability to provide this oversight. I hope that we can support trade and have good trade agreements, but I hope we can all oppose the idea of Fast Tracking these trade deals.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative HAHN. I think you said it very eloquently. We are all for trade. I don't think there is a Member in this body who doesn't want to see trade happen, but we want fair trade. We don't want the so-called free trade that makes it harder for American workers, that depresses our wages and ultimately includes a whole lot of other things that affect everything from food safety to environmental concerns to our ability to have something as basic as buy American laws and buy local laws. So thank you for your comments.

I would also like to yield to a gentleman, a colleague, and a friend from the State of Michigan, someone who represents the Flint and Saginaw area. I would like to yield to Representative DAN KILDEE from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. First of all, thank you to my colleague, Mr. POCAN, for his leadership on this and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a really important subject for the American people. It is a really important subject for the

people that I represent in Flint, Michigan, in Saginaw, Michigan, Bay City.

You mentioned Flint. It is my hometown. I was born and raised there. September 16, 1908, General Motors was incorporated in Flint, Michigan, and it was a company that brought together carriage-makers and wheel-makers, and they put the world on wheels.

About 30 years later, the workers in that city at General Motors organized and got the first UAW contract. Between the auto industry itself and the organized workers who were able to then claim their fair share of the tremendous wealth generated by their productive capacity, we built the American middle class. We built an amazing society that gives opportunity, gave opportunity, I think, to just about anybody who felt they could work hard and would put in the time and get a fair wage and get decent benefits and be able to go to work with some dignity.

□ 1645

We built something that was truly amazing.

It was not that long ago, because of globalization and because of trade deals like the one that is being considered right now, that the Federal Government, rightfully, and this President, rightfully, stood up for the American auto industry and put it back on its feet. They gave the American auto worker—the American worker—the chance to reclaim that dignity that so many people fought for even decades ago.

What I worry about is that everything that those people worked and fought for could go away. In fact, even the great work that this President did to rescue the American auto industry could all be for naught if we continue down this path of pursuing trade policy that puts corporate and stockholder and offshore interests, really, in front of the interests of the American people and the American worker.

My hometown has seen this play itself out. I remember—I was in local government—when the North American Free Trade Agreement was adopted. We keep hearing that the agreement that is being contemplated right now is a vastly different sort of agreement, but we don't see that. What we do hear and see is the very same language and the very same rhetoric and the very same explanations or excuses about the need to grant Fast Track authority to negotiate this agreement and bring it back to Congress for a "yes" or "no" vote. The same arguments that are being made now were being made then, and the people whom I represent truly believed that they were sold a bill of goods.

At one point in time, in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, we had 79,000 autoworkers. This was a city that was never more than 200,000 in population,

so this is a city that really grew up around American manufacturing. It was direct GM employees, but it was suppliers and a whole community built around this incredible productive capacity that started over a century ago; but in just a few short years, we have gone from that 79,000 number to about 10,000 autoworkers in my hometown.

When I think about trade and these trade deals, it is not a question of sort of the big geopolitical tensions that we are trying to address. It is not even a matter of this kind of esoteric argument about the philosophy of trade policy. It is about Flint and Saginaw and Bay City, Michigan, families who have worked hard their whole lives and who stand to lose everything because we are continuing to pursue trade policy that thinks about the short-term profits of multinational corporations and not about strengthening the long-term integrity of the American middle class. This is a dangerous path that we are on.

What is particularly concerning to me is that, when I go home, as I do—as you all do—we get questions about this.

The questions are: "We keep hearing that this trade agreement will have a high standard, a high set of standards, and that it will not be like past agreements." Even some here in Washington have said that we are fighting old battles and that this is a new day. Yet, when I have to answer to my constituents' questions like: "Will these agreements have environmental protections and enforcement mechanisms for those environmental standards unlike some previous agreements?" I have to say, "I don't really know because we don't have access to the documents. We don't have access to the process. We haven't been asked to weigh in."

"Will the agreements have labor standards that guarantee that American workers won't have to compete with nations that outlaw labor unions?" for example.

"I don't know because we have not seen that language."

We are being asked to accept on faith that, somehow, miraculously, this trade agreement is going to look dramatically different than others, even of those that have been fairly recently passed.

Finally, I am asked, "Will there be protections to keep other nations from manipulating their currency?" No matter what else is in any of these trade agreements, if currency can be manipulated to a point so that the price of one nation's exports makes it impossible for us to compete with them, all is lost.

From what we hear, there will be no currency provisions or at least, if there are any at all, they certainly won't be strong enough to have any influence whatsoever on the ability of these nations to undermine the American economy by dumping goods, by manipu-

lating currency in a fashion that makes it impossible for us to compete.

This is the wrong track for this country. It is something for which Congress needs to stand up and assert its constitutional role in defending. I stand with my colleagues, and I know many, many others who simply are not going to sit idly by no matter who the President is—a Democrat, a Republican, or otherwise—and allow the prerogatives of Congress, which means the prerogatives of the people who sent us here, to be overlooked. It would be a dangerous path for us to take, and I am very grateful to my friend Mr. POCAN for his leadership and for the leadership of many others here on this issue.

I am glad to stand with you in fighting this battle.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you so much, Representative KILDEE.

When you mentioned the auto industry, I have to admit that I grew up in Kenosha, Wisconsin. American Motors was the company that ran the town. Almost everyone had a family member or a neighbor who worked at American Motors. Now, granted, we made Pacers and Gremlins, so there were some mistakes along the way. American Motors eventually went away to Renault, and it went away to Chrysler. It went away to nothing as well as the people who had the strong family-supporting wages from that auto industry. Now the companies that have replaced the auto industry are, quite honestly, jelly bean manufacturers and companies like that. It does not pay the same wage. It doesn't support the family in the same way.

Just as we were promised with the Korean free trade agreement, especially around autos, in that 70,000 jobs would be created, instead, 60,000 jobs were lost. That is exactly why we have to be involved now while it matters, not after it has been negotiated. We don't have a debate, and we don't have a chance to amend it. So thank you for all of your work on this on behalf of the people of Michigan.

I would also like to yield to another colleague of mine, someone who has been a stalwart in the Progressive Caucus, someone I respected long before I ever had the chance to come to Congress. I would like to yield to my great colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE, from the great State of California.

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much.

Let me thank you, Congressman POCAN, for yielding but also for your tireless leadership on behalf of the American people and for leading not only this Progressive Caucus special hour but each and every one of them for so many years. You have been our voice. I think the American people are hearing from us through you, so I just want to thank you again for really beating the drum across America, allowing the American people to know what the real deal is here in Washington, D.C.

Let me also thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus for rising tonight to talk about why we are strongly opposed to Fast Track for the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to trade deals and American jobs, Congress should never be a rubber stamp. As the Representative from California's 13th Congressional District, I have the honor and the privilege of representing the Port of Oakland—one of our Nation's busiest seaports—and also the airport. I support trade because it is critical to the economy of my district and our Nation. Trade is good when it is fair, when it is open, when it is transparent, and when it creates good-paying jobs here in America. Trade is bad, however, when it ships American jobs overseas so that the 1 percent can reap even greater profits. For this reason, I join the vast majority of Americans—Americans from both parties—in opposing Fast Track for the TPP. Bad trade hurts all American workers—American families, American businesses, and also, especially, those individuals and businesses in communities of color.

Of the 2.7 million jobs lost because of the U.S.-China trade deal, a disproportionately high percentage—35 percent, mind you—came from communities of color. That is outrageous. Now, after these individuals lost their jobs, their situations got even worse. When they found a new job, it was, on average, for a 30 percent lower wage. The loss of these jobs and wages totals more than \$10 billion in lost economic growth for these communities, not one time, but each and every year. Enacting another bad trade deal will continue to prevent communities of color from building wealth and moving into the middle class. In addition to the negative impact on communities of color, Fast Track for TPP will not provide an opportunity to add critical labor and environmental protections that are critical to respecting human rights and preserving our planet.

That is why my colleagues and I are here, saying “no” to Fast Track for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Trade negotiations should not be conducted in back rooms. The American people and Members of Congress deserve to know what is in these deals. That is why, again, Congress is so important. Otherwise, people have no say. They have no voice on trade policies that really affect their economic livelihoods—their ability to put food on the table and their ability to aspire into the middle class. Fast Track for the Trans-Pacific Partnership does not help the American people. It only allows special interests and corporations to craft trade deals that are bad for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to turn the lights on the TPP. If the United States

is going to pursue a trade deal in the Pacific, Congress needs to fully debate it so we are certain that it creates jobs and all the protections that we all are standing for and know about and want right here in America.

Over the last 20 years, the U.S. has lost nearly 3.5 million jobs due to NAFTA and the United States-China trade deal. Many of these jobs were lost in California and in communities of color. Let's not make the same mistake again. Let's stand together in opposing Fast Track because it will sacrifice American jobs and environmental protections in the name of international corporate profits. Let's take Fast Track off of the table, and let's start talking about creating good-paying American jobs for American families.

Thank you, once again, for your tremendous leadership.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative LEE.

I look forward to working with you on our Progressive alternative also for the budget, when, I think, we will showcase many of those initiatives that we would much rather see the country do to help create good-paying jobs and get more people back to work. So thank you for all of your efforts.

At this point, I would like to yield to a colleague of mine from the great State of Ohio, who has seen much of this firsthand and who, today, has very eloquently explained her experiences of being around when NAFTA had passed. Let me yield to Representative MARCY KAPTUR from the great State of Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very able gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman POCAN, for organizing all of us this evening and for his indefatigable efforts to tell the truth about what is happening to the workers of our country and those around the world.

I rise with you tonight because America—our wonderful country—has a huge “good jobs” deficit because we have a gigantic free trade deficit. Our trade policies export more U.S. jobs than U.S. products. More and more foreign imports come across our shores than we send goods out, and the gap grows wider every decade at extraordinary proportion. Never before in American history have so many good jobs been outsourced off our shores. America's workers have had income shortages—every family knows it—because America has had this jobs hemorrhage due to the flawed, Fast Tracked free trade agreements that have been ramrodded through this Congress.

Since 1975, when Wall Street's free trade regimen began to lock down, America has amassed a \$9.5 trillion trade deficit with the world. If you count up every year, numbers don't lie, and this has translated into a gigantic, unprecedented jobs loss of over 47.5 million lost American jobs—good jobs

from coast to coast, living-wage jobs, jobs that have evaporated from our communities, jobs that have been shipped out. We know the places as we just look at the tags on any products—Mexico, China, Vietnam, Korea, Bangladesh, Honduras, Guatemala, Turkey, El Salvador—to dozens of Third World nations—frankly, most very undemocratic—where workers are treated like a bonded class. Workers everywhere—here, too—are being treated like expendable parts. Yes, American jobs are being shipped out to penny-wage sweatshops behind the Iron Curtain of anonymous towns in distant countries most Americans will never visit.

□ 1700

Anonymity, worker exploitation, and hidden squalor are fundamental to free trade. And so are the stories of Americans who struggle to earn a living, who lose their jobs and are forgotten, are forgotten in their plight.

In our country, the impact on the average American family has been a loss of real income of \$7,000 a year. Imagine that. The public knows it.

The people who elected me to Congress—and I thank them—have allowed me to be a voice, to put the ugly puzzle of outsourcing together. And I have made it my mission to travel the world to find the companies that fled our shores. And I have traveled to find them.

I have lots of photos, and I have lots of interviews. And I have had time to talk to unemployed Americans too—far too many—and the exploited workers of developing nations and to visit the plants that have been displaced from this country and built elsewhere.

The titans who run these global transnational corporations, their operatives, and the Wall Street giants that finance them couldn't care less about workers anywhere or the communities in which they live. And, frankly, these new bosses of global production don't care about democracy or the rule of law either. They pay whatever they want, and they can pay off as they see fit.

I have seen workers making Maytag washing machines in Monterrey, Mexico. Those used to be made in Newton, Iowa. These Mexican workers don't earn enough to buy the very washing machines they make. And with the jobs lost from Newton, the poverty rate in Newton has dramatically increased in the town that Fred Maytag proudly helped build. However—I don't know if you have noticed—the quality of those machines has gone down too. Who can be proud of what is happening?

I have visited the homes where those workers from Monterrey live and other maquiladora factory zones and have seen firsthand their impoverished living standards.

I have stood at a surreal location in Mexico following NAFTA's passage

called Michigan-Ohio Avenues and witnessed the jobs outsourced from our country from a windshield wiper factory that used to be located in New York.

I have met women in the garment industry from Honduras and El Salvador who earn 10 cents for every T-shirt they produce in those sweat shops down there, barricaded off behind barbed wire and outsourced from places like the Carolinas. The women are being paid 10 cents an hour for every T-shirt that then comes in here and is sold for \$20 each at stores and shopping centers around the country. Meanwhile, the booming garment and textile industry of the Carolinas, like the furniture industry too, has all but disappeared, and the tens of thousands of jobs that went with them. I visited those massive shuttered factories, and they reminded me of the auto plants that existed in my industrial region.

I have tracked furniture jobs to Vietnam and have seen child laborers perched with their bare feet on the edge of large wooden bowls that they sand and spray with lacquer paint, wearing no face masks, with no air filters, breathing in the fumes and chemicals certain to damage their fragile lungs and bodies.

Let me just say in closing, as an Ohio Representative, we have lost over 5 million manufacturing jobs alone in northern Ohio since the passage of NAFTA, which I fought with every ounce of being that I had here in 1993. We lost that fight. A 12-votes switch here would have made the difference. And as I speak here today, another global company, Hugo Boss, a German-owned company, is shutting down a factory in Brooklyn, Ohio, where workers had their pay cut 17 percent 2 years ago to save that company. You can walk into any Hugo Boss outlet, and you can see men's suits selling for \$1,200 apiece. What a tragedy. What a tragedy for our country. What a tragedy for workers globally.

I will say to my wonderful colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), thank you so much for doing this.

In terms of China—and others will cover this more completely—just in the past year, 2013, the latest complete year of data, our country assumed \$319 billion of trade deficit with the nation of China just in that year, just in that year with that one country. Because of that deficit, we have lost an additional 1,595,000 more American jobs, just with this one country in 1 year.

The answer to balanced global growth is to pay workers a living wage and to respect their work, not exploit it. The answer to balanced growth is to stop the outsourcing of U.S. jobs and to pry open the closed markets of the world, starting with Japan, China, and Korea. And the answer to balanced growth and fair trade is to stop the hemorrhage of more jobs from this

country by defeating any more deals like NAFTA and all of its offspring, and the Fast Tracking of more jobs that they are trying to do in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

It is time for America to stand up and for this Congress to stand up with the American workers and communities.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative KAPTUR, for all that you have done. You have been an articulate spokesperson on behalf of jobs and the effects of these bad trade deals on jobs. And I have to say, I am really glad you brought up the textile industry, because when we talk about the need to work together in this Congress, this is an issue where Democrats and Republicans can absolutely unite.

About 12 years ago, I was on a delegation of the American Council of Young Political Leaders. And one of the people on the delegation was a very conservative judge from the State of Mississippi. She and I and the group had met with some sweatshop workers in Indonesia to talk about all the mills that have left, especially in the southern part of the United States, and those jobs are pretty much gone forever.

I have been in business for 27 years, since I had hair. I have had a small business. And in that role, we screen-print on T-shirts. And I have watched over the years all of the mills that made T-shirts in the United States pretty much leave. It is pretty hard to find clothes still made in the USA. It is even harder to find them union-made in the USA. And this is something that unites people of different political ideologies because we see those jobs leaving. It doesn't matter. It is not a Democratic job or a Republican job. These bad trade deals too often just cost us jobs.

I appreciate you bringing that up, and thank you again for all that you do.

Next I would like to yield to someone who has been an extraordinary leader in this area. She has helped to coordinate Members of Congress like no one else, not just on this issue but on many other issues. She is an absolutely tireless advocate for the American public and for making sure that Congress has the proper role when it comes to trade agreements. She is someone whom I am extremely honored to have as a colleague and a friend. I would like to yield to the great Representative ROSA DELAURO from the State of Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you so much to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Again, it is reciprocal. It is just such an honor to serve with you. We are simpatico in the views that we hold with regard to this and so many others. I am honored to be able to serve with

you and to be tied together on this critically important issue.

Earlier today, my colleagues who are on the floor here tonight and others who have spoken, we were all at a press conference. And I think we can say with one voice that it was one of the broadest advocacy coalitions that we have seen come together. It certainly is true for me in my 24 years in the House. The advocacy groups and Members of Congress came together to oppose Fast Track. It included faith groups, human rights groups, labor unions, environmental groups, and consumer protection groups. And the purpose, as I said, was to oppose the policy known as Fast Track for trade deals.

Under this Fast Track umbrella, if you will, what happens? Members of Congress are denied the opportunity to debate and vote in detail on the text of these deals. We cannot have a serious debate, nor can we amend the process.

Negotiations are going on right now between the United States and 11 other countries. If these negotiations are successful, it will create the largest trade deal in history, something called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Yet the details of this trade agreement remain a secret from the American people, from the Representatives of the American people in this body. The contours of the deal are being sketched out in secret, as I have said, by a Who's Who of Wall Street firms, big pharmaceutical companies, energy companies, and other corporate interests.

They want to ram the agreement through the Congress, again, without amendment and with little opportunity for debate. To me, that is the very opposite of what we have been sent here to do.

I have always opposed Fast Track, no matter who was in the Oval Office. I will oppose it again. We cannot, and we must not, really just sign away our constitutional duties. We need to retain the ability to scrutinize trade deals page by page, line by line, word by word. We should do that for all legislation, let alone legislation with such far-reaching implications for American workers.

Some of us remember the debate on this floor or going back home during the debate on health care when our constituents and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say to us, have you read the bill? Have you read the bill? How can you vote on a bill that you have not read?

The TPP is 1,000 pages, 1,000 pages. We want to read the bill. That is what we are asking for.

Make no mistake: bad trade deals can have grave consequences for our people.

And it used to be that the working-class families became middle class by finding work that paid enough to save a little, buy a home in a safe neighborhood, send their kids to college, and

leave the next generation better off. But today, the good jobs that used to lift people into the middle class have been shipped overseas to places where labor is cheap. Many of them have gone to countries that get ahead by abusing labor rights, polluting the environment, risking public health, or manipulating their currency.

A recent GAO report tells us of unpunished violence against trade unionists in Colombia, of union suppression in Guatemala, of abuses against foreign workers in Oman. These are all countries that we have trade deals with, agreements under which they promised—they promised—to improve their records. We haven't held them accountable on these promises.

I am not against free trade. I am in favor of fair trade on a level playing field. Hardworking Americans will win 9 times out of 10, but the competition must be fair.

A recent Gallup Poll showed that in 2014, the issues Americans most often identified as the biggest problem facing our country was "poor government leadership." Today, 80 percent of Americans disapprove of the job that this institution is doing. Why? Because far too often, we are seen as working not for all Americans but for a privileged few: tax breaks for millionaires, benefit cuts for the poorest; unprecedented paydays for those at the top, dwindling paychecks for everyone else. The big economic problem today is that jobs that people have do not pay enough to them so that they can live on it. Fast Tracking this trade agreement will exacerbate that problem.

NAFTA-style trade deals are in the same category. For a narrow band of wealthy individuals and big corporations with the means to invest their money beyond our borders, they do wonders. For the rest of us, they spell disaster. They send our jobs overseas. They erode our ability to protect our workers, consumers, and the environment. Worst of all, they threaten to saw the legs off the ladder of opportunity that leads to the middle class.

Fast Tracking these deals would be yet another insult to American workers, yet another sign of how little their political leaders really care about them.

□ 1715

Instead of our abdicating our constitutional responsibility, let's send a clear message: enough is enough. No more offshoring. No more NAFTA-style trade deals, no more Fast Track. Let us focus on helping American workers, not throwing their jobs away.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for all of his efforts, and it is a privilege to work with you on this issue.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you so much, Representative DELAUNO, for all

your leadership. You are helping to coordinate all of our voices in this battle, and we really appreciate that and all your efforts. Thank you so much.

When you brought up the public opinion of Congress, there is no question. If you were actually to explain this process to anyone, regardless of their political ideology, that for the last 2 years, about 600 people in this country from America's biggest corporations and Wall Street's biggest banks have been involved in trying to craft this legislation that we haven't seen and the American public hasn't seen and we are going to be asked to vote on something that would take away our ability, sight unseen, to vote to limit our ability to debate and to amend any kind of a trade agreement—that is exactly what is wrong with Washington. That is why people, I think, get so disgusted with Washington.

We need to stand up, Democrats and Republicans together, to make sure that we have our ability to have our voices heard, which is the public's voices through Members of Congress. So your efforts on Fast Track, on TPP, food safety, and so many areas, thank you so much. Again, I appreciate it.

Another one of our leaders of our caucus is here who has been an articulate fighter on so many progressive issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Maryland, Representative DONNA EDWARDS, my great colleague.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank Mr. POCAN for yielding and for his leadership for calling us together this evening to talk about what trade means to American paychecks.

Thank you again because I was sitting in my office, and I was listening to my colleagues speak so eloquently about the need for Congress, for individual Members of Congress representing—those of us representing 725,000 Americans, to have a voice in a process that is so important to American paychecks.

As I sat there, I thought I owed it to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland to come to this floor to stand on their side for their paychecks, so I thank you for that.

As I listened to some of my colleagues, one of the things that I heard Ms. KAPTUR say was to talk about the job loss in the manufacturing sector, in the clothing textile sector in the Carolinas. I represent a district in Maryland, but my family is from North Carolina.

A lot of my family members had those good-paying jobs in the mills. They were making the sheets, pillowcases, T-shirts, and hats, and they all lost their jobs. All of those jobs went someplace else, but they didn't stay in North Carolina. That was a tragedy. It was a tragedy for my family, as it has

been a tragedy for families all across this country.

I remember the NAFTA debate, and so many Members of Congress—I wasn't in Congress at the time, Mr. POCAN wasn't in Congress at the time—but we remember the debate. We remember that they told us: "Well, there would be other jobs that would be created, so don't worry about any jobs that would be lost." They said the jobs in the service sector would grow and they would stay.

Almost one of the first things to happen after NAFTA went into effect was all those call centers closed. Those were service-sector jobs, and they left, along with millions of manufacturing jobs.

In my home State of Maryland, we lost 70,000 jobs—and we are a small State—but we lost those just to NAFTA, so when people tell me now as a Member of Congress: "We want you to just Fast Track this trade deal, this Trans-Pacific Partnership deal, and just trust us that the process is going to work, just trust us that all you have to do is rubberstamp the trade deal"—I remember—and Mr. POCAN, you remember—and that is what requires us for our constituents to say no way, that we cannot just give Fast Track authority over, hand it over and, in effect, just say that whatever the deal is that has been negotiated, we will just take that deal for the American people.

Well, you and I know better. One of the things that has long concerned me is getting wind that our Trade Representative, on behalf of my constituents and your constituents, were negotiating away Buy American provisions, negotiating them away without our even having a voice in that conversation.

Let's look at those Buy American provisions. In 2012, 68 of our colleagues joined us in saying to President Obama, "Don't negotiate away the Buy American provision." Then just last year, 120 Members of Congress said, "Mr. President, don't negotiate away the Buy American provisions."

So I see that the wind is really beneath our sails because the American people understand that when you negotiate away Buy American, what you do is negotiate away the buying power and the jobs of American workers. You trade what is, in effect, billions of dollars of American taxpayer buying power for very little buying power coming from the other direction.

I am troubled that we have a Trade Representative that just wants to say, "Take the deal and run," and those of us who stand in the steps of American workers, we are in their place. We are representing them. We have their voice. We need to have their voice, and we have to have their back and say "no" to Fast Track and say "no" to the TPP and "no" to provisions that would trade away what we know the statistics are.

The U.S. procurement market is more than 10 times larger than all the TPP procurement markets combined, and so that means that we would trade away preferential access for U.S. firms to \$556 billion in Federal Government procurement. For what? \$53 billion in return? We have to say “no” to this deal.

I want to thank Mr. POCAN for bringing us together. It is good that we are doing this from day one in the United States House of Representatives because what we are saying to American workers is: “Not only will we stand with you on the first day of the Congress and the next day of the Congress, but all the way to the end, to keep from trading away millions of your jobs.”

Mr. POCAN. Thank you again so much, Representative EDWARDS. When you talked about the job loss in Maryland, we lost nearly 75,000 manufacturing job through the NAFTA-WTO period in the last 20 years.

When I was a legislator in the State of Wisconsin, it was a Buy American law that I got passed with a bipartisan vote in the Wisconsin Legislature. The fact that we are going to give up our sovereignty to have that law and some multinational corporation can sue any local unit of government so that they can contest those laws and we can lose that ability, I think the average person, if they knew that was something even being discussed, would be opposed to that, much less the other 28 chapters in addition to procurement that are included in this Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Thank you so much for all the work you have done on this and for making people aware of all the little hidden gems that if we don't have an ability to have a full and fair debate in this House, things that could happen in the biggest and the baddest of the trade deals yet we have seen in this country, so thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus is going to be doing everything we can in the coming months to fight this, to make sure that Congress has a say. We aren't against trade, we want fair trade, but the so-called free trade that is out there right now that is being drafted by corporate CEOs and Wall Street banks doesn't include the public and doesn't include Congress, and it needs to have every single person represented.

We are the voices of the American people. We need to be able to have a full debate in this body, and we need to be able to amend any deal that we don't like, the particular deals that have been decided by others, by corporate leaders in this country. The American public has to be included.

Before I ever came to this Congress, the last 27 years, I have run a small business, a small specialty printing business. One of the things we do is we

source American-made and union-made products for people.

I watched, over that 27 years, companies leave this country over and over and over, whether it be the mills that I mentioned from the South that made T-shirts to things as simple as pens. Companies like Parker Pen used to have up to 1,000 jobs in Rock County, Wisconsin, that now have all gone out of this country. Those are the types of jobs that we have seen leave over and over.

When you go back into these communities, they have not replaced the same quality paying jobs. That is part of why we have got a problem. While the economy has been coming back, unfortunately, many people are being left behind, and they are not having the same family-supporting wages that they need out there.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is 29 chapters, but only five of those chapters actually relate to trade. So much of what we have talked about has been about the job impacts and your income impacts of a trade deal, but this also covers environmental law, currency law, intellectual property law, food safety, and the ability for procurement, as we just talked about on Buy American laws, and on and on and on.

This Congress, I think, can work together, Democrats and Republicans, who have a concern about giving carte blanche authority to simply the U.S. Trade Representative and the White House and leaving the people out, leaving the Congress out of that conversation.

We are going to continue to fight this, to talk about this and to make sure that people understand what Fast Track is and what it isn't and to make sure that those myths that may be out there about how to help create jobs may not be true, and there is a lot more ramifications that are out there.

Mr. Speaker, we thank you so much for this time this evening. We appreciate the ability to talk about this on the floor of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it very much. Like my colleague before me, I am grateful for the opportunity to be here on the floor to speak about issues that are of concern to the American people.

My colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is joining me for a short period of time, and I would like to give

him the opportunity to speak for a few minutes. I believe that he has some important things to say, and I would like him to share those.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate it. Thank you to my colleague from North Carolina. You are very gracious in yielding to me, and it has been a pleasure to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank those assembled here tonight. I just want to talk a little bit about some of the issues we have going on in the West, in northern California.

First of all, the excitement we have of coming in—it is a new Congress, it is a new direction for our country, I think. We have a stronger majority in the House of Representatives, of the Republican House. As well, it is a different majority over in the Senate. A lot of people aren't too concerned with what party it is or what partisan issues are; they want to see results. That is what I am looking for as well.

Many bills were sent out of the House last session and languished on a desk over on the Senate side, and I think we will now see action on those common-sense measures that are going to help jobs in America, help our economy rebound, and help people get out from under the grip of government power and government regulation that is just killing their hopes and killing their ideals.

We are looking for that in this new session, and we expect we will be held accountable to make that happen. It is not going to be a miracle. We are not going to get all the results we hoped for, but at least there are going to be things on the RECORD now that have gone through this House and have gone to the Senate that will be showing the American people what our agenda is and what it has been about.

Bringing it back home to California, I represent the First District in the northeast portion of the State. It is a beautiful district. I am very proud to have been elected for a second time to represent the First District. It is an area that has a lot of great resources that benefit our whole State, even our whole country.

To be able to have my family here with me in Washington attending the festivities, the honor of being sworn in and getting started, getting a fast start, going to work here in this new 114th has just been a real delight.

What we need to be happening in California is a better and wiser use of our resources. You may have seen, at the end of the last session, we were working towards better management of our water supply. Now, we have a deluge of rain once in a while, even when we are suffering drought for the last few years in California.

The water seems to all come at once. If it isn't being saved in snowpack, it

will come quickly via rain through our streams, and that is an opportunity for us that we should be retaining that behind the dam, so that we have as well the water that gets down the Feather River and the Sacramento River and can be transferred and put somewhere to be used later.

We have the ability to have the water allocated as needed for fish, for habitat, but there is excess water that needs to be stored. I don't know why that isn't the automatic protocol, but Congress—a bill I cosponsored with many of my other colleagues put forward reminding the Bureau of Reclamation and others that they need to retain this extra water.

It isn't needed for fish, and it isn't needed for the normal runs, so we will have more stored later.

□ 1730

That is what we will continue to work for. But I still go back to the vision that people before us had that have given us Shasta Dam, Lake Oroville, and the whole State water project and the Central Valley project that we have in our State that we have benefited from for so many years, that everybody benefits from, whether you are an environmentalist, a farmer, a person who lives in a city, or if you just have a tap in the country. If you are not on a well, you are probably benefiting from these projects because we had the vision in the past to build them and we didn't have nearly the roadblocks.

Now, of course, we have great environmental concerns and environmental awareness to do things better than we did in the 1850s or the 1880s or what have you. We know how to do these things. But it doesn't mean that, because of a handful of people who don't want to see things happen, we stop the progress for all the rest of us.

So that is what we will be pushing for in this new Congress, to build more water storage. We can do that in northern California. Sites Reservoir, and there are other projects that can be enhanced to retain more water, and there are smarter ways to keep the water that we do have to make the water go further because it is necessary. The way California is suffering from droughts, agricultural land is going to be the first thing to go. Any time an emergency can be declared to switch whatever water does get to agriculture to meet other needs around the State, we have to take care of people first and we have to take care of cities, but when we see so much being run out through the Golden Gate that could be saved, or for questionable tactics on fish that really haven't been proven for that kind of habitat, then we are missing the mark.

So we will be working very hard to add to our water storage and to be smarter with the water we have avail-

able to us because we can't count on a record rainfall this year. We are very thankful and we have been blessed with good rainfall in November and the early part of December, but it has tailed off lately. We will need record rainfall the rest of the season up through the spring to have the kind of water we need to get through a good crop year. In the meantime, we should be doing everything possible in government to enhance, to retain, to be smarter with the water we have.

When we hear ideas of removing dams in the north part of the State, part of my district, that produce hydroelectric power because of dubious studies that might benefit fish, we are hurting our region of the State. We are hurting our grid by taking enough renewable electricity off the grid that would somehow need to be replaced with other green power to manage 70,000 homes in the State because of dubious lack of science. We need to battle through this and have smarter use of our resources.

Another thing that we are very rich in in our part of the State is timber. Each summer we see the crisis of non-management of our timber and what that looks like. It is in the air. It is in our brown skies. We get to breathe that. The people within those communities are wondering why their mills are shut down and why their storefronts are boarded up and why they don't have jobs and why they have things like domestic violence increasing because people don't have work in those communities sometimes because their industry has been taken away from them.

I sit on the Natural Resources Committee to get after both of these and other issues—our water, our timber use, and other resources—that are so necessary to the rural part of the State, the rural West that has been languishing for many years, ever since the Endangered Species Act was passed in 1973, for good reason at the time, to save the bald eagle. We have bald eagles in our rice fields where I live at home. But we have gone so far beyond that rural America is suffering from this type of regulation that it isn't even proven to help recover a single species. Indeed, somewhere around 1 percent, at best, of species have been recovered after 40-plus years of the Endangered Species Act. That is pretty deplorable for what the cost has been to the people, to the jobs, and for the communities and their values.

But I am still optimistic that America is turning the corner and seeing things a little bit differently and that the job needs to come back home. And the jobs at home need to be revived once again. As a grower of grain myself, we look at our alternatives. Do we want to be in a situation where in the past we were dependent on oil from people who don't like us much? Do we

want to be in a position to have our grain crops, the breadbasket of our Nation, do we want to become more dependent on that from people who maybe aren't always a reliable ally overseas? Wheat from Russia and rice from China, do we want to rely on that, or do we want to do the best we can?

My fellow farmers across the country and in my area, they are good stewards of the land. Many have been there for many, many generations. Some of the ranchers I know, their families have been farming and ranching for 160 years in northern California, my own family 80-plus years. We know how to take care of the land. We know what needs to be done. It is sustainable, to use that buzz word that goes around a lot these days. If it wasn't sustainable, the land wouldn't still produce.

So this is the type of thing we are fighting for. If we don't have a breadbasket in this country, what will America rely on to keep us fed? With the unrest we have in the world, ultimately, if we can't fuel our own Armies if it becomes necessary, what kind of position will we be in to defend ourselves or our allies, like in Europe, like in Israel, like in Japan, or others we have great relations and great trade with? We are in great peril right now if we keep our head in the sand on these issues. We need to look at the resources we have.

As I look at the young people in the audience tonight, one of the first things that I am reminded of is that we are running an \$18 trillion national debt. We have lived for the future in the present on someone else's money. And so every dollar we have, every dollar that comes in, we have to be good stewards of, much better than in the past. So every dollar has to go for the type of infrastructure that will improve our transportation system, our water system, our flood control system, and keep our communities safe, and not on frivolous things.

I am reminded in California, instead of this water infrastructure that we so desperately need, we have had several years of drought to remind us, they are still pursuing a high-speed rail system in California. As a former State legislator, we were right in the middle of that as it was coming to a head. What will the rail cost? Voters were told then \$33 billion to go from San Francisco to Los Angeles at 220 miles per hour. It isn't even close to being that project anymore, and the price has tripled, at least. It has gone from \$33 billion to at least \$98 billion by the admission of the rail authority in a hearing we had in the State legislature back then. They are still chasing this dream. Now they have tried to downsize it to be a \$68 billion project. To this day, right now, they have still only identified \$13 billion—\$10 billion from the State bond and \$3 billion from the Federal Government via the Stimulus Act of 2009. So \$13 billion of a

needed and downsized \$68 billion project. They are \$55 billion short, and they still think today they are going to go find that money. From the private sector, they are staying away in droves.

There is no way that it is going to be built anywhere near on time, anywhere near on any kind of budget, or that the riders they would have will ever be able to afford to ride it. Why don't we take a fraction of that money, of the \$13 billion or the \$68 billion, or whatever number it is, and put it towards the water storage we need?

We could build two really nice dams with \$68 billion, especially with private sector money that wants to come in and be a partner on this. Let's get it done, because this is the infrastructure that will help our State and help the people and help bring jobs back to rural California and rural America.

I am looking for help from my other colleagues from other States, especially other Western States that have water infrastructure needs they are looking at themselves. Let's work together on this. That is what made us great back in the day.

We have had these huge projects that have made so much hydroelectric power. We like green power. We like renewable power. When it rains behind a dam, you have renewable power and it is reliable. And it is low cost, much more so than windmills and solar panels that require government assistance to put them in and keep them going. Let's do the right thing here and allow these things to happen, all that private sector to happen.

I am optimistic in this Congress that we can make that case and put it in front of the American people. I ask the President to join with us and help on that, whether it is that or the further development of energy that we need in this country to stay ahead of the curve. We are seeing prices coming down, amazingly. Hydraulic fracturing has played a big part in us seeing the price of fuel in some areas—not in California, but other States going below \$2 a gallon. In California, we are still taxing ourselves and thinking up cap-and-trade measures to drive the cost up so we will be our own island of high costs. But the other 49 States, God bless you, you have it pretty good.

The vision that we have had to do these things is what we need desperately going forward in 2015 because when we are productive, like what we can produce in northern California with agriculture, with timber, with our mine resources, all of the other things that come from the land, that sets the table for everything else across our district and across our State and across the whole country. That puts us back to work again.

We have trillions of dollars offshore that would love to be repatriated back to this country if we had any kind of

constant as to what the tax burden would be for those dollars, for those businesses and investment that needs to be here, any kind of consistency for what our regulatory burden would be so they could predict. If they are to put 30-year loans and 30-year infrastructure in place, will they be able to do business 5 years from now? We would be bringing American jobs back if we could repatriate that money back here. So let's get it done.

We don't come here in Congress—at least I haven't—because it is nice to wear a suit and tie. We come here to get results. To be results oriented, we need to use real facts, real figures, real budgets, real numbers to get to the core of what we are supposed to be doing as to what the Founders had set for our government. The government is doing a lot more things it has no business doing and it can't do well. Let's make sure that we are doing and we have the economy, we have the engineering to generate so we have a functioning school system, it has the funding it needs at fair and proper levels; for our law enforcement, so they are not left wanting for the equipment and backup they need; and for the folks deployed overseas defending our borders as well as helping our allies. We shouldn't leave them wanting while they are deployed; and certainly with the mess that the VA system is, when they come back home, the promises made to them are broken and the shame that we should all feel when our veterans, so many are left homeless or simply begging to have their claims processed.

I am confident in this new Congress that the House and the Senate can work together and put these ideas forward. We can put them out in front of the American people, have the accountability, have the oversight that our job demands. We will get there.

So whether it is now or 2 years from now, I challenge the President to look at these things from a commonsense way of thinking. Think about America first. That is what we will be doing in this House and over in the Senate.

So from northern California to the rest of the country, help us all to be productive and to live the lives we choose to give our kids a chance to live at home, to find jobs and opportunities in their own communities—farming, ranching, mining, whatever it is, or related industries in those small towns that so many are boarded up now. Let them have that chance to live at home, not have to go someplace else, go to a big city somewhere, a different State, or even overseas to try to find good employment so they would have the dream they see fit and the one that their parents would like to pass along to them.

My colleague from North Carolina, I appreciate the time tonight and the opportunity to talk about my district

and the things we need to do there, as well as what we need to do for our country. I bid you a good evening, and thank you.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LAMALFA from California. I have heard him often speak on the floor. I have invited him several times to speak and do 1-minute speeches because I am the person in charge of getting people to the floor. I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to hear him speak in a little longer time because I found out how much we agree on issues.

□ 1745

I am particularly keen about the water issue that he spent some time talking about. I grew up in a house with no electricity and no running water. I grew up carrying water. Water has always been a precious, precious commodity to me.

We are the most fortunate people in the world in the United States that we have the greatest resources available to us. Many times I think we don't appreciate the scarcity of some of those resources or the need to husband those resources in a way that protects them not only for ourselves but for future generations.

I have always felt that people who are farmers are among the most eloquent speakers for our environment. As Mr. LAMALFA said—and I completely agree with him and said it many times myself—farmers are the best stewards of our land. They believe in sustainability. They believed in sustainability long before sustainability became a catchword in the community because if they didn't keep the land sustainable, then they wouldn't have the land in order for their own livelihood.

I am a person who also grew up farming, sometimes on a very small scale. My husband and I still have a garden every year. We certainly understand the importance of taking care of all of our resources, but particularly our natural resources. I think so often Republicans don't get the credit that they deserve for being good stewards and for looking after our land and all of our resources.

I also am very keen on the fact that we have a diversity of people serving in Congress. Again, I think it is very important that we have people from all walks of life serving in here because it is the diversity of experiences that are so important to us in terms of having the different points of view as we consider legislation, so that there are people who grew up in cities who have no idea what it is like to farm, have no idea where food comes from exactly, and it is important for us to get the different points of view. We need farmers, we need educators, we do need some lawyers, but we need people who have had all kinds of experiences. We need people who have driven trains,

train engineers. But every kind of diversity that is at all possible here. I think it is very important, though, that we have particularly a large share of farmers. Our numbers of farmers have gone down over the years, obviously, as we have left the farm and as farmers have become so incredibly productive in this country. They provide so much more than they have in the past. So I really appreciate the eloquence of my colleague from California in presenting the issues that he has presented.

I want to talk a little bit about some of the other things that he talked about. He talked about our need for jobs and for, again, maintaining what we can in this country, improving the economy. I want to talk about the three focuses that we in the majority have in this session of Congress, the three initiatives that we are going to be working on: energy, jobs and the economy, and regulatory reform.

This week already we have already passed two bills that we think will help us with the creation of jobs and the economy. On our first day here on Tuesday, it got very little attention, but we passed a bill, the Jobs for Heroes Act. The idea for it came from a constituent of one of our colleagues from Illinois. The constituent said: Look, I was a veteran, couldn't get a job because the employer was concerned about going over the 50 limit, or hitting the limit of 50, which then his company would be subject to ObamaCare, and companies are avoiding being subject to ObamaCare.

So we passed a bill introduced by Congressman RODNEY DAVIS that said veterans don't have to be included in the 50 persons in a business requirement and then be forced to go into ObamaCare; that if they are covered by TRICARE then they don't have to do that. That is a positive bill to help create jobs.

Today, we passed another bill that we think will help with employment in this country. As many people know, ObamaCare has told employers if people are working 30 hours or more then you have to cover them with ObamaCare. So we changed the definition of full-time employment from 30 hours to restore the traditional 40-hour workweek. As I have said in other comments that I have made, from adjunct professors to hourly workers, I have heard from constituents all across North Carolina's Fifth District who have one thing in common: their work hours are being reduced. ObamaCare has placed an undue burden on employers and their employees by undermining the traditional 40-hour workweek, which has long been the standard for full-time work.

This legislation will help protect the estimated 2.6 million Americans at risk for lost hours and wages at work under this destructive rule. The employer

mandate in ObamaCare defines a full-time employee as someone who works an average of at least 30 hours a week. But H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, which passed the House today by a vote of 252–172, changes that definition, and that is a good thing for American workers.

As I said, we have three big initiatives: energy, jobs and the economy, and regulatory reform. So the American people are going to see us passing bills all this year and next year focused on these three issues, in addition to the other things that we work on. We work on a plethora of subjects here.

But I introduced a bill on the first day which will help us deal with regulatory reform. It is a bill I am proud to say has passed the House before with bipartisan support. I am very proud to say that when I introduced the bill on Tuesday, it had bipartisan original cosponsors. I am very pleased that Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, from Mr. LAMALFA's State of California, joined me in introducing legislation to shed light on how Federal policies impact the budgets of State and local governments and private sector employers.

The bill is called the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act—H.R. 50—and it would fix loopholes within the bipartisan regulatory reform act, known as UMRA, which passed in 1995. I introduced this legislation in the past four Congresses, and it has successfully passed the House with bipartisan support on three separate occasions.

Every year, Washington imposes thousands of rules on local governments and small businesses. Hidden in those rules are costly mandates that stretch State and city budgets and make it harder for North Carolina businesses to hire. While Congress cannot create prosperity, we can work to ensure entrepreneurs and employers aren't crushed under costly regulations. This legislation will help restore transparency and hold Washington bureaucrats accountable for the true cost in dollars and in jobs that Federal dictates pose to the economy. Americans are better served when regulators are required to measure and consider the cost of rules they create.

The bill "increases transparency in the regulatory process and protects State and local governments from the burden of unfunded and often unnecessary mandates that waste time and money," is what my colleague LORETTA SANCHEZ said. H.R. 50 would increase transparency about the cost imposed by unfunded mandates and holds the Federal Government accountable for considering those costs before passing them on to local governments and small businesses. The legislation would make it easier for people to determine how much these regulations are going to cost and make sure that we are not

imposing unnecessary rules and regulations on both State and local governments and the private sector. So I am very pleased that that bill has passed. It is going to be a part of the regulatory reform package that passes this House.

I encourage people watching this to contact your Member of Congress if you are aware of unnecessary rules and regulations that are out there that we could do something about. Obviously, we need rules and regulations. We want to make sure that we have safe food, that the airlines are flying correctly and safely, we want to make sure the railroads are operating safely, we want to make sure our cars are safe to drive in.

But as we all know, often bureaucrats in Washington, and sometimes at the State and local level, look for ways to create jobs for themselves, create a reason for their being, and pass along rules and regulations that are simply unnecessary for the health and safety of the people in this country.

So what we want to do is reduce those rules and regulations. That reduces cost, that helps with our emphasis on jobs and the economy. I believe that is going to be very important to us in getting our economy going again.

As I mentioned, we are going to be working hard on our third initiative: energy. We will be passing another version of the Keystone XL pipeline. We will do that tomorrow. That bill will then go to the Senate. The Senate is already holding hearings on the bill, but the Senate does work a little bit slower than we do here in the House. We hope very much that the President will work with us in a bipartisan fashion and sign that bill.

We are all very happy about the cost of gasoline having gone down in our country in the past few months. It, of course, doubled under President Obama, and now it is coming back down. It is because in many cases we have been able in the private sector to create more energy supply, and that's been helping bring down the cost. We know that the economies in Europe and Asia have slowed down considerably so there is less demand. We are all very grateful for the price of gasoline going down. I am very grateful for it. Every Member of Congress is very grateful.

So what we hope is to help that cause even further by passing the Keystone XL pipeline and have more energy available in this country. We want to do everything we possibly can. Republicans have always believed in all of the above. As Mr. LAMALFA said, we want solar, wind, and all those other things, but they are primarily operating now because of giant government subsidies. What we would like to see is renewable and sustainable energy that doesn't require government subsidies, and we believe Keystone XL pipeline will help us along those lines.

□ 1800

I am looking forward very much to our passing that legislation, the Senate passing that legislation, and our being able to send that bill to the President for his signature. I am hoping that he will sign it.

I oftentimes get people quoting the Constitution to me and talking about what the Constitution says. Particularly, I hear from people a lot about the role of the House of Representatives. I want to talk a little bit about that in terms of our work in appropriations.

In particularly the last few weeks, many people have expressed genuine concerns to me about the appropriations bill that passed Congress in December. Unfortunately, many Washington-based special interest groups are confusing the matter of what happened in December with the omnibus bill that we passed with incomplete and sometimes, frankly, false messages aimed more at fundraising for themselves than uniting behind our shared goal of stopping President Obama's executive overreach on immigration.

One of the most misleading and commonly circulated suggestions is that the Constitution grants the House of Representatives alone the "power of the purse," or giving the House exclusive authority to withhold funding for targeted initiatives.

I am going to be reading a part of the Constitution in a moment that relates to this, but I want to read another part of the Constitution that I think often gets misquoted to prove this example.

We often hear the quote from the First Amendment, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

This comes oftentimes from groups who protest Ten Commandments being placed in public buildings or creches being placed on public land. They often quote that, but they usually forget to quote the second part of that sentence, which says "or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congress has a dual responsibility there. It is the same when people, I believe, are attempting to quote the Constitution when it comes to their version of what they call the power of the purse.

As I said, they are, I believe, misconstruing a part of the Constitution. Specifically, it is article I, section 7, clause 1, of the Constitution which states, "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

I believe many well-meaning people believe that that means the House of Representatives has total control over what happens with appropriations, but they have forgotten that there is another phrase there, and it is "but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

While the House may pass an appropriations bill, it still has to go to the

Senate for the Senate to pass. As we all learned in civics, the bill has to pass the House and pass the Senate in exactly the same form and be signed by the President in exactly the same form.

There is another clause that people are often thinking about also. Article I, section 9, clause 7 states, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Those two are often talked about as power of the purse, meaning that is what people are talking about when they talk about power of the purse. As I said, all bills, including the appropriations bills that pass the House, must also pass the Senate and be signed by the President in the exact same form.

What happened, particularly last year, is the Democrat-controlled Senate could reject a House-passed bill. It could pass liberal amendments and return it to the House, forcing the House either to accept a worsened product or risk a Federal Government shutdown, which would still not stop the President's executive overreach.

What we did last December was pass a bill that would fund the rest of the government, except for the Department of Homeland Security, in a negotiation with the Senate because we needed to not shut down the government. Most of what was in that bill had already been passed by the House.

We passed seven appropriations bills and sent them to the Senate, but the Senate had refused to act. We had also passed four more appropriations bills out of committee, but hadn't taken them up on the floor because they take so many hours to pass, and once the Senate made it clear they wouldn't take any of our appropriations bills, we thought we shouldn't waste additional time.

While H.R. 83 was not a perfect bill, we are all faced here with making decisions on what is presented to us rather than what we would like to be presented. We did have a lot of conservative victories in H.R. 83. It continued our track record of cutting wasteful discretionary spending by \$165 billion since FY 2010, but it is no small achievement that the Republican-led House has been able to implement overall spending cuts to save taxpayers more than \$2 trillion over the next 10 years since taking the majority 4 years ago. Certainly, we want to do more, but we shouldn't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

We cut back spending to the Internal Revenue Service to pre-2008 funding levels. We blocked the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating farm ponds and ditches. There was no new funding for ObamaCare, and a host of pro-life and conservative, pro-gun policy "riders" were protected in that bill also.

House Republicans have worked extremely hard in the past 4 years to stop President Obama and the Senate Democrats from furthering the damage they did to this country when they and NANCY PELOSI were in control.

In fact, NANCY PELOSI and ELIZABETH WARREN both stridently opposed that legislation. However, unfortunately, when people focus on the perfect instead of the good, they don't give credit to us, and we were criticized by the liberal media and the conservative media.

Despite the short time we have had, the obstacles we faced, and the enormity of our task, House Republicans have still managed a number of conservative victories. Last summer, a bill I authored was passed. It streamlined the Federal workforce development system, including the elimination of 15 duplicative programs.

I would have liked to have eliminated more than that, but again, we take the victories that we can get. It is like being on a football team. You get the ball, and you look down field, and you think, "Gosh, I can't score a touchdown," so I just sit down because I can't score a touchdown.

No, that is not what the receiver does. The receiver says, "If I can make a few yards, if I can make a yard, I'm moving in the right direction." That is what Republicans have been doing for the past 4 years, moving us in the right direction.

Occasionally, we are going to score a touchdown, but if we are moving in the right direction totally, then we are going to win this game, and that is what we are doing. We wish we could have done more, but we are going to have greater opportunities over the next 2 years with the Republican-led House and Senate.

This 114th Congress offers us new chances to pass legislation that will lead our country down a road of economic recovery. We are going to work to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government, protect against executive overreach, reform Federal spending, and keep America strong.

This is America's Congress, and we are going to be addressing the American people's greatest priority in the 114th Congress. We are going to work hard to build a better future for American families. I believe we will accomplish that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GETTING THE COUNTRY ON TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have great appreciation and affection for my friend from North Carolina, Dr. FOX, who

and I appreciate her comments. Actually, I didn't realize at the time, but some of the things she said leads into some rather painful things to talk about this evening, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly encouraged, first of all, over the last few days to find out that Americans are paying attention. They realize what is at risk. They realize there is a great deal at stake in this country, and now—maybe not more than ever, but as much as ever—we need to be about the business of getting this country on track.

I have mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, in recent years—maybe 3 years or so ago—my wife and I had gone to Togo, West Africa, which is by Nigeria, while Mercy Ships headquartered in my district were there. It is just an awesome charitable institution.

They bring a huge medical hospital ship into a dock in a Third World country, usually in Africa, and it is controlled by Christians, operated by Christians. They don't proselytize. They do the job of reaching out and ministering.

After the ship has been there, blind can see, and lame can walk. People who had massive tumors that were about to cut off their breathing are able to live. Women who had a child and developed a small hole in either the urinary tract or the colon when having a child that had been banned from families—sometimes, for 20 years, they were not allowed to be with the family. They were considered unclean.

They would have the fistula repaired and, after rather emotional ceremonies, for the first time, they would be reunited with family members. Sometimes, like I said, they hadn't seen them in 20 years. There were specific occasions like that.

□ 1815

And it is an amazing thing to watch. I was there for a week, really was blessed to help out with a number of different things.

But some of the West Africans wanted to meet with me before I left. They knew I was in Congress. Some of them were a little perplexed to see a Member of Congress. They were told he was a Member of Congress, but he is back there washing dishes in the kitchen.

But my late mother once said: I am not going to have you bunch of boys grow up and not be able to cook and wash dishes. So she made sure we could, and we can.

But we had the meeting with the West Africans there. They were Christians. And the oldest, senior citizen, hardworking man, after we had a really nice visit, he concluded, in essence, by saying: We were so thrilled when you elected your first Black President—his words—but since then, we have seen America getting weaker. It appears you are getting weaker and weaker.

And the weaker it appears America gets, the more we suffer. Please, please, go back to Washington and tell your friends there stop getting weaker, because we know where we go when we die, but our only chance of having peace in this world is if America is strong.

I don't try to shove my religious beliefs on others, but it is part of who I am, just as it was with most of our Founding Fathers and those that went before us. But we were founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs. If you go look at one of the most important documents that established our independence—yes, the Declaration of Independence is critical. We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights.

But the Treaty of Paris, 1783, that was after the Revolutionary War, after the war had been won, but the Americans weren't sure that Britain wasn't going to come back. They had the most powerful navy, the most powerful army. What is to say they wouldn't come back?

So it was critical that a document be signed, and something put in that document that was so important, that would be such an oath that the leaders of Great Britain would not dare break that oath, that they truly would recognize the United States as being independent and free of Great Britain.

I didn't know until I got to Congress—I mean, I read history books. I read biographies. I love to learn more all the time. But I was struck when our pastor, David Dykes, his wife, Cindy, were up here and they wanted to go on a tour of the State Department. I had never been through a tour of the State Department.

I went with them and, lo and behold, there was an original copy of the Treaty of Paris, the actual treaty. We were told it was an original copy. And I was surprised at the huge, big, bold letters that started the document because that document, if that is not signed, we are not free and independent, regardless of what the Declaration of Independence says. It means Britain is going to come in any time they get ready to. There had to be something so important put in that document so that when they signed it they wouldn't dare want to break it.

The words that started the Treaty of Paris, 1783, were: "In the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity." That is a Christian belief. That was so important and held with such reverence that neither side would want to break an oath under the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.

Mr. Speaker, for those that don't know—I know you do—but that means the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. That is how the Treaty of Paris started that established not just our hopes and aspirations and principles as the Declaration of Independence did, this was the treaty that gave us the independence.

So, yes, we got back into a fight with Great Britain in 1812, the War of 1812. 1814, part of that war, this building was burned and, apparently, if it had not been for a massive thunderstorm or rainstorm that night, this would have gone the way—this actual wing didn't come into existence for about 40 years, 44 years or so, but the reason we didn't get a big ruin up here on what was once called Jenkins Hill was because the rainstorm put out the fire. The roof was badly damaged. And even though sandstone, marble granite doesn't burn, necessarily, in the presence of extreme heat you get cracks and it falls. We didn't get a big ruin because of the rainstorm.

Some thought maybe we ought to move the Capitol back to Philadelphia or New York, but others felt that what was here was preserved for a reason, so it was built back. It is part of our founding.

And what we have seen in the last 6 years as this noble effort by our President wanting to bring peace throughout the world by showing how nice we were, by showing that we meant them no harm, we would be glad to meet with them, to sit down, we will give them offices, we will give them things, we will let murderers go from prison, and those type things will show our enemies how really decent and good we are, and so they will want to be our friends and will not want to be at war with us—the only problem is that may work in some common core-type thing taught in school, but it is not in touch with reality because there is evil in this world, and that evil has been most recently manifested repeatedly in radical Islamic jihadist actions. And there is no way around it. The more the people in this administration refuse to rise up and call evil what it is, the more the evil rises up.

Last June, I was asked to go to Nigeria and meet with 23 of the mothers of daughters who were kidnapped by Boko Haram, a radical Islamic group. And I hope and pray more around this town, especially down the end of Pennsylvania Avenue, will begin to develop the courage and understanding that we are not going to bring peace to Christians and Jews throughout the world, and we are not going to bring peace to moderate Muslims who want to stand up to radical Islamists, but they know they go to the top of the death chart. But we have got to have people in the executive branch understand this is evil, and it is done in the name of Islam, and it is radical, and it is what they believe is jihad.

Yes, it is their religion. It is not the religion of moderate Muslims, but to them it is their religion. It is their religion. It is their politics. It is their world view. And under their world view, you don't have freedom of expression. Ultimately, shari'a law will prevail, and either they must wipe you out

and kill you as dogs, or some of the more moderate of the radicals will allow you to pay a tax, admit that you are subservient to the Islamists, and they may let you live in peace, unless they feel that they are being led by some religious fanatic to do otherwise.

Things around the world have gotten worse for Christians and Jews because we had an administration, as noble and idealistic as it wanted to be—as wonderful as it would be if you could just say, “We want to be at peace and we will turn the other cheek,” that is not for a government to do, even a Christian-based government, as this one started and was for most of this country’s existence.

For Christians, there is an obligation to follow the beatitudes, the teachings of Christ. But, Mr. Speaker, some get confused and think that is the government’s role, that if its people get killed, well, if we just say, “Oh, that was probably our fault; we deserved it,” then it will stop. It does not. It gets worse.

People need to begin to understand what is going on in this world. There is evil, and people are being killed and tortured and women and young girls raped and their lives stolen from them, Christians and Jews being persecuted in greater numbers than any time in the world’s existence—not a greater percentage but greater numbers.

I met with many Nigerians who have been adversely affected by this radical Islamist—yes, radical Islamist—group, Boko Haram. And make no mistake, I am not advocating for sending troops into Nigeria. That would be a huge mistake, in my opinion. But we can help them. They need intelligence. We might use a drone and drop a bomb. That might help save many Christians from the horrors they are experiencing. We could work with the southern, with part of the Nigerian Government, at least, to help save those people.

I mentioned before, I asked—these were all Christians. I asked did they attack this girls’ school, because I know they don’t believe girls should be educated. And they said no, they don’t believe girls should be educated, but they attacked the school because they knew it was a Christian school.

And usually when they attack a school, if there are boys, they kill the boys, and then they take the girls and sell them into sex slavery. And in the case of these innocent children, these girls, they took them captive. They raped them repeatedly. They abused them severely. They demanded that they convert from Christianity to Islam.

But I asked the Christian pastor—and we were a couple of hours outside of town, where I had to go without the State Department or other people that would not have wanted me to put myself in that situation, but getting out to the remote location, secret location,

where these survivors were. I said to the pastor: Where are the fathers? And he said: That is another part of the tragedy. They know that girls are being raped, sexually abused, abused in so many ways. They left their homes and they went into the bush because they are the fathers. They were supposed to protect their children, and they feel guilty, and they don’t believe they deserve to be in a bed or a home while their daughters are being abused like they are.

□ 1830

That is a real human tragedy.

Then we hear not of just some violent action in Paris, France—it was a terrorist action, committed by radical Islamic jihadists who are being taught, so many of them, as tiny children growing up, to hate the West, to hate Western civilization, to hate America, that it is a good thing to kill innocent Americans, and that somehow, in their weird religious belief—in this evil—they benefit by killing and harming what are really innocent people.

This is a story from CNS News, on January 8, by Curtis Kalin:

In the wake of the terrorist attack on the offices of French satirist paper *Charlie Hebdo*, one Muslim cleric justified the murders under Islamic law.

Mr. Speaker, for those who don’t understand, when they say they are justifying this under Islamic law, it means, to them, it is their religion. Yes, it is their religion:

USA Today published a column by avowed “radical Muslim cleric” Anjem Choudary. The piece, titled “People know the consequences,” asks why France would allow the paper to mock Islam, and further excuses the systematic murders as justified under Islamic law.

Then it quotes him:

“Muslims consider the honor of the Prophet Muhammad to be dearer to them than that of their parents or even themselves. To defend it is considered to be an obligation upon them. The strict punishment, if found guilty of this crime under sharia law, is capital punishment implementable by an Islamic State. This is because the Messenger Muhammad said, ‘Whoever insults a prophet, kill him.’”

See, for those who don’t understand, those are people who are saying, “This is our religion; it is our state; it is our lives,” and until the people leading this administration understand that, it is going to get worse.

I do believe what is in the Bible: that to whom much is given, of them much will be required.

We have been put here in America in such a place and time that if we stand strong, we don’t have to send American troops, who then end up being seen as occupiers, but we can help. We can give them intelligence, and we can give them the ability as we did in Africa. Within about 4 or 5 months, and with fewer than 500 American special ops people and intelligence, they defeated

the Taliban by February of 2002. Then we became occupiers and added tens of thousands of troops and ended up, eventually, with over 100,000 in this administration. Occupiers don’t do well in that part of the world. If we tried to be occupiers in Nigeria, we wouldn’t do very well, but we can help with information and if we get weapons in the right hands.

I am not talking about sending weapons to the Free Syrian Army, which is working frequently with the Islamic State. I am talking about putting them in the hands of people who are our friends. Send them directly to those we can be sure are our friends in Nigeria. Send them to Erbil, where I was 2 or 3 weeks ago, in northern Iraq with the Kurds. They didn’t throw down their weapons. They didn’t hand them over to the Islamic State. They stood and fought. They are still standing and fighting. They helped clear an avenue to free some people who were trapped on a mountain while I was there.

My dear friend, DANA ROHRBACHER, set the trip up. He and I have traveled to so many places. My friend STEVE KING was there, and GREGORY MEEKS was there—a good man. We also were in Kabul in Afghanistan. There is hope there. We have got to be smart about the way that we help, but it does not help when we can’t even recognize the enemy.

I warned about one of the Homeland Security advisers—top advisers—for a number of years. Finally, after all of this time—back, I believe it was, in August, he tweeted about the Islamic State’s beheading and killing people. This adviser—top adviser—in the Obama administration tweeted out, Hey, the Islamic caliphate is inevitable, so just relax—words to that effect. Finally, that was enough. They let him resign and not renew his term again. Thank goodness.

I have been talking with people in Nigeria and emailing, and I have great hopes for the girls I have met with, these young girls, that they are going to come out of it. They are still traumatized. The families are still traumatized. The girls have not been released, and it doesn’t appear that this administration has done anything to really help. As I was communicating with African friends in Nigeria, we got word of this story, this one from NBC News:

More than 2,000 people are unaccounted for after radical Islamist sect Boko Haram torched more than 10 towns and villages in Nigeria, a local lawmaker told NBC News. Ahmed Zanna, a senator for Borno state, where the attack happened, said the militants razed the town of Baga as well as “10 to 20” other communities in the country’s rural northeast over the past 5 days. “These towns are just gone, burned down. The whole area is covered in bodies.”

Look, I know that there are people in this administration, including our President, who think you can win over evil by just being nice to it—offering to

buy offices in Qatar, offering to release the evil forces—murderers—from captivity, and that such wonderful, gallant gestures will turn the tide. Individuals can, but governments are supposed to protect the people. It is causing this weakness to grow, which allows evil to grow around the world. There is a vacuum being filled as we have lost our leadership role around the world, and it is being filled with evil religious nastiness called “radical Islam.”

As this administration continues to act as if it is not a religion and as if we can win them over with kindness, more people die. Now they are saying maybe 2,000 Nigerians have died today. So I couldn’t help but reflect back to my senior citizen friend in Togo and his words, his imploring: “Stop getting weaker. When America gets weaker, we suffer.”

How much suffering is this administration going to allow before it wakes up to the reality of what radical Islam is?

Until such time, this Congress needs to stand up and say we are not going to keep supplying weapons to radical Islamists who are working with the Islamic State in Syria. We will help our friends, like the Kurds. We are not going to keep supplying weapons to people who may have them end up with the Taliban. We are going to help our friends like we did with the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan. It is time to wake up to the reality of evil that this radical Islam is because, until this administration does, it is going to get worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O’ROURKE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 9, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

6. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Medical Device Clas-

sification Procedures; Reclassification Petition: Content and Form; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-1529] received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Filing of Form 5472 [TD 9707] (RIN: 1545-BM08) received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 204. A bill to continue restrictions against and prohibit diplomatic recognition of the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 205. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from granting a work authorization to an alien found to have been unlawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 206. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to carry out memoranda issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 207. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 208. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to make loans to certain businesses, homeowners, and renters affected by Superstorm Sandy; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 209. A bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South

Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JONES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution’s employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 211. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to authorize assignment to States of Federal agency environmental review responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 212. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of cyanotoxins in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. LABRADOR, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 213. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 215. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to clarify the treatment of administrative expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs during sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 216. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mrs.

BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BENISHK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MICA, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr.

GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BARR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. YODER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. FOXX, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BUCHSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.R. 217. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 218. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 219. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 220. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 221. A bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 222. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financial support for certain high carbon intensity energy projects; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOYCE (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. REED, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 223. A bill to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 224. A bill to require the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to submit to Congress an annual report on the effects of gun violence on public health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 225. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to remove the exclusion

of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product in order to permit the issuance of safety standards for such articles by the Consumer Product Safety Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 226. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or other disposition of a firearm to, and the possession, shipment, transportation, or receipt of a firearm by, certain classes of high-risk individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 227. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for certain immigration-related policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself and Mr. VISLOSKY):

H.R. 228. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 229. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a biometric exit data system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POSEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 230. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to authorize the Central Everglades Planning Project, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 231. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to deauthorize the Ten Mile Creek Water Preserve Area Critical Restoration Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 233. A bill to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 234. A bill to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Homeland Security, for

a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding outreach to families of members of the Armed Forces who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan, and in other conflicts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H. Res. 23. A resolution congratulating the San Antonio Spurs for winning the 2014 National Basketball Association (NBA) League Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: To Establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have power "to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to "lay and collect

Taxes” and “provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .” The bill will exempt certain educational institutions from taxes imposed by public Law 111-148, as amended. Congress has the power to repeal such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that “Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .” (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 18—“The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—“The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; whereby the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Furthermore, this bill makes specific changes to existing law, in accordance with the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, which states that “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 18—“The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JOYCE:

H.R. 223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1 (“The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States[.]”); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (“The Congress Shall have the Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for foregoing powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”). The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is operated using tax dollars, and serves the function of promoting and advancing the nation’s public health. Legislation requiring the office to submit an

annual report on the impact of gun violence on the nation’s public health is a “necessary and proper” means of focusing the office’s attention, and ensuring all future public health legislation is well informed and effective.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 (“The Congress has the Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes[.]”). The sale, transfer, and manufacturing of firearms crosses state lines, and is therefore a component of interstate commerce—making firearm safety regulations a valid regulation of interstate commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 (“The Congress has the Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes[.]”). The sale, transfer, and possession of firearms crosses state lines, and is therefore a component of interstate commerce—making regulations limiting who can sell, transfer, or possess a firearm a valid regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 provides Congress the power to “establish a uniform rule of naturalization.”

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce clause.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BOST, Mr. DENT, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 24: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SANFORD, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 27: Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BOST, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 29: Mr. OLSON and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 30: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MICA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 37: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 44: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 86: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 90: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 109: Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 122: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 125: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 132: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JONES, Mr. AMASH, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 154: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 160: Ms. SPEIER and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 161: Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 167: Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TIPPON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COOK, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 173: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 176: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 177: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 178: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 187: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 189: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 191: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MICA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 197: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 203: Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. PITTINGER.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 11: Mr. BYRNE.

H. Res. 12: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COOK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LANCE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SIREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. KUSTER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE JANUARY 8, 2011 TUCSON SHOOT- ING

HON. MARTHA MCSALLY

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, four years ago, our community was shaken to its core by an act of senseless violence that took the lives of six of our own and wounded thirteen others. They were our friends, neighbors, and loved ones. Our community still carries the enduring pain of their loss but also the bright recollection of their lives and memories.

We remember the victims and what they came to do that day: speak with their elected representative. We remember the selfless acts of bravery and love by those who put themselves in harm's way, even giving their own lives to save others. We remember how the city of Tucson came together, in grief and consolation, to move forward with a spirit of compassion and strength that was felt across the nation.

Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families and loved ones of those lost or wounded, who carry the pain of what happened on that quiet Saturday each and every day. We are inspired by their courage; made stronger by their strength.

Today, as the bells ring out from the University of Arizona and in the moments of silence that follow, our community, united and strong, proclaims with one voice: we will never forget those we lost.

Christina Taylor Green
Dorothy Morris
John Roll
Phyllis Schneck
Dorwan Stoddard
Gabriel "Gabe" Zimmerman

HONORING DYLAN LEE WISDOM

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dylan Lee Wisdom. Dylan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1900, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Dylan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Dylan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Dylan

has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Dylan Lee Wisdom for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

FATHER LOUIS LOHAN

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Father Louis Lohan upon the occasion of his retirement from active priesthood with the Diocese of Biloxi after 43 years of service.

Father Lohan, a native of Ireland, was ordained a priest in June of 1971 and traveled to the United States in August of the same year to join the Catholic Diocese of Biloxi.

A man of unwavering faith and commitment to serve, Father Lohan was appointed as Pastor at St. Thomas the Apostle Catholic Church in Long Beach, Mississippi, where he has served for the last 21 years.

While appointed as Pastor, Father Lohan was influential in the restoration efforts of the church, office complex, community center, and elementary school after the devastation of Hurricane Katrina destroyed them all.

Prior to his tenure in Long Beach, Father Lohan served at other churches along the Gulf Coast as well as overseas in Saltillo, Mexico.

His humble spirit and encouraging demeanor has been an asset, not only to his parishioners, but to the community as a whole.

I would like to send Father Louis Lohan my congratulations on the legacy he has left. He has touched the lives of thousands, and he will never be forgotten.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,097,814,959,110.13. We've added \$7,470,937,910,197.05 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN HONOR OF 21ST CENTURY SAFEHOUSE PROGRAM

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 21st Century Educational Safehouse Program for providing high-quality, innovative programming for the at-risk youth in Lexington, Kentucky since 2010.

The 21st Century Educational Safehouse Program is an after-school program, coordinated by The Martin Luther King Academy, within the Fayette County Public School System, that provides a safe, drug-free environment for the most vulnerable youth in Fayette County. The program serves all middle and high school students in the district at three community based program sites. It also includes at-risk students from private, parochial, and homeschools located in Fayette County.

To date, the 21st Century Educational Safehouse has served nearly 3,000 students. Students are recommended for the program by their school's Youth Service Center, Social Worker, Counselor, and/or community partner. The program's curriculum focuses on a variety of issues including, tutoring, mentoring, educational enrichment, STEM, college/career preparation, and the arts. Students show remarkable improvement in the areas of behavior, character, and academic ability at the conclusion of the year-long program. Our community benefits greatly from the program's passion for pro-actively educating the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the 21st Century Educational Safehouse Program's dedication to ensuring a brighter future for the at-risk youth in Fayette County. This program's positive impact on our community and our Commonwealth is far-reaching and I commend them for their honorable mission.

HONORING MS. BETTY BERRY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Ms. Betty Berry. Ms. Berry was a beloved mother, daughter, and friend. With her passing on October 26, we look to Ms. Berry's personal legacy of leadership, service, and the outstanding quality of her life's work.

Born on December 21, 1932, Ms. Berry dedicated her life to community service and activism in the city of Oakland, California. She received numerous accolades for her leadership and service to the community.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

A longtime friend of Ronald V. Dellums, she led fundraising efforts that helped him get elected to the United States House of Representatives numerous times and was a staunch supporter of him during his time as Mayor of Oakland.

For all of her work supporting organization dedicated to equality, Ms. Berry was known as the consummate fundraiser. She was famous for her annual "100 Men Cooking for a Taste of Freedom" event, which raised money for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the United Negro College Fund (UNCF).

Additionally, she was a staunch advocate for workers represented by the National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMC) and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

On a personal note, Betty was a dear friend for many years. She supported all of my efforts for elected office and constantly encouraged me. This community will miss Betty's physical presence but will always cherish wonderful memories and the results of her hard work.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual, Ms. Betty Berry. Her dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the state of California. I join all of Betty's loved ones in celebrating her incredible life. She will be deeply missed.

HONORING ANDREW JOHN
STOCKMAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew John Stockman. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 394, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew John Stockman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HEALTH SPENDING RISES ONLY
MODESTLY

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article.

[From the New York Times]

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON.—Spending on health care in the United States grew in 2013 at the lowest rate since the federal government began tracking it in 1960, the Obama administration said Wednesday.

It was the fifth straight year of exceptionally small increases in the closely watched indicator. The data defied critics who had said such slow growth would not continue for long once the recession ended in mid-2009.

Health spending totaled \$2.9 trillion last year, up 3.6 percent from 2012, the administration said. The share of the economy devoted to health care, which appeared to be growing inexorably for decades, has been the same since 2009.

"The 3.6 percent increase in 2013 is the lowest increase on record in the national health expenditures going back to 1960," said Micah B. Hartman, a statistician at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and lead author of the report, published in the journal Health Affairs. "The next lowest increase was 3.8 percent in 2009. These rates are within the range of the recent low rates of growth in health care spending, between 3.6 and 4.1 percent from 2009 to 2013."

Spending for health care in 2013 averaged \$9,255 a person, government economists and statisticians reported. Health spending grew at about the same pace as the economy and accounted for 17.4 percent of the gross domestic product, which reflects the total output of goods and services.

Among factors restraining the growth of health spending, the administration pointed to new limits on Medicare payments to hospitals and health maintenance organizations; automatic across-the-board cuts in federal spending required by a 2011 law; and the proliferation of high-deductible health insurance plans, which tend to discourage the use of care by requiring consumers to pay more of the cost.

Faster growth in Medicaid spending offset some of the slow-down in spending by Medicare and private insurance in 2013, officials said. The 2013 figures did not show the effects of major expansions in coverage that took effect this year.

Moreover, the data did not answer a question hotly debated by health policy experts and economists: whether the recent slow-down in health spending was attributable to aftereffects of the recession or to cost-control features of the Affordable Care Act, signed by President Obama in 2010. The civil servants who wrote the report said some provisions of the law "exerted downward pressure" on health spending while others "exerted upward pressure."

"The key question is whether health spending growth will accelerate once economic conditions improve significantly," the report said. "Historical evidence suggests that it will."

Marilyn B. Tavenner, the administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, said the report was "another piece of evidence that our efforts to reform the health care delivery system are working."

Retail sales of prescription drugs totaled \$271 billion last year, accounting for 9.3 percent of all health spending. This proportion has not increased substantially in recent years, but it results from two divergent trends: an increase in the use of high-cost specialty drugs and greater use of low-cost generic medicines.

"Higher prices for specialty drugs were due in part to expensive new medicines—in particular, those used to treat multiple sclerosis

and cancer—as well as more rapid price increases for existing specialty drugs," Mr. Hartman said. "Although specialty drugs accounted for less than 1 percent of prescriptions dispensed, they represented almost 28 percent of total pharmacy-related prescription drug spending in 2013."

At the same time, the report said, the share of prescriptions filled with generic drugs climbed to 80 percent in 2013, up from 73 percent in 2011.

Under the Affordable Care Act, federal and state officials review insurance rates to identify "unreasonable increases in premiums," and the government requires insurers to spend at least 80 percent of premium revenue on medical care and quality improvement activities. These provisions helped hold down health spending, the report said.

The government reported lower use of inpatient and outpatient hospital services in 2013, coinciding with requirements for patients to share more of the cost under some types of insurance.

For example, the report said, "the average patient cost-sharing charge per day increased 19.5 percent in 2013, while the average cost-sharing for an outpatient surgery episode increased by 10 percent."

Over all, the report said, medical prices increased just 1.3 percent in 2013, slightly less than prices in the general economy. Prices for doctors' services increased less than one-tenth of 1 percent, the smallest change since 2002, and prices for home health care services declined. While Medicare spending for doctors' services increased 2.5 percent last year, Medicaid payments to doctors increased 14.9 percent, mainly because of a temporary increase in payment rates for primary care doctors treating Medicaid beneficiaries.

Medicare, for older Americans and people with disabilities, and Medicaid, for low-income people, accounted for more than one-third of all health spending.

TRIBUTE TO COLUMBIA CHAPTER
OF MOLES

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the Columbia Chapter of Moles as they celebrate their 50th anniversary. The Moles is a national organization of professional women that strives to promote the civic and social welfare of its members. The Columbia Moles was sponsored for membership in the national body by the Charlotte, North Carolina Chapter and was chartered on January 16, 1965 as the 19th of what are currently 30 chapters.

Incorporated in 1950, The Moles seeks to distinguish itself from similar social and civic organizations by supporting its national and local projects without public solicitation or fundraising. The Moles' 30 chapters are located in 16 states and the District of Columbia. Each chapter meets monthly, and a National Conclave is held annually.

As energetic, talented, and productive women who meet regularly to engage in organized social activities and sisterly exchanges of ideas, they have demonstrated great vision and leadership for five decades. However, the true foundation of The Moles' success is its

enduring sisterhood which has been indelibly forged in mutual love and respect.

Their motto, "enjoy yourself, it's later than you think," reflects the primary purposes of The Moles: to individually and collectively enhance the social graces while pursuing educational opportunities and to enhance the civic welfare of its members.

Since 1965, The Columbia Chapter has fulfilled these purposes through its elegant social events for members and guests, including fellowship-filled monthly meetings and its renowned Labor Day Weekend retreats. The chapter also honors historic community leaders through the presentation of national Moles Resolutions and local recognition. The Columbia Chapter also makes annual contributions to numerous charitable and service organizations as part of the National Conclave.

The Moles currently sponsors two four-year scholarships to deserving students who are competitively selected. The first scholarship was established in 1968 following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and is appropriately named the Martin Luther King, Jr. Scholarship. In 2007, a second four-year scholarship was established and named The Moles Scholarship. It is a great honor that the Columbia Chapter's 2013 nominee, Mr. Lindsey Hallingquest, received the Martin Luther King, Jr. Scholarship. Lindsey, a Columbia, South Carolina native, is currently a sophomore at Duke University.

I am particular enamored with their creed, which was authored by Mole Madeline T. Peters: "There is a destiny that makes us sisters, None goes her way alone; all that we send into the lives of others, comes back into our own. Care not what our temples or our creeds; one thing holds firm and fast, that in our fateful heap of days and deeds, the soul of man is cast."

Mr. Speaker, The Moles have enriched the lives of many and continue to make outstanding contributions to our society in a wide range of fields. I ask that you and my colleagues join me in congratulating them on this major milestone.

HONORING ROYCE HICKMAN

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Royce Hickman, an outstanding individual who has been serving as President/CEO of the Bryan/College Station Chamber of Commerce since 1998.

Royce has held a number of high profile positions throughout his business career. He is a past member of the Executive Committee of the Texas Association of Business. In addition, he served on the Board of Directors and as Chairman of the Texas Chamber of Commerce Executives.

Just recently, Royce was presented with the 2014 Distinguished Service Award by the Texas Chamber of Commerce Executives. He was awarded this recognition for his leadership as chairman of the state organization. During his time as Chairman he led the organization towards its current thriving position.

Royce is a past Chairman of the Texas A&M Association of Former Students, a past president of the friends of the Sterling C. Evans library and in 2007 was presented with the International Excellence Award in the Community by Texas A&M University. He currently serves on the George Bush School of Government and Public Services Development Council, the Texas A&M Career Center Advisory Council and the Bush School Public Service Organization Advisory Board. He also serves on the local March of Dimes Board and on several committees at his Church.

Royce is a great asset to the Brazos Valley. His service to our community has helped it grow and prosper. He has shown tremendous dedication and willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty. Most importantly, he has been a committed husband to his wife, Mary, and a nurturing leader for his children and grandchildren.

Today we are thrilled to recognize and honor Royce Hickman's devotion, dedication and loyalty to our nation, our state, our community, and his family.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I ask everyone to continue to pray for our country and for our military men and women that protect it.

God bless the United States of America.

HONORING MELISSA JOANNE ROE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize a special member of my staff. After more than ten years of service, Melissa Joanne Roe will be leaving her post in my Kansas City District Office.

As a driven person and political leader in Jefferson City, Melissa began working in my District Office in 2004 and was immediately an important asset for my office. While with the office, she held many leadership roles and is ending her prominent career as my District Director. Melissa oversaw crucial issues such as transportation, river logistics and appropriations.

Melissa could be depended on to keep my offices running efficiently and represent me at meetings when I was away in Washington. Melissa has also been instrumental in helping the various towns in my district to grow and prosper through the dedication to the district. Through earmarks, she was able to successfully establish growing businesses, make roads safer and strengthen communities. Melissa was also tireless in making sure my offices worked together in serving the people of the Sixth Congressional District. Her outstanding work and immense knowledge is incomparable.

I have received many kind words from constituents praising the outstanding service Melissa has provided. Her professionalism and dedication to this office and my constituents was a great example of how government should work. She would often work nights and weekends, while time and again going beyond her job description, all without complaint. While I am losing a valuable member of my

team, I am excited for Melissa to begin the next chapter of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in thanking Melissa Joanne Roe for her many years of service to the people of the Sixth Congressional District. I know Melissa's colleagues, family and friends join with me in thanking her for her commitment to others and wishing her best of luck in all her endeavors and many years of success to come.

HONORING THE WORK OF BERT ISACKSON

HON. SUZAN K. DeIBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. DeIBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bert Isackson, who was recently nominated for the President's Lifetime Achievement Award, celebrating Americans who volunteer 4,000 or more hours of their time. Mr. Isackson was honored for his extraordinary work at the Blaine Food Bank in Blaine, Washington. Additionally, he received plaques from the City of Blaine and the Volunteer Center of Whatcom County, honoring his decades of work.

Mr. Isackson worked as a commercial fisherman until his retirement, but has continued volunteering at the food bank that he and his wife founded more than 40 years ago. Even though Mr. Isackson recently celebrated his 100th birthday on December 8, 2014, he still dedicates four days each week to preparing coffee for volunteers and organizing materials for pick-up and distribution.

The Blaine Food Bank serves between 375 and 400 families weekly, distributing 75,000 pounds of food each month. Mr. Isackson's commitment is an inspiration to the food bank's 25 volunteers and the community alike. At the time of the food bank's founding, Mr. Isackson was one of few community members who recognized the need for a food bank in the Blaine community. This award recognizes Mr. Isackson's invaluable contributions to the Blaine area, and I am grateful that he plans to continue his valuable work.

I want to congratulate Bert Isackson on his well-deserved recognition, and I thank him for his tremendous commitment to the entire community of Whatcom County.

IN RECOGNITION OF H&H RESTAURANT IN MACON, GEORGIA

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize H&H Soul Food at 807 Forsyth Street in Macon, Georgia. The popular Southern restaurant has been named the "most iconic restaurant in Georgia" by Thrillist.com, a website that specializes in food, beverage, and entertainment.

In order to earn this honorable designation, a restaurant must have been in existence for

at least 30 years, and yet still maintain its popularity among its clients. In other words, title winners not only survive the test of time, but they do so while remaining an "icon" in the community. H&H effectively does both.

The restaurant traces its roots all the way back to the civil rights era, when owners Inez Hill and Louise Hudson, known affectionately as Mama Hill and Mama Louise, first opened the doors in 1959. They have been serving Southern classics ever since, with crowd pleasers such as fried chicken, peach cobbler, and of course, sweet tea.

Historically, the eatery was frequented by prominent musical figures such as The Allman Brothers Band, Wet Willie, and the Molly Hatchet Band. Legend has it that The Allman Brothers Band in their early years did not have enough money to pay for the food but Mama Louise took care of them anyway. She continued to serve other Southern musicians over the years and the restaurant also became a common meeting place for influential civil rights activists, including members and officers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Adding to its list of modern celebrities and change-makers, H&H even welcomed a visit from Oprah Winfrey in 2007.

Co-Founder Inez Hill passed away that very same year, and the restaurant suffered a brief closing at the end of 2013. Nevertheless, H&H overcame adversity and recovered successfully from financial difficulty with the assistance of Macon's Moonhanger Group. The restaurant is thriving again today and continues to welcome its regular patrons as well as new guests from all over. H&H's enduring imprint on Macon's landscape bears tribute to its lasting influence and historic renown in the hearts of the people of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the iconic H&H restaurant in Macon, Georgia for its rich history, its perseverance, and its dedication to serving the community the most delicious soul food around.

ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO
H.R. 30

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letters.

JANUARY 7, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the three million members of the National Education Association, and the students they serve, we urge you to vote NO on the Save American Workers Act of 2015 (H.R. 30), scheduled for a floor vote this week. Votes associated with this issue may be included in NEA's Report Card for the 114th Congress.

We oppose the bill because we believe it would create a disincentive for employers to provide health care coverage, negatively impacting employer-sponsored health insurance and harming families, children and educators who need coverage.

We believe that the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) shared responsibility for employers, sometimes referred to as the employer pen-

alty, supports the overall goal of expanding quality, affordable coverage to all Americans.

We are concerned that this bill's changes to the ACA's definition of what constitutes full-time employment from "on average at least 30 hours of service per week" monthly to an average of 40 hours per week monthly would adversely affect overall employer-sponsored health coverage. That change would make a shift towards part-time employment much more likely. Employers could respond by cutting employees' hours to under an average of 40 per week to avoid possible shared responsibility penalties and could eliminate coverage for these employees without fear of penalties.

The result of a cut in employee hours would be substantially less employer-sponsored health coverage—and as a result, a potentially large increase in federal spending for the premium tax credits that many low- and moderate-income people will receive under health reform to help them buy coverage through a health insurance marketplace (exchange). Employers and employees would also face a complex new administrative burden as they tried to determine which employees paid on a salaried basis fell above or below the 40-hour mark; salaried school employees' exact hours of service are generally not counted the same way as hourly employees' hours, but tallying their in-school and out-of-school hours would suddenly become issues of concern to employers interested in avoiding penalties.

Additionally if employment-based coverage is reduced, an even greater number of low-income individuals and their families in the 23 states that have failed to expand Medicaid would be unable to afford to buy health coverage. In those states, childless adults whose incomes fall below 100 percent of the federal poverty line would not only be denied access to Medicaid coverage, but they would be ineligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions through a health insurance marketplace. Moving the full-time definition from 30 hours to 40 hours, as this bill does, would only expand the number of people hurt by this coverage gap.

We believe H.R. 30 misses the mark by substituting "40 hours" for "30 hours" because it would do nothing to stop employers' misuse of the ACA's employer penalty provisions as a justification for cutting employees' hours of service and health coverage. Experience with this portion of the ACA shows that one of the biggest implementation challenges in the education sector consists of making sure that employers and other health plan sponsors fully understand the law's provisions related to shared responsibility for employers. For years, we have engaged with the Department of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service to ensure that regulations on shared responsibility for employers work consistently well in the education sector, and believe regulators have taken important steps in this direction.

The changes contemplated in this bill, however, would simply shift the hours-related context in which these common errors take place:

Mistakenly believing that the only way to avoid employer penalties is to cut employees' hours to under 30 a week or to under six hours a day. In fact, school calendars include so many unpaid days during the school year—for spring break, winter break, federal holidays, and other such times—that hourly employees can normally work more than 6 hours a day without ever being considered a full-time employee.

Misunderstanding how and when to use proposed regulations related to an optional hours-counting method called the look-back measurement method. It's unfortunate that some school employers wrongly blame the look-back measurement method for limiting their hours-counting options when regulations recognize four different ways that employers can calculate whether an employee is a full-timer or not.

Overestimating the potential cost of complying with the law's provisions on shared responsibility for employers. Regulations include many ways that employers can minimize or even avoid penalties, but some employers fail to factor these options into their analyses, so they exaggerate and often incorrectly state the potential for penalties.

Failing to incorporate into their decision-making the statutory and regulatory provisions that ensure that this part of the ACA establishes the possibility of a penalty on large employers rather than an "employer mandate." Just like before the ACA became law, there is no federal law that requires employers to offer coverage to employees. Many large employers will not face penalties at all, or will face smaller penalties than they initially thought.

These and other ACA-implementation errors can lead to exaggerated responses that hurt students, workers, and families alike. Unfortunately, H.R. 30 would just shift the hours-related focal point for such errors.

Employers who take the time to understand the law and regulations as they currently stand can develop common sense, constructive, and consensual approaches to properly implementing the law. Again, we urge you to vote NO on Save American Workers Act of 2015.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,
Director of Government Relations.

SAVE HEALTH CARE FOR WORKING FAMILIES—
OPPOSE H.R. 30

The Communications Workers of America (CWA) opposes H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act and urge you to vote against it. We believe the Act will make middle-class workers worse off by decreasing access to employer-sponsored health insurance.

Recent analysis by the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation confirms our expectations. CBO and JCT estimate that the number of people who currently receive employment-based health care coverage will be reduced by 1 million as a result of this bill. An estimated 500,000 to 1 million workers and their dependents will be pushed by employers onto Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), or subsidized coverage through the health insurance exchanges. Up to 500,000 will be left without coverage at all.

By pushing workers and their dependents from employer-sponsored plans to federal health programs, this Act will increase the federal budget deficit. The CBO estimates an increase to the budget deficit of \$53.2 billion over ten years as a result in the change in definition of full-time hours as proposed in the Act. That includes \$21.4 billion in new spending for exchange subsidies and outlays for Medicaid and CHIP.

The CBO and JCT assume that employers will increase wages in exchange for eliminating health coverage, but our experience at the bargaining table contradicts this theory. In this continually weak labor market, employers have sought every opportunity to cut benefits and block wage increases. The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities

found that changing the full-time hour definition to 40-hours would make 44% of US workers vulnerable to a reduction in hours. We believe these workers would not receive a commensurate increase in wages.

We believe Congress should help American workers and their families improve their standard of living. H.R. 30 will undermine that goal by reducing paid work hours and cutting health coverage.

The Communications Workers of America urges you to vote no on H.R. 30.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015, I missed recorded votes #1–7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted no (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted no (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted yes (Motion to Commit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted no (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 22—Hire More Heroes Act of 2015).

THE TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015 (H.R. 26) AND SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2015 (H.R. 30)

HON. TOM PRICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House voted on the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, H.R. 26, and today, the House will consider the Save American Worker's Act of 2015, H.R. 30.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 amends the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 to extend the Terrorism Insurance Program through December 31, 2020, and revises certain requirements of the program. It also establishes the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (NARAB), which will have the authority to license insurance agents and brokers to operate in multiple states. The House passed this bill on December 10, 2014, by a vote of 417–7. However, because the Senate did not act on the House passed bill before the end of the 113th Congress, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program expired on December 31, 2014.

The Save American Workers Act of 2015 changes the definition of “full time employee”

as applied to the Affordable Care Act's (Obamacare) employer mandate. This will prevent small businesses from reducing employee hours solely because they cannot afford to comply with the Obamacare mandate. The House passed this bill on September 16, 2014, by a vote of 320–102.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 increases direct spending in the budget year as well as over the ten-year budget window, bringing the Committee on Financial Services over its 302(a) allocation in the first year and over ten years, violating section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA). Additionally, the bill violates the House's “Cut As You Go” rule (Rule XXI, clause 10) by increasing direct spending over the relevant enforcement time periods, without being offset by direct spending cuts of equal or greater value.

The spending increases in this bill are fully offset through a surcharge on commercial property and casualty policyholders and NARAB fees, and the bill as a whole provides deficit reduction over the relevant enforcement time periods. As a result, I did not oppose a waiver of section 302(f) of the CBA and the “Cut As You Go” rule for consideration of this bill on this occasion.

The Save American Workers Act of 2015 also increases direct spending in the budget year and over the ten-year budget window, violating section 302(f) of the CBA and the House's “Cut As You Go” rule (Rule XXI, clause 10). The bill also reduces revenues over the ten-year budget window, violating section 311 of the CBA. Because the revenue loss results from a repeal of Obamacare tax increases, and the bill increases cash wages and opportunities for workers, I support granting a waiver of sections 302(f) and 311 of the CBA and the “Cut as You Go” rule for consideration of this bill on this occasion.

However, my lack of opposition to these waivers should not be interpreted as a willingness to support similar waivers in the future. Budget enforcement is among my top priorities for the 114th Congress. As we move into the 114th Congress and begin drafting new legislation, it is my intention to ensure compliance with the CBA and House Rules as they apply to budget enforcement and the budget resolution in effect at the time of enforcement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 6th, 2015, I was unavoidably detained due to ongoing issues surrounding the health of my youngest daughter in Minnesota.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #2, I would have expressed my support for Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI of California to be Speaker of the House.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #3, I would have voted Nay.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #4, I would have voted Nay.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #5, I would have voted Yay.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #6 (On Agreeing to the Resolution), I would have voted Nay. I have strong objections to the Rules adopted by the House for the 114th Congress.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #7, I would have voted Yay.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #8, I would have voted Yay.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #9, I would have voted Yay.

Had I been present and voting on Roll Call #10, I would have voted Yay.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF KENNETH WESLEY JONES AND SUSAN DIANE YOUNG JONES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special occasion—the 40th wedding anniversary of Kenneth Wesley Jones and Susan Diane Young Jones.

Ken was born on September 6th and Susan was born on November 15th, both in 1955. The two met while attending Oxford High School. Mr. Jones was 18 years old and Mrs. Jones was 17 years old when they started dating. After eight months together, they got engaged on April 4th, 1974 and were married eight months later at Coldwater United Methodist Church at three o'clock in the afternoon on December 7th, 1974.

Ken was an athlete in high school and played basketball, baseball, football and was a member of the wrestling team. He even earned a scholarship to play baseball. Susan was involved in fashion and design and was Miss Oxford. She also earned a scholarship for fashion design. Susan owned a clothing boutique and made clothes. Instead of going to college, the couple decided to stay in Oxford, Alabama, so they could begin their love story.

The Jones are blessed with two children and four grandchildren: John Wesley (Wes) Jones who was born on April 4th, 1980 and Kasi Louise Jones who was born on March 16th, 1982. Wes is married to Amanda Mullinax Jones and they have twin daughters Kayleigh and Kensley. Kasi is married to Samuel Duke Brown and they also have twins, Talon and Sophia.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating this lovely couple on 40 years together.

HONORING THE COURAGEOUS SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF STAFF SERGEANT MATTHEW R. AMMERMAN

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute of a true American hero,

Staff Sergeant Matthew R. Ammerman. Tragically, on December 3, 2014, Sergeant Ammerman was killed when his unit came under fire in the Zabul province of Afghanistan. I, along with people from across the United States, stand in eternal gratitude for the dedication, service and sacrifice of this young man.

A native of Noblesville, Indiana, Ammerman joined the Army in July 2004. He was deployed in 2006 to Iraq, where he served for 14 months. In 2009, he served as an assistant gunner, fire team leader and squad leader in Afghanistan. In 2012, he volunteered for the Special Forces and graduated in 2013 as a Special Forces Communications Sergeant. Sergeant Ammerman again answered the call of duty in late 2014 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

His many awards are a testament to the exceptional character of this incredibly talented and immensely brave young man. His accomplishments include the Army Commendation Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, the Global War on Terror Service Medal, the Non-Commissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon and the NATO Medal. He also received the Special Forces Tab, the Ranger Tab, the Combat Infantryman Badge, the Expert Infantryman Badge, the Parachutist Badge, and the Driver and Mechanic Badge.

Staff Sergeant Matthew Ammerman will forever be remembered as a man willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice to defend the freedoms that we so cherish. Staff Sergeant Ammerman is survived by his wife, Emily Ammerman, his aunt and uncle, Dave and Dorothy Francis, and brothers, Kevin and Anthony Ammerman. I join all Americans in praying for their comfort in this time of grief and the safe return of all those continuing to protect the United States abroad.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON 35—
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH 34

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they were down 31–6 as the fourth quarter began. A lead that they surely couldn't overcome.

But, they never wavered.

Down 34–13 with six minutes left.

But still, they never wavered.

The University of Houston football team, my alma-mater, displayed a calm confidence during their gutsy, 25-point comeback on the afternoon of January 2nd in the Armed Forces Bowl.

To pull off the unthinkable, the Cougars had to recover back-to-back onside kicks—a feat that is almost never accomplished—and score multiple touchdowns in the closing minutes.

They capped off the comeback with a miraculous two-point conversion that gave them a one point victory.

Head Coach David Gibbs instilled in his team that day a will to fight to the end, no matter the odds, score, or deficit.

The Cougars pulled off the largest comeback of the college football season that day, and held true to the words of the late great Vince Lombardi, who said “Winners never quit and quitters never win.”

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING LUCIAN HENRY FRYE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lucian Henry Frye. Lucian was not only a well-respected resident of Indiana's 6th Congressional District, but the father of my good friend, State Representative Randy Frye.

Lucian was a devoted husband to his wife of 49 years, Marjorie. Together, they were the proud parents of six children, grandparents of 17 grandchildren, and great-grandparents of 17 great-grandchildren. Lucian was a devoted family man as well as a respected member of his community. As a retired over-the-road truck driver, he was a hard-worker who spent his free time at both New Point Christian Church and Metamora Lodge #156 F&AM.

It was once said that, “What was silent in the father speaks in the son, and often I found in the son the unveiled secret of the father.” I can personally attest to the admiration and respect that Randy had for his father, and it is abundantly clear in Randy that Lucian taught him the value of hard work and the importance of being a man of integrity, who is committed to faith and family. Randy serves as a pillar of leadership in our community and has made a profound impact on my life personally.

I am more than thankful for the friendship that I share with Lucian's son Randy as well as his wife Debbie. It is a privilege to honor the life of Lucian Henry Frye today.

TAR SANDS TAX LOOPHOLE ELIMINATION ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with twelve of my colleagues, I am reintroducing the Tar Sands Tax Loophole Elimination Act. This bill will ensure that oil companies can no longer sidestep paying their fair share into the dedicated trust fund created so that, in the event of an oil spill, there are resources immediately available for cleanup. If enacted, the legislation would generate approximately \$665 million over ten years.

The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, authorized in 1990, ensures we have funding available to pay for the immediate costs of cleaning up oil spills. It is funded by an eight cent per barrel excise tax on crude oil and petroleum products. In 2011, however, the Internal Revenue

Service (IRS) issued a misguided decision stating that oil derived from tar sands, the same type that will flow through the Keystone XL Pipeline if approved, is not considered crude oil and is therefore currently exempt from the tax that pays into the Fund.

In 2013, we imported approximately 925 million barrels of crude oil from Canada, with over 400 million of these barrels coming from tar sands and not subject to the tax that goes into the cleanup fund. This is a significant liability, without any investment being made for if and when there is a tar sands spill.

Oil that comes from tar sands is a thick, sticky form of crude oil that can be more difficult and costly to clean up than other types of crude. In 2010, for example, a pipeline owned and operated by a Canadian company, Enbridge, spilled more than 850,000 gallons of tar sands oil into a waterway that flows into the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. That has been one of the largest and costliest pipeline spills in American history, with the price tag now at \$1.2 billion dollars.

I do not support the development of tar sands—doing so is environmentally destructive and carbon-intensive. Moreover, we should not keep in place a loophole that lets big oil companies off the hook for cleaning up their tar sands spills.

The Tar Sands Tax Loophole Elimination Act would add oil derived from tar sands and oil shale to the definition of crude oil, closing the current loophole and ensuring that oil companies pay into the fund.

Oil companies already get billions of dollars in taxpayer-based subsidies, and this bill will ensure they will not be given an additional free ride on tar sands and any future oil shale development.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FLORIDA'S LGBT COMMUNITY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Florida's LGBT community in their fight against discrimination. In particular, I would like to commend their commitment to bringing marriage equality to the great State of Florida.

Following decades of advocacy and exhaustive legal battles, marriage equality finally became legal this week in Florida. At 12:01 a.m. on January 6, 2015, the Osceola County Courthouse opened its doors. I stood with Armando Ramirez, the county's Clerk of Courts, as he conducted the first same-sex marriage ceremony in Central Florida, which united County Commissioner Cheryl Grieb and her partner of 22 years, Patti Daugherty. At long last, the promise of marriage equality was fulfilled.

More than twenty couples participated in marriage ceremonies, before the courthouse doors closed at 2 a.m. These couples had at last achieved one of the greatest promises of this nation, the promise of equal protection under the law.

What this demonstrated is that the American Dream is not really about a house, a job, or a 401(k) plan. The American Dream is also about love, opportunity, and equality—the promise that each and every one of us has the right to love whomever we please, and the opportunity to have our love recognized equally by the law.

Thanks to the unrelenting efforts of Floridians fighting for marriage equality, same-sex couples in Florida finally had that opportunity. The marriages that began on January 6th at 12:01 a.m. could not have happened without the perseverance of these individuals.

To those Floridians who fought for this day, I say “congratulations” and “thank you.” Thank you for helping our State and our communities come one step closer to true equality. I am proud to have worked with you to achieve this goal. There is more work to be done, and I look forward to serving as your ally in the years ahead.

The Osceola County Commission and the Osceola County Clerk of Courts Armando Ramirez also deserve thanks for their efforts. When county clerks in Florida were advised that they would face arrest if they issued same-sex licenses, Commissioner Grieb and I called on State Attorney Jeff Ashton to promise that he would not prosecute clerks for doing so. Thankfully, he agreed. Following my letter urging the County Commission to ensure that same-sex marriages could take place in Osceola County immediately, the Commission and the Clerk worked together to issue licenses and conduct ceremonies as soon as legally possible.

I also want to acknowledge the Floridians who fought for marriage equality but never lived to see this dream become reality. For those who called for marriage equality when others said it was impossible; those who had the audacity to believe in equality when many could not; and those who paved the way for this historical achievement but never experienced it for themselves. This is their legacy. May their memory serve as an inspiration for the next generation of Floridians striving to achieve a more equal and just world.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to celebrate this enormous accomplishment and honor the Floridians who made this happen.

COMMENDATION OF DR. TIMOTHY SNYDER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise as co-chair of the Congressional Polish Caucus to announce that this week in Washington, at an historic ceremony to be held today at the Polish Embassy, Thursday, January 8, pre-eminent American scholar and historian Dr. Timothy Snyder will be awarded the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit of the Republic of Poland by Minister of Foreign Affairs Grzegorz Schetyna on behalf of the nation of Poland.

We in Ohio are celebrating this occasion because we know the global significance of Dr.

Snyder's work. His scholarship allows liberty's flag to fly higher. An Ohioan by birth, Dr. Snyder—now Bird White Housum Professor of History at Yale University—has been documenting the complicated, epic history of what he terms “The Bloodlands,” the 20th century history of Europe between Hitler and Stalin. With the opening of the Soviet archives after the fall of the Soviet Union, Dr. Snyder has led a team of incredible scholars from many nations in piecing together the complex, and often under reported history, of what happened to people in Europe before, during, and after World Wars I and II.

He places the historical and political complexities that led to World War II in a broad, contextual framework unparalleled by other efforts. He factually documents the suffering that innocent people from various nations endured in places that still today have seriously inadequate archival memory of what occurred. Dr. Snyder, in my opinion, is one of the most indefatigable and profound scholars of our time.

As author of the bill that created the World War II Memorial here in our nation's Capital—which has now been visited by over 42 million people—it is clear to me the American people through their own families understand the magnitude of what was at stake. But as Dr. Snyder rightly points out, “America's soldiers never reached far enough east.” He states, “American and British forces liberated German concentration camps such as Belsen and Dachau. But the western Allies liberated none of the important death facilities . . . the Red Army liberated Auschwitz, and it liberated the sites of Treblinka, Sobibor, Belzen, Chelmo. Majdanek. American and British forces reached none of the bloodlands and saw none of the major killing sites.” Even America was shielded from the bloody truth of tyranny's grip on the continent of Europe.

The people of Poland even more fully comprehend the betrayal and suffering that their Slavic ancestors endured in Poland and Sovietized Ukraine. The Jewish people of the world know too what happened there and why the struggle for Israel's existence continues to this day. The people of Belarus, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and adjoining nations know too. With the systematic ethnic slaughter that occurred, Dr. Snyder's masterful work pays homage to all victims, in the most complete and objective presentation I have read. Yet, still more scholarly work needs to occur.

This past August, the people of Poland commemorated the memory of the Warsaw Uprising. Those brave Poles honored at that national remembrance lived and died by the motto “Freedom Means Never Surrender.” Poland never surrendered. Her capital was levelled. And the martyrdom of Poles—fully twenty percent of the people of that nation—humbles us mortals who stand in awe of their valor against insurmountable odds. What distinguishes Snyder's work is its comprehensiveness and depth in paying tribute to the fallen across that entire war torn region.

We will fly a flag over the U.S. Capitol honoring the work of American scholar Dr. Timothy Snyder and his legion of dedicated scholars. I have come to respect Dr. Snyder's work because his scholarship helped me reach my own epiphany and conclusion about why it has

taken the world so long to appreciate what the people of Poland suffered during that gruesome period. Nearly all of the educated and academic leaders of Poland were annihilated at Katyn in 1940, when over 23,000 were rounded up and summarily shot by Stalin's NKVD, the Soviet secret police. There simply was almost no Polish memory left able to record and relate. It has taken new generations of those able to probe the carnage to enlighten the pages of memory.

So, please let me express sincere gratitude to the government of Poland for bestowing this great honor on a native son of Ohio who has gone on to serve the cause of historical truth. As a history major myself from my own alma mater—the great University of Wisconsin—I recall the words of that University's motto: “Whatever limitations may trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe that the great State University of Wisconsin should encourage the continual sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found.” Dr. Timothy Snyder and his associates surely live those words. Congratulations! Onward truth. Onward liberty.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015, due to weather, I was unavoidably detained and missed recorded votes #1–2. Had I been present, on rollcall #1 (Quorum Call), I would have voted present and on rollcall #2, I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker of the House.

REDESIGNATION OF THE 209TH SPECIAL OPERATIONS CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress and as a fellow member of the Mississippi National Guard, it is my pleasure to welcome and congratulate the brave men and women of the 209th Civil Engineer Squadron. The airmen who stand before you today are unique professionals who have answered the nation's call to support and defend our great nation and state. Today's ceremony truly represents the next chapter in a storied legacy of “Americans at their best.”

Since 1969, the 209th Civilian Engineer Squadron has served our State with honor and distinction and for more than a decade, worked shoulder-to-shoulder with the Special Operations community. These airmen have provided world class support services and civil engineering teams during crisis response operations all around the globe. Today's redesignation ceremony officially recognizes your skills, talents and esprit de corps . . . the hallmark of the Special Operations community.

As the new colors are uncased, you will carry on a long lineage of Special Operations units, who for nearly a century have operated at the tip of the spear and in harm's way. Most recently, our special operators have played key roles in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom, as well as provided significant efforts toward humanitarian operations in Africa and counter-narcotics missions in South America. Within our own shores, National Guard Special Forces have responded to the devastating effects of natural disasters, providing unique resources and personal commitment to aid their fellow Americans.

I'd like to send a special thanks to our military families. The preparedness of our airmen is only possible through the loving support of our immediate and extended families, who keep our households running during the uncertainty of deployments.

Congratulations again to our unit leaders and airmen! As we look toward the future, the world isn't getting any safer. Your skills, talents, will remain in high demand. Through perseverance, hard work and training, the 209th Special Operations Civil Engineer Squadron will remain ready, strategically mobile and postured to respond to crisis at home and abroad.

HONORING MARQUITA DEAN
SODREL

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Marquita Dean Sodrel, a loving mother and the wife of my friend, former Congressman Mike Sodrel.

Marquita, who was known as Keta by her friends and family, was a devoted wife to her husband of 47 years, Mike. Together, they had two children and seven granddaughters. Keta enjoyed a family centered life. Although she worked hard as a Corporate Secretary at her family business, Keta considered her main job to be a loving wife, mother, and grandmother. Keta was a woman of strong faith. Wherever she traveled and worked, Keta always said that she was "working for the Lord."

Keta was also an important partner to her husband Mike's service in Congress. In every sense, they served the people of Indiana's 9th Congressional District together.

Keta was a remarkable woman who will be missed by all of those whose lives she has touched. Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Marquita Dean Sodrel.

IN HONOR OF JOSEPH "JOJO
BENSON" HEWELL

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, legendary musician and dear friend, Mr. Joseph "JoJo Benson" Hewell. Sadly, JoJo passed away on Tuesday, December 23, 2014. A home-going celebration was held in his honor on Saturday, January 3, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. at the Occasions Event Center in Columbus, Georgia.

JoJo was born in Phenix City, Alabama where he attended Mother Mary Mission School. He and his brothers, Gene and Fletcher, were gifted with musical talents which they shared performing together across the Columbus area. But JoJo was destined for greatness and he rose to become an incredibly well-known and adored American blues and soul singer with a distinctive style.

JoJo was a passionate and dedicated artist who captured the hearts of hundreds of fans with his duets with Peggy Scott. Their best hits made it to the Billboard charts and eventually became gold records. The hit "Pickin' Wild Mountain Berries" was also nominated for a Grammy. For over 40 years, JoJo worked to accomplish his dream of making his music heard all around the world. His music traveled across nations delighting the ears of many fans of different backgrounds, and he became known as a great International Recording Artist.

In 2004, JoJo was inducted into the Alabama Music Hall of Fame for his wondrous musical talent. He was also elected to become Ambassador of Music in Columbus, Georgia. Throughout his life, he continued to receive honors and accolades as he became a successful entrepreneur while still recording music and performing shows.

JoJo was also an avid golfer. He loved the game and his life in many ways reflected it. On the front nine, he always managed to land in the fairway, with long beautiful drives, great approach shots, excellent chips, solid putts and thunderous cheers from the gallery. On the back nine, he struggled not to land out of bounds, to get back to the fairway, to avoid the hazards and to reach the greens—with loud groans from some in the gallery. But he did not pick up his ball and quit! He kept his pride, never gave up and continued planning his next shot and his next big show!

As a man, JoJo was charming and his silver tongue and flamboyant persona melted the hearts of countless ladies who found themselves overcome and taken by his infectious charisma. But watch out! If you crossed him, that same tongue using the most acid invective and most colorful expletives could inflict a sharp and cutting tongue lashing—an old fashioned "cussing out!"

JoJo is survived by his children, Joseph Hewell, Jr., Gregory Henley, Dionne Henley, Collette McCoy, and Josette McCoy; a host of grandchildren, great-grandchildren, nieces, and nephews; siblings, Walter Gene Hewell,

Vera Harris, Windon Harris, Litton Harris, Rita Harris, Lois Hewell Hall, Sherwood Hewell, Jessie Hewell, Michael Hewell, Danny Hewell, and Carl Stevens; lifelong companion Angela McCoy; lifelong friend Shirley Sturgis; and many, many friends.

JoJo loved life and lived it to the fullest. He was my friend and he touched all of our lives in ways we will never forget. JoJo's legacy will live on in the spirit of his children and many stories and anecdotes will be enjoyed by his grandchildren, great-grandchildren, nieces, and nephews. JoJo's eleven siblings and many friends will always recount the joy of knowing, loving, and sharing the life of such a unique and accomplished man.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 700,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District and adoring fans across the world, continue to enjoy and cherish JoJo Benson's remarkable musical achievements. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to JoJo's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING MRS. LAURA ROSS
BROWN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Congressman ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT and Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL, to honor the extraordinary life of Mrs. Laura Ross Brown. Mrs. Laura Ross Brown was a beloved mother, daughter, wife and friend. With her passing on December 17, we look to Mrs. Brown's personal legacy of leadership, service, and the outstanding quality of her life's work.

Mrs. Laura Ross Brown was born on April 28, 1932 and raised in Sacramento, CA. She was a mother of four, a former Air Force wife, a mentor and our friend. Mrs. Brown dedicated her life to community service and social activism and was known as a consummate fundraiser. She formerly served as the national fundraiser for Links, Inc., and dedicated much of her time to supporting political campaigns, serving as a member of the financial committees of the campaigns for former Congressman Ronald V. Dellums, Reverend Jesse L. Jackson's 1984 presidential race and Marion Barry's mayoral race.

In addition to her community service and political involvement, Mrs. Brown also led a successful and long career as a real estate agent in Alexandria, VA, where she assisted military officers and political officials relocating to the Washington Metro area. She later expanded her business ventures by starting a financial advisory and investment company, as well as offering political consulting and fundraising services. Her success was highlighted on the Oprah Winfrey Show.

We have many fond memories of Laura. As a former member of Congressman Ron Dellums' staff, I had the opportunity to work with

Laura on many events. Her focus, diligence and commitment to completing any project demonstrated her ability to overcome any challenge in life. She always supported the men and women she believed in throughout her life, including myself. Even during her

health challenges, she was upbeat and loved to be around family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to honor the life of Mrs. Laura Ross Brown. Her dedication and community service has had a great impact on my life and the lives of many others.

For Laura's friendship and love, we are deeply grateful. Our thoughts and prayers are with Laura's wonderful family. We will deeply miss her, as she was a beautiful African American woman who lived an incredible life to the fullest.

SENATE—Friday, January 9, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of greatness, higher than the Heavens, may Your Name be praised. Lord, You fill our lives with good things. Fill our lawmakers with a reverence for You that will empower them to stand for right, whatever the consequences. Influence their thoughts, words, and actions, and keep them from the roads that lead to disunity. Lord, give them courage and resolve to glorify Your Name as they trust the unfolding of Your loving providence. Be their strength and shield this day and always.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed a bipartisan terrorism risk insurance bill and sent it to the President for signature. We worked with our colleagues in the House and on the other side of the aisle to quickly process that bill in a timely manner, and I thank the Speaker and all Members of the Senate for granting unanimous consent to set up those votes yesterday.

This morning we will continue to debate the motion to proceed to the Keystone bill. Chairman MURKOWSKI and several members of the energy committee will be here to talk about this bipartisan infrastructure bill.

No votes are scheduled for today, but we will have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed on Monday night. It is my hope that Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL can begin the amendment process under the regular order. Unfortunately, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to block our effort to even get on the bill, and therefore the cloture vote on Monday is required.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am here this morning to once again talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline, the legislation we will be voting on next week. We will be voting on cloture on the motion to proceed to the legislation. Then, hopefully, we will be debating that bill and offering amendments, which is exactly what we are supposed to be doing in this Chamber.

On Thursday, yesterday, we had a hearing on the bill. In that hearing we brought the bill forward. It is a bill I have authored. JOE MANCHIN is the lead Democratic cosponsor. We have 60 cosponsors on the bill. So we have strong bipartisan support. It is the Keystone approval bill. Essentially, what it does is under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States, which authorizes Congress to oversee trade with foreign countries, we approve the Keystone XL Pipeline crossing the border from Canada into the United States.

A lot of people do not realize the pipeline carries domestic oil from places such as North Dakota and Montana—the Bakken region of our country—to refineries, and it carries both Canadian and domestic crude. But part of the approval requires approval for crossing the border from Canada into the United States. Typically, that is done by a national interest determination by the President of the United States. But the President has been unwilling to do that now for more than 6 years.

The company that is trying to build this pipeline, TransCanada, applied for approval to build this project pursuant to other pipelines it had already built. The original Keystone had already been built. This is the Keystone XL sister pipeline. But in September 2008 they applied for approval to build the Keystone XL Pipeline and to get a cross-border permit determination by the President that, in fact, this vital energy infrastructure is in the national interest.

Well, more than 6 years have elapsed, obviously, since September 2008. The President has still not rendered a final decision, arguing that somehow the process has not been completed after more than 6 years. Of course, America was able to fight and win World War II in less than 6 years. But our President feels that somehow that process still has not been completed after more than 6 years on this project.

So, of course, the purpose of the bill is, in essence, to say: All right, Mr. President, if you will not approve this project, Congress will—under the commerce clause of the Constitution—which we have the authority to do. Earlier we passed legislation. As a matter of fact, I had written a bill in 2011, which we passed in 2012. We attached it to the payroll tax holiday, a bill that got 73 votes, as I recall, which required the President to make a decision. At that time the decision he made was no, on the basis of the route in Nebraska.

So what happened then in 2012 is that the good citizens of Nebraska went to

work on a new route in Nebraska. The legislature, the Governor dealt with that new route, came up with a new route, and approved it overwhelmingly.

It was then subsequently challenged by opponents of the project. Some of the extreme environmentalists have continued to oppose the project, and so that decision went to the supreme court.

We learned today the supreme court has now decided in favor of TransCanada. The news came out this morning that yet another obstacle, after more than 6 years of obstacles, today has been taken care of. The problem is solved.

The Nebraska State Legislature ruled in favor of the Governor—Governor Dave Heineman, whom I know very well, the former Governor of Nebraska—and the legislature, and it said the way they cited this pipeline is, in fact, proper and upheld their decision. I will talk about that decision in a few minutes.

But the other thing I wish to talk about in terms of the Keystone Pipeline is the discussion we had yesterday in the energy committee because it was an opportunity to begin the debate we are going to have on the floor next week. The proponents had an opportunity to state their positions and why, and the opponents had their opportunity to state their positions and why. So for several hours we began that debate. We then voted on the legislation and moved it out, without amendment, on a 13 to 9 vote. It was a bipartisan vote, 13 to 9, and we will have that bill for a vote on the floor Monday.

I wish to address some of the arguments the opponents put forward in opposition to this project. I will start with the Nebraska court decision because that was one of the issues brought up at our energy hearing yesterday. Some of the opponents of the project said: Well, you know what. The process hasn't been concluded—even though it has been going on for more than 6 years. I will put a diagram up here that shows the route of the pipeline.

As I mentioned, the original Keystone pipeline has already been built. That is the red. That has already been built. It was permitted. It took 2 years to permit and 2 years to build. I was actually Governor of North Dakota at that time. We can see it goes right through our State.

It seems to me that application was submitted by TransCanada in 2006. It was during the Bush administration, obviously. It was approved within 2 years, and the project was constructed within 2 years.

So from start to conclusion, 4 years to build this pipeline, which I think carries about 640,000 barrels of oil a day. It brings it down to Cushing so that oil can go into our oil refineries in the gulf. It also goes over here to Pato-

ka, IL, so it can go to our refineries in the East.

Based on that project, there are 640,000 barrels a day. TransCanada wanted to build a second pipeline. This one is 830,000 barrels a day. I think it is about a \$7.9 billion project in all.

Not only does this project carry crude from Canada, our closest friend and ally, but it also brings oil out of this Bakken region in North Dakota and Montana. We put oil on it as well. So both Canadian and domestic crude are going to our refineries.

Again, it is just basic infrastructure that we need to move energy from where we produce it to where we refine it and consume it. We can't build an energy plan for this country without the necessary infrastructure. We have to have pipelines, roads, rail, and electric transmission lines to move electricity.

We cannot build what we want, which is either—some people refer to it as energy independence. I call it energy security. But, net, we produce more energy than we consume.

When we produce more energy than we consume, we get jobs, we get economic growth, we get national security because we don't have to depend on places such as the Middle East or Venezuela or Russia—as does so much of Europe. Western Europe and Eastern Europe is dependent on Russia for their oil and gas. What a terrible situation for them. The people of this country don't want to depend on OPEC for their oil.

So we produce it here. We are doing that. You know what else. We are working with our closest friend and ally Canada, and already that is happening. We are already moving toward a situation—we already produce more natural gas, but soon, if we keep it up, we will produce more oil. Working together with Canada, we will get a little bit from Mexico, and we will produce more oil and gas than we consume.

Some call it energy independence—not really, because it is a global market for energy. But it is certainly energy security. We don't have to depend on anyone else for our energy because we have it right here.

Not only does that create jobs directly, but energy is a foundational industry for all of the other industry sectors. Think about it. If you are in manufacturing, high-tech—just name it—or if you are in farming, agriculture, you depend on energy. If you have lower costs and abundant, available energy, you are more competitive in the global economy, aren't you? So it is a foundational industry as well, and that is why we have to have this vital infrastructure as part of the energy building plan for our country.

It is working. Don't take my word for it. Drive to the gas station. Go on over there. Fill up your car. Look at the bill when you are done. It is a lot lower

than it was a few years ago, right? Check it out.

Every consumer is benefiting at the pump. Small businesses are benefiting across the board. All the industry sectors benefit from lower oil and gas prices.

Why did that happen? OPEC decided to give us a Christmas present; is that what it is? I don't think so.

Russia decided: Oh, gee, to our friends in America, we better send them some oil to reduce the price at the pump. I don't think so.

It is because we are producing so much more oil and gas—not only in the Bakken and in the Eagle Ford formation in Texas, which are shale, clays for oil, but also natural gas in the Marcellus, other areas of our country—in the eastern part—and by working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. We are getting millions of barrels of oil from Canada.

So the oil we produce at home and the oil we get from Canada we don't have to get from Venezuela, we don't have to get from OPEC, we don't have to get from Russia, and we don't have to get from countries in Africa. When we send those dollars over to other countries, how are they using those dollars? Look at what is going on in Paris today.

How many of those petro dollars fund terrorist activities? Isn't it better, if we are not going to produce that energy at home, that we get it from Canada? And isn't it better that we produce that energy at home?

How are we going to produce that energy at home if we don't have the infrastructure to move it from where it is produced to where it is consumed? Gee, then somebody will say: Well, yeah, that is just common sense, of course, right?

I mean, that is just basic common sense. Why aren't we doing it? Yet here we are in a process for more than 6 years still waiting to produce it because the extreme environmental interests have decided: Well, we just don't want to produce more oil. We don't want more oil produced in this country, and we don't want more oil produced in Canada.

Of course, you say: Well, then what? We keep buying it from Russia or we keep buying it from OPEC? Oh, no, no, no, we will just keep developing all these alternatives. I am all for developing all kinds of energy. I would say go ahead. Let's do it.

We worked hard in our State. We have not only oil and gas—we are now the second largest oil-producing State, second only to Texas, but we also produce natural gas. We have coal fired, we have solar, we have wind, we have biofuels. We have all of them. I am for all of them.

What I don't understand is how developing our oil and gas resources, building the vital infrastructure—how

does that prevent us from developing any other type of energy? How does it prevent that? It doesn't.

It just makes sure that as we work on anything else, we don't have to continue to be dependent on OPEC or somebody else for our oil and gas. That is all we are doing.

So let's not sit here and pick winners and losers and do that kind of thing. Let's create the best business climate we can. Let's develop the vital infrastructure we need to move energy around our country, and let's truly become energy secure. That is what this project represents.

Make no mistake. At the end of the day, that is what this project is about. It has been held up for more than 6 years with hurdle after hurdle. Somebody says: Oh, well, gee, that is TransCanada. That is one company. Who cares about that?

Think about it. If you are going to build a pipeline or move energy around this country, if you are going to try to develop oil and gas—whether it is for Canada or anyone else—and you see a company that wants to build a simple pipeline—something that has been done, I think, 19 times before—and they have to spend billions of dollars and take years and years and years, and they still don't have it, are you still going to rush out and do that? Are you going to rush out and build a lot more infrastructure? Probably not.

So isn't this really about trying to shut her down? Isn't this the opponent saying: No, we are going to shut down developing the energy resources in this country. We are not going to work with Canada to do it.

And then what do we end up doing? We say: Well, we will have all these other things.

Maybe we will, maybe we won't or maybe we will go right back to what has been happening—history tends to repeats itself—and we will go back to remaining dependent on OPEC oil, back to remaining dependent on OPEC. It has to be music to these guys' ears.

I wish to take a couple of minutes—I know the chairman of our energy committee will be coming to the floor and speaking on this issue as well—and work to rebut some of the other arguments that have been brought up on this issue, and some of these were brought up yesterday at our energy committee.

The first one, as I say, was: Well, look, the process isn't done because the decision in Nebraska hasn't been made.

Well, in fact, the decision in Nebraska has been made several times. Now the Nebraska Supreme Court put out a ruling today saying that it is fine. All the work the legislature in Nebraska did, all the work the Governor in Nebraska did—the rerouting in Nebraska is upheld.

That is done. That excuse is gone. As the House works to pass this bill today,

and as we work to pass it next week, that argument is off the table. That has been taken care of.

The biggest argument is the environmental argument. The opponents say: Oh, well, it will produce greenhouse gas emissions. They are opposed to oil development because it produces greenhouse gas emissions.

Yet the environmental impact statement—I should say the multiple environmental impact statements done by the State Department—this is what they say. Understand there have been five different reports—three draft reports and two final reports—over a 6-year timeframe. The State Department has done this not once, not twice, but three times in draft form and two times in final form. They have gone in, and they have analyzed the environmental impact of this project.

When you read the report, do you know what it says? "No significant environmental impact" is what it says. That is the Obama administration's State Department environmental impact statement, after 6 years of study—not once, not twice, but five times between three draft statements and two final statements—"No significant environmental impact." That is what it says.

It just stands to reason because if we don't build the pipeline, they pointed out, then what happens? Well, if you don't have this pipeline, the environmental impact statement pointed out that it will take 1,400 railcars a day to move that oil. So instead of moving that oil from Canada, not even counting—I mean, we have to move our oil too. If we don't have the pipeline to move that oil in the safest, most cost-effective and efficient way, then it has to be moved by rail. If you don't have a pipeline, you have to move it by rail. Now you have 1,400 railcars a day creating congestion on the rail.

That creates more greenhouse gas, that creates more congestion, more difficulty in moving our ag products and other products.

We are already seeing that. We already have congestion on our rail that is backing up the shipment of other goods. We had a tremendous problem moving our ag goods this year. So are we going to have another 1,400 railcars on a railroad system that is already overloaded? It doesn't make much sense.

You know what. It creates more greenhouse gas. So by not having the pipeline, you increase the greenhouse gas emissions. I suppose Canada could say—although it is unlikely because they are already moving it by rail.

In my home State of North Dakota we are already moving 700,000 barrels a day by railcar because we can't get enough pipeline, and we are producing more oil. We are up to 1.2 million barrels a day, moving 700,000 barrels by railcars because we can't move it by

pipeline, benefiting the rest of our country—light, sweet Bakken crude.

The other thing with Canada is they say: If we can't bring the pipeline down and work with our closest friend and ally, the United States, if they would rather work with—I don't know—OPEC than Canada—we can't figure that one out. I am sure Prime Minister Harper is saying: Oh, boy, that is unbelievable. But OK, then I guess what we will have to do is we will build these pipelines—and they are already in the process of doing so—to the west coast of Canada. We will load that oil on tankers, and we will send it all to China because China wants it. They are not only willing to buy the oil, but they are trying to buy the source of the oil.

So then it gets on the pipeline, and then it goes on tankers over to China. Well, those tankers produce greenhouse gas emissions as they haul that oil to China. In China the refineries have much higher greenhouse gas emissions. They are much less efficient. They are much less environmentally sound than our refineries in this country. So what do we end up with? We end up with much higher greenhouse gas emissions because we didn't have the pipeline.

Oh, and by the way, instead of us then refining it, tankers have to bring that petroleum to us from OPEC, from Russia, heavy crude from Venezuela, creating some more greenhouse gas. So the net effect is we have increased the environmental impacts by not allowing the pipeline. It increases it. It doesn't reduce it, it increases it.

Furthermore, Canada's laws, in terms of environmental stewardship, are tougher than ours, but they are continuing to move to what is called in situ development in the oil sands. What is in situ development? In situ development is drilling and then the use of steam to bring up the oil rather than excavating, which is the traditional way they produce oil up here. So the greenhouse gas footprint is very similar to drilling in the United States. In fact, it has a lower footprint than the heavy crude that comes out of California—a very environmentally conscious State.

Again, when we talk about the environmental impact, let's talk about the facts. Let's talk about reality, and those are the facts. That is what it is truly about.

Safety is another thing they brought up. Something could happen with the pipeline. That is true, and we always have to work on safety. It is very important we always address safety in whatever we do. The best way to have a safe infrastructure system to move energy around this country is to have the right mix of pipelines and roads and rail—the right mix along with transmission lines—so we move all types of energy as safely and as effectively as possible.

This graph reflects the pipeline system in our country. Oil and gas are

moving through millions and millions of miles of pipelines in our country. This pipeline is going to be the newest, with the latest and the best technology. Oh, by the way, if we don't have the pipeline, as I mentioned just a minute ago, we are adding 1,400 railcars a day. Everyone can do their own calculation, but do we think we are safer and more likely to have less accidents with another pipeline—with the latest, greatest technologies and safeguards—or would we rather have 1,400 railcars a day going through our communities loaded with oil? Common sense again, and the statistics support it.

There is more. They brought up more concerns, but I am nearing the end of my time, in terms of floor time right now, and I know our chairman is coming down, so I will have to wrap this up. I went a little longer on some of these issues they brought up, and they brought up others, but here is the good news. We are going to vote on a cloture motion to proceed to the bill on Monday. I am hopeful, with our 60 sponsors on this legislation—we will have 60, maybe 63 votes based on what people have indicated to me as to how they will vote right now—that after the vote on Monday we will be on the bill.

Unlike the past several years in the Senate, once we are on the bill, we will be open for business, and we are welcoming amendments. We are saying to Republicans and Democrats alike: Bring them on. Bring on your amendments. If you have a good idea, come on down. If you have a good idea, come on down and let's talk about your amendment. Let's debate your amendment, and you know what. You are going to get a vote, and if you get 60 votes in support of your amendment, then we will make it part of this legislation.

We are hopeful that in allowing amendments, we can improve the legislation, we can make it more bipartisan, and we can get more supporters, so if in fact the President does decide to veto it, we will have 67 votes instead of 60 or 63 votes. That is how the process is supposed to work. We are supposed to be able to have that debate, offer those amendments, and produce the best product we can. That is what we are hoping to do with this legislation.

We are also hoping that will not only generate more bipartisan support on this issue, on this legislation, but on other energy legislation and other legislation of all types so we can get the important work of the American people done in this body. That is what it is all about: finding a way to get things done—get the job done for the American people.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday morning those of us on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee had an opportunity for good discussion about our Nation's energy future. More specific to the agenda of yesterday's business meeting was a bill that would allow for a much-delayed project—the Keystone XL Pipeline—to advance. It moved through the committee favorably. It moved through the committee with bipartisan support.

As I noted to several colleagues yesterday, the discussion we had in the committee about the significance of this pipeline—the significance of its contribution to our Nation's economy from a jobs perspective and from a resource perspective is considerable. Obviously there was debate on both sides—I think good, healthy debate—and it is debate I hope we will see reflected on this floor in the next week and perhaps the week following as we have an opportunity to debate. But first we have to get onto that bill. We have that process in place. We will have a vote on the motion to proceed the first of next week.

I am anxious, as the new chair of the energy committee, to move the debate here in the Senate on issues that are so important to us in this Nation. When we think about our Nation's security—national security and energy security—and when we think about our Nation's economy and prosperity, so much of it comes back to energy, access to energy that is abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure. These are principles I have laid out about my views of energy. I am hopeful that the discussion we will have on this floor will help advance us as a Senate, as a Congress, and really as a country in moving forward on those policies that will only make us stronger and more secure.

I felt the debate yesterday in committee was kind of a precursor of some of the agenda items we will see on this floor that will be brought forward by way of amendments. I would encourage colleagues, as they think about next week and as they think about the debate we will have on energy, let's stick to energy. We haven't had a good, robust debate on energy in a long while.

We have a lot of other concerns. We have colleagues who want to bring up the President's initiatives as they relate to immigration or perhaps health care. We will have plenty of opportunity here in the Senate under Leader MCCONNELL's management to hear and debate issues that are of great substance and weight. But we have waited far too long for our energy issues to be fully debated on the floor, so I am welcoming that discussion.

We heard a lot of good reasons within the committee and we have heard a lot

of good reasons here on the floor why the Keystone XL Pipeline is significant, is important to this country. This morning I wish to take a few moments to discuss some of the arguments that have been made against it and perhaps provide some context, some rebuttal, because I think it is fair to acknowledge that the Keystone XL Pipeline evokes some strong feelings, but not all of what we have heard is perhaps as factual as we would like it to be. As we note often around here, people are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts. So I would like to address some of the responses.

One of the issues we heard yesterday was that this bill is almost too much. Well, if those on the committee and on the floor would look directly to the language of the bill, it is pretty simple. The text of the full bill takes up fewer than two pages. It is roughly 400 words long. It doesn't take long to read or understand. It is pretty simple. It is a pretty simple measure. It approves this long-delayed cross-border permit that is needed to construct the Keystone XL Pipeline. That is all it does. It approves a permit. It doesn't give some grand sweetheart deal to a foreign company. It doesn't feather the nest of oil companies. It allows for a permit to cross the border between the United States and Canada to allow for a construction project, and it does this while protecting private property rights.

It allows Nebraska to find the best possible route for the pipeline, and it requires all State and local obligations to be fully met. This bill does not deal with routing through the States. It was suggested that somehow or other we here in the Senate and the House are kind of like a zoning committee. That is not what is happening. It doesn't deal with the routing. As we know, that discussion took place at the State level—and appropriately so. So what this measure does is it just allows for that cross-boundary permit.

Some of the other points raised were that somehow or other this bill provides subsidies—subsidies—whether to TransCanada or to others. It does not authorize a single taxpayer dollar for any purpose. It doesn't create any new tax credits. It doesn't reduce current tax rates. The bill is simply about approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is that simple.

I would encourage you to read it. Again, it is pretty brief.

Another question raised yesterday in committee: Why the urgency? Why the push right now? We are just in the first week of the 114th Congress. Why are we pushing so quickly to advance this?

Well, for new Members, such as the Presiding Officer, here today, this is the first opportunity you will have had to weigh in on the Senate floor on this very important legislation, but many of us who were here in the 113th Congress recall that it was just about 6 or

7 weeks ago that this same measure—in fact, the same language of this bill is what we had on this floor just before we departed at the end of the 113th Congress. We fell one vote short of cloture. We had 59 supporters in the Senate. We obviously had very significant Democratic support. Coming up with 59 votes was substantive. I think folks would remember that.

In effect, this is a little bit about unfinished business. We were working on it less than 2 months ago—a month and a half ago. We are now back in the 114th Congress. So what has changed? Well, what has changed is that the Presiding Officer is now a Member of the Republican Party, and our leader, Senator MCCONNELL, is leading the Senate. We are now in a new Congress with new leadership, and the bill that has been introduced by my friend and colleague from North Dakota has 60 cosponsors—60 cosponsors—not people who have said: Yes, I think I am going to vote for this bill. These are 60 who have committed and signed their names, and we now have enough votes to pass it in this Chamber. So I think that is a good sign.

I think it is not a bad sign that what we are starting with is a bill that is unfinished business but also a bill that has strong bipartisan support, with 60 cosponsors. It is not very often in this body that we have legislation that has that level of support. So why not start this new Congress off with something that enjoys bipartisan support? I don't think it was the intention of our leader to start off saying: By gosh, it is going to be Republican ideas only. We are trying to find those ideas and those issues that will advance our country. I believe that moving forward with the Keystone XL Pipeline is something that will advance the best interests of our country.

So when we talk about timing, I think it is important to note that this is not only a good time, it is the best time to bring up Keystone XL. Our colleagues on the other side of the building are taking up the Keystone XL Pipeline today.

We had, of course, good news coming out of Nebraska this morning with the announcement that that litigation has been resolved, if you will, with the courts effectively upholding the pipeline route.

There have been some on the other side of the aisle who have suggested that we shouldn't cut off a process, that we shouldn't move until things have been resolved in Nebraska. And there are some who would say: Well, OK, that is something we do need to consider. It has been suggested that until that has been resolved, action on the Keystone XL Pipeline is somehow or other premature or untimely.

I want to speak to the aspect of timeliness and whether we are moving too quickly. The Presidential approval

process is actually another reason we are starting on this bill in this Congress. A final “yes” or “no” decision has now been delayed by more than 2,300 days. I think the exact number is 2,303, and we are counting. That is more than 6 years—not to build a pipeline; we are not talking about it taking 6 years to build the pipeline; we are talking about 6 years to approve a permit to cross from the Canadian side to the U.S. side. The energy committee is on its fourth chairman since the initial cross-border application was filed.

We have seen a lot of process. We have seen a lot of talk here in this body. Literally everything that has happened during the Obama administration—the legislation that has moved, regulations, all of the extra-curricular stuff that goes on outside—that has all happened while the Keystone XL permit has been pending. One has to look at this and say: 2,300 days and counting, over 6 years—it is pretty clear to me that the President really doesn't want to make this decision, and so if the Congress can step in and make it happen, the Congress should step in and make it happen.

I mentioned the decision coming out of Nebraska this morning and the fact that it allows—the pipeline route was effectively upheld. So that aspect of the process that individuals have been waiting for I think we can fairly say has been resolved.

In the Statement of Administration Policy—effectively the veto threat the President has issued on Keystone XL that I would note he issued the day we gavelled into the 114th Congress, before we started any of our business. In his veto message, the President said the legislation would cut short consideration of important issues relevant to the national interests. Again, I would just ask anyone, really? Some 2,303 days and we think we are somehow or other cutting short a process?

In his veto SAP, he states further that “the bill would also authorize the project despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska.” Well, it looks as though that part of it has been resolved, so that can't be used as the excuse.

It is not just in that Statement of Administration Policy. Back in April the Press Secretary for the President, Mr. Carney, stated, “Absent a definite route from Nebraska, the decision, as I understand, by State is that that can't continue until the situation in Nebraska is resolved.” OK. We are letting you know now that the situation in Nebraska has been resolved.

Further, there was a statement that came out of the State Department on April 18 in which they note that a core reason for the delay is “the potential impact of the Nebraska Supreme Court case which could ultimately affect the pipeline route.” All right. The State Department also has word now that we are no longer waiting for that.

So when one talks about timeliness, when one talks about why it is imperative that we allow this permit to proceed, it is because it has been 6 years. It is because the decks have been cleared. It is an infrastructure that will benefit our Nation as well as our friends to the northern border.

I would like to talk about the issue of job creation. We have talked a lot about the jobs that are created with a potential Keystone XL project. We heard in the committee discussion yesterday that, hey, this is not as advertised. There are only going to be about 55 permanent jobs and only 4,000 construction jobs that will be created.

We have been saying it is closer to 42,000 jobs. There is a lot of water in between 4,000 and 42,000. Who is correct? I think it is important to note that the numbers we are talking about are drawn from the State Department's final supplemental EIS. It is one of those situations where if you are opposed to it you are going to grab some low numbers, and if you are supportive of it you might grab the high numbers. But I think you need to read the whole thing in context, my friends.

The final supplemental EIS goes on to say:

Construction contracts, materials, and support purchased in the United States would total approximately \$3.1 billion, with another \$233 million spent on construction camps. During construction, this spending would support a combined total of approximately 42,100 average annual jobs and approximately \$2 billion in earnings throughout the United States.

It goes on further to say:

Approximately 16,100 would be direct jobs at firms that are awarded contracts for goods and services, including construction directly by Keystone. The other approximately 26,000 jobs would result from indirect and induced spending; this would consist of goods and services purchased by the construction contractors and spending by employees working for either the construction contractor or for any supplier of goods and services required in the construction process.

So, again, these aren't LISA MURKOWSKI's numbers that are drawn from the air or Senator HOEVEN, the sponsor of this bill, conjuring up these numbers. These are the numbers that come from the State Department's final supplemental EIS. This is what they are saying—42,100 average annual jobs, \$2 billion in earnings, 16,000 direct jobs, 26,000 jobs from indirect and induced spending.

The State Department estimates construction workers on a seasonal basis—4 to 8 months per period. On an annual basis that is 1,950 jobs per year for 2 years, and that is where they get the 4,000 construction jobs.

But think about it. The nature of the construction business is not that these are jobs in perpetuity. That means you build things, and once they are built you move on to build something else. Of course they are not permanent jobs

because we are not in a permanent state of construction. The key here is to approve projects in a timely manner so that these good, skilled, qualified workers can go from one job to the next and have permanent, stable employment—not necessarily on the same project for their entire lifetime but to be able, as a welder, as a skilled technician, to move from one project to another.

I would support this project even if it were just 4,000 temporary jobs, but it is not. What we are talking about is supporting over 42,000 workers over a 2-year period. That is significant. It is significant given the unemployment levels we are at—we are at 5.6 percent now. Isn't this what we are wanting to do, to bring on new jobs?

In my State right now we are trying to figure out how we can move Alaska's natural gas to market, not only to benefit our State with revenues but to benefit jobs. We don't have a deal yet that allows us to build that pipeline, although our Governor today and our previous Governor and Governors before them have been working diligently to make that happen, and one of these days we are going to see it. But in the meantime, do you think Alaskans are saying: Well, we are not so sure we want this because these are only going to be temporary construction jobs. Absolutely not. We are building training facilities. We are getting our workforce kind of teed up for that day so that when it comes, we are ready because we want those construction jobs. We recognize it will be a construction project, and by its very definition it is not permanent.

Don't you think that bolsters my State's economy? Don't you think we are hoping every day that we are going to get moving on this project? Absolutely. Is it going to benefit my State? Yes. Is it going to benefit this country? Yes. Let's get moving on it, and let's get moving on Keystone XL.

I get a little frustrated when we talk about the jobs, and we have those who say we should dismiss the fact that if we can't get to a certain number of jobs, the project is not worthwhile. What we are doing is approving a non-subsidized, nonfederally funded project. This is not costing us anything. This will be a benefit to us. It is not an entire industry, nor is it a multiple-year funding authorization for transportation projects around the country. I think those kinds of comparisons are inaccurate and to a certain extent unfair.

I suggest to those who criticize Keystone XL's job-creating potential to be careful. We don't want to put ourselves in a position where we are going to wind up opposing nearly all individual projects for any purpose all across the country just because they don't create enough jobs.

Take the Department of Energy's Loan Guarantee Program. It has fund-

ed some good programs, in my view, over the years. We have seen some renewable energy projects in recent years that I think have been beneficial to our region. By our count, more than one dozen of these projects would create less than 50 permanent jobs. We are not creating hundreds or even thousands of jobs. It will create less than 50 permanent jobs. One solar project created 7 permanent jobs, a wind project created 10, a geothermal project created 14, and we had a transmission line that created 15 permanent jobs. I think the question that has to be asked is: Should we have opposed these projects based on the number of permanent jobs that are associated with them? Is there a minimum number of jobs we are going to use as a benchmark for approval or denial or should we just be glad and encouraged when any new job is created because it means Americans have found steady work? This is what I thought we were working toward.

Keep in mind Keystone XL is one project. It is one project. It is one pipeline. There is one connector between Canada and the United States that connects up to a pipeline that has already been built in the South and will feed into our existing system. This is not brandnew frontier. We are allowing for a connector between Canada and the systems we have in the United States.

Keystone XL is one project. It is one small part of the employment that energy production and infrastructure development can provide for our Nation. We already have 19 cross-border oil pipelines. This is coming down from Canada in the North and coming up from Mexico in the South. We are already building up our LNG export capability and so much more.

Again, keep in mind this is not the first time there has been a request for a cross-border pipeline. We have 19 that are already in place. What makes this one so special?

I will have more to say on that issue in the future. I know our leaders are expected to come down to the floor shortly. I look forward to a good, honest debate about our energy resources, our energy opportunities, and our energy challenges. I think the American public is ready for this discussion.

I don't know what happens around the dinner table in the hometowns of Georgia, but I can tell you in Alaska we talk a lot about energy, and we don't talk about it because we are an energy-producing State. We talk about it because it costs us a lot of money to keep warm in a cold place. It costs us a lot of money because we are not part of anybody else's energy infrastructure.

We don't have transmission lines that connect us from one place to the other. We have what we have, and we are thankful to have it. We are ready to share it with others around the country and around the globe, but we

in Alaska talk a lot about the affordability of our energy resources. We talk a lot about how we can access our abundant resources. We talk a lot about how to use our ingenuity and technology to advance us so we can have cleaner energy sources and move to a world of renewable energy, and that is so exciting for us.

We have a lot of fossil fuel in Alaska—and we have a lot of everything else—and we are excited to be developing our geothermal, our marine hydrokinetic, our biomass, our wind potential, and our solar potential. It is a little dark there now, but our solar potential in the summer is second to none.

We are excited as to what we might be able to do in understanding how we can tap into ocean energy resources. It is exciting. We need to do more as a nation when it comes to efficiency and conservation. We should be leading in that way, and that is why I am pleased we will have an opportunity to again revisit the merits of the legislation my friends Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN have been working on so long as it relates to energy efficiency and taking that up as an opportunity for amendment. We have such good issues to talk about—issues that the American public is talking about because it impacts them, and it impacts their family budget. It impacts their opportunities for jobs, and it impacts our Nation's security.

I have not talked today about the security aspects of it, but it doesn't take a foreign policy analyst to understand that gaining the benefit from an energy resource from our friends in Canada is better than asking for that same resource from the OPEC nations or Venezuela or from any nation that might not like us. That is a debate that again is so core to what we are talking about with Keystone XL.

We have a healthy relationship with Canada. It is important because when someone drives to my State, which is a heck of a long drive, they have to go through more of Canada than anyplace else. I want to have a good relationship with Canada, but I can tell you our friends on the Canadian border are wondering what is happening in the United States. It has been 2,303 days, and we can't make a decision on whether we should benefit from a jobs perspective, an economic perspective, and a national security perspective.

I look forward to the discussion next week, and I look forward to a robust and full debate on good energy amendments that will be coming before this body.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline. I see my colleague from Alaska is here this morning, and I think she and I were thinking we would be continuing this debate next Monday as the Senate moves forward on the motion to proceed to rule XIV of the bill that relates to this issue. Obviously we had committee action yesterday, but we are both here this morning.

I wish to say to my colleague before she leaves the floor that I do look forward to the opportunity where she and I can sit down and talk about an energy strategy and other issues that will help move our country forward so we can produce jobs.

I had a chance to work with Senator MURKOWSKI's father and other Republicans on the energy committee. We produced some very good energy legislation in both 2005 and 2007 that did result in moving our country forward. It was bipartisan legislation and definitely not unanimous. I mean, there was a great deal of debate about them, but we got them done nonetheless. I am looking forward to working with the Senator from Alaska on these issues.

It is probably safe to say the Senator from Alaska and I had plans this morning other than coming to the Senate floor; nonetheless, I am more than happy to talk about the recent decision by the Nebraska Supreme Court and how Congress will continue to discuss the issue of Keystone XL approval. Many of my colleagues probably know that the House will take up this action sometime today. The President has consistently said he is interested in having the process play out in Nebraska before he makes a decision about whether this pipeline is in the national interest. The President of the United States and the State Department have the authority and responsibility to look at this issue as it relates to what is in the national interest of the United States of America.

This decision by the Nebraska Supreme Court today is a very interesting decision. It is a very interesting decision because a majority of the Nebraska Supreme Court, four out of the seven justices on the court, said this law was unconstitutional—this attempt to circumvent the public interest process by which the citizens of Nebraska can raise concerns about a pipeline going through their community. The majority of the supreme court said, yes, that decision to short circuit the public process in Nebraska was unconstitutional.

Unfortunately for those citizens in Nebraska and those citizens in the

United States of America who want to make sure the environmental security issues and economic issues are fully discussed, they are getting shut down by a supermajority of the Nebraska Supreme Court. They failed to get five out of the seven supreme court justices to side with them. Nonetheless, I think there is a lot in this decision for all of us to think about; that is, just how much this process has been circumvented.

To me it is very unusual that the Senate would be asked to vote on a bill that would expedite the siting of a pipeline through the United States of America simply because a Canadian company wants us to do so. It is perplexing to me because I hear a lot of people talk about our neighbors, and I definitely value the relationship that the United States and Canada have. We are in the process of a major discussion with them on issues that impact the Pacific Northwest, and we have to work with our neighbors.

I am struck that my state has a great relationship with British Columbia, which is Washington's neighbor to the north. Sixty-eight percent of British Columbian residents oppose a tar sands pipeline across their province. That is right, a Canadian province definitely does not want a tar sands pipeline going through their neighborhood.

We have First Nations all across Canada who don't want tar sands development and pipelines across Canada. In addition, there are a lot of concerns about environmental practices for tar sands production that are in place in Alberta.

People should know that the oil and gas producing province of Alberta, not the federal government of Canada, regulates tar sands development. Alberta does not require what we in the U.S. would consider "best practices" for development of some of the dirtiest oil production in the world. In the U.S., we actually have federal laws that make oil production cleaner than in Alberta.

There is a lot of concern about these not only tar sands production, but also about byproducts, such as pet coke. As my colleague from Michigan stated in our business meeting yesterday, uncovered pet coke mounds, which could just blow around in the wind, caused serious environmental concerns in Michigan and Illinois. In addition, I am sure my colleague from California has been down here talking about benzene, which is a byproduct that is left behind and can adversely affect individuals.

To say that just because this Nebraska court decision became final today, that all those environmental issues and public safety issues have gone away, is surely a misstatement. Congress is being pressured to make a sweetheart deal for a business interest.

I believe tar sands producers should pay into the oil spill liability trust fund, just as companies that produce

other oil products have to do. This is a very important issue for me because oil spills are a situation that we in the Pacific Northwest have cared about for a long period of time. In fact, the Commandant of the Coast Guard appeared before the Senate commerce committee last year, and I had a chance to ask the commandant whether the Coast Guard had a way to respond to a tar sands oil spill, and he basically told me that, no, they didn't.

So, to me, there are a lot of environmental issues, a lot of process issues, and issues of paying a fair share for helping to clean up oil spills—and these issues all add up to serious concerns with legislatively approving a construction project. My colleagues on the other side want to turn Congress into a siting commission, to give a special interest the certainty to move forward on a project that needs to go through the proper process and channels.

In the State of Nebraska, the public said we have concerns about a tar sands pipeline running through our state, straight through the environmentally sensitive Sand Hills region and the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides drinking water to six states. Instead of dealing with those environmental issues, the company and its advocates came to the Congress and tried to get that route approved. This is why the President had to reject the proposal in 2012—because TransCanada did not want to do right be the citizens of Nebraska or the environment.

The long and short of it is, if TransCanada had been successful in getting the original route approved, that pipeline would go across the Ogallala Aquifer. There is now a broad consensus that this would have been the wrong route, endangering the water supply in America's agricultural heartland.

So, thank God, Congress, which tried to act and give a sweetheart deal to TransCanada, was thwarted by the President. The President said, I cannot approve this project now. And guess what happened. The company said, yes, that is right; we have to figure out a better route for the pipeline. And TransCanada had to start the process all over with a new application for a better route through Nebraska.

In my State, a utility and transportation commission—in the State of Nebraska I think it is called a public service commission—oversees the siting process for these kinds of infrastructure projects. That commission has a public process and answers all of the questions the public raises, debates the issues that are before the public and makes sure those issues are taken into account—I know many of my colleagues probably can relate to this more from the perspective of siting transmission lines or a grid system. I am sure people have seen a neighborhood complaining about a transmission line going through their neighborhood.

This is a pipeline, and for us pipelines are very important in the Pacific Northwest. We had a natural gas pipeline that blew up, killing some young children in the Bellingham area. So, for me, pipeline siting, and the process that goes into assuring the safety and security of the siting, should be decided in the broad daylight of public discussion through the proper channels. In this case, people circumvented that public commission process in Nebraska, circumvented what would have been a utilities and transportation commission process, and let the Governor decide the route. Then the decision was sent to the Nebraska Supreme Court to determine whether in fact the Governor had the authority to do that. Four of those seven justices said it was unconstitutional—not the supermajority for sure, but four of them said it was unconstitutional. But nothing in that decision corrected the original problem of them circumventing the environmental and economic and security issues that a public commission is supposed to go through in this process.

I ask my colleagues, why are we in such a big hurry to make this decision on behalf of a utility commission and on behalf of the President of the United States when there are real issues of safety and security that need to be discussed?

Next week my colleagues are going to have a lot of discussion on a lot of different amendments, but I still advocate that Congress has no business deciding for a special interest where a pipeline should go without the due process of citizens who are affected by pipeline having input to the decision.

I hope my colleagues will continue to let the process play out. I hope my colleagues will care more about public process and public interest than special interest. There is a great article, which I will submit for the RECORD, in Business Week citing welding issues with the current Keystone Pipeline. That existing pipeline has had safety problems.

We in the Pacific Northwest celebrate that we are a gateway to Asia, and we celebrate the fact that a lot of people will want to use that gateway. But we are very concerned about due process for infrastructure projects. We see other countries wanting to move energy and other products through our gateway when safety, security, environmental, and public issues are not being fully addressed.

I hope my colleagues will continue to make sure due process is given and that we will continue to make sure all of these public interest and environmental issues are addressed.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I see the leader on the floor, so I will not suggest the absence of a quorum.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING FACTORY SERVICE AGENCY

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, Louisianians are well-known for our delicious food, rich cultural traditions, and enthusiasm for football. Less well known, but just as important, is our deep appreciation for reliable air conditioning. During the muggy summer months, every Louisianian needs a reliable air conditioning contractor on speed dial. As the newly elected chairman of the Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, I am honored to recognize a small business from my State that provides this vital service to its customers—the Factory Service Agency—which is celebrating its 40th year of operation this year.

Based out of Metairie, LA, Factory Service Agency serves the entire New Orleans metro area. While the business encompasses a multitude of mechanical and general contracting specialties, the primary focus is on the installation, service, and maintenance of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment. This longstanding Louisiana business emphasizes its middle name—“service”—and truly provides outstanding customer service, including 24-hour emergency assistance and maintenance for airflow and ductwork problems. For four decades, Factory Service Agency has gone above and beyond to supply quality products and service to local hospitals, universities, manufacturing facilities, nursing homes, and more.

Small businesses provide the backbone for our economy, and their successes would not be possible without the direction of exceptional leaders. Mike Mitternacht, the owner of Factory Service Agency, is not only responsible for all operations of the business, but also makes representing small businesses across the State a top priority. Over the years, Mike Mitternacht has served on a variety of notable government and business organizations. In addition to his chairmanship of the statewide Louisiana Economic Development Small Business Advisory Council, he has served as the chairman of the Louisiana Association of Business and Industry and as a member of the National Federation of Independent Business, Louisiana Workforce Investment Council, and the National Small Business Association, the last of

which he was named the 2010 Advocate of the Year. Small businesses across the country are fortunate to have a strong proponent with such valuable experience in each aspect of business operations, including financial management, job coordination, and project management.

For my first small business of the week as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am honored to recognize a local business that has not only flourished, but has been an inspiration for entrepreneurs in Louisiana and across the country. Small businesses consistently provide unmatched attention, communication, and results to their customers, and I am proud to advocate for them. Once again, I congratulate Factory Service Agency on an exceptional 40 years and wish them continued success in the future.●

REMEMBERING SERGEANT STEPHEN R. PAQUIN

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I have the solemn duty of memorializing SGT Stephen R. Paquin, a soldier and native of Nashua, NH, who passed away on December 16 at the age of 27. After serving two tours in Afghanistan and a tour in Europe, Sergeant Paquin had recently transitioned from active duty into the U.S. Army Reserves and was training to become a drill sergeant with 1st Battalion, 304th Regiment in Londonderry. Born and raised in Nashua by his parents Kenneth and Paula alongside his brother Shawn, he was a graduate of the University of New Hampshire and Nashua High School South, where in his senior year Stephen was a member of the Purple Panthers 2005 State championship baseball team.

Stephen will forever be a member of the special community of Americans who selflessly defend our country so that the rest of us may continue to live in peace and freedom. He bravely joined the military at a time when it was almost guaranteed that new recruits would be called on to serve in a dangerous warzone far from home. It is my hope that during this extremely difficult time, Stephen's family and friends will find comfort in knowing that Americans everywhere deeply appreciate his commitment to our Nation.

Stephen is survived by his parents, Kenneth and Paula, his brother Shawn D. Paquin, and Christine Smith of Waltham, MA, his grandmothers Gloria Paquin of Nashua and Carol Mulligan of Dracut, MA, many aunts, uncles, cousins, and friends. This patriot will be missed by all.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring the life and service of this brave American, SGT Stephen Paquin.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 30. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 9, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-172. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reduction of Fees for Trademark Applications and Renewals" (RIN0651-AC94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-173. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Adjustments of Status Granted Under Section 13 of the Act of September 11, 1957"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-174. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on the Continuing Need for Authorized Bankruptcy Judgeships"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-175. A communication from the Project Manager, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notices of Decisions and Documents Evidencing Lawful Status" (RIN1615-AC01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-176. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of proposed legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-177. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commis-

sion's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-178. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Direct Investment Surveys: BE-13, Survey of New Foreign Direct Investment in the United States" (RIN0691-AA82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-179. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1067)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 13, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-180. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-181. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Portsmouth International Airport (PSM); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-182. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Dawson Community Airport (GDV), Glasgow International Airport (GGW), Havre City-County Airport (HVR), Wolf Point International Airport (OLF), and Sidney-Richland Municipal Airport (SDY); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-183. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Fundamental Properties of Asphalts and Modified Asphalts—III"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-184. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the 2014 Trimester 2 Directed Longfin Squid Fishery" (RIN0648-XD378) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-185. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD609) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-186. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks (LCS) and Hammerhead Sharks in the Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-XD636) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-187. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gag" (RIN0648-XD599) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-188. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2014 Gulf of Alaska Pollock Seasonal Apportionments" (RIN0648-XD627) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-189. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Boundary Expansion of Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary" (RIN0648-BC94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-190. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia" (RIN0648-XD601) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-191. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD638) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-192. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD631) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-193. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XD632) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-194. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska Trawl Economic Data Report” (RIN0648-BE09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-195. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 7” (RIN0648-BC09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-196. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Trawl Rationalization Program; Chafing Gear Modifications” (RIN0648-BC84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-197. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2014 Commercial Fishing for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean; Commercial Retention Limit” (RIN0648-BE58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-198. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015” (RIN0648-BE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-199. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations and Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; American Lobster Fishery”

(RIN0648-BE57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-200. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Framework Adjustment 51 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2014” (RIN0648-XD354) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-201. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Framework Adjustment 3” (RIN0648-BE01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-202. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2015 Atlantic Shark Commercial Fishing Seasons” (RIN0648-XD276) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-203. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Chinook Salmon Bycatch Management in the Gulf of Alaska Non-Pollock Trawl Fisheries; Amendment 97” (RIN0648-BD48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-204. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod Pot Gear Fishing Closure in the Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone in the Bering Sea; Amendment 103” (RIN0648-BC34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-205. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Carquinez Strait Cable Repair Operation, Martinez, CA” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0950) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-206. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulated Navigation Area; Arthur Kill, NY and NJ” (RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2013-1063) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-207. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Christina River; Wilmington, DE” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1033) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-208. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones Within the Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone, Louisiana” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0993) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-209. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Anchorage Regulations: Anchorage Grounds, Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California” (RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0841) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-210. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulated Navigation Area; Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, Oregon Inlet, NC” (RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0987) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-211. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Reduced Visibility, Sector St. Petersburg Captain of the Port Zone, FL” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1013) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-212. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Kent Narrows Draw Bridge Repairs, Kent Island Narrows; Queen Anne’s County, MD” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0898) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-213. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Safety/Security Zone Regulations;

2014 Tampa Bay; Captain of the Port St. Petersburg Zone, FL" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0040)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-214. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of New Jersey" (RIN0648-XD571) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-215. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments" (RIN0648-BE64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-216. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Porgy Complex" (RIN0648-XD388) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 143. A bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 144. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or making financial support conditioned upon a State, local educational agency, or school's adoption of specific instructional content, academic standards, or curriculum, or on the administration of assessments or tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 23

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 23, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 117, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 119, a bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability.

S. 123

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

S. 126

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 126, a bill to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes.

S. 129

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri

(Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 129, a bill to repeal executive immigration overreach, to clarify that the proper constitutional authority for immigration policy belongs to the legislative branch, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 25, a resolution commemorating 50 years since the creation of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Cathy Cahill for the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, January 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1, the Keystone bill, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. The first vote of the week will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Keystone bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:08 p.m., adjourned until Monday, January 12, 2015, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, January 9, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend Patrick Riffle, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

God, our father, You guide everything in wisdom and love. "You are good and forgiving, full of love to all who call upon You."

We now praise You for that love and rejoice in Your abundant blessing. You call us today to grow in the knowledge of that love and invite us to receive Your blessings.

Accept the prayers we offer for our beloved Nation; protect it and keep it ever in Your sight. Fill this House of Representatives with Your holy wisdom, and may that wisdom lead to right action.

Strengthen these Representatives and their staffs as they labor for the common good and for what is just in Your eyes. May true harmony, lasting freedom, and justice be secured for all so that there may be lasting peace.

We ask this in Your most Holy Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARINO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FAREWELL, VERONICA KALTRIDER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to express my appreciation for Major Veronica Kaltrider. Veronica has been on loan to the office of the Second District of South Carolina from the United States Marine Corps for the past year serving as a military fellow.

Major Kaltrider enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1997 and received training the following year at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina. As the former Representative of this base, I know firsthand of the proficiency that Veronica has because of her training by the highest Marine Corps standards. Veronica's ability to connect with veterans has been a tremendous asset to our office.

Beginning this month, Veronica Kaltrider will serve as the manpower and personnel officer of the Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs. I wish her and her husband, Eric, a military police officer in the Marine Corps, all the best in the future. Godspeed.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy for the citizens of France fighting terrorism.

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN STIVERS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to celebrate the unanimous Senate confirmation of a public servant of integrity, energy, expertise, and ability; a person of deep dedication to our country, to ending poverty, fighting disease, and advancing democracy; someone I have had the privilege to have on my staff for the past 15 years, the new assistant administrator for Asia at USAID: Jonathan Stivers.

Over the years, Jon worked closely with USAID and congressional committees to promote our national interests, fight poverty and disease around the world, and address ongoing challenges in global development across Asia.

He played a central role in advancing foreign policy priorities of our country, especially in the fields of human rights, appropriations, HIV/AIDS, international trade, and in countries across the Asia-Pacific region. Many of our Republican colleagues know that Jon worked very much across the aisle on all of these issues.

Jonathan's professionalism and attention to detail were unparalleled,

and I can say with confidence on the most challenging and critical issues of our day, Jon Stivers consistently exhibits the leadership needed to improve the global community.

Though we will miss his expertise and his experience, I am proud that he is serving these critical issues in his new position, and I wish him; his wife, Ramsey, who is here with us; his baby daughters, Josephine and Parker, all the best in their new adventures.

Thank you, Jonathan Stivers. Congratulations and good luck.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I want to extend my support and gratitude to the law enforcement officers across the country who serve our communities and the American people daily.

Our Nation was founded on the rule of law, and every day law enforcement officers carry out this legacy. They protect our neighborhoods from criminals, fight crime, ensure justice, and keep the peace.

Sadly, many law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty. Last year 118 law enforcement officers died, including three from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Last year's murder of two NYPD officers is a sober reminder that our Nation's law enforcement officers face danger every day as they carry out their duty to protect the American people.

In the Gospel of John, we are told that there is no greater love than to lay down one's life for one's friends, and this is true of our Nation's law enforcement officers. Every day they risk their lives so that you and I may be safe from harm.

These brave men and women are heroes and deserve to be recognized and honored for their service to our country.

TAR SANDS TAX LOOPHOLE ELIMINATION ACT

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, while I do not support the development of tar sands—an environmentally destructive and carbon-intensive process—we should not continue a loophole

that lets oil companies off the hook for covering destruction from oil spills.

In 1990, we authorized the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the immediate costs of cleaning up oil spills, and it is funded by an excise tax on crude oil and petroleum products, but the oil derived from tar sands that would be transported through the Keystone XL pipeline is not subject to this tax.

Since that oil is a thick, sticky form of crude, more difficult and costly to clean up than other types of oil, the exemption makes no sense, especially if it is as safe as some allege. That is why yesterday I reintroduced the Tar Sands Tax Loophole Elimination Act, which would ensure that oil pays into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that travels through this pipeline if it is ever constructed.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

READING THE CONSTITUTION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes my colleagues and I will be following a tradition that we began when Republicans regained the majority in 2011 of reading the Constitution during the first week that we are back into session. I think this is a very important tradition that we have established here in the House of Representatives.

Our Speaker reminded us the other day that this is the first time in the history of the country that this has been done. This is our third Congress in a row to do this.

All of us, or almost all of us, carry a copy of the pocket version of the Constitution with us to remind us why we are here and what undergirds everything that we do in this House and in this Congress.

In the front of the copy I have, it says, "The Declaration of Independence was the promise; the Constitution was the fulfillment," and there is a quote from Alexander Hamilton: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records. They are written, as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by the mortal power."

CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on this body to take up legislation to repeal the last-minute changes to campaign finance law that were tacked into a 1,600-page bill to fund the government this December.

As a result of this legislation, the wealthiest donors can now each con-

tribute more than \$750,000 per year to a political party, more than seven times the previous cap. Worst of all, these changes were buried in a bill with no hearing and no public debate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this body never even got a chance to vote on this provision since the bill was not considered under an open amendment process.

In all the conversations that I have had with residents throughout Washington State, I can tell you I have never heard anyone, Democrat or Republican, argue that the wealthy can't spend enough on politics or that those with the deepest pockets don't have enough influence in our Nation's Capital.

That is why I have introduced the Close the Floodgates Act, to protect the interests of "We the People" and make sure that the wealthiest donors don't get another chance to flood our elections with even more money and to undermine our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, let's take up this legislation, strip out those loopholes, and get to work restoring the faith and trust of American voters.

DR. KENNETH COOPER

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable individual from Dallas, Texas, to recognize him for his introduction into the National Football Foundation's Leadership Hall of Fame last night, January 8, 2015.

I would like to thank Chairman Archie Manning, football player Troy Aikman, Mayor Tom and Laura Leppert, and football player Roger Staubach for recognizing Dr. Kenneth Cooper for his dedication to health and fitness and his continuing leadership to health care for all.

Throughout Dr. Cooper's career in the United States Air Force and in a medical career in Dallas, Texas, he has continued to revitalize health care and fitness. He is also the father of preventive medicine and known as the father of aerobics, trying to make sure that the American people and the world understand how important fitness is to our life and our health.

I want to express my hearty congratulations to Dr. Cooper on receiving this outstanding award on behalf of the National Football Foundation, and I hope the American people and, today, the United States Congress will do so as well.

FUNDING COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR ALL

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today the President will be speaking in Knoxville, Tennessee, on extending college educations to Americans.

I share with the President the goal of giving more Americans the opportunity to go to college, but I would submit to him he should not be holding up the Tennessee Promise plan in Tennessee as an example. He should be holding up the Tennessee HOPE Lottery Scholarship program, which I worked 20 years to achieve in Tennessee and has provided over \$3 billion to education, \$250 million a year.

Scholarship programs such as the President is talking about should have standards for students in high school to achieve to get a scholarship. They should have strong standards in college to maintain them. They should be in addition to Pell grants and in addition to other scholarships to pay for books and tuition.

The Promise plan takes from middle class and lower income students and gives to higher income students, doesn't have standards in high school to get the scholarship, and doesn't have high standards to keep it. It is a last dollar scholarship.

The President's plan should be more like the Tennessee HOPE Lottery Scholarship: assure students have an incentive in high school to get it and incentives to keep it with high grade standards, and it shouldn't go to for-profit schools, for that is an invitation to abuse.

I thank the President for his commitment, but I think he has the wrong program as his model.

FUNDING AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's attempt to bypass Congress and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants is wrong and dangerous. It undermines the rule of law and threatens American jobs.

That is why right now several of my colleagues and I, including fellow appropriators, are putting the finishing touches on a plan that will wield the power of the purse to block executive amnesty.

I believe we have a solid strategy. We wanted to put forward the simplest, most straightforward bill language that could defund the President's immigration actions. Thankfully my own Alabama Senator, JEFF SESSIONS, had already generated some great model language doing just that, so we crafted that into the House bill.

We are still working on it, but I am confident that strong defund language will be presented to this House for inclusion in the Homeland appropriations title.

I believe the will of Congress must be to fund Homeland Security and its important functions, but to specifically block implementation of President Obama's unconstitutional immigration orders.

□ 0915

READING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, for the third time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud on the floor of the House the full text of the United States Constitution.

It is our hope that this reading will help demonstrate to the American people that the House of Representatives is dedicated to the Constitution and the system it establishes for limited government and the protection of individual liberty. We also hope that it will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution themselves.

The text we will read today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness to all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up to be recognized on a first-come, first-served basis. I will recognize Members based on this guidance. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order in order to ensure bipartisanship and balance. Additionally, because of his long-term leadership on civil rights issues, I will recognize the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, to read the Thirteenth Amendment.

I want to thank the Members of both parties for their participation in this historic event. I will begin by recognizing the gentleman from Ohio, Speaker BOEHNER, to read the preamble to the Constitution:

Mr. BOEHNER. "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Article I, section 1:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

I now yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. "No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

"The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty-thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. "When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

"The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Section 3:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. "The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second

year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided."

"The Senate shall chuse their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the Members present."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Section 4:

"The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chusing Senators."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Section 5:

"Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. "Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. "Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Section 6: "The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. "No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI, Section 7: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. "Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States: if

he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. "If after such reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. "But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. "If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law."

□ 0930

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. "Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR, Section 8: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. "... to borrow money on the credit of the United States;

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

"To establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the

subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. "... to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

"To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

"To establish post offices and post roads; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. "... to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. "... to constitute tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

"To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. "... to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. "... to provide and maintain a navy;

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. "... to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. "... to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of

particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. ". . . and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Section 9:

"The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it."

"No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed."

"No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken."

"No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. "No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another."

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States; and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state."

Section 10:

"No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant

letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. "No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and controul of the Congress."

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Article II, section 1:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected, as follows:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office or trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. "The Congress may determine the time of chusing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States."

"No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. "The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive

within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them."

"Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.'"

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Section 2:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. ". . . but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

"The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Section 3:

"He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient;

"He may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; . . ."

□ 0945

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. “. . . he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.”

Section 4:

“The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Article III, section 1:

“The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Section 2:

“The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;—to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. “. . . to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;—to controversies between two or more States,—between citizens of different States,—between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. “In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. “The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes

shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Section 3:

“Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. “The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Article IV, section 1:

“Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Section 2:

“The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

“A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Section 3:

“New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. “The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Section 4:

“The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Article V:

“The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. “. . . or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Article VI:

“All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. “This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. “The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States

and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Article VII:

"The ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. "Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the seventeenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. George Washington, President and deputy from Virginia.

Delaware: George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom.

Maryland: James McHenry, Daniel of St Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll.

Virginia: John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. North Carolina: William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson.

South Carolina: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler.

Georgia: William Few, Abraham Baldwin.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. New Hampshire: John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.

Massachusetts: Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King.

Connecticut: William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman.

New York: Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. New Jersey: William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton.

Pennsylvania: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Amendment I:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or

prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Amendment II:

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Amendment III: "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

□ 1000

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Amendment IV:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Amendment V:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. ". . . nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Amendment VI:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law. . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. ". . . and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Amendment VII:

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Amendment VIII:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Amendment IX:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Amendment X:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Amendment XI:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Amendment XII:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President. . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. ". . . and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted

for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. “. . . the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. “. . . the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. “The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. “. . . a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Amendment XIII, section 1:

“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

Section 2:

“Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Amendment XIV, section 1:

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Section 2:

“Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. “But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the Members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Section 3:

“No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. “. . . or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Section 4:

“The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law,

including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. “But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Section 5:

“The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.”

Amendment XV, section 1:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. Section 2:

“The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Amendment XVI:

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Amendment XVII:

“The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

“When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. “. . . provided, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

“This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.”

□ 1015

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Amendment XIX:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Amendment XX:

Section 1:

"The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 2:

"The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Section 3:

"If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. ". . . and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Section 4:

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from

whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Section 5:

"Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article."

Section 6:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Amendment XXI:

Section 1:

"The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

Section 2:

"The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Section 3:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Amendment XXII:

Section 1:

"No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. "But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Section 2:

"This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Tipton).

Mr. TIPTON. Amendment XXIII:

Section 1:

"The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as Congress may direct:

"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. ". . . they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment."

Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE. Amendment XXIV:

Section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay poll tax or other tax."

Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Amendment XXV:

Section 1:

"In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President."

Section 2:

"Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Section 3:

"Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Section 4:

"Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. "Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Amendment XXVI:

Section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Amendment XXVII:

"No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend remarks and insert omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 95-277, as amended by the appropriate provisions of Public Law 102-246, and in consultation with the Majority Leader, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a five year term:

George Marcus of California, vice Elaine Wynn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1104

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keystone XL Pipeline Act".

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original

and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I enthusiastically rise today to support H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. And for those who have not heard, according to the administration, the final hurdle has been removed, and that is that the Nebraska Supreme Court this morning has approved the pathway for the pipeline, the routing of the pipeline, the Keystone XL pipeline.

Again, the administration has said that was the major hurdle. It has fallen. So I hope the President is not going to establish another hurdle, that being himself.

America is undergoing an energy renaissance, and the prospect of securing North American energy independence is in sight. However, to achieve our goal of energy security, we need to make sure we have the infrastructure in place to keep pace with the changing energy landscape. Keystone will be a critical addition to the Nation's pipeline network, increasing our supply of oil and helping to reduce its cost.

The State Department completed its environmental analysis a year ago. However, there has still been no action by the administration on the pipeline.

There is simply no reason to delay this important project. As I mentioned, the President's main argument in this premature veto threat is that the bill would authorize the pipeline despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, that uncertainty has ended this morning, and the Supreme Court of Nebraska has allowed the planned route to go forward in Nebraska. Again, there is simply no reason to delay. In fact, the southern leg of the pipeline has already been built.

In March 2012, in Oklahoma, the President expressed his support for expediting construction for the southern leg of the Keystone pipeline, and I agree with the President when he stated at that ceremony that he was directing his administration to cut through red tape, break through bureaucratic hurdles, and make this project a priority to go ahead and get it done. It was the right thing to do then, it is the right thing to do now, and it is exactly what this bill does.

We should move forward because this pipeline will be a tremendous boon to the economic development and one that doesn't require a single Federal dollar. The very nature of infrastructure improvement creates jobs, and Keystone is no exception.

I know my colleagues have made the argument that it is only temporary, but every infrastructure job is a temporary job. When a road is completed, when a bridge is completed, when a pipeline is completed, those construction workers move on to hopefully other construction jobs.

Indeed, five unions representing over 3 million workers—and I repeat that to my Democratic colleagues, five unions representing 3 million hardworking Americans—support this project, and I would like to submit their letter in the RECORD for support of this project.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express the support of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters for S. 2280, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. The Keystone XL Pipeline project has been subjected to over six and one-half years of scrutiny, including review by 10 federal agencies, as well as numerous state and local agency reviews. We believe that it is time to end the delay and to move forward with the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. We ask you to support S. 2280 when it comes to the Senate floor this week.

The Teamsters Union believes that the Keystone XL Pipeline will contribute to enhanced energy security, economic prosperity and, of critical importance, the creation of good paying jobs. Unemployment in the building and construction workforce remains too high. Construction of the pipeline will provide much needed and good paying jobs for this workforce. The utilization of a project labor agreement will enhance the safety, technical performance, reliability and quality of the project as well as maximize employment opportunities for local residents along the proposed corridor. Further, the fifty-seven special conditions agreed to for the project will provide an even greater degree of safety than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline.

If the pipeline is not built, important socioeconomic benefits will not be realized—the positive impacts of local, state and federal revenue, spending by construction workers, and spending on construction goods and services. Building the Keystone XL Pipeline will enhance U.S. energy and economic secu-

rity. It is time to move forward without further delay.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2013.

Hon. JOHN HOEVEN,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARY L. LANDRIEU,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HOEVEN AND LANDRIEU: The International Union of Operating Engineers supports your amendment to energy-efficiency legislation, S. 1392, which simply expresses congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) represents approximately 400,000 skilled American and Canadian heavy-equipment operators and other craftworkers, including thousands of members who hope to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The IUOE is one of four unions signatory to the National Pipeline Agreement.

To create jobs and improve American energy independence, the Keystone XL pipeline should become a key part of America's energy infrastructure. The economic benefits of the project are dramatic and undisputable. The State Department's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) says that approximately 10,000 construction workers would be employed building the pipeline, including thousands of Operating Engineers. A total of 42,100 jobs throughout the United States would be supported by the project, generating over \$2 billion in total earnings. All told, this pipeline project would contribute approximately \$3.4 billion to America's Gross Domestic Product.

The Keystone XL will also be one of the safest pipelines ever built. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and voluntarily agreed to by TransCanada "... would have a degree of safety greater than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations." In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the highest safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build this essential piece North American energy infrastructure. Every state along the pipeline route has approved the project. Over 80 percent of Americans believe it's in our national interest to build it. Now it's time for the federal government to approve the project. Congress can send a strong message by supporting your amendment.

The IUOE endorses the Hoeven-Landrieu amendment in support of Keystone XL, and looks forward to working with you to see it passed into law.

Thank you again for your leadership.
Sincerely

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. All of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. Members on both sides of the border hope to build the Keystone XL. Members of the Operating Engineers, through the collective bargaining process, will earn roughly \$35 an hour on their checks as they build the Keystone XL. The project is expected to generate approximately 3,000 job-years for Operating Engineers alone. With congressional approval of the pipeline, you can unleash this massive economic activity—at no cost to taxpayers.

The misguided criticism of the pipeline by the environmental community does not change the facts. Virtually the whole critique depends on a fundamental misunderstanding of the oil-transportation industry and its economics. Despite the conclusion of five different environmental studies, critics of the project refuse to accept that Keystone XL has little or no effect on the extraction rate of oil sands. Alternative transportation methods will step in to move the commodity, irrespective of the Keystone XL decision. The oil and gas industry possesses too much operational flexibility to allow one pipeline to limit the extraction rates of oil sands in Western Canada. Rail and other pipeline alternatives are ready to move oil sands and Bakken crude.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has ensured that Keystone XL will be safer than any other domestic oil pipeline system built under current code as a result of its required 59 Special Conditions. These conditions usually accompany pipeline requirements in a "High-Consequence Area"—steep slope, for example. Yet these conditions will apply across the entirety of the Keystone XL pipeline. The conditions relate to everything from manufacturing specifications of pipe, to construction techniques, to post-construction monitoring.

This \$5 billion privately-funded pipeline will move an essential North American commodity more safely than other alternatives. It will also grow the economy by putting thousands of Operating Engineers and other construction workers back on the job.

The International Union of Operating Engineers respectfully requests your support for H.R. 3, legislation to approve the Key-

stone XL pipeline. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

Mr. SHUSTER. I want to name them off. It is the Teamsters; it is the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; it is the Laborers' International Union of North America; it is the Operating Engineers; it is the pipefitters of the United States and Canada all supporting this project. Again, they see it as positive economic impact.

When these jobs are completed, they will move on to other, hopefully, construction jobs; but what is left behind will have a positive impact to our economy, to job creation for a generation.

Our energy renaissance is helping make North America more secure and energy independent, and, in fact, I want to quote the President:

In this time of significant political uncertainty in key oil-producing countries and regions, and in the context of a difficult economic situation, non-OPEC Canada crude oil supplies advance the energy security of the United States.

Now, I wish he would have said that about this pipeline, but he didn't. He said it in 2009 about the Enbridge pipeline, which started transferring oil sands from Canada to the gulf coast last month. The President, 5 years ago, supported this type of thing. He should support it now. So other than politics, I don't understand why he hasn't approved this project as he did with Enbridge. It is time to build.

Ladies and gentlemen, I especially look to my Democratic colleagues. Let's put down our gloves. Let's do something positive for America, for those 3 million union workers that are out there supporting this. Let's do what is good for the environment. Let's do what is good for energy independence.

Finally, let's be fair to our greatest friends in the world, our Canadian neighbors. They allowed us to build a pipeline across their land. We should allow them to do the same in ours. They are our best allies. They are our greatest friends. They are a great neighbor. So let us, today, pass this bill and build the Keystone pipeline.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, it is Groundhog Day come early to the floor of the House. It is cold enough I guess for Groundhog Day, but this will be the 10th time in the last 4 years that the House of Representatives has moved this bill with the assertion that somehow it leads us to energy independence, energy security, lower prices at the pump.

Well, the reality is a Canadian corporation is going to build a pipeline from Canada to Texas. They are going to be exempt from paying into the Oil

Spill Liability Trust Fund, unlike most other projects in this country, because of a stupid ruling by the IRS—but that is nothing new—regarding tar sands. So they will be exempt from paying into that. So if this thing bursts, there is an accident, the taxpayers of the United States get the bill, not the taxpayers of Canada. They don't get the bill. The taxpayers of the United States get the bill. Now, that is one of a number of problems regarding this project.

It is somewhat unprecedented, I believe. This may have happened at some other time in American history, but I do find it particularly ironic today, when we had the reading of the Constitution, that the effect of passing this bill, if it were to become law—and the President has already said he will veto it. But if this were to become law, the effect would be to give a foreign corporation the right to take private property from American citizens.

I am not aware of any other time in the history of the Union where we have given a foreign corporation the right to take Americans' private property. And, yes, some people were happy to sell the rights, but many others weren't, including some in Nebraska and some in Texas. It has been quite contentious among landowners who are just having this corporation come.

I would like to put in the RECORD a letter from TransCanada. We have blacked out the name of the recipient of the letter, but it is a true copy of a letter to a person who will have their private property taken by eminent domain by a foreign corporation, and the foreign corporation informs them that they will begin proceedings this month, I guess because of the anticipated Republican action, to take their private property away.

TRANSCANADA,

Omaha, NE, December 8, 2014

Re Keystone XL Project Update.

DEAR LANDOWNER: While we continue to wait for decisions from the Nebraska Supreme Court and from the U.S. Department of State regarding our proposed Keystone XL Pipeline, I would like to provide you with an update on our project.

To date, Nebraska landowners have voluntarily granted us easements representing 84 percent of the required right-of-way for the Keystone XL Pipeline Project. We continue to work to acquire the remaining land rights. In Montana and South Dakota, we have acquired easements for 100 percent of the privately owned right-of-way.

Between September 2008 and earlier this year, five successive sets of extensive public comments were taken and five successive independent environmental assessments were published by the State Department. Each review confirmed the safety and environmental soundness of the project. The State Department is continuing its review of our Presidential Permit application and will ultimately make a determination whether the project is in the national interest. The State Department has not announced a definitive timeline for reaching that decision.

In addition, reviews have been completed separately by the States of Montana, Nebraska and South Dakota. As with the federal reviews, these state reviews included extensive public input. Each resulted in state approval of the project.

In South Dakota, the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission approved the project in 2010. Because construction did not begin within four years, we must certify that the pipeline continues to meet the conditions upon which the permit was issued. We have initiated the certification process and we expect a decision in 2015.

The State of Nebraska enacted legislation in 2011 and in 2012 requiring state review of the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline route. The Governor approved the route in January 2013, after a year-long public review process overseen by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality. Following a legal challenge of the new law, a lower court determined that the law was not valid and that the review should have been overseen by the Nebraska Public Service Commission. The Nebraska Attorney General appealed the lower court ruling to the Nebraska Supreme Court and the Court is expected to make a ruling later this year or early next year.

Pending a decision on the appeal, the law remains in effect as does the resulting Keystone XL route. In the event that the Nebraska Supreme Court affirms the lower court ruling invalidating the new law, we would expect a second Nebraska review to be required, this time by the Nebraska Public Service Commission.

If instead, the Nebraska Supreme Court reverses the lower court ruling, affirming the validity of the existing state review, we expect that other aspects of that law would remain in effect as well. One of those aspects affects the timing available to complete negotiations to acquire remaining property rights in Nebraska. If parties ultimately are not able to reach voluntary agreement on acquisition of necessary land rights for the project, we are required to commence the legal process of eminent domain to obtain those rights within two years of the January 2013 Nebraska approval.

We recognize that the Supreme Court ruling may not be issued before we are required to take action in preparation for the existing January 2015 deadline. While we would prefer not to initiate the process to acquire outstanding land rights while there is uncertainty, we are bound by that deadline in order to meet our responsibility to continue to prepare to build the pipeline necessary to safely transport North American energy.

Regardless of your perspective on the project, we would welcome the opportunity to address your questions and concerns and discuss property-specific details for pipeline construction. When we are able to work with landowners to achieve mutual agreement where possible, we are better able to minimize potential effects of construction on land and operations.

A member of my land team will follow-up with you or your legal counsel. If you have not heard from us or if you have questions, you are welcome to contact me. If you would like to see an operating pipeline, please let us know and we'd be happy to arrange for a tour of a pump station on the operating Keystone line in Nebraska.

Sincerely,

ANDREW CRAIG,
Manager—Land, Keystone Projects,
TransCanada Pipelines, USA.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Now, that is a bit ironic, again, on the day we read the

Constitution and also of the party of individual rights for property owners. So that is also of concern.

Yes, there will be construction jobs, and I am the first to admit we need more jobs in America. In fact, I voted against the President's so-called stimulus bill because it didn't invest enough in building infrastructure in this country. Instead, it did a whole bunch of stupid tax cuts because of Larry Summers, a highly acclaimed hack economist, and we didn't put a lot of people back to work. Seven percent went to infrastructure, that created jobs; 42 percent went to tax cuts, didn't create jobs. But that is another agenda the Republicans are pursuing is tax cuts to create jobs, but we won't get into that here today.

So, yes, that will happen, but there are a lot of other investments we should, could, and I believe the chairman supports making that will create significant construction and infrastructure jobs.

Now, were this just in isolation and it didn't involve the total destruction of the boreal forests of Canada, if I were Canadian I would be pretty upset about that; and perhaps the dirtiest, most environmentally problematic way of extracting fossil fuels from the ground to get these oil sands, the construction jobs might carry the day, but sometimes you have to draw a line.

In this case, we also hear it is going to lead somehow to energy security. Well, that is interesting because the crude, tar sand oil, or whatever you want to call it, is going to come down to Texas without paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund—creating a potential problem for the future taxpayers of the United States—go to a refinery in an export zone in Texas, and, yes, it will be refined and then it will be exported.

We are exporting millions of gallons of fuel every day, so to somehow say this is going to lead to lower prices at the pump in America—maybe it is lower prices at the pump in China or I don't know where else, Japan or someplace, but it isn't going to be here because the product is ultimately going to be exported. So it is also not going to do anything for our energy security, and at the moment we have kind of a surfeit because of fracking and other things of fuels, and prices are down considerably.

□ 1115

So those are just a few of the problems.

And by passing this bill, the House of Representatives will attempt to preempt the executive authority of the President in this matter because this pipeline crosses an international border. The President has authority, and the State Department has been considering it.

And even with the Supreme Court of Nebraska refusing to make a judgment,

they didn't uphold the law of the Nebraska legislature. In fact, four out of seven judges—normally a majority in most places—said it was unconstitutional, but Nebraska has a peculiarity that if the other three judges take a walk—which they did—then even though a majority found it unconstitutional, it is not found unconstitutional, and that is the end of the proceeding.

So that is the big news out of Nebraska. They need a little work on their constitution, I think. So it hasn't received a stamp of approval there. There are still aggrieved landowners in Nebraska who object to the route and who are going to have their private property taken by a foreign corporation. So other than that, it is a great idea.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to remind my Democratic colleagues that, first of all, I am from Pennsylvania. Punxsutawney is several miles outside of my district. That is where Punxsutawney Phil resides. So I am somewhat knowledgeable on Groundhog Day. And I just want to point out to my Democratic colleagues that in the movie "Groundhog Day," Bill Murray learned from his mistakes the day before and improved his situation each day. So hopefully today, your references to your learning from yesterday and how we can move forward—I think the Nebraska situation improves the whole situation for all of us. And I certainly don't question the wisdom of the Nebraska Supreme Court.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill as vice chair of the Pipeline Subcommittee.

Pipelines are the single safest way to transport liquids—safer than rail, safer than trucks. The State Department says Keystone would have a minimal impact on the environment.

President Obama and his administration have confirmed that Keystone will create thousands of construction jobs. These are men and women's livelihoods.

Respectfully, I would remind the administration, but by their nature, all construction jobs are temporary. And it is insulting to marginalize the value of these jobs or the people who might hold them.

Keystone is supported by many unions, including mine, Local 545, the Operating Engineers, where I have been for almost 35 years.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper of Canada said, and I agree, that Keystone is in both of our nations' interests and that "the logic here is overwhelming."

Keystone will help us stop sending billions and billions of dollars overseas

to our enemies, many of whom would harm us.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to start building this Keystone pipeline.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how much time remains of the 15 minutes that I had?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Each side has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to what can only be described as an earmark for a Canadian corporation. It speaks volumes about the Republican agenda, as this new Congress convenes, that the first order of business in the House and Senate is to rubberstamp the Keystone XL pipeline.

We have not dealt with unemployment benefits that the American people need that have lapsed for more than a year. Millions of Americans are suffering from a low minimum wage and income disparity, but we are not helping them. Women in this country still only earn 77 cents to every dollar their male counterparts earn, but we are not trying to end that disparity.

Instead, they are forcing Keystone through without the proper approval process. Building a pipeline clear across the United States so that TransCanada can sell its dirty tar sands oil to the highest bidder—namely China—is not in the American people's best interests.

We take on the risk to our lands, the American people face threats to their health, and TransCanada gets to reap the rewards. That is not a winning formula for our country or the economy. In fact, it is a sham.

And yet the Keystone XL pipeline continues to be sold to the American people on blatantly false pretenses. We are told by proponents that this is about job creation, yet not a single independent analysis supports these claims.

The burden of proof is on the GOP. They pull fantastic claims out of thin air, and yet they refuse to back them up. Instead, we are told to take their assertions at face value.

Here is what we actually know. These are the facts that can actually be substantiated:

The State Department found in its supplemental environmental impact study of the Keystone pipeline that it will generate less than 2,000 jobs a year for 2 years and only during the period of construction. Once the pipeline is built, these jobs will disappear, leaving a mere 35 permanent jobs that will result from this project—35. To put that in context, under President Obama, 353,000 jobs were generated in November and a total of 2.9 million in 2014.

There is also the claim that it is going to lower gas prices for the American people. Please. Gas prices have been dropping for more than 100 straight days and are at the lowest level in more than 5½ years. They won't go any lower by allowing oil to be piped across our country just to be sold abroad.

In contrast to fantasy impacts on gas prices, the potential impacts on our environment are very real. Not only will burning these tar sands add to global climate change, but any leak, failure, or, God forbid, explosion will have disastrous impacts on our environment. And because tar sands importers are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, the American taxpayers will have to bear the cost of cleaning up any spills.

The public needs to know these facts, and that is why allowing 1 hour of debate with not a single, solitary amendment today robs the American people of a full debate and discussion.

On top of all that, this bill is being pushed through despite the fact that it violates not one but two treaties with American Indian nations.

What does this say about the GOP's respect for the rule of law?

If the Republicans truly want to generate jobs for the American people, they should fully fund the highway trust fund and support the GROW AMERICA Act to invest in the crumbling infrastructure all across this country, not help Canadians build a superhighway for their dirty tar sands oil.

We would be supporting not just 2,000 jobs per year for 2 years but millions of jobs for American families, across every congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have a chance to take an important stand today early in this Congress on behalf of taxpayers, the environment, Native American communities, and the rule of law by supporting President Obama's veto and rejecting this toxic giveaway to foreign corporate oil interests.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to say that there have been 15 hearings on the Keystone pipeline. This is the 10th time we have debated it on the floor. This, quite possibly, could be the most debated piece of legislation in the history of Congress. I don't know that for sure. But I do know that it has been out there for 2,303 days, and 60 percent of the American people support it, while 20 percent don't support it. So I think the American people are fully aware of what is going on here. They understand it, and they do support it.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keystone pipeline, which will

safely move 300 million barrels annually, strengthen our economy, continue to decrease our dependence on Mideast oil, and support thousands of jobs.

This body has shown tremendous leadership on this issue and last year passed bipartisan legislation to approve Keystone for the ninth time. Today, with strong support from unions, businesses, and the American people, we must pass it again.

I am grateful for Representative CRAMER, Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman UPTON, and the leadership for their work on this vital legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman just referenced safely transport. Of course that is a hypothetical. And let me give a real example:

In 2010, a Canadian company, Enbridge, had a pipeline burst in Marshall, Michigan, spilling 1 million gallons of tar sands oil.

Now, here is the thing. All oil has viscosity and other characteristics. The thing about tar sands oil is, it doesn't float. It goes right to the bottom. They are still dredging Canadian tar sands oil out of the bottom of the Kalamazoo River 4 years later. And so far, claims of \$53 million have been made, which will have to be paid by American taxpayers against the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and not by Enbridge, the Canadian corporation.

Which is what we are setting up here: an even greater transshipment by a foreign corporation, exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, creating even bigger potential for spills with this oil, which has unique characteristics which are much more difficult to clean up if it comes in contact with water and, God forbid, it gets into the aquifer in one of the States that are being transected.

The chairman did reference the 15 hearings. We have a difference in counting. But let's say 15 hearings. Three were in the Rules Committee. Those aren't hearings. That is sort of a little star chamber where you take things before you bring them to the floor of the House. You don't discuss substance there. One was in the Senate. There were 10 in the House, but not a single one of those hearings was in the principal committee of jurisdiction, which would be the Transportation Committee. And of course the bill that was marked up by the Transportation Committee in the first session of the last Congress was very different than the bill that is being advocated for today, which has not been marked up.

And we heard a lot about regular order, read the bill, and all that stuff. It is fine to say, gee, we have voted on this a lot of times before. With 61 new Members of the House, gas prices are down by almost 50 percent, a lot of things have changed. I would even wonder about the viability of this project.

I did just recently learn that the Koch brothers, though, have a significant investment in tar sands in Canada. But that probably has nothing to do with an attempt to expedite this project.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would just like to remind the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation Committee, arguably the most knowledgeable man in Congress when it comes to transportation issues, with many years of service plus an intellect that is very sharp—I would never presume to tell him—I just want to remind him that the safest way to move product, to move oil is by pipeline. And I think the gentleman knows that, but I just wanted to remind him of that.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard a word that is almost hard to believe. We have been accused of expediting this process. Ladies and gentlemen, this is day 2,303 of this process. It is time now.

It is time because it is good for job creation. It is time because it is good for the environment. It is not just the safest way, as the chairman said; the most environmentally sound way to move tar sands oil is in a pipeline. It is good for national security. It is good for economic security. It is good because 62.8 percent of labor force participation is the lowest since 1978. It creates jobs. And it is for these reasons that not only does the majority of the United States House and the majority of the United States Senate support it, but it is because of these reasons that the vast majority of the people of the United States support it, including the people of Nebraska. And for those reasons, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At this moment, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

□ 1130

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the permitting for the Keystone pipeline has taken longer than it took for the United States to win World War II. Isn't that lovely?

The pipeline will bring oil to my home State of Texas. Pipelines are the safest way to transport oil. The Keystone will deliver as much oil as we get from Saudi Arabia. The United States should work more with our neighbors—our normal neighbors—Canada and Mexico to develop our national resources and compete with OPEC.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national security and energy security issue. We can

make the Middle East, its politics, its oil, and its turmoil irrelevant. It is time to pick a horse and ride it.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In response to the transport, yes, pipelines are generally safer, but the consequences—look at the case in Michigan—when a pipeline goes are generally much greater, much greater volumes.

Even in the horrific train accidents we have had, the volumes were relatively small that were spilled, even though the consequences—particularly in the one in Canada—were very, very damaging. Minimally, you should have added to the bill requiring them to pay into the oil spill liability trust fund. That would make that slightly less objectionable.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. This bill is based on the Cassidy Keystone bill which passed the House last Congress on a bipartisan vote of 252–161.

As Chairman SHUSTER noted, this pipeline will create jobs, enhance our energy independence, and strengthen our national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that makes numerous project benefits a reality. According to the Department of Energy, the pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels per day of oil from Canada to the gulf coast, which will help reduce reliance on more hostile nations.

Some have argued that the oil will just be exported, but the administration's own environmental analysis denies that that will ever occur. It will also create good-paying jobs now, while promoting the growth of our energy economy for the future.

This is the most studied pipeline in our history. In the history of our Nation, we have never studied a pipeline like this. There is no need to continue to stall its approval. This project will be safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, America currently has 2.6 million miles of pipeline providing an extremely safe way to transport energy products.

The Keystone pipeline will be the safest ever built, with 95 special mitigation measures, including nearly 60 recommended by the Department of Transportation. It is time to approve this project.

We can't afford any more delays. The American public deserves these jobs, and we deserve to be energy independent.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, we know that building the Keystone pipeline will create some jobs, and it can even help lower consumers' prices, but many of these jobs are temporary, which is true in most capital cases anyway. The price of oil has already fallen below \$50 a barrel for the first time since 2009.

We really got some good news about jobs today again. We added 252,000 jobs, and the unemployment rate is the lowest since 2008—I think May or June of that year.

While we are going in the right direction, we need some serious creation of jobs and at least a reach-out to the administration, "Hey, you are doing a pretty good job on this, on oil prices, on gasoline prices," just a little bit of encouragement. We all roll on the same ship, come on.

You boost our energy security, and you save consumers money at the pump, but the debate over Keystone has become a symbolic issue. Come on, let's admit it. It is clear that this fight is vastly greater than the economic, environmental, or energy impact. It is the end of the world if you listen to the extremes of both sides.

I could support the construction of this pipeline but do not believe Congress should circumvent the administrative view.

Mr. Speaker, let me just recommend something perhaps through you to the Chair. I believe that the reason why we have this problem is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has nothing to say about oil lines. They do on gas lines, but not oil lines.

I think we could have saved a lot of time if we used the same situation. I am going to vote "no" on this, but I think there is some good things that need to be done and could be worked out.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a Nebraskan.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, as you all know, a major portion of the Keystone XL pipeline will run through Nebraska's Third District. Nebraskans overwhelmingly support this project to improve access to North American energy and decrease the strain on our overwhelmed infrastructure system.

As we all now know, the Nebraska Supreme Court has upheld the process as established by the elected Nebraska officials.

I urge my colleagues to support approval of this project, and I urge the President to sign off on the pipeline as a needed step to encourage private investment in infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK.)

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL pipeline. This bill is about good-paying jobs and energy security.

Republicans and many Democrats agree on this, as well as the unique coalition of unions like the Teamsters, LIUNA, the Tea Party, as well as the Chamber of Commerce.

Listen to what the president of LIUNA said:

To the tens and thousands of men and women in the construction industry, this isn't just a pipeline; it is their mortgages, college tuitions, car payments, and food on the table. And for our country, this isn't just a pipeline; it's a lifeline to family security, energy security, and national security.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the passage of this critical, bipartisan bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to authorize the building of the Keystone pipeline. It is time. Enough is enough. We agree, thousands of jobs would be created by this pipeline.

This will improve consumer prices. This will bring stability to oil markets around the world. This will contribute to protecting us here on American soil rather than relying on energy sources from hostile nations of the world. It doesn't cure all the problems, but it is a step in the right direction.

Our constituents sent us here, Mr. Speaker, to solve problems. This is part of the solution. I rise in support of the Keystone pipeline and ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reaffirm the bipartisan message of the last Congress and approve this legislation today.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone XL pipeline, the most studied pipeline in American history.

After 6 years and 22,000 pages of review, the President's own State Department tells us that construction of this pipeline will support over 42,000 good-paying jobs and do nothing to harm the environment. Pipelines have been shown to be the safest way to transport oil.

Keystone has bipartisan, widespread support—Democrats, Republicans, in-

dustrial leaders, and labor. Unfortunately, the President issued a veto threat, putting the wishes of environmental activists ahead of creating jobs for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, let's say "yes" to much-needed jobs and approve the Keystone pipeline without any further delays.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are exporting more than 60 percent of the oil that we produce every day either as refined or even as crude product. In this case, Canadian oil, exempt from a tax, will flow through the United States to a refinery.

It will be processed and exported overseas. Somehow, that is going to lower prices further at the pump. Somehow, that is going to lead to American energy security.

You have to blow the dust off those arguments. They are a little dated, so we have raised a number of concerns here today.

Minimally—minimally—the Republicans should require this Canadian corporation to pay the same tax that most U.S. corporations pay when they transport products through pipelines and not put American taxpayers at risk.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the final hurdle has been removed. The Nebraska Supreme Court has said that the Keystone pipeline can move forward. That should be enough for my Democratic colleagues.

But there is more. It is safe. It is the safest way to transport this oil, this natural resource. It is the most studied pipeline. It is going to be safe and environmentally sound. It will protect the environment. It creates jobs. Don't listen to me; listen to the five unions that represent 3 million workers. Three million union workers say the Keystone pipeline should be built.

Mr. Speaker, it provides energy security for us, it is good for our economy, and it helps our allies—it strengthens our allies, and it weakens our enemies.

The last point is it is fair to our best friends in the world, the Canadians, who have allowed us to build a pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48. We ought to return the favor to our best friend—our best ally—and say: "Yes, you can build a safe pipeline, you can build a pipeline that will help all of North America, that will help all of our allies around the world and weaken our enemies."

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee has shared jurisdiction over this issue with T&I, and we have a number of members that would like to speak on the issue as well.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, do you like cheap oil? Most Americans would say "yes," and a number of us have strongly pursued a North American energy independence plan for years, and our friend, Canada, is a big part of that.

In August of 2009, President Obama signed off on a new pipeline called the Alberta Clipper. Guess what? It brings 400,000 barrels of oil a day from western Canada to the United States.

We have been waiting for the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline for years—over 6 in fact. I remember well when President Obama promised to do whatever it takes to create American jobs. That was followed by a so-called year of action; yet here we are, 6 years later, and nothing has happened.

By the administration's own estimates, tens of thousands of jobs will be supported by this landmark project. Bringing oil from Canada to the U.S. displaces imports from Venezuela and the Middle East. Isn't that a good thing?

I also note that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton signaled that she was inclined to support the project, and that was way back in 2010.

In fact, in the summer of 2011, the White House issued its first veto threat against congressional action on the Keystone XL, claiming that legislation was unnecessary because their process was working and a decision would be reached by the end of that year. Since then, we have upgraded new oil and gas pipeline standards, and Keystone will exceed those, Mr. President, as it should.

We used to be a nation of big ideas and big dreams. We imagined building the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge and accomplished both in far less time than it has taken the President to muster the courage to simply say "yes" or "no." We can do better.

The election, Mr. President, is over. There has been broad, bipartisan support for this project from the very first day. The President has been hiding behind the Nebraska court case to block the critical jobs project called Keystone XL, and with that contrived roadblock cleared, the White House is now out of excuses. Vote "yes."

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, a bill to approve the application for the construction of Keystone XL pipeline.

I rise in support of this bill because I support North American energy development.

Today, the Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed that Keystone XL should be built.

Keystone XL pipeline not the first cross-border pipeline project built in North America.

But if some opponents had their way, Keystone XL pipeline would be the last pipeline we built in North America.

Energy prices are at their lowest point in the last decade.

Energy imports from partners like Canada and Mexico, and domestic production, have put more than \$900 a year in the pockets of the American people.

Keystone XL will continue this success in a time of struggle.

The United States still imports approximately 40 percent of the oil we use domestically.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has decided to directly challenge the new North American energy market by maintaining, and in some cases, increasing production.

This is a direct affront to North American producers and an all-out price war.

This, however, is a struggle we can win, with the help of our North American partners.

Breakeven prices for North American crude, including Canadian oil sands and United States shale oil, are as low as \$40 per barrel.

Our producers can support our domestic demand while further driving out more expensive competitors.

Unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot win without cost-effective and environmentally sound transportation.

Keystone XL offers that advantage and I support it, although I do not believe H.R. 3 is the perfect legislation.

I believe that oil sands should be subject to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Almost every other source of crude oil that transits the United States is subject to the Trust Fund tax and oil sands should be as well.

It makes fiscal sense, it makes environmental sense and it makes competitive sense.

Oil sands should not be favored over any other sources in our country.

The Keystone XL pipeline is the most scrutinized project in as long as I can remember.

As we face the 114th Congress, we have real problems that require answers.

Keystone XL pipeline is good for the United States, it's good for North America and we should support this bill.

□ 1145

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are voting once again to grant special treatment—and I stress “special treatment”—to TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline. It is the 10th time since Republicans took control of the House.

American families face many pressing problems, and they want us to use this new Congress to work together to solve them. Unfortunately, we will begin this new year with a bill crafted solely to help the Canadian tar sands industry. The administration issued a statement in opposition to this legislation and indicated that the President will veto the bill. I heard my Republican colleagues talk about the action

or inaction, whatever it was, by the Nebraska Supreme Court today; but I would stress that the White House press office still says in a statement that regardless of the Nebraska ruling today, the House bill still conflicts with longstanding executive branch procedures regarding the authority of the President and prevents the thorough consideration of complex issues that could bear on U.S. national interests, and if presented to the President he will veto the bill. So the bill will still be vetoed by the President, which is another indication why we are wasting our time today.

Mr. Speaker, oil prices are at their lowest level in more than 5 years. Gas prices are now below \$2 a gallon. Domestic U.S. oil production is skyrocketing. Tar sands are among the dirtiest and most carbon-intensive of all fossil fuels. Approving the Keystone XL pipeline will create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions we have been working so hard to accomplish. According to some experts, building the Keystone XL pipeline will triple production of the tar sands, and that is totally inconsistent with any future scenario for avoiding catastrophic climate change.

We don't need this oil. Approving and constructing this pipeline won't lower gas prices for Americans. In some areas, it may even raise prices. This pipeline is a terrible deal for the United States. We get all of the risk while the oil companies will reap all of the rewards.

I was at the Rules Committee the other night and all I kept hearing was how wonderful Canada is, how we have to help Canadian companies. This is all about Canada. Frankly, I don't know why we are so worried about a Canadian corporation. It wasn't clear during the Rules Committee hearing, based on the conversations and debate we had with the Republican side, that this pipeline would even ever be built. And yet here we are rushing to basically say to the President: We don't care what you or the State Department or the Department of the Interior says what is in the national interest; we are just going to do this because of some Canadian interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new year and a new Congress. We have new Members who will vote on this bill without the benefit of any hearings or markups or floor amendments, without the benefit of learning how our changing energy picture alters the need for this pipeline, and without considering whether our time might be better spent on efforts to promote other cleaner energy sources.

We need sound energy policy in these challenging times. As the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I am anxious to begin working with all of my colleagues on

pragmatic energy policy; but we need a balanced energy policy, one that takes into account current circumstances, one that takes into account our need to combat climate change, and one that works with the President rather than against the President to actually deliver legislation that the President can sign rather than veto. This legislation doesn't meet any of these criteria, so I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman and friend.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a former naval aviator who flew alongside Canadian Armed Forces as we won the cold war. We have no greater ally than our neighbor to the north—Canada. We were attacked on September 11 and went to war in Afghanistan; they went with us. To date, nearly 200 of their precious sons have come home in coffins. That is a true ally.

When Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans in August 2005, within 3 days our neighbor to the north authorized three military vessels, a Coast Guard vessel, numerous planes, 25 military divers, and tons of tents, blankets, beds, water, and medical supplies. That is a true ally.

And yet this strong alliance is being weakened dramatically because President Obama has chosen to listen to a small group of wealthy radicals who want no drop of oil coming from our neighbor to the north—Canada.

In November, I met with officials from Canada, officials from all over, from Leeds-Grenville and Nova Scotia. They were dismayed because we are telling them: We don't want your oil; don't help us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSON. It is a bad world, Mr. President, with terrorists in Paris, and ISIS. Terrorists hit our country from North Korea. We need strong allies.

Today, pick up two things, Mr. President:

Pick up the phone, dial Mr. HARPER and say: I am going to approve this pipeline;

After it passes in the Senate, pick up that pen and sign this bill into law.

Let's have a strong alliance with Canada forever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill, and I strongly disagree with this abhorrent process that the majority side has undertaken in order to hastily bring H.R. 3 to the floor after only 1 hour of debate and denying the minority the ability to offer one single, solitary amendment.

Truth be told, Mr. Speaker, it is unclear how this legislation would actually be of benefit to the American people. A 2014 report by the State Department concluded that the Keystone pipeline would create 35 permanent, full-time domestic jobs, which is roughly the same amount of jobs that would be created by opening a new corner fast-food burger joint, albeit with more risk to the American environment.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this bill is unnecessary because there is already an independent process that is taking place at this very moment, and H.R. 3 short-circuits this approval process.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, let it be fully understood by all Members of this House, the President has indicated that he would veto this bill. This bill is dead on arrival if it ever reaches the President's desk.

The State Department has already released its final supplemental environmental impact statement and has begun the review period to determine whether the pipeline is in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, more than 2.5 million Americans have contributed comments on how this foolhardy project would impact the national interest, and their voices, the voices of 2.5 million Americans, deserve to be heard.

I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again: this bill is about seizing power away from the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RUSH. This bill is about seizing power away from the American people by seizing power away from our duly-elected President. It will prevent the thorough, sober consideration of complex issues that could have serious security, safety, environmental, and other ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to vote "no." The Keystone XL pipeline is a Republican pipe dream.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the floor debating a bill to approve the Keystone pipeline, we all need to admit that we shouldn't be doing this. We should not have to be here today.

It is 2,303 days after the application for Keystone was first submitted to the

State Department. We shouldn't be debating it; we should be building it.

For years, approval has been stuck in the Senate. Well, now the Senate is open. The Senate is changed. It moved through committee.

Mr. Speaker, for the longest time, the President hid behind the lengthy and delayed review process saying he wanted to wait to make a decision. He said he was waiting because of environmental and legal considerations. But Keystone won't harm the environment; it will help protect it. The people know that. Mr. Speaker, the President knows that.

Mr. Speaker, the President, before we even started the debate today, has submitted a threat of a veto. I take these seriously as a majority leader, so I wanted to read it. Mr. Speaker, one of the rationales why the President wants to veto it is because this bill also authorizes the project, despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, hallelujah. We have good news for the President, Mr. Speaker. The Nebraska Supreme Court solved that problem for him today.

So we should move forward just as we have done before on a bipartisan basis. Why? Because of 42,000 jobs. Those are American jobs created here, an economy continuing to move forward.

And rest assured, the oil in Canada will be produced. The question before us today: Will that oil move down through America, refined in American refineries, built by American women and men, or will it go to a whole other continent?

We take up many issues here on this floor, but we have to look to the future and we have to build for a strong future. I want North America to be energy independent. We all know the strength of that. I want an environmentally sound way to do it. Today does it.

I listened to the President's concerns, Mr. Speaker. We have had 2,303 days. We have studied it. Our departments have studied it. They have come back and said, environmentally, we are safe. There was a legal concern. Well, the Supreme Court dealt with that.

So today we can join together, just as we have done before, in a bipartisan manner and pass this bill. There is a change in the Senate with an open process. They can pass it there, and it can go to the desk and be signed so 42,000 Americans can get back to work.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of this issue are two questions: First, is climate change real? Is it a threat to our economy, to jobs, to our environment, and to our security?

Speaking for Vermont, climate change is real. In the past 5 years, Vermont has had 10 Federal disaster

declarations from severe weather, including Tropical Storm Irene that did nearly \$1 billion worth of damage. Our farmers, ski area operators, and maple sugar producers are all trying to contend with the changing climate.

□ 1200

Also, we know that that oil is the same. This is not sweet Texas crude. Tar sands produce about 20 to 40 percent more carbon emissions than that Texas oil, and extracting it is going to produce about 27 million metric tons of carbon emissions.

The second question is this: Should Congress now or should Congress ever pass a major piece of legislation without any committee hearings, particularly when that legislation is only about oil going through our country, not to our country?

And this legislation includes a special provision that exempts a foreign corporation from contributing to an environmental cleanup fund all our domestic corporations are required to pay into.

On the issue of jobs, these are good jobs, about 2,000 jobs. But if this Congress would do its job, we would pass a surface transportation bill that would create 200,000 jobs and put those 3 million men and women in our labor unions to work on good things that are going to rebuild this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong bill, it is passed in the wrong way, and at exactly the wrong time.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman from Kentucky for his tenacious work on this issue. This is the 10th time this has come to the floor and he has been diligent and has continued to push it, and we thank him for those efforts.

I have to tell you, listening to this debate, it just goes to show you why the American people are so tired of what they consider to be the political games that are played here in Washington.

They said they wanted us to come and get some things done. This is getting some things done. It is appropriate that we take up this bill today. And here is why: Do you realize 88 percent of all Americans support energy independence—88 percent? Sixty-five percent of all Americans think that building the Keystone pipeline is what this country should do.

Now, I have to tell you, I listen to the President and to the excuses that come out of the administration, and I think that with the Supreme Court decision in Nebraska today the President is out of excuses. He is out of excuses. He has run the gamut on it. No more

excuses. It is time that we pass it, the Senate passes it, and that this legislation goes to the President's desk.

One of my colleagues said that being here on the floor today is a waste of time. I really disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. The President vetoing this legislation is a waste not only of the American people's time, but of the resources and the taxpayer money that come into the coffers for this government to function.

Create 20,000 new jobs, increase our energy supply, move us to energy independence. Pass the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to how much time is available on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a labor economics jobs bill. The American people need jobs. The labor unions who founded and built the middle class of this Nation need jobs.

But, ladies and gentlemen, nobody needs jobs like young Black men. I see this as an opportunity here today. The highest unemployment rate is with Black young men. For Black young men between the ages of 19 and 35, the unemployment rate is 38 percent—38 percent—and in some communities it is 50 percent.

That is why I come before you today. I support the bill. But I want you all to help me support an amendment. You all know the amendment process is going on over in the Senate.

Over in the Senate, Senator McCONNELL said he is open to amendments. Here is the amendment: the amendment would just put language in this bill that would put the apprenticeship programs, what they affectionately call "earn as you learn" on-the-job training—no Federal money—and target those and guide and direct and encourage in this language that our labor union partners bring in these young African American men to learn these trade building skills. Each of the labor unions are ready. They have the apprenticeship programs, they have them there.

We need this desperately, ladies and gentlemen. Do you know that sitting in the prisons right now are 1 million Black men. Every week, thousands of our Black men are going into prison. The number one reason: they don't have jobs. This is a jobs bill. Yeah, it has got maybe, some people say, 4,000, some people say 2,000, but there will be other jobs that they can learn these skills from when we rebuild our infrastructure.

You all have seen the sign. Black lives matter, but Black lives with jobs.

Help me get this amendment in on the Senate side and let's pass this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3 and the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Part of the existing pipeline system actually supplies the Wood River Refinery in the 12th Congressional District in Illinois.

In anticipation of the construction of this pipeline, the owners have spent \$4 billion upgrading the facility and created about 2,400 jobs over a 4-year period. Construction of the Keystone XL extension would deliver similar benefits to other regions of the country, creating over 42,000 jobs in construction, manufacturing, transportation, and services industries.

It is for these reasons that a diverse coalition of businesses and labor unions in the construction and building trades industries have come out in support of H.R. 3, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, how does this one project, the Keystone XL pipeline, get so much outsized attention? We currently have a sprawling, 185,000-mile network of oil pipelines in the United States and a regulatory process to ensure that they are operating safely.

So why are we spending so much time trying to exempt a Canadian company from the environmental reviews that every other company in America has to abide by?

And the big question, Mr. Speaker: Who will pay for any future oil spills? Not Keystone. This bill exempts Keystone from contributing the same 8 cents per barrel that every other oil company is required to pay into the oil spill trust fund.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, why is this? If the authors are so certain that this pipeline does not carry any environmental risk, won't they allow the review process to run its course?

I stand with my colleagues. I want those jobs, I want them around the country. We can do this, we can do better.

I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to say congratulations again to my friend Congressman PALLONE for assuming the ranking position. We look forward to working with you.

Today is a great day. This pipeline should have been approved 6 years ago,

like so many other transnational pipelines in our history. A pipeline is the safest way to move bulk liquid product, more than any other means. It will be from an ally, a trusted ally. More crude oil on the world market lowers prices for everybody. It is more money in the individual citizen's pocket. It actually is a very great day.

Let's just debunk this myth. This oil is going to go in refineries in my district, MIKE BOST's district, Ohio, Indiana, and in the gulf coast. We are going to get the double effort because we are going to be able to refine this, put it on the U.S. market, and lower energy prices for all our citizens. It is a great day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

We have been promised thousands of jobs, but the U.S. State Department estimates that this will create only 35 permanent jobs. Yes, they will be construction jobs, but they are not permanent. They are for a year, maybe 2 years.

Let's be clear about what we are getting with Keystone: a dirty and dangerous pipeline running through the heart of our country which will help Canadian oil companies export their oil, and it happens to be the filthiest possible energy form.

I would like to say that if we put the same time and energy into a transportation bill as we have to this Canadian pet project, we could upgrade our crumbling roads and bridges, expand our mass transit system, provide a huge boost to the American economy, and create jobs in almost every single congressional district in this country, thousands and thousands of permanent jobs in our good country.

We don't need another pipeline dividing our country, polluting our water, pushing us closer and closer to the climate tipping point. A transportation overhaul will actually create jobs that Americans can live off of. Keystone will not, unless what they are considering with these jobs are just the 35 permanent jobs. And maybe they are considering that there will be jobs to create the leaks and the pollution and treat the pollution and illnesses that may be associated with the pollution.

I urge a "no" vote. We should invest in American companies. We should invest in American pipelines. We should invest in American jobs that are here in America for Americans and are permanent.

Again, the State Department estimates that there will be only 35 permanent jobs. So what are we getting? No jobs and pollution from the dirtiest oil source and energy source that is on the Earth at this point.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, would you explain again the amount of time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Here we are again working to pass a bill to approve construction of the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline. Again, with the facts on our side. Again, with bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. And again, under threat of a veto. But with the new Republican majority in the Senate, the President just might get to make good on his veto threat this time, and we should force him to make that decision.

I urge my colleagues to support this job-creating, North American energy-producing, bipartisan, labor union- and Chamber of Commerce-supported, shovel-ready project. The American people asked for H.R. 3. We have waited long enough.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

□ 1215

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard more than one person say common sense isn't so common anymore. Boy, isn't that right? Well, today, we have a unique opportunity to pass commonsense legislation that will truly help the American people and strengthen America.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. It is projected this pipeline will create more than 40,000 good-paying jobs, and it will create far more good jobs indirectly by increasing our energy supply.

At a time when our families are struggling to make ends meet, it is irresponsible for the President to walk away from doing what is right for America. Building the pipeline will help us achieve energy independence. This is an opportunity to strengthen our position in the world, eliminate a key revenue source for our enemies, and strengthen our economy by lowering fuel prices even more.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers and the President to support the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. This is an opportunity to show the American people that there is still a glimmer of hope for good old common sense.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a combat veteran, we should never have

to fight for something that we can so readily produce here. Why should we put competitors in leverage over our economy and give them dollars to use against us?

We hear a lot of talk from progressives on the environment, Mr. Speaker. Imagine a life without petroleum, no cell phones, no asphalt for roads, no synthetic clothing, no plastics. On what do progressives suppose we run our magnificent Nation and lifestyle? Perhaps their answer is sweet bubble love and rainbow stew.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone XL pipeline moves us in exactly the wrong direction: enabling production of the dirtiest crude oil on the planet to expand and increasing our carbon pollution for decades to come.

We still have a lot of work to do to cut our carbon pollution and avoid catastrophic carbon change. The concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere just hit 400 parts per million for the first time in human history.

Although this administration is making great progress, we are far from achieving our pollution reduction goals, and the need to act is more urgent than ever. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no." The President is going to veto this legislation. It is just a political exercise at this point.

Again, it bothers me that I hear so much from the other side about trying to help this Canadian company. We should be concerned about the United States. We should be concerned about the world and the environment that results from climate change and the continued production of greenhouse gases.

My concern and the concern of the President is that this is simply not legislation that has been proven to be, so far, in the national interest. The President is just asking for more time to make that determination.

Vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address a couple of things.

First of all, I will place in the RECORD letters I received from the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council and Caterpillar.

JANUARY 7, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Longworth Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and our nationwide membership of business owners and entrepreneurs strongly

support H.R. 3, the "Keystone XL Pipeline Act."

Delays in approving this important project cannot be justified on any grounds. This is a critical energy supply and security issue, as well as being vital for U.S. economic growth, job creation and small business development.

This project means quality job growth, new business formation, and an increase in oil supplies from reliable sources. The building and operation of Keystone XL would benefit small businesses via affordable energy and economic growth. Small businesses within the energy sector would see growth opportunities as a result of the pipeline's construction and operation. An underreported fact is that the U.S. energy sector is dominated by small businesses.

Consider the latest U.S. Census Bureau data:

Among oil and gas extraction businesses, 91.1 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among oil and gas pipeline and related structures construction businesses, 65.5 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

And among oil and gas field machinery and equipment manufacturing businesses, 57.6 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among support for oil and gas operations businesses, 83.3 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among drilling oil and gas wells businesses, 79.8 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

The energy business is all about small business. A new study released by SBE Council on November 13, 2014, found that small businesses are driving America's energy renaissance. For example, from 2005-2012, construction businesses related to oil and gas pipeline and related structures grew by 12.2 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; oil and gas extraction businesses grew by 4.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses drilling oil and gas wells grew by 7.9 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses supporting oil and gas operations grew by 29.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; and manufacturing businesses related to oil and gas field machinery and equipment grew by 8.5 percent among firms with less than 20 workers. It is important to understand that during this same period, the total number of small and mid-size employer firms declined, but the opposite was true in the energy sector. Construction of Keystone XL would mean increased small business growth, opportunities for entrepreneurs, and a stronger economy for America.

A vote in favor of H.R. 3 is a vote for small business and quality job creation. Thank you for considering America's small business sector on this critical issue. SBE Council and its members look forward to House passage of H.R. 3.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO.

JANUARY 8, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: On behalf of Caterpillar Inc., I write today in support of H.R. 3 the "Keystone XL Pipeline Act", which would authorize construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Caterpillar has long supported the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline because of its significant economic and energy security benefits to North America.

As the world's leading manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, diesel and natural gas engines, industrial gas turbines, and locomotives; along with our commitment to providing leading financial, remanufacturing, logistics and rail services, Caterpillar has been making sustainable progress possible on every continent for more than 80 years.

With energy related products and services accounting for over one-fourth of our business, Caterpillar, our dealers, and our customers are uniquely positioned to provide solutions to the world's energy challenges. Through our core business and through new innovative technologies, Caterpillar is one of the world's leading technology suppliers to the diverse energy market and leverages its technology and innovation to meet the world's growing energy needs.

In the United States, the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline would result in billions of dollars of investment, create tens of thousands of jobs, and would allow for the movement of hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil per day. Pipelines are a safe, reliable, economical, and environmentally favorable way to transport oil and petroleum products, as well as other energy liquids throughout the U.S. America already depends on thousands of miles of liquid pipelines to move the energy and raw materials our country relies on for everything from heating homes to powering manufacturing facilities. This additional pipeline capacity will help consumers and business throughout the United States and increase American competitiveness.

Caterpillar commends you for your leadership on this critical issue and looks forward to working with you on the approval of this important project.

Sincerely,

KATHRYN D. KAROL,
Vice President.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the climate change issue because I think it is an important issue to a lot of people.

The argument that the other side makes is based on the false idea that somehow oil sands are not going to be developed without the United States. It is. Moving anything by rail is 1.9 times more the emissions of CO₂ than moving it by pipeline. Moving it by truck creates 2.8 times the CO₂ emissions as moving it by pipeline. Moving it by barge to China is priceless.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, I would like to point out a couple of things. First of all, this was a significant issue in the last election just a couple of months ago. This is a piece of legislation about the American people, not a Canadian oil company. In polls, 72 percent of the American people say they support this legislation.

This is about jobs for people in America who need jobs. This is about increasing the energy infrastructure of our country. This is also a project that would not include one dime from the Federal Government. It is going to be at a cost of approximately \$7 billion of private funds that will create a lot of jobs and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

The application for the Keystone pipeline was filed in September of 2008. There are 2.6 million miles of pipelines in America. Most of those pipelines do not have to be approved by the President of the United States, but in this particular pipeline, since it crosses into the country from Canada to the U.S., the President must approve it.

The President has said that one reason he is not going to approve it is because of litigation in Nebraska, which ended today in favor of the Governor of Nebraska who supports this pipeline.

The second ostensible reason for the President to oppose it is CO₂ emissions; yet the Secretary of State's office under Hillary Clinton and Mr. Kerry in their final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement have said on three occasions that it will have minimal impact on the environment.

Today, we want to pass this legislation once again for the American people. The U.S. Senate said that they will pass it, and we would ask the President to join us and sign this legislation.

I would urge the passage of H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the majority has chosen the first week of the 114th Congress to relitigate the battles of the previous two Congresses. This time, we're here debating whether or not to approve a pipeline, through our nation's Heartland, carrying Canadian tar sand oil.

There are many reasons why I'm opposed to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, the fact that oil produced from tar sands creates 17% more carbon emissions than other crudes; the potentially devastating impact wrought by this heavy crude should a pipeline rupture occur; or that my constituents are enjoying the best prices at the pump in several years without the completion of this pipeline due to the record glut in global oil supply.

Without even getting into the disappointing number of permanent jobs created by this project, which is 50, Mr. Speaker; the President has already clearly stated that he will veto this measure should it ever make it to his desk.

So at the end of the day Mr. Speaker, what are we really talking about here?

It would seem to me that instead of trying to score political points and refighting old battles, the 114th Congress should be using its first week to bring legislation to the floor that fosters an environment of innovation, energy diversification and an investment in clean, domestic forms of renewable energy. Policies that would create hundreds of thousands of new, permanent jobs while also ensuring energy independence for years to come.

While I understand that some of my Democratic Colleagues are in favor, I would strongly urge a "no" vote on this misguided legislation.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. For far too long, President Obama has impeded construction of the Keystone XL pipeline—costing the American people thousands of good-paying jobs and blocking an affordable source of energy. In the face

of his continued obstruction, I proudly joined a strong bipartisan group of my colleagues voting to put an end to Obama's obstruction and approving the Keystone XL pipeline.

This legislation is not only good for America, but it is also uniquely important to the 36th District of Texas. The pipeline will bring an economic boost to our area through its construction and new energy supply. For six years President Obama has put politics above what is good for the American people and our local and national economy. This is an important step in putting more Americans back to work, creating opportunity to good jobs and growing our national economy.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of The Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

The Keystone Pipeline represents a critical asset in our efforts to increase energy security and reduce our dependence on Mid-East oil. It would also further lower prices at the pump for American families.

Most importantly, the Pipeline would create thousands of jobs in Texas and across the United States.

The President has threatened to veto this legislation and ignore the will of the American people. Six years of stalling is enough.

The Administration should stop standing in the way of a stronger energy future and thousands of new American jobs. Keystone must be approved immediately.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. While I welcome an open and transparent debate about whether building this pipeline is in our national interest, that is not what this legislation is about. Instead, we are being asked to circumvent the administration's permitting process and pass legislation that has been rushed to the House floor, without consideration by any committee or proceeding through regular order. This is no way to legislate.

The people of Michigan sent me to Congress to fight for our shared values. And no one knows better than the people of my state the importance of protecting our natural resources. This legislation puts those resources at risk by exempting the operators of the pipeline from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps the federal government respond to oil spills. It also waives all the requirements of the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, both of which contain critical environmental protections that cannot be ignored. I simply cannot support legislation which sets these landmark laws aside.

Congress needs to have a real and thoughtful debate on how we promote clean energy in the United States. I am ready to have that debate, but until then, I cannot support flawed legislation that puts our natural resources at risk.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. The legislation would immediately authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline.

My constituents are sick and tired of the delays in approving and building the Keystone

pipeline. The recent drop in gas prices highlights the economic benefits of increased energy production right here in North America.

Building the Keystone pipeline will increase access to more North American energy sources and further reduce our dependence on oil from the Middle East. For the first time in decades, North American energy independence is within our grasp if we make the critical investments in the necessary infrastructure.

President Obama's opposition to the Keystone pipeline and all of its economic benefits shows just how out of touch he is with middle class working families.

The State Department studied the environmental impacts of the Keystone XL pipeline and concluded that it would not have a negative impact. Furthermore, the State Department found that the Keystone XL pipeline project would support roughly 42,000 jobs. Earlier today, the Nebraska Supreme Court dismissed a key lawsuit challenging the Keystone XL pipeline.

The passage of H.R. 3 is the tenth bill approved by the House of Representatives to authorize the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. Thankfully, the new Republican majority in the Senate has indicated it will take action on similar legislation next week. I know my constituents and hardworking American families hope we can finally start construction on this economically important project.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, which would circumvent the legal approval process and grant blanket automatic authority for TransCanada to "construct, connect, operate, and maintain" the Keystone XL pipeline and cross-border facilities.

Every cross-border pipeline must undergo a vetting process to make sure that it is in the national interest. This process has been ongoing at the State Department and has been complicated by disputes over the route, most notably in Nebraska, where their Supreme Court ruled on the issue just this morning. Today's legislation would provide a special deal for one company to bypass federal permitting requirements.

Additionally, the oil that would be transported by Keystone XL, tar sands oil, is currently exempt from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that is used to fund the response to leaks and accidents. This means that the American public would bear the risks for the immediate cleanup costs from any potential accidents or leaks from the pipeline. Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER introduced legislation last night, which I am proud to cosponsor, to close that loophole and ensure that TransCanada and other companies transporting tar sands oil share responsibility for those costs by paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. Democrats are offering a motion today to address this issue for the oil that would be transported through the Keystone XL pipeline, and I hope my Republican colleagues will work with us to close this loophole.

Ultimately, there is no reason to give special treatment to a single, foreign company, which would be exempt from permitting requirements and from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. We should reject this bill and allow the State Department to complete its ongoing review.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote for the tenth time to bypass a process

established by law and instead, move to approve an oil pipeline that will harm the climate, do nothing to enhance our energy security, and create 35 permanent jobs. In the process, the legislation before us disregards the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the more than 2.5 million Americans who submitted comments to the State Department on the Keystone XL pipeline proposal.

Keystone XL is a proposed 2,000-mile pipeline to carry up to 830,000 barrels per day of tar sands oil from Alberta, Canada to the Gulf Coast. Because the pipeline crosses the U.S.-Canadian border, existing law requires that a Presidential Permit be obtained to ensure that the project is in the interest of the United States. TransCanada, the Canadian company planning to build the pipeline, was initially denied a Presidential Permit in early 2012. The company then split the project into two sections and reapplied for a Presidential Permit for the 1,200-mile section of pipeline from Alberta to Steele City, Nebraska. This section has undergone an environmental review process and the State Department is currently reviewing the public comments to determine if the project is in the national interest. This bill ends that review and deems the project immediately approved.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have participated in the hearings on this issue since 2011, and it is clear to me that Keystone XL is not in the nation's interest. It will provide an export route for one of the dirtiest fuels on earth, putting the U.S. at risk of a spill and unleashing billions of tons of future greenhouse gas emissions. Beyond the environmental impacts, TransCanada has acknowledged that this project will create very few permanent U.S. jobs and that most of the oil will be exported overseas rather than remaining in the U.S. market. In my view, this is a bad deal for the American people and should not be given a special legislative exemption in the form of this bill.

Construction of Keystone XL is also incompatible with our long-term climate goals and would put millions of Americans at risk of a catastrophic oil spill. Tar sands oil produces up to 40 percent more carbon pollution than conventional oil on a life-cycle basis and is much harder to clean up in the event of a spill. In Michigan, a 2010 tar sands oil spill in the Kalamazoo River took over four years to clean up at a cost of over \$1.2 billion.

Despite claims from its backers, Keystone XL will not improve U.S. energy security or reduce our dependence on oil from the Middle East. A study commissioned by the Department of Energy found that U.S. oil imports from Canada will grow at "almost identical" rates with or without Keystone XL. The State Department's review of the Keystone XL proposal estimated that a majority of the oil that travels through the pipeline will be exported overseas. In fact, contrary to the company's claims in promotional materials, TransCanada has refused to guarantee that any of the oil will remain in the U.S. In 2011, I participated in an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing where TransCanada's President of Energy and Oil pipelines, Alex Pourbaix, acknowledged under questioning that his company was not willing to guarantee in law or in ship-

ping contracts that oil from Keystone XL will remain in the U.S. market. Several attempts to insert language ensuring that a portion of the oil remains in the U.S. have been rejected by the House Republican leadership.

Supporters of Keystone XL have widely touted the job-creation benefits of this pipeline, but in reality this project will provide less than three dozen permanent jobs. The projections in the State Department's environmental impact statement, made in consultation with TransCanada, reveal that up to 42,100 direct and indirect temporary jobs will be supported during construction of the pipeline. I do not diminish this factor. However, when construction is completed in less than two years, Keystone XL is expected to support only 35 permanent jobs.

Rather than investing in renewable energy technologies and infrastructure updates that would benefit millions of Americans, the House has chosen as its first order of business in the 114th Congress to provide a special deal to a Canadian company, without any guarantee that a single drop of the oil will remain in the United States. For this reason and the others I've stated, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and any further attempts to short-circuit the Keystone XL review process.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 3, which grants approval to build the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline. The public has been misled by the pipeline's advocates, who have played down the pipeline's potentially devastating effects on our nation's environment and on the American people.

For starters, this bill allows a foreign company to take property from U.S. landowners through eminent domain. The taking of private land for public purposes has always been for local government or local interests. We cannot allow a foreign company to take our private property to feed its corporate profits.

In addition, the bill exempts TransCanada Corp. and any other company producing, shipping, or refining tar sands oil for this project, from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps to finance the federal government's response to spills. This exemption essentially reduces the companies' liability for spills from the pipeline and makes the U.S. taxpayers pay to clean up those spills. That's outrageous, especially when you consider the pipeline will go over the underground water supply for eight of our states.

The legislation also gives this project special regulatory treatment by exempting the pipeline from all federal permitting requirements. Our federal permitting process exists to ensure worker safety, and to provide health safeguards and environmental protections for the American people. It is irresponsible to give this project a blanket exemption from these critical safety measures.

This is particularly true given that the tar sands oil to be transported is more destructive than any other oil in the world. Converting a barrel of tar sands into synthetic crude oil emits three times more greenhouse gas emissions than are emitted by producing a barrel of conventional crude oil. If this pipeline leaks, the health of thousands of Americans will be at risk—and Americans, not the Canadian company, will be held responsible for the cost of the clean-up.

Considering this foreign-built pipeline takes private property and poses serious economic and safety risks, I stand in firm opposition to this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the Keystone XL Pipeline Project and the legislation before us, H.R. 3.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone XL project proposed by TransCanada, a Canadian company, would build new pipeline to transport Alberta oil sands crude and crude oil produced in North Dakota and Montana to a market hub in Nebraska, and from there to Gulf Coast refineries.

The proposed pipeline would deliver an estimated 830,000 barrels of oil per day. One of the most appealing aspects of the project is the positive economic impact it is expected to have on the economy.

Let me just take one state's economy and realize what would happen with this particular effort. There would be a \$2.3 billion investment in the Texas economy, creating more than 50,000 jobs in the Houston area, providing \$48 million in state and local tax revenues, and increasing the gross domestic product of the state by \$1.9 billion.

I favor the job creation potential of the Keystone XL Pipeline project, and voted accordingly less than a month and a half ago, on November 14, which was H.R. 5682. Yet the legislation contains several provisions that are of great concern to me which I feel inclined to address.

First, because the pipeline would cross an international border, construction requires a presidential permit and would be subject to applicable state laws and permitting requirements.

To issue a presidential permit, the State Department, after consulting with other federal agencies and providing opportunities for public comment, must determine that the project would serve the national interest.

Because the Keystone XL project would constitute a major federal action with a potentially significant environmental impact, it is also subject to environmental impact statement requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The bill, however, declares that a presidential permit is not required for approval of the Keystone XL pipeline's northern route from the Canadian border through Nebraska even though the project crosses an international border. This is unprecedented.

Second, H.R. 3 deems that environmental impact statements issued to date would be considered sufficient to satisfy all requirements of the NEPA and the Endangered Species Act.

As a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with "deeming" something done that has not been done in fact.

Third, the bill vests exclusive jurisdiction regarding legal disputes over the pipeline or the constitutionality of this bill would be granted to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and requires claims regarding the pipeline to be brought within 60 days of the action that gives rise to the claim.

It is unduly burdensome to require aggrieved parties to bear the considerable expense and hardship of traveling from their

homes in North or South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, or Texas to Washington, DC to vindicate their legal rights.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe the bill before could have been improved had amendments been made in order.

For example, two proposed amendments, one from a Democrats and one Republican, making oil sands petroleum eligible to pay an excise tax into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and another splitting revenue generated by the pipeline's construction between DOE's energy efficiency and renewable energy research and deficit reduction, were not made-in-order.

Had the bill been subject to amendment and the amendments offered in the Rules Committee been made in order and approved, the bill before us would be improved markedly.

And Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of this body, you are well-aware that when amendments are made-in-order, the rank-and-file can at least feel that they had a say in the process but when a Closed Rule is put forth—it does not stoke optimism about the legislative process for the 114th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

In the approval process authorized under this Act, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify to the President that diluted bitumen and other materials derived from tar sands or oil sands that are transported through the Keystone XL pipeline will be treated as crude oil for the purposes of determining contributions that fund the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an amendment to this bill. Passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, my amendment will simply be incorporated into

the bill, and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if a question is appropriate, but is this February 2? Is this Groundhog Day? I am curious. This is the 10th time this bill has been before the House, and those who are in support would argue, "Enough is enough. Let's pass it and get on with it."

Those of us in opposition would say, "Well, why haven't you written a bill that is sufficient to the problems raised by the pipeline?"

Specifically, 10 times on this floor—and even additional times in committee—the issue of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund has been raised. We have raised that issue 10 times. It has been debated here on the floor. I have heard five, six people speak to that issue.

The chairmen of the committee are well aware that this bill has a huge loophole in it allowing one company that owns a pipeline to avoid paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Why in the world would we move a bill that allows this company, unique among all others, to not participate in a very, very important part of the protection of communities and the environment?

The Kalamazoo issue has been raised here—the spill. Over \$60 million was paid for by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and then reimbursed by the pipeline company.

Let's do something right. This is great fun: back and forth, back and forth. We kick this thing around. We may get some political points on one side or the other. But why in the world don't we write a decent piece of legislation? Why don't we do it right? Why would we exempt one company among all of the others of hundreds of pipeline companies and allow this one Canadian company—and I love Canada, my son-in-law is a Canadian.

This is about doing what is right. This amendment would simply include this company being required to participate in the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. It is a lot of dollars. It is about \$24 million a year. That is a pretty good tax break. Who among us would not like to have that tax break? I guess we are all going to stand up because we want to have it.

The rest of the story is this: we have spent an enormous amount of time on this issue when, in fact, as has been said here many times by proponents and opponents, we ought to get on to real infrastructure.

Consider the time spent on this issue when you consider the time that has been spent on transportation bills on this floor. Consider the time that we must spend figuring out how to pay for repairing our bridges, building our highways, our ports, our airports. Consider that time.

Ten times, this bill has been here. Ten times, this House has ignored a tax

break that is not warranted. It will allow to move forward to the Senate a bill that, in its very substance, provides an unwarranted, unnecessary, and grossly unequal tax break to one company among all the other pipeline companies.

This amendment simply comes to the point of making sure that this pipeline company, like every other petroleum pipeline company in America, pays its fair share of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which is essential.

I see some of my friends from Michigan here. You know how important this is. The Kalamazoo River was a big deal—\$60 million thus far and more to come. The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund was there to provide the early money for the cleanup.

It is important, folks. My colleagues, this is important. Let's do it right. This is our 10th time. Let's do it right. Adopt this amendment. We clear up one problem in the bill. We remove one point of opposition, and we do what is right.

I ask for your "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the motion to recommit, and I would just say to all my colleagues: our side certainly views that as a procedural issue, not as a real amendment.

I would say that in the markup that we had on this bill in earlier years, I pledged to work with Mrs. CAPPS on our committee to find a solution that would be fair to the bill.

I support the concept of what the gentleman is doing, and in fact, I sent a letter in 2012 to the then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, asking for help on this, and we were hoping that we would see comprehensive tax reform, and this would have been included as part of that.

□ 1230

But that did not happen. We didn't get tax reform.

So as this bill comes forward, a review does have to be made in terms of how to treat crude oil derived from oil sands for the purposes of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. But I have to say that really is a Ways and Means issue, now a Transportation issue, not an Energy and Commerce issue.

I know that this issue is going to be raised in the Senate with an amendment probably in the next week. I would just say to the gentleman and those that support this idea, I look forward to working with our Senate colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, as well as Republicans and Democrats

in this body to, in fact, address this situation that does need to happen.

But as a motion to recommit, we shouldn't do it now. So let my Democrat friends vote "yes." I would urge my Republicans on this side to vote "no." I just want to give them the assurance that, in fact, as this bill moves into the conference, as what I expect to happen, that I certainly intend to see an understanding go forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

I am in agreement with the chairman of Energy and Commerce. This is, again, something to be dealt with on a tax bill.

Two things that are good have happened today. One, the Nebraska Supreme Court has removed the final hurdle to move this bill forward; and number two, my good friend from California and I agreed today on something—that this thing should be dealt with. But this is not the place or the time to deal with it.

Moving forward, we want to make sure that this is dealt with in the proper way, and I believe that the Ways and Means Committee will do that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

I have enormous respect for the two of you, and this issue has been before us many, many times. If we wait for a comprehensive tax reform, the tar sands may be totally eliminated and used up. We have an opportunity today to get it done.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, we understand that this will not be part of a comprehensive tax reform bill. We need to act earlier than that.

With the Senate now passing a bill, in all likelihood next week, likely with an amendment addressing this situation, we can deal with it as part of that conference report, and I look forward to supporting that and the inclusion of such in the final package.

I would again urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the procedural motion to recommit so that we can get to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—180

Adams	Gabbard	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gallego	Neal
Ashford	Garamendi	Nolan
Bass	Graham	Norcross
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarella
Bera	Green, Gene	Payne
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hahn	Peters
Bonamici	Hastings	Peterson
Boyle (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Himes	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rush
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Chu (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kennedy	T.
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lawrence	Sherman
Costa	Lee	Sinema
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lieu (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loeb	Takai
DeFazio	Lofgren	Takano
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lowe	Titus
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Deutch	(NM)	Van Hollen
Dingell	Lynch	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	Carolyn	Vela
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Ellison	Matsui	Visclosky
Engel	McCollum	Walz
Eshoo	McDermott	Wasserman
Esty	McGovern	Schultz
Farr	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meeks	Welch
Foster	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Yarmuth
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	
	Nadler	

NAYS—237

Abraham	Blackburn	Calvert
Aderholt	Blum	Carter (GA)
Allen	Bost	Chabot
Amash	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amodel	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Babin	Brat	Coffman
Barletta	Bridenstine	Cole
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Benishek	Buchanan	Comstock
Billakis	Buck	Conaway
Bishop (MI)	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (UT)	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Black	Byrne	Cramer

Crawford Joyce
Crenshaw Katko
Culberson Kelly (PA)
Curbelo (FL) King (IA)
Davis, Rodney King (NY)
Denham Kinzinger (IL)
Dent Kline
DeSantis Knight
DesJarlais Labrador
Diaz-Balart LaMalfa
Dold Lamborn
Duffy Lance
Duncan (SC) Latta
Ellmers LoBiondo
Emmer Long
Farenthold Loudermilk
Fitzpatrick Love
Fleischmann Lucas
Fleming Luetkemeyer
Flores Lummis
Forbes MacArthur
Fortenberry Marchant
Foxy Marino
Franks (AZ) Massie
Frelinghuysen McCarthy
Garrett McCaul
Gibbs McClintock
Gibson McHenry
Gohmert McKinley
Goodlatte MCSally
Gowdy Meadows
Granger Meehan
Graves (GA) Messer
Graves (LA) Stutzman
Graves (MO) Miller (FL)
Griffith Miller (MI)
Grothman Moolenaar
Guinta Mooney (WV)
Guthrie Mullin
Hanna Mulvaney
Hardy Murphy (PA)
Harper Neugebauer
Harris Newhouse
Hartzler Noem
Heck (NV) Nugent
Hensarling Nunes
Herrera Beutler Olson
Hice (GA) Palazzo
Hill Palmer
Holding Paulsen
Hudson Perry
Huelskamp Pittenger
Huizenga (MI) Pitts
Hultgren Poe (TX)
Hunter Poliquin
Hurd (TX) Pompeo
Hurt (VA) Posey
Issa Price (GA)
Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
Jenkins (WV) Reed
Johnson (OH) Reichert
Johnson, Sam Renacci
Jolly Ribble
Jones Rice (SC)
Jordan Rigell

NOT VOTING—12

Cárdenas Hinojosa Pearce
Duckworth McMorris Sanchez, Loretta
Duncan (TN) Rodgers Thompson (MS)
Fincher Moore
Gosar O'Rourke

□ 1256

Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. BYRNE, HANNA, and STEWART changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. DELBENE, Messrs. PAYNE, NEAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida and KAPTUR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS IN FRANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks in France.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 153, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—266

Abraham Farenthold Lance
Aderholt Fitzpatrick Latta
Allen Fleischmann Lipinski
Amodei Fleming LoBiondo
Ashford Flores Loeb sack
Babin Forbes Long
Barietta Fortenberry Loudermilk
Barr Foxx Love
Barton Franks (AZ) Lucas
Benishek Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis Garrett Lummis
Bishop (GA) Gibbs MacArthur
Bishop (MI) Gibson Maloney, Sean
Bishop (UT) Gohmert Marchant
Black Goodlatte Marino
Blackburn Gowdy Massie
Blum Graham McCarthy
Bost Granger McCaul
Boustany Graves (GA) McClintock
Brady (PA) Graves (LA) McHenry
Brady (TX) Graves (MO) McKinley
Brat Green, Al McMorris
Bridenstine Green, Gene Rodgers
Brooks (AL) Griffith McSally
Brooks (IN) Grothman Meadows
Buchanan Guinta Meehan
Buck Guthrie Messer
Bucshon Hanna Mica
Burgess Hardy Miller (FL)
Bustos Harper Miller (MI)
Byrne Harris Moolenaar
Calvert Hartzler Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA) Heck (NV) Mullin
Chabot Hensarling Mulvaney
Chaffetz Herrera Beutler Murphy (FL)
Hice (GA) Hice (PA) Murphy (PA)
Clyburn Neugebauer
Coffman Newhouse
Cole Hudson Noem
Collins (GA) Huelskamp Nolan
Collins (NY) Huizenga (MI) Norcross
Comstock Hultgren Nugent
Conaway Hunter Nunes
Cook Hurd (TX) Olson
Cooper Hurt (VA) Palazzo
Costa Issa Palmer
Costello (PA) Jackson Lee Paulsen
Cramer Jenkins (KS) Pearce
Crawford Jenkins (WV) Perry
Crenshaw Johnson (OH) Peterson
Cuellar Johnson, Sam Pittenger
Culberson Jolly Pitts
Curbelo (FL) Jones Poe (TX)
Davis, Rodney Jordan Poliquin
Denham Joyce Pompeo
Dent Katko Posey
DeSantis Kelly (PA) Price (GA)
DesJarlais King (IA) Ratcliffe
Diaz-Balart King (NY) Reed
Dold Kinzinger (IL) Reichert
Doyle (PA) Kline Renacci
Duffy Knight Ribble
Duncan (SC) Labrador Rice (SC)
Ellmers LaMalfa Richmond
Emmer Lamborn Rigell

Roby Sessions
Roe (TN) Sewell (AL)
Rogers (AL) Shimkus
Rogers (KY) Shuster
Rohrabacher Simpson
Rokita Sires
Rooney (FL) Smith (MO)
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NE)
Roskam Smith (NJ)
Ross Smith (TX)
Rothfus Stefanik
Rouzer Stewart
Royce Stivers
Russell Stutzman
Ryan (WI) Thompson (PA)
Salmon Thornberry
Sanford Tiberi
Scalise Tipton
Schock Trott
Schrader Turner
Schweikert Upton
Scott, Austin Valadao
Scott, David Veasey
Sensenbrenner Vela

NAYS—153

Adams Fudge Moulton
Aguilar Gabbard Nadler
Bass Gallego Napolitano
Beatty Garamendi Neal
Becerra Grayson Pallone
Bera Grijalva Pascarell
Beyer Gutiérrez Payne
Blumenauer Hahn Pelosi
Bonamici Hastings Perlmutter
Boyle (PA) Heck (WA) Peters
Brown (FL) Higgins Pingree
Brownley (CA) Himes Pocan
Butterfield Honda Polis
Capps Hoyer Price (NC)
Capuano Huffman Quigley
Cárdenas Israel Rangel
Carney Jeffries Rice (NY)
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Roybal-Allard
Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Ruiz
Castor (FL) Kaptur Ruppertsberger
Castro (TX) Keating Rush
Chu (CA) Kelly (IL) Ryan (OH)
Ciocilline Kennedy Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA) Kildee T.
Clarke (NY) Kilmer Sarbanes
Clay Kind Schakowsky
Clever Kirkpatrick Schiff
Cohen Kuster Scott (VA)
Connolly Langevin Serrano
Conyers Larsen (WA) Sherman
Courtney Larson (CT) Sinema
Crowley Lawrence Slaughter
Cummings Lee Smith (WA)
Davis (CA) Levin Speier
Davis, Danny Lewis Swallow (CA)
DeFazio Lieu (CA) Takai
DeGette Lofgren Takano
Delaney Lowenthal Thompson (CA)
DeLauro Lowey Titus
DelBene Lujan Grisham Tonko
DeSaunier (NM) Torres
Deutch Luján, Ben Ray Tsongas
Dingell (NM) Lynch Van Hollen
Doggett Maloney Vargus
Edwards Carolyn Velázquez
Ellison Matsui Vislosky
Engel McCollum Wasserman
Eshoo McDermott Schultz
Esty McGovern Watson Coleman
Farr McNeerney Welch
Fattah Meeks Wilson (FL)
Foster Meng Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—9

Duckworth Gosar O'Rourke
Duncan (TN) Hinojosa Sanchez, Loretta
Fincher Moore Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1305

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, myself and other members of the New York delegation were not able to be here on swearing-in day because we were attending the funeral of former Governor Mario Cuomo in New York, and we were also not here to cast a vote for Speaker of the House.

Had I been present during that vote, I would have cast my ballot for the right Honorable NANCY PELOSI of California, and I would like the RECORD to reflect my vote for Ms. PELOSI.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I was with Mr. CROWLEY attending the funeral on Monday of former Governor Mario Cuomo, and therefore I was not able to be here.

Had I been here, I would have cast my vote for Speaker for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI from California, and I want the RECORD to reflect the same.

□ 1315

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. So at this point, I am pleased to yield to my friend from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected around noon. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 186, the Regulatory Accountability Act, authored by Chairman GOODLATTE. This bipartisan bill will modernize the regulatory process, ensure transparency, and reduce overly burdensome costs that are hurting job creators across the country.

The House will also consider H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, authored by the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania, Representative FITZPATRICK, which includes bipartisan reforms to reduce red tape and ensure that small businesses have access to the capital they need to grow.

Finally, the House is expected to consider legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security and respond to the President's unconstitutional executive action.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given us.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the majority leader for bringing to the floor in a timely fashion the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, which we passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. I think that it was very, very important that we got that through the House early. As the majority leader knows, the Senate has already passed that bill, and it is on its way to the President. That, obviously, will raise the confidence level of those who are going to create jobs and enter into construction projects. It is very important for our economy and for our communities. So I thank the majority leader for his quick action and leadership on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful the majority leader can inform us of what form the Department of Homeland Security appropriation bill will come to the floor. And what I mean by "what form," the committee bill, obviously, will be supported almost unanimously on both sides—certainly on this side of the aisle unanimously—if, in fact, it is the funding levels that resulted from the agreement between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and passed overwhelmingly, known as the Ryan-Murray budget numbers.

The committee marked up its bill, reported it out. It was included in the omnibus. But it was included, as the gentleman knows, only until February 27.

Can the gentleman tell me whether that will come to the floor as reported out of committee? And when I say "committee," I mean the House Appropriations Committee. Or when reported out, will it be considered under a rule? And if considered under a rule, will that rule allow amendments?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The base bill will reflect the Appropriations Committee's bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the text of which will be available later today. And to answer the question, yes, the funding level will be at that.

We also will consider a series of amendments which respond to the President's executive action, and I expect the text of those will be available a little later today.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I am pretty sure I understand exactly what the gentleman said. Therefore,

those amendments will be offered on the floor and will not be incorporated in the base bill?

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

When will the hearing on the rule be held so that our Members can know; so that if they have amendments they would like to offer, they can appear at the Rules Committee?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I anticipate the Rules Committee meeting on Monday.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that, and I will make sure that our Members know that.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Speaker just held a moment of silence—and I will be saying something in a few minutes—on the tragic events that have happened in France, the loss of life in the initial incident, in the hostage-taking, and of the law enforcement officer. Clearly this was in France, but we know that we are all vulnerable in all of the free world.

I would urge the majority leader to ensure that the Homeland Security bill passes this House in a bipartisan fashion. And what I mean by that is, I know there are going to be amendments offered. I know his side of the aisle is very concerned and believes—and he has asserted—that the actions taken by the President were unconstitutional. We do not share that view, as the gentleman knows, that they were unconstitutional. We believe the executive was within his authority and prosecutorial discretion on the executive side of the government. But we also know that that issue is going to be an issue of substantial debate, discussion, and I am sure other legislative actions.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority leader to—I think it is in the best interest making sure the Homeland Security bill is passed so there is no doubt as to the resources that the Homeland Security Department will have to protect all Americans, to protect our homeland, and to coordinate extensively.

Secretary Johnson has made statements this week that the failure to have full funding for the Department of Homeland Security has already impeded his ability and the Department's ability to act fully on behalf of the security of this country.

So, Mr. Majority Leader, I know that all 435 of us are committed to making sure that we do everything we can to keep our homeland safe and our people safe. And I would hope that we would have nothing included in the bill which would be very controversial, reflecting our differences, when the underlying bill, I think, is not controversial, when the underlying bill is something on which we can almost unanimously, I think, agree and is something that ought to be passed and ought to be

signed by the President and ought to give the Department of Homeland Security the full resources it needs to keep America safe.

And I would be glad to yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, currently, the Department of Homeland Security is funded up until February 27. But as was noted, next week is the second week back in. And we are taking this up in the second week because I believe on both sides of the aisle, we care about the homeland, we care about our security, and this is something that has been worked on together. And inside this body, we have a constitutional responsibility to deal with those items that are germane, and we will deal with all the items that are germane.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I look forward to working with him next week to hopefully achieve the passage of a bill that will not prove controversial in the Senate or with the President of the United States so that this can be effective, as the gentleman observed, as quickly as possible. I appreciate him bringing it to the floor, and I also appreciate the fact that the amendments are going to be considered separately. And I would hope that we could join together in opposing amendments which will undermine the bipartisanship of the legislation.

We have 3-day weeks coming up now. We will have a couple of short weeks when the Republicans go to their retreat, their issues conference, and then when the Democrats go to their issues conference.

I would ask if you could give me a sense of the legislation that will be on for the remainder of the month.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. We have 3-day weeks for retreats for the House on both sides of the aisle. And this year, the Republicans will be retreating with the Republicans in the Senate as well, leaving next Wednesday.

The House will be very active throughout January, focusing on bipartisan solutions that have been needlessly stuck in the Senate. As the gentleman knows, 382 bills did pass this House but got stuck in the Senate, and more than half of those actually were even passed by voice vote.

This will include a bill to expedite the Federal review process for natural gas pipeline permit applications and a bill to cut through red tape and ensure exports of liquefied natural gas to our allies.

As we get closer to consideration for each week, I assure the gentleman that a full list of bills coming before the House will be available for Members.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And lastly, Mr. Leader, if I could ask you about the border security bill. It is my understanding that the border bill could be coming to the floor this month. And I know that the gentleman from Texas, Chairman McCaul, has said that Republican leaders are getting close—and I am quoting—to having a separate border policy bill ready to go. I know they, referring to the Republican leadership, want Homeland appropriations on the floor next week, as we have already discussed. So what is going to be tied to that is unclear at this point, but we are working on a border bill right now.

Now, as you know, Mr. Leader, the McCaul border bill passed out of committee either on voice vote or unanimously, with both parties agreeing. And, in fact, the Democrats in the last Congress, in the comprehensive immigration bill that we introduced, included dropping the Senate border security bill and putting in the McCaul bill, as the gentleman undoubtedly knows, because we believed that was the better approach.

Can the gentleman tell me, will the McCaul bill, as passed in the last Congress, be the border bill that will be reported? Or does the majority leader know that at this point in time?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In speaking to Chairman McCaul, he does want to move a bill, maybe towards later this month. I know he has a trip to the border with a number of Members. I know he would like to move the bill after that trip. So I anticipate a bill shortly. And as soon as we have a date, I will let the gentleman know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And I hope that we can, as we did in the first iteration of the McCaul bill, have a unanimous bipartisan agreement because all of us want to make sure the border is, in fact, secure again, as we want to see that the Homeland Security Department has its full complement of resources to protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 12, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS REGARDING IMMIGRATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the President's executive orders on immigration, set to take effect in mid-2015.

The Constitution, in article I, section 8, expressly grants the legislature the sole authority to establish rules for naturalization. Yet on November 20, 2014, the President announced new policies that would enable a substantial portion of the unlawfully present alien population to obtain relief from removal and work authorization.

In addition to substantive constitutional separation of power concerns, the action raises national security implications and a range of other potentially harmful consequences.

For this reason, in December, the House passed H.R. 83, which imposes a February 27 funding sunset for the agencies responsible for carrying out the President's orders.

While this limitation creates an opportunity for the new majority in Congress to take action against the President's unilateral actions, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle should want to protect the rule of law, our constitutional separation of powers, and the best interests of hard-working Americans. The American people deserve as much.

□ 1330

WE ARE ALL CHARLIE

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as I know all Americans would rise if they were here, to express our solidarity with, our sympathy to, and our convictions for a strong alliance with the people of France.

The despicable and tragic murder in Paris on Tuesday of journalists and those who protected them ought to be a reminder that we cannot and must not take for granted the freedoms we enjoy living in a democracy.

The men and women who were targeted in Paris on Wednesday were cartoonists whose job was to use humor to make people question their leaders and their most cherished principles. Freedom of speech, protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which was read today on this floor, means nothing if that speech can be intimidated and shuttered by violence.

The principles that we speak of were part of a long tradition in France and in this country of bringing the loftiest of people and ideas down to Earth through the power of satire.

Freedom of the press and free expression of ideas are a necessary check against tyranny and oppression. They are as much a part of democracy as the right to vote and due process in court.

Mr. Speaker, in attacking these journalists, the terrorists made their target clear, and that is freedom itself—freedom in America, freedom in France, freedom throughout the world, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of dissent.

The taking of innocent hostages at a kosher market today further demonstrated the terrorists' utter disregard for the "liberty, equality, and brotherhood" that are the foundation of the French democracy and the American democracy.

The democratic nations of the world must continue to stand up to those who wish to stifle the basic freedoms that all people deserve. I know that all 435 Members of this Congress are united in that conviction. I join with all of my colleagues in offering my condolences to the families of the victims and to the French people.

Mr. Speaker, in that regard, I articulate what has just been demonstrated by all by standing in silence, just as President Kennedy declared, "Ich bin ein Berliner," and newspapers around the world after 9/11 read, "We are all Americans."

Today, all freedom-loving people around the world join together in solidarity to say, "We are all Charlie"—"Nous sommes tous Charlie."

CHRISTMAS DRONES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Red Ryder BB gun is a ghost of Christmas past because, this year, Santa gave drones. Here a drone, there a drone, everywhere a drone. Just more eyes in the sky and these eyes could be anywhere and on any person. How comforting is that?

It is estimated that by 2030, 30,000 drones will be over the skies of America. People are rightfully concerned that these eyes in the sky could be a threat to their constitutional right of privacy.

Mr. Speaker, we are entering a world of uncharted drone technology. That is why I am reintroducing the Preserving American Privacy Act. This bill seeks to ensure the privacy of Americans. It establishes specific guidelines for about when and what purposes that law enforcement and private entities can use drones.

Technology may change, but the Constitution does not. The Christmas spy machines that have useful purposes also need constitutional rules to prevent unlawful surveillance by law enforcement or private organizations.

And that is just the way it is.

A RETURN TO AMERICA'S HIGHEST IDEALS

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Members of the 114th United States Congress took their oaths of office. Families and friends from around the country came to participate in this great American tradition of representative democracy and to support their loved ones. I was pleased that my own wife and five daughters were here with me as well.

The start of a new Congress is always an exciting time to renew our government and the promise of America, but as we all know, we face tremendous challenges. Political dysfunction and partisan gridlock have made smart and effective government very difficult here.

An arthritic economic recovery has dimmed the financial prospects of too many small businesses and their families. In our time of social fracture, more and more people are feeling directionless and alone.

Mr. Speaker, as I often like to say, there is nothing wrong in America that can't be fixed by what is right in America, but this will require bold resolve, innovative public policy, and a return to our highest ideals.

We must restore our economic vibrancy through responsible government, reclaiming our best traditions, and building a culture of life that respects the dignity and rights of all persons.

Let's repurpose Washington. Let's turn our country around.

CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's concessions to the tyrannical Cuban regime have only strengthened the iron grip of the dictatorship, and by President Obama attempting to normalize relations with the island, we are only putting more money into the coffers of these thugs to continue their repressive ways.

The White House and the State Department were once again fooled by a tyrant, and that has grave consequences for our credibility around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal. It is a bad deal for the people of Cuba, a bad deal for America, and a bad deal for freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today, I was joined by other Members of Congress in sending a letter to Secretary Kerry urging the administration to stop its concessions, abandon the talks scheduled with Cuba later this month, and get serious about

bringing true reforms to Cuba first before even contemplating a change in our relations.

If they won't listen, it is up to us in Congress to defend freedom for Cuba and, indeed, around the world.

APPRECIATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF PAUL CLYMER, PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, last fall, after 34 years of distinguished public service, Pennsylvania State representative Paul Clymer from upper Bucks County announced his retirement. Throughout his career, Representative Clymer has been a strong advocate on many issues ranging from education to economic development.

An avid historian, Paul chaired the committee responsible for the renovation on the State capitol building. He took a personal interest in this project, working diligently to ensure the completed renovation would live up to President Theodore Roosevelt's declaration in 1906 when he called it, "the handsomest building he ever saw."

More than a century later, thanks in part to Paul's work, the building still strikes visitors with awe. Although he has many accomplishments to his name, it has been Representative Clymer's gentlemanly demeanor for which he was best known.

Paul was known in government as a man of conviction who would stand up for his principles, yet also able to listen to those who passionately opposed him. He has been a model public servant and a mentor to many, including to me, and I want to say, "Well done, Paul, in your retirement."

AMERICA WELCOMES ALL PEOPLE AND DOES NOT STIGMATIZE BASED ON RELIGION, ETHNICITY, OR RACE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we started by reading the Constitution, and I did not want to leave this week without reminding us of Amendment One of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Today, we stand with the people of France who, in the early years of our beginnings, certainly gave to America many of the democratic principles by

way of their own values. Today, we acknowledge that violence will not undermine democratic values around the Nation or around the world.

We mourn those who have lost their lives, and we want to stop the terrorist violence, but what we most want to do is to be able to acknowledge the individual dignity of all people and that we will not stigmatize religions or ethnicities or race in this country, but we will recognize that we are great because we are able to welcome all from all places and to be able to accept their human dignity.

We have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights, and I am grateful for the greatness of this Nation, but I stand with the people of France and mourn their loss this week.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I would like to claim this time to spend a few moments on the floor of this House to express the appreciation of myself and my colleagues to those who serve every day in our law enforcement community.

There is no better way to kick off this time than to yield to a colleague of mine from the State of Washington, a former sheriff of 30 years in law enforcement, and a former Sheriff of the Year from King County, my colleague from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his kind introduction.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. I hope this becomes a yearly thing. It is sponsored today by the National Sheriffs' Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the FOP, and other law enforcement organizations—national, State, and local organizations.

As Mr. JOLLY said, I served 33 years in the sheriff's office in Seattle, starting in a patrol car and eventually ending my career as the sheriff. I know from my own personal experience in serving those years that a cop's mission is to protect their community.

I know this from working with law enforcement not only in the sheriff's office in Seattle, but with the Seattle Police Department, all the police departments and sheriffs' offices in the State of Washington and even across this country. I have had the opportunity to work with a number of law enforcement organizations—local, State, and Federal.

Mr. Speaker, they come each day with the heart of a servant. They come

each day knowing that, when they put on that badge and that uniform, that they may not go home. They know that, but they do it anyway.

Why do they do that? Why do they take that risk? Why did I take that risk for 33 years? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I did come close several times in my career to losing my life to protect the community I served.

Let me also say that I lost some dear friends over those 33 years. One was my best friend, Sam Hicks, who was shot and killed in June of 1982. Another good friend in 1984 was stabbed to death.

It is a dangerous job, but it is a job they choose to do because they choose to serve the community. They choose to put their life on the line to protect and serve all of us, protect our families, our children, our businesses, and our property each and every day.

□ 1345

But no one is perfect, we know that. There are good police officers and there are bad police officers. There are good mechanics and there are bad mechanics. There are good lawyers and there are bad lawyers. We all come from the human race. There is good and bad in all of us. So no police department is perfect, and no police officer is perfect, and sometimes things go wrong. They are required to make split decisions, life-and-death decisions. In a moment's notice, you can have a gun pointed at you, and you have to make that decision: Do I shoot or not? Can I talk that person out of that gun? I have been in that position, too. Fortunately, I was able to talk that person out of his gun and took him to jail.

But sometimes things go wrong, and when it does, police, rightly so, must be under the microscope. There must be public scrutiny. Cops know that. Police chiefs know that. Sheriffs know it, and we accept that, too. But when things go wrong and we watch these incidents and these events unfold over the media, let us all remember that police officers have constitutional rights, too. They are allowed due process, too. They are American citizens, too. They have constitutional rights and protections also.

The Constitution, as was mentioned earlier, was read today, reminding us that we all have those constitutional rights. You are innocent until proven guilty. So when something happens that we think is wrong, let's pay attention to the facts. Let's let the process go forward; and then based on the facts—based on the facts—let's work with the community, with the police department and the mayor and city council and change the policy, change the procedures, and make sure that it doesn't happen again.

But today, let us also remember the service of the men and women, the brave and dedicated men and women

who put that uniform on every day. I am going to name a few police officers from Washington State who, 5 years ago—and this is the 5-year anniversary of the death of these police officers, gunned down, four of them gunned down while sitting in a coffee shop in Lakewood, Washington—paid that ultimate sacrifice, that ultimate price that we often hear talked about: Sergeant Mark Renninger, Officer Ronald Owens, Officer Tina Griswold, Officer Greg Richards, as well as Seattle Police Officer Timothy Brenton and Pierce County Deputy Kent Mundell, all from Washington State, all not with us today, all of their families missing them.

During these difficult times, Mr. Speaker, we need to come together as a community, as a country, as a nation, and recognize the service of these police officers across the country. I will end with the simple act that comes so easily for us with people who serve in the military, just a simple "thank you." If you see a police officer today as you go about your duties, your day's duties, please walk up and say "thank you." Please tell them you appreciate their service. That means the world to them.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague from the State of Washington.

Today, on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I would like to yield to a champion supporter of law enforcement, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for scheduling this Special Order to honor the men and women who put their lives on the line every day, as we just heard from our colleague from Washington.

Last year in the United States of America, 119 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line of duty; 119 lives snuffed out. It was not because they did anything wrong, but they were performing their duty to protect you and me so that every night when we go to sleep, we put our heads on our pillows and sleep soundly.

We take it for granted. There is something about it that we think is just natural. There is nothing natural about someone who goes out every day and consciously gives of themselves and puts their life on the line for someone else. Jesus said there is no greater love than this, than someone who would lay down his life for his brother. And law enforcement officers do that every day.

Yet sometimes when we get these incidents in America, we somehow forget that. We forget that they have husbands and wives and children and parents and sisters and brothers and friends, that they are people, too. They are citizens in our community, just like we are, and they go out every day to protect you and me and give us a quality of life that, as I say, we take

for granted. So it is altogether fitting that we would take today and recognize them, salute them, recognize them, honor them, thank them for what they do for all of us.

I hope that we won't just do it for today. I hope we do it 365 days a year, because they are here for us 365 days a year.

So on behalf of my constituents in the First Congressional District of Alabama, I say to law enforcement officials in my district and throughout America: We thank you. We salute you. God bless you.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as well to say thank you to law enforcement officers throughout Pinellas County, Florida, and across the Nation. Thank you for your service and thank you for your sacrifice. And I thank your families.

Each day in Pinellas County, Florida, the community I have the opportunity to represent, as well as across the country, thousands of law enforcement officers serve and protect us, often at great sacrifice to their families and at risk to their very own lives.

This was the case on December 21 when Officer Charles Kondek of the Tarpon Springs Police Department in Pinellas County responded to simple a noise complaint. It would be Officer Kondek's end of watch as he tragically lost his life at the hands of a gunman, a gunman whose actions represent the type of inhumanity that we entrust our law enforcement officers each day to protect us from. Officer Kondek was only 45 years old, and he is survived by, and his memory lives on through, his wife and his six children.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this story repeats itself throughout communities across the country. The Nation witnessed, on December 20, in New York, two law enforcement officers who were assassinated by an individual with one intention: to take the lives specifically of law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of Pinellas County, the brotherhood of law enforcement officers, the sisterhood of law enforcement officers who protect us each day understands, just like law enforcement officers across the country, the very risk to their safety and to their lives and the risk and the heartbreak of their families and their children, that that risk is very real.

In our county, we have lost a total of 24 officers, including, in recent years, St. Petersburg officers David Crawford, Jeffrey Yaslowitz, and Thomas Baitinger, each representing a precious loss of life while serving and protecting us.

And yet we find ourselves today listening to some, a minority in our society, who wish to give voice to those who undermine the very honor of law enforcement officers, who undermine

the very sacrifice of our law enforcement officers, and who undermine the very danger that these law enforcement officers face each day. Instead, we should be rising to say "thank you" to the men and women of law enforcement, "thank you" to the men and women in our communities who protect and defend us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do just that, to say "thank you." Thank you to Officer Kondek of Tarpon Springs for his service, and thank you to his family for sharing him with a community that will forever remember his ultimate sacrifice. Thank you to the families of all fallen law enforcement officers, and thank you to those who continue to serve each day.

I want to thank our local law enforcement leadership in my hometown of Pinellas County: Pinellas County Sheriff Bob Gualtieri, Clearwater Police Chief Dan Slaughter, St. Petersburg Police Chief Anthony Holloway, Chief Terry Hughes of my hometown of Indian Shores, Belleair Police Chief Bill Sohl, Gulfport Police Chief Robert Vincent, Kenneth City Police Chief Kevin Matson, Largo Police Chief Jeffrey Undestad, Pinellas Park Police Chief Dorene Thomas, Pinellas County Schools Police Chief Rick Stelljes, Tarpon Springs Police Chief Robert Kochen, Treasure Island Police Chief Tim Casey, and Chief David Hendry of the University of South Florida, St. Petersburg.

I especially want to thank all members of law enforcement in my hometown and those throughout Pinellas County who get in their cars each day and walk the streets, respond to crime, investigate crimes and respond to disturbances and ultimately protect us. I want to thank those I am privileged, within the law enforcement community, to call friends, officers from the Clearwater police force: my dear friend Detective Jonathan Walser, Detective Michael Stonelake, Detective Christopher Precious, Sergeant John Brown, Officer Bill Renfro, Lieutenant Juan Torres, and Lieutenant Richard Harris. And from the Pinellas County Sheriff's Department, my friend, Sergeant Steve Wagner.

Thank you to each of you.

And I want to thank the Capitol Police officers who protect each of us here as Members of Congress and the thousands of Capitol visitors each year that are protected from threats that at times can be tragically real. Thank you to all who serve, from Pinellas County, throughout the State of Florida, communities across the country, and right here in this very Chamber. Thank you for protecting us. Thank you for serving. Thank you to every law enforcement officer for your commitment to duty, your service to your community, and your service to your fellow man.

As my colleague, BRADLEY BYRNE said, blessed are those who would lay

down their life for their brethren. That is the oath—to risk their life to protect others—that our law enforcement officers renew each day.

Indeed, may our loving God richly bless each one of you who put on the uniform of law enforcement, and may God richly bless your families. May God's loving hands protect and defend each of you every day of your service, just as you protect and defend each one of us. Please know that this Member of Congress and millions of people across the country, including those in Pinellas County and Florida's 13th District, including communities throughout our Nation, are forever grateful for the service of law enforcement officers, your service to your fellow man. So today, on behalf of millions of Americans, I simply say to each of you serving as law enforcement officers, thank you.

With that, I yield to a new colleague of mine from Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

This week, I was honored and grateful to be able to vote for and help pass several bills that will improve the lives of so many hardworking Americans.

Earlier today, I was proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. I am grateful to be pushing this bill across the finish line because the Keystone runs through the Fourth Congressional District that I am privileged to represent. It is a long overdue, commonsense piece of legislation which will create good-paying jobs, will grow our economy, and will support more manufacturing and trade in this country.

During its construction, it is estimated that 42,000 jobs will be created by the Keystone, and it will put more than \$2 billion in the pockets of American workers.

□ 1400

To put this impact in perspective, those 42,000 jobs are 12,000 more than the unemployed population in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Unfortunately, President Obama has indicated that he will veto the Keystone if it passes both Houses. I hope that this is just an idle political threat because, if it is not, then the President is intentionally harming the middle class Americans that this great job creation bill is going to help.

I hope and pray that our President won't play politics with legislation that will provide opportunities to create jobs for tens of thousands of Americans to support their families.

This week, I was also proud to be able to support H.R. 30, which changes the definition of a full-time employee from 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week under the perversely named Affordable Care Act.

ObamaCare's 30-hour rule places an impossible burden on individuals and small businesses in my district and across this country, and I am glad to be able to help pass a bill which repeals a terrible provision from a terrible law.

But I say we haven't gone far enough. I know the people that I represent in east and north Texas won't be satisfied until we repeal every provision of the Affordable Care Act.

I was sent here to Washington to deliver results for the hardworking people of north and east Texas, and these bills show that I am doing that, and it is what I intend to keep doing because, while these are great bills and I am proud that we passed them this week, it is just a start.

We need more good bills to combat the President's executive overreach; to restore fiscal sanity; to secure our borders; to repeal all of ObamaCare; and, most importantly, to defend our great Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers for this time.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of an unscheduled medical procedure.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 12, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Subpart B — Rural Energy for America Program (RIN: 0570-AA76) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention (RIN: 2501-AD53) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Clothes Washers [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0020] (RIN: 1904-AC77) received January 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

11. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency blocking property of the Government of the Russian Federation relating to the disposition of highly enriched uranium extracted from nuclear weapons that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

13. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

14. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

15. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Elizabeth River; Portsmouth, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1032] (RIN-1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

16. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone:

Carquinez Strait Cable Repair Operation, Martinez, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0950] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

17. A letter from the Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter notifying the Congress that the United States intends to join a consensus among Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) participants to invite the Government of Iceland to join the current group of 13 WTO Members engaged in the EGA negotiations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 235. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 236. A bill to provide for the exchange of information related to trade enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 237. A bill to authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MENG, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 238. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 239. A bill to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 240. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COOK, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. NUNES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 241. A bill to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to impose notice and a compliance opportunity to be provided before commencement of a private civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 242. A bill to restore access to year-round Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 243. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to Microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 244. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for pharmacy benefits manager standards under the Medicare prescription drug program to further transparency of payment methodologies to pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 245. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify certain existing provisions of law relating to effective dates for claims under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 246. A bill to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 247. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Maya Angelou in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

visions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 249. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 250. A bill to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services in event of any period of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 251. A bill to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 252. A bill to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for start-up expenditures for business for 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs and to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments in research intensive small business concerns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 257. A bill to provide for United States participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 258. A bill to establish the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Poverty which will create and carry out a national plan to cut poverty in America in half in ten years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 261. A bill to prohibit monetary payments by the Federal Government to employees, officers, and elected officials of foreign countries for purposes of bribery, coercion, or any activity that is illegal or undermines the rule of law or corrupts a public officer or the office such officer represents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 262. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act so as to exempt real property from civil forfeiture due to medical marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 263. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 264. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California,

Ms. DELAURO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 265. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish a public health insurance option; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 266. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 267. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to allow former volunteers to use the seal, emblem, or name of Peace Corps on death announcements and grave stones; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage Canadian tourism to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 269. A bill to prohibit certain real property from being named after a sitting Member of Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should provide, on an annual basis, an amount equal to at least one percent of United States gross domestic product (GDP) for nonmilitary foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr.

McDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NEAL, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 24. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a reading of the names of members of the Armed Forces who died in the previous month as a result of combat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 25. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, honoring those who lost their lives, and expressing continued solidarity with the Haitian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U. S. Constitution which gives Congress authority to “regulate Commerce . . . among the several States.”

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 15

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 8 and Amendment XIV Sections 1 and 5

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause

1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order the enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 and Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1)
Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1)
Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments,

and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rules XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rules XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." This provision establishes the authority of Congress to appropriate funds, and place limitations and conditions on the use of those funds.

By Mr. BARR:

H.J. Res. 11.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is stated in Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which establishes the method for enacting amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 13.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification

may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

By Mr. SALMON:

H.J. Res. 14.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 27: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 32: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 36: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. YODER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BABIN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 44: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 123: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 125: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 132: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 154: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 159: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 160: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 167: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SALMON, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 169: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 173: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 185: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 191: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 203: Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 204: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 206: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 208: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 217: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 227: Mr. JONES and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 230: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 232: Mr. DENT.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 2: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Res. 12: Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 13: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on H.R. 37 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 185 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE
OF GERALD "JERRY" LEE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Gerald "Jerry" Lee, who was born in San Francisco on August 15, 1952, and died on December 24, 2014, at the age of 62 in his home city. Jerry, the son of Fon Yook Lee and Sai Soo Lee, was raised in San Francisco and attended Washington Irving Elementary, Francisco Junior High, and Galileo High School, City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University.

Jerry and his wife Beverly Chin were married in San Francisco in 1975, and gave so generously of their time and considerable talents to their community. They devoted countless hours to causes including: the San Francisco Chinese New Year Parade; Self-Help for the Elderly; Chinatown Community Development Center; Community Youth Center of San Francisco; Cameron House; Wu Yee Children's Services; United Way of the Bay Area; Have a Ball Foundation; Salvation Army; APA Family Services; Glide Memorial Church; the San Francisco Junior Giants; Big Brothers and Big Sisters; On Lok; Boys & Girls Club; Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, and the Asian Police Officers Association. Jerry's commitment to his community included being an ardent supporter of the San Francisco Giants and the 49ers.

Jerry worked at United Parcel Services for more than four decades, beginning as a loader and climbing the corporate ladder to the position of Community Affairs Manager. At UPS, he took on special assignments at the regional and corporate levels and was recognized for his work as the United Way Coordinator and Congressional Awareness Coordinator. As UPS's representative he formed close relationships with California's non-profit organizations, providing them with grants and sponsorships and coordinated teams of volunteers to support the needs of the community.

Jerry was appointed by Mayor Art Agnos to form San Francisco's Department of Parking and Traffic. Jerry also served as Chair of the City's Taxi Committee and was an important part of the development of the industry's manual. Mayor Gavin Newsom appointed Jerry to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors and he was re-appointed to this position by Mayor Ed Lee.

Jerry is survived by his beloved spouse Beverly; his children Kimberly, Corbett and Bennett, and his mother Sai Soo Lee. He was preceded in death by his father and he also leaves his sisters Aimee, Vickie, Marie and Patricia, and many aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces and nephews.

I had the privilege of working with Jerry Lee on many efforts. I saw first-hand his great en-

thusiasm for collaboration, a deep sense of pride in all the employees at UPS and an unswerving commitment to his community rooted in patriotism, decency and integrity. He was a trusted friend and an extraordinary partner, and I join the many in our region in grieving his loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and great accomplishments of a proud American, Jerry Lee. We are a better community and a stronger country because of him.

IN HONOR OF ROCK SCULLY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of a truly remarkable man and to mourn the passing of a dear friend, Rock Scully. Rock passed away just before Christmas following a long battle with cancer. The world knew Rock as the man who managed the Grateful Dead from their inception in San Francisco through their rise to prominence to become music legends. I knew Rock as the new kid in the 6th grade who became my lifelong friend. Rock taught the Dead about business. He taught me how to ski. We grew up together, spent time together exploring the wonders of Carmel-by-the-Sea, and later traveling together to serve in interfaith peace camps in Germany and Austria in 1958. Some of my fondest memories were created with Rock. As a Member of this House, I rise to honor Rock's contribution to American culture. But as SAM FARR, I rise today to shed tears for the loss of a friend who I had known for 61 years.

Rock was born in Seattle in 1941. I first met him when he moved to Carmel in 1952. We became friends in grammar school and went to Carmel High School together before he moved to Switzerland to finish his senior year. Rock attended Earlham College in Indiana before moving back to California for graduate school in San Francisco.

Rock began his public career in the early 1960s, while studying at San Francisco State College. He helped organize civil rights demonstrations to fight discrimination in San Francisco including the now famous sit-ins at the Sheraton Palace Hotel and at automobile dealerships on Van Ness Avenue in 1964. The sit-ins were successful in improving hiring practices and creating agreements of non-discrimination. They also caused Rock and others to spend 30 days in the San Bruno county jail for disturbing the peace.

At the same time, Rock found his calling in San Francisco's fledgling rock music scene. He became the manager of The Charlatans, one of the originators of what became known

as the San Francisco Sound in the 1960s. He also helped support the fledgling rock scene as part of a collective known as the Family Dog.

Just before I left to join the Peace Corps, Rock called to tell me he was going to quit graduate school to manage a new band full time. "You're crazy!" I said. Rock told me they were amazing and definitely going places. "Besides," he said, "they have the coolest name: the Grateful Dead." Rock may have been crazy but he was right. The Dead was a local Bay Area act when he started managing them in 1965. The band became an American icon in the two decades he was with them. Bob Weir of the Grateful Dead put it beautifully in a message he posted upon learning of Rock's death, "Rock helped explain the Dead to the world."

Rock chronicled his twenty years with the band in his book "Living with the Dead." He became a voice for the narrative history of musicians and artists that changed the cultural landscape of California. In many ways he was part of the broad and varied movement that helped shape California's openness to innovation, creativity, and diversity. That movement can be traced at the University of California, Santa Cruz, whose library houses the complete archives of the Grateful Dead.

Rock played such a huge part in so many lives, but especially to his family and friends. I want to extend my condolences to his daughter, Sage Scully and stepdaughter, Aca-cia Scully; half sisters, Norah Scully and Kate Scully; step sisters, Julie Mayer Vognar and Amanda Mayer Stinchecum; and his brother, Dicken Scully, who travelled with us in Europe in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in celebrating Rock Scully's amazing spirit and in offering our best wishes to his family and friends. To quote the band that Rock managed for two decades, "A box of rain will ease the pain and love will you see you through."

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
GERALD LEE

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gerald "Jerry" Lee. Jerry was born on August 15, 1952, in San Francisco, California, where he attended Washington Irving Elementary School, Francisco Junior High School, and Galileo High School. He went on to attend City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University.

Jerry's firsthand knowledge of San Francisco and dedication to improving public transit and the MUNI system provided him the experience necessary to excel as the United Parcel

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Service's (UPS) Community Affairs Manager. Jerry began working for UPS 43 years ago as a loader. Jerry was recognized for his work as the United Way Coordinator and Congressional Awareness Coordinator. As the Community Awareness Coordinator, Jerry worked one-on-one with California's non-profit organizations, he extended grants and sponsorship opportunities, and coordinated volunteers to support the work of the community.

Jerry dedicated his life to serving the residents of his hometown. While working for UPS, Jerry also served as a special assistant to San Francisco Mayor Art Agnos in 1988. In this position, Jerry established the Department of Parking and Traffic. He also served as Chairman of Mayor Agnos' Taxi Committee where he wrote the taxi industry's manual and created a management structure for over three hundred parking control officers. In 2008 Jerry was appointed by Mayor Gavin Newsom to join San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) Board of Directors, and was later re-appointed by Mayor Ed Lee. Jerry served as SFMTA Vice Chairman until 2010 before becoming Chair of the Board's Policy and Governance Committee.

Jerry also served as a member of the city's Citizen's Advisory Committee as well as Self-Help for the Elderly's Board of Directors. He and his wife, Beverly, were actively involved in their community, working with the San Francisco Chinese New Year Parade, Chinatown Community Development Center, Community Youth Center of San Francisco, Cameron House, Wu Yee Children's Services, United Way of the Bay Area, Have a Ball Foundation, Salvation Army, APA Family Services, Glide Memorial Church, the San Francisco Junior Giants, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, On Lok, Boys & Girls Club, Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, and the Asian Police Officers Association.

Jerry is survived by his wife Beverly; his children Kimberly, Corbett, and Bennett; his mother Sai Soo Lee; and his sisters Aimee, Vickie, Marie and Patricia; and his aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, and nephews. Jerry was preceded in death by his father, Fon Yook Lee. To his fellow committee members and fellow organization members, Jerry will be missed and never forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FAMILIES

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the dedicated men and women who serve and protect our communities every day as members of police departments large and small.

In recent months, we have seen chilling examples of how a lack of appreciation and respect for these men and women can rip apart communities and result in senseless and lethal violence.

All of us would be well-served to remember that the men and women who pin on a badge

every day are not just police officers. They are also husbands and wives; mothers and fathers; brothers and sisters; aunts and uncles.

We should all recognize that police officers do more than just patrol our streets. They are part of our community.

In light of recent events, it is important to express our gratitude and offer a simple "thank you" to the countless law enforcement officers who serve with valor and distinction.

I had the honor of doing just this last weekend in West Chester, and again will have the honor of doing so this weekend in Berks County. Let us all be solemnly reminded that the Thin Blue Line is willing to risk their own safety so that our loved ones, our homes and our businesses are protected.

So ahead of this upcoming weekend, I want to personally thank the efforts of retired Reading Police Lieutenant Michael Kurtz, Tricia Wertz—a widow of fallen Reading Police Officer Scott Wertz—and many, many others as the Berks County community will unite to show respect and in the spirit of building stronger, safer communities where all lives matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015 I missed recorded votes #1–7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted "no" (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted "no" (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted "yes" (Motion to Commit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted "no" (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted "yes" (Passage "Hire More Heroes Act" H.R. 22).

HONORING AMERICA'S PEACE OFFICERS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, everyday men and women of the police force put on their uniform and head out into the unknown. They encounter callous criminals and outlaws who have no regard for the law or their fellow man.

But yet every day, these police officers still get up and put on the uniform. They bravely face what could very well be some of the most dangerous situations and potentially their last moments on this Earth as they work to protect

us: our families, our friends, our children. Because that's what they do, they work to restore and maintain peace in our communities and neighborhoods.

When New York Police Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu woke up on the morning of December 20th to put on their uniform, they had no idea it would be their last day. The two patrol officers were sitting in their squad car, working overtime, when a hateful and spiteful criminal struck. The ruthless murderer shot and killed the two officers in cold blood.

Officer Ramos and Officer Liu's lives were robbed from them.

Officer Liu was married only two months before, and now his wife is left as a widow. Officer Ramos was a devoted husband and father, active in his church with plans to join the ministry. These two men of solid character, were targeted and attacked. So much hate has been hurled at police officers.

Recently, two more New York Police Officers were shot while investigating a robbery call in the Bronx when they were shot and wounded by criminals. The disrespect of our law enforcement must stop. The soulless thugs who hunt down police officers and kill them have to be punished to the highest degree.

Underneath these uniforms are moms, dads, sisters, brothers, cousins and friends. Protecting us is their job. It is their duty to bring safety to our communities, to separate anarchy from order, and to bring justice to crime victims. No police officer should have to be any more fearful than they already are for their life while on patrol.

As Americans, we must let them know that we support them and are grateful for all they do for our communities. A nationwide campaign called Project Blue Light was launched to show support for the special men and women in our police force.

A single blue light in a window or front porch shows support for our peace officers. Neighborhoods, communities and towns should beam the glow of blue in support of these community warriors. Take the time to thank a police officer.

To many, the unknown is terrifying, but to police officers, it's just another day. Today, on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, we lift up all those who put their lives on the line every single day for us. They deserve the utmost respect and support not just today but every day of the year.

During my other life, I was a prosecutor and criminal court judge in Houston, Texas. I have known and still know individuals who wear the badge or the star over their heart. Some of those peace officers I knew gave their lives for the safety of others.

Peace officers put their lives between us and criminals. They stand between the law and the lawless. I have had the opportunity to know peace officers from all over the U.S.—including New York and especially New York City.

Years ago, I taught at the New York State Police Academy. After those folks from New York and I got through the language barrier, I found them to be some of New York's finest of people—some of the best peace officers in the country.

Peace officers are necessary in our society because some in our country refuse to follow the law. Ironically, we hire these men and women to do society's dirty work then society criticizes them for their actions.

Peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the fox and the chickens. They have earned and deserve our respect. America should mourn the ambush and assassination of all those in law enforcement who have given their lives for order in America—especially the men in blue of New York.

And that's just the way it is.

H.R. 37—PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 2015 I inadvertently voted yes on Roll Call number 9, on H.R. 37—the so-called "Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act". I intended to vote no on this bill and I wish to make my position clear for the record.

I oppose this bill because it undermines the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act. This important law was passed in response to the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression and it was designed to ensure that Wall Street will never again be able to destroy our economy. The crisis was made worse by the widespread trading of complex financial derivatives, many of which were not understood by those engaged in their trade, and many of which were not used by "end users" engaged in traditional hedging of risk. Dodd-Frank protects our economic security by requiring over-the-counter derivatives to be regulated by both the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). This bill would undermine those protections by forbidding regulators from imposing requirements that margin or collateral be provided for derivatives transactions involving commercial companies. The legislation is also harmful in that it entirely eliminates statutory authority for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to regulate margin and collateral at non-bank derivatives dealers serving commercial end users.

Even though regulators have not proposed to require any margin of commercial end users at this time, it is inappropriate to completely eliminate the ability of central derivatives market regulators to take action in this important area. This is a clear attempt by Republicans to delay and weaken implementation of core parts of the Dodd-Frank Act at the expense of main street, and our future economic security.

Unfortunately, this misguided bill was brought to the floor with complete disregard for proper legislative process. Legislation such as this should be considered by committees and members should have the opportunity to offer amendments. This did not occur in this instance and instead was brought directly to the floor on a suspension of the normal House rules that apply.

Although I inadvertently voted "yes" on this bill, I am encouraged that H.R. 37 did not pass the house and I stand in solidarity with my colleagues who voted no.

RECOGNIZING PAULA SAMPSON ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM FAIRFAX COUNTY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and commend Paula C. Sampson on the occasion of her retirement after a long and distinguished career in public service to the residents of Fairfax County, Virginia. For the past 15 years, Paula has been the director of the Department of Housing and Community Development. She has spent her career focused on putting home ownership within reach of more people and finding more affordable options for those not yet able to purchase their own home.

After graduating from the University of Michigan with degrees in political science and history, Paula landed a job as a local urban planner. She then relocated to the National Capital Region and accepted a position with the National Association of Counties in its Legislative Affairs Office.

Fairfax County recruited her to become the Housing Department's Director of Real Estate Finance in 1986. In 1994, Paula left Fairfax to become CEO of the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund, a state-wide, nonprofit organization focused on affordable housing. Thankfully Paula realized her true home was here in Fairfax, returning in 1999.

I served on the Board of Supervisors at the time and knew she would be a real champion for housing, which is no small feat. On the administrative side, you're managing public dollars, gauging the local housing market, and building community partnerships with banks and nonprofits. But there is also a human side, in which you're working to assist residents across the spectrum, from those seeking help buying a first home to those wanting assistance managing their money so they can one day afford a home to those who are homeless and simply need a warm place to rest their heads.

Paula truly gets it and proved adept and skillful in juggling those different aspects of her duties. In describing herself, she says, "While the complexities of real estate finance, the challenges of deal-making and the excitement of the ribbon-cutting are all fun, the real motivator for me is helping an individual have a place to call home. My own modest beginning showed me that growing up in a stable home is the stepping stone to future success."

I had the pleasure of working closely with Paula during my tenure as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors on a successful affordable housing preservation initiative. We had identified the growing shortage of affordable housing as a primary challenge for the County. Job growth was significantly outpacing construction of new housing units, and those that had once been affordable were quickly being

converted or redeveloped into condominium units to capitalize on the hot real estate market at the time.

We convened a summit of business, faith, nonprofit, and community leaders, and from that exercise we appointed a task force, which recommended the Board of Supervisors establish a goal of preserving 1,000 affordable housing units over a four year period, which at the time we viewed as a stretch goal. As Chairman, I was pleased to champion that goal and set that course for our community, but it was Paula who seized the mission and kept the Department's staff focused on advancing this cause at every turn and through every hurdle. Thanks to her efforts, and those of our many partners, we not only surpassed our goal, we nearly tripled it with 2,700 homes preserved. We were so successful that at one point, the Board dedicated the value of one penny on the local real estate tax to the preservation effort.

Based on the success of that initiative, we launched a campaign to prevent and end homelessness in 10 years, again hosting a summit and appointing a task force to build community support. It is because of that effort that Fairfax was able to break the mold and actually reduce its homeless population during the Great Recession while other communities struggled. Through it all, Fairfax has been blessed to have the strong support of the faith, nonprofit, and business communities, including Catholics for Housing, Homestretch, Cornerstones, Pathway Homes, United Community Ministries, Sekas Homes, Deloitte, the Fairfax County Chamber, and so many other community partners. We also worked together in advancing the concept of Magnet Housing in the County to provide workforce housing for nurses, police officers, firefighters and other young professionals serving the community.

More recently, I was pleased to collaborate with Paula in support of the County's application to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for acceptance as a Move to Work agency. That designation provides invaluable flexibility with federal dollars to allow Fairfax to better leverage its housing and human service funds with assistance from community partners to provide homeless residents with housing and job training so they can "move to work" and self-sufficiency.

In addition to her regular duties, Paula also has served on multiple regional, state, and national boards, including the National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, the National Community Development Association, and the Freddie Mac Affordable Housing Advisory Committee.

Without question, she has helped make our community stronger, and helped provide other communities with the tools to model our success in Fairfax. Thanks to Paula's leadership Fairfax is moving ever close to goal of providing safe, affordable housing for all those who wish to call our community home.

Mr. Speaker, Paula Sampson's commitment to public service has set an example that will benefit our community for generations to come. Her accomplishments are truly outstanding and deserving of our sincere appreciation. When I was Chairman of the County Board, we often joked when retirement announcements like this came before the Board

that we should pass a resolution to not allow such talented and dedicated staff to leave public service, and I certainly wish that was the case here.

I wish Paula the best of luck in her retirement, and I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in expressing our appreciation for her long and fruitful service to the residents of Fairfax County.

FRACKING IS JEOPARDIZING THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my growing concern about the economic issues of fracking. The once booming oil fracking market could be headed for a bust.

If a bust in the oil fracking sector does happen, it could create massive losses on Wall Street and for investors on Main Street in two ways. First, fracking oil drillers issued massive amounts of debt to construct the necessary wells. With the price of gas falling, many oil fracking drillers now face cash shortfalls. As a result, it is becoming more and more difficult for frackers to meet their debt servicing obligations. If the debt servicing obligations are not met, investors on Main Street and Wall Street could be left holding billions of dollars of worthless bonds.

Second, many companies took out derivatives contracts against market fluctuation, insuring stable cash flow. Losses are mounting on these contracts as oil prices fall. Wall Street banks that own many of these contracts will have to absorb massive losses. The unexpected shock of falling oil prices may destabilize the balance sheet of these big banks, creating the conditions for another financial crisis.

Below is an article from Truthout.org that further explains this issue.

[Truthout.org]

RUSSIA BLAMED, U.S. TAXPAYERS ON THE HOOK, AS FRACKING BOOM COLLAPSES

(By Ben Ptashnik)

As Congress removes restrictions on taxpayers bailing out the too-big-to-fail banks, the right is blaming environmentalists and Russia for the demise of the fracking boom. In reality, the banks' junk bonds and derivatives have flooded Wall Street, and now the fracking bubble threatens another financial crisis.

Collapsing crude oil prices due to oversupply are reaching tsunami proportions, threatening Wall Street banks, investors and a dozen countries, foremost Russia, Iran and Venezuela, where revenue losses have caused severe financial degradation, and economies are about to implode. While Americans are today enjoying \$2 per gallon gasoline, Wall Street's analysts predict that an imminent energy market collapse will bring financial institutions to their knees once again, and taxpayers are being set up for another mandatory bailout.

At the heart of these tectonic shifts in the entire energy sector is the recent expansion of the hydraulic fracturing (fracking) indus-

try, a boom cycle that began in earnest when Congress and the Bush administration passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which exempted the new horizontal drilling technology from the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. By tapping considerable quantities of new oil and gas resources from shale deposits, the fracking boom promised U.S. energy independence, upending the world's prevailing paradigms around renewable energy and peak oil expectations. Environmentalists fought against the huge Keystone pipeline infrastructure that would deliver the fossil fuels to foreign markets, fearing that exploiting these resources would undermine the struggle for the curbing of carbon emissions.

Fracking also threatened the dominance of Russia and Saudi Arabia as the fossil fuel suppliers of Europe when it became evident that the United States would soon become a net exporter. In the United States, fracking was hyped on Wall Street as a get-rich-quick opportunity, attracting massive capital input, and creating an investment bubble. Bloomberg reported this year that the number of bonds issued by oil and gas companies has grown by a factor of nine since 2004.

"There's a lot of Kool-Aid that's being drunk now by investors," Tim Gramatovich, chief investment officer and founder of Peritus Asset Management LLC, told Bloomberg in an April 2014 article. "People lose their discipline. They stop doing the math. They stop doing the accounting," he continued. "They're just dreaming the dream, and that's what's happening with the shale boom."

When gas fracking first popped onto the scene, grandiose claims were made that the United States had 100 years of gas supply in shale, or 2,560 trillion cubic feet. And Wall Street rode that initial estimate. The only downside (beside the environmental disaster left by this toxic industry) was that, like the housing bubble which depended on ever-growing home values to maintain profitability, shale gas wells had to deliver consistent or growing production and profitability to pay back heavy debt interest loans on well driller companies: \$3 to \$9 million per well. Fracking wells require not just drilling, but also huge injections of energy, water, sand and chemicals to fracture the rocks that hold the oil and gas deposits.

But in fact, no statistical evidence confirmed the hyped claims of a 100-year shale gas supply. In 2011, a study downsized this estimate from 2,560 trillion cubic feet to 750 trillion cubic feet, and by 2013, the U.S. Geological Survey refined that down to 481 trillion cubic feet—less than a 19-year supply based on 2013 rates of production. Nevertheless, huge amounts of capital poured into increasingly marginal operations, and the fracking market was flooded with junk bonds and derivatives as investors piled in.

Meanwhile oil fracking, which is separate from gas fracking, also needed huge injections of capital, but more importantly, oil frackers needed oil prices to stay at \$85 a barrel or higher on average to break even. Many of the shale oil wells that have sucked up a huge amount of investment have also turned out to have short lives and their operators required continued infusions of capital to drill new wells to keep afloat, even as prices tumbled due to the glut they themselves created. The Bakken, one of the largest oil fracking plays, is a typical example. It grew exponentially after environmental protections were removed. But since 2008, Bakken has required increasingly larger

numbers of wells just to maintain level production and service debt. The industry, already in trouble in 2013, has now endured plunging revenues through a year of oil selling at \$60 to \$70 per barrel, on average, instead of \$90 to \$100.

Everyone had expected that in 2014 the Saudis would move to limit supply and maintain stable oil prices by cutting back production, as OPEC has done for decades. But an unexpected shockwave hit the industry in November 2014: The Saudis laid down the gauntlet and announced their intention to continue full production and let oil prices drop.

For the Saudis, this serves two purposes: First, it undermines the expansion of U.S. shale oil by forcing prices down so low that many of the wells have to be shut down or lose money. Second, it punishes their enemy, Iran, whose oil export-based economy has been savaged by the lower prices. The Saudis are sitting pat, with a trillion-dollar war chest savings account accumulated over a decade of \$100 per barrel oil. Oil Minister Ali al-Naimi has publicly admitted that the Saudis will wait as long as needed to retain market share, even if prices plunge further.

Falling oil prices will place a huge stress on the world's junk bond market as energy companies now account for 15 percent of the outstanding issuance in the non-investment grade bond market. The plunge in the prices of crude could trigger a "volatility shock large enough to trigger the next wave of defaults," according to Deutsche Bank.

This explains why the Obama administration—with complicity of both congressional Democrats and Republicans—managed in the wee hours of the morning to slip a loophole into the supposedly "must-pass" cliff-hanger omnibus budget bill. This toxic Trojan horse, passed in December 2014, now includes a minor footnote provision that might cause taxpayers to pick up the tab on more than a trillion dollars (yes, trillion) if the energy market bubble implodes, which it must if oil stays at half the price it fetched just six months ago.

After last minute, heavy lobbying on the budget bill by Jamie Dimon of JPMorgan Chase and an army of 3,000 Wall Street lobbyists, it appears that once again sufficient insecurity and fear had been spread among the political class regarding destabilization of the financial markets (or withdrawal of campaign financing). They allowed a last minute amendment that killed Dodd-Frank protections, and allowed U.S. taxpayers to be shaken down to cover Wall Street's shale gambling debacle.

The heavy-handed move by the financial industry has outraged progressives and libertarians alike. It seems that these Wall Street criminals, like junkies attached to their drugs of choice, just could not resist the high of easy cash from Ponzi scheme market bubbles, and so they have stuck it to the U.S. public once again: Preposterously huge bonuses, Porsches, pricey call girls, and million-dollar Manhattan condos were at stake. So hey, why should they kick the habit? After all, not a single one of those con artists went to jail last time.

Wall Street is now flooded with fracking industry derivatives contracts that protect the profits of oil producers from dramatic swings in the marketplace. Derivatives are essentially insurance policies taken out by the oil industry to guard against fluctuations in the cost of fossil fuel supplies. Dramatic swings rarely happen, but when they do they can be absolutely crippling.

Derivatives taken out to ensure prices don't go down are now creating billions in

losses for those who sold such bets on the market; someone is going to have to absorb massive losses created by the sudden drop in oil on the other end of those insurance contracts. In many cases, it is the big Wall Street banks, and if the price of oil does not rebound substantially they could be facing colossal losses.

The big Wall Street banks did not expect plunging home prices to implode the mortgage-backed securities market in 2008, but their current models also did not have \$60 oil prices included in projections. The huge losses may send a shock wave into the entire financial industry. It has been estimated that the six largest "too-big-to-fail" banks control \$3.9 trillion in commodity derivatives contracts, those same gambling instruments that brought us the 2008 housing collapse. And a very large chunk of that amount is made up of oil derivatives. Combined with the huge flood of shale junk bonds on the market, the derivatives could initiate a bubble burst that could turn into a financial market implosion.

Meanwhile, the global climate change issue and energy market turbulence have morphed into geopolitical tensions over European fracking. Unsubstantiated allegations in a New York Times report by Andrew Higgins claim that the Russians are funding anti-fracking protests to maintain their hegemony over gas markets.

The allegations have infuriated environmentalists and climate justice activists. The last thing they want is to be made scapegoats for the fracking collapse and be played as the neo-Cold War dupes of the Russian empire. But memories of red-baiting suddenly hang in the air as (by seemingly coincidence) dozens of right-wing media sites regularly devoted to anti-Soviet slanders or climate change denial immediately picked up Higgins' Times piece, as if on cue.

There are now dozens more of such published reports. Even as the U.S. fracking industry collapses and tensions over control of Ukraine and other former Soviet satellites re-emerge, there seems to be a concerted right-wing effort to label fracking opponents Russian agents.

Vague innuendos dominate this narrative. In the Times piece, for example, former NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen is quoted: "I have met allies who can report that Russia, as part of their sophisticated information and disinformation operations, engage actively with so-called non-government organizations." Others write, "Some in Sophia believe" or "Those who suspect Russian involvement" or "There's no smoking gun, yet . . ."

Critics in Romania accused the Times and Higgins of scapegoating environmentalists and acting as partisan players in a renewed Cold War.

"What, exactly, is the grand total of evidence that Russia is financing these anti-fracking protests?" asks American blogger in Romania, Sam C. Roman, in his article, "Pot vs. Kettle," pointing out that the first anti-Russia allegation came from a politician who owned land that Chevron planned to frack, and is thus losing money from the protests. "Not one allegation against Russia in the entire article is proven by a single document, piece of evidence or other direct proof. All that exists are shadowy insinuations and allegations." He asserts that accusations by Lithuanian, Romanian and NATO officials against Russia have not yet to be backed up by any proof.

"Add it up," Roman writes. "You've got two former NATO [secretary generals]

stumping for Chevron (which competes with Gazprom, a Russian energy company that also conducts fracking operations in Europe) blaming the Russian government for protests. . . . And all of this tied up in a neat little bow by an American journalist who has already been caught publishing anti-Russian propaganda in his newspaper before."

This all leaves the United States somewhat schizophrenic. On the one hand, the United States and NATO's foreign policy hawks are delighted by the oil price collapse; it serves to isolate and subdue Russia, expand NATO's influence in Eastern Europe, and puts pressure on Iran to negotiate on nuclear aspirations. Not to mention that with gasoline at \$2 per gallon, consumer spending and economic growth will be enhanced. The U.S. economy grew by a comparatively robust 5 percent in the third quarter of 2014.

According to an article by Larry Elliott in *The Guardian*, "Stakes Are High as U.S. Plays the Oil Card Against Iran and Russia," the price drop was an act of geopolitical warfare by the United States, administered by the Saudis. Elliott suggests that U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry allegedly struck a deal with Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah in September. That might explain how oil prices dropped during the crisis caused by Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, which would normally have caused prices to rise.

It would also explain why the Obama administration allowed the financial industry the amendment to Dodd-Frank that effectively exempts financial institutions from liability associated with derivatives. Though shale derivatives were not specifically mentioned by the Wall Street lobbyists as they pressured their allies in Congress and the White House, it is becoming increasingly clear that the too-big-to-fail banks were beginning to panic as dark clouds gathered on the horizon in the shale derivatives trade.

Most bank customers and voters don't know that Congress has already written into finance regulations that, in the case of insolvency, financial institutions could grab the assets of depositors and "bail-in"—which means they can save themselves from their losses in gambling operations at their investment divisions by grabbing cash assets of depositors, even those that are FDIC guaranteed, and legally convert them to bank stocks. That means that in the event of another market crash, Chase and Citi could take their depositors' cash in savings accounts or CDs, and give the customers back a bank stock certificate (of questionable value) instead.

There are also those who scratch their heads and ask, "Why did the TBTF banks push for a deletion of the Dodd-Frank provision now, instead of waiting for the friendlier Republican-controlled Congress to pass this legislation?" The only answer that seems to make sense, and explain their urgency, is that the collapse is imminent.

In the 1990s dot-com craze, every new Silicon Valley start-up company was advertised as the next Microsoft. What followed was the crash of 2000, when the NASDAQ dropped 4,000 points (80 percent) in months. This chart below is what the crash looked like in 2000 to 2002 after the market had reached 5,000 (almost exactly where it stands today).

Having learned their lesson well from the last bailout, and knowing that they will have a much harder time coming to Congress hat-in-hand after a collapse, the TBTF banks probably decided not to wait, pushing their minions in the Beltway to inoculate them as soon as possible from the potential market explosion. In the meantime, they were

probably dumping their own stocks on unsuspecting investors. Based on year-end reports for March 31, 2014, for 127 major oil companies, cash input for the fracking industry was \$677 billion, while revenues from operations only totaled \$568 billion—a difference of almost \$110 billion. And this was before the price of oil started dropping six months ago.

In three out of seven major fracking fields in North America, companies are already reporting losses, with closures particularly acute in Canada. It's not clear whether economists fully appreciate what's about to transpire. This decline in rig count is just the beginning. Perhaps the end will come as early as this winter or spring, as fiscal reports for 2014's fourth quarter are published, operations shut down, crews are laid off, and many unprofitable oil and gas rigs are mothballed.

So, whom will the banks, brokers and investors scapegoat for this upcoming crash? Some predict that they will likely use every available media outlet to blame community activists, Democrats and Obama for stopping the Keystone pipeline and for opposing the fracking industry. And as in the climate change denier movement, the narrative will probably use "communist" and "socialist" rhetoric, which is why the Russian card is so important to play: Hence the Higgins article.

The pundits on Fox will likely play on the patriotism of the right and use their Big Lie play (say something enough times, it becomes the truth) to the hilt. Six months from now, while studiously avoiding mention of our "allies," the Saudis, or the Wall Street banks, they will likely be vociferously defending those poor "beleaguered U.S. oilmen" who could have made our country strong and independent again in energy, but were broken by the Democrats and those "commie environmentalists" working for Putin. The market crash will be blamed on the "climate hoax."

NORTH KOREA IS A STATE SPONSOR OF TERROR

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the saga with North Korea and its band of tyrants has gone on far too long.

On November 24th, Sony Pictures Entertainment was attacked. No its headquarters were not bombed, nor did anyone storm the buildings. This was a cyber attack.

It is believed to be the worst of its type on a company on U.S. soil. Hackers released personal data of Sony employees, disabled Sony's IT systems, and destroyed data.

Shortly after, anonymous emails threatened movie-goers hoping to see the Sony film, "The Interview". These threats warned about "9/11-style" terrorist attacks.

A little over a month later, on December 29, the FBI said North Korea was responsible for the cyber attack.

Contrary to what the President has called "cyber vandalism", this cyber terrorism deserves a bold, immediate response.

The world's dictators and terrorists must know without a doubt that an attack—cyber or physical—on the U.S. will result in a devastating response. This starts with the little dictator of Pyongyang, Kim Jong-Un.

It needs to immediately put North Korea back on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list. Representative ROS-LEHTINEN has a bill that puts tough sanctions on North Korea and urges the Administration to put North Korea back on the list. I am an original cosponsor of the bill.

There is no doubt that North Korea belongs on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list.

In July 2009, UAE officials discovered a North Korean ship full of weapons heading to Iran.

Iran has been on the state sponsor of terrorism list since 1984 because it provides hundreds of millions of dollars and tons of weapons to terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. So when one hears about North Korea sending weapons to Iran, it is not a typical transfer of weapons. This is about giving a recognized state sponsor of terrorism more guns to put in the hands of known and designated terrorist groups.

Five months after the UAE seizure, Thai authorities found 35 tons of North Korean weapons on a plane, also traveling to Iran and ultimately bound for delivery to foreign terrorist organizations Hezbollah and Hamas.

In April 2010, South Korean officials apprehended two North Korean military-trained agents who had orders to assassinate a defector from North Korea.

On March 26, 2010, North Korea sunk a South Korean naval vessel, killing 46 sailors.

On November 23, 2010 North Korea repeatedly bombed a small South Korean island, killing two civilians and two marines.

So far, as punishment for the cyber attack on Sony, the President sanctioned ten individuals and three organizations tied to North Korea's intelligence, arms supply, and defense research.

These sanctions are not enough. Other people or organizations not sanctioned by the U.S. can easily take over the same work.

Reinstating North Korea on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list would deepen existing sanctions and could deliver a crippling blow to the little dictator of Pyongyang.

This Administration cannot allow the United States to be bullied again and again.

The West allowed Putin into Ukraine. We have watched ISIS behead our journalists. We have seen Americans die in Israel at the hands of Hamas.

Now, we have let North Korea silence us.

To have a country on the other side of the world not just threaten but actually take away one of America's most fundamental rights is outrageous.

It is time to stop appeasing our enemies.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF OUR BRAVE MEN
AND WOMEN ON LAW ENFORCE-
MENT APPRECIATION DAY

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the rule of law. For that reason, today on the first annual Law Enforcement Apprecia-

tion Day (L.E.A.D.), I would like to honor our brave men and women in both state as well as federal law enforcement agencies. In our nation, we have approximately 900,000 law enforcement officials. Without these hard-working individuals, who constantly risk their lives, the rule of law would not be possible. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 76 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line-of-duty in 2013, 27 deaths were the result of felonious, criminal acts by perpetrators. My own home state of Texas has lost more officers than any other state in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my life I have been truly inspired by the professionalism and devotion to public safety of those in law enforcement. I know I speak for many people of good will when I say I wholeheartedly support the efforts of law enforcement officers to serve and protect our communities and our country. Additionally, we will not let the questionable actions of a few individuals acting under the color of law besmirch the reputation and legacy of all law enforcement officers in our great nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015, I missed recorded votes #1–7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted no (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted no (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted yes (Motion to Commit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted no (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted yes (Passage "Hire More Heroes Act of 2015" H.R. 22).

I would also like to reflect that I would have voted for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI for Democratic Leader.

RECOGNIZING U.S. AMBASSADOR
TO BANGLADESH DAN MOZENA

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as he retires from the Foreign Service next week, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of the U.S. Ambassador to Bangladesh Dan Mozena. He

led a distinguished career of public service to the United States, capped by his impressive efforts over the past several years to promote workers' safety and advance fundamental labor rights in Bangladesh.

Following a string of tragedies in the Bangladesh garment industry, including the collapse of the Rana Plaza factory that took the lives of 1,138 workers in 2013 and the factory fire at Tazreen Fashions that took the lives of 112 workers in 2012, Ambassador Mozena has advocated for workers' safety and their right to freedom of association. He has urged Bangladesh to transform its garment sector from a model based on a race-to-the-bottom in labor standards, to one where a "Made in Bangladesh" becomes a label valued for the country's commitment to workers' rights and high standards for safety.

Following the U.S. Government's decision to suspend trade preferences and issue an Action Plan focused on labor rights and factory safety, Ambassador Mozena convened the embassies of other garment importing countries (Netherlands, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the European Union) with the responsible Bangladesh Government Secretariats on a monthly basis to track progress. This model for joint advocacy is one that merits recognition and replication as our Embassies work to elevate labor rights in developing economies.

Ambassador Mozena worked with the U.S. Department of Labor to bring the first Labor Attaché to Bangladesh, and he leaves an institutional framework to help advance labor rights in this young and developing country. Under Mozena's leadership the U.S. Embassy became a place where workers could turn to for help when they faced coercion, repression, and anti-union violence.

Of course, there is a tremendous amount of work that still needs to be accomplished in Bangladesh to ensure that workers are safe and that their fundamental rights are respected in the workplace. Ambassador Mozena has fought to ensure that momentum is going in the right direction in Bangladesh—we must continue this work moving forward.

Ambassador Mozena's accomplishments extend beyond labor rights. Since presenting his Letters of Credence to the President of Bangladesh on November 24, 2011, Ambassador Mozena has strengthened relations between the United States and Bangladesh by promoting a Bangladesh that is peaceful, secure, prosperous, healthy, and democratic. He emphasized understanding the diversity of Bangladesh, making visits to each of the country's 64 districts. In the United States, he has visited Bangladeshi-Americans across the country.

During his time as Ambassador, Mozena oversaw the largest aid budget in Asia outside of Afghanistan and Pakistan, bolstering Bangladeshi food security and nutrition, improving health, and increasing capacity to cope with climate change, natural disasters, and security challenges.

Beyond Ambassador Mozena's current posting in Dhaka, he had an impressive career advancing U.S. interests in South Asia and Africa. He previously served in Bangladesh as Political/Economic Counselor from 1998–2001 and as a Deputy Political Counselor in India

and Pakistan. A member of Senior Foreign Service, Mozena was U.S. Ambassador to Angola from 2007–2010 and previously worked in the Office of Southern African Affairs from 1993 to 1995, during South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy. Previous postings include Lusaka and Kinshasa and a year as a professor at the National War College.

Ambassador Mozena's family has stood by his side as he has pursued his career overseas. His wife of 40 years, Grace, is a retired elementary school teacher who served with him as a Peace Corps volunteer in then-Zaire. Their two children, Anne and Mark, followed their father throughout the world. I understand that Mozena also looks forward to spending time with the newest addition to his family, a granddaughter named Mira, as well as his mother Edna.

As Ambassador Mozena returns to his family in the United States, we recognize his work in Bangladesh and throughout his career as a Foreign Service Officer.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION TURNS 226

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week 226 years ago, the first presidential election in United States history was held across the 13 original colonies. Nowadays things change in the blink of an eye, so one can imagine how much our country has changed in 226 years.

Texas was still a part of the Spanish Empire in 1789 and the United States had just recently gained its independence from the British Empire. Back then, voting eligible citizens would walk or ride their horses down cobblestone roads to the nearest poll.

Oddly enough, the first voters voted by voice, rather than the secret ballot that we're all used to now. Voters wouldn't even vote for who they wanted as President, but would actually vote for their state's electors. The chosen electors would then cast their vote for President. Though we still have electors, citizens now vote for who they believe should be President rather than their state's electors. Electors are instead chosen by state governments and then each one is expected to vote with the will of the people of their state. The Electoral College voting system has been one of the lone constants in an ever-changing political and voting landscape. It was used in the first Presidential election and has been used in every election since.

While the Electoral College has remained in place since 1789, voting rights have changed significantly over the years. For the first Presidential election, an eligible voter was defined as any white, land-owning male. However, our country has progressed a great deal since then and now defines an eligible voter as any citizen over the age of 18, regardless of race, gender, or societal status.

We should be proud to live in a country whose government recognizes everyone as equal and allows each individual to vote, re-

gardless of race or gender. From 13 colonies to 50 states and from voting by voice to voting on touch-screen computers, our elections have come a long way since 1789, and I expect the next 226 years to be just as great.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF PETER CHACON

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Peter Chacon for a lifetime of selfless service and leadership to our nation and our community. He served honorably in the United States Air Force during World War II and in the California State legislature for over 20 years.

Born in Phoenix, Arizona, Mr. Chacon was raised in a home of modest means with three older sisters and three younger brothers. As a teenager, he would shine shoes and park cars in downtown Phoenix to help support his family. His father, Petronilo Chacon, served as a commander in Mexico to Pancho Villa's revolutionary Army and taught Mr. Chacon to fight for what he believed in with passion and determination, while defending the rights of those who could not do the same.

In 1943, at the age of 18 and in the midst of World War II, Mr. Chacon enlisted in the U.S. Air Force. He served honorably for two years of wartime service as a Ball Turret Gunner on a B-17 Flying Fortress. During his service, he flew 35 successful missions over Germany. On one such mission, his plane was shot down and forced to crash land on a small island off the Italian coast where he and the rest of the crew were later rescued.

After the war, Mr. Chacon returned home as a hero and enrolled in San Diego City College and later San Diego State University where he received a bachelor's degree in education and a master's degree in school administration. He began a career as a teacher, where he discovered injustices facing Spanish speaking children in schools. In 1968, with the help of two friends, Mr. Chacon founded the Chicano Federation in an effort to unite the Latino voice in the San Diego community. One of the first accomplishments of the Chicano Federation was the creation of the historic Chicano Park in the Barrio Logan community. Chicano Park has come to be an important symbol of the Chicano Movement.

In 1969, Mr. Chacon decided to run for the California State Assembly in an effort to change the education system from within. Mr. Chacon was elected in 1970 to represent California's 79th assembly district, where he served for 22 years. He is best known for authoring legislation to create the California Housing Finance Agency, the Rural Housing Development Program, and the landmark Bilingual/Bicultural Education Program for the more than 230,000 limited English speaking students in the state.

Mr. Chacon was an inspirational leader in the San Diego community and his contributions will not be forgotten. He is survived by his four sons, Chris, Paul, Ralph and Jeff.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KAREN WILKINSON

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, as Ranking Member and former Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I join with my colleague, Rep. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, the former Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, in celebrating the life and recognizing the accomplishments of Karen Wilkinson, who sadly passed away on January 5.

Karen was a dedicated public servant, highly valued counsel to the Committee, and beloved colleague.

We were fortunate to get to know Karen through her work for the Committee in 2008 and 2009. During that time, Karen, an Assistant Federal Public Defender, was a detailee from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Her detail was the first of a Federal Public Defender to Congress. After her work with the Committee, she returned to Phoenix, Arizona to continue representing indigent clients in federal criminal cases, which she had done for eight years before coming to the Committee. Prior to that, she clerked for the U.S. District Court for Arizona and then joined the law firm of Brown & Bain. Karen graduated magna cum laude from Arizona State University Law School, received a Masters in Business Administration from Nova University and her Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Michigan.

Karen's accomplishments during her tenure with the Committee include a number of bills that dealt with issues that are very important to improving our country's criminal justice system. During the 111th Congress, she was responsible for guiding several legislative measures to approval on the floor of the House of Representatives, including: H.R. 448, the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009; H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act of 2009; H.R. 748, CAMPUS Safety Act of 2009; H.R. 908, the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization Act of 2009; H.R. 1333, amending chapter 40 of title 18 of the United States Code to exempt the transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation of explosive materials for delivery to a federally recognized Indian tribes; H.R. 1727, the Managing Arson Through Criminal History, MATCH, Act; H.R. 1933, a Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act; S. 1289, the Foreign Evidence Request Efficiency Act of 2009, and H.R. 2661, the Court Security Enhancement Act of 2009.

In addition, she served as lead counsel on several other very important bills under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee in the 111th Congress, such as: H.R. 503, the Prevention of Equine Cruelty Act of 2009; H.R. 2289, the Juvenile Justice Accountability and Improvement Act of 2009; H.R. 2095, the Restitution for the Exonerated Act; H.R. 1149, the Child Protection Reauthorization Act of 2009 and H.R. 1422, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Reauthorization Act of 2009.

Karen also developed proposals subsequently introduced as the Literacy Education and Rehabilitation Act, a bill to require a criminal defense representative to be appointed to the United States Sentencing Commission, the Firearm Recidivist Sentencing Act, and legislation to correct the computation of good time credit in the federal prison system. Her work in developing H.R. 3327, the Ramos-Compean Justice Act of 2009, has led to subsequent bipartisan, bicameral introduction of that bill, now known as the Justice Safety Valve Act. This bill has become one of the critical proposals under consideration as a growing consensus in the country is recognizing the need to reform our sentencing laws in order to achieve greater fairness, save unnecessary costs in the criminal justice system, and reduce recidivism. These bills to reform the criminal justice system, developed through her efforts, are a lasting legacy of her dedication to achieving fairness and justice for all.

Karen's dedication to these issues during her time working for the Committee was representative of the professionalism and commitment she showed as an Assistant Federal Public Defender in representing her clients and vindicating their rights to equal and fair treatment under the law.

Today, we remember and appreciate Karen Wilkinson's dedication to public service, her commitment to fairness, her wise counsel, and the friendships she developed with us and her Judiciary Committee colleagues. We will honor her by pledging to advance the causes that were her life's calling.

HONORING GENE BESS

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gene Bess from Poplar Bluff, Missouri for his exceptional years of service to the community as a basketball coach and mentor.

Coach Gene Bess is considered one of the most winningest college basketball coaches recently gaining his 1,200th win. Coach Gene has been recognized as one of the best coaches in college basketball winning two national junior college championships.

Coach Bess has been named the NJCAA Coach of the Year twice and Regional Coach of the Year 18 times. He has led the Raiders of Three Rivers College to 17 tournament appearances and the program has kept a winning record consistently over .750.

Coach Bess's impressive winning record is only one of the reasons he is such a beloved and respected member of the community. Coach Bess not only strives to motivate his players to do their best on the court, but to keep a clear focus on their future. He has expressed the importance he places on seeing his players continuing their education at other institutions and finishing their degrees.

For his remarkable accomplishments as a college basketball coach and his dedication to serve our community, it is my pleasure to rec-

ognize the achievements of Coach Gene Bess before the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING J. JORGE VERDUZCO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of J. Jorge Verduzco of Laredo, Texas.

Jorge Verduzco's extraordinary career has been characterized by global citizenship and community service. Before beginning his career, Mr. Verduzco earned a Bachelor's in International Relations from St. Mary's University, a Master's degree in Latin American Studies from Georgetown University, a second Master's from the American Graduate School on International Management, and he completed graduate programs in Bank Marketing and Commercial Lending.

Jorge Verduzco worked in the Latin American and Administrative Bureaus of the U.S. Department of State for several years prior to joining the International Bank of Commerce in Laredo in 1981. With IBC, Mr. Verduzco has served admirably for over two decades. In addition, his economic development efforts along the Texas-Mexico border have been outstanding, serving as Chairman of the Texas-Mexico Authority Advisory Board, a member of the Policy Board of the Texas Department of Commerce, a founding member of the Border Trade Alliance and the Association of South Texas Communities, a founding Board Member of the Alliance for I-69 Texas, and a Board Member of the Texas Association of Business and Chambers of Commerce. His service exemplifies a shining example of humility and dedication.

In addition to his exemplary career, Jorge Verduzco is a committed husband of forty five years, father, grandfather, and author of "International Relations, The Organization of American States."

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize J. Jorge Verduzco for his many accomplishments and great contributions to the Laredo area. I thank you for this time.

RECOGNIZING MR. RAYMOND BENCIVENGO

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize a career of committed service to our nation and our communities by Raymond Bencivengo of Philadelphia.

Mr. Bencivengo's service began as a United States Marine serving in Vietnam and continued for 25 years after as a Philadelphia Police officer, both on the beat and administratively. Even after retiring from the police force in

1984, Mr. Bencivengo continued his commitment to law, order and protection by serving as a Pennsylvania State Parole Agent for 20 years.

In the summer of 2014, Mr. Bencivengo officially began his well-deserved retirement.

The quiet, selfless service of those like Mr. Bencivengo should never go forgotten or unthanked. So today, I congratulate Raymond Bencivengo and wish him all the best in his retirement.

CELEBRATING THE DEDICATION OF THE TINNER HILL HISTORIC SITE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the Fairfax County Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and to congratulate the Tinner Hill Heritage Foundation on the long-awaited dedication of the Tinner Hill Historic Site.

On January 8, 1915, at the home of Joseph Tinner in Falls Church, nine community leaders formed the Colored Citizens Protective League (CCPL) in order to fight an ordinance in the then Town of Falls Church that would have legalized forced segregation in the town. This pioneering group evolved to become the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP, which has played an instrumental role in the struggle for civil rights in Fairfax County and the nation for the past 100 years and will continue to do so in its next century.

The Tinner Hill Foundation is a 501(c)(3) non-profit founded by Edwin B. Henderson II, a descendant of E.B. Henderson, the CCPL's first Secretary, to preserve this important piece of our community's history. The Foundation helps prepare tomorrow's leaders by ensuring they understand our community's past through cultural enrichment, arts, career and entrepreneurial education, mentoring, and counseling opportunities and by sponsoring clubs, groups, and organizations. The Foundation also has been engaged in the creation of The Tinner Hill Historic Site, The African American Heritage Walking Tour, The "Dear Editor" Contest, and The Tinner Hill Blues Festival.

I am proud to have partnered with the Foundation since I was the Providence District Supervisor on the Fairfax County Board. It was at a Foundation event like this where we first discussed the idea of preserving this property, and the very next day I worked with my colleagues on the Fairfax Board to direct the County Executive to collaborate with the City of Falls Church to purchase this site, which is so significant to the cultural history of our community. And earlier this year, I was pleased to help capture moving and inspirational stories from some of the Foundation's members as part of the Northern Virginia Civil Rights Archive, which my office assembled in collaboration with the Library of Congress and local library branches.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the Tinner Hill Heritage Foundation on this momentous occasion and commending its members for their steadfast efforts to preserve and promote the legacy of the brave African Americans who established the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP and for their commitment to advance educational opportunities for students in the community. I also congratulate the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. Please accept my sincere appreciation for your tireless efforts in support of equal rights and justice for all.

SENATE—Monday, January 12, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, You know our thoughts from afar. Teach us how to live to honor Your Name. Rule in our lives, injecting our intentions with such purity that even our motives can withstand Your scrutiny.

Have Your way on Capitol Hill, surrounding our Senators with Your power and love. Deliver them from fear and uncertainty as You inspire them to stay within the circle of Your will. Lord, bless and consecrate their labors today, and use them to serve the common good as You strengthen them during the hour of temptation.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will debate the motion to proceed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, with the time equally divided until 5:30 p.m. At 5:30 p.m. we will have a cloture vote on the bill to proceed to this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure bill. If all time is used the Senate will begin consideration of the bill at midnight tomorrow night. Once cloture has been invoked, it is my hope that Chairman MURKOWSKI can work with Senator CANTWELL to yield back time, get on the bill during the day tomorrow, and begin to process amendments under the regular order.

The Senate will be out of session on Wednesday and Thursday of this week to accommodate our respective conference retreats. We will return for consideration of the Keystone bill on Friday, and Senators should be work-

ing with the bill managers to get their amendments in the queue.

TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about what has been happening in Paris. We have seen remarkable displays of support for the French people. Out of terrible darkness, we have seen defiant recommitments to the ideals of free expression, and the French people should know that the Senate stands in solidarity with them as they work to recover from such awful terrorist attacks. They should also be assured that we are prepared to cooperate in whatever appropriate way we can.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week the House of Representatives voted on a bipartisan basis to pass a Keystone jobs and infrastructure bill. Meanwhile, the Senate energy committee got the process moving in this Chamber as it debated and approved a bipartisan Keystone measure as well. The committee consideration allows Senators from both parties to offer amendments and make their voices heard. It is the kind of serious legislating many Senators have been waiting a long time to see. It is the latest example of Congress getting back to work under a new Republican majority.

Later this afternoon we will consider a cloture motion that will allow us to proceed to a similarly open debate here on the Senate floor. I know Senators from both sides are hungry for a real Senate debate. I know they want to offer amendments. I know they are anxious to finally have their voices and the voices of the people they represent heard here on the Senate floor. I expect the cloture motion to pass on a bipartisan basis.

Of course, we originally hoped to start this process last Thursday. We wanted to spend Friday working on this bipartisan jobs bill, but the Senate lost that opportunity when some colleagues across the aisle objected to beginning the debate.

Now, moving forward, what I would urge is for our Democratic friends to work with us as the new Republican majority continues to bring more openness to the Senate. The changes we are making are ones that many Democrats have indicated they want to see as well. The reforms we are implementing will give a real voice to constituents represented by Democratic Senators. We need to work together to ensure

positive change takes hold. I am hopeful that will happen.

Here is one consequence of that delay I mentioned. The Nebraska Supreme Court has since eliminated what has to be the last conceivable pretext to veto the Keystone jobs bill, so we will be starting the Senate's debate at a time when the rationale for building this pipeline has almost never been more obvious.

I know the American people would welcome a change in posture from the President. I know supporters in both parties are determined to get a bipartisan jobs and infrastructure bill to his desk as soon as possible. We will take the next step in the process at 5:30 p.m. today, and then we will have an open floor debate on jobs, the middle class, infrastructure, and energy. At the end of this process, we will send a bipartisan jobs bill to the President. We will fulfill our pledge to stop protecting him from good ideas. It may force the President to finally make a difficult choice between jobs and the middle class versus the demands of powerful special interests, but President Obama now has every reason to sign the bipartisan jobs and infrastructure bill we will pass.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, later today Members of the Senate family will have two opportunities to express our solidarity with the people of France in their hour of grief and to reaffirm our commitment to the principles of freedom and tolerance—values that have bound our nations together since the creation of the United States and the French Republic.

In a short while the Senate will consider a resolution condemning the series of terrorist attacks that have shaken France, starting with the attack on the offices of the satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo and ending with a siege Friday at a kosher supermarket in Paris. Our resolution expresses our condolences to the families of the victims and our solidarity with the people of France. It also expresses our deep commitment to the universal right of freedom of expression—a freedom for which the writers and artists of Charlie Hebdo gave their lives. I am

honored to lead this resolution, along with Senators MURPHY of Connecticut and JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

Later this afternoon Senators and their staffs will have an opportunity to sign a condolence book expressing their sympathy and solidarity to the people of France. The book will be outside the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room on the first floor of the Capitol. In memory of the victims, we will welcome the French Ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Gerard Araud, in the committee room at 4:15 p.m.

If the terrorists who attacked Charlie Hebdo and the kosher supermarket in Paris meant to frighten and divide freedom-loving people in France and around the world, they have failed utterly. Yesterday 4 million people marched in demonstrations in cities across the nation of France. A million and a half people marched in Paris alone. Authorities said it was the largest gathering in Paris since the end of World War II and the largest demonstration in the history of the nation of France. They marched to declare their solidarity with the victims of the Charlie Hebdo massacre and the supermarket murders and to demonstrate their unity. The marchers included Christians, Muslims, Jews, and many other religious faiths and nonbelievers. President Francois Hollande led the march. He was joined by European and African leaders, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, America's Ambassador to France, and our Assistant Secretary of State.

Marches were also held in other cities around the globe yesterday, from Washington to the West Bank. Tens of thousands of people showed their solidarity with the victims of these terrorist attacks in France.

In Chicago hundreds of people turned out in the cold yesterday to rally at Daley Plaza under American and French flags. One of the organizers of the Chicago rally was a young woman named Eve Zuckerman who holds joint U.S. and French citizenship and has lived in Chicago for about 4 years. She said the spasm of violence that has shaken France is not simply an attack on France. In her words, "What it really means is that anyone who is for freedom and for tolerance is also under attack."

In our own country in the days after 9/11, our grief was made bearable by the countless acts of courage, kindness, and solidarity we witnessed amidst the carnage, and so it is within France today.

One story that has touched many in France and around the world concerns a young man who worked at the kosher supermarket in Paris that was attacked on Friday. The young man risked his life to hide seven Jewish customers in the freezer in the super-

market's basement. He then risked his life again to slip out of the basement and tell the police there were people hidden downstairs. This young man described the layout of the supermarket and the location of the hostages—crucial details that enabled the police to save so many lives and end the standoff. This young man has been hailed as a hero by the citizens of France and by Israeli President Netanyahu. One more thing about this young French hero—he is a Muslim immigrant, born in Mali.

Martin Luther King told us: We are bound together in a single garment of destiny. The millions of people in France and around the world who marched yesterday and freedom-loving people throughout the world understand this. Together in our unity and resolve, we will overcome this latest assault on our shared values.

HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, over the weekend, as I mentioned, as millions of people were marching on the streets of France and around the world to demonstrate the world's unity in the aftermath of the horrible terrorist attack in France, the President announced that he will convene a summit at the White House next month to discuss what can be done further to stop the threat of violent extremism.

This is a time when we should all be focusing on what we can do to stop the threat of terrorism in our country as well as the rest of the world, so it is truly surprising, to say the least, that the House of Representatives will vote on a bill this week that threatens to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. That is our government agency that is responsible for protecting Americans from terrorism. What in the world would lead the House of Representatives to threaten to shut down this agency? We should not even be debating the Department of Homeland Security at this moment in history.

Every other government agency—every single one of them—has already been funded through the end of this fiscal year, September 30, and that is normal when we fund the government. But the Republicans in the House and Senate insisted weeks ago that the Department of Homeland Security only be funded through the end of February. Why did they demand that this critical agency that is responsible for keeping us safe across America not be funded in the normal manner? Why did they put America at risk with this type of funding? Well, because they wanted an opportunity early in the year—early in the legislative session—to take a stand against President Obama's immigration policies. They feel so strongly about this, they are willing to put the Department of Homeland Security's budget at risk.

So this week the House Republicans are preparing to pass legislation that would defund President Obama's immigration policies, including the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. What is that program? It puts on hold the deportations of immigrant students and children who grew up in this country and allows these young people to live and work legally in America on a temporary basis. That is what DACA is. These young people are well known to me and to most. They are known as DREAMers.

It was 13 years ago that I introduced the DREAM Act. For 13 years I have been trying to pass a bill into law which says that the sins of the parents should not be visited on the children.

These young people who are affected by DACA and the DREAM Act—many of them were brought to the United States as infants and toddlers. They had no voice in this family decision to come here. They did not know, could not know, that one of their parents was undocumented. They grew up in America. They went to school in America. They participated in America. They went to the neighborhood churches and mosques and temples. They were the ones who were standing in their classroom every single day of their lives stopping for a solemn moment to pledge allegiance to the American flag—the only flag they have ever known. But the fact is, they were brought here as babies and children, and they were undocumented. They grew up in America. They identified this country as home. They envisioned this dream of living here. Yet they did not have a legal status.

The DREAM Act said we would give these young people a chance. If they had a clean criminal record, if they would finish high school, if they would go on to college or even enlist in our military, we would allow them to move to legal status—give these DREAMers a chance.

Time and again, we called this legislation. Sadly, it never passed the House and the Senate at the same time. Then President Obama decided 2 years ago that he would use his Executive authority to protect these young people from being deported. We estimate there are about 2 million of them across the United States. He said to them: If you will come forward, pay your fee, go through a background check—if you are prepared to do that and register with the government, we will spare you from deportation. That is what the DACA program is. Mr. President, 600,000 did. Mr. President, 600,000 came up with the money.

I can recall in the city of Chicago when we had the sign up—the very first sign up for this DACA Executive order. It was amazing. We did not know if 200 people would show up or 400 or even

1,000. Well, the night before—at midnight, the night before we started signing them up—the first day they could sign up for DACA, the families started gathering, standing outside at Navy Pier in downtown Chicago. They stood there all night waiting for a chance to sign up for this program. Many of them were parents accompanying their children. The parents themselves were not going to get any direct benefit from this, but they wanted their kids to be spared the fear of deportation. They wanted to give their kids a chance. In the end, thousands came through the door—so many we could not even handle the volume with our volunteer attorneys and many others who were helping.

But it was a clear indication that these families wanted their children to have a chance—a chance to earn their way into legal status in America. That is the DACA—

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until the Sergeant at Arms has restored order in the galleries.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the young people I have described are known as DREAMers. They were brought to the United States as children. They grew up in this country, and they have overcome great obstacles to continue to live here. They are the future doctors, engineers, teachers, and soldiers who will make America stronger.

Now, in the last 2 years, as I mentioned, more than 600,000 DREAMers have received DACA—this Executive order by President Obama which allows them to stay as long as they are registered, pay their fee, and not be deported.

What has happened to these young people now that they have their chance, they have gone to school? I met 10 of them who are now at Loyola's school of medicine. They are extraordinary students. They were the best of the best. They did not have a chance because they did not have that document that gave them an opportunity to enroll. Well, they are going to school now, and they have pledged to continue to serve this country as doctors, given that chance, in some of the poorest communities in my State and our Nation.

In past speeches I have given on this floor—over 50 of them—I have highlighted the contributions that many DACA recipients already make to our country. They are working as engineers, small business owners, and public school teachers. The Center for American Progress and the Partnership for a New American Economy has found that giving legal status to DREAMers will add \$329 billion to our economy and create 1.4 million new jobs by 2030.

How can this be possible that 600,000 have that kind of impact? These are not ordinary young people or ordinary young graduates. These are extraordinary young people who want to be part of this Nation of immigrants.

But the Republicans in the House of Representatives want to end DACA. They want to put an end to this program. They argue it was unconstitutional for the President to say he would suspend deportation for these young people. They want these young people to be deported, removed from this country, sent back to countries where many of them can never recall living, going to countries where they literally cannot speak the language. That is the House Republican position. They feel so strongly about deporting these young people, they are willing to hold the Homeland Security funding bill hostage to force the Democrats to agree.

Well, let me be clear. Democrats will not be swayed by this kind of blackmail. We will insist the Department of Homeland Security be funded and that the President have the authority that every President has had to establish his own immigration policies within the limits of Executive authority.

It is the height of unfairness. First congressional Republicans obstructed immigration reform legislation. Now they want to obstruct the very agency responsible for homeland security.

It was more than a year and a half ago—the date was June 27, 2013—on the floor of this Senate, we passed comprehensive immigration reform with a strong bipartisan vote of 68 to 32. This bill—which I joined seven other colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, working on it—strengthened our border to a level even greater than today, cracked down on illegal immigration, protected American workers in a fair and humane manner, and addressed the challenges facing 11 million undocumented workers currently living in our country.

But for the last year and a half, the House of Representatives, led by Speaker BOEHNER, has refused to allow a vote on the Senate's immigration reform bill. Not once would they allow this bill to come to the floor of the House for a vote. If Speaker BOEHNER had brought the bill to the floor, it would have passed with a strong bipartisan vote. He knew it and he was determined not to ever let that happen. It was only after the Speaker had demonstrated clearly to the President, to the Senate, and to the American people that he would not even participate in the debate on immigration reform that President Obama issued his second order.

I have been involved in a lot of efforts to pass bipartisan immigration reform legislation. It is so frustrating for us to have finally passed a bill in the Senate—Democrats and Repub-

licans; supported by the AFL-CIO, representing organized labor; supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, representing business; supported by virtually every major faith in this country—and then to see it ignored and stopped in the House of Representatives.

So President Obama, after the election, announced that, having given the Republicans in the House a chance to legislate, he would use his powers to try to fix our broken immigration system, to put on temporary hold the deportations of individuals who are the parents of U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents, who have lived in our country for years, and who pose no threat to America's safety.

This is clearly not amnesty, because at the end of the day, what the President has given is only a temporary reprieve to these people to stay and work in America—so long as they register and pay their fee, so long as they submit themselves regularly to criminal background checks, and so long as they pay their fair share of taxes. This deferred action status does not give them permanent status or citizenship. It is not amnesty by any definition.

The President's Executive action will make America safer, bringing millions of immigrants out of the shadows to register with the government and to go through background checks. It will also help our economy and American workers. You see, these undocumented workers, working off the books, are many times paid much less than minimum wage, if they are paid at all, and they are competing with American workers. Once they are brought out of the shadows under the President's recent Executive order, they will need to be paid the ongoing wages, the minimum wage of America. By bringing these workers into the legal workforce, it will eliminate the unfair competition of the underground economy. And all of these workers will be paying their taxes, which will increase tax revenues by billions of dollars each year.

The President's Executive action is also smart and realistic when it comes to enforcing our immigration laws. It is not humanly possible to deport all of the undocumented immigrants in this country. So every administration has had to set priorities on those who will be deported and those who will not. The government should not waste its limited resources to deport immigrants who have lived and worked here for years, who have children who are citizens or lawful permanent residents, and who do not pose any threat to America's future. Instead, the administration has made it a top priority to deport those who have committed serious crimes or are a threat to safety.

Now, Executive action on deportation is clearly lawful. Every single President—Democrat and Republican—

every one of them since President Dwight David Eisenhower has used his Executive authority to improve our immigration system. This argument that it is somehow unconstitutional just does not bear basic scrutiny. The Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed that the Federal Government has broad authority to decide whom to deport. President Obama is acting well within his legal authority when he establishes policies about whom will be deported by this administration.

The American people have elected us to solve problems. Because the House Republican leadership has failed to reform our immigration system, the President had no choice but to use his authority under the law to improve our economy and security and keep families together and at least do a small part toward solving America's broken immigration system problems.

However you feel about the President's immigration policies, it is hypocritical and counterproductive—it is just wrong—to take out your frustration by putting at risk critical homeland security funding.

I hope the House Republicans will somehow or another overcome this fit of pique that has led us to this moment and realize their first obligation is to this great Nation.

CONGRATULATING GOVERNOR BRUCE RAUNER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was unable to attend the inauguration of the new Governor of Illinois today. Bruce Rauner was elected November 4 to serve as the 42nd Governor of the State of Illinois. His wife Diana was by his side when he took the oath of office.

I had a chance to attend some of the receptions last night and called him over the weekend and said my duties in the Senate made it impossible to accept his invitation to say a few words at his inaugural. But despite the fact that we come from different political parties and despite the fact that we have many differences when it comes to issues before us, I certainly wish our new Governor, Bruce Rauner, the very best in his efforts to lead the Land of Lincoln, the great State of Illinois. He faces an extraordinary number of challenges—broken public pension systems, struggles in coming up with the revenue we need to keep our schools moving forward, and the safety net to protect the most vulnerable people living in our State.

I have given him my personal pledge, and I will renew it on the floor of the Senate today, to stand by him and his administration to solve these problems and to lead Illinois forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I further request that the time not be charged to either side on the debate on the Keystone pipeline, if that is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—I am sorry, I was discussing with the staff. If the Senator will please repeat her request.

Ms. COLLINS. I asked unanimous consent to proceed for up to 15 minutes as in morning business, and since my remarks do not pertain to the debate for the Keystone Pipeline, that the time not be charged to either side in that debate.

Mr. DURBIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIORITIES OF SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve on the Senate Special Committee on Aging since my very first days in the Senate, and I am honored to have been elected to chair this committee for the 114th Congress. I wish to welcome the Presiding Officer, Senator COTTON of Arkansas, to the committee. He will be a new member on our committee, and I believe he will enjoy his service as much as I have.

My service on the aging committee is particularly appropriate since Maine is the oldest State in the Nation by median age. Many people would guess that Florida would have that distinction, but, in fact, it is the great State of Maine.

Throughout its history, the aging committee has spurred Congress to action on issues that are important to older Americans through its hearings,

its investigations, and its reports. This is the first time a Maine Senator has chaired the committee since the 1990s, when my predecessor, mentor, and friend, Senator Bill Cohen, served as chairman.

I wish to share with my colleagues today my priorities for the committee as we begin this new Congress. I have three major priorities for the committee's work: first, retirement security; second, investments in biomedical research targeting diseases that disproportionately affect older Americans, such as Alzheimer's and diabetes; and, third, protecting seniors against financial exploitation and scams.

I am increasingly concerned that our seniors will not have adequate savings and other financial resources during their retirement years. The committee will, therefore, focus on retirement security and, in particular, on the need to encourage more savings and better financial planning. According to the nonpartisan Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, there currently is an estimated \$6.6 trillion gap between the savings Americans have today and what they should have in order to maintain their standard of living during retirement.

Nationally, one in four Americans has no source of income beyond Social Security. In the State of Maine, the number is one in three. Social Security provides an absolutely vital safety net. However, with an average benefit of just \$16,000 a year, it certainly is not enough to finance a comfortable retirement for many Americans.

According to a Gallup survey published in 2012, more than half of all Americans are worried they will not be able to maintain their standard of living in retirement. That is up sharply from 34 percent two decades ago, and the Boston College analysis demonstrates that their concern is warranted.

There are many reasons for the decline in retirement security facing American seniors, including the demise of many defined benefit pension plans in the private sector; the severity of the recent financial crisis, which wiped out much of the net worth of many seniors, at least temporarily; rising health care costs; the need for long-term care; and, most of all, the simple fact that Americans are living far longer than we used to. Many Americans reaching retirement age also have more debt than retirees of previous generations.

I remember when my parents paid off the mortgage on their home and had a mortgage-burning party. Well, today, people who are the age my parents were when they paid off their house are taking on new debt and new mortgages. We found in the aging committee that there are seniors who are still paying off their student loans or the student loans of their children. These are all

issues I look forward to the committee exploring in depth in this new Congress.

Another priority will be highlighting the importance of biomedical research on diseases such as Alzheimer's and diabetes, which take such a devastating toll on older Americans and their families. Investments in biomedical research not only improve the health and longevity of Americans but also provide benefits to our economy and to the Federal budget.

For example, nearly one out of three Medicare dollars is spent treating people living with diabetes. According to multiple economic analyses, there is roughly a 2-to-1 return on investment in Federal support for biomedical research. This investment at the National Institutes of Health and at research centers across the country spur job creation and are critical to America's competitiveness in the global research environment.

As the Senate cochair of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I am particularly committed to helping to spur breakthroughs in Alzheimer's disease, which has had such a devastating impact on 5.2 million Americans and their families. In addition to the suffering it causes, Alzheimer's costs the United States an astonishing \$214 billion a year. That includes \$150 billion in costs to the Medicare and Medicaid programs. These costs will only skyrocket as the baby boom generation ages.

Fortunately, there is promising research that holds hope for Alzheimer's patients and their families. The research community is poised to make important advances through clinical trials and investigating new therapeutic targets. But adequate funding is critical to advance this research and to achieve these breakthroughs.

At a time when the United States is spending more than \$200 billion a year for Alzheimer's patients, we are spending less than three-tenths of 1 percent of that amount—about \$600 million a year—on research. Surely, we can do more for Alzheimer's, given its tremendous human and economic price.

The National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease has as its primary goal the prevention and effective treatment of Alzheimer's by the year 2025. To meet that goal, the chairman of the Federal Alzheimer's Advisory Council says that we need to devote \$2 billion a year to Alzheimer's research. Well, think about that. That is only 1 percent—in fact, it is less than 1 percent—of what we as a society are spending to care for people with Alzheimer's. That investment will lead to better treatments and ultimately to a means of prevention or even a cure for this awful and expensive disease.

The aging committee will also continue its focus on scams that target our seniors, such as the Jamaican lot-

tery phone scam we exposed in the last Congress. This nefarious scheme, which is estimated to have cost Americans as much as \$300 million a year, particularly targeted seniors in the Northeast. Some seniors in my State lost tens of thousands of dollars to the scam which involved a con artist calling a victim to tell him or her that they had won the Jamaican lottery but needed to pay fees to process the winnings. I don't need to tell my colleagues that these seniors had won nothing of the sort. But this was a very sophisticated scheme.

In addition to educating seniors to help them avoid becoming victims of such scams, the hearing resulted in the Jamaican Government passing new laws targeting the scammers and prompted Federal law enforcement to make several arrests. The aging committee will also continue its fraud hotline to help protect seniors from these kinds of scams and financial exploitation, and the phone number for that fraud hotline, which is toll-free, is 1-855-303-9470.

In addition to these three major priorities, it is my hope our committee in the second year will also take a close look—really scrutinize—Federal programs designed to help our seniors, such as those authorized by the Older Americans Act. We want to make sure these programs are as effective and efficient as possible and that their benefits reach those seniors as intended. So we will be performing that oversight function and sharing our findings with the committee of jurisdiction—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—on which I am also privileged to serve.

The Senate Special Committee on Aging has a long history and tradition of bipartisanship, and my work on this committee during the past Congress was particularly rewarding because of the strong partnership I forged with the committee chairman, the senior Senator from Florida, BILL NELSON. I look forward to continuing that bipartisan tradition with my good friend and close colleague, Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri, who will be serving as the committee's ranking member in the 114th Congress.

Finally, I encourage the Presiding Officer and all of the other members of the committee not only to be active participants in the committee but also to share with us their thoughts on issues that we should pursue.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor, and seeing no one seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to S. 1, which will circumvent the administration's official review process for projects crossing international borders and approve construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, a pipeline dedicated to increasing production of some of the dirtiest, most polluting, and most dangerous crude oil in the world.

Supporters of this pipeline in Congress have been relentless. Over the last 2 Congresses they have held 44 votes in the House and Senate intended to approve Keystone. On Tuesday, the very first bill the new Republican majority introduced, traditionally reserved for a party's highest legislative priority, was Keystone. Think about this. Here we stand in what people still call the world's greatest deliberative body, and the first bill we are taking up is not infrastructure generally, not national energy policy, not even national laws as they relate to our pipeline infrastructure. No, we are legislating about a specific pipeline which will move oil from Canada through the United States to be primarily exported from our southern border.

I understand there are people of good will and good faith, including the Presiding Officer, who are on both sides of this issue. But it is hard to imagine why this should be the first piece of legislation we take up in this Congress. We have yet to seriously consider or to clarify our policy with respect to the Islamic State. Income inequality is gutting the middle class. Our national infrastructure needs a jolt of investment. Our immigration policy is a failure and a mess. I do not understand why this would be S. 1.

Supporters of this bill have stood up three main arguments in favor of Keystone and expanding drilling of tar sands oil reserves in Canada. One, they say it will increase energy security; two, they think it will lower oil and gas prices; third, they say it is a jobs bill.

Let's examine these claims, because however tenuous they were, they have been undermined further by facts over the last couple of years.

First, the United States has never during the modern age of global energy trade been more energy secure. We import far less oil from unstable regimes and unfriendly countries than we have in decades. We are continuing to build massive amounts of ever cheaper homegrown clean energy such as wind and solar, even as we use our energy more efficiently.

The United States will add nearly 10 gigawatts of wind and solar capacity in the next year. Not including hydro, the United States has over 85,000 megawatts of renewable energy capacity and continues to build on that

number year over year. The prices for solar have dropped 80 percent since 2008 and prices for wind power, which are already competitive with fossil fuels, have dropped 30 percent since 2008.

These trends are creating jobs right here at home. For example, the wind industry has over 500 manufacturing facilities across 44 States that are responsible for making wind turbines with over 66 percent domestic content.

Second, the recent collapse of crude oil and gasoline prices demonstrates two things. In my home State of Hawaii, energy prices remain far too high. But on the mainland, oil and gas prices are currently very low. The idea that Keystone would make a significant difference was never based in reality, but now it is just obvious. We have low prices and the project has not even started.

Gasoline is now \$2.21 a gallon. Crude oil prices have slipped below \$50 a barrel. The last time gasoline prices were this low was in the aftermath of the financial crisis. As a practical matter, it is not clear to me, and it is certainly not clear to most energy experts, how moving oil from Canada through the United States and exporting refined crude from the Gulf of Mexico would significantly reduce energy prices for us in the United States.

Finally, this is called a jobs bill by some. This is many things. It is anti-clean air; it is anti-clean water; it is anti-public health. It is a regulatory earmark. But it is not a jobs bill. It is not deserving of being the No. 1 priority of the 114th Congress.

We have heard estimates ranging as high as 42,000 indirect or induced jobs during the construction phase. We know, and everyone seems to agree, that Keystone will employ approximately 35 full-time employees when construction is finished. That is not 3,500 employees. That is not 35,000 employees. That is the 35 full-time employees when construction is completed.

If we want to do a real jobs bill worthy of the Senate, we should do a real jobs bill. An infrastructure bank, a highway bill, Shaheen-Portman—all would create orders of magnitude more jobs than this.

The American economy added 353,000 jobs in November alone, which made 2014 the strongest year for job growth since 1999. If we pass a highway bill, we get millions of jobs. If we pass an infrastructure bank, we will get hundreds of thousands of jobs. If we pass the bipartisan Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, we will also get hundreds of thousands of jobs. Look, even one new job is a good thing. But if we want to do a jobs bill, let's do a jobs bill.

There is plenty of room for us to work together on infrastructure, on energy efficiency, and create hundreds of thousands and even millions of jobs. But this is an energy bill. It moves us

in the wrong direction. There are colleagues, with whom I agree, who are arguing against this legislation primarily saying they want to allow the administration's process to play out and that we should not supersede the State Department review. I agree.

It is fair to say this is unprecedented, even a little strange, for the Congress to legislate the specifics of a particular infrastructure project. But I want to be clear. This is not a process argument for me. I oppose Keystone because it is a bad idea. Whether it is done through the regular order or in an expedited fashion, whether it is done through the administrative process or the legislative process, I oppose any action, whether through legislation, litigation, or administrative action, that will enable the extraction of Canadian tar sands oil.

My reasons are very simple—climate change and math. Climate change, because it is the greatest and most urgent challenge to the health of our families, to the economy, and to our way of life. I want to preserve the American way of life, not endanger it. Math, because we have crunched the numbers and we know we simply cannot afford to burn the oil from tar sands and put its pollution into the air.

It is simple. We have a budget. Just as every family in this country must stick to its budget and live within its means, we have to do the same as a planet when it comes to carbon pollution. A new study published last week in the scientific journal *Nature* makes this clear. The authors asked the question: If we want to stay within our carbon budget and limit warming to 2 degrees Celsius, which is the limit 167 countries agree we must meet to avoid catastrophic effects of climate change, how much more coal, gas, and oil can we burn?

The study finds that in order to meet this goal, the majority of the world's known reserves of fossil fuel must stay in the ground between now and 2050. This includes one-third of the world's current oil reserves and 80 percent of current coal reserves. It also finds, and this is critical, that:

Any increase in unconventional oil production—

Which includes Canadian tar sands.—is incommensurate with efforts to limit average global warming to 2 degrees Celsius.

As we learn more about climate change amidst a clean energy revolution, we find that moving toward clean energy, taking control of our future, is good for business. Our economy will do better. It will grow faster and it will be more resilient if we embrace the technologies and solutions at our fingertips and end our reliance on fossil fuel. We have a chance to embrace the future here. Our future is not tar sands oil. Our future is wind and solar and geothermal and energy efficiency. Our future is not in adding carbon pollution.

Our future is in innovating our way out of this problem. Throughout our history, America always leads when we are needed the most. That is what we have to do, not in the direction of more carbon pollution but toward a clean energy economy.

A report by New Climate Economy, a group chaired by former Mexican President Felipe Calderon, and including Bank of America chairman Chad Holliday, among others, marshals quantitative evidence to show that action on climate change is a requirement for future global economic growth. In other words, those who warn about the EPA regulation or prices on carbon killing jobs have it exactly backward. The truth is that in order to avoid major disruptions to our economy, we have to reduce carbon pollution and work with other countries such as Canada to ensure that they do the same.

I am looking forward to the open amendment process on this bill that the majority leader has promised. It will be an opportunity for the American public to see where Members of the Senate stand on the facts of climate change. Anyone who looks at the facts and does the math ought to oppose this bill and oppose construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. For me and for many Americans, a vote against this bill is a vote to preserve and protect the air we breathe and the water we drink. It is a vote to ensure that we continue to reduce carbon pollution and fight climate change. It is a vote to leave our children a healthy world.

I urge my colleagues to oppose closure on the motion to proceed.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENTRY-EXIT VISA SYSTEM

MR. SESSIONS. Madam President, the attacks on the people of France demonstrate in the most chilling terms the threats posed to Western nations by those who are imbued with Islamic terrorism. While there are many factors that play into the spread of this jihadist ideology in the West, it is time for an honest and plain admission that our open immigration policies are ineffective and have failed to meet the minimum standards that are set by existing law in the United States.

This is something I have been dealing with for quite a number of years—a decade really. We have laws that would improve dramatically our ability to identify and block terrorists from entering and staying in the country, but

they are not funded and they are not carried out and it is unacceptable, as I will point out.

Dozens of terrorists and terror plotters have been admitted to the United States on visas or are relying on broader networks to simply enter into our country, taking advantage of lax immigration policies. For instance, the 9/11 attackers all came here on visas. A visa is a document that allows an individual to come for a limited period of time and then return to their home country. This visa system is essential in a modern world, but it needs to be managed and carried out in an effective way.

The Boston bombers came as asylees, people seeking asylum, while their mosque was linked to foreign nationals tied to ISIS and foreign terrorists.

The individual behind the attempted Christmas bombing in Oregon was a refugee. We have a class of individuals we accept each year who claim to be refugees from foreign countries. This one was from Somalia.

The recently foiled plot to bomb a courthouse and school in Connecticut was attempted by a Moroccan national who had a revoked student visa. Many individuals have visas to be students in the United States. We are not managing that well at all. This one had a revoked student visa. It was revoked because of information that came to the attention of officials, but no one made an effort or successfully attempted in any real way to find the individual so he might be deported.

Al Qaeda operatives who were apprehended in Kentucky were on visas from Iraq.

These are only some of the examples that are out there. These individuals use lax visa policies, flawed asylum policies, flawed refugee policies, and flawed border protection policies. In addition, we are not organized in a way that works effectively. In addition to that, the President of the United States has directed his ICE officers, his Citizenship and Immigration Services officers, and his Border Patrol officers, who are the key individuals in this system, to conduct their business in a way that guarantees failure. That is just the fact.

The 9/11 Commission—we all remember that great Commission after the terrible attack on 9/11—zeroed in on our lax immigration policies. Among other things, the Commission demanded implementation of a biometric entry-exit visa system. What does that mean? That means a biometric system where people are identified effectively through fingerprints or some other identifier.

I have been through this for years. Back when President Bush was President and we worked with Homeland Security, Governor Ridge was the Secretary of Homeland Security. I think at the end he was finally convinced,

and I worked on him very hard. But he volunteered, the last day in office, to use a fingerprint biometric system. It should have already been done by the time President Bush left office, but it wasn't, and it hasn't been done yet. We need a system that works.

By the way, police officers have in their cars all over America computer-type screens where they can stop someone on the road, they can ask them to put their hand on the screen, and it reads their fingerprints. It checks the National Crime Information Center to find out whether the person is wanted for murder in New York. He might have caught him in Texas. It lets the officer know whether there are warrants out for these individuals. This is the way the system works in our country, and we need to use it with regard to people who come here on visas.

It is an outrage that this hasn't been done, completed fully, and made operational years ago. It is an outrage. It is in the law of the United States. Congress has funded money for this project and it has not yet been done. It will cost us in the future, as the 9/11 Commission has so warned. The 9/11 Commission demanded this system, and it is designed to track those entering and departing the United States on visas.

By the way, almost half of the people, at least 40-plus percent now of individuals unlawfully in America entered on a visa. In other words, they didn't come across the border unlawfully. They came lawfully—perhaps using false documents, but they got a visa. They came to the United States maybe lawfully, but they just did not return to their home country when the visa expired.

My colleagues have to know no one is checking. We have no idea whether they left the country or stayed in the country. We do not have an operable exit visa system. This is so bizarre because it is not expensive. It can be implemented rapidly. It will work and give us valuable information that we must have if we are serious about this process, and we must be serious about the process.

The individuals in France—I mentioned the ones in the United States—left the country, went through Yemen, apparently, were trained in some sort of terrorist camp, and came back and executed their violent acts in France. So we have to do a better job of this, and we can do it.

President Obama's administration has refused to implement the entry-exit system as required by law. We have talked about this publicly and debated it for years. Just last year the co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission, in an evaluation of how well the recommendations they made back after 9/11 have been carried out—a 10-year review of how their report had been received and how much of it had been accomplished—issued this written statement.

Without exit-tracking, our government does not know when a foreign visitor admitted to the United States on a temporary basis has overstayed his or her admission.

Here is the language. We put it on a chart because it is important that we understand this.

Without exit-tracking, our government does not know when a foreign visitor admitted to the United States on a temporary basis has overstayed his or her admission. Had this system been in place before 9/11, we would have had a better chance of detecting the plotters before they struck. . . . There is no excuse for the fact that 13 years after 9/11 we do not have this much capability in place.

Amen. That is exactly correct. That is from "Reflections on the Tenth Anniversary of the 9/11 Commission Report," Thomas H. Kean and Lee H. Hamilton, in 2014.

In fact, the original report said this:

The Department of Homeland Security, properly supported by the Congress, should complete, as quickly as possible, a biometric entry-exit screening system.

That was the report from 2004. It is a very important report. They went to great length to help this Nation figure out what is the responsible thing to do to protect ourselves better from those attackers on 9/11, many of whom were visa overstayers. They didn't come across the border unlawfully; they came across on a lawful visa. Some of them I think had false documentation to get that visa, but they came on a visa, for the most part lawfully, and did not go home as they were required to go home. They overstayed their visa. Nobody knew they had overstayed. Nobody made an inquiry about it.

The "Tenth Anniversary Report Card: The Status of the 9/11 Commission Recommendations," by Thomas H. Kean and Lee H. Hamilton, 2011, said this:

Full deployment of the biometric exit component of US-VISIT should be a high priority. Such a capability would have assisted law enforcement and intelligence officials in August and September 2001 in conducting a search for two of the 9/11 hijackers that were in the U.S. on expired visas.

This would have helped. Indeed, of course, those of us who have some experience in law enforcement know that when you get to one or two of the guys, the whole scheme may get disrupted, and we can penetrate the organization and break it up and stop crime from occurring. To me, it is mind boggling, as the commission leaders have told us, that we haven't completed this.

I am told there are forces that don't like the exit visa system. They think it might slow things down a little bit. First, this is not correct. When you come into the country, you are clocked in and you are biometrically fingerprinted. What would you have to do when you leave? Go to the airport, go in a certain line, go through, show your ticket, show your passport, put your hand on a biometric screener, you

are read, and you are approved to leave. It is not going to take any massive amounts of time. One excuse after the other has slowed this down, and it is not acceptable. We have to do better.

In fact, the administration has suspended enforcement of the visa system almost entirely. We have to understand, colleagues: If we don't have even an exit visa system where we know who left the country, how do we know who overstayed and who stayed in the country? Unless somebody overstays their visa and they are caught for speeding and the police officer identified that, I will ask colleagues, what happens? Under the policy of this President of the United States, directed to the lowest officers in America, nothing happens. If the individual does not commit a serious felony, they will not be processed for deportation, even though they have come to the country on a promise to leave on a certain date and flatly refused to do so.

This is not acceptable. If we don't have a system that has integrity, then everybody gets the message pretty soon: Just get a visa, come to America, you never have to leave. If you don't get a felony charge against you, you are never going to be deported.

This is the policy of this government at this very moment. It is hard for anybody to believe, but that is the truth. We have approximately 5 million visa overstays in the United States. But as the National ICE—Immigration Customs Enforcement—officers Council president Chris Crane has explained:

ICE agents are now prohibited from arresting illegal aliens solely on charges of illegal entry or visa overstay.

What a dramatic statement that is. And not only visa overstays, they are prohibited from arresting and removing people who came across the border illegally. That is what he means by illegal entry or visa overstays.

This of course removes a cornerstone of integrity in any law system. If we can't look people in the eye and say: We give you a visa, you have a 6-month visa, but at 6 months you have to return to your home country, and mean it, and say: Eventually you will be apprehended and deported if you don't—then the system has no integrity. That is where we are today.

Unsurprisingly, ABC News reported that the Obama administration had lost track of 6,000 foreign students who had overstayed their visas and were of "heightened concern."

In other words, these 6,000 had some special concern in their background that made us worry about them, whether it was drugs or terrorism or whatever. Of course they have lost sight of them. They are not attempting to find them.

So the head of the union representing U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services officers, one of the three major components of the Department of

Homeland Security dealing with immigration, Mr. Ken Palinkas, was explicit in his warning to us. It is remarkable what Mr. Crane has said and now what Mr. Palinkas has said:

There is no doubt that there are already many individuals in the United States, on visas—expired or active—who are being targeted for radicalization or who already subscribe to radicalized views. Many millions come legally to the U.S. through our wide open immigration policy every year—whether as temporary visitors, lifetime immigrants, refugees, asylum-seekers, foreign students, or recipients of our "visa waiver program" which allows people to come and go freely. Yet our government cannot effectively track these foreign visitors and immigrants.

This is the man whose officers do this job. They are the ones who approve the visas and manage this system.

He went on to warn that the President's so-called Executive amnesty would make the situation radically worse, saying:

I write today to warn the general public that this situation is about to get exponentially worse—and more dangerous. . . . Express your concern to your Senators and Congressmen before it is too late.

It is a national security imperative to stop this Executive amnesty. It sends exactly the wrong message. What it says is that if you can get into America—through the border, by boat, by plane, on a visa—any way you get into this country and pass the border, you are not going to be asked to leave unless you commit some felony—some serious felony, for that matter. Many felonies don't qualify. And we have over 100,000 people who have committed serious felonies who have been released into America. We don't know where they are, and they are not going to be deported.

We have to restore immigration enforcement, establish better controls and screening on immigration from high-risk regions of the world. We really should give more attention to that. It is perfectly legitimate.

The visa system, the immigration system of the United States, should serve who? It should serve the interests of the American people. Somebody doesn't have a constitutional right to come to America. The decision is whether America feels like it is in its interests. We have always accepted a large number of people. In fact, we have the largest immigration numbers of any nation in the world. We admit 1 million a year lawfully. When they come from high-risk areas of the world, terrorist states, we should indeed give more scrutiny to those applicants.

Census data shows that legal immigration to the United States from the Middle East is one of the largest and fastest growing categories of new admittances. For the national security of the United States, it is imperative that Congress block Executive amnesty and restore essential enforcement, basic

bread-and-butter law enforcement. Anyone who claims to be concerned about our national security should be resolutely focused on this task. There is so much that can be done with relatively little difficulty if we have the leadership and will to get it done.

It would be unthinkable for the President to veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill in order to continue this illegal and dangerous amnesty scheme during a time of growing threats abroad.

Again, let me say that this: the entry-exit visa system is an unappreciated, important part of American immigration law. It is critical to the national security of the United States, as the 9/11 Commission has so stated on more than one occasion. We can do this. Why is it not being done? What forces, what special interests, are interceding between the people of the United States, the national interests, and their special interests that block this kind of system?

We can make it work. It is not that hard. We need a biometric system, and that system should be founded on the fingerprint. It took us a number of years, but I think the government has finally concluded it must be the fingerprint for a lot of reasons, one of which is if somebody got a visa to the United States and they committed a murder, an armed robbery, a terrorist act, a major fraud, and a warrant was issued for their arrest—if you don't clock it in at the airport, who knows when they are leaving? So this would pick it up and would pick up any warrants that might be outstanding for those individuals anywhere in the United States that are put in the NCIC, National Crime Information Center.

That is the way the system should work. It is long overdue. In the course of the discussions we will have in the weeks and months to come about the necessity of fixing a broken immigration system, the entry-exit visa system has to be implemented. It is long overdue. We can make it happen. It is not that expensive. It is relatively inexpensive, actually, and it will make us much safer in the process.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to each side and utilized be counted against both sides equally during quorum calls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, here we are at the beginning of a new year and a new Congress, and I think we all feel a responsibility to do what the American people voted for in the November 2014 election, which is to come together in this body and in this Congress and work together to find sensible solutions to the very real problems facing Americans.

It is no secret that the last 6 years have been pretty tough for a lot of people who are out of work or doing part-time work; kids graduating from high school, graduating from college, graduating from community schools, 2-year schools; going back and getting new training and still unable to find meaningful jobs; finding jobs that are part time, two or three of those together; parents trying to save money, pay the mortgage, save money to send the kids to postgraduate school. It has not been easy. So we have come to a point where we have legislation in a new session of Congress, with commitments on a bipartisan basis to stand together, to work together, to try to find solutions, to get people back to work and get our economy moving again. Now we come to the very first issue up for discussion and debate and hopefully passage in this new Congress—the Keystone Pipeline.

This is an issue that has been going on for 6 years. The President has been obstinate in his obstruction in letting this go forward, in making a decision. Yet here we are, finally, with an opportunity to not only pass legislation which has passed the House of Representatives, again, just last week with very significant bipartisan support—but now in the Senate to take up this legislation and to move it forward tonight with this vote, to start the process to allow amendments, to allow debate, and to move forward and hopefully enjoy bipartisan support with over 60 votes and then move it to final passage and then send it to the President for, hopefully, signing.

This project is the largest, ready-to-build infrastructure project in the United States. It supports tens of thousands of jobs. The estimate has been well over 42,000. It invests billions of dollars in the American economy. It increases revenue to States and local governments, all without spending one dime of taxpayer money. This is a private sector initiative that can be of great benefit to our country. It can provide meaningful jobs and has many benefits for us in the future.

It is supported by Democrats, by Republicans, and by a number of labor

unions. For instance, the Indiana State Building and Construction Trade Council, which represents 75,000 working Hoosiers in my State, reached out to me recently and asked me to support construction of the Keystone Pipeline, calling it “an important job creation and energy security issue.” They are right on the mark. They know I have been a longtime supporter of this effort, but they wanted to put it in writing. I am not sure it was necessary, and they weren’t weighing this on the basis of Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative; they were saying that this is good for us and we hope all of our Senators can support it. We hope it passes. This is an initiative that puts our people to work. Other labor unions, including the North America’s Building Trade Unions and the Laborers’ International Union of North America support this project.

I mentioned the President, for 6 years, has come up with more feeble excuses in terms of why he believes this should not go forward. The last excuse was: We are in a process here and the process has to go forward. That process was waiting, apparently, on the Nebraska Supreme Court approval of the pipeline route through Nebraska, and that was his excuse for why he would have to veto it. I am sure my colleagues now have the word that the Nebraska Supreme Court has upheld State approval of the Keystone Pipeline. In fact, the President’s own State Department, in response to numerous calls for environmental studies—all of which were used as an excuse for not going forward—the President’s own State Department has repeatedly approved this, saying it will not have a negative environmental imprint.

So what could possibly be the reason the President remains intransigent on this particular issue, because every other box has been checked? We have to come down to the inevitable conclusion that it is all political, that an extreme environmental wing of the President’s own party is simply putting untold pressure on him to not go forward with anything having to do with fossil fuels or providing energy security for America from our own resources. After all, a significant portion comes from Montana and North Dakota—and the last time I checked they are in the United States—and from our friendly neighbor to the north, Canada. If this doesn’t go through, we will keep importing large quantities of oil from the Middle East. We know what complications there are in terms of securing that oil and how much volatility occurs there based on what is happening today in the Middle East.

So getting this product from our Northern States of North Dakota and Montana and getting this product from our friend to the north, Canada, simply makes a great deal of sense in terms of our energy security, our energy sup-

plies, and lessening our reliance on the volatility that comes from getting oil from other sources.

To conclude, let me just make it clear what it is we are trying to do. This will help the United States diversify its energy supply. It will offset our dependence on Middle East oil. It will support tens of thousands of American jobs in construction. It will invest billions of dollars in the American economy. It will increase revenue to State and local governments. It will not harm our environment, as numerous studies have indicated—all these benefits without spending a dime of taxpayer money.

So after 6 years of delay, procrastination, and evermore feeble excuses, it is time for the President to make a decision. Soon he will have an opportunity to use that pen he so famously talked about not to sign a veto or to declare a veto but to sign a bill approving the Keystone Pipeline into law.

I strongly support construction of this pipeline and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. COATS. I certainly will. I didn’t see my colleague. I am happy to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I am happy I was here for the comments of my colleague from Indiana on the Keystone Pipeline and, similar to the Senator from Indiana, I am also happy to finally have this debate. The comments he made are very sincere and passionately believed. I accept that. I only challenge one aspect of the comments, which is the suggestion that opposition of Keystone is feeble or only for political reasons.

I am a pro-energy Senator. The first bill I introduced in the 114th Congress was a bill I am cosponsoring with Senator BARRASSO of Wyoming to expedite American exports of liquid natural gas, but I am an opponent of Keystone on environmental and economic grounds, and I wish to spend a few minutes describing why.

To begin with, it can probably be summed up in a question: Why embrace dirty energy when America is in the midst of a clean energy revolution? That is a primary reason I oppose Keystone. The United States, thank goodness, is on a clean energy roll. Not only are we on a clean energy roll, we are on an energy production roll that is helping our economy, helping our trade deficit, and hurting some of our most significant global adversaries, notably Russia and Iran.

We have embraced over the last few years a set of conservation and efficiency investments, probably most notably the increased CAFE standards

that have saved energy use in the vehicle sector as well as helped the American auto industry significantly rebound. Our natural gas revolution, of which I am a strong supporter, has enabled American industry and consumers to get lower priced energy, and it has enabled us to lessen our dependence on dirtier fuels in the production of electric power and other aspects of our power usage. Wind and solar and other noncarbon energy developments have rocketed ahead. Nearly one-third of the energy that has been added to the American electricity grid since 2005 has been in the wind and solar area. We are one of the few nations in the world that in the period from 2005 to 2012 actually saw a reduction in our carbon emissions.

We are on a clean energy roll. We are innovating for the world and we are selling technologies to the rest of the world and that is good for our economy as well as good for the environment.

We are also asserting American energy leadership not just in the advances in clean energy but also in the significant advances in American energy production. I think we should feel good about the fact that we are a country that has gone from being one of the greatest net importers of energy in the world to now a country that is going to be one of the greatest energy producers in the world, and in many energy areas we are now a net exporter. So emissions are going down. Production and exports are going up.

The other thing that is great for Americans is that prices are going down. A barrel of oil right now is in the \$50-a-barrel range, which is putting about \$1,000 a year back into the pockets of an American family. It is helping American businesses, and it is imposing, as I mentioned earlier, some significant harm upon two of our most persistent global adversaries—Iran and Russia—that rely on energy exports to drive their economy.

This energy revolution—higher production, greater economic efficiency, greater cleanliness—has all been happening without the Keystone Pipeline. It has all been happening without the United States embracing tar sands oil. We are going in the right direction now. I oppose the Keystone Pipeline because accelerating the use of tar sands oil turns us around. Instead of going in the right direction to more production, more national security and greater emissions control, the Keystone Pipeline accelerates tar sands oil and takes us in the wrong direction. Simply put, tar sands oil and the exploitation of that resource is a bad bet for the environment and, I believe, a bad bet for the economy.

Last month, December 2014, a magazine I really like that normally has a lot of articles about the outdoors, *Outside* magazine, ran a lengthy article on the area of Canada in Alberta where

tar sands are mined. The article is called “The High Cost of Oil.”

To anyone who is interested in this debate—pro, con or undecided—go online to *Outside* magazine, December 2014, “The High Cost of Oil,” and read what the mining of tar sands oil does to this part of Canada and to this planet.

Tar sands oil is not like conventional gas or petroleum. Tar sands oil, the mining and refining and production of it, produces about 15 to 20 percent more greenhouse gas emissions per unit of energy than conventional petroleum. Natural gas produces dramatically less CO₂ than conventional petroleum, but tar sands oil produces dramatically more. If you care about the emissions of CO₂—and I think we should all care about the emissions of CO₂ because I accept the science that says CO₂ emissions cause significant climate effects—if you care about CO₂ emissions, then tar sands oil is absolutely the worst thing that can be done.

Over the 2 years now that I have been in the Senate, I have had a lot of folks come to me and talk to me about Keystone. They never say a word about greenhouse gas or CO₂ emissions—not a word. Senator COATS didn't say a word in his comments about CO₂ or greenhouse gas emissions. I ask individuals, when they come and talk to me about Keystone: What do you think about CO₂ emissions? What do you think about the fact that tar sands oil is significantly more carbon dense than normal petroleum? The response I find myself getting is: I don't know; I am not a scientist. In fact, I heard that from an energy CEO who employs tons of scientists in his organizations: I don't know; I am not a scientist.

The scientific consensus I believe is very clear. We have to do what we can—not drastically and dramatically but in an incremental way—every day to bring down our CO₂ emissions. I believe we need to do that in smart ways. Yet, from an emissions standpoint, tar sands oil goes exactly in the wrong direction. It is not just CO₂ emissions. Tar sands oil also involves the mining of it. I would encourage you to read this article. It involves scraping up vast acreages of an arboreal forest in Alberta to get to the tar sands underneath. So far, an area about the size of the State of Rhode Island has been completely despoiled to look like a moonscape to get to tar sands, and this will significantly accelerate the more tar sands are built.

In the area of Alberta where the mining and refining is taking place, there has been a dramatic increase in respiratory illness and other illnesses associated either with airborne emissions or with the contamination of the area's water supply.

Probably one of the most powerful things about the article is not the lengthy analysis, not the words, it is

the pictures. The pictures in that article are staggering. When you see what has to be done to these arboreal forests to mine tar sands oil, you come back to this question: Why would we embrace a dirtier technology when America is on a clean-energy revolution that is driving down prices, driving up production, and also driving down emissions.

Tar sands oil takes us in the wrong direction. It is not so much about the pipeline. We rely on pipelines in this country, but it is about the acceleration of the development of a resource that, frankly, just doesn't need to be developed.

I will conclude and say this. Some say—and I made this argument—well, look, it is going to be mined anyway and refined anyway. If the pipeline doesn't go through the United States, it will go westward or eastward through Canada or another direction. I am not completely sure that is correct. The article in *Outside* discusses the fact that Canadians, who know this better than anybody because they live in the neighborhood, are fighting against pipelines being built in Canada. There is also the matter with oil now at a significantly lower price than it has been. Even the economics of this tar sands oil, which is pretty expensive because of what you have to do to refine it, may not make any sense. But even if we set those arguments aside and somebody says to me, why shouldn't the United States just give the big green light to tar sands oil because somebody is going to get it, the reason I think we shouldn't is the United States is showing the world right now what it means to be an energy leader.

With increased production, lower emissions, lower prices through innovation—through American innovation—we are showing the world what it means to be an energy leader. We are a leader because we have embraced a simple effort.

I am not an engineer, but as I look at what happened in innovation in the last decade, the ethic we have embraced is: Let's do it cleaner tomorrow than today. That is pretty simple. Let's do it cleaner tomorrow than today—not dramatically cleaner. It doesn't have to turn day and night from today to tomorrow. Let's just get a little bit cleaner tomorrow than today.

That is what we have been doing as a Nation. It has been increasing supply. It has been driving down demand. It has been driving down prices. It has been helping us control emissions. That is what we should keep doing. I am a pro-energy Senator, but I am a deep skeptic about the use of tar sands oil. For that reason, I am glad we are going to have the debate. I think we should finally be at it. But I am going to oppose the Keystone Pipeline because tar sands oil is going backwards

and not forwards. We are showing the world what it means to go forward, and that is the direction we should continue to go.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we are going to be voting shortly on the motion to proceed to S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline. I am here to urge my colleagues to vote no on that motion to proceed. We had a couple of chances to come to the Senate floor already today and last week and talk about the important issue of energy development in the United States and how we move our country forward with job creation and energy development. The President—we got to hear his remarks and certainly we respect people's points of view that this issue is an issue we have had a lot of time to discuss.

Mr. President, the issue is whether the American public and people in affected States have had a lot of time to talk about this issue and whether they have had a transparent process to talk about this issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article that was in USA TODAY whose headline is "Permit problems plague Keystone XL pipeline's S.D. leg."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From USA Today, Jan. 7, 2015]

PERMIT PROBLEMS PLAGUE KEYSTONE XL
PIPELINE'S S.D. LEG

(By John Hultjhult)

The South Dakota Public Utilities Commission on Tuesday voted down a move by tribal and environmental groups to force a reboot to the Keystone XL pipeline's state-level permitting process. (<http://www.argusleader.com/story/news/2015/01/06/sd-permit-keystone-xl-still-question/21359367/>)

PUC commissioners said there are clear questions about whether South Dakota's stretch of the massive and controversial project is still due the construction permit it earned in 2010, given a series of changes to its original scope.

The 2014 version of the pipeline would be able to carry crude from North Dakota, for example, along with the anticipated crude extracted from tar sands in Alberta, Canada.

Even so, commissioners ruled that forcing pipeline owner TransCanada to start over without being offered a chance to explain how it could make those changes while meeting its old obligations would be a denial of due process.

"We need to go through the process to find out," Commissioner Chris Nelson said.

TransCanada asked for re-certification of its 2010 construction permit in September. The company had to ask for re-certification

because four years had passed since the permit was granted.

The pipeline stalled as President Obama chose Tuesday to delay the issuance of a federal permit indefinitely, a move that has frustrated supporters, who say the project will add jobs and boost energy security. If completed, the Keystone XL pipeline would release more than 800,000 barrels of oil a day.

The GOP-controlled Senate is expected to take up the issue this week.

In a new application for the 313 miles of pipeline planned for South Dakota, the company notes 30 changes to the original project, including the addition of North Dakota oil, minor route changes, alterations to construction plans and costs.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe filed a motion to dismiss the company's application based on those changes, saying the re-certification process is meant for projects that have been delayed, not those that have altered dramatically in scope.

The permit was issued with a set of 50 conditions, which were based on the project as approved four years ago.

Thomasina Real Bird, a lawyer for the Yankton Sioux Tribe, told commissioners that the changes to the pipeline are simply too significant to allow the company to apply for re-certification.

The company isn't just asking to re-certify a stalled project, she said.

"They're going a step beyond, and that step is not allowed by law," Real Bird said.

Several others spoke in support of the Yankton Sioux Tribe's motion to dismiss, including Kimberly Craven of the Indigenous Environmental Network.

"I would urge the commission to start over," Craven said. "It's a new permit, a new ballgame."

Bill Taylor, a lawyer for TransCanada, told commissioners that re-certification is meant to determine whether delayed projects still fall within the scope of an old permit. Dropping a re-certification request because a project changes renders the re-certification process pointless.

Keystone XL has changed, but Taylor said the company is prepared to prove that it still meets each of the 50 conditions attached to its 2010 approval. The pipeline is still a pipeline, the product is the same, and the end result is more energy security for the U.S., Taylor said.

"The current iteration of the project can and will meeting the conditions upon which the permit is issued," Taylor said.

The PUC voted 3-0 to deny the motions to dismiss the application brought by the Yankton Sioux Tribe and joined by others. The hearing on the merits of the re-certification is planned for May.

Ms. CANTWELL. This is an article that just recently appeared in the paper about how South Dakota is bringing up objections to the pipeline, and they want to do due process with their public utility commission to make sure this project meets the criteria of environmental and safety concerns and security concerns that State wants to see met.

The reason this is still an issue in South Dakota is because part of the pipeline will go through South Dakota. There have been many changes since the original proposal was put forth, and people in South Dakota want to know exactly what these changes are and exactly how they will go through

the process. In fact, one Native American tribe representative who was objecting said:

The company is not just asking to recertify its old project. They are going a step beyond that that is not allowed by law.

So there are people who want them to go through the normal process because siting of a pipeline of this nature is of great concern to local residents, to property owners.

I find it interesting that in the debate on this issue, we on this side of the aisle are the ones who are advocating and standing up for property owners to make sure there is not a taking of their property without a transparent process and input for that process because that is exactly what transpired here when the company, with the help of the State of Nebraska, did not continue to proceed through their public service commission, their public utility commission, and instead tried to pass a law saying that the environmental review and security issues and oversight could be done by the Governor.

Now, my colleagues who are Governors know that when you are Governor, you do not have the most transparent process. It is not as if citizens are going to come to hearings in the Governor's office. It is not as though all of that is there for review. Certainly those citizens do not have the ability to object and make sure they are getting the right compensation for their property and make sure issues of safety and security are addressed.

So that is why some private property owners sued. Because the legislature and the Governor did not have the right to act; the law taking the power away from the utility commission and giving it to the Governor was unconstitutional. The separation of powers is divided between the Governor and their public service commission. It is the job of those UTCs—utilities and transportation commissions around the country—to protect the interests of the public in the siting of these facilities. That this authority was now moved up through the legislature to the Governor to decide all of that was clearly something that was not constitutional. I find it very interesting that four of the seven supreme court justices said, in fact, yes, that law passed by the legislature was not constitutional.

So my question is, What is the hurry? Now that this issue, based on standing and the other justices not deciding, has the process to move forward, Congress feels some sort of urgency to be a siting commission and site a pipeline that has, No. 1, failed to go through the public process in the State of Nebraska; No. 2, has a public process now being questioned in the State of South Dakota, raising concern and urgency that those issues of the public be addressed; and No. 3, goes over what the President of the United States has said

he wants to follow as a due process and make sure all the issues are brought to the table.

I will remind my colleagues that if everybody here had their way, the President would have approved the original Keystone XL pipeline route. Congress thought they should stick their hands in the middle of this siting and land use issue and put in legislative language on a passed bill by the Congress saying the President, if it was a national security interest, must decide and site the Keystone Pipeline. Thank God those at the State Department and the White House decided that was not such a smart idea because that current pipeline went through a major aquifer that served eight States and posed a great deal of concern to landowners, farmers, residents, and various individuals about that particular proposal.

So if this body would have had its way before—those who support this pipeline—they would have pressured the President to approve what is now a defunct, horrible idea of what was proposed by TransCanada. So now I ask my colleagues, are you sure all of the issues have been addressed here at the local level? Because clearly there are people in Nebraska and people in South Dakota who do not think so.

Last I checked, our job is not to site pipelines; our job is to move our country forward on an energy strategy that will produce jobs, diversify our resources, and make the United States a leader in energy.

I know my colleagues feel as if we will get a chance to address a lot of issues if we do move forward in a debate, and I am sure there will be many on many sides. I question whether we shouldn't be spending our time focusing on a bipartisan energy bill with lots of support on a whole myriad of other issues we need to work on, as we did in 2007, to make sure we are helping in the transformation of energy policy moving forward that will produce a lot more jobs.

This particular proposal, as many of my colleagues have pointed out, while there are some immediate construction jobs, the long-term jobs are very few compared to many of the other things we have been doing.

I would also like to point out that since Keystone has undertaken more development in the United States, that part of that development in the United States has also come into question lately. The security of the welding on the pipeline that has been done in the southern part of that pipeline has come into question, even to the point where I think the State Department has said to the company: We are going to have a third-party validator approve whether you are actually meeting the standards we would like to see in the development of this pipeline in the United States.

But there are many issues here about safety and security, as my colleagues can point out who have brought up these issues before. My colleague from Michigan suffered one of the most devastating oil spills in her area. That was a tar sands oil spill. My colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, has actually flown over that oil spill and cited that it took 4 years and \$1.2 billion to clean it up and that the tar sands sunk to the bottom of the river and the river had to be dredged.

So this is something my colleagues may not quite understand, that the tar sands, even according to the Commandant of the Coast Guard—we do not really have a solution for its cleanup when it spills in water. That is why I want to make sure that tar sands pay into the oil spill liability trust fund, as any other oil source does, so that we can make sure we are planning for the future and for getting help and response for any of these oil spills that could occur in the future.

But needless to say Michigan and the Kalamazoo spill taught our Nation how dangerous this oil spill process could be. So why are we prematurely trying to cut off the debate on this issue at the local government level and say that we in Congress know better than these utility and transportation commissions and their transparent siting process for the American public? Why do we somehow know better that this is where a pipeline should go and how the process should work?

So I hope my colleagues will stop and think more about how TransCanada proposal. I know some of my colleagues like to talk about being a good neighbor, and I like to say, you know, we in the Pacific Northwest consider British Columbia a very big friend and neighbor. There are many times that people talk about two provinces and five States working together as an organization on economic issues. So that structure has been in place for many years in the Pacific Northwest. But the people of British Columbia have not been a big supporter of tar sands oil expansion. Something like 60 percent of the public of British Columbia opposes having a tar sands pipeline cross their province. TransCanada knows they are not going to be successful in getting this oil from Alberta across British Columbia out to the Pacific because the people of British Columbia do not want it. So, of course, why not come to the United States? Why not ask them if they want a pipeline going through the middle of their country?

British Columbia Premier Christy Clark laid out five principles that ought to have been met in order to site a pipeline of tar sands. Those conditions have not been met, and the province is officially opposed to the pipeline. So there was a lot of opposition and concern there.

I will note for my colleagues that when a public UTC—a utility commis-

sion or public service commission—when they evaluate a project, they have to look at the environmental impact, and that is water supply, wildlife, vegetation, plants, and they have to look at the economic and social impact. They need to look at alternative routes, the impact to future development near the pipeline, and the views of cities and counties. Again, I will note that I think all of those are a part of having a transparent process instead of a political process on siting.

So I am not for moving forward on what I consider special interest legislation, Congress siting for a special interest—this TransCanada company—a project that even people in Canada have raised suspicion about.

I hope that we will allow the President to still do due process on such an important issue of environmental concern and that we will not start setting a standard that if you want to short-circuit the eminent domain and protection rights of individuals, we will just bypass all of that at the local level and somehow go to Congress and they will get that done for you. I think that is a very bad message.

I hope my colleagues will turn down this legislation. I hope that we can move on to other energy issues that will help our country diversify and move forward in the future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to again talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline approval bill. We will be voting on cloture on the motion to proceed in about 15 minutes or so.

I believe we have a bipartisan majority. We have 60 sponsors of the legislation, and we will have some others join us in voting to proceed on the bill.

That is important, not just because this is bipartisan legislation, important energy legislation for our country but, as I have said before, this is an opportunity for all the Members of this body—Republican and Democrat—to come forward with their amendments in an open amendment process and really have an energy debate.

Let's talk about the energy future of this country and let's bring forward amendments to this legislation that can be good amendments and help us build the right kind of energy plan for our country.

What I would point out about this Keystone Pipeline approval bill is that as we work to build an energy plan for this country, as we work to produce more energy so we are truly energy secure—a lot of people call it energy

independence—but the way I define it is energy security for our country where we produce more energy than we consume, so we control our destiny. If we produce more energy than we consume, then we control our destiny when it comes to energy. But to do that, we would not only have to produce that energy, we have to have the infrastructure to move it safely, cost effectively, and efficiently from where it is produced to where it is consumed.

We have this incredible opportunity with Canada to have North American energy security. We are working with our closest friend and ally in the world. We together produce more energy than we consume, and we have the infrastructure in place to move it from where it is produced to where it is consumed in our country. Now we control our own destiny.

When it comes to OPEC or when it comes to Russia or when it comes to China, when it comes to geopolitical events that affect the price of energy, we are in a strong situation. Look at what is going on in Western Europe right now. Look at what is going on in Ukraine. They are in a tremendously difficult situation because they are dependent on Russia for their energy, for their natural gas, at a time when Vladimir Putin is undertaking very aggressive action in Europe. He is invading Ukraine. He has taken Crimea. He continues his aggressive efforts. And at the same time the European Union is trying to support Ukraine, Ukraine is fighting with Russia. This is a situation where Ukraine is depending upon Russia for its energy.

Does America really want to be in that kind of a situation in the future when we have real problems in the Middle East, when we have real problems with fundamentalists, Islamic jihadists conducting terror on our people and other freedom-loving people around the world? Do we want to be in a situation where we continue to depend upon the Middle East for our oil?

Well, the answer to that is no. The American people resoundingly answer that question—no.

Also, the American people well know that the reason gas prices at the pump today are lower is not because OPEC just decided to give us a Christmas present. They know the reason energy prices are low in this country, that when they pull up to the pump they are saving money, is because we are producing so much more energy in this country and we are getting more energy from Canada.

Unless OPEC cuts back their production, more supply drives prices down. So it is not only about low prices now, it is about making sure we are able to control our energy destiny in the future. We have to take a long-term view. It is working.

Of the 18 million barrels of oil a day this country consumes, we now produce

11 million barrels in this country. We are up to 11 million barrels that we produce in this country of the total we consume, so we are still importing about 7 million barrels a day.

Canada is now up to 3 million of those 7 million barrels, so we are down to only importing about 4 million barrels a day, but if we keep working at this, we can continue to produce more in this country. Canada's production is continuing to grow. And if we build the infrastructure, we can make sure that we control that energy—North American energy security.

That means not only now do our consumers and small businesses and our whole Nation benefit from lower energy prices, lower gas prices at the pump, but we have that ability to make sure we control our destiny and that we benefit in the future.

Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past where we return to this dependency on OPEC down the road because we haven't built the infrastructure, we haven't worked with Canada, and we haven't brought our domestic industry to North America so that we truly are energy secure. If we don't build the necessary infrastructure, if we block the necessary infrastructure, we can't build that energy plan for the future.

I have heard my counterparts, some of the critics, say: Well, it is not up to us to issue a building permit for infrastructure.

Really? So you mean it is the President's job and it is Congress's job to block critical energy that will get us to energy security? Our job is to block it? Our job is to prevent the very infrastructure we need to build energy security for this country, to block the private investment, the \$8 billion that private companies want to spend to build this infrastructure, to create jobs, to produce more energy in North America, and to help make this country's energy security? The President's job and this body's job is to block the ability of our country and Canada to build this necessary infrastructure? Well, I don't think so.

If you want to put it in terms of: Oh, well, we are not supposed to issue a building permit—really? So our job is to prevent the building of critical infrastructure even when it does not cost one single penny—not one penny—of government money?

This is almost \$8 billion of private investment that will generate hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue—State, local, and Federal. Every State on the route has approved it.

There is an idea somehow we are jumping the gun after 6 years? Let's see, it has been in process for 6 years. Every State on the route has approved it. We are not spending any Federal money. We are saying our job as a Congress and the President is to block that kind of investment, block that kind of job creation, block that kind of energy

development, and block our ability to get to energy security for this country.

Then there is this argument: Oh, well, it is TransCanada. It is one company. It is only one company, so it really doesn't matter.

Really? Well, if you were a company—a Canadian company or a U.S. company—and you were about to build infrastructure so that we could continue to produce more energy in this country, would you do it? If, in spite of the process that the Federal Government has to approve this project, where all of the requirements have been met—not once, but over and over again—and Congress and the President continue to block your ability to build that infrastructure, are you going to jump up and spend billions of dollars and do it? I doubt it.

And isn't that really what this is all about? That is what it is about, isn't it? It is for the folks, for the extreme environmental groups that don't want the development of fossil fuels—they are going to block it. This is sending the message and making sure they shut her down here. That has to be music to OPEC's ears. I have to believe that OPEC is going: Boy, that is great; they are not going to build the infrastructure in their country to produce the energy.

That is going to keep OPEC in business.

There is another country that I think will be very pleased, really excited, if this project gets blocked, and that is China. China is so anxious to get this oil, they are trying to buy that production in Canada. Because, make no mistake, if the energy doesn't come to the United States, it is going somewhere else, and it is most likely going to China.

So when we get back in that situation down the road when oil prices move back up, energy demand goes back up, and we have prevented our industry from growing—and Canada is sending all the oil to China, and we have to go back hat in hand to OPEC, Venezuela, and all of these countries, remember—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent to continue for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Reserving the right to object. Is the vote scheduled for 4 minutes from now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the vote is scheduled for 5:30 p.m.

Ms. CANTWELL. I am happy if the Senator speaks until the time of the vote, but I think we should keep to the vote schedule.

Mr. HOEVEN. What time is the vote scheduled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is scheduled at 5:30 p.m. That would leave the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I note the presence of the chairman of the Energy Committee. I defer to her for some time if she wishes to speak before the vote. That would be my question, whether we could get maybe a couple of minutes for that purpose. I can certainly wrap up in a couple of minutes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I defer to my colleague, the sponsor of this legislation, Senator HOEVEN from North Dakota, to conclude his remarks within the remaining time so that we can begin our vote at 5:30 p.m. We appreciate his leadership on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HOEVEN. I will wrap up on this note.

Let's not get back into the same predicament we have gotten ourselves into before. Let's build this vital energy infrastructure so we can develop energy security for our country, together with Canada.

The other point I want to make is on the environmental point: No significant environmental impact. That is the finding of the Obama administration's environmental impact statement done by the State Department. That is their own report: No significant environmental impact.

I look forward to having more discussion on the environmental aspects as well.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending motion to proceed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, Tim Scott, John Boozman, Ron Johnson, Lindsey Graham, James Lankford, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Rand Paul, Kelly Ayotte, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, David Vitter, John Hoeven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Casey	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	King	Tester
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Udall
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—32

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Peters
Booker	Kaine	Reed
Boxer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Leahy	Schatz
Cardin	Markey	Schumer
Cooms	Menendez	Shaheen
Durbin	Merkley	Stabenow
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—5

Brown	Reid	Wyden
Cassidy	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 32.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and that that time count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, first, I congratulate my colleagues Senator

HOEVEN and Senator MANCHIN, the co-sponsors of this legislation. I also commend the energy committee chair, Senator MURKOWSKI. This is important legislation. It is long overdue that we take this up, but it is encouraging that we finally are doing that. So I commend them for that.

Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Could Senators please take their conversations out of the Chamber. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. TOOMEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

A couple of things about the Keystone Pipeline, and then I wish to talk about an amendment I am going to be offering.

First, I think one of the encouraging things about approving this pipeline is the benefits for the environment. The fact is we will be moving oil on a pipeline which is a cleaner, safer way to do it than any available alternative. That is good news.

It is good news that it is going to create jobs across our country. The State Department has estimated 42,000 jobs in the development of this pipeline. That is terrific news for everyone who is going to get a chance to benefit from that work.

Clearly it is going to reduce our dependence on non-North American oil, which can only be good from a geopolitical point of view as well as an economic point of view. Of course, the fact is this legislation has bipartisan support and has for a long time. It received 31 Democratic votes in the House, 14 Democratic votes in the Senate, as well as every Republican Senator the last time it was brought up. It is strongly supported by the labor community because they recognize the benefits of the jobs it will create, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I also would like to take a moment to thank Leader MCCONNELL for doing exactly what he said he would do and what many of us said we needed to do in this Chamber, which is to reopen this body—reopen it and have debate and put legislation on the floor and open it for amendment. Let's have a discussion. Let's change policy in this country in ways that will be constructive. We are beginning this process now as we said we would, and I think that is terrific and I intend to take advantage of the opportunity.

I have several amendments I am going to file and I intend to bring up with respect to this legislation. One is going to be an amendment that will encourage a transition of our Federal Government's vehicle fleet from the current practice of burning gasoline mostly, and I encourage the adoption of natural gas as an alternative fuel because natural gas is cleaner, it is domestic, it is actually cheaper. Without

any government subsidy or taxpayer help, natural gas is a cheaper source of fuel.

We have a staggering quantity. The United States is the world's No. 1 producer of natural gas. We have 2.2 quadrillion cubic feet of natural gas. That is too big a number for me to wrap my brain around, but let's put it this way: That is the gas we know of, and it is enough to last the next 85 years, based on any plausible projection of our use. It is a staggering amount.

I have another amendment that also has bipartisan support. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN, Senators FLAKE and MANCHIN for supporting the effort to repeal the corn ethanol mandate in our fuel. This is a very bad policy that we have had for far too long. It is time to end this mandate that we grow corn and use it to burn in our gas tanks. It is a practice that is bad for the environment. It raises the cost of filling our tanks. It raises the cost of food because so much of our corn production goes into this, and it is not good for our engines. There is no good reason to continue this, and I look forward to having the debate that will enable us to repeal the corn ethanol mandate.

But the amendment I wish to talk about is another bipartisan amendment. I thank Senator CASEY for being the Democratic cosponsor for this amendment, and I thank Senator HATCH for joining me. This is an amendment that will preserve an important, environmentally beneficial source of alternative energy that we have especially in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and it is under threat by two new rules that have been proposed by the EPA.

Let me give a little bit of background as to why we have gotten to this place. In Pennsylvania and West Virginia we have been mining coal for well over a century, and for many of the decades, especially in the early years of our coal development, we took the high-energy density coal and our coal miners sold it to the steel industry where it was used in the manufacturing process of making steel, and the low-energy coal was left in piles—huge piles—actually mountains. It is often referred to as waste coal.

The first photograph illustrates one of these waste coal piles. It is in Nanty Glo in Cambria County, PA. It is one of many piles or, as I say, mountains throughout Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection estimates that there are 2 billion tons of waste coal such as this covering 180,000 acres in Pennsylvania alone. Think about that. It is a massive scale because of over a century of legacy of coal mining. Some of these piles are literally in people's backyards.

Here we can see the people who live literally within a stone's throw—if you have a reasonably good arm—within a

stone's throw you can reach this pile. That is also Nanty Glo in Cambria County. There are people who live within a couple of hundred feet.

What is the problem with these mountains? The problem with these mountains of coal is it rains on them, and when it rains the runoff is horrendous. It looks like this. It looks like this in every one of these mountains of waste coal everywhere that one exists, every time it rains. In 2003 in an op-ed entitled "The Benefits of Waste Coal," former Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania Ed Rendell's Department of Environmental Protection secretary, whose name is Kathleen McGinty, wrote: "For years these piles sat abandoned, generating iron, manganese and aluminum pollution that discharged as runoff into Pennsylvania's watersheds."

That is exactly what happens when these piles just sit here.

In 2011 the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection report states:

Coal refuse piles that are not removed (i.e. burned for fuel) generally create severe acid mine drainage, with pH in the 2.5 range . . .

A pH that high, by the way, is somewhere between the intensity of stomach acid and hydrochloric acid. That kind of acidic chemical running into our waters is enormously damaging.

Slide No. 4 is another depiction of exactly what happens when rainwater runs through these piles and finds its way into the streams, rivers, ponds, and lakes of Pennsylvania. It pollutes hundreds of miles of rivers and streams.

In 2007 former Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, Ed Rendell said:

These piles are domestic energy sources that have significant value when put into production in CFB cogeneration plants. When left on the ground, waste coal presents a grave environmental threat. Runoff from these piles contributes to the "abandoned mine drainage" that is the second leading water pollution problem in the Commonwealth, literally killing all life in some 2,000 stream miles in Pennsylvania.

But that is not all. Photo No. 5 shows something else that happens with these piles. They catch fire. They spontaneously combust. It could be from lightning, carelessness, and sometimes it is unknown, but they catch fire. This particular photo is from Fell Township in Lackawanna County, PA.

The pile caught fire in December of 2013. It burned for over a year. It is very hard to put these fires out. It burned out of control with, obviously, no ability to do anything about the pollutants that are being released by the combustion because it is completely uncontrolled.

We think the fire went out in January, but authorities are still not certain that it may not be smoldering somewhere below the surface. By the way, this mountain is 600 feet from residential housing. What is the effect of

this kind of combustion on the residents in that area?

How much of this will burn? Maybe some people think this is just a freak incident. Not really, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection estimates that 6.6 million tons of waste coal burns each year—unintended, uncontrolled, but it is burning—and in the process it emits 9 million tons of carbon dioxide and many tons of other uncontrolled air pollution.

What about cleaning all of this up? The costs would be absolutely staggering. Again, former Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Secretary McGinty estimated that it costs between \$20,000 and \$40,000 to reclaim just one acre of waste coal. We have hundreds of thousands of acres of waste coal.

The Pennsylvania General Assembly has estimated it would cost approximately \$15 billion to remediate Pennsylvania's abandoned mine set. That is the bad news.

The good news is the market has figured out a solution to address this matter. The free market has developed a way to systematically eliminate these mountains of waste coal, and for decades we have had powerplants designed specifically for the purpose of burning this coal and doing so in a controlled and regulated fashion. They have removed 210 million tons of waste coal and used it to produce electricity.

They have remediated over 8,000 acres. They have generated 1,769 gigawatts of electricity, which is enough to power 1.3 million homes, and in the process the generation of electricity from this waste coal has directly resulted in creating 1,200 jobs.

In the past, the EPA has always acknowledged the benefits of systematically eliminating these mountains of waste coal and doing so by generating electricity. In fact, I will quote a report from the EPA in 2011 that says this: "Because of the unique environmental benefits that coal refuse-fired EGUs provide, these units warrant special consideration."

The problem I am here to address is that there are two new rules passed by the EPA that would bring an end to the systemic elimination of these mountains because these rules are prohibitive. It is not possible for the waste coal powerplants to comply with these rules, so they would all be shut down and we would be left with these piles indefinitely, which would mar our landscape and pollute our water and air.

The two specific rules that would do this—the cross-State air pollution rule is very likely to have the effect of imposing absolutely unattainable goals on waste coal powerplants, and the utility MACT rule establishes new and very stringent emission controls and a whole new generation of very stringent

regulations that this industry cannot meet.

If these rules go into effect—and they are scheduled to go into effect later this year—then waste coal and electric generation ends, and these plants close. As a result, we lose the electric power they have been generating, the 1,200 jobs they sustain, and the low-cost energy that is reliable and domestic. We will end up with a more serious air pollution problem when the spontaneous combustion continues, and we will have an ongoing problem with water and air pollution as the nearby streams and water table will be polluted.

That is why Senator CASEY, Senator HATCH, and I have joined together to offer an amendment to this legislation that will exempt the waste coal powerplants from the most onerous and prohibitive aspects of these new rules.

With respect to utility MACT, we would retain all of the regulatory limits on mercury, chromium, nickel, and other heavy metals, but it would exempt the waste coal plants from the cross-State air pollution rules, and it would allow these plants to continue remediating these waste coal sites.

I wish to stress that it is important to point out that all of the existing regulations that have long been in effect will remain in effect. What we are talking about are the two new rules that would be guaranteed to shut down the industry. Those two rules would not go into effect with respect to the waste coal electric generation.

The fact is if our amendment is adopted and becomes law, we will be helping our environment by continuing to systematically eliminate these blights. I want more success stories like the one in this photograph.

This photo was taken in Nesquehoning in Carbon County, PA. The first photo shows what the ground looked like when the waste coal was piled up. The second photo shows what happens after it has been consumed and the land has been restored. This happened precisely because there is a nearby waste coal powerplant that was able to take this coal, generate electricity for us to use, and restore the land to a much safer, much more environmentally friendly, and much more attractive environment.

We need to keep these plants operating. It is about improving our environment, it is about keeping people working, it is about the low-cost, reliable electricity that we have from it, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

MISSOURI'S EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me today in honoring the 150th anniversary of the State of Missouri's Emancipation Pro-

clamation which ended slavery in the State of Missouri. This proclamation of freedom was imperative for democracy and progress in our State. It is undoubtedly a landmark in Missouri's history.

In 1720, the arrival of 500 slaves to the areas presently known as St. Louis County and Jefferson County, marked the beginning of slavery in Missouri. Those slaves, who were brought to work in the lead mines in those counties, experienced great discrimination over the course of 1½ centuries. When the Territorial Slave Codes were created in 1804, slaves were banned from using firearms, participating in assemblies, holding church services and selling alcohol. Under the codes, slaves were also punished severely for participating in resistance efforts and the mutilation of slaves for the sexual assault of white women was made legal. White men who sexually assaulted slave women, however, were charged for trespassing upon a slave owner's property.

Retained by the State Constitution in 1820, the Territorial Slave Codes were only a premonition of more to come. In 1821, Missouri entered the Union as a slave State with the passing of the Missouri Compromise and in 1825, the Missouri Legislature passed a law which declared slaves to be incompetent as witnesses in legal cases involving whites. That gloomy trend continued as the education of slaves was banned in an 1847 ordinance. One of the most foreboding events, however, occurred in 1857 with the infamous Supreme Court case *Dred Scott v. Sandford* when the judicial system in the state of Missouri and the wider judicial system in the United States decided that persons of African descent were not U.S. citizens.

At the time of the Civil War, over 100,000 slaves were living in the State of Missouri and when President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, Missouri's slaves were not freed as Missouri was not officially in rebellion against the United States. Missouri's slaves received their freedom on January 11, 1865, when the Emancipation Ordinance was signed at a State convention in St. Louis. That ordinance was made effective immediately and the strict codes of the past were eliminated.

I ask that the Senate join me in reflecting upon this difficult time in Missouri's history and honoring the historical significance of the Emancipation Ordinance which ended slavery in the State of Missouri, 150 years ago.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING WILLIAM "BILL" HARRISON BULLOCK

• Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today I highlight the service of William "Bill"

Harrison Bullock to his country, commitment to his family, and contribution to both the city of Wilmington and the State of Delaware.

Bill was born on November 11, 1926, in Wilmington, DE, to William and Amy Bullock. He graduated from P.S. DuPont in 1945 and was immediately drafted to serve as an aircraft mechanic in the Asia-Pacific theater during the Second World War.

Upon his return to the United States, Bill joined and ultimately took over the five generation family business, Bullock Iron Works, which allowed him to meld his passions of building and construction with artistry. Bill invented a process for the precision bending of cold steel for decorative applications, including railings. The family business gave him an opportunity to work with his brother-in-law James Broad—husband to his sister Amy—and his nephew Jim Broad. Bill very much enjoyed and spoke often of the bond created by working and creating beautiful ornamental steel creations with his family members.

Bill had a long-standing bet with his brother-in-law that he would not get married before he turned 30 years old. Bill married Norma McBride on November 10, 1956—1 day before his 30th birthday. They had two children, William and June. Through his management of Bullock Iron Works, Bill developed a very strong set of business principles and ethics, which he was able to pass along to his children, even though neither went into the family business.

His friends often joked with Bill that Delaware is not flat and that if he left he would not fall off a cliff into a chasm. He retorted that he never left the State because he had no need or reason to do so. Bill loved Delaware and found there everything he needed to raise a family, to grow the family business, and to enjoy his hobbies and passions: fresh and salt water fishing, cultivating beautiful phalaenopsis and cattleya orchids, and enjoying the comradery of his fellow veterans at the Delaware Veterans Club, Post #1.

Bill was preceded in death by his wife of 33 years Norma, his sister Amy, and brother-in-law James Broad. He is survived by his daughter Blake McBride, son William H. Bullock II, and daughter-in-law Marci Hanlon, three grandchildren, his sister and brother-in-law, and several nieces and nephews.

Bill was a true Delawarean and one of the best and brightest of the Greatest Generation. He helped to win the Second World War, raised a strong and loving family, grew and bolstered his business, and was a true friend to his neighbors, war buddies, and the wider Wilmington community. He will be missed.●

COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF VIRGINIA ORGANIZING

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 20th anniversary of Virginia Organizing, a group committed to challenging injustice by empowering people in local communities across the Commonwealth to address the issues affecting the quality of their lives.

Virginia Organizing has been on the forefront of the debate on local, statewide, and national issues such as economic security for families, education, environment, health care, equality, poverty, and other social justice issues.

Virginia Organizing and I share a common goal—one that I have spoken about many times—that all Virginians and all Americans should have a fair shot at success. We share the belief that all people should be treated fairly and with dignity in all aspects of life, regardless of race, class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, age, ability or country of origin. Both as Governor and now as Senator, I am proud to have served alongside a group who embraces and celebrates diversity.

This year, during their 20th anniversary, I would like to recognize and thank the leaders, members, and staff of Virginia Organizing, who continue to work tirelessly to provide children, low-income residents, immigrants, veterans, retirees, people with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups with the resources that they need to have a fair shot. I appreciate their work for the people of the Commonwealth and wish them all the best as they embark on their next 20 years.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House, was signed on January 9, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH):

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3. An act to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 30. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours; to the Committee on Finance.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3. An act to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-217. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification to Scope of Certain '600 Series' ECCNs" (RIN0694-AG40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-218. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order to take additional steps to address the Russian occupation of the Crimea region of Ukraine, with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-219. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order with respect to North Korea that expands the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13455 of June 26, 2008, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-220. A communication from the Director of the Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Import Inspection Application and Certification of Imported Products and Foreign Establishments; Amendments To Facilitate the Public Health Information System (PHIS) and Other Changes to Import Inspection Regulations" (RIN0583-AD39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-221. A communication from the Director of the Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Change in Accredited Laboratory Fees" (RIN0583-AD55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-222. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Serv-

ice, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Energy for America Program" (RIN0570-AA76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-223. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Khaphra Beetle; New Regulated Countries and Regulated Articles" (Docket No. APHIS-2013-0079) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-224. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Energy's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-225. A communication from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Annual Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-226. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Awarding Agency Regulatory Implementation of Office of Management and Budget's Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards" (RIN1991-AB94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-227. A communication from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Veterans' Preference" (RIN3206-AM79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-228. A communication from the Chief Operating Officer and Acting Executive Director, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2013 Activities"; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-229. A communication from the Deputy Director, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards to Prevent, Detect, and Respond to Sexual Abuse and Sexual Harassment Involving Unaccompanied Children" (RIN0970-AC61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-230. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022 and 29 CFR Part 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-231. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets

in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age" (29 CFR Part 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-232. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9921-38-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-233. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 and 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9921-29-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-234. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa" (FRL No. 9921-19-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-235. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska: Nonattainment New Source" (FRL No. 9921-40-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-236. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the International Labor Organization Protocol and Recommendation concerning Forced or Compulsory Labor, 1930 (No. 29) and Supplementary Measures for the Effective Suppression of Forced Labor (No. 203), adopted by the 103rd session of the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-237. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0180 - 2014-0187); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-238. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report related to the Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-239. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Physical Security Reliability Standard" (Docket No. RM14-15-000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-240. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Clothes Washers" ((RIN1904-AC77) (Docket No. EERE-2012-BT-STD-0020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-241. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Alternative Efficiency Determination Methods and Compliance for Commercial HVAC, Refrigeration, and Water Heating Equipment" ((RIN1904-AC46) (Docket No. EERE-2011-BT-TP-0024)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-242. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Test Procedures for Direct Heating Equipment and Pool Heaters" ((RIN1904-AC94) (Docket No. EERE-2013-BT-TP-0004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-243. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Expiration Dates for Several Body Systems Listings" (RIN0960-AH72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-244. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Direct Fee Payment Rules" (RIN0960-AH21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-245. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation: Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-246. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reallocation of Section 48B Credits Under the Qualifying Gasification Project Program" (Notice 2014-81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-247. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Base Period T-Bill Rate" (Rev. Rul. 2014-33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-248. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additional Requirements for Charitable Hospitals; Community Health Needs Assessments for Charitable Hospitals; Requirement of a Section 4959 Excise Tax Return and Time for Filing the Return" ((RIN1545-BK57; RIN1545-BL30; and RIN1545-BL58) (TD 9708)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-249. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe Harbor Methods of Accounting for Cable System Operators" (Rev. Proc. 2015-12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-250. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Filing of Form 5472" ((RIN1545-BM08) (TD 9707)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-251. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Title IV Treatment of Rollovers From Defined Contribution Plans to Defined Benefit Plans" (RIN1212-AB23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-252. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Employee Plans Determination Letter Processing" (Announcement 2015-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-253. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-254. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Elizabeth River; Portsmouth, VA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-255. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Fisheries for 2015" (RIN0648-BE13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-1. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the Congress of the United States, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states for the sole and exclusive purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution that would provide for a balanced budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 70

Whereas, the failure of the federal budget process has produced an enormous federal budget deficit, and growing national debt presently burdens the American people and threatens to burden their descendants for generations to come; and

Whereas, the congressional practice of deficit spending and repeated raising of the ceiling on the federal debt has had the effect of endangering the jobs, incomes, retirement security, welfare, and future of American citizens; and

Whereas, such debt diverts scarce resources from crucial programs to pay interest on the national debt, constricts the ability of the federal government to address long-standing national problems and to respond to new needs, and increases pressures to raise taxes on the American people; and

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that an amendment to the constitution may be proposed by congress, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, congress is required to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment, which, in either case, shall become part of the constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the several states: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States of America for the specific and exclusive purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, for submission to the states for ratification, to require that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal outlays made by congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints; and be it further

Resolved, That this application is to be considered as covering the same subject matter as the presently outstanding balanced budget applications from other states, including but not limited to previously adopted applications from Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas; and that this application shall be aggregated with such applications for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds of states necessary to require the calling of a convention but shall not be aggregated with applications on any other subject; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the president and the secretary of the United States Senate, to the speaker and clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of this state's delegation to the congress, and to the presiding officer of each house of each state legislature in the United States, requesting their cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That this application by this legislature supersedes all previous applications

by this legislature on this same subject matter and that this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made application for a similar convention pursuant to Article V.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 147. An original bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline (Rept. No. 114-1).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CORKER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 145. A bill to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 146. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 147. An original bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 148. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 12

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 55

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to extend the seaward boundaries of certain States, and for other purposes.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 117, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 128

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 128, a bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 submitted by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act”.

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (in-

cluding the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

SA 3. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 submitted by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

DIVISION B—ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015”.

TITLE I—BETTER BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Better Buildings Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) COST-EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term “cost-effective energy efficiency measure” means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides energy savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(3) COST-EFFECTIVE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term “cost-effective water efficiency measure” means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides water savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(b) MODEL PROVISIONS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and after providing the public with an opportunity for notice and comment, shall develop model commercial leasing provisions and best practices in accordance with this subsection.

(2) COMMERCIAL LEASING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection shall, at a minimum, align the interests of building owners and tenants with regard to investments in cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures to encourage building owners and tenants to collaborate to invest in such measures.

(B) USE OF MODEL PROVISIONS.—The Administrator may use the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection in any standard leasing document that designates a Federal agency (or other client of the Administrator) as a landlord or tenant.

(C) PUBLICATION.—The Administrator shall periodically publish the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection, along with explanatory materials, to encourage building owners and tenants in the private sector to use such provisions and materials.

(3) REALTY SERVICES.—The Administrator shall develop policies and practices to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures for the realty services provided by the Administrator to Federal agencies (or other clients of the Administrator), including periodic training of appropriate Federal employees and contractors on how to identify and evaluate those measures.

(4) STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make available model commercial leasing provisions and best practices developed under this subsection to State, county, and municipal governments for use in managing owned and leased building space in accordance with the goal of encouraging investment in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures.

SEC. 103. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

“(b) STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

“(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the

design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

“(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) descriptions of—

“(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

“(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

“(iii) policies and best practices to achieve reductions in energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

“(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of available incentives;

“(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

“(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether such measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

“(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

“(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) case studies reporting economic and energy savings returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 423 the following new item:

“Sec. 424. Separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.”

SEC. 104. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by

section 103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as ‘Tenant Star’, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

“(c) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

“(1) collect, through each Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

“(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by data centers, trading floors, and restaurants; and

“(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption;

“(2) with respect to the first Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey conducted after the date of enactment of this section, to the extent full compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) is not feasible, conduct activities to develop the capability to collect such data and begin to collect such data; and

“(3) make data collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public in aggregated form and provide such data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (d).

“(d) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

“(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which sufficient data is received pursuant to subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

“(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop policies and procedures to recognize tenants in commercial buildings that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

“(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (c) and any other appropriate data sources; and

“(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

“(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required by section 424(b) is completed, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in

consultation with the Secretary and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 (as added by section 103(b)) the following new item:

“Sec. 425. Tenant Star program.”

TITLE II—GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS

SEC. 201. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) in section 325(e) (42 U.S.C. 6295(e)), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) ACTIVATION LOCK.—The term ‘activation lock’ means a control mechanism (either a physical device directly on the water heater or a control system integrated into the water heater) that is locked by default and contains a physical, software, or digital communication that must be activated with an activation key to enable the product to operate at its designed specifications and capabilities and without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

“(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term ‘grid-enabled water heater’ means an electric resistance water heater that—

“(I) has a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

“(II) is manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

“(III) has—

“(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

“(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

“(BB) 0.00168; or

“(bb) an equivalent alternative standard prescribed by the Secretary and developed pursuant to paragraph (5)(E);

“(IV) is equipped at the point of manufacture with an activation lock; and

“(V) bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

“(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

“(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

“(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

“‘IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.’”

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key for a grid-enabled water heater only to a utility or other company that operates an electric thermal storage or demand response program that uses such a grid-enabled water heater.

“(C) REPORTS.—

“(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled

water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

“(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

“(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

“(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

“(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that—

“(I) grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement; or

“(II) sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually and procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes would not be adequate to prevent such product diversion.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

“(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including any impact on energy savings, electric bills, peak load reduction, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.”;

(2) in section 332(a) (42 U.S.C. 6302(a))—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) for any person—

“(A) to activate an activation lock for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge

that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(B) to distribute an activation key for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such activation key will be used to activate a grid-enabled water heater that is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(C) to otherwise enable a grid-enabled water heater to operate at its designed specification and capabilities with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program; or

“(D) to knowingly remove or render illegible the label of a grid-enabled water heater described in section 325(e)(6)(A)(ii)(V).”;

(3) in section 333(a) (42 U.S.C. 6303(a))—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(B) by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (5) of section 332(a)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(4) in section 334 (42 U.S.C. 6304)—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(B) by striking “section 332(a)(6)” and inserting “section 332(a)(7)”.

TITLE III—ENERGY EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Energy Efficient Government Technology Act”.

SEC. 302. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

Subtitle C of title V of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 121 Stat. 1661) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 530. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given that term in section 1101 of title 40, United States Code.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, each Federal agency shall coordinate with the Director, the Secretary, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an implementation strategy (that includes best practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technologies, taking into consideration the performance goals established under subsection (d).

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing an implementation strategy under subsection (b), each Federal agency shall consider—

“(1) advanced metering infrastructure;

“(2) energy-efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing asset and infrastructure utilization;

“(3) advanced power management tools;

“(4) building information modeling, including building energy management;

“(5) secure telework and travel substitution tools; and

“(6) mechanisms to ensure that the agency realizes the energy cost savings brought about through increased efficiency and utilization.

“(d) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section,

the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technology.

“(2) BEST PRACTICES.—The Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, shall recommend best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, which shall include Federal agency consideration of the use of—

“(A) energy savings performance contracting; and

“(B) utility energy services contracting.

“(e) REPORTS.—

“(1) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this section.

“(2) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2015, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this section.”.

SEC. 303. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D)(iv), by striking “the organization” and inserting “an organization”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by striking subsections (c) through (g) and inserting the following:

“(c) STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall carry out subsection (b) in collaboration with information technology industry and other key stakeholders, with the goal of producing results that accurately reflect the best knowledge in the most pertinent domains. In such collaboration, the Secretary and the Administrator shall pay particular attention to organizations that—

“(1) have members with expertise in energy efficiency and in the development, operation, and functionality of data centers, information technology equipment, and software, such as representatives of hardware manufacturers, data center operators, and facility managers;

“(2) obtain and address input from Department of Energy National Laboratories or any college, university, research institution, industry association, company, or public interest group with applicable expertise;

“(3) follow—

“(A) commonly accepted procedures for the development of specifications; and

“(B) accredited standards development processes; and

“(4) have a mission to promote energy efficiency for data centers and information technology.

“(d) MEASUREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall consider and assess the adequacy of the specifications, measurements, and benchmarks described in subsection (b) for use by the Federal Energy Management Program, the Energy Star Program, and other efficiency programs of the Department of Energy or the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(e) STUDY.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Administrator, shall, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server

and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109-431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

“(1) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2007 through 2014;

“(2) an analysis considering the impact of information technologies, to include virtualization and cloud computing, in the public and private sectors;

“(3) an evaluation of the impact of the combination of cloud platforms, mobile devices, social media, and big data on data center energy usage; and

“(4) updated projections and recommendations for best practices through fiscal year 2020.

“(f) DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in Federal data centers. Each Federal agency shall consider having the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years by energy practitioners certified pursuant to such program, whenever practicable using certified practitioners employed by the agency.

“(g) OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders and the Office of Management and Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making such data available and accessible in a manner that encourages further data center innovation, optimization, and consolidation. In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider the use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

“(h) INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders, shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy efficiency.

“(i) DATA CENTER UTILIZATION METRIC.—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders, shall facilitate in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of a data center (including equipment and facilities).

“(j) PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall not disclose any proprietary information or trade secrets provided by any individual or company for the purposes of carrying out this section or the programs and initiatives established under this section.”.

TITLE IV—ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

SEC. 401. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”; and

(2) by striking “signing the contract,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

“(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

“(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multi-tenant building owners; and

“(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

“(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.”.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall complete a study—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and any associated building efficiency policies, for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multitenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and television studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure laws and data aggregation for multitenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

(c) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with other relevant agencies, shall maintain, and if necessary create, a database for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) information on buildings that have disclosed energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, only in an anonymous form unless the owner provides otherwise.

(2) COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS.—The database maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall complement and not duplicate the functions of the Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Portfolio Manager tool.

(d) INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.—The Secretary of Energy shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Jimmy O'Dea, a fellow in my office, for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

CONGRATULATING THE PRESIDING OFFICER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Presiding Officer on his election and welcome him to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I remember when I first came to the Senate and I sat in that chair, it was a moment to really learn a lot about the heartbeat of the Senate—the ebb and flow. So congratulations to you.

I was a little shocked to hear the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, say that the economic uptick coincided with the election of the Republicans in this last election. There is no question that the Republicans won many seats here, and it is clear that the Democrats lost, but to say that is why we are having this economic uptick, I believe, would win my friend, the majority leader, the award for most creative spinner. I see he is here because I think

he wants to stop me from speaking at this point.

Without losing the floor, I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank my friend from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, January 13, 2015; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume the motion to proceed to S. 1 until 12:30 p.m., with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings to occur; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all time during morning business, the recess, and the adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Unfortunately, there is an objection from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to yielding back time on the motion to proceed to the bill. So I say to my colleagues that if all time is used, we will be on the bill shortly after midnight tomorrow night, and then we would have to begin to offer amendments under the regular order.

Chairman MURKOWSKI is ready to start that process on the floor tomorrow whenever that may occur—whether it is during the day by agreement or whether it is in the middle of the night without agreement.

I encourage Senators on both sides of the aisle to file their amendments and get them in the queue.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator BOXER for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

THE ECONOMY AND KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the majority leader for allowing me this time to proceed. It is one thing to rewrite history a few years after it passes. It is another thing to rewrite it while you are still living through it. To say that this economic recovery is a Republican recovery is kind of funny and strange.

In fact, the year 2014 was the best year for job creation since 1999, and it could have been a lot better in 2014 and in prior years if our Republican friends had not filibustered every single job proposal that President Obama put forward. It is sad because we could have gotten here much quicker.

The economy added almost 3 million jobs in 2014, averaging almost 250,000 jobs a month. The unemployment rate has fallen to 5.6 percent, and most of that decline—and here is the good news—came from long-term unemployed workers getting back to work. The GDP growth has accelerated, reaching an annualized rate of 5 percent in the third quarter of 2014. This is the best GDP growth we have seen in over 10 years.

Our economic recovery has been long, it has been tough, but it is happening and I thank the President for his leadership. We have added 11.2 million private sector jobs since February of 2010. That is the longest streak of recorded private sector job gains in American history.

The stock market has bounced back from the crash and added more than 10,000 points, reaching an all-time high of over 18,000 points. Our annual deficit has been reduced by almost two-thirds.

I think it is important to put into context the job growth under Presidents Democratic and Republican. I think we need to look at private sector job growth. This is an extraordinary chart. Under George Herbert Walker Bush, there were 1.5 million jobs created in his term of office. In Bill Clinton's term of office, there were 21.2 million jobs created. I have seen that number up to 23 million, but that is probably including the public sector. But during Bill Clinton's term, there were 21.2 million private sector jobs. Under George W. Bush, there was a loss of 460,000 jobs. Under President Obama, there is a gain so far of 7 million, and he has 2 years to go, and we are just moving forward.

To me this says that we Democrats know what we are doing, and if you want to look at deficits, that is another day's speech. It was Bill Clinton who balanced the budget. It was George W. Bush who unbalanced it, put two wars on a credit card, gave a tax cut to the rich, and we had terrible deficits. Barack Obama has now reduced this deficit by two-thirds.

So I say all this leading up to my discussion of the Keystone Pipeline. How does that even connect? I will tell you.

When a new majority takes over in Congress you know the first bill they take up symbolizes their priorities. Out of all the things that they pick, all the things that they pick, they pick a bill that in terms of permanent job creation will be thirty-five jobs. And that is proven by the State Department—35 long-term jobs.

One has to wonder, Why are they doing this? I believe I know the answer. This is really a big hug and a big kiss to big oil and Canadian interests. That is what it is about. Otherwise, why wouldn't we turn to the highway bill? I think the Presiding Officer and I know we have worked across partisan lines on that issue, and it means good jobs for America—good jobs, long-lasting jobs, rebuilding our bridges and our roads and making sure we have transit systems that work. We have a terrible record in terms of the condition of our bridges today. Thousands and thousands—tens of thousands of bridges are not in good shape, and we have seen bridges fail, and we know the outcome. Why are we pursuing a project for Canadian oil business interests that they will make billions off of instead of pursuing projects for America—America—such as building our infrastructure?

This bill isn't about helping American workers or families. Let's be very clear. It does nothing. Again, when I say 35 permanent jobs, I am not making that up. That is in the final supplemental environmental impact statement which I believe the Republicans want to make final, so they are accepting it. The Republicans are accepting the fact that there are 35 permanent jobs, because they, in their language, say, We approve of the final supplemental environmental impact statement, which is where it says there will be 35 permanent jobs.

Now, yes, there are temporary jobs for 2 years—a couple thousand—but the fact is we can have millions of jobs when we rebuild our infrastructure. We have 400 new jobs coming to the Imperial Valley in my home State because we have lithium there and they are going to start producing it. So 400 jobs, just one little project. This is 35 jobs for Americans. They have to be kidding. This is what they have for us, after all that blood, sweat, and tears during the election? I think that wasting another minute on the tar sands project doesn't make any sense.

What we need is a multiyear surface transportation bill. We still have unemployed people in the construction industry. We have 600,000 construction workers who remain out of work. What are we giving them? We are giving them 2,000 temporary jobs and 35 permanent jobs? Let's do a highway bill. By the way, the trust fund is running dry and in 4 months will be completely dry. Let's step up to the plate and do our job, not do the job for the Canadian oil interests.

I don't get it. I don't think it makes sense, because I know we have worked together on transportation projects. We are worried. Billions of dollars going to our States—whether it is Oklahoma, California, Nevada, east coast, west coast—the funding is going to be delayed or stopped. And all these short-term extensions the House did are absolutely irresponsible. It doesn't provide stability to our local governments, to our businesses.

So we know what we have to do. We have to invest in our aging infrastructure. No country can be great if we don't have an infrastructure that moves people and moves goods. Again, 50 percent of our Nation's roads are in less than good condition and 63,000 bridges are structurally deficient. Let's do something for America. That is what we are here for; not to do something good for Canadian oil companies. Let's focus on what is good for the people.

Now let's turn to this infrastructure project, the Keystone Pipeline. I want to say unequivocally—and I don't have any doubts because I resource everything I say—that from extraction to transportation to refining to [waste/waist] storage, misery follows the tar sands. That is the oil that gets put in the pipeline—the dirtiest oil. I think XL stands for extra lethal.

So a pipeline is a pipeline. Fine. It is what we put in it. This is the filthiest, most polluted kind of oil. Tar sands oil contains levels of toxic pollutants and metals that are much higher than conventional crude oil—11 times more sulfur and nickel, 6 times more nitrogen, 5 times more lead than conventional crude oil. Who is saying that? Is it BARBARA BOXER? No. Let me source it: The USGS, the U.S. Geological Survey, the heavy oil and natural bitumen resources in geological basins of the world—documented. Tar sands equal the dirtiest oil.

Why do some of my Republican friends and some of my Democratic friends—I admit that; I know there are a few—want to rush to bring this filthy oil into our country? The only benefit is to the Canadian oil interests. The fact is we need less pollution, not more pollution.

Now high levels of dangerous air pollutants and carcinogens have been documented downwind from the tar sands refineries. People in nearby communities are suffering higher rates and types of cancers, such as leukemia and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Again, is this me saying it? Some rightwing blog took me to task the last time I said it. They said, Oh, she was on the floor making stuff up. OK. Let's be clear. I am not making stuff up. I am telling the truth, and I am going to document it in every case: Significantly higher levels of volatile compounds and carcinogens were found downwind of tar sands processing facilities. There were

elevated rates of cancers linked to these toxic chemicals, including leukemia and non-Hodgkins lymphoma.

Where does this come from? Simpson, I.J., et al., air quality in the Industrial Heartland of Alberta, Canada and potential impacts on human health. Characterization of trace gases measured over Alberta oil sands mining operations: 76 speciated C2-C10 volatile organic compounds, and they list what they are. This is from two peer-reviewed papers.

Is this what the Republicans do first? I thought we wanted to make people healthy. It is one thing to want to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which now, in my State, has reduced the uninsured by close to 50 percent—that is bad enough. Now they want to bring in this oil and help the Canadian oil people and it is going to bring all of these carcinogens and all of this pollution to our country.

We already know about the people from Port Arthur, TX, where they have these refineries. Look at this picture. A picture is worth a thousand words. I know that is a cliché, but it is a fact. I could try to explain to my colleagues what happens near the playground when this stuff is refined. One might say, Oh, that is nice, BARBARA, but are you really making this up? No. Here it is. Look at it. They suffer asthma, respiratory ailments, skin irritations, and cancer. This is what happens, right near a playground. Now, there are some politicians down there saying, Bring it on. We want it. We like it. But talk to the real people there who live there with children. They have had enough of tar sands. They have had it up to here with them. They want none of it. Let's not forget about the waste. Once they burn all of this stuff, they have waste left over. It is called petcoke, petroleum coke. Look at this. This is what it looks like, as shown in this picture. It is stored in the Midwest. A lot of it is stored in the Midwest. What happens? In this photograph we can see it is not wet, so it can blow in the wind. Billowing black clouds have contaminated our children. They contain heavy metals. Children playing baseball have been forced off the field to seek cover from the clouds of black dust that pelted homes and cars.

This happened. This is why my friend Senator DURBIN is so concerned, because it happened to his Little League players in the Chicago area. When inhaled, these particles can increase the number and severity of asthma attacks. They can aggravate bronchitis—I am coughing just at the thought of it—lung disease. They reduce the body's ability to fight infections. Where does that come from? I will say it again. When inhaled, these particles can increase the number and severity of asthma attacks, cause or aggravate bronchitis and other lung diseases, and

reduce the body's ability to fight infections. What is the source of that? California Air Resources Board, Air Pollution Particulate Matter brochure dated May 6, 2009.

So I don't know how exposing Americans to this kind of pollution is in the national interests. I believe instead of waiving all of the environmental reports as my Republican friends do in their bill, they ought to call for more studies on the health impact of the tar sands oil so our families know what they are going to get with this pipeline.

Also there are spills to worry about. Not only is the Keystone tar sands pipeline harmful to human health, it hurts environments and communities located near it, because if there is a spill, it is the toughest kind of oil to clean up. Here is the source for that: The EPA NEPA compliance comment letter, State Department. That is what they talk about.

We have had spills at the tar sands—spills in Michigan, spills in Arkansas. If my colleagues don't believe me, ask those folks. Do my colleagues know in 2010 a pipeline ruptured and spilled over a million gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River in Michigan? The local health department ordered the evacuation of 50 households and approximately 100 families were advised not to drink the water. The Michigan spill was the largest inland spill in U.S. history and more than 40 years and \$1 billion later, it is not cleaned up.

So wait a minute. Let's review. Republicans take over and the first bill they give us is the tar sands bill. The only people it helps, in my opinion, backed up by fact, are Canadian oil interests. The only jobs it creates permanently are 35 jobs. What it does to our health is a disaster, because the tar sands oil is the most toxic, dirty type of oil, and if there is a spill, it is the hardest to clean up. Who do we think is paying the \$1 billion to clean up a tar sand spill in Michigan? I can tell my colleagues. It is probably most of the government. Maybe we are trying to collect some from the private sector.

If my colleagues don't believe me about Michigan, let's turn to Mayflower, AR. This is a beautiful neighborhood of homes, as shown in this picture. This is filthy, dirty, disgusting oil and the camera is taking pictures of it. In 2013, 200,000 gallons of tar sands burst from a pipeline, because it is volatile. It burst from the pipeline and spilled into the streets of a subdivision. It forced the evacuation and abandonment of 22 homes—residents who were exposed to high levels of benzene, a known carcinogen, and hydrogen sulfide. People in this community—not some made-up, mystical community or mythical community—in this community they suffered dizziness, nausea, headaches, respiratory problems, all classic symptoms of exposure to the chemicals found in the tar

sands. So remember this picture and remember the picture of the filthy, dirty oil and the petcoke, because a picture tells a thousand words, and that is the picture my friends want to make a reality in America. Their first great bill, their first great contribution to the economy, 35 jobs. Please. We can do better. We can work together on a highway bill, on a transportation bill. We do so well on that. And we can add millions of jobs, especially in the construction industry.

Now there is the issue of climate change. We know we are dealing with a lot of deniers on the other side of the aisle. They deny climate change is real. It doesn't matter what we tell them. July was the hottest month, August was the hottest month, and September was the hottest month in 2014.

We know what is happening. The world knows what is happening. We have deniers here, so they deny any problem and they go rush to build the Keystone Pipeline. What will happen is the Keystone Pipeline will undermine our efforts to address climate change. The State Department's own analysis says a barrel of tar sands oil carried by the Keystone tar sands pipeline will create at least 17 percent more carbon pollution than domestic oil.

Peer-reviewed research estimates that the increase in oil consumption caused by Keystone could result in up to 110 million metric tons of carbon pollution each year—four times the State Department's estimate. So this is even more than the State Department says. The source there is Erickson et al., "Nature Climate Change." That is a peer-reviewed study as well. This is equivalent to carbon pollution adding 23 million new cars to the road or building 29 coal-fired powerplants. So the State Department is very modest in its projection. Even that is too much.

Here is more. Here is the State Department. That is the 17 percent quote. And it could add up to an additional 27 million metric tons of carbon pollution each year. That is more of the State Department. This is their modest conclusion. We believe the peer-reviewed study shows it is far worse than even the State Department says.

If you don't believe climate change is a problem, I am really sorry for your constituency because let me tell you what scientists are saying. And I am saying it is 98 percent of scientists. Let's be clear. Ninety-eight percent of scientists say climate change is real, and 2 percent say: We are not so sure. So my friends side with the 2 percent.

Suppose one of my friends didn't feel well and went to the doctor, and the doctor said: I am sorry to tell you this,

sir, but you have a cancer that is raging over your body, and we need to operate today.

You say: I want a second opinion.

That is good. You go get a second opinion.

The second doctor says: Absolutely, you better get that operation.

You say: Well, I want a third opinion.

All right. I understand it. You go for a third opinion. Absolutely, those two doctors were right, but you keep going, and you get nine opinions that all say: Sir, you are a dead man if you don't get this operation. And then you find the 10th, and he says: You know, just go on a vegetarian diet, and you will be fine. If you listen to that one out of 10 doctors, there is something wrong with you.

It is just like Big Tobacco. They did the same thing. They said: Oh, tobacco is fine, not a problem—until we realized there was a whole campaign by the big tobacco companies to turn us away from the fact that tobacco causes cancer. That is the truth. Guess what we found out. In a Union of Concerned Scientists expose, they found out that the same people who led that fight of tobacco denial are leading the fight of climate denial.

If this was just going to hurt you, I say to my Republican friends rhetorically, I wouldn't care. I mean, I would be really sad and sorry if one of my friends went to the doctor and didn't listen to the best advice. But you know what. That hurts him. I would be miserable, and I would try to talk him out of it. But this is about my constituents and the people of this country. I have to say this is wrong. This is just wrong.

This is an opportunity to bring the parties together. We could have done it around so many issues and in particular the highway bill. So common sense tells us this isn't the right thing to do. We are looking at unleashing this dirty, filthy oil. It is going to be harmful to our families' health. It is going to worsen the impact of climate change. It will not create the jobs we need to create.

Again, I urge my colleagues vote no. It is not ready for prime time. There are going to be amendments that will reveal the fact that if we go forward with this, it is actually going to raise gas prices for Americans because all this stuff is going to be exported. Even the tar sands that are now currently in America—they are going to export it because of the world market. We are going to have amendments that are going to show that.

This bill doesn't even have a "Made in America" amendment to it. We are going to offer that. Why don't we make this deal here? Why don't we put people

to work here? That is not in this bill. This bill is not ready. This bill does not help us; this bill hurts us. I know my friends came here to make this country better. I think they think it helps. I don't question that. But if you look at all of the facts—and I have them lined up here, one after the other—whether it is the jobs impact, the health impact, who benefits, who gets hurt, it is pretty clear. It is on the record. All you have to do is look at it. Don't shop around for a doctor who will tell you this is a good deal because they have already spoken. It is not a good deal. We can do so much better.

Because I think it is going to be a contentious debate, after this I hope we turn to the highway bill. My friend JIM INHOFE and I, who worked so well together, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and across the Capitol on the other side, the House, can finally come together and do something that will send a strong signal to the American people that the election just ended, now let's govern. But when you bring things before the body that some of us feel are so detrimental to the American people, I am willing to vote on it at midnight. It is OK with me. We will vote at midnight and vote at 1 o'clock in the morning. I don't care what time we vote, but why are we taking this up? This is not what we should be doing.

S. 1—I looked at some of the S. 1 bills the Democrats have put forward, and they mostly have to do with creating a lot of jobs or making sure there is equal pay for equal work or making sure the minimum wage is increased. We could be doing all of those things together.

It is with pride that I stand here again for my State. It is with no animosity about the election. It was hard-fought and hard-won. But I believe this is an enormous mistake, and I will continue to stand on my feet as long as it takes to make the case as to why I think it is wrong and make the case where I think there is so much else we could do for the good of our people.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his courtesy.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:54 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 13, 2015, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 12, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 12, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANE BLACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

REMEMBERING STANLEY ISRAELITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to remember one of eastern Connecticut's most generous, caring, and devoted citizens, Stanley Israelite.

Stanley passed away this past December at age 89 and leaves behind an enduring powerful legacy in his native Norwich and throughout Connecticut. I ask the U.S. House to join me in expressing condolences to his wife, Linda Hershman; and his four children, Michael Israelite, Abby Dolliver, Mindy Wilkie, and Jon Israelite.

After his passing, a memorial service was held at Beth Jacob Synagogue, which was the scene of an overflow crowd of people from all walks of life. His longtime boss, former U.S. Senator Chris Dodd; Lieutenant Governor Nancy Wyman; State legislators; mayors and former mayors; small business owners; labor union leaders; and his neighbors and friends from the city he loved, Norwich, Connecticut, were all in attendance.

Senator Dodd delivered a stirring eulogy filled with humor and passion, describing Stanley's amazing life of service. As Senator Dodd related, Stanley dedicated his life to helping others.

After starting his career in his family-owned jewelry store, he uncovered his true passion, assisting members of his community with any problem, anytime, after intervening with a family in crisis. He left the business, and after holding a variety of human service and business advocacy positions in Norwich—and earning citizen of the year and citizen of the decade awards in the 1960s—went on to work for Chris Dodd.

Stanley ran his constituent service programs, beginning in 1974 with Dodd's election as Second District Congressman, the seat that I now have the honor to hold, and later as State director to Senator Dodd after Chris' election to the Senate in 1980.

Stanley remained a fixture in Connecticut politics, known for his consummate dedication to helping constituents get the help they needed. He spent decades ensuring that Connecticut citizens received help from the VA, Medicare, and Social Security; solved thorny immigration problems; helped small business owners get their feet under them; and then doggedly pushed forward projects to improve local communities.

Today, one of the projects he spearheaded, an industrial park in Norwich that never would have been realized without Stanley's efforts, now bears his name, the Stanley Israelite Norwich Business Park, renamed in his honor in 2005. In 1995, Stanley was recognized as U.S. News and World Report's 12 Indispensable Americans.

For all the awards and honors that his community rightly bestowed on him throughout his career, Stanley, himself, valued the thank you notes that he received from grateful constituents above everything. In 1995, he explained to a reporter from The New London Day that the highest honor in the Dodd office was to post a constituent thank you letter on the office refrigerator. "That is our glory," he said. "If you are on the refrigerator, then you have done a good job."

Stanley's personal mantra—which he instilled in his colleagues, friends, and family—was always, "Don't forget the people." After a lifetime of service to his community, the people he helped and everyone who had the privilege to know him will certainly never forget him.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, just last month, we made a promise to the American people. We promised our constituents that we would fight the Obama administration's decision to give executive amnesty to many of those in this country illegally.

I am pleased to announce that this week the House will fulfill that promise and act to defund the illegal executive action. All last year, we strongly urged the President not to act alone, and the American people spoke clearly in last November's election, but the President forged ahead anyway.

Now, in order to preserve our Nation's longstanding system of checks and balances to preserve the very order of our Constitution, the House will act to rein in President Obama's plans for executive amnesty.

We will vote on legislation, which I was proud to cosponsor, written by my Alabama colleague, Congressman ROBERT ADERHOLT, which would prevent the President from carrying out his plans for executive amnesty.

Let me be clear: this is tough legislation which completely eliminates all funds for implementation of the President's illegal actions. The bill has the support of many leading voices in the immigration debate including my home State Senator, JEFF SESSIONS.

Just as important, the legislation makes clear that no Federal benefits can be granted to any alien as a result of the policies defunded and also eliminates funds to consider new, renewal, or previously-denied applications for executive amnesty.

The legislation doesn't just defund the President's executive action. The legislation paves the way for stronger border security by increasing funds for border agents, detention beds, and enforcement activities.

In order to halt illegal immigration in this country, we must stop encouraging illegal immigration by offering amnesty and instead put more attention on actually securing our borders.

I wish this legislation wasn't necessary. I wish President Obama had listened to the American people and enforced our current laws instead of continuing his my-way-or-the-highway style of governing; instead, he moved ahead with action that clearly violates our Constitution and has poisoned the well for serious conversation on immigration reform.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Madam Speaker, I must ask a simple question that has very serious consequences: When will it stop? When will President Obama stop issuing short-sighted executive action and instead work together with this Congress to find long-term solutions to the real issues plaguing our country?

I fear that the answer to that question is not promising, given that while we were on this floor taking our oath of office, the White House was busy issuing veto threats.

I understand that the legislative process may not be convenient for the President, but the process exists for a reason. The Congress makes the laws, and the President should enforce them. This President just doesn't get that.

This week, the House will act to rein in the President once again. We will attempt to right the scales of power and restore our constitutional system of checks and balances.

We cannot and we will not sit back idly and allow the President to act alone. We promised the American people we would respond, and this week, we will hold true to our word.

CELEBRATING THE SAN ANTONIO SPURS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, today is a special day for San Antonio because our San Antonio Spurs are being recognized at the White House for their victorious season. We have, of course, already had many a celebration in San Antonio, but it is good to see this celebration now reaching 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Congratulations to the San Antonio Spurs on this fifth amazing championship ring.

Serving here in Congress as a representative for much of San Antonio, including the very place in the Alamo City where the Spurs have scored so many of these victories, I know that nothing defines the Spurs or San Antonio like the teamwork, the determination, and the positive attitude they displayed on this trail to the 2014 championship victory. These values are shown through the Spurs' "Silver and Black Give Back"; a community and outreach program which has benefited over 250,000 children and coaches in the past couple of decades, all this in a city that is overflowing with Spurs enthusiasm and Spurs fans.

I would have to say that all of San Antonio knows that the Spurs are certainly no Mavericks at basketball; they are well-seasoned, team players. They were able to rain down Thunder on all of their 2014 opponents with a regular season record of 62 wins out of 82 games. And that is not all that set the Spurs apart; they are true Trailblazers, hiring the first female assistant coach in the NBA, Becky Hammon.

Overall, when it came down to that fifth ring, the Spurs, a team that lives in our Texas temperatures, were able to beat the Heat with a cool 4-1 series blowout.

Like San Antonio itself, the Spurs have attracted the best and brightest from all over the world. There never has been, and there never will be, a team quite like the San Antonio Spurs in a city that is like no other.

Congratulations to a dynasty. Like so many of my constituents, I am ready for the "Race for Seis!"

THE FRENCH FIGHT BACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, around 11 a.m. on January 7, on a cold winter day in Paris, France, two men armed with AK-47s forced a woman entering the offices of a French newspaper to let them in.

After murdering the security guard in the lobby, they ran up to the second floor and shouted, "Where is Charb? Where is Charb?" Charb is the nickname for the newspaper's editor, Mr. Charbonnier.

Over the next 5 minutes, the two men would seek out and execute Mr. Charbonnier and 10 other people in the newspaper. They left the building, shouting the Islamic phrase, "Allah Akbar" or "God is the greatest." They then murdered a policeman, ran back to their car, shouting, "We have revenge the Prophet Muhammad."

You see, Madam Speaker, these killers murdered because the paper exercised the human right of free speech and a free press. The assassin brothers were on the run for 2 days, but on January 9, the police cornered them at a standoff near the Paris airport. The police rescued a hostage, and the brothers were killed, going out just like they wanted to, in a massive firefight as martyrs.

On the same day, another gunman, but an accomplice of the two brothers, took hostages at a kosher grocery store on the east side of Paris. Police stormed the grocery store and killed the terrorist, but not before he had murdered Jewish hostages.

You see, Madam Speaker, these three killed because people disagreed with them. They killed the Jews because they were Jews. They killed the people at the newspaper because they had the audacity to print things that these folks—these terrorists—did not approve of.

The French authorities did a superb job hunting down and killing these terrorists. The two brothers responsible for the initial attack have a history of terrorist activities. One brother said he even dreamed of killing Jews in France.

Hours before one of them met his Maker, they called a French TV sta-

tion, saying, "We are telling you that we are defenders of the Prophet—peace and blessings be upon him—and that I was sent by al Qaeda in Yemen and that I went there, and it is the imam al-Awlaki that financed me."

Yes, Madam Speaker, we have heard this before, young people traveling overseas where they meet radical Islamic jihadists who preach hate and murder in the name of religion.

□ 1215

They are indoctrinated and infected with the cancer of radical Islam and sent back to their home country to inflict terror and kill men, women, and children. They kill in the name of their radical religious beliefs.

We are even seeing this in the United States. Groups like ISIS are encouraging Americans to join their reign of terror. Americans who travel overseas to fight with ISIS are not coming back home to America to open coffee shops. They are coming back to do mischief and kill us.

That is why I have introduced and reintroduced the FTO Passport Revocation Act that would authorize the revocation or denial of passports to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations. The Benedict Arnold traitors who turn against America and join the ranks of foreign radical terrorist organizations should lose their rights. This bill will help law enforcement locate these individuals by preventing them from traveling internationally so they can be captured and brought to justice. Most importantly, this legislation will prevent traitor Americans from entering the United States undetected.

Madam Speaker, the French people held a solidarity rally in honor of the murdered. It was also a statement of freedom. Some estimated over 2 million attended the rally in Paris. Marching arm in arm with French President Hollande were 40 world leaders, including German Chancellor Merkel, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu, and Palestinian President Abbas.

Unfortunately, the United States President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State did not choose to show up and support this solidarity meeting. That is unfortunate. The French are a close ally and our oldest ally. We have a portrait of the great Frenchman Lafayette in this very Chamber across the way from George Washington.

Freedom is under attack by these terrorists. They are a threat to civilization, order, and liberty. The United States should be more outspoken in our support for the French people and our opposition to terror. We should support our allies like the French and mourn when they mourn and be resolved to track terrorists down anywhere in the world where they are. They are at war with us, Madam Speaker.

The French Prime Minister said it best:

We are fighting a war, not a war against religion, not a war of civilizations, but to defend our values, which are universal. It is a war against terrorism and radical Islam, against everything that aims to shatter solidarity, liberty, and brotherhood.

And that is just the way it is.

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL BOONDOGGLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, today I once again will speak about California's high-speed rail system.

Now, just this last week, they had a symbolic groundbreaking for this system in the context of getting started. California has been, since 2008, anticipating the start of high-speed rail. What do we have instead? Empty promises, a lot of waste, and a lot of money going down the tubes.

What we see is that when the plan was first put in place, the voters of California approved a \$33 billion link from Los Angeles to San Francisco. What they are now being given is something that has tripled in price. What they have now been given at this groundbreaking, which is symbolic, what you saw was a mound of dirt with about an 8-foot section of ties and rails on that. That is very symbolic for those doing the groundbreaking, but also for those of us that will be paying for it.

What this high-speed rail system will turn into is several links of rail between north and south California that aren't linked up, that have no way to power them, and no trains will be running on them for several years.

So instead of the \$33 billion plan that they saw on the ballot in 2008—which, by the way, it was on the 2006 ballot and, before that, on the 2004 ballot, but those involved knew that they would have, politically, a hard time selling that to people in California—it has ballooned to a \$100-billion plan until they revise it again downwards by taking away part of the high-speed system in San Francisco and L.A., where they will instead be using local transit to link to the center section that runs through central California.

That is not even legal under Prop 1A. What Prop 1A spells out is that it has to be a high-speed system that will make it from San Francisco to L.A. or reverse in 2½ hours at speeds of 220 miles per hour. This promise will not be upheld.

Now, why is this important to a national audience, to Members of Congress, and to people in other States? It is because, after the stimulus package was passed in 2009–2010, some of that Federal money is going to go for the

high-speed rail system in California. Indeed, several other States were recipients of those initial grants. After they looked at their own ideas for high-speed rail and saw the costs involved and the infeasibility, they turned that money back into that pot of money. California, of course, stepped forward and said: Hey, give us all of that money. So they have received, at this point, about \$3.5 billion that they can spend, dollar for dollar, for the bond money they spend themselves, the State money.

So what that means for Americans is that we know Californians will be back at the Federal well once again trying to get more money for their high-speed plan. What we see is that their downsized plan will still cost \$68 billion. They only have identified \$13 billion for the whole system. No private sector money—which is what we were told when the ballot measure passed—has stepped forward to be part of this. The plan is \$55 billion short. The Federal Government, so far, has offered about 3½. Did they think they would get the other 52 from the Federal Government since no private sector money wants to come forward for this? Will they get it out of the California taxpayers? Nobody knows.

Indeed, the Governor, at the groundbreaking the other day, said: Don't worry about the money; we will get it. Well, part of their measure has been to impose a cap-and-trade program on the people of California which so far has generated about \$250 million per year. At that rate, it will be how many centuries before they can catch up and get enough money just to pay for high-speed rail which cap-and-trade wasn't even intended for anyway?

Folks, we have a giant problem here. High-speed rail in California should not be the Federal taxpayers' burden. It shouldn't even be the people of California's burden. They barely passed it by 52–48 percent on that 2008 ballot after two previous ballot delays. Delay, delay, delay is what you see with this system.

So what really needs to happen is the people of California need to step forward, put this back on the ballot, and have a vote once again on this. And the Federal Government doesn't need to be giving signals that they are going to send even more money for this boondoggle which has been failed, flawed, and deceptive since day one.

Madam Speaker, it is a massively flawed project that leaves taxpayers at all levels on the hook for many, many years to come for something that may not even run in our lifetime. So we, as Federal legislators, need to put a stop to any idea—as my colleagues have been doing—for more money to go forward for high-speed rail. And we need the people of California to wake up to that idea and demand that it be placed back on the ballot, this money go in-

stead for other projects that could be helpful for their transportation corridors, for their highway system, and for the normal mode of rail which can be made to be enhanced to drive 125 miles per hour, which would be beneficial.

Madam Speaker, we need to get on the ball and get back to reality on what high-speed rail will really cost Californians and the American taxpayer and urge that it be placed back on the ballot and give the people that choice once again.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As a parent encourages a child or a mentor calls forth the hidden potential of an intern, Lord, our God, may You bless all who work as the 114th Congress, especially new Members.

Remove fear and confusion, wipe away distrust, which only inhibit good judgment and leadership. Strengthen the resolve and compassion of all Members, that they may serve Your people with renewed clarity of vision and refined purpose that will soon unify this Nation in self-discipline and confidence, for You reward the just and their deeds.

Bless all Members this day, O God, and be with them and with us all in every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ISRAEL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IMMIGRATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as the granddaughter of Italian immigrants, I am thankful America has always opened her arms to people looking to build a better way for themselves and their families. However, breaking the law to enter the United States should not be rewarded.

Well, that is exactly what President Obama is doing by granting amnesty to millions of illegal aliens through executive actions. President Obama does not have the legal authority to legislate, and his unilateral actions on immigration are a blatant overreach of his constitutionally-granted executive authority.

It is also wrong to short-circuit the American immigration process in this manner when there are so many individuals who have waited years for the opportunity to come to this country the right way.

This week, the House will take action to defund President Obama's unconstitutional executive actions on immigration. It is the responsibility of Congress to pursue reforms and ensure a strong immigration policy is arrived at through consensus, and we should begin by securing our borders.

DO NOT HOLD THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HOSTAGE TO A POLITICAL AGENDA

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in France has put us all on notice that the threat of terror is strong and we must be prepared. We need to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is ready, willing, and able to

detect and stop what happened in France from happening here.

Shockingly, this week, Republicans, rather than taking steps to strengthen the DHS, will take steps to actually weaken it. They will do so by holding the Department hostage to their politics on immigration.

They will offer five amendments to politicize the DHS at a time when we need it to be its professional best. They have placed their ideological agenda ahead of paychecks. Now, they are placing their ideological agenda ahead of our protection.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to pass an immigration bill, pass one. If they want to politicize issues, do it on another issue, but not the Department of Homeland Security. Do not jeopardize the safety of the American people with a political stunt and not this week, after terrorists murdered innocent civilians in France. Do not hold the DHS hostage to a political agenda.

They are saying that this is a political compromise. I understand political compromise, but the homeland security of my constituents and the American people should never be the subject of a political compromise.

THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a majority of Americans support building the Keystone pipeline to create jobs and strengthen our energy independence; yet President Obama threatens to block this critical project. The most environmentally secure means to transport oil is by pipeline.

This pipeline means hundreds of permanent jobs in South Carolina's Second Congressional District, where companies like Michelin Tire Corporation in Lexington and MTU America in Graniteville produce the earthmover tires and engines used for Canadian oil sand development; also, the Colonial pipeline to North Augusta reduces gas prices for consumers locally.

Last week, in a bipartisan vote, the House passed a bill to approve the Keystone pipeline. I hope the President will support the priorities of the American people rather than cater to a generous campaign donor.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to America's first ally, France, over the terrorist attacks last week. Our solidarity with France is clear with the portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette gratefully placed in the House Chamber as one of only two portraits in this room.

NEBRASKA'S INDEPENDENT TRADITION OF GOVERNING

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Nebraska's independent tradition of governing. In Nebraska, we do things a little differently. We have the only nonpartisan unicameral legislature in the Nation, a body that I proudly served in for 16 years, as did my good friends Senator DEB FISCHER and Congressman ADRIAN SMITH.

In Lincoln, legislators are not bound by political parties but by the needs of their constituents; rather than provide partisan sound bites, members of the unicameral provide solutions forged through compromise and collaboration.

We need more of this tradition in Washington, and I hope to bring Nebraska common sense to this body. We need to find more ways to come together and solve our Nation's problems. The American people do not want dogged partisanship. They want us to work together to get real results that help make their everyday lives better.

I have pledged to be an independent, pragmatic voice for my constituents to responsibly tackle the difficult issues facing our country and to do so in a bipartisan manner. I hope that my colleagues will follow Nebraska's example.

HONORING COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY—PUEBLO'S NATIONAL CHAMPION THUNDERWOLVES

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Colorado State University—Pueblo ThunderWolves men's football team and their coach, John Wristen. In their trip to the NCAA Division II National Finals this year, the ThunderWolves claimed their first national football championship in school history.

The ThunderWolves squared off against Minnesota State, who were undefeated for the season. With grit and a stout defense, the Wolf Pack shut out the Mavericks by a score of 13-0.

Before the season began, Coach Wristen gave each player a shirt with the letters W-T-L-G, which meant "Win the Last Game." Coach Wristen's dream, when he became head coach of the ThunderWolves 7 years ago, was to win a national championship. Now, the Wolf Pack players and coaches can proudly say they are national champions. The city of Pueblo is proud of the team.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the team and their outstanding coach, John Wristen, for the stellar season and

championship. With Coach Wristen's leadership and the team's tireless commitment to winning, they captured their first football championship and are solidifying the ThunderWolves program's legacy of excellence.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, after last week's horrific attacks in France, we are reminded that the threat of terrorism is very real. The Department of Homeland Security is on the front line of protecting our Nation from terrorist threats.

House Republicans are using the funding for DHS for political posturing rather than governing. The President has prioritized on how our national security dollars are spent. He focused DHS' tools and resources on preventing terrorist threats and protecting the American people.

Republicans continue to play political games with immigration reform, and now, they are bringing forward a series of amendments to pick a fight with the President. The political games that the Republicans are playing with this bill would jeopardize our national security. We need an appropriations bill that ensures that DHS has the resources and tools they need to protect America.

We must pass a strong bipartisan Homeland Security Appropriations bill that keeps America safe and protects our country.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, Americans watching this debate must be shaking their heads in astonishment. The question on everyone's mind at this moment is: Are we doing everything we can to prevent a Paris-like terrorist attack in the United States?

Americans would be right to suppose the Republican majority is rushing to finally adequately fund the Department of Homeland Security after they already delayed funding by making it a political football on immigration; but, no, it seems the Republicans can't help themselves, even when it comes to national security.

They can't simply vote for the necessary funding to keep the American people safe; instead, the Republicans view this potentially dangerous moment as an opportunity to undermine the President's executive actions on immigration going all the way back to 2011, putting 600,000 young people in

jeopardy of deportation and refusing to let the government prioritize for deportation felons over families.

Shame on them. We should stop playing games with our national security by defeating these amendments and passing a clean Homeland Security funding bill.

LET'S NOT PLAY POLITICS WITH HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security is about keeping our Nation and our citizens safe.

Just as we fund the military to face threats abroad, Department of Homeland Security does that work to keep our communities safe at home. Now is not the time to play politics with our immigration laws as if it is a child's toy. If you want to talk immigration, let's talk immigration.

We have a plan. The Senate passed a bipartisan plan with more than two-thirds support last session. Let's see some ideas about resolving our broken immigration system.

The President's step is an important first step to keep our communities safer, by focusing our limited enforcement resources on criminals who represent a threat to our community.

Do you want to undo that and instead use our enforcement resources to go after kids and families rather than criminals? That makes our communities less safe rather than more.

Let's not play politics with Homeland Security. Pass a clean bill, and tackle the immigration issue.

THE HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BILL

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise my concerns about the upcoming Homeland Security funding bill.

The tragedies in Paris reinforce how critical it is that we keep DHS strong and appropriately financed. Unfortunately, the majority leadership has decided to play politics with our national security. The appropriations package is littered with amendments which would undermine what little progress we have made to our broken immigration system.

Our family business just lost one of our most valuable employees, Cesar Arias. He may have originally come to Virginia without proper papers, but in the Reagan years, he found a way to stay here, raise his family, and open and close our store 6 days a week for

more than 20 years. Cesar is one small, powerful example among millions of new Americans who have helped our economy grow and kept our democracy strong. He believed it was long past time for comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Republicans to bring a clean bill to the floor without the anti-immigrant amendments. We need to invest in homeland security, and we need a real conversation about immigration reform.

THE HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING BILL

(Ms. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are just 1 week into this Congress and the Republican majority promised bipartisanship, especially on homeland security, the security of our homeland, yet, oh, no, it is politics as usual from Republicans now politicizing the Department of Homeland Security and its important funding at this time when we know around the world, and especially in France, which has felt so poignantly what happens when we don't pay attention to security. But here they are.

They are mad at the President. Why? Because the President did what other Presidents have done, taking executive action on immigration. And so they are mad at the President, and Republicans are now going to punish the American people by not protecting our homeland. Well, shame on the Republican Party for politicizing the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get to business. The American people expect that, and the Republicans, if they plan to govern, need to do it and pass a clean bill funding our Department of Homeland Security and take care of our homeland. This is what the American people expect, and it is what the Republican Party needs to deliver if they want to govern.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1706

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CLAY HUNT SUICIDE PREVENTION FOR AMERICAN VETERANS ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 203) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 203

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act” or the “Clay Hunt SAV Act”.

SEC. 2. EVALUATIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) EVALUATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1709B. Evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs

“(a) EVALUATIONS.—(1) Not less frequently than once during each period specified in paragraph (3), the Secretary shall provide for the conduct of an evaluation of the mental health care and suicide prevention programs carried out under the laws administered by the Secretary.

“(2) Each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) use metrics that are common among and useful for practitioners in the field of mental health care and suicide prevention;

“(B) identify the most effective mental health care and suicide prevention programs conducted by the Secretary, including such programs conducted at a Center of Excellence;

“(C) identify the cost-effectiveness of each program identified under subparagraph (B);

“(D) measure the satisfaction of patients with respect to the care provided under each such program; and

“(E) propose best practices for caring for individuals who suffer from mental health disorders or are at risk of suicide, including such practices conducted or suggested by other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, including the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

“(3) The periods specified in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The period beginning on the date on which the Secretary awards the contract under paragraph (4) and ending on September 30, 2018.

“(B) Each fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 2018.

“(4) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with an independent third party unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct evaluations under paragraph (1).

“(5) The independent third party that is awarded the contract under paragraph (4) shall submit to the Secretary each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

“(b) ANNUAL SUBMISSION.—Not later than December 1, 2018, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains the following:

“(1) The most recent evaluations submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a)(5) that the Secretary has not previously submitted to such Committees.

“(2) Any recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1709A the following new item:

“1709B. Evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs.”.

(b) INTERIM REPORTS.—Not later than September 30 of each of 2016 and 2017, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the independent third party awarded a contract by the Secretary pursuant to section 1709B(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall submit to the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the mental health care and suicide prevention programs carried out under the laws administered by the Secretary that includes, with respect to each such program, the following:

(1) A description of the program.

(2) The number of veterans served by the program.

(3) The budget of the program.

(4) The number of full-time equivalent employees assigned to the program.

(5) Whether veterans may repeat participation in the program or participate in the program in addition to other similar programs.

(6) Any study results or research published regarding the efficacy of the program.

(7) Any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF INTERNET WEBSITE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION REGARDING MENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Using funds made available to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to publish the Internet websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary shall survey the existing Internet websites and information resources of the Department to publish an Internet website that serves as a centralized source to provide veterans with information regarding all of the mental health care services provided by the Secretary.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The Internet website published under subsection (a) shall provide to veterans information regarding all of the mental health care services available in the

Veteran Integrated Service Network that the veteran is seeking such services, including, with respect to each medical center, Vet Center (as defined in section 1712A of title 38, United States Code), and community-based outpatient center in the Veterans Integrated Service Network—

(1) the name and contact information of each social work office;

(2) the name and contact information of each mental health clinic;

(3) a list of appropriate staff; and

(4) any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) UPDATED INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the information described in subsection (b) that is published on the Internet website under subsection (a) is updated not less than once every 90 days.

(d) OUTREACH.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the outreach conducted under section 1720F(i) of title 38, United States Code, includes information regarding the Internet website published under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REPAYMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LOANS FOR CERTAIN PSYCHIATRISTS OF VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to repay loans of individuals described in subsection (b) that—

(1) were used by such individuals to finance education relating to psychiatric medicine, including education leading to—

(A) a degree of doctor of medicine; or

(B) a degree of doctor of osteopathy; and

(2) were obtained from any of the following:

(A) A governmental entity.

(B) A private financial institution.

(C) A school.

(D) Any other authorized entity as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), an individual eligible for participation in the pilot program is an individual who—

(A) either—

(i) is licensed or eligible for licensure to practice psychiatric medicine in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

(ii) is enrolled in the final year of a residency program leading to a specialty qualification in psychiatric medicine that is approved by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education; and

(B) demonstrates a commitment to a long-term career as a psychiatrist in the Veterans Health Administration, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) PROHIBITION ON SIMULTANEOUS ELIGIBILITY.—An individual who is participating in any other program of the Federal Government that repays the educational loans of the individual is not eligible to participate in the pilot program.

(c) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select not less than 10 individuals described in subsection (b) to participate in the pilot program for each year in which the Secretary carries out the pilot program.

(d) PERIOD OF OBLIGATED SERVICE.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each individual selected under subsection (c) in which such individual agrees to serve a period of 2 or more years of obligated service for the Veterans Health Administration in the field of psychiatric medicine, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) LOAN REPAYMENTS.—

(1) AMOUNTS.—Subject to paragraph (2), a loan repayment under this section may consist of payment of the principal, interest,

and related expenses of a loan obtained by an individual who is participating in the pilot program for all educational expenses (including tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses) of such individual relating to education described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) **LIMIT.**—For each year of obligated service that an individual who is participating in the pilot program agrees to serve under subsection (d), the Secretary may pay not more than \$30,000 in loan repayment on behalf of such individual.

(f) **BREACH.**—

(1) **LIABILITY.**—An individual who participates in the pilot program and fails to satisfy the period of obligated service under subsection (d) shall be liable to the United States, in lieu of such obligated service, for the amount that has been paid or is payable to or on behalf of the individual under the pilot program, reduced by the proportion that the number of days served for completion of the period of obligated service bears to the total number of days in the period of obligated service of such individual.

(2) **REPAYMENT PERIOD.**—Any amount of damages that the United States is entitled to recover under this subsection shall be paid to the United States not later than 1 year after the date of the breach of the agreement.

(g) **REPORT.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the pilot program under subsection (a) commences, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The number of individuals who participated in the pilot program, including the number of new hires.

(B) The locations in which such individuals were employed by the Department, including how many such locations were rural or urban locations.

(C) An assessment of the quality of the work performed by such individuals in the course of such employment, including the performance reviews of such individuals.

(D) The number of psychiatrists the Secretary determines is needed by the Department in the future.

(3) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the pilot program terminates under subsection (i), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives an update to the report submitted under paragraph (1) and any recommendations that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section, including standards for qualified loans and authorized payees and other terms and conditions for the making of loan repayments.

(i) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to carry out the pilot program shall expire on the date that is 3 years after the date on which the Secretary commences the pilot program.

SEC. 5. PILOT PROGRAM ON COMMUNITY OUTREACH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a pilot program to assist veterans transitioning from serving on active duty and to improve the access of veterans to mental health services.

(b) **LOCATIONS.**—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) at

not less than five Veterans Integrated Service Networks that have a large population of veterans who—

(1) served in the reserve components of the Armed Forces; or

(2) are transitioning into communities with an established population of veterans after having recently separated from the Armed Forces.

(c) **FUNCTIONS.**—The pilot program at each Veterans Integrated Service Network described in subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) A community oriented veteran peer support network, carried out in partnership with an appropriate entity with experience in peer support programs, that—

(A) establishes peer support training guidelines;

(B) develops a network of veteran peer support counselors to meet the demands of the communities in the Veterans Integrated Service Network;

(C) conducts training of veteran peer support counselors;

(D) with respect to one medical center selected by the Secretary in each such Veterans Integrated Service Network, has—

(i) a designated peer support specialist who acts as a liaison to the community oriented veteran peer network; and

(ii) a certified mental health professional designated as the community oriented veteran peer network mentor; and

(E) is readily available to veterans, including pursuant to the Veterans Integrated Service Network cooperating and working with State and local governments and appropriate entities.

(2) A community outreach team for each medical center selected by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(D) that—

(A) assists veterans transitioning into communities;

(B) establishes a veteran transition advisory group to facilitate outreach activities;

(C) includes the participation of appropriate community organizations, State and local governments, colleges and universities, chambers of commerce and other local business organizations, and organizations that provide legal aid or advice; and

(D) coordinates with the Veterans Integrated Service Network regarding the Veterans Integrated Service Network carrying out an annual mental health summit to assess the status of veteran mental health care in the community and to develop new or innovative means to provide mental health services to veterans.

(d) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the pilot program under subsection (a) commences, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program. With respect to each Veterans Integrated Service Network described in subsection (b), the report shall include—

(A) a full description of the peer support model implemented under the pilot program, participation data, and data pertaining to past and current mental health related hospitalizations and fatalities;

(B) recommendations on implementing peer support networks throughout the Department;

(C) whether the mental health resources made available under the pilot program for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces is effective; and

(D) a full description of the activities and effectiveness of community outreach coordi-

nating teams under the pilot program, including partnerships that have been established with appropriate entities.

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the pilot program terminates under subsection (e), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives an update to the report submitted under paragraph (1).

(e) **CONSTRUCTION.**—This section may not be construed to authorize the Secretary to hire additional employees of the Department to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a).

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The authority of the Secretary to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date on which the pilot program commences.

SEC. 6. COLLABORATION ON SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND NON-PROFIT MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **COLLABORATION.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may collaborate with non-profit mental health organizations to prevent suicide among veterans as follows:

(1) To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of suicide prevention efforts carried out by the Secretary and non-profit mental health organizations.

(2) To assist non-profit mental health organizations with the suicide prevention efforts of such organizations through the use of the expertise of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(3) To jointly carry out suicide prevention efforts.

(b) **EXCHANGE OF RESOURCES.**—In carrying out any collaboration under subsection (a), the Secretary and any non-profit mental health organization with which the Secretary is collaborating under such subsection shall exchange training sessions and best practices to help with the suicide prevention efforts of the Department and such organization.

(c) **DIRECTOR OF SUICIDE PREVENTION COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall select within the Department a Director of Suicide Prevention Coordination to undertake any collaboration with non-profit mental health organizations under this section or any other provision of law.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY FOR HEALTH CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS OF COMBAT SERVICE DURING CERTAIN PERIODS OF HOSTILITIES AND WAR.

Paragraph (3) of section 1710(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(3) In the case of care for a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D), hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care may be provided under or by virtue of subsection (a)(2)(F) only during the following periods:

“(A) Except as provided by subparagraph (B), with respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D) who is discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service after January 27, 2003, the five-year period beginning on the date of such discharge or release.

“(B) With respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D) who is discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2011, but did not enroll to receive such hospital care, medical services, or nursing home care pursuant to such paragraph during the five-year period described in subparagraph (A), the one-year period beginning

on the date of the enactment of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act.

“(C) With respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D) who is discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service on or before January 27, 2003, and did not enroll in the patient enrollment system under section 1705 of this title on or before such date, the three-year period beginning on January 27, 2008.”.

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise made available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. This bill was introduced by my good friend and a very important member of the Veterans Affairs' Committee, Congressman TIM WALZ from Minnesota. I am honored to join him and Congresswoman TAMMY DUCKWORTH from Illinois as an original cosponsor of this legislation. I am also grateful for the support of several of our military veterans' service organizations, including the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Officers Association of America, and the Wounded Warrior Project.

H.R. 203 is named after a true American hero, Clay Hunt. Clay was a Marine Corps veteran who served honorably in both Afghanistan and Iraq, where he was wounded in battle. Clay returned home grappling with posttraumatic stress disorder but refused to let his personal struggles prevent him from devoting his time to humanitarian work and advocacy on behalf of his fellow veterans. However, in March of 2011, at just 28 years of age, Clay took his own life.

With an average of 22 veterans committing suicide each day, Clay was far from alone in his pain, and his family and friends are far from alone in their heartbreak over his loss. The last several years have seen significant increases in the Department of Veterans

Affairs' mental health and suicide prevention budget, staff, and programs; however, we have not seen a corresponding decrease in the number of our Nation's heroes who take their own lives. What is more, for some groups of veterans, including female veterans and veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, suicide rates are actually getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to do more to help these veterans access the supportive services and mental health care that they need to save their lives. With the passage of H.R. 203, we will.

To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of VA programs and increase awareness of available services, H.R. 203 would require an annual third-party evaluation of VA's mental health care and suicide prevention programs and require that VA publish an interactive Web site to serve as a central source of information regarding VA mental health services.

To increase VA's capacity to meet the mental health care needs of our veterans, it would establish a pilot program that would repay education loans for individuals who have received a degree in psychiatric medicine and who agree to work at the VA for at least 2 years.

To create a seamless transition from Active Duty to veteran status and increased community support for those in need, it would establish another pilot program to assist veterans during transition and require VA to collaborate with nonprofit mental health organizations in the community.

Importantly, H.R. 203 would extend an additional 1 year of eligibility for VA health care services for certain combat veterans who have not yet enrolled and whose 5-year combat eligibility period recently expired.

Before I yield, I want to take a moment to once again express my condolences to Clay's family and friends as well as the families and friends of our honored veterans who have lost their lives to suicide. I want to offer them my personal commitment to continue the aggressive pursuit to end veteran suicide.

The passage of this bill today is just the first in what will be a continuing series of legislative and oversight efforts that our committee is going to undertake throughout the 114th Congress to improve access to mental health care for veterans in need, increase the efficiency and effectiveness of VA's mental health and suicide prevention programs, and increase meaningful partnerships with community providers who are often the first line of defense for their struggling veterans and the families of those veterans.

This bill, which passed the House last Congress, will not single-handedly halt the scourge of veteran suicide, but it is an important step, and it is a step that we owe Clay and those like him who

desperately need and certainly deserve our help.

With that, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 203.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. This legislation passed the House last month in the closing days of the 113th Congress. I am pleased that we were able to act on this measure as one of the first items of business in the 114th Congress.

Providing the mental health care that veterans need and effectively dealing with the crisis of veteran suicides have been longstanding concerns of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. War is indeed terrible, and the effects of combat and service on our veterans lasts a lifetime. For far too long, society—and the military culture itself—has acted as if the need for mental health care treatment is a weakness and has discouraged adequate treatment. This attitude is changing, but it cannot change fast enough. In the area of mental health for our veterans and returning servicemembers, there is no easy answer or quick fix.

I appreciate the work of my friend from Minnesota, TIM WALZ; Chairman MILLER; and all of my colleagues on the committee in fashioning a bill that I believe will make a difference in the lives of our veterans.

H.R. 203 takes a number of important steps, including improving the safety net for at-risk veterans, while also introducing some accountability into the VA mental health care and suicide prevention program, using a third-party evaluation. It will provide veterans with a Web site that will serve as a centralized source of information on mental health services.

H.R. 203 initiates a program to help address some of the glaring mental health personnel shortages at the VA. While the incentives in this bill are limited to the psychiatry field, I would like to see this effort expanded in the future to all the mental health professional shortfalls.

□ 1715

H.R. 203 would expand peer support networks, which we have heard are quite effectively used. And I believe the reporting requirement in this bill will confirm that additional resources should be permanently dedicated to fully utilizing peer support.

H.R. 203 would also provide an additional window of eligibility for combat veterans who may have missed the window of opportunity to sign up for VA health care. This extra time will help to ensure that veterans receive the health care, including mental health care, that they need.

I thank the chairman for working to bring this bill up quickly so that the

House can act and send this important measure to the Senate. I look forward to working with Chairman MILLER, and with Florida being the State with the second-largest population of veterans and the most senior population, I know that the committee will do a good job having two of the leadership team from Florida.

But let me be clear: there are 435 Members of Congress, and each of them have veterans in their district, and we will work to make sure that all veterans get the care that they have earned and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the new ranking member for her words. I look forward to working with her on legislation in the future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Second District of Indiana, from Elkhart, Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I am grateful to be here today to support the Clay Hunt SAV Act.

Every day, 22 veterans take their own lives. We have all experienced this in our districts; I have as well.

On March 31, 2011, Clay Hunt was one of those 22 veterans that day who took his own life. Today, we honor Clay and his family with the Clay Hunt SAV Act.

Clay's story was one of bravery and dedication. He relied on the VA for care and received a 30 percent disability rating for PTSD brought on during his service. He appealed the rating and encountered a bureaucratic nightmare.

Clay had to wait months to see a psychiatrist at a VA Medical Center. Two weeks later, Clay took his own life.

Five weeks after his death and 18 months after filing an appeal with the VA for his PTSD rating, his appeal was approved.

Clay's story details the urgency that our Nation's heroes deserve. The Clay Hunt SAV Act will increase access to mental health care and improve the quality of care troops and veterans receive.

Together, we can change this system so that no other veteran ever has to endure what thousands of veterans have already gone through, including Clay.

I am honored to stand here today and am grateful to my colleagues. I urge support for this legislation.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 16½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for your support of this important piece of legislation.

As you heard, we are here once again. We had a piece of legislation that attempted to, as I think the chairman spoke about, address an issue that cuts to the heart and the soul of this Nation: When our warriors come home, how can we reintegrate them?

And I think it is important, and I want to thank the chairman, one, for working so diligently on many numerous issues, but on this piece of legislation, and for bringing it back up again, but I think also for setting an example.

The Nation expects us to do what is right by our warriors. They expect us to work together to find solutions. Something that we do in the committee is looking and seeing where we can improve and pointing out where there are faults.

But that is not good enough. Pointing out the faults is one thing, and it is important. Finding solutions is what really matters, and this piece of legislation, I think, starts to do that.

To my colleagues who are here, I would say this. We can certainly disagree and disagree strongly and passionately. But I think if the public knew and they could feel it and, I think, in this piece of legislation see it, there are many more things that bind us together, and our care and our commitment for our warriors is one of those.

This is a piece of legislation that wasn't just written here in the Halls of Congress. It was written by the families, Susan and Richard Selke, Clay's parents; by the Houghtalings in Minnesota; and the Kellys in New Ulm, Minnesota; and each of these Members that you hear speak about it.

Since we passed this legislation, and it failed in the Senate, over 750 veterans have taken their lives.

Many times down here, we feel like everything we do is the most important thing that needs to happen now. Rarely is that true. In this case, it is.

We can't wait another day. We can't pass this problem forward because it is not only ripping at families, it is ripping at our Nation. These are our best and brightest.

You heard about Clay. Clay's a Marine who went to Iraq. He got shot by a sniper and, as a Marine, that irritated him. It didn't hurt him. He came back. He had his Purple Heart, and he could have come back and taken our thank yous. He didn't. He went to Afghanistan to continue on.

He knew the extremism that was threatening Iraq and Afghanistan would some day threaten this Nation, so he was forward. He did his time.

After he came back, that wasn't enough. He went to Haiti to help. After that, that wasn't enough. He sat in our offices on numerous occasions working on everything from access to the VA to the things you heard the gentlelady talk about in Indiana that were causing frustration amongst our veterans.

And I think for me the thing is, like for so many of us, Clay appeared to have everything. He appeared that he knew and was competent and had it there, but we all know that they have demons, and Clay had demons.

So what this piece of legislation does—you heard the specifics, and it does do specific things, and no one is claiming that this is going to be the fix.

But I would make the case that what the Clay Hunt bill has done and what it has done amongst our partners in the veterans service organizations is made it absolutely clear we will not leave anyone behind. We will not turn a blind eye to this, and we will not rest until we at least make the attempt to get that number down to zero. We may never get there, but this piece of legislation starts to address it.

So I think it is important, and I want to thank the ranking member for being on this bill and putting it forward, and the chairman, who was an original author of this and has been instrumental in making it happen.

What we are doing here is not just passing legislation. What we are doing here is changing the attitudes, focusing the Nation's attention on this, because I don't care if it is Elkhart, Indiana, if it is Pensacola, Florida, or if it is Mankato, Minnesota.

When we go to talk to our constituents, regardless of their political leanings, they tell us, take care of our warriors, do what is right. Fix the system.

This piece of legislation does that. It does it in a cost-effective, smart manner, and we have got the opportunity to start moving forward.

I would say and encourage my colleagues, let's pass this thing, but let's not see it as an end result of a process we have been working on. Let's see it as the first of many things to try and make changes to be smarter about how we use taxpayer dollars, but also to demand effectiveness, because Clay's parents deserve that. Thousands of others across this Nation deserve that.

The more than 1 million veterans that will return over the next few years are counting on us to put everything in place to provide that help.

So I encourage my colleagues, support this legislation. I encourage my colleagues, take this as an example.

I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader MCCARTHY for making it a priority. I think it speaks volumes. This piece of legislation is on the floor in the first week. That says something, that there is a commitment to getting it right, there is a commitment to working together, and there is a commitment to showing effectiveness for the American people.

So, we have got that opportunity. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, get engaged with what is happening with our veterans, and let's

prove that their service was not in vain, that this democracy is strong, that our commitment to them is unwavering and that, at the end of the day, that is what really matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the opportunity to again tell you about a very important piece of legislation that will help in our fight to improve mental health care for our returning warriors: H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. I'd like to thank the Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, Mr. MILLER, and Rep. DUCKWORTH for continuing to be my partners in this effort. I'd also like to thank Speaker BOEHNER for bringing this to the floor swiftly. And, a big thank you to Senators MCCAIN, BURR, BLUMENTHAL, and ISAKSON for all their work on the SAV Act. Most importantly, I'd like to thank Clay's parents, Susan and Richard Selke. They are holding Congress' feet to the fire to make sure we get this done and to prevent another family from going through what they continue to go through each and every day. We cannot let them down.

H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act, is an example of how we can work together on Capitol Hill. The legislation is named in honor of Iraq and Afghanistan War Veteran and suicide prevention advocate, Clay Hunt. Clay epitomized what it meant to live a life of service, both in and out of uniform. He helped countless veterans overcome their demons but tragically took his own life in March of 2011. The legacy he left behind, however, will live on for generations to come.

The bill you see before you was the result of strong partnerships with our veteran service organizations, strong bipartisan efforts here in Congress, and the resolve of Clay's parents pushing and pushing and pushing to get this thing done. This bill is what you get when you have folks sitting around the table, trusting one another, and working together to get it right for our nation's veterans.

Our premise for this bill was simple: suicide occurs because many vets return to their community and then disconnect from it. So, we wanted to create a bill that would get the communities involved and coordinated. We also knew it would be important to increase both oversight of the VA and their capacity to deal with over a million veterans returning from war.

Specifically, the bill:

1. Establishes a peer support and community outreach pilot program to assist transitioning servicemembers with accessing VA mental health care services.

2. Requires the VA to create a one-stop, interactive website to serve as a centralized source of information regarding all mental health services for veterans.

3. Addresses the shortage of mental health care professionals by authorizing the VA to conduct a student loan repayment pilot program aimed at recruiting and retaining psychiatrists.

4. Requires yearly evaluations—with interim reports due in the first two years and a final report due the third year and every year after—conducted by a third party, of all mental health care and suicide prevention practices and programs at the VA to find out what is

working and what's not working and to make recommendations to improve care. Authorizes a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on the transition of care for PTSD and TBI between the DoD and the VA.

One veteran lost to suicide is one too many. With many of our warriors returning from war, all too often our heroes return only to face a war of their own at home. While there is no bill that will completely end veteran suicide, this bipartisan measure is a step in the right direction. In short, it's a start towards fixing a problem, but we must not lose focus on this problem after passing this bill. We must continue working to improve care for our veterans. I urge my colleagues to support this measure so that we can send it over to the Senate and onto the President swiftly.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), a new member of the committee, who, in his first week, has already jumped in with both feet. Mr. COSTELLO has been to my office and started looking closely at the oversight agenda that we have.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to express my support of Congressman TIM WALZ's Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act.

It is a privilege to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and in this Congress, to work to improve the quality of life for our Nation's veterans, their families, and their caregivers.

In the coming months, I look forward to working in a bipartisan, commonsense manner with dedicated Members and veterans like my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) to find solutions to help our Nation's veterans transition to civilian life.

One of the most critical areas that we as a committee and Congress must work to establish is comprehensive, timely, responsive, and effective mental health care services for our post-9/11 veterans, many of whom have served our country for multiple deployments in conditions not witnessed or experienced by any other generation of soldier.

This bill first prioritizes bringing accountability to the VA. By bringing in a third party to conduct an annual evaluation within the Department of Veterans Affairs, we can better provide agency accountability by doing just this.

Second, we must provide better access to mental health services for our veterans and their families. This bill does just that.

Finally, it helps facilitate and increase awareness for peer and community support providers for our veterans and their families.

This commonsense legislation works towards those priorities of providing an accountable and supportive VA for our

veterans, in furtherance of helping veterans get the best treatment possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation to promote mental health support for our Nation's heroes and thank Congressman WALZ for his leadership on this important legislation.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate and wonderful statement of two distinguished Members of Congress, the chairman and ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I associate myself with their words on how crucial this legislation is, and what an important statement the Veterans' Affairs Committee is making: that there is no party affiliation when it comes to saving the lives of our men and women who put on the uniform.

To the author of this bill, Mr. WALZ, as I chatted with him on the floor, I indicated to him that just this weekend I met for hours with two wounded warriors, both of them having experience with PTSD, both of them being challenged about the transition into civilian life, both of them knowing of this legislation, feeling left out and deprived that it did not, despite the valiant effort of this House, pass in the last Congress.

So let me congratulate all of you for recognizing that this is a crucial, life-saving element of the men and women that we stand and admire and love. Every day, 22 veterans take their lives, but it is 8,000 a year.

And if I might say, Texas walks alongside of Florida and other States in having the highest number of returning vets. Two million served in Iraq and Afghanistan across the Nation. Now, one-third, 600,000, have experienced traumatic brain injury and PTSD.

From the early years of working with then-Chairman and Ranking Member Murtha, I was privileged to bring \$1 million to my district for PTSD, but that is not the heart of it.

The bleeding and the sorrow of these men and women is not befitting of the service and the uniform that they put on. Not one moment should they wait at a veterans hospital for treatment for PTSD that should keep them grounded. Not one moment should they be alone contemplating suicide, without treatment and friends and family having assistance.

This bill makes that statement, H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. It says that you are not alone and that we have put our actions where our words are. We have walked the walk.

So I want to say to those wounded warriors who shared their heart with me, proudly come back and say: This bill is moving, and as it moves to the

United States Senate, this bill is moving. And as we look to the President's desk, a signature will allow this bill to be in place.

To those who missed the deadline, this law will allow you to still be able to receive that treatment because it allows an extended time for those who have missed the deadline.

I know as I go back home to Texas and meet families that they are looking for action when it comes to our beloved veterans and those who have put on the uniform to serve this Nation as they watched their comrades die. This is a bill that says, God bless America.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This is a bill that reflects the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and our wonderful Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

I want to say to my friends at Ellington Field, which is just down the road from my congressional district, and to the many bases across the State of Texas that have amongst their ranks veterans who have served in Active Duty and who are still pressing forward in spite of conditions that they face, this is the bill that provides the answer and the love and affection for the veterans and military personnel who have put on the uniform every day and who have never—never once—shied away from their duty and decided that their lives and their ills were greater than their commitment to this Nation.

We owe them this. This is a “God bless America” bill. I thank the proponents of it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the ranking member how many speakers she has left.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The last speaker just finished. I have no additional speakers.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I have no additional speakers either, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is unacceptable that 22 veterans are dying by suicide every day. We need to pull all stakeholders together to work as a group to solve the problem. There is not one cause and not one answer. There are a multitude of answers and a multitude of causes and solutions.

The Department of Defense, the VA, and the veterans service organizations need to work together to come up with many solutions that will meet the needs. There is not one solution but

many. I pledge to work with my colleague from Minnesota and Chairman MILLER to address the issues in the upcoming session.

Access to mental health care and benefits for our veterans is an issue I plan to focus on in the months ahead, and I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to ensure that veterans are given the benefits and services that they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, and certainly, I want to thank the chairman. I won't take the 2 minutes, but I want to thank them for their incredible cooperation on this most important of issues.

Derek Denfeld, from my district, lost his life. There has been sadness and the coming together of the community. Our hearts go out to his wife, Heather; to his son, Felix; and certainly to his parents, Deb and Chris, whom I know personally.

I thank the ranking member. I thank the sergeant major for his sponsorship of this bill, and I thank the ranking member and the chairman for what is an important piece of legislation.

As noted, we can't wait another day for this to take effect.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I appreciate the comments from both sides of the aisle, and I look forward to working with all of our colleagues on future issues as they relate to the Department of Veterans Affairs and, in particular, the SAV Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that my colleagues unanimously agreed during the 113th Congress that we must act to combat Veteran suicide and I am grateful that we are acting quickly in the first days of the 114th Congress to address this critical unfinished business. The statistics are heartbreaking. An average of 22 Veterans commit suicide every day. So each day that we delay action is a day we cannot afford. I was proud to help introduce HR. 5059, Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act with Chairman JEFF MILLER and Representative TIM WALZ. While there is no bill that will completely end Veteran suicide, this comprehensive measure is a step in the right direction. It will remove barriers that prevent our nation's heroes from getting the quality, timely mental health care that they deserve. It is my sincere hope that my colleagues in the Senate will take note of the momentum in the House and bring this legislation to the Senate Floor as soon as possible.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans (SAV)

Act, which will help stem the epidemic of veteran suicide.

Tragically, an estimated 22 veterans commit suicide each day—more than 8,000 each year.

Of the more than 2 million Americans who have served in combat in Afghanistan and Iraq, it is estimated that one-third, roughly 600,000 men and women, have traumatic brain injury, PTSD or Depression.

Mr. Speaker, combatting the epidemic of veteran suicide must be one of the nation's highest priorities.

The bill before us is important to our nation and critically important to my home state of Texas, which has one of the highest rates of veteran suicide in the country.

According to an analysis conducted by the Houston Chronicle, suicides among Texans under the age of 35 who had served in the military “jumped from 47 in 2006 to 66 in 2009—an increase of 40 percent.”

According to that same analysis, “last year, suicides made up nearly 25 percent of the deaths of Texans younger than 35 who served in the military. That percentage is more than twice the rate of suicide in the comparable civilian population.”

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 203 expands access to mental health services for our nation's veterans and increases the capacity and efficiency of VA care to deal with the more than one million veterans returning from war.

Our veterans deserve to have our support. These individuals put their lives on the line for our country to stay safe.

Specifically, H.R. 203, which enjoys broad and deep bipartisan support:

1. Establishes a peer support and community outreach pilot program to assist transitioning service members with accessing VA mental health care services.

2. Requires the VA to create a one-stop, interactive website to serve as a centralized information source regarding all mental health services for veterans.

3. Takes steps to address the shortage of mental health care professionals by authorizing the VA to conduct a student loan repayment pilot program aimed at recruiting and retaining psychiatrists.

4. Requires yearly evaluations—with interim reports due in the first two years and a final report due the third year and every year after—conducted by a third party, of all mental health care and suicide prevention practices and programs at the VA to find out what is working and what's not working and to make recommendations to improve care.

Passing H.R. 203 is an essential first step in ensuring that our veterans are receiving the help and care they need.

I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 203.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support of the bipartisan H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act. The bill will reiterate our commitment towards our courageous veterans who have fought to defend this country. Statistics of the Department of Veteran Affairs say an average of 22 veterans commit suicide every day, meaning that this tragic news occurs every 65 minutes. The cases account for 20 percent of suicides in the

U.S. These brave men and women suffer with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, and other types of mental injuries. Mental illness can also lead to other issues, including homelessness and substance abuse. The issue is of national importance, and more needs to be done. Their well-being deserves our highest priority and we have to ensure that their illness is adequately addressed. With this legislation, Congress can prevent further tragedies and ensure our veterans have the mental health services they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 203.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 33

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act”.

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND CERTAIN NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

“(A) EMERGENCY SERVICES VOLUNTEERS.—Qualified services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to an eligible employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms ‘qualified services’, ‘bona fide volunteer’, and ‘eligible employer’ shall have the respective meanings given such terms under section 457(e).

“(B) CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to a specified employer

shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee.

“(ii) BONA FIDE VOLUNTEER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘bona fide volunteer’ means an employee of a specified employer whose only compensation from such employer is in the form of—

“(I) reimbursement for (or reasonable allowance for) reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of services by volunteers, or

“(II) reasonable benefits (including length of service awards), and nominal fees, customarily paid by similar entities in connection with the performance of services by volunteers.

“(iii) SPECIFIED EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘specified employer’ means—

“(I) any government entity, and

“(II) any organization described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(iv) COORDINATION WITH SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—This subparagraph shall not fail to apply with respect to services merely because such services are qualified services (as defined in section 457(e)(1)(C)).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 33, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am here bringing forward Mr. BARLETTA’s bill, and it is really simple. One of the cornerstones of our civil society—one of the great pieces of the American story—is volunteerism but, in particular, volunteerism among our first responders.

So many of us represent congressional districts that thrive on and exist on and preserve their safety on volunteer firefighters and first responders. Unfortunately, in the Affordable Care Act, there is a huge glitch. Under ObamaCare, volunteer firefighters and first responders are counted in many ways as if they were full-time equivalent employees, and therefore, volunteer fire departments are getting hit with enormous fines, mandates, and taxes.

It shouldn’t be that way. It is causing a huge paperwork burden, not to mention a fiscal drain on the budgets of these small fire departments and emergency responding agencies in our communities and in rural areas all across America. This legislation fixes this.

I want to thank Congressman BARLETTA for introducing this because he clearly understands as a former mayor and as someone who represents Pennsylvania, which I know has a lot of volunteer firefighters just like we do in rural Wisconsin, that these are the lifeblood of our communities.

The last thing that they need to do when they are so concerned about preserving public safety and health is to worry about all of these ObamaCare mandates. Mr. BARLETTA’s bill preserves the freedom to operate for our 780,000 public service volunteer firefighters. It removes this mandate and exempts them from this onerous mandate, so they can continue providing the public service that they have been right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), the author of this legislation.

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 33, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

This is a good, truly bipartisan bill that protects our first responders, our volunteer firefighters, and emergency services personnel. It protects them by ensuring that they are not considered employees under the employer mandate provision of ObamaCare.

If they were, some fire companies would be forced to pay for the volunteers’ health insurance or pay a fine, driving many fire departments out of business. As a former mayor, I know how important volunteer fire companies are to the health and safety of a community. Simply put, this is a public safety issue.

I first learned about this issue from a volunteer firefighter, Bob Timko, back home, and I began a crusade to clear this up for volunteer firefighters and localities and the residents of Pennsylvania and every other State.

As you know, the employer mandate of ObamaCare kicks in for employers with 50 or more employees. Now, some fire companies may hear about this and immediately think, “Well, we only have 25 volunteers, so we are safe. We don’t have 50.”

That may not necessarily be the case. Some fire companies are considered part of their local government. If you take the number of firefighters, paid and unpaid, and add them to the number of other public employees, such as highway workers, police, code enforcement officers, health officers, and clerical workers, you can easily reach 50, even in a small town.

This would be a very big deal in my home State of Pennsylvania, where 97 percent of our fire companies are either completely or mostly volunteers. Nationally, almost 92 percent of fire companies use at least some volunteers, and over 86 percent depend on all or mostly volunteers.

Those numbers come from the 2012 National Fire Department Census conducted by the United States Fire Administration. If your district is like mine, then volunteer firefighters are ingrained in your community.

We won an initial battle on this issue. After I raised it with the IRS and brought pressure to bear through this legislation, they finally relented and changed their rules regarding the Federal tax status of volunteer firefighters.

However, this is too important of a public safety issue to be left to the changing positions of unelected Federal bureaucrats at the IRS. Their arbitrary regulatory guidance could easily be changed back.

Our people back home deserve better. We owe our emergency service volunteers, who risk their lives every day, rock-solid certainty. This legislation says, once and for all, that volunteer firefighters are just that—volunteers—and should not be subjected to the employer mandate. It takes away the power of the IRS to change the rules.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their continued support. Last year, this bill passed the Ways and Means Committee by a strong bipartisan vote of 37-0, and it passed the House by a very rare unanimous vote of 410-0. Not one single Member, Republican or Democrat, opposed it.

I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, Majority Whip SCALISE, the Ways and Means Committee, and their staffs. We all recognize that my bill is a simple, bipartisan solution to an unforeseen consequence of the President's health care law.

This bill has the strong support of the National Volunteer Fire Council, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute. I want to thank my partners, as well as the men and women they represent, for their help.

To be clear, forcing volunteer fire companies to comply with ObamaCare will not extend health insurance to the uninsured; rather, it will close firehouses, placing people at risk.

I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start off by certainly extending congratulations to Representative BARLETTA for his persistency in continuing to bring this legislation forward. As he has pointed out, it has been bipartisanly supported, and it deserves passage. It passed unanimously, as he indicated, in both the Ways and Means Committee and also unanimously on this floor, which is no small order.

Of course, it comes in the midst of controversy. I say "controversy" be-

cause—well, our distinguished chairman is to be congratulated as well for not only bringing this bill forward, but also for the great victory that was won by the Green Bay Packers yesterday.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. In a moment, because I do want to continue my praise of the Aaron Rodgers look-alike.

Today, our distinguished chairman announced that he is not running for President. We think that it is so that his look-alike, Aaron Rodgers, may fill that void. I know that it was an outstanding victory by the Packers yesterday, but it was not without controversy on our own committee.

I know that KENNY MARCHANT, KEVIN BRADY, and SAM JOHNSON are very concerned about this, but as the chairman said, "The rules are the rules," and we should proceed from there.

□ 1745

But I also want to thank all of those, and especially the chairman, who raised the point about volunteer firefighters. All of us have that visual in our minds, of course, of those going up the stairs so that people can come down the stairs. And since September 11, and noting that volunteer firefighters cover more than 70 percent of this country, this clearly is a bill that was worthy of the unanimous approval and consent that it received and, as I indicated, is bipartisanly supported by our entire delegation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative COURTNEY, who will speak later, and also the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Representative ESTY, and also the National Volunteer Fire Council, which has been 1,000 percent behind this and also other tax issues that are going to be coming before our committee that have been bipartisanly supported as well by Representative REICHERT, Tom Latham, and others. And I know that we share the bipartisan spirit in this.

I also would like to say that, along with firefighters, the many people who are emergency medical volunteers could benefit from a number of volunteer tax breaks that we could provide as well. I look forward to working with our distinguished chairman and, again, commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BARLETTA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that I appreciate the kind words from the gentleman from Connecticut.

This is bipartisan. It is wonderful when we can work together and find common ground to get things done and find common ground where the completion of a pass is the completion of a pass, it is a rule.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. We are especially gratified, though, in a true show of compassionate conservatism that you reached out to the chief fan of the Jersey Cowboys—excuse me—the Dallas Cowboys, Chris Christie, to provide him with both a hug and a sincere gesture from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, all in good jest.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a member of the full committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 33, and I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader MCCARTHY for allowing this legislation to come forward so early in this Congress.

I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). People always say: I wish you guys could get along; just get something done. This is something that we overwhelmingly believe in and we are going to get done.

I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) has explained very clearly that it has to become statute. It can't be left to be some nebulous fact that is rolling around out there.

Now, these people who do this work—and in Pennsylvania, 97 percent, almost eight out of every 10 firefighters come from the volunteer aspect of it; they are not paid. Yet because of some type of allowance they are given, they fall under the Affordable Care Act, and this would destroy volunteer fire departments as we know them. So what Mr. BARLETTA has very thoughtfully done is he has put forth a piece of legislation that would guarantee that these folks don't have to worry about that.

Now, I have got to tell you, in the little town that I grew up in and live in, Butler, Pennsylvania, so many people volunteer their time to do the volunteer fire fighting. They are also the EMS. They are the first responders.

Last spring, one of our volunteer firemen by the name of Ryan Sekerski, on his way home from work, he heard over his scanner that a fuel truck had overturned. The driver was trapped inside that truck. He then went to the scene of the accident, got his equipment that was in the trunk of his car, got out, and saved that driver's life. These are the people that we are talking about.

When you come to the people's House, America's House, America's Congress, we look at the things that we can do together, things that just make sense. While we may disagree on some other aspects of what it is that we try to get done, on this, we are solid. This just makes sense for America. This makes sense for all those that lay their life on the line anytime there is an emergency or a fire. They do it voluntarily.

Hundreds and thousands of hours in training go into this. They spend time away from their families. They take time away from personal time, where they could be doing other things, to get trained so that they can help other Americans who may need their help. It is absolutely incredible. It is so American. It is something we look at with a great sense of pride.

And we went to the IRS and said: Listen, what we really need now is a statute that guarantees that these volunteer fire departments will not be put under pressure, where they would have to go out of business.

This is not a health care issue, not as far as it is supplying health care or paying a fine for those that volunteer; but this is a health care issue for every single American for whom these people supply necessary services on a voluntary basis to save their lives and their property.

So I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) is a champion on this issue. He was in the last Congress and the fact that it has come forward again—it is so overwhelmingly supported by both sides of our House that it truly is America's Congress. It truly is America's issue. It truly is an issue that makes sense for all of us. It is maybe our small way of thanking all those folks that do that every day without any pay, just because of the greatness in their hearts.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I really deeply appreciate the words of my colleague and fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee. Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

I want to submit for the RECORD a letter from the Department of the Treasury that, at the bequest of a number of Members bipartisanly submitted and they made the changes to the rules.

B. EXCLUSIONS FROM DEFINITION OF HOUR OF SERVICE

Commenters requested that hours of service performed in certain capacities not be counted as an hour of service. The final regulations adopt the following changes in response to these comments.

1. VOLUNTEER EMPLOYEES

Commenters requested that hours of service performed in the capacity of a volunteer for a government entity or tax-exempt organization not be counted as hours of service for purposes of section 4980H. Under the definition of hour of service outlined in these regulations, an hour of service is generally defined as an hour for which an employee is paid or entitled to payment. Accordingly, hours worked by a volunteer who does not receive (and is not entitled to receive) compensation in exchange for the performance of services are not treated as hours of service for purposes of section 4980H.

Commenters noted, however, that some volunteers receive compensation in the form of expense reimbursements, stipends, contributions to employee benefit plans, or nominal wages. Local governments, for in-

stance, noted that many volunteer firefighters or other emergency responders are paid a salary or an hourly wage, generally at a rate lower than the rate paid to non-volunteers performing services in a similar capacity. Other volunteer firefighters or emergency responders may receive expense reimbursements or other fees each time they respond to a call. Commenters generally expressed concern that volunteer service would be discouraged if volunteer hours were required to be counted when determining whether the individual is a full-time employee for purposes of section 4980H.

In response to these concerns, the final regulations provide that hours of service do not include hours worked as a "bona fide volunteer." For this purpose, the definition of "bona fide volunteer" is generally based on the definition of that term for purposes of section 457(e)(1)(B)(i), which provides special rules for length of service awards offered to certain volunteer firefighters and emergency medical providers under a municipal deferred compensation plan. For purposes of section 4980H, however, bona fide volunteers are not limited to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical providers. Rather, bona fide volunteers include any volunteer who is an employee of a government entity or an organization described in section 501(c) that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) whose only compensation from that entity or organization is in the form of (i) reimbursement for (or reasonable allowance for) reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of services by volunteers, or (ii) reasonable benefits (including length of service awards), and nominal fees, customarily paid by similar entities in connection with the performance of services by volunteers.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I think it is both appropriate and right that we codify this and put it into a law.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, JOE COURTNEY, one of the chief sponsors who, along with ELIZABETH ESTY, helped engineer this bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for his leadership on this legislation, which has been noted.

As we are standing here today, there are probably thousands of calls happening all across the country for fire suppression, for medical emergencies, for people with all types of difficulties that volunteers—people who don't have to step up and train and spend all the hours and be available at the expense of their family time and their work time—will respond to these calls.

And for a lot of communities that rely on volunteers, the issue of recruitment and retention and just trying to make the environment conducive for people to make that act of volunteering is a challenge that I think all of us hear about from our volunteer fire departments and first responders all across the Nation.

So when this issue of the Affordable Care Act being possibly a requirement for the shared responsibilities of employers was out there, again, I applaud Mr. BARLETTA for stepping up, intro-

ducing this legislation, and following up with mail to the IRS Commissioner. They did respond almost exactly a year ago, saying that the regulations would not count bona fide volunteers in terms of the 50-employee count. But as was noted, I think it is always better to have it in statute rather than rely on the whims of administrative agencies that can change with the change of administration. So again, I think this is an example of how the country really wants us to operate.

Again, if you look at the Affordable Care Act, since its passage, we have worked together to eliminate the 1099 filing requirement; we have worked together to make sure that our military families, through TRICARE, would have age 26 coverage, which was left out when the bill was initially filed; and here today, we are following up again with an example of commonsense fixes to the legislation, which is what I think the country really is looking for.

I would also note that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) has legislation to restore tax exclusions which were on the books a number of years ago to help volunteer fire departments use property tax exemptions and equipment donations that had been treated as income by the IRS in past years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. COURTNEY. Unfortunately, those tax exemptions expired. And I know, again, the gentleman—and I am sure with bipartisan support—is going to introduce measures to bring those back and, again, allow these departments that are struggling to retain and recruit to have the tools so that they can make it easier, rather than having to file 1040s and drive people crazy around tax filing time for things like boots and coats and a property tax exemption being treated as taxable income.

So again, I look forward to the passage of this legislation with the huge bipartisan margin that we saw last year; and given the administration's response to our entreaties, again, I fully expect that there will be a bill signing ceremony at the White House, assuming it gets through the Senate. Again, with that, I would urge passage.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time other than to close.

May I inquire of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I have no further requests for time.

JOE COURTNEY said, "Don't forget to mention the Patriots," so I would be remiss if I didn't.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Representative COURTNEY also for recognizing the Volunteer Responder Incentive Protection Reauthorization Act, as I mentioned earlier, which is something that has been bipartisanly cosponsored in the past by Representatives REICHERT, Latham, myself, and others.

The distinguished chairman and I, who are classmates, who came into this Congress together—he has also been a great proponent and advocate for making sure that these volunteers, who never were intended in both the case of Mr. BARLETTA and also in the case of the IRS, something that is administratively burdening for the IRS, this is, as Mr. KELLY so passionately said, something that is common sense, that we ought to work on together, and that we ought to provide the relief for, those who provide more than 70 percent of the volunteer aid across this country, especially when it comes to fighting fires. And our National Volunteer Fire Council is supportive of this as is the Fire Chiefs Association. I am looking forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle to ensure this.

Again, with that, I commend and congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and thank him for his fine work in this area, and I look forward to supporting him on future endeavors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself just a few moments to say to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), I appreciate him for his comity, for the bipartisan nature of this.

I would say to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), first, they have to get through some tough luck—Andrew Luck, in particular—in order to make it to where they want to go.

With that, for the purpose of closing on his own bill, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides. There are very few times when you have a vote here that is unanimous, and it is for a simple reason. It is that everyone here understands and appreciates what these men and women in our communities are willing to do to make the community safe.

You know, as a mayor, I have come to appreciate the volunteer firefighters more than I could ever imagine. Many times, I have watched them stand out in the middle of a road with a boot, trying to raise money so that they could buy gear or equipment or get more training. The volunteers ask very little of their community compared to what they are willing to give, and that is the ultimate sacrifice. They are willing to give their lives for people that

they don't even know. They are willing to walk into a burning fire.

I can remember one night, our local fire department in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, they ran in, and they came out with a little baby whose life they saved. And I also remember a day when they couldn't save a life and how it affected every one of those men and women as if it were their own child. They have a lot to worry about, and what they shouldn't worry about is where they are going to get money to provide health insurance or pay a fine. I am sure this was an unintended consequence, and we here recognize that.

So again, I want to thank the chairman and my colleagues for standing with me and saluting the real American heroes, the men and women who volunteer to save us, our first responders.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 33, the "Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act," which clarifies that volunteer firefighters and first responders are not to be counted towards an employer's calculation of its full-time employees for the purposes of determining if the employer falls under the ACA's employer responsibility requirement.

I support this bill because it protects fire departments from being required to pay for the insurance of their volunteers.

If they were required to pay, it is likely that many fire companies would be forced out of business.

This bill is identical to H.R. 3979, reported in the 113th Congress by the Ways and Means Committee by a 37-0 vote, and passed on the House floor by a bipartisan 410-0 vote.

The only reason this bill was never delivered to the President's desk was that the Senate ran out of time in their effort to pass the FY 2015 National Defense Authorization Act, preventing the Federal government from shutting down.

Within the state of Texas, nearly 85% of fire departments are operated entirely on a volunteer or mostly basis.

Failure to pass this bill would mean dire consequences for the future of these volunteer fire departments.

As this bill was passed unanimously in the previous House, I see no reason why it should not do the same in this one.

I ask that my colleagues to join me in protecting our nation's fire departments by voting for the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 33.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 203;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 33;

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CLAY HUNT SUICIDE PREVENTION FOR AMERICAN VETERANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 203) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—403

Abraham
Adams

Aderholt
Aguilar

Allen
Amash

Amodei	Duffy	King (NY)	Polis	Schiff	Tsongas
Ashford	Duncan (SC)	Kirkpatrick	Pompeo	Schock	Turner
Babin	Duncan (TN)	Kline	Posey	Schweikert	Upton
Barletta	Edwards	Knight	Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Barr	Ellison	Kuster	Price (NC)	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Barton	Ellmers	Labrador	Quigley	Scott, David	Veasey
Bass	Emmer	LaMalfa	Rangel	Sensenbrenner	Vela
Beatty	Engel	Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Serrano	Velázquez
Becerra	Eshoo	Lance	Reed	Sessions	Visclosky
Benishek	Esty	Langevin	Reichert	Sewell (AL)	Wagner
Bera	Farenthold	Larsen (WA)	Renacci	Sherman	Walberg
Beyer	Farr	Larson (CT)	Ribble	Shimkus	Walker
Bilirakis	Fattah	Latta	Rice (NY)	Shuster	Walorski
Bishop (GA)	Fincher	Lawrence	Rice (SC)	Simpson	Walters, Mimi
Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Levin	Richmond	Sinema	Walz
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Lewis	Rigell	Sires	Waters, Maxine
Black	Fleming	Lieu (CA)	Roby	Slaughter	Watson Coleman
Blackburn	Flores	Lipinski	Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Blum	Forbes	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Blumenauer	Fortenberry	Loeb sack	Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Welch
Bonamici	Foster	Lofgren	Rokita	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Bost	Fox	Long	Rooney (FL)	Speier	Westerman
Boustany	Frankel (FL)	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Stefanik	Whitfield
Boyle (PA)	Franks (AZ)	Love	Roskam	Stewart	Williams
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal	Ross	Stivers	Wilson (FL)
Brat	Fudge	Lowey	Rothfus	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Bridenstine	Gabbard	Lucas	Rouzer	Swalwell (CA)	Wittman
Brooks (AL)	Gallego	Luetkemeyer	Royce	Takai	Womack
Brooks (IN)	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham	Ruiz	Takano	Woodall
Brown (FL)	Garrett	(NM)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Brownley (CA)	Gibbs	Lujan, Ben Ray	Russell	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Buchanan	Gibson	(NM)	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Buck	Goodlatte	Lummis	Salmon	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Bucshon	Gosar	MacArthur	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi	Young (IA)
Burgess	Gowdy	Maloney	Sanford	Tipton	Young (IN)
Bustos	Graham	Carolyn	Sarbanes	Tonko	Zeldin
Butterfield	Granger	Maloney, Sean	Scalise	Torres	Zinke
Byrne	Graves (GA)	Marchant	Schakowsky	Trott	
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Marino			
Capps	Graves (MO)	Massey			
Capuano	Grayson	Matsui	Brady (TX)	Kinzing (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Cárdenas	Green, Al	McCarthy	Carney	Lee	T.
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McCaul	Cohen	Lynch	Schrader
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McClintock	Cummings	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Carter (TX)	Grijalva	McCollum	DesJarlais	Perlmutter	Titus
Cartwright	Grothman	McDermott	Duckworth	Pocan	Valadao
Castor (FL)	Guinta	McGovern	Gohmert	Rogers (AL)	Walden
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McHenry	Hahn	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Chabot	Gutiérrez	McKinley	Hice (GA)	Rush	Schultz
Chaffetz	Hanna	McMorris	Katko	Ryan (OH)	Westmoreland
Chu (CA)	Hardy	Rodgers	Kelly (IL)		
Cicilline	Harper	McNerney			
Clark (MA)	Harris	McSally			
Clarke (NY)	Hartzler	Meadows			
Clawson (FL)	Hastings	Meehan			
Clay	Heck (NV)	Meeks			
Cleaver	Heck (WA)	Meng			
Clyburn	Hensarling	Messer			
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Mica			
Cole	Higgins	Miller (FL)			
Collins (GA)	Hill	Miller (MI)			
Collins (NY)	Himes	Moolenaar			
Comstock	Hinojosa	Mooney (WV)			
Conaway	Holding	Moore			
Connolly	Honda	Moulton			
Conyers	Hoyer	Mullin			
Cook	Hudson	Mulvaney			
Cooper	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)			
Costa	Huffman	Nadler			
Costello (PA)	Huizenga (MI)	Napolitano			
Courtney	Hultgren	Neal			
Cramer	Hunter	Neugebauer			
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Newhouse			
Crenshaw	Hurt (VA)	Noem			
Crowley	Israel	Nolan			
Cuellar	Issa	Norcross			
Culberson	Jackson Lee	Nugent			
Curbeo (FL)	Jeffries	Nunes			
Davis (CA)	Jenkins (KS)	O'Rourke			
Davis, Danny	Jenkins (WV)	Olson			
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)	Palazzo			
DeFazio	Johnson (OH)	Pallone			
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Palmer			
Delaney	Johnson, Sam	Pascarell			
DeLauro	Jolly	Paulsen			
DeBene	Jones	Payne			
Denham	Jordan	Pearce			
Dent	Joyce	Pelosi			
DeSantis	Kaptur	Perry			
DeSaulnier	Keating	Peters			
Deutsch	Kelly (PA)	Peterson			
Diaz-Balart	Kennedy	Pingree			
Dingell	Kildee	Pittenger			
Doggett	Kilmer	Pitts			
Dold	Kind	Poe (TX)			
Doyle (PA)	King (IA)	Poliquin			

□ 1900

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—401

Abraham	Capps	Delaney
Adams	Capuano	DeLauro
Aderholt	Cárdenas	DeBene
Aguilar	Carson (IN)	Denham
Allen	Carter (GA)	Dent
Amash	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Amodei	Cartwright	DeSaulnier
Ashford	Castor (FL)	Deutsch
Babin	Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Chabot	Dingell
Barr	Chaffetz	Doggett
Barton	Chu (CA)	Dold
Bass	Cicilline	Doyle (PA)
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Duffy
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Bera	Clay	Edwards
Beyer	Cleaver	Ellison
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Ellmers
Bishop (GA)	Coffman	Emmer
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Engel
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Eshoo
Black	Collins (NY)	Esty
Blackburn	Comstock	Farenthold
Blum	Conaway	Farr
Blumenauer	Connolly	Fattah
Bonamici	Conyers	Fincher
Boustany	Cook	Fitzpatrick
Boyle (PA)	Cooper	Fleischmann
Brady (PA)	Costa	Fleming
Brat	Costello (PA)	Flores
Bridenstine	Courtney	Forbes
Brooks (AL)	Cramer	Fortenberry
Brooks (IN)	Crawford	Foster
Brown (FL)	Crenshaw	Fox
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Buchanan	Cuellar	Franks (AZ)
Buck	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Bucshon	Curbeo (FL)	Fudge
Burgess	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Butterfield	Davis, Rodney	Garamendi
Byrne	DeFazio	Garrett
Calvert	DeGette	Gibbs

Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Zeldin
Rooney (FL)

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Duckworth
Gohmert
Hahn
Hice (GA)
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Lee
Lynch
Messer

Murphy (FL)
Perlmutter
Pocan
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Schrader

Smith (WA)
Titus
Valadao
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland

McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meng
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascarell
Payne
Pingree
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Quigley
Rangel

Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier

Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

□ 1909

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, nays 128, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—257

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook

Cooper
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuear
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hardy
Harper

Harris
Hartzler
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock

Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Benishek
Bera
Bishop (MI)
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dold
Duffy
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foss
Fudge
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hanna
Bass
Brady (TX)
Carney
Cohen
Cummings
DesJarlais
Dingell
Duckworth
Gohmert
Granger
Graves (LA)
Grijalva
Hahn
Hice (GA)

NAYS—128

Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lewis
LoBiondo
Love
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McGovern
McKinley
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moore
Mulvaney
Nolan
Norcross
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi

NOT VOTING—47

Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kinzinger (IL)
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Lynch
Meeks
Messer
Murphy (FL)
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Ros-Lehtinen
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Slaughter
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Turner
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOT VOTING—31

Bost
Brady (TX)
Carney
Cohen
Cummings
DesJarlais

Titus
Tsongas
Valadao

Walden
Wasserman
Schultz

Westmoreland

□ 1916

Mr. HILL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO FIRST SPECIAL SERVICE FORCE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table (S. Con. Res. 2) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 2

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO FIRST SPECIAL SERVICE FORCE.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on February 3, 2015, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force collectively, in recognition of its superior service during World War II. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 217

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative ADAM SMITH be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 217. He was inadvertently added through a clerical error and did not intend to cosponsor the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOE STRICKLAND

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our own, Joe Strickland, the Chief Reporter of Debates, on his retirement from the House after more than 21 years of service.

Joe Strickland is a native Texan. He came to the House in 1993, 2 years after graduating from court reporting school. He quickly distinguished himself not only as an excellent court reporter but as a very capable manager. In 2000, the Clerk of the House promoted Joe to Deputy Chief Reporter and made him Chief in 2005.

Joe has participated in seven State of the Union addresses by three Presidents, and he has developed a global reputation as a leader in reporting parliamentary debates.

Joe has represented the House abroad on several occasions, Mr. Speaker, including participating in the World e-Parliament Conference in Johannesburg.

Here at home, Joe has addressed the national convention of the National Court Reporters Association three times, and he has served on the board of the Greater Washington Shorthand Reporters Association.

Mr. Speaker, the House has lost a great resource and role model for the 43 dedicated professionals Joe manages. One of the reporters, of course, is on the floor reporting this now, and we thank her, and we thank all of those who have to listen to us and report what we say. That is a tough job. But I know that Joe will continue to inspire those who serve in the reporting office.

I join, and I know all of my colleagues join, in honoring Joe Strickland, thanking him for his service to

this House. We wish him a very happy retirement, full of time spent with his husband, Tom, and their son, Kevin. I thank him for his service to the Congress and to our country.

PLACATING THE COMMUNIST REGIME OF CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is truly astonishing that President Obama is asking Congress and the American people to applaud and reward the Castro regime for releasing 53 innocent people from its gulags today while ignoring the fact that over 1,000 were arrested last year.

These individuals were imprisoned for expressing their basic rights as human beings, and for seeking reforms on the island based on the universal and fundamental principle of freedom.

What a pathetically low bar President Obama has set. This administration has shown, time and again, that it is more willing to appease tyrants than to fulfill America's role as the defender of freedom, of democracy, and respect for human rights.

President Obama's concessions to the Castro regime further illustrate that he is willing to abandon American core principles of liberty and justice in order to placate a dangerous regime.

AMERICANS MOURN WITH THE PEOPLE OF PARIS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn with the people of Paris. Americans stand with Paris and attacks on innocent people everywhere across the world.

Terrorists are escalating their attacks on innocent people across the world as we speak. Americans here at home are rightfully concerned, and to protect them, they look to us, their lawmakers.

Our greatest responsibility, above everything else we ever do, prescribed to us in the Constitution, is to keep people safe in their homes and in their country.

As security measures go up in our country to keep us safe, unfortunately, House GOP leaders are proposing to shut the Department of Homeland Security down. We cannot play politics with our national security.

I urge my House GOP colleagues to stand up for security and not shut down the government. Let's put the safety of the American people first and put petty politics aside. Now is the time that we stand strong for the security of everyone.

SECURING AMERICA'S BORDERS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss work in the House to secure our borders and address the Obama administration's unilateral actions on immigration.

This week, the House will consider the 2015 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, which takes a number of steps to bolster border security and law enforcement efforts.

To start, the legislation provides for the largest operational force levels in the history of the Customs and Border Protection agency. The measure also supports several critical border security initiatives, including around-the-clock surveillance of air, land, and sea approaches to the border.

Furthermore, the legislation boosts internal enforcement efforts and strengthens related domestic and international investigations.

Finally, the legislation will provide for the amendments that will stop the President's executive actions on immigration.

Mr. Speaker, the President's unilateral executive orders should be of concern to each and every Member of this body. I call on colleagues from both sides of the aisle to do what is right—support this legislative package. It protects the borders, it restores the rule of law. The American people deserve as much.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in opposition to the House Republican plan to tear apart millions of families through extreme amendments to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill.

In the face of inaction by this House last year, our President was forced to use his constitutional authority to bring millions of our neighbors out of the shadows to fix a broken immigration system.

Through scrapping the Secure Communities Program and ensuring that parents of American citizens could no longer live in fear of deportation, the President's executive order has moved our country forward. However, it is no substitute for the bipartisan congressional action that the majority of the American people feel that we need and that passed the Senate 2 years ago.

By undermining the President's executive actions through amendments to DHS appropriations, my colleagues are not only jeopardizing critical funding for our Nation's security but also ignoring the pain and suffering they will cause to millions across our country.

IT IS COOL TO BE FROM NORTH DAKOTA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, Aristotle said, "We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act, but a habit."

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, the North Dakota State University Bison football team was in Frisco, Texas, attempting to win their fourth consecutive NCAA Division I FCS national title.

After a long stampede with a talented flock of Illinois State Redbirds hot on their tail, they finally ended up in the end zone. The only ones in the winner's circle were the Thundering Herd.

The seniors finished their careers with more national championships, Mr. Speaker, than losses. I am especially proud of the boys from North Dakota.

Bismarck Century's Carson Wentz earned MVP status by quarterbacking his team to success, and BHS' Esley Thorton sealed the deal with a last-minute interception.

All of the teammates from the Rough Rider State and beyond, you have made us proud again, and you remind us why it is so cool to be from North Dakota.

□ 1930

AN ANTI-IMMIGRANT CANCER

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to represent one of the most diverse districts in the entire Congress. Approximately 33 percent of the people whom I represent were born outside of the United States of America. Folks from all over the world come to Brooklyn and to Queens to pursue the American Dream. This is part of what makes America great; yet there is an anti-immigrant cancer spreading in this town that is moving like a malignant tumor amongst some on the other side of the aisle.

As a result of this invidious infliction, there are some in the House GOP who are prepared to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, even though America continues to be a top target for terrorists all across the world.

This is shameful. This is reckless. This is irresponsible. The American people need to rise up to stop it from happening.

NORMALIZING U.S. RELATIONS WITH CUBA

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was in Havana, Cuba, when the President of

the United States declared that he was going to relax the restrictions that we have on the embargo in Cuba, and I tell you that the people in Havana rejoiced. In the streets of Havana, they said there were two basic things they liked about America: one was American movies, and the second was everything else.

When I got to come back home through Miami, at the airport, people with Cuban backgrounds—Americans—were so excited about the opportunity for America to rejoin the family of nations and to recognize the contributions that Cuba can make. We thought that, today, we would be hearing a rejoicing for those people who should have never been in jail in Cuba who were released. Obviously, there are some people who have a different opinion.

I am here today to say that, with all due respect to those Americans and to those Cubans who suffer under the dictatorship in Cuba, we feel their pain, but now, American policy should override the pain that a few feel for what is in the best national interest of our great Nation.

A HOUSE OF GAMES

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of games being played at this time of year. Tonight, we are going to have a national championship game for the NCAA national football championship, playoff games for the NFL championship. We have basketball games being played and hockey games. The American people don't need games being played in the House of Representatives, but that is exactly what we are seeing this week.

The Republican majority is holding hostage the security of this Nation—holding the Department of Homeland Security's budget hostage—so they can advance some ideological provisions on immigration reform.

This is nothing but a big pout on the part of the Republican majority because they are upset with the President's executive action. If they want to undo what the President has done and proceed toward a sane immigration policy, we have an entire body of Democrats and Republicans who is waiting to do that. I was part of the bipartisan group last year that worked for the entire Congress in trying to get that done. I know it is possible.

No more games, Mr. Speaker. We need action—we need sane action—and not holding our national security hostage.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MARIO CUOMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the senior member of the New York delegation, it affords me a great honor to come from the Empire State of New York, where we have so many people we are proud of, but because Mario Cuomo represented the true nature of the American Dream, we from the State of New York would just like to laud the contributions that he has made, not just to Queens, where he was raised, not just to the great State of New York, but to those democratic principles that all of us believe in, and no one could articulate it the way our great Governor has.

So many people have come to this country from faraway places, and somehow, when they succeed, some change their names, some change their attitudes, and some just absolutely forget how they got here and how they were perceived; but Mario Cuomo was different.

Mario was so proud of the fact that his parents were immigrants. He was proud of the fact that they came here with nothing but a hope and a dream that their son would succeed. He succeeded in everything that he touched, from neighborhood arbitration, to secretary of state, to Lieutenant Governor; and, of course, the Nation remembers him as Governor and as one who articulated the principles not of the Democratic Party, but of the entire country at a Democratic Convention.

Of course, he leaves behind a son who, for those of us who attended his funeral would have to say not only did he talk about his father in terms that made us all feel proud, but in that voice that he had, if you closed your eyes for one moment, you would see that Mario Cuomo did not die. He left his son to continue in describing the great opportunity that we have in this great country.

I am so glad that so many New Yorkers are here. Because we are here for such a short period of time—we are in committees and reorganizing—the delegation has asked me to reduce my remarks to 2 minutes, and I share that concern with the rest of our great delegation.

It is my great pleasure to yield back the balance of my time so that the gentleman from New York, JOSEPH CROWLEY, may control the remainder of my time.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MARIO CUOMO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the distinguished member and longest-serving member—I don't want to say "senior member"—in the New York delegation for getting us off to a start to sing the praises of Mario Cuomo. It is my honor to join the New York delegation. I feel honored to do so. Four of our children were born in New York, so that gives me some standing on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to join the New York delegation in paying tribute to the memory of Governor Mario Cuomo. I am reminded of Ecclesiasticus. We all know this, but just think of how appropriate it is for Mario Cuomo.

In Ecclesiasticus, it says:

Now let us praise great men, the heroes of our Nation.

They led the people by their counsel and their knowledge of the laws. From their font of wisdom, they gave instruction.

These are godly men whose righteous deeds have not been forgotten. Their wealth is their descendants, and their inheritance is their children's children. Their bodies are buried in peace, and their names will live forever.

The people will tell of their wisdom, and the congregation will continue to sing their praise.

Does that remind you of Mario Cuomo? Is that perfectly appropriate for him? Surely, those words apply to the life and legacy of our great departed friend, Mario.

As a fellow Italian American, I have always taken great pride in his leadership. As a San Franciscan who hosted the Democratic Convention, we in California had some kind of claim on Mario Cuomo because of the great speech that he made at that convention which Mr. RANGEL referenced, but my observing of his greatness goes farther back than that.

It was during a trip to Italy that we were invited by President Carter in 1980 to bring the sympathy and support of the American people to Italy at the time of the earthquake, when they lost 2,700 lives and which left 265,000 people homeless. I mention that because we went by helicopter from village to village to village. Villages were devastated.

Mario Cuomo, here was this person who had such a large spirit and a good soul, who could sympathize with these people in English and Italian. For example, in a village where a First Communion class was rehearsing for First Communion, all of the 7-year-olds in that village were in that church when the earthquake hit. The roof came down, and every 7-year-old in the village was lost.

Imagine the grief of those individual families and of that community to lose

those children, but as you would expect, he was up to the task, knowing that words were completely inadequate and that no sympathy could meet the pain that they were feeling; nonetheless, there was this beautiful, sympathetic man identifying with these people from a region from which his family had come in southern Italy.

Mario Cuomo was a pillar of strength through his community, his State, and our Nation. His values, his vision, and his effectiveness for the people of New York were an inspiration around the world. He was a man of principle and eloquence—that was good—and all the world saw, again, that manifested in the "shining city on a hill" speech at the 1984 Democratic Convention.

With those soaring words, Governor Cuomo summoned the best of America and called us to empower the working people and middle class families who are the backbone of our Nation. He asked us to remember how futures are built. We know Mario Cuomo's language and leadership will echo through the ages just as vital, just as urgent, just as energizing as his words were that day.

In word and deed, Governor Cuomo challenged us to make real the American Dream. He had it for his family. He wanted it for everyone else, for all who strived to realize it, and opened the doors of opportunity for every American family.

Family meant everything to him. He was a proud Governor of New York for three terms, but his proudest achievement was his beautiful family. No one could miss the pride and inspiration he found in his immigrant parents and how he talked about them so beautifully or in his boundless dedication to Matilda and his children.

Our country has lost a great leader, but his family has lost a devoted husband to his wife of over 60 years, to Matilda. He was a loving father to five children—Margaret, Andrew, Maria, Madeline, and Christopher—and was a doting grandfather to some really lovely grandchildren.

My husband, Paul, and I and our entire family are heartbroken. We are really heartbroken by his passing, and we continue to extend our deepest sympathy and love to Matilda and their family.

I hope it is a comfort to them that so many people in their own State, in the country, and, really, throughout the world mourn their loss and continue to pray for them and continue to be inspired by this great man.

As Ecclesiasticus says:

People will tell of his wisdom, and the congregation will continue to sing his praise.

I thank Mr. CROWLEY for yielding. I thank him for bringing us together to sing the praises of Mario Cuomo.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Rochester, New York, LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank Mr. CROWLEY for yielding to me. There is so much on my mind as to what I could say about him.

I knew him longer than the rest of the New Yorkers. I met him in 1973. I was a member of the Democratic State committee in Rochester, New York, and I was asked by the district attorney to come over to his house and meet a man from New York City who was thinking about running for Governor; so I joined my friends and sat in the living room for about an hour, awaiting the guest from New York to get off the telephone in the kitchen and come out and talk to us.

He came out. He was perfectly charming, but he didn't know upstate New York. He started by telling us: "A lot of people are talking to me about running for Governor, and I thought it would be a good idea if I came up here to see what all of you thought."

I left the house that night, and I said to my friend that I was driving with: "He is really a nice guy, and he is very smart, but, boy, he needs a lot of help." I was really pretty lucky, I think, that I got to do that. As it turns out, Governor Carey ran for Governor at that time, and Mr. Cuomo was appointed secretary of state.

He had some great ideas for upstate New York. One of them was they were going to have an upstate coordinator, which is kind of an amorphous title, but I was very blessed that he let me try that job. I had been out of the workforce. I was home. My youngest child was about 12 years old. It was back in the day when one income could bring up a family and educate them.

□ 1945

And so trying to get back into work and to get back into all of that was pretty difficult for me. And I am not sure anybody else would have put up with me, other than Mario Cuomo, giving me every opportunity in the world to try to learn what it is we were trying to do.

But, boy, did I ever teach him a few things. We had an old State car, a rattletrap. I drove him all over upstate New York, and the conversations we had would absolutely astound you.

We stopped one day in one of our beautiful rural villages in upstate named Pavilion to get a cup of coffee. And a 16-year-old girl came out to wait on us. And here he was: a new person to speak to. Now, those of you who knew him know how exciting that would be. And he started in by asking her, What was the main business in Pavilion? What was the gross domestic product there? He was asking her all these questions. And all she wanted to do was get him a cup of coffee. And I felt a little sorry for her, so I said, "He is the secretary of state." Unfortunately, I forgot the part to say secretary of state of New York. She went back into

the kitchen, knowing this man was not Henry Kissinger, and never came back out.

And as we rode around in this old red car, he would ask me about the cornfields. And I will tell you, if my agriculture people knew what a botch I made of trying to explain to him the life of the cornstalk, it was really awful. And he would say things like, How do they heat that house over there? What do you think they do? Where do they all go to school? Everything in the world interested him.

He was the most extraordinary teacher that I have ever had. I just had those 2 years of showing him upstate New York. And then when he got elected lieutenant governor—I ran that upstate campaign—the State Police took over. But we still carried on all these great conversations we had. And I remember one of the policemen said once that no matter how upset Mario was, when he got off the plane and would go 10 miles or 10 rounds with LOUISE, they were off on a whole other subject.

I learned so much from him. And I know that everybody thinks of him as a one-speech maker sort of a—but let me tell you, that was not it. The speech that he made at Notre Dame was so incredibly wonderful and so important and so instructive that everybody should read that as well. But one of my very favorites was when he made his speech about my hometown of Rochester on Lake Ontario.

He described Rochester as a necklace of neighborhoods clustered around the lake. Now that is talking. And he also talked about life, that our life needed to be more than to just hope always to land on the safe squares. And we thought that was such an incredible thing to think about, that your life had to have more meaning than that.

The people that we worked with at the secretary of state's office who were holdovers from the previous administration had said to me many, many times how wonderful it was for them to be able to work for such a first-rate lawyer. And believe me, he really was.

He loved the country, as NANCY PELOSI pointed out. His love of his family was absolutely legendary. He was a man of deep conviction, of religious faith, who loved his family more than anything. But he also loved the great opportunity that this country had given to him.

He talked so admiringly of his father and the strength that his father and mother had, coming here with literally nothing. And it was the manual labor that his father did to lift himself up and, consequently, his family to a better life, and the country.

He loved New York. He loved its people. He loved its history more than anything. He loved the institution of governing.

So I speak of him as somebody that maybe other people didn't get to know

the way I did, but I admired him always. And I am pretty sure I would not be in elected office at all had I not had the opportunity to learn from him, the wonderful opportunity to represent our neighbors and to come down and to try to make law and to make some changes.

So I thank you very much for the time, Mr. CROWLEY. We will not see his like again.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentlelady.

I now yield to the gentleman from the Bronx, Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank my colleague, Mr. CROWLEY.

This week in 1975, I became a member of the New York State Assembly. This week in 1975, Mario Cuomo became secretary of state. I left to come to Congress in 1990, so I am fortunate to have served in the legislature 16 of the 20 years that he served in the executive branch.

And in 1983, when I became chairman of the Education Committee, I really got to know him and to speak to him and to understand what everyone that has spoken has already said. Above all, this man never forgot, and he understood how important it was for him to be the son of an immigrant family. So he wanted everyone else to have the same opportunity.

Yes, he was eloquent. Yes, he had to be a great human being—after all, he was a minor league baseball player and was signed by the Pittsburgh Pirates, I believe, to play ball, that alone makes him a great guy. But he was an eloquent man who also remembered his humble beginnings in the grocery store, having to work to get through law school, to be able to understand.

So when I stood in front of him as one who had been born an American citizen—but a lot of people forgot along the way that we were and treated us in a different way—he understood. There was that *simpatico* that he had with him, where he understood where we came from and what we needed. And I am just so honored to have served all those years with Mario Cuomo and to have considered him a friend.

When I went to his funeral, Matilda was just so gracious because she wrote a book once where she asked people to write about who had influenced them. And I wrote about a certain gentleman in the Bronx who had played major role in my starting my public career. And she remembered that.

And I, once again, offer my condolences to the Cuomo family.

But we should not feel sorry that he is gone. We have been blessed with the fact that he lived among us. And for me, 16 of those 20 years, I learned so much from him, and hopefully I was able to help him along the way at times too.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from the Bronx.

And I yield to the gentleman from Manhattan, Mr. NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I too came to the legislature and served for 16 years there. And for most of that time, Mario Cuomo was Governor.

We all know that he was an eloquent philosopher in politics, someone who could express the goals and the principles of public office and of government more eloquently than almost anyone else.

Mario Cuomo graduated first in his class from St. John's Law School in 1946. And despite sending out over 70 resumes, he couldn't get a response or an interview from a top law firm because he was Italian. And that was the state of prejudice in this country—or at least on Wall Street in 1946.

He went on from there to become a major lawyer, to become the Governor of a State, to become a leader of a philosophy in American politics. But in doing so, he never forgot where he came from. He didn't forget his experiences, and he knew that other people were having similar experiences.

He was a man of great principle. He vetoed the death penalty—though he knew that the death penalty was very popular in New York—12 times in a row, and he sustained those vetoes. Having not forgotten where he came from, he always wanted to use government to help defenseless people who needed the help of government, and he did.

We all know many of the things he did. I am not going to repeat them here. But I want to just mention a couple of things that didn't get great publicity but that I saw as a member of the legislature.

When he became Governor, he set up a commission. I forget the exact title—Commission on Child Support, Commission on Day Care, whatever it was. But every year for years, that commission came up with legislation which he supported and pushed, and some of us in the legislature worked on that. And he passed—we passed pioneering legislation, pioneering in this country on child support enforcement, which was considered a radical idea in the early 1980s. We passed the Child Support Standards Act so that judges couldn't leave women and their children without adequate support. He passed day care resource and referral legislation and family day care, all of which came from the initiatives of Governor Cuomo, none of which got a lot of publicity, which was focused on so-called bigger items. But these helped people. These were vital for people living their lives without a lot of money, without a lot of resources. But government became a helper and a friend because of Governor Cuomo.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you, Mr. NADLER.

I now yield to the gentlelady from Brooklyn, Queens, and Manhattan, Ms. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a leader who inspired not only New Yorkers but who also captured the imagination of progressives across the Nation. At a time when our national dialogue was dominated by those seeking to leave working families to fend for themselves, Governor Cuomo outlined a different vision. Through his policies as Governor and his evocative speaking abilities, he articulated our moral obligation to care for one another while working toward a society that benefits all Americans, not only the affluent and powerful.

All of us remember his famous words from the Democratic convention in San Francisco. Questioning conservatives' rose-colored view of the Nation, he noted we were becoming too much a "tale of two cities," rather than a "shining city on a hill." That speech crystallized the differences in competing philosophies between those who believe Americans can do more to help one another and those who think our Nation has already reached its greatest heights and cannot further improve.

However, just as he was serving as an intellectual lodestar for progressive and liberals nationally, Mario Cuomo remained dedicated to improving New Yorkers' lives. A son of Queens, in many ways, he reflected the aspirations and dreams of that borough's residents. Today, Queens is where families of all backgrounds—Latinos, Asian, Italian, and Greek immigrants—converge to secure a decent, affordable place to live.

In today's political landscape, we could all benefit from remembering those words. In today's cynical environment, many have forgotten the tremendous good our government can achieve in pursuing justice, creating opportunity, and caring for neighbors in need.

Governor Cuomo made many contributions, but that may be among his most important. He provided the intellectual framework to remind us that we have more to do, that our Nation can be better, and that we cannot afford to leave our fellow New Yorkers and Americans behind.

For ensuring these ideas remain part of our national conversation, all of us owe him a debt and all of us appreciate his decades of steadfast service.

I send my thoughts and my prayers to his family, including his son, Governor Andrew Cuomo. I hope they can take comfort in knowing that all of us join in mourning with them.

□ 2000

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Brooklyn, Queens, and Manhattan. I now yield to the gen-

tlelady from Queens and Manhattan and Brooklyn, Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in so many ways, and I thank the leader of the Democratic Party for leading us in this tribute to our great Governor. We appreciate very much your presence and support of Mario Cuomo on the floor.

It seems only fitting and proper for us to pay tribute to the late Mario Cuomo here in this historic Chamber, here where some of the most powerful and eloquent speakers in our Nation's history have changed the course of human events, not with swords but with words and ideas.

Mario Cuomo, the former Governor of New York, the liberal lion of the Empire State, the conscience of the Democratic Party, and a cherished friend, had few peers when it came to making the power of ideas and ideals irresistible forces for good.

His faith, his passion, his values, and his unique gifts produced in him an unrivaled ability to articulate the plight, defend the rights, and engage the hopes of ordinary citizens.

I had the great fortune to be a delegate when he gave one of the most storied speeches at the National Democratic Convention in 1984. I will never forget it. When Mario Cuomo spoke, it electrified the whole convention. We were transfixed by the power of his appeal right to the deepest reaches of our common humanity.

He made all of us feel like we needed to do more, work harder, and help others because that is what really came through when Mario Cuomo spoke: his deep, unwavering commitment to fundamental decency, justice, and humanity.

He spoke to a sitting President on behalf of the forgotten and the dispossessed. He spoke to the powerful on behalf of the powerless. "There is despair," he said, "in the faces you don't see and the places you don't visit."

Mario Cuomo was right. He spent his life working and looking out for the hardworking people who build our shining cities, who supply our food, who teach our children, who staff our hospitals, people who are too often overlooked, overlooked, and underserved.

His own family had owned a store in Jamaica, Queens, and he knew full well the value of hard work and of education. He lived the American Dream and spent his life trying to build the American Dream for others. Mario Cuomo worked his way into St. John's University. He attended St. John's University School of Law in New York and graduated first in his class.

He first rose to public attention when he came roaring out of Queens back in the 1970s to challenge city hall's condemnation of a working class neighborhood in Corona. People quickly began

to appreciate that Mario Cuomo had the transformative power to inspire others to demand for themselves a more just and humane society and a better government. He insisted that representative government should be just that: a government for all the people.

Whenever he was on the ballot—and I remember as an active Democrat then—Democrat registration went up because everybody wanted to vote for and help elect Mario Cuomo. They knew he would do everything in his power to give them a fair shake.

He once told me—and I always had these terrible elections. He would always tell me that he was my fairy godfather, and he would grant me three wishes to win the election, but only on one condition, that I would go out and grant three wishes to someone else and help them do a better job in what they wanted to do.

He was a wonderful friend and a mentor, a husband, a wonderful father. As a parent, there is no question he did a remarkable job. One son is a Governor, another is a news anchor, one daughter is a physician, another active in continuing the family work in housing the homeless, and another is an attorney. If that was all that he ever did, that would be plenty for one lifetime.

Mario Cuomo did much more. He was secretary of state of the great State of New York, then Lieutenant Governor, and finally Governor for three terms. He led New York to provide health care for children. He began the Decade of the Child, an effort that used multiple health care and educational strategies to better the lives of our most vulnerable. He passed the child support enforcement bill.

Under his leadership, the most intense public health plan in the Nation was put in place to take on the AIDS epidemic. Under Mario Cuomo, New York State became the first State in the Nation to enact a seatbelt law. He was a great man, and I am proud beyond all telling to be able to say that he was a friend, a mentor, and a supporter.

I grieve his passing, and I send my most heartfelt condolences to his family and his friends. I shall miss the singular and remarkable man until the end of time. To know him was to love him.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Queens and part of Nassau, Mr. MEEKS.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I think of Governor Mario Cuomo, many talk about his great oratory, many talk about some of the fantastic speeches that he made, but when I think about Mario Cuomo, he didn't just talk the talk; he walked the walk.

His speeches were not made just because it was a political gathering or forum. His speeches were made because

that is what he truly believed. It came from his heart. It is how he lived his life, and you could see that in how he dealt with his family because that was his foundation.

From that foundation, he was able to build—and starting with that little place in Jamaica, Queens, that I am now proud to represent, he looked at Queens and then, by extension, the city of New York and then, by extension, the State of New York as the foundation of which he could make a difference, learning from his growing up with his parents.

As a result, you found individuals falling in love with Mario Cuomo, and you could see that by the people that were around him who became completely loyal to him because he had a real great leadership.

Once you became infected with the spirit of Mario Cuomo, you continued to stay around him, and you would see in the visuals who were with Mario Cuomo until the day that he died folks loyal to him. In this business in this day and age, sometimes, if you don't have that kind of character, people come, and people go.

Lastly, because I know that we have got so many members of the New York delegation that are here that want to speak, let me just say that he was competitive. I can think about those days when—I thank him first because he talked about getting into politics, he allowed me to cut my teeth by appointing me first to the New York State Workers' Compensation Board as a judge, then later appointed me to become the supervising judge in the State, having me going all over the State, and then encouraging me to run for the State assembly and, once I got elected to the State assembly, working very closely with him.

Once I got into the assembly, I thought he was a nice guy until you got on the basketball court. How competitive was he on that basketball court? Elbows—I look at some of the players now when they are complaining, et cetera, well, you need to go play old school basketball with Governor Mario Cuomo.

I close by saying that I thank God—because he was a very religious man, Mario Cuomo, too, but God could have sent him to California; he didn't. He could have had him in Illinois or in Texas or in Florida; no.

We were fortunate because God had him, through his parents, who emigrated from Italy to come to a place where the Statue of Liberty was, who believed "Give me your tired, give me your weary," who believed in family, and we had him in the great State of New York.

Thank you, Governor Mario Cuomo.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend.

I now yield to the gentleman from Buffalo, New York (Mr. HIGGINS). Mario

Cuomo was known all over New York State, obviously, as the Governor, but my colleague BRIAN HIGGINS knew him well.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, to honor the life and legacy of Governor Mario Cuomo who passed away on January 1 at the age of 82.

When we think of Governor Cuomo, we think of him along with his son—now Governor Andrew Cuomo—and then his counsel Tim Russert from Buffalo driving in a car, riding from the airport to the Moscone Center in San Francisco, still writing new sections of his historic keynote address at the 1984 Democratic National Convention which catapulted him forever as a prominent figure within the Democratic Party.

Less remembered than his speeches but just as admirable were his writings. He wrote extensively on the American Dream his immigrant parents achieved, and the numerous causes that he cared about, "Diaries of Mario M. Cuomo," "Reason to Believe," "Why Lincoln Matters," and "More Than Words," which is a collection of 31 speeches he wrote going back to 1974.

As a student of government, a teacher of government, and now as a practitioner, in 2006, I went to see Governor Cuomo, former Governor Cuomo, who was practicing law in Manhattan at a place called Willkie, Farr, and Gallagher. Remember, I had 15 minutes scheduled with him and left 2 hours later. I told him that his writings, going back to 1974, were as relevant today as they were when they were written. They were timeless; they were classics.

My favorite story is the one that he told about how he came to edit the book, "Lincoln on Democracy." In 1988, Governor Cuomo met in Albany with a delegation from the teacher section of Poland's Solidarity Union, which was the leading advocate for bringing democracy to Poland when it was under Communist rule.

The teachers told the Governor that they were building an archive of influential and insightful writings on democracy. They asked if he could recommend writings by American thinkers that had influenced his approach to public service and democracy. Cuomo immediately identified Abraham Lincoln as his favorite source of wisdom.

The Polish delegation said, "Governor, Lincoln's writings and speeches are not available in Poland." In fact, they were banned. Cuomo promised to give them the speeches that they needed in order to appreciate what he had come to appreciate in Lincoln.

Cuomo says, "Delegation, come over here." He pulled out the 378-page index of the collected works of Abraham Lincoln—not one mention of democracy in those works; so together with Lincoln scholar Harold Holzer, he wrote, edited,

and published "Lincoln on Democracy," a book that to this day is essential reading for anyone wishing to understand the uniquely American approach to democracy and governance. True to his word, the Polish version of the book appeared in Warsaw in early 1990 before its English version was available in the United States.

Mario Cuomo's gift was that he forced us to think for ourselves. He forced us to consider our history, and he forced us to recognize our responsibility to build a foundation that is better than the foundation that those who came before us built for us.

That is the true meaning of the American Dream, and it was embodied by a unique individual who was an unlikely successful lawyer, an unlikely Governor of New York, Mario M. Cuomo.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments on Governor Cuomo. I now yield to my colleague and friend from the upstate region, Mr. PAUL TONKO, who also served in the State assembly while Mario Cuomo was Governor.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Queens, State of New York, for the opportunity to share some thoughts here this evening with our leader, NANCY PELOSI, and members of the New York delegation, as we pay tribute to the life of Mario Matthew Cuomo, the greatest of Governors in New York, and certainly a true statesman, a bold and great individual, a humble giant, and a roaring voice, a lion voice for social, economic, and environmental justice.

This evening, what I recall about the life of Mario Cuomo is that as I entered the New York State Assembly in 1983, that was the same year that he entered into the office of Governor, and for my first 12 years of service in the New York State Assembly, it was guided and nurtured and impacted by the strength and the passion of Mario Cuomo.

□ 2015

The walk with him and with Matilda Raffa Cuomo as a first couple of New York was a joyous one but a challenging one to pay tribute to the greatness, the foundation of family, and the passion of immigrants. Those two guiding dynamics drove the principles, the integrity, and the message of Mario Cuomo.

As a member of his upstate cabinet informing and alerting the Governor to various strengths, vitalities, contributions, and history of upstate New York, we were able to connect in a very meaningful way; the work with him very deliberate and very challenging. I will forever be grateful for the learning curve that was developed by working alongside this person of greatness.

I think, also, we need to understand that, as his son Governor Andrew

Cuomo eulogized at his funeral service, he made mention very deliberately, Mario Cuomo would not offer, render his words of speeches to an audience telling them what they choose to hear but, rather, what he needed to share. That, I think, speaks to the humble greatness of this individual, one who had a vision not only for his State, but for his country and, for that matter, the world.

I was also touched by the Governor's sharing about his dad, the eloquence of his speech, the eloquence of his speaking, his public speaking that reached so many people throughout the world. He talked about those words and put it into an analogy of a fine bit of jewelry where each word seen as a gem would be deliberately chosen, strategically placed, and majestically clustered in a way where that array would reach our senses, would speak to our senses about what is correct, what is socially just and morally sound. That is true leadership. And it is no wonder through that speech in San Francisco that he lit within the minds, hearts, and souls of Americans the best within us, how we could assume this level of greatness by understanding that we are at our best when we incorporate in an inclusive set of principles in our world of politics.

Mario Cuomo impacted all of us, myself included, by his reverence for his parents' journey as immigrants. That journey, which was a pathway to freedom, that journey which settled into a grocery store, a corner grocery store, became the pulse of the American Dream for his family that was tethered into this country called the United States of America. He never forgot that. He revered it. He was guided by it. The light that he brought to his field of politics was immense, and it was driven by fairness and inclusion.

So this evening, it is an honor to join with my colleagues to speak to a humble man, a great individual, who, with his wife alongside him, Matilda, brought to this State of New York a sense of hope when there was despair.

As was said at the funeral, he will continue to live. His voice may have been silenced, but his integrity, his spirit, and his principles will long live in the lives of those who struggle and reach to America, to her government, for a better tomorrow.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask the gentleman from Brooklyn and from Queens, Mr. JEFFRIES, for his comments.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Queens, for anchoring this Special Order hour and for yielding a few moments for me to reflect on the passing of our great Governor, Mario Cuomo.

Mr. Speaker, like many other members of the New York delegation, I also

served in the New York State Assembly. But unlike most, I didn't get the opportunity to serve alongside Governor Mario Cuomo. I arrived several years after he had completed his three terms in office.

So I speak today not from the perspective of someone who served in government alongside Mario Cuomo, but as a young man who grew up in Mario Cuomo's New York. What an opportunity to be able to come of age in the 1980s with a Governor, a leader, who articulated such an eloquent vision of equal protection under the law for everyone. What an opportunity to be able to come of age under a Governor who believed in opportunity for everyone, who recognized that New York State's greatest strength was our diversity from every community, every perspective, and every religious background.

It was great to be able to come of age and look up at a Governor who, notwithstanding the political potential pitfalls, stood on principle, was ahead of his time as it relates to his firm opposition to the death penalty at a time when that was not a popular position to take. He was a great leader, a charismatic intellectual, a wonderful family man, a tremendous lawyer, and a wonderful statesman and Governor.

I can only imagine that when Mario Cuomo arrived up in Heaven he was prepared to get to work. But I think that there was probably a greeting committee that was there at the gates of Heaven, one of whom was FDR, a former Governor of the State of New York, the other of whom was FDR's cousin, Teddy Roosevelt, two former great Governors of the State of New York. And I think they probably ushered Mario Cuomo to a place in front of the throne of glory where Almighty God Himself may have said to Governor Cuomo:

Listen, you can take your suit off and put this robe on. Governor Cuomo, you can rest now. You have been faithful over a few things. You can rest now. Well done, My good and faithful servant, well done.

Mr. CROWLEY. Well done, my friend from Brooklyn and Queens.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Flushing, Queens, New York, Ms. GRACE MENG.

Ms. MENG. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker. Governor Mario Cuomo's legacy is important for all of us to remember here in Congress. Although the late Governor Cuomo is most well known nationally as an eloquent orator and bastion of liberalism, he first received public attention for his career creatively merging the values of social justice and access to affordable housing while protecting family values in my home borough of Queens.

Governor Cuomo's life is a personal inspiration as he was also raised in

Queens and born to immigrant parents. Perhaps it was this background that allowed him to regard himself as a progressive pragmatist who upheld the idea that government should be a positive source for good.

This is best seen through Governor Cuomo's advocacy for an activist government that provides shelter for the homeless, work for the idle, and care for the elderly and infirm even in times of austerity. This belief in a dynamic government met some opposition, but Governor Cuomo recognized the crucial safety net and that government investment is the foundation for a strong economy, an understanding that is imperative in today's political and economic climate.

As a mom of two young children, I am particularly touched by his launching of the Decade of the Child to enact educational and health care reforms affecting children. He deeply understood that improving children's lives ultimately betters our communities and empowers our future. Under his leadership, New York was the very first State to enact seatbelt laws, and today we continue focusing on making sure that children's toys and car seats are safe and effective. This academic year, New York City implemented universal pre-K, a concept that the late-Governor Mario Cuomo championed and the current Governor Andrew Cuomo aptly budgeted for success.

I believe in what Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of a government is how it treats those who are at the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those who are in the shadow of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

I think that Hubert Humphrey would have found Governor Cuomo to be a strong, moral leader and, like the rest of us, would have mourned the loss of an inspired beacon of progressive ideology.

I join my colleagues today from the New York delegation in sending condolences and sympathy to the entire Cuomo family, and know that Governor Cuomo's respected legacy will be a blessing to us all.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentle lady for her remarks. I thank all the members of the New York delegation, as well as Ms. PELOSI, the Democratic leader, for their remarks today and remembrance of the great Governor of the State of New York, Mario Cuomo.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity at the early age of 15 years of age to be engaged in, really, my first political campaign. My then-Uncle Walter Crowley, who was one of my political idols in life, along with a fellow by the name of Michael Dowd, were in charge of a portion of Queens County in terms of making sure that, I think, the Catholic vote came out for Mario Cuomo during the 1977 race for mayor of New York,

which was famously won in that primary by Ed Koch. But that was not the only election that Mario Cuomo—and storied election—that Mario Cuomo was a part of. He had been a part of elections before that, and, lo and behold, in 1982 he once again found himself in a matchup between himself and Ed Koch, and Mario Cuomo prevailing in that statewide election.

At 15 years of age, I remember handing out literature at the churches in western Queens and southern Queens, and it really was my entree into a political life. Then, in 1984, as a student at Queens College, I interned in the office of then-Governor Cuomo. And what an experience that was to be working with Bob Sullivan, his storied pollster, but officially, on the official side, was working in the statistics office with Dick Starkey, a former reporter, a storied reporter in New York City; Marty Steadman; to have Tim Russert walk into the room. We all died because Tim Russert just walked into the room.

I can remember in 1986 when I was elected to the State assembly how supportive Mario Cuomo was to me as a young man, recommending me to travel around the world with ACYPL, to come here to Washington to get my feet wet as well, to get that Washington sense. I remember being on the second floor in 1988 in the Blue Room, what is known as the Blue Room where the Governor would give his budgets, anticipating his delving into, diving into the 1988 Presidential elections, only to have my heart broken when Mario Cuomo said he would not run in that election.

Mario Cuomo was tough. He had one of the biggest hearts I have ever come to know.

He had also gone to law school, my Uncle Walter, and there was an intimacy between the Crowleys and the Cuomo family in Queens County politics, one that exists to this day with his son Andrew, as Governor, and my family as well.

Mario Cuomo always did the right thing. He always did the right thing. And Mario Cuomo had an incredible magnetism about him. I have never seen, outside of people who are Presidents of the United States, the kind of magnetic sense that Mario Cuomo emitted. People wanted to be around him. Whenever he was publicly out, he was walking in the street or at an event, it was hard to get near Mario Cuomo because everyone wanted to be around Mario Cuomo.

I was always nervous around Mario Cuomo, a healthy nervousness, but I was excited to be around him. I always wanted to be around him. I loved the man. I loved him dearly, although I never had enough time to be with him. As PAUL TONKO had said at the funeral—and what a beautiful funeral Mario Cuomo had, what an incredibly beautiful funeral—simple, yet elegant.

That is how I describe it. His son Andrew and his entire family, how respectful they were of their father. And I think of the people who attended that funeral had to walk away knowing that these children, all of them, were raised so well: Andrew, Margaret, Madeline, Maria, and Christopher. And all their grandchildren, how they behaved. It was just remarkable, just wonderful to see the respect they had for their father and their grandfather, for their in-law.

But Andrew had said that his father told him you don't tell people what they want to hear—and I am paraphrasing. He told them you tell them what they need to hear. You told them what you wanted to tell them, the message you wanted to get across.

It wasn't always popular, the message of Mario Cuomo; but I do know that people, even when they disagreed with him, they respected him and they admired him because of his tenacity, because he believed in what he was saying.

□ 2030

I think what they respected about him was he was always consistent as well in his thoughts. We will miss Mario Cuomo. Queens County, his home borough, will miss him. The city of New York and the State of New York, and, I think, the country have lost a great statesman, someone who didn't look to the next election but looked to the next great issue that needed to be tackled, not only in New York, because New York in many respects is the leader of State legislators in the country; he was thinking nationally, he was thinking globally as well.

Mario Cuomo will forever be one of my heroes, as is Lincoln. Mario Cuomo was bipartisan. He loved Lincoln, a Republican, but was true to his own democratic principles and his party as well. There is not enough time to say everything about him. But, Mr. Speaker, I once again want to thank the delegation for their loyalty this evening and being here for as long as they were, and the indulgence of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OPPOSING RAPPROCHEMENT WITH CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so humbled and pleased to see my colleagues who have turned out tonight at this late hour in a bipartisan manner to say that we reject the President's ill-advised treatment of the policy of rapprochement with the Cuban

regime, and no one is better able and better equipped to talk about freedom and democracy and our fight for justice than Mr. CHABOT.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join with my colleague and friend, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, in opposition to the December 17 announcement by President Obama to change U.S. policy toward Cuba. We will also be joined by some of our other colleagues, and I want to particularly thank Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN for her leadership on all issues regarding Cuba. She has been a leader on this issue for a long, long time and will continue to be, I am sure.

This policy change was a unilateral decision made without consulting Congress and with complete disregard of long-term national security consequences. Similarly, the so-called prisoner exchange was terribly flawed.

In 2013, Secretary Kerry stated that swapping convicted Cuban spies for Alan Gross was off the table, testifying before Congress that since Mr. Gross was wrongly imprisoned, there was no equivalency to pursue a spy for spy tradeoff. Let us be clear: the freedom of Alan Gross is welcome news, but this exchange was totally one-sided. It was tragically flawed. It was not in the best interest of the people of the United States, and it was not in the best interest of the people of Cuba.

As my colleague, Representative ROS-LEHTINEN, has rightly highlighted these past few weeks since the decision and the prisoner exchange occurred, Cuban spies have been responsible for the deaths of American lives. It is absolutely true that they have been. And they have been released. Those are the people who were responsible for American deaths. Cuban patriots who have risked their lives every day to fight for basic rights and freedoms feel betrayed.

The exchange was flawed. The policy itself is flawed, and the announcement has also let down one of the United States' strongest allies in the world, Israel. Year after year, Israel has stood at the United States' side—one of the very few—supporting the United States at the United Nations in 98 percent of all votes, including votes that the world's worst actors pushed through to condemn the U.S. embargo on Cuba.

Unfortunately, those who have long nourished and fostered cozy relationships with Cuba, most notably Russia and Venezuela and various terrorist organizations around the world, are welcoming the policy changes with open arms.

We need to be honest about the implications of President Obama's new policy. His unilateral decision to

change Cuba policy poses a threat to U.S. national security. If the trade embargo is lifted, money will flow into the hands of the Castro brothers, allowing them to financially support surreptitious espionage activities with terrorist groups like Hezbollah and nations like North Korea.

Since the President made his public announcement, nearly 100 Cubans have already been detained. The United States should always stand for democracy and freedom around the world. We should demand that the Castro regime release all political prisoners and hold free and fair elections before establishing diplomatic relations.

I once again thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership in this area for many, many years, and it is an honor to speak this evening with her.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much, and thank you for looking out for our U.S. national security, and thank you for trying to uphold the values of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. CHABOT brought up the fact that Mr. Kerry, speaking before our committee, said that we would not release spies for Alan Gross' life. And that came because of a question posed by our next speaker, and I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs), the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to speak tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment and deep concerns regarding the administration's plan for loosening the sanctions and initiating diplomatic discussions with the Cuban dictatorship. It is naive and misguided to think that this is going to give us the long-desired political and economic changes that the Cuban people deserve.

In fact, just a few days after the announcement, Raul Castro made sure to dispel any misgivings and brazenly declared that the regime would not abandon its communist path, let alone loosen its stranglehold over the people of Cuba. I feel that the administration has abandoned all those Cuban people for all those years who fought for human rights and democracy in Cuba. I feel that those people who are still lingering in the Cuban jails are so disappointed in this administration's efforts.

You know, the Alan Gross release should have been something joyous. And we all wanted Alan Gross released because he was incarcerated for no reason other than he was foreign. But to release three Cuban spies or a network of spies that exists in this country currently is just not acceptable. Alan Gross should have been released on his own. He did nothing. He just went to Cuba to establish some sort of communication for this community.

The other thing that is troubling me, coming from New Jersey, is the fact that there was no discussion about any extradition of the criminals that are currently in Cuba. There are over 100 criminals in Cuba, including Joanne Chesimard, who killed a State trooper in New Jersey point blank 30 years ago. She escaped to Cuba. She has been enjoying the sun, she has been enjoying the beach. Meanwhile, Trooper Werner Foerster's family for over 30 years grew up without a father. And yet we can't seem to get this government to think that it is important that we bring these people to justice. As a matter of fact, the FBI has named Joanne Chesimard as number one in the list of terrorists that they want back.

So to me it was very disappointing because the people of New Jersey, after all these years, are still trying to bring this woman to justice.

People tell me, well, we negotiate and we trade with Vietnam, we trade with China. We trade with other countries. And I say this: that is not the island that I want in Cuba. We haven't helped Vietnam's people at all. There is still no freedom, and there are human rights abuses. You look at China, it is the same thing. You look at North Korea, it is the same thing. I don't want that for the island where I was born. And I surely don't want that kind of government 90 miles away from this country. You know, the history of Cuba, all in the past 50 years of this dictatorship, has been one to try to hurt this country as much as it can, and I certainly don't want that 90 miles from this country.

The administration with this effort has taken away what we believe was a pressure point on a communist dictatorship 90 miles from this country. It has taken away how we can pressure this island. First of all, Russia used to help Cuba to the tune of \$4 billion a year. Venezuela can't any more. Venezuela is falling apart. There are 30,000 Cubans in Venezuela trying to create the same type of country that we have in Cuba.

And at this point, we take away this pressure and basically give millions of dollars to this dictatorship. People may not know it, but any time anybody sends any money to Cuba, the Cuban government keeps 30 percent of it. So if you raised it from \$500 to \$2,000, you tell me how many millions that is going to be. When you go to all of the beaches and to the restaurants, that is all government owned. In Cuba, if you want to set up a business, you have to negotiate with the government.

If I want to set up a business and I need 100 workers, I don't go out and get 100 workers, I go out and speak to the government and the government tells me you have to pay \$15 an hour. They in turn give those workers \$2-3 an

hour. That is not helping the Cuban people in their economics. That is not helping them move forward.

So I think it is really naive to think that these kinds of changes are going to help. You know, I can only think back when I was young, and I came to this country at the age of 11. I remember when they took all of the books out of the school system and started the indoctrination process. I remember the military coming into my house and they took inventory. My mother and father were poor people, but they took inventory of everything that was in the house. And they threatened my parents that if anything was missing at the time we got our visa, it would be revoked.

This is not the country that I want for Cuba. I want a country with democracy. I want a country where human rights are observed. And yet, for 50 years this dictatorship has been killing.

People talk about Raul Castro as some sort of a changer. People forget that Raul Castro and Che Guevara were the ones who set up the firing squads in Cuba that killed thousands of people. Thousands of people were killed by the firing squads.

So I rise today in total disappointment, and I hope that this administration sees that this is not the way forward, that this is a hardened dictatorship, and that the only way we can deal with this dictatorship is through pressure. Through pressure is the only way to deal with these people, especially at this time. There is nobody that is going to come out and bail out Cuba.

□ 2045

Just last year, they were funneling arms to North Korea right in our backyard. Is this the kind of government we want 90 miles from our shores?

I thank my good friends for having this hour, allowing me to express my sentiments, and I thank all my colleagues who are here speaking with the same approach.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as you heard from Mr. SIREs, he was born and reared in Cuba, but you don't have to be a Cuban American to understand the principles that are at stake here. One person who knows that is a wonderful congressman from our great State of Florida. So I am proud to yield to the gentleman from Florida, GUS BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you for holding this very important Special Order.

Way back in the Florida Legislature, when I was a member of the Cuban Caucus, so proud to be a member of the Cuban Caucus, I started speaking out against the Castro brothers' brand of oppression.

Over the past 5 years, I joined with all of you to decry Alan Gross' arrest. I am thankful for his recent release. Alan Gross' freedom was long overdue,

we all agree. I am glad he is safely on U.S. soil, but a large injustice remains: the plights of Cuban citizens, who have suffered for over five decades under the Castro regime in search of basic human rights and political freedoms that we as Americans, frankly, take for granted.

Then, almost out of nowhere, the Obama administration decides to normalize relations with Cuba. This will allow American dollars to the rescue of the Castro brothers at a critical time.

Their normal economic benefactors—Russia and Venezuela—cannot afford to help. Now, more than ever, economic sanctions can be used as an effective tool to force the Castro regime to afford basic human rights and political freedoms to all of Cuba's citizens.

Scholars have noted that normalizing our economic policy with oppressive countries, like China or Vietnam, have produced no significant improvements in human rights treatment.

Given the precedent, there is no reason to believe the situation with Cuba will yield significant different results. In fact, we already know that the suffering for Cuba's citizens will continue, unfortunately. Raul Castro proclaimed that there would be no renunciation of any of their principles. Cuban restrictions on free speech, assembly, and press will remain. They proved it just this last week.

Travel and tourism will remain strictly controlled by the Castro regime. Tourism dollars that Americans will spend will go directly to the oppressors.

We cannot ignore the sense of betrayal that Cuban defectors feel in response to the President's plan. We should be demanding genuine freedom: release of all political prisoners, universal human rights, Democratic principles, and a free market for the Cuban people.

In order to ensure the citizens of Cuba stand a chance to benefit from this ill-advised agreement, Cuba's despots must relinquish control and eradicate their tools of tyranny. Actual human rights reforms must occur before any commercial or political normalization takes place.

I will continue to monitor the actions on the island in search of positive movement.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. BILIRAKIS, I thank you for your clear and consistent message that restrictions should not be lifted against the Castro regime until those conditions are met.

Our next speaker, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman BRADLEY BYRNE, who so understands that good trade is based on free and fair countries that cherish the principles upon which our great country was founded—freedom, democracy, respect for the rule of law—all of which are missing in today's Cuba. His great city of Mobile, Alabama, will greatly

benefit once we have free trade and fair trade with a Democratic Cuba. I yield to the gentleman from Mobile, Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentlewoman, both for your time and for your leadership on this very important issue.

As she said, I represent Mobile, Alabama. If you go and look at a map, it is a straight shot north from Havana to Mobile. For over three centuries, Mobile has been a major port for the export of goods and import of goods back and forth between Cuba and the United States. It is in the economic best interest of the people in my district for us to get to the point where we have normalized relations and trade with Cuba.

I should be ardently in favor of this deal that the President is pursuing, but I am not. This is not the time, these are not the circumstances, and—to put it simply—this is not the way to do this.

Let me address the way for a moment. It has been alluded to previously that we have done deals with China and with Vietnam. In both cases, the Presidents involved worked with Congress. That is critically important to whatever success they have had in both of those deals.

In this circumstance, the President has refused to work with Congress. You can't reach the sort of agreement that he is looking for without Congress. You can't have an embassy unless we are willing to pay for it. You can't have an ambassador unless the Senate approves the ambassador.

He is pursuing what, in essence, is an errand that cannot result in success that he is looking for, but he is pursuing it anyway without us because this is just another example of these efforts to make these unilateral, executive-type decisions, leaving Congress to decide to try to keep itself relevant as he becomes a lameduck President. That is no way to do this.

Let me address the circumstances. I can't say it any better than the prior speakers have said it. This is a brutally oppressive regime that cannot change, and until they change, until they put in motion the things that we are talking about for change, I don't see how a country like the United States can seriously engage in negotiations with them.

Most importantly, for me, from my perspective, I serve on the House Armed Services Committee—I don't think I have to tell everybody here the history of this country—this country with this regime in charge allowed the then-Soviet Union to put nuclear missiles aimed at the United States on their soil. They have never apologized for that; they have never renounced that.

As we heard earlier, just a year ago, they were caught redhanded in an arms deal with the North Koreans, who are

presently enemies of the United States. What sort of assurance do we have as part of this deal that Cuba is not going to be a staging ground for military activity, terrorist activity, against the people and the security of the United States of America? Nothing, nothing; yet we engaged in this deal, a very bad deal from my perspective—and I don't want to take anything away from the American citizen who we were able to bring back home—but look who we traded in return for that.

It reminds me of the Bergdahl deal we had last year that was so very controversial. This administration doesn't know how to make a good deal. They know how to give everything away and get very little back.

I want to normalize relationships with Cuba. I want us to open up that trade again because it is going to benefit my district.

I am willing to do anything I can to help make that happen, but this country should never give in to people like the Castro brothers until there is a change in that regime, until there is a change in the Government of Cuba, until they renounce their activities that have been against the security of the United States, until we know that we have a good faith trading partner and a good faith partner, period, in this hemisphere.

I look forward to the day when I can stand at the Port of Mobile and welcome goods coming in from Cuba and goods going out from Mobile to Cuba as part of a deal that is made in the right way, under the right circumstances, for the right reason. I hope and pray that that day comes, but that day is not today.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. I look forward to continuing to follow that leadership in the days to come.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you very much. I am so thankful to my good friend from Mobile, Alabama, for his words, because he understands that American principles are not for sale.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that every country with whom the Castro brothers do business is a country to whom they owe a lot of money. They have not paid all of their bills to any businesses, and they have not paid what they owe to any country, and it would be all the same for Mobile, Alabama. Thank you for standing up for U.S. values.

Now, I am so pleased to yield to my good friend from South Carolina, a gentleman who understands the threat to our hemisphere. Why? Because he is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), my good friend.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on this issue, not just today, but for her whole tenure in Congress.

As the new chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I was grateful to see the return of Alan Gross to the United States last month after 5 years of unjust imprisonment in Cuba. The announcement over this past weekend that the Cubans freed 53 prisoners was also welcome news.

Nevertheless, I have major concerns with the way this administration, the Obama administration, conducted negotiations and the way the decision was made to radically alter longstanding U.S. policy towards Cuba.

The administration failed to consult Congress, failed to consult any Cuban dissidents or civil society in its decision to embark on its new course in Cuba. The administration says this decision will empower the Cuban people; yet softening U.S. policy without concrete Cuban reforms will only boost the Castro regime and government and facilitate the survival of the communist regime.

We need to focus not on what is best for the Cuban Government, the Castro regime, we need to focus on what is best for the Cuban people.

I ask you this: Will this deal mean more self-governance for the Cuban people? Will it mean more economic freedom for those who strive to innovate, those that are entrepreneurial within the Cuban society? Will they be able to start more businesses and have economic freedom? Will there be more religious freedom for the Cuban people? Will there be more rights to free speech? Are the Cuban people seeing this debate tonight on Cuban TV? Are the Cuban people able to access the Internet and watch what we are doing via YouTube or any other media? These are rhetorical questions, but I answer them with "no," based on my understanding.

I recall it was only 1 week after the announcement of this U.S.-Cuba deal that the Cuban Government cracked down on peaceful protestors in Havana's Revolutionary Square. I point to that as evidence that it is still a closed communistic society.

In conclusion, the administration's decision is a reward to the communist dictatorship at the expense of the Cuban people. This action is especially disgraceful when we consider the administration's disrespect toward our friend and ally in Canada by vowing to veto legislation approving the construction of the Keystone pipeline.

These are issues that require vigorous congressional oversight. I look forward to working with the ranking member, Mr. SIRES, that you just heard from, as we hold hearings in the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere in the coming weeks and month.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. DUNCAN. We are so pleased that we have this dynamic duo of the chairman and the ranking member of

Western Hemisphere. You are so right to point out, Mr. DUNCAN, that there is no freedom of the press in Cuba. That is one of the many freedoms that Cuban people are denied.

Now, I yield to my colleague from Florida, Congressman RON DESANTIS, who is a war veteran, but who understands that the war for freedom and democracy takes on many fronts, a member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to recognize my colleague from Florida because she is just not only on the House floor fighting for freedom for the Cuban people, with whom she obviously has ancestral relations, she fights for freedom for everybody. Whether it is in Venezuela or Iran, she is there; you can set your clock to it.

When I first heard about these concessions, I was really scratching my head. I texted some of my colleagues, and I was like: "We are not really getting anything for this."

Sure enough, Raul Castro goes out, talks to the people, and says: "We are not changing. We are not changing anything." They are staying exactly with the values that they have been with from the beginning, which are antagonistic to freedom, antagonistic to everything we hold dear in the United States.

□ 2100

You know, when you look at countries like Cuba, a lot of times you don't even need to get into the nitty-gritty. There are just certain signs where you know the nature of the regime. For example, when you look at communism in Eastern Europe, you don't have to look at the daily life or any of that. You just look at the fact that there was a Berlin Wall that kept people in like caged animals. If you look at the differences between North and South Korea, all you have to do is look at that satellite photo at night, where South Korea is lit up like a Christmas tree and North Korea is a land of darkness and despair.

For me, when I think of what is the nature of the Cuban regime, I think all you need to know is that you have tens of thousands of people living in Cuba. It is a nice island, it has great weather, and they are suffocated so much that they are willing to swim across 90 miles of shark-infested waters—the Florida Straits—knowing that they are probably going to die. That is all you need to know.

This is a Stalinist regime. And as my colleague from Alabama mentioned, the Cuban missile crisis wasn't even just that there were nuclear weapons in Cuba pointed at the United States. Fidel Castro was telling Khrushchev to fire them into the United States. We actually were fortunate that Nikita Khrushchev was actually the cooler

head in that. So if Castro had his way, there would have been nuclear weapons sent here. And so this is the nature of the regime.

So what are you doing with this policy? To me, I look at it very simply. I think this fact is true. Every single dollar spent in Cuba benefits the Castro regime. Every single dollar. Europe doesn't have restrictions. Most of the other world doesn't have restrictions. Have the Cuban people benefited from that? Has their standard of living gone up? No. This all goes to benefit the government.

To me, this is the worst possible time to throw the Castro regime a lifeline. If you look at what is happening in Caracas, if you look at what is happening in Moscow, these regimes are buckling because of the decline in the price of oil.

So this is a moment of profound weakness for the Castro regime. And giving them these concessions is exactly what the Castro regime wants. I am scratching my head trying to figure out: What do we get in return for this?

The Americans who had property seized when Castro took power, are any of them getting their property back? No.

What about the Cuban Americans who had to flee? They had their businesses taken, property taken. Are any of them going to get any type of recompense? Of course, not.

What about freedom of speech, political rights, the ability to participate in political life and criticize those in power? Is that being extended to the Cuban people? Not on your life. Nothing.

I will say, it is interesting—and my colleague from Florida mentioned this—the dismal credit rating that Cuba has. They don't pay back any loans. Are we then going to extend Export-Import Bank loans that are backed by the taxpayer to do business in Cuba? The American taxpayer is going to have to end up paying for that. That is not a good source of business for our taxpayers.

The tragedy of this is we have given away leverage that could have come in handy. These Castro brothers are on their last legs. When they finally leave the scene, we want to use the leverage we have to leverage a democratic transition. Instead, we are essentially normalizing status quo. So if the Stalinist dictatorship survives beyond the Castros due to U.S. support, you are going to have 11 million Cubans who are consigned to another generation of tyranny.

I will just say one more thing. When I read the media coverage—and I think I can say this because I am not from south Florida—the coverage is so negative about Cuban Americans who fled Castro. They say: Oh, they're living in the past. This is anachronistic, all this stuff.

For me, the people that I want to talk to to know the true nature of the

regime are the people who suffered under the regime, the people who were forced to flee and who had family members killed, had family members in prison. That, to me, is the number one source of information that I would look to.

And so the media frames it as if somehow the American policy is anachronistic. I think it is the Castro regime, based on Stalinist principles, that is anachronistic, and yet it continues to lumber on. And the tragedy of this is that we are giving them a critical lifeline so that they can continue having their country governed like a political prison.

So I appreciate you organizing this, my colleague in Florida. We are giving speeches here tonight, but we need to act in this body, and we need to show that this policy does not represent the will of the American people and does not represent what is best for people in Cuba that are struggling for freedom.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. DESANTIS. You are so right when you categorized this unilateral bad deal as an economic lifeline to the Castro regime.

A person who understands that just as well as you do is our next speaker, the gentleman from Iowa, a senior member of the House Committee on Agriculture, Congressman STEVE KING. He can say: Hey, my State is going to benefit a lot by this deal.

The sad reality, as Mr. KING and I know, is that Castro doesn't pay his debt. As we had just said with the other speaker, he owes everybody money. This deal will not strengthen U.S. national security. It will not be good for America's farmers, and it will not be good for the people of Cuba.

Congressman KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for organizing this Special Order, and I associate myself with her words and her position and also that of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS). I didn't, Mr. Speaker, realize how much was in him about this issue. It was instructive for me to listen to that stream forward.

I have had the privilege of serving here in this Congress with a good number of Members that do a great job of representing the interests of the Cuban people, and I also had the privilege of going to Cuba on a legal trip some years ago before I came to this Congress. But I would take you back, Mr. Speaker, to a time in 1959 and trace some of this history.

The revolution against Batista in 1959 was back before we had as many replays on television as we have today. And I recall watching the revolution in Cuba, and as Castro took over, as the promise came that they were going to bring democracy to Cuba—that was the promise. It was going to be democracy; it was going to be free and fair elections, a government of, by, and for the

people of Cuba; and they were going to choose their leadership.

But I remember seeing on television the videos of the people who were lined up against the wall and executed without a proper trial, executed without true justice. I remember in particular—it is branded in my memory—a man who insisted: If you are to shoot me here in front of this wall, let me give the order for my own execution. And he stood there in a Cuban shirt down to here—white pants, white shirt—and he raised his hand and faced the firing squad and dropped his own hand. That was the signal to the firing squad. They fired. He was shot to death in front of that wall, along with many, many others.

We don't know at this point how many political prisoners have been executed, how many have died in custody. We have got a list of some; we don't have a list of all. But we know this: it has never been, since that time in 1959, a government of, by, and for the people of Cuba.

And the hope that there will be the day that the Cuban people would be free was manifested—or at least attempted to be manifested—at the Bay of Pigs. I would have liked to have seen the air cover that would have made that be successful. We didn't get that. But we look for the day to come ever since that the Cuban people could be free. The Cuban people could be free.

Since that time, there has been the nationalization of the real property, which we heard from Mr. DESANTIS. At the time that Castro took control of Cuba, 25 percent of the real estate in Cuba was owned by Americans. They held deeds to that property. There was other land in Cuba that was owned by people from other nationalities.

Every other country was compensated for their real estate, except Americans. No American that I know of has been compensated for their real estate. They hold those deeds to this today, sometimes a second generation.

Before I came to this Congress, while I was there, there was also a situation where the exchange rate for Cuban peso to dollar was 21 to 1 at that time. And so if anyone achieved an American dollar, they could take it into a dollar store and they would get one peso's worth of goods for it or they could deposit it into a Cuban bank and they would get one peso for that. That is a 20-peso difference. And that is one of the things that supported the Castro regime financially.

Another thing that happened was sugar was 6 cents a pound. The Russians paid them 52 cents a pound in oil for the sugar. That was a subsidy of Cuba. When the Soviet Union—it was the Soviet Union rather than just the Russians—collapsed, then the subsidy for Cuba also collapsed and the Cuban economy was no longer propped up.

You saw Russian tractors sitting out there, having been stripped for parts,

in the only country in the world I know that had gone from mechanized agriculture to animal husbandry agriculture because their machines no longer worked. And the taxicabs are driven by doctors, with a five-cylinder Russian diesel under the hood of a 1954 Chevrolet.

This country has been frozen in time. It has a collapsed and failed economy. It has been propped up by the subsidy of, first, the Soviet Union, and then later on, the Venezuelans, who are collapsing, themselves, today.

This is a country of people that are vigorous people. They are an outgoing, hardworking, I will say, gregarious people. I thought I would see people down there that had the thousand-yard hopeless stare. I am sure that exists. But I also saw people that worked hard and they kept their chin up and they kept a smile on their face.

I thought, If these people could be unleashed, if they could be unleashed by the heartbeat of freedom, if we could just get them that opportunity to be who they are, they would become a very, very successful island and trading partner and a nation unto themselves and, one day, an ally of the United States.

So my dream has been to help them with that opportunity, and my dream has been to one day swim ashore at the Bay of Pigs and walk out and wade onto a free Cuba, with a free Cuban.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Cuban people have been burdened with more than five decades of Marxist slavery that they have had to face. And this policy of the President's that comes right on the cusp of what is likely the biological solution in Cuba, which would be the end of the Castro brothers that would come along naturally and the opportunity to bring about a regime change in Cuba, the President of the United States may well have handed Cuba another 50 years of living in Marxist slavery when he had just the opportunity for them to be free.

So our policy here in this Congress, I am hopeful, is the policy that says: regime change in Cuba and a government of, by, and for the people of Cuba. And I, one day, hope and pray to do what I have said with my colleagues here and many others, and that is swim ashore at the Bay of Pigs and wade out on the shore of a free Cuba.

God bless them all.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. KING. That is our fervent hope as well. And we work and we pray every day for that dream of a free Cuba to come alive. We thank you for your voice here tonight. Thank you, my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, many people talk about the last generation of Cuban exiles and how this is really not the dream of young Cuban Americans who were born here in the United States, reared here in the United States. They come from

Cuban families, but they really don't much care about freedom and democracy and the land of their ancestors.

This next speaker, Mr. Speaker, is a newly elected gentleman who understands that that search for a free and democratic Cuba is a yearning that lives very fervently in his heart, and that is the Congressman from West Virginia, Congressman ALEX MOONEY, who was born here, as American as apple pie, but comes from a proud lineage of Cuban American heritage.

Thank you, Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. I want to thank Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for arranging this important Special Order to show solidarity with the Cuban people as they continue to live under an oppressive regime.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has senselessly yielded ground, with no stipulations for reform, to the Cuban regime, with the announcements of a secret deal going around Congress to "normalize" relations. This misguided grab for a legacy item has cost our country and the Cuban people a valuable bargaining chip for their freedom.

Of course, this is yet another foreign policy failure or, more accurately, unilateral surrender from this administration. From the bright red line in Syria, which was crossed with impunity, to sending a secret message to President Putin that, "After the election, I will be more flexible," to now rewarding tyrants in Cuba who continue to deny basic human rights to their oppressed citizens, President Obama has chosen wrong policies.

The despotic government the President would normalize relations with has, for decades, sought to subjugate the Cuban people's appetite for freedom. The many realized American Dreams of Cuban refugees, including my mother, are a great testament to the greatness of the United States and our constitutional rights. As the beacon of freedom in the world, America must continue to use sensible policy to protect our values around the world and in our own backyard.

□ 2115

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. MOONEY. We are a better Congress for you being a part of it. Thank you so much for being proud of your American heritage and your Cuban American ancestry as well. So, welcome to Congress, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to introduce another millennial, another one of this younger generation of Cuban Americans who the press continues to say don't represent the desires of this new generation.

Well, CARLOS CURBELO is one of our newest elected officials. He was born here in the United States, doesn't know Cuba, and is less than 35 years old but understands that yearning for a

free Cuba. We are so pleased as punch to have him here as a Member of our Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank her for her tireless advocacy and work on this very, very important cause.

Mr. Speaker, during the 56 years of the Cuban tragedy, also known as the Cuban Revolution, there had always been two constants.

First, the nature of the Castro regime, a dictatorship that brutally represses its own people, and that aggressively opposes U.S. national security interests throughout the globe. That has not changed.

The second was that, to varying degrees, the occupant of the White House had always been on the side of the Cuban people and in opposition to their oppressors, who for decades have collaborated with America's most dangerous allies. Today, this is, regrettably, no longer the case.

By trading an American hostage, cruelly held by Cuba's dictators for 5 years, for three criminals convicted of spying against our government, including one who was serving a lifetime sentence for conspiring to murder American citizens, the President sent a message to our enemies that the United States can be extorted.

What was the Cuban government's reward for holding an American hostage for 5 years? Three convicted spies and full diplomatic relations, plus an economic bailout for a financially and morally bankrupt regime.

The men who rule Cuba today are the same men who had nuclear missiles installed on the island and pointed them at the United States, as my colleague from Alabama stated earlier. When they were cash-rich, they ran a robust military and deployed troops throughout the world to fight alongside our most dangerous enemies.

They have trained and supported terrorist groups such as Colombia's FARC. They ordered three American citizens and one resident blown out of the sky in the tragic shootdown of February 24, 1996.

A few months ago, they were caught shipping arms illegally to North Korea, and they collaborated with the Venezuelan government in last year's brutal crackdown, which resulted in the death of over 40 students.

Human rights atrocities by the dictatorship against its people continue. The Castro regime consistently resorts to violence because they know it is the only way they can maintain control since the Cuban people are desperate to be free.

The President's decision to ease sanctions only serves to bolster the dictatorship and its apparatus of repression. There is virtually no private sector in Cuba. More than 85 percent of Cubans

work for government controlled-enterprises and earn less than \$20 a month.

Foreign investment doesn't benefit the average Cuban. Cubans that work for corporations with foreign capital are only allowed to keep 8 percent of their salaries. Cuban workers are, in effect, slaves of the dictatorship.

Now, it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, President Obama's administration approved sanctions in recent months against Venezuela and North Korea. Why, then, is it rewarding an enemy of the United States just 90 miles from our shores that actively collaborates with both of these regimes?

Why does the President insist on an incoherent foreign policy that too often rewards our enemies and punishes our allies?

As other American Presidents have shown us in the past, peace through weakness and appeasement is not an effective strategy for dealing with Cuba's military dictatorship.

We also have to ask ourselves, what kind of neighborhood do we want to live in?

The Americas, the Western Hemisphere, is the American neighborhood of the world. What kind of standards do we want for this part of the world?

Do we want to endorse the chronic abuse of human rights, the imprisonment of people who disagree?

That is the nature of the Cuban government, and we, the United States of America and, by the way, the other nations of this hemisphere, have agreed that we support a democratic form of government, and that we want this part of the world to be free without exception. There is one glaring exception, and it is Cuba.

Our sanctions policy, some say, well, it hasn't worked. Of course the sanctions have worked. The sanctions have denied billions and billions and billions of dollars to a regime that would use those profits to oppose our interests throughout the world.

What did the regime do when it had resources?

It had troops all over the world. It exported revolution. And if you don't know what exporting revolution means, in the context of Cuba, it means aggressively opposing American interests throughout the world.

Today, we remember in a very special way, Mario Manuel de la Pena, Carlos Costa, Armando Alejandro, and Pablo Morales. These were the men who were brutally assassinated by the Cuban regime on February 24 of 1996.

One of the spies was convicted of conspiring to murder these young men, three of whom were American citizens, and the other was a resident of our country. These four men are dead, and the Cuban spies are free.

But it isn't too late, Mr. Speaker. The President still has time to get back on the right side of this issue and

on the right side of history by standing against Cuba's dictators, with the victims of their brutality, and for a strong American foreign policy that advances our national security interests.

Again, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from south Florida for her leadership. We have admired her for so many years for her work on this issue.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. CURBELO. You are a fresh young voice, and I thank you and Mr. MOONEY for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker I am so pleased to yield to a gentleman who understands what freedom is all about. He was one of the speech writers for our great President, Ronald Reagan. He is a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In fact, he is the chairman of the Europe Subcommittee, and he is here tonight with one of his triplets, Christian, who wants to be an author and an inventor.

I look at Christian, this new generation, and I think, what kind of life would he have under the communist tyranny of Cuba, as opposed to the freedom and democracy that we enjoy here?

So with that, I am pleased as punch to yield to my good friend from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you very much.

America is about to send a message to the world exactly on whose side are we on, and I am very proud to stand here with my colleagues, standing on the side of liberty, of justice, of treating people decently, of government that serves the people rather than a systematic government that requires the people to serve them, the bureaucracy, the tyrants that hold power.

That is what this is all about. Let's get an understanding of who this Castro gang is. Castro murdered the freedom fighters who overthrew the dictatorial government of Batista back in the 1950s.

Castro, himself, took people out who had fought against the dictatorship of Batista and shot them in the head. These were people that risked their lives to bring democracy to Cuba, and this man co-opted their revolution.

He has allied himself, over the years, with gangsters and tyrants throughout the world. He has had a safe haven for the drug dealers of Latin America, who look to him as the moderator of any disputes between these monstrous gangsters who murder each other and murder anyone who gets in their way.

He has allied with these drug dealers. But also, during the cold war he was allied to the hilt to the communist movement throughout the world. He wanted his country to become a nuclear base to attack and drop nuclear bombs on the people of the United States.

Let's not forget that. This is the man who wanted to kill Americans by the

millions. For us now, oh, well, that is history; let bygones be bygones.

Are you kidding me?

This is the guy that we need to send a message to. When people have that much hatred of the United States, undermine the freedom of the people in the world, we are not just going to sit aside and forgive him of these things.

Oh, by the way, he is not even asking for forgiveness. The Castro regime is just saying, accept us as we are, a country that has had more political prisoners than almost any other country of this hemisphere, and we are just going to accept them as they are.

Well, remember, when people were struggling during the cold war against communism, Castro was on the wrong side. During the cold war, he was the one who wanted to kill Americans by the millions by having Soviet missiles in his country.

Finally, what does this agreement that this administration—what will be the effect of it?

Oh, yeah, they say, we have been told, well, if you just have free trade people are going to get better. There is going to be liberalism.

I call this the "hug a Nazi, make a liberal" theory. The fact is that Fidel Castro, just like the Chinese Communists, I might add, no matter how much trade we have, they will manipulate it so that the clique that is in power, the clique that has been able to monstrously oppress their own people, take that wealth, manipulate that wealth that is coming into the country to cement their own power.

It is very clear what this man has and his clique have in mind, and that is continuing their oppression of the Cuban people.

Let's not be partners to that. Let us again, stand for liberty, stand for justice.

The Soviet Union has fallen. It is time for Castro and communism in Cuba to fall as well.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. ROHRBACHER. And you so rightly point out that hours after President Obama announced, in a shocking way, that we would resume diplomatic relations with Cuba and the Castro regime does not have to change, Raul Castro put on his military uniform and spoke to the oppressed island nation and said, hey, don't worry. We are not changing a thing. It is still the same failed regime.

We got nothing from that deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development. I had the honor of serving with his older brother. I have the honor of serving with his youngest brother now, MARIO. Born in the United States and, just like Carlos and ALEX MOONEY, Mr. CURBELO and Mr. MOONEY, a gentleman

who is 100 percent American and so proud of 100 percent of his Cuban ancestry.

Thank you, Mario.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Let me first thank you, Madam Chairwoman, for your leadership. As we heard tonight, your leadership in the cause of freedom does not stop at the shores of Cuba. Wherever there is repression and oppression, there is the clear concise voice of Chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, as we have heard again tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot. And I know that the time is getting short, but I want to quote somebody whom we have not quoted, as far as I remember here tonight, and this is President Obama. When Mr. Obama was running for President he stated what the right policy, what his policy would be to deal with the Cuban tyranny.

He said: "My policy towards Cuba will be guided by one word, 'libertad'—freedom. And the road to freedom for all Cubans must begin with justice for Cuba's political prisoners, the right of free speech, a free press, freedom assembly, and it must lead to elections that are free and fair."

Mr. Obama went on to say: "I will maintain the embargo. It provides us with the leverage to present the regime with a clear choice. If you take significant steps towards democracy, beginning with the freedom of all—political prisoners," Mr. Obama said, "we will take steps to begin normalizing relations. That is the way to bring about real change in Cuba," Mr. Obama said, "through strong, smart principled democracy."

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, in essence, that day, then-candidate Obama, Senator Obama, and now-President Obama drew a red line about what the right policy was to deal with the Cuban regime; sadly, on December 17, President Obama announced that he was breaking that promise, that he was, once again, crossing—breaking—his own red line.

We have heard tonight what we have also heard from the vast majority of the pro-democracy leaders within the island who are struggling. They have objected to President Obama's change of policy. Mr. Speaker, if President Obama doesn't want to do it for the sake of a future of freedom for the Cuban people, he should stand firm for the sake of the national security interests of the United States.

As we have heard today—right now, as we speak, not 50 years ago—the Cuban regime harbors fugitives from American law, including cop killers and terrorists. What is President Obama's answer? "No problem, we will normalize relations."

The Cuban regime has an active espionage network against the interests of

the United States. What is the President's answer to that? "No problem, we will normalize. You can continue to do that."

The Cuban regime shot down two American airplanes in international airspace; and for the people who are in prison, including one who was in prison for conspiracy to murder, not only is it okay—no problem, we will normalize—but no. We will send them back. You can go back home.

Mr. Speaker, the night is late, but I know and I am confident that, unlike President Obama, this Congress will continue to stand firm with the cause of freedom and the cause of a free Cuba, even while President Obama does not.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much, Mr. DIAZ-BALART. You so eloquently stated that. We have so much to say, and we have run out of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members not to refer to guests on the floor of the House.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 37, PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 185, REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 240, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-2) on the resolution (H. Res. 27) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMERICA'S FREE TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) until 10 p.m.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to paint a picture of U.S.

job loss resulting from our trade policies extending back now almost three decades.

I rise because America has a huge "good jobs" deficit because we have a gigantic trade deficit. That means more imports come in here than our exports go out, largely because markets and other places are closed. Our workers and our communities have paid a tremendous price for this.

I oppose any further NAFTA-like trade agreements, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which the administration is proposing. That will ship out more U.S. jobs. We have had enough. The American people have had enough.

Since 1975, when Wall Street's free trade job outsourcing roulette began, America has amassed a \$9.3 trillion trade deficit with the world. If you look at this chart, we have on here every single trade agreement that was signed and all of the lost jobs that resulted from the growing trade deficits we are amassing with countries around the world. This has never happened before over our history in the United States of America. It is a very serious problem.

The staggering loss of productivity associated with this deficit translates into a huge job loss here at home. In fact, that \$9.3 trillion of accumulated trade deficit of more imports coming in here than exports going out has actually cost us over 47,500,000 lost American jobs.

Most of those were really good jobs that paid living wages, jobs that just evaporated from our communities, jobs that were shipped to Mexico or to China, Korea, Bangladesh, Honduras, Guatemala, Turkey, El Salvador—everywhere in the world—largely to the Third World, and, frankly, to undemocratic countries where workers are treated like a bonded class.

Our workers, no matter how loyal or hardworking, became expendable as this began. In fact, they were treated like expendable widgets. What is being hurt in the process is the belief of the public that the value of hard work has any meaning. There are some workers who have simply dropped out.

Yes, American jobs are being outsourced year after year—for over a quarter century now—and workers are being treated like a game of musical chairs. Our jobs have been shipped out to penny-wage sweatshops hidden behind the Iron Curtain of anonymous towns in distant places most Americans will never visit. Anonymity, exploitation, and hidden squalor are as fundamental to free trade as the hollowing out of American jobs, our communities, and our middle class.

Those who exploit workers in our country and globally believe they are so powerful that the American people won't be able to rein them in, and they think this Congress will continue to

behave as it did before, despite the evidence that this doesn't work for the American people.

Some of those very powerful interests are asking for another Fast Track trade deal to do it all over again in something called the Trans-Pacific Partnership, on an even bigger scale, including nations with the grossest violations of basic human rights.

Let me turn first to the broken promises of NAFTA, which was really the fundamental agreement passed—over my objections—in the early 1990s and another agreement, CAFTA, that dealt with Central America. Fast-forward to this past summer when thousands of migrant children from Central America swarmed our southern border. Remember that?

The American press acted surprised upon their arrival, and some people even threw tomatoes at buses that carried children from one detention facility to another.

These children had lived under 20 years of NAFTA and CAFTA in Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. They had experience with the NAFTA trade agreement and the CAFTA trade agreement, which covers those countries, trade agreements that were sold as opportunities that would rise the tide of all boats, of all workers.

What happened? Here in the United States, we had a huge loss of jobs to those countries, and Mexico's and Central America's infrastructures were not modernized. Their standard of living was not raised.

In fact, the promise that those countries somehow would turn into stylistically rustic versions of the American consumer market never happened. They were told new jobs would abound, but our Nation began to hemorrhage jobs to Mexico as wages in Mexico and throughout Central America began to drop. Those deficits became part of the overall total.

The problem is that in most of these countries where the free trade agreements were signed, what you see happening is more goods coming in here than our goods going out, a little trickle going to some places. In Mexico, what happened ever since NAFTA's passage was that we were promised trade balances. Every single year, it has gotten worse and worse.

This week, the broken promises sold to the American public and their elected officials is that these agreements would really work. The people who voted for those agreements should pay some attention to the debate of trying to withhold funding for the Department of Homeland Security because of the President's action on immigration.

The stories of the youth being shipped back by the plane loads tell of families' lands being stolen from under them. The land was handed over to multinational corporate agricultural groups that come in and grow, for example, palm oil.

Local displaced farmers were forced into urban settings—desperate, in search of food, in search of work at factories where jobs that were promised in return for the land—guess what—never materialized. Here on our own continent, the children became the refugees of transnational economic policies that harmed the entire continent.

Hardly anyone even talked about that; but when you have this kind of disruption, when you have so much job loss, and when you have land, transferring title with millions of farmers disrupted from their way of life, what do we expect?

Millions of displaced people in Mexico and Central America living in the shadow of border plants and urban factories exist in a state of peonage that makes older versions of slavery look positively beneficent, squatting on poisoned ground in jerry-rigged plywood and tar paper shacks.

I have been in those shacks. I have gone to those places. When you do, you never forget it. Next door, water in gutters that surround these places is so polluted that communities smell of a rancid odor, and even chickens that they keep to try to feed themselves die from the drinking water. We have seen it. We have been there.

The displaced population on the run is surging, thanks in large part to NAFTA and CAFTA's agricultural provisions, those very flawed provisions that provided no opportunity for adjustment as a First World nation met the economy of Third World nations.

The terms of the agreement forced the revocation of land and allowed multinationals to begin buying up vast tracts in the interior, pushing untold millions of peasant farmers, who remain nameless, off their land and into the labor pool of the maquiladoras; yet we, as Americans, are surprised when their children, as migrants, flock to our southern border.

If we seriously looked at the impact of our free trade agreements, we would easily see the havoc wrought on local economies throughout the lands on the other side of the border. Those who forced this to happen should know the consequences of their policies and what they reap: legions of desperate workers willing to do anything to survive.

Now, let me turn to the Trans-Pacific Partnership that proposes to expand trade into regions with the worst labor violations and working conditions.

We can't be fooled into thinking expanding trade agreements with 11 new nations in the Pacific rim will actually be the end to American jobs being shipped overseas. Of the 11 nations with which the United States is negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership, nine have wage levels significantly lower than our own.

This will only intensify the already real reduction in wages American workers are experiencing year after

year as our jobs are shipped overseas to increase profits of shareholders as they take advantage of impoverished laborers.

Worse yet, for the immigration debate, as those who run the maquilas of Mexico and Central America realize, the next move will be to Vietnam for even cheaper labor. Factories on this continent will shut down, further exacerbating the poor economic conditions of our southern neighbors, leaving even fewer options other than for those individuals to flee north, seeking any economic opportunity to sustain themselves.

I wanted to spend a moment looking at the Korean agreement because that was one of the latest ones they brought up here as a free trade agreement. They promised there would be thousands of jobs and that America would be able to sell 50,000 vehicles to Korea.

□ 2145

Well, guess what. We haven't even hit 10,000, while there have been over 561,000—half a million—vehicles sent from Korea here. So look at what is happening with the Korean agreement, another free trade agreement, which just passed a couple of years ago. The proof is in the pudding.

The Fast Track procedure, which allows no amendment here on the floor, yields this—more red ink for the United States.

We were promised that the Korean agreement would create jobs and help balance our trade deficit in an effort to strengthen our economy and rebuild the American auto industry. Nothing could be further from the truth, as with every other agreement.

We are in a deep trade deficit with Korea. The U.S.-Korean free trade agreement promised 70,000 jobs. In actuality, we have already lost 40,000. It is going in exactly the opposite direction.

The U.S. Census Bureau recently revealed that the United States had a \$2.8 billion monthly trade deficit with Korea just in November of last year, the highest monthly U.S. goods trade deficit with Korea on record. The historic U.S. trade deficit with Korea was driven by a record-setting \$6.3 billion in imports from Korea and a lackluster \$3.5 billion in exports to Korea from the United States. Auto sales did not surge, as we were promised. Exactly the reverse is true.

And now we can look at China. You know, the story is no different. You would think we would have learned something. But if you look at trade with China—and China became a member of the World Trade Organization in 2001—Americans were promised, again, that that deal would expand market opportunities for United States companies, thereby increasing jobs here and American prosperity.

How has this worked out? Let me share some specifics:

The United States has lost over 64,000 manufacturing firms and at least 5.8 million manufacturing jobs to China. In the year 2013, the latest complete year of data, America actually racked up a \$319 billion trade deficit with China. And you know this to be true because everything you buy—coffee cups, clothing, electronics, even solar panels—are all made in China. And the massive deficit we have racked up with China just in 1 year—that 1 year—amounted to a loss of 1.5 million American jobs. And that is just 1 year's damage.

What America needs is not more of the same NAFTA-styled trade agreements. What America and American workers need is a trade policy that creates jobs, opportunity, and wealth in this country first. We need balanced trade accounts, not trade accounts that are in the red with every single country with which we have racked up these deficits. The American people—not just the global corporate elite—need to be in the driver's seat again, and that is where Congress has to do its job. Our Nation needs a trade policy that is results-oriented, that will yield jobs in America.

We must open closed markets of the world. We must grow our exports. We must hold those who wrote these agreements accountable for the damage that they have done, and we must not create any more free trade agreements that dig the hole deeper.

We must create jobs here in our country by moving our Nation toward economic independence—not dependence—by rebuilding our own manufacturing base here at home, by restoring our domestic energy security, and by making sure that these agreements result not in deficits, but in trade balances and, even more importantly, trade surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, there are ways that a developed nation can trade with the developing world without gutting its own economy. America has got to figure out how to get there. And no trade deal should be brought up here under that Fast Track procedure where Congress can't amend until we fix what is wrong with these agreements. Haven't we learned in three decades that that flawed trade model just simply isn't working?

Pushing huge trade agreements, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, through Congress on a Fast Track course with no opportunity for amendment is not the way to create a strong middle class, rising wages, and real opportunity for the American people. Now is the time to hold this administration and this Congress accountable for changing course and start to invest in this country again and make sure that these trade partners with whom we do business open their markets. To do any less is to continue to harm the American people and continue to have this

enormous downward pressure on job creation in this country and wage levels and benefit levels in this country, where the average American hasn't seen a raise in years. We have to change. This is too great a price for the American people to pay.

So this evening, I thank those who are listening for their time. I thank the Speaker for the time this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of flight delay due to weather.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. TITUS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 9, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 26. To extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 13, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

18. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility, Caroline County, MD, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8363] received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

19. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Assessments (RIN: 3064-AE16) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

20. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Title IV Treatment of Rollovers From Defined Contribution Plans to Defined Benefit Plans (RIN: 1212-AB23) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

21. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clarification to Scope of Certain "600 Series" ECCNs [Docket No.: 141119982-4982-01] (RIN: 0694-AG40) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

22. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision to the Export Administration Regulations: Controls on Electronic Commodities; Exports and Reexports to Hong Kong [Docket No.: 141107937-4937-01] (RIN: 0694-AG33) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

23. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 13-14, informing the Congress of the Department's intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Communications and Information Organisation (NCIO), as represented by the NATO Communications and Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

24. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties, entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

25. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

26. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period April, 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

27. A letter from the Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program Miscellaneous Changes: Medically Underserved Areas (RIN: 3206-AN03) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

28. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones within the Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone, Louisiana [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0993] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

29. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Arthur Kill, NY and NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1063] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

30. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's

final rule — Safety Zone, Christina River; Wilmington, DE [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

31. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Additional Requirements for Charitable Hospitals; Community Health Needs Assessments for Charitable Hospitals; Requirement of a Section 4959 Excise Tax Return and Time for Filing the Return [TD 9708] (RIN: 1545-BK57; RIN: 1545-BL30; RIN: 1545-BL58) received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

32. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe harbor methods of accounting for cable system operators (Rev. Proc. 2015-12) received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

33. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, OLCA, OLDO, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Several Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2014-0068] (RIN: 0960-AH72) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

34. A letter from the Administrator, TSA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at Portsmouth International Airport (PSM) at Pease will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

35. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting a report to the Congress entitled "Impact of Home Health Payment Rebased on Beneficiary Access to and Quality of Care", pursuant to Public Law 111-148, section 3301; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 27. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-2). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 270. A bill to continue the use of a 3-month quarter EHR reporting period for health care providers to demonstrate meaningful use for 2015 under the Medicare and Medicaid EHR incentive payment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 271. A bill to establish a commission to examine the evidence-based therapy treatment model used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for treating mental illnesses of veterans and the potential benefits of incorporating complementary alternative treatments available in non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities within the community; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 272. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the priority for enrollment of Medal of Honor recipients in the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 273. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to enhance services to small business concerns that are disadvantaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 274. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 275. A bill to establish a commission to identify and examine issues of national concern related to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, to make recommendations for the resolution of the issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 276. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from using Federal funds for the position of Public Advocate, or the position of Deputy Assistant Director of Custody Programs and Community Outreach, within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 277. A bill to prohibit assistance to the Palestinian Authority until it withdraws

its request to join the International Criminal Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 278. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the TIGER discretionary grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 279. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to limit the authority of the Federal Communications Commission over providers of broadband Internet access service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 280. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARINO, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. ROTHFUS):

H.R. 281. A bill to prohibit recovery of damages in certain wrongful birth and wrongful life civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 282. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require that the Congressional Budget Office prepare long-term scoring estimates for reported bills and joint resolutions that could have significant economic and fiscal effects outside of the normal scoring periods; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 283. A bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 284. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BARR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COOK, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 285. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 286. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting Congress the authority to enact laws limiting the number of terms that Representatives and Senators may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the sixteenth article of amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.J. Res. 17. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the United States Government from increasing its debt except for a specific purpose by law adopted by three-fourths of the membership of each House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit Congress' power to impose a tax on a failure to purchase goods or services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H. Res. 26. A resolution strongly supporting the quality and value of diversity and innovation in the Nation's higher education institutions, and strongly disagreeing with the President's proposal to create and administer a Postsecondary Institution Ratings System; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 28. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of door delivery for all business and residential customers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority to raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
"The Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have Power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution granted Congress the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Further, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 provides that Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution (relating to the power of Congress with respect to taxes and spending).

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, § 8

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution which provides that, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law, and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

AMENDMENT IV: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no

Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath of affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Additional authority derives from Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States that states "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.J. Res. 15.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 16.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This joint resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution under Article V of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 17.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article V of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.J. Res. 18.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution provides for amendments to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.J. Res. 19.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states,

or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.J. Res. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 27: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 32: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 33: Mr. HANNA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 36: Mr. AMASH, Mr. BRAT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 44: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 94: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 109: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 114: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 132: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 143: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JONES, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 154: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 156: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 161: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 167: Mr. VALADAO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 173: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 177: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 178: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 181: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 185: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 187: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 191: Mr. PALMER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 203: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 204: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 206: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 217: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 223: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 227: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 228: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COOK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 238: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 246: Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. KLINE.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. EMMER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. POSEY.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. EMMER.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H. Res. 11: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PERRY, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. RIGELL.

H. Res. 12: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 24: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BARR, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. KNIGHT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY Mr. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 37 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY Mr. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 217: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 14R-10-247, urging the Department of Labor to more effectively enforce the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 and other

continued efforts for ensuring parity in pay for women so that women in comparable positions make incomes much more closely related to their male counterparts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2. Also, a petition of the City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 14R-12-278, supporting the Haitian Family Reunification Parole Program that was created by the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. KENNETH COOPER

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable individual from Dallas, Texas for his induction into the National Football Federation's Leadership Hall of Fame last night, January 8, 2015. I would like to thank Chairman Archie Manning, Troy Aikman, Tom and Laura Leppert, and Roger Staubach for recognizing Dr. Kenneth Cooper for his dedication to health and fitness and his continued leadership in the North Texas community as a whole.

Throughout Dr. Cooper's career he has continued to revolutionize health and fitness and has proven to be a leading pioneer in preventative medicine. Known as the "Father of Aerobics" he has motivated thousands of people in Texas and across the United States to exercise in pursuit of good health and overall well-being. I want to express my heartiest congratulations to Dr. Cooper on this outstanding accomplishment and sincerely thank him for his immense contribution to the Dallas community.

RECOGNIZING PINE CASTLE,
FLORIDA

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of the Town of Pine Castle, Florida.

Pine Castle's rich history begins in the years immediately following the Civil War. Originally, Pine Castle was a private residence erected by Will Harney, a poet and settler from Kentucky. He built his home from the abundant pines of Central Florida and dubbed it his "pine castle." Soon, the areas of modern-day Edgewood, Belle Isle and the Conway chain of lakes came to be known as "Pine Castle." In 1915, the Town of Pine Castle was formally incorporated.

I join the residents of Pine Castle in celebrating this historical milestone. It is truly an honor to serve the residents of Pine Castle in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN ENI FALEOMAVAEGA OF AMERICAN SAMOA FOR HIS NEARLY FOUR DECADES OF SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the nearly four decades of service of my former colleague Congressman Eni Faleomavaega of American Samoa. After nearly four decades on Capitol Hill, American Samoa's longest serving Member of Congress and the first Asian Pacific American in U.S. history to become chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, bid farewell to colleagues and friends at a reception on Capitol Hill held in his honor on Wednesday, November 19th. The farewell reception for Faleomavaega included Members of Congress from the House and Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, ambassadors, foreign delegations, and their family members. They paid tribute to the man they call "Our Eni," and did so by sharing memories from their years together. Congressman Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, beloved by so many on the Hill, first came to Capitol Hill in the 1970s and served as Chief of Staff to the late Paramount Chief A.U. Fuimaono, American Samoa's first Representative in Congress, and as staff counsel to the late Congressman Phil Burton of San Francisco before he became American Samoa's Representative in 1989.

As a reflection of Faleomavaega's genuine kindness that touched so many and his bipartisan approach that reached across party lines, the reception was attended by many, including House Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI and her husband Paul. Leader PELOSI shared memories of Faleomavaega in their early years with Congressman Phil Burton long before she and Faleomavaega were both elected to Congress. "Eni, you are family from the Burtons on," Leader PELOSI stated. The Pelosis visited privately with Faleomavaega and his family, including his wife, Mrs. Hinanui Hunkin, and his daughter and son-in-law, Leone and Fui Vakapuna.

Current and former members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee also attended. Republican Senator JEFF FLAKE of Arizona, who first came to the Hill as a Representative from Arizona's 1st District in 2001, expressed his gratitude to Faleomavaega as a leader, mentor, and friend, including an unforgettable moment with Faleomavaega when the two were on their way to a hearing. Congressman Faleomavaega was in an elevator with a good number of Samoan visitors who the Senator described as all resembling NFL linebackers.

Faleomavaega immediately held the elevator door open when he saw his friend coming down the hallway. Mr. FLAKE squeezed in to the elevator but once the door closed, rather than ascend to the next floor, the elevator dropped a few feet and the entire group was trapped for about twenty minutes before they were rescued. Senator FLAKE joked that the irony of it all was that the hearing was on submerged lands. In his message to Faleomavaega, Senator FLAKE stated, "Eni, I have such good memories of our time together. Thanks for being such a good friend and mentor to me, and such a good example of a disciple of Christ. I look forward to working with you on a range of issues in the future. With admiration, JEFF FLAKE, U.S. Senate."

Hawai'i Senator MAZIE HIRONO, reminisced with Faleomavaega about their early years in the House together and conveyed how much she will miss him being an honorary member of the Hawai'i State delegation. Over the years, because of his close ties to Hawai'i and friendship with the delegation, Faleomavaega was always invited to speak at the annual King Kamehameha Lei Draping Ceremony. The Senator also shared how, whenever Faleomavaega had the opportunity, he always reminded President Obama that Kahuku (Faleomavaega's alma mater) is better than Punahou (the President's alma mater). "To my brother," Senator HIRONO stated, "Thank you for all the kokua. Kahuku High, here I come! Take care, aloha."

In a surprise tribute to the Congressman, former Hawai'i Senator Daniel Akaka, whom Faleomavaega affectionately calls by his Hawaiian name, "Kaniela", also joined in on the reception from his home in Hawai'i via telephone. The pair, who for many years were the only Members of Congress with Polynesian ancestry and who were also founding members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, laughed about their imaginary "Polynesian Caucus" in which Senator Akaka was the chair and Faleomavaega was the secretary. Senator Akaka thanked his "brother" Faleomavaega and his wife, Hina, for their years of friendship to him and his wife "Auntie Millie" all the way back to when Faleomavaega was first elected.

Congressman CHARLES RANGEL of New York and Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO of California shared their admiration for Faleomavaega's decades of service, noting how much personal dedication and family sacrifice is required to be a Member of Congress. Congressman RANGEL stated, "Eni, the Congress will miss you so much and I even more" and added that when Congress loses one of its devoted servants, a family gains a husband, father, and grandfather. Congresswoman NAPOLITANO said, "Eni, my friend, I will miss your smiling face" and shared how being so far from home in Washington, D.C. makes her miss her grandchildren, to which Faleomavaega replied, "I don't even know

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

how to be a grandpa!" The Congressman's youngest daughter, Leonne, who was only two years old when Faleomavaega was first elected to Congress and who is now a wife and mother, smiled and gave her dad a big hug.

Republican Congresswoman, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, former chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said "I'm gonna miss you, amigo!" as Faleomavaega introduced her to all the famous Samoans pictured in photos around his office. When they came to a picture of Faleomavaega with Dwayne "The Rock" Johnson, she asked, "Do you really know Dwayne Johnson?" Without skipping a beat, the Congressman replied, "Of course I do. His mom is my cousin!" Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, who represents Florida's 27th District including Miami, where Dwayne Johnson lives, said, "Everyone is your cousin, Eni. And he's my constituent!" When they came across Faleomavaega's centerpiece photo from the 1960s featuring him with Elvis in Hawai'i, the Congresswoman laughed, "Elvis is Samoan too? You do know everybody Eni, even Elvis! I already like you. But now I like you even more."

Congresswoman MADELEINE BORDALLO of Guam brought her entire staff to bid farewell to Faleomavaega. "Hafa Adai! To our friend Eni from the Guam office! I will always remember our many years together in Congress. You were a dear friend and you helped me along with advice during my early years! One memory I will take with me is our CODEL to American Samoa. What a fiesta that was!!! Love, MADELEINE and from all your friends on Guam!"

Other Members, including Congressman STEVE CHABOT (R-OH), Congressman DAVID CICILLINE (D-RI), Congressman JOHN CONYERS (D-MI), Congressman ELIOT ENGEL (D-NY), Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD (D-HI), Congressman MIKE HONDA (D-CA), Congressman GREGORY MEEKS (D-NY), Congresswoman GRACE MENG (D-NY), Congressman Nick Rahall (D-WV), Congressman GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN (D-MP), Congressman BRAD SHERMAN (D-CA), and former Congressman Solomon Ortiz (D-TX) also attended Faleomavaega's farewell reception.

Several who attended wrote the following in Faleomavaega's guestbook.

"You are my buddy and you always will be!"—Congressman DANA ROHRBACHER (R-CA).

"To a dear dear friend. You have made a giant difference in the lives of so many! Thank you, thank you so much, SHEILA!"—Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE (D-TX).

"I've really enjoyed serving with you. You've done a great job!"—Congressman Buck McKeon (R-CA).

"The mark of success is not measured in what you've accomplished but rather in the lives that you have touched. Eni you've touched so many lives in your years of service, you're the definition of success. Be well my friend."—Congressman AMI BERA (D-CA).

"Hermano, you are the best. We will see you soon!"—Congressman HENRY CUELLAR (D-TX).

Ambassadors and delegations from the Asia-Pacific region, including Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Kazakhstan, Taiwan, Pakistan, and Uzbekistan, also expressed their gratitude to Faleomavaega.

From Myanmar: "On behalf of the Myanmar Government, I wish to extend our sincere gratitude to you for your kind contribution toward promoting Myanmar-U.S. relations as well as for your country."

From Pakistan: "The Embassy of Pakistan deeply appreciates gracious support received by your office. Thank you."

From Vietnam: "Brother Eni, we love you so much. Thank God for helping us meet each other on the earth!"

Also from Vietnam: "We'll keep you forever in our heart, millions of Vietnamese will do."

Faleomavaega expressed his gratitude and appreciation to all who attended. "I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity to have worked with such distinguished leaders during my time in Washington, DC. The memories we built are priceless and I wish my friends and colleagues and the people of American Samoa continued success and happiness," Faleomavaega concluded.

As you can see his years of service have had a tremendous impact on U.S. policy in American Samoa and on U.S. foreign policy across the globe. I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE KIWANIS CLUB 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Kiwanis Club, as well as the outstanding work of the Kiwanis Club of Santa Fe.

While the Kiwanis Club originated as a business fellowship, it has evolved into an important worldwide service organization. Over the years the Kiwanis Club has devoted itself to making a positive impact on the lives of underprivileged children and communities, contributing nearly 150,000 service projects, 6 million hours of service, and \$100 million per year to communities around the world. Some of their notable projects include a partnership with UNICEF to eliminate maternal/neonatal tetanus, a worldwide service project to end Iodine Deficiency Disorder, and the Young Children Priority One program to address the needs of children age 0–5. The Kiwanis Club has truly set an example for selfless and enduring community service.

The Kiwanis Club of Santa Fe is an important part of the international Kiwanis Club organization. Originally formed on April 25, 1921, the Club has had a significant impact on the children and community of Santa Fe. In addition to helping over 155 students with more than \$450,000 for college scholarships, the Club has also had an important hand in many community service projects, such as the organization of the annual Pinewood Derby, building a computer lab for St. Catherine's Indian school, and the Kamp Kiwanis camping facility and program for handicapped children. Moreover, the Club has helped organize and produce the annual Zozobra event, one of the oldest celebrations in North America and a tra-

dition that is dear to all New Mexicans. The Kiwanis Club of Santa Fe has had a tremendous effect on the city of Santa Fe and has truly helped make a difference in its community. I applaud the Kiwanis Club of Santa Fe for setting an example of dedicated community service for the people of New Mexico.

TRIBUTE TO THE ARMENIAN SISTERS' ACADEMY OF LOS ANGELES

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Armenian Sisters' Academy of Los Angeles upon its thirtieth anniversary.

The Armenian Sisters' Academy of Los Angeles (ASA), nestled in the foothills of the Verdugo Mountains in Montrose, offers a Day Care Program, Preschool, Kindergarten and grades 1st through 8th. Established in 1985, the ASA is one of three schools in the United States operated and governed by the only existing Catholic Order of the Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, which was founded in 1847. The other two schools are located in Radnor, Pennsylvania and Lexington, Massachusetts, established in 1967 and 1979, respectively.

Since its inception, the ASA has been committed to providing an exemplary and well-rounded education to its students. The ASA offers a bilingual curriculum, art, music and computer instruction to all students, and has been successful in preserving the identity and culture of the Armenian people by teaching the Armenian language, Armenian cultural courses and religion. The ASA also offers after school extracurricular activities such as Armenian dance classes, basketball and volleyball.

The Armenian Sisters' Academy of Los Angeles is dedicated to the development of the child spiritually, personally, emotionally, intellectually and socially. Among the many goals and objectives the ASA strives to achieve include providing each student with a respectful and optimistic environment in which each student feels encouraged, creating an atmosphere where the Armenian language, heritage and culture may be taught and experienced, emphasizing the heritage, privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship, and encouraging small group work and the increased use of independent study. I commend the ASA for being an integral part of the community, and applaud the school's unwavering commitment to our youth. The ASA plays a central role in shaping our children into responsible citizens and thriving members of society.

I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the Armenian Sisters' Academy of Los Angeles for thirty years of dedicated service to the community.

HONORING LARRY BLAKENEY FOR HIS EXCEPTIONAL CONTRIBUTION TO ALABAMA ATHLETICS

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Larry Blakeney, an exceptional Alabamian who has made an enormous contribution to athletics and the development of young people in my state.

Coach Blakeney is best known as the head coach of the Troy University Trojan football team, a position he held for 24 years, retiring this past December. During that time, Coach Blakeney built a little-known Southeast Alabama team into a conference powerhouse and a nationally-competitive program. His remarkable career at Troy has included six 10-win seasons, five Sunbelt Conference championships, and 178 wins—a total that places him among the top three Alabama college coaches, behind the legendary Paul “Bear” Bryant and just ahead of his mentor and winningest Auburn coach Ralph “Shug” Jordan.

Among the defining characteristics of Larry Blakeney-coached teams was the fearless attitude they took into competition. “Any team, anytime, anywhere” was Troy’s motto, never phased or intimidated by traditional college football powers. And the Trojans would not just compete against the best, they would win. Simply put, Larry Blakeney has personified Troy Football, so much so that the field on which the Trojans play bears his name.

Larry Blakeney’s impact on the game of football in Alabama started as a player in high school, when he led the Gordo Green Wave to a record of 24–2–2 and three-straight Warrior Conference championships. He enrolled at Auburn University, where he became the first sophomore to start at quarterback under Coach Ralph “Shug” Jordan, a distinction that even Auburn Heisman winner Pat Sullivan does not share.

Blakeney began his coaching career in the high school ranks, first at Southern Academy, then Walker High School and Vestavia Hills High School. He was then hired at his beloved alma mater, Auburn, where he served as an assistant coach for 14 seasons. Auburn would experience one of its most successful runs ever with Coach Blakeney calling plays, including three-straight SEC championships in 1987, 1988 and 1989. Coach Blakeney’s success and championship drive made him the perfect choice to lead Troy’s burgeoning football program beginning in 1991.

His success on the gridiron has led to many accolades, including multiple “Coach of the Year” honors and placement in the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame. However, Coach Blakeney’s impact goes far beyond the playing field.

From Gordo to Auburn to Troy, he has maintained close, warm relationships with his teammates, fellow coaches, and players. The Auburn Creed, which outlines how Auburn men and women are supposed to live, emphasizes “the human touch,” which cultivates love, understanding and sympathy with your fellow man. Larry Blakeney personifies and

embodies that “human touch” to a great and rare degree.

Hundreds and perhaps thousands of once-young men are, today, better husbands, fathers, and citizens because of the positive influence of Coach Blakeney; a good man who used the game of football to teach integrity, character, and perseverance throughout his entire career.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to acknowledge Coach Blakeney’s positive impact on young people in Alabama, to celebrate his remarkable career, and to honor his place among the greatest college football coaches to walk the sidelines in my state.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Law Enforcement Appreciation Day and honor our brave law enforcement officials who put their lives on the line day in and day out and keep our communities safe. The millions of state, local and federal law enforcement officers nationwide constitute both our first and last line of protection for the American people.

As a former mayor, I know how important having well-staffed and properly equipped public safety departments is to protecting our communities. Our law enforcement officials work tirelessly to protect our families and business, and I am committed to ensuring that they have access to the resources they need to uphold the public’s safety. That is why I have long been a supporter of the federal Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Technology Grants program as well as for the COPS Hiring program, which provides invaluable resources and technical assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies in an effort to keep our communities safe.

Finally, I want to recognize my friend, colleague and former sheriff Congressman REICHERT for all his work to honor and support law enforcement officers across our country. Protecting the American people must be the number one priority of our government. It is our brave law enforcement officers who protect our streets day and night who are the very essence of our national security and deserve our utmost gratitude and thanks.

EXCELLING IN THE CLASSROOM AND ON THE COURT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school student Cassidy Nussman for being named to the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state and academic all-state volleyball

teams. Nussman is a senior at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. These prestigious awards recognize her hard work and exemplary performance as a scholar-athlete.

Nussman earned a spot on the academic all-state team by maintaining a GPA of 3.9 or higher while competing on the court at an elite level throughout her high school career. She was also named an honorable mention selection on the Under Armour Girls High School All-America Team by the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) and competed on the 2014 TGCA Blue All-Star team for Class 5A/6A as one of the division’s top 12 college-bound players. She has committed to play volleyball for Northwestern University next year.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Cassidy Nussman for being named to the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state and academic all-state volleyball teams. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

INTRODUCING THE DEFEND ISRAEL BY DEFUNDING PALESTINIAN FOREIGN AID ACT OF 2015

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Defend Israel by Defunding Palestinian Foreign Aid Act of 2015.

Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas’ application to join the International Criminal Court (ICC) is an affront to all of those who have engaged for years in efforts to accomplish a peaceful resolution to the decades long Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Palestinian Authority’s anticipated war crimes complaint against Israel will, in no uncertain terms, severely hinder future comprehensive peace talks in a time when the advancement of a two-state solution that ensures enduring peace has never been more important.

For more than half a century, Israel has been America’s most reliable strategic partner in the Middle East. It is essential that we remain supportive of Israel’s absolute right to defend itself and protect its citizens. We cannot stand by while the Palestinian Authority, engaged in a unity government with Hamas, makes frivolous and damaging claims against Israel Defense Forces soldiers and Israeli citizens residing in settlements in the disputed West Bank. Congress must halt the \$400 million American dollars sent annually to the Palestinian Authority until it withdraws its counterproductive request to join the International Criminal Court and returns to the negotiating table with Israel.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in calling for the defunding of Palestinian foreign aid by becoming a co-sponsor of this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 2015, I underwent emergency surgery to repair a broken bone and, therefore, was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on the Motion to Recommit to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and no on Final Passage of H.R. 3.

PEARLAND LEGACY CONTINUES

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school student Brooke Botkin for being named to the Texas Sports Writers Association (TSWA) first team and the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state volleyball teams. Brooke is a sophomore at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. These honors recognize her hard work and outstanding athletic achievements.

The TSWA and TGCA selected Brooke for her skill and sportsmanship, which have made her a top prospect for collegiate volleyball programs. Her dedication to the sport ensures her place in an elite class of competitors and continues Pearland's legacy of producing some of the nation's best student athletes.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Brooke Botkin for being selected as a first team athlete on the TSWA and TGCA Class 6A all-state volleyball teams. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

On Friday, January 9, 2015 it was \$18,098,260,560,760.27. We've added \$7,471,383,511,847.19 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

Today, it is \$18,084,817,920,825.53. We've added \$7,457,940,871,912.45 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 16 had I been present, I would have voted aye.

TRIBUTE TO JIM PAULY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Corona, California are exceptional. Riverside County has been fortunate to have committed community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Jim Pauly is one of these outstanding individuals. On Thursday, January 15, 2015, Jim Pauly will be honored with the Lifetime Achievement Award at the Corona Chamber of Commerce Installation Dinner.

In the history of Corona, California, few individuals can match the years of devoted service Jim has given to his hometown. After attending local schools throughout his childhood, Jim enlisted in the United States Navy during World War II at seventeen years old as a senior at Corona High School. Following his service in the Armed Forces, Jim returned to attend Chaffey College. In 1947, Jim began working full time at Emerson's Men Clothes. Due to his strong work ethic and commitment to the business, Jim became a partner, changing the name to Emerson-Pauly Menswear. After thriving for over fifty years in Corona retail, Jim retired and closed the storefront in 1993.

Jim's commitment to the business community is only matched by his devotion to service and leadership. Jim regularly contributes to the community through work on the Charity Solicitation Committee as Vice Chairman of the Downtown Corona Redevelopment Project and as the Chairman of the Corona Parking Authority. Additionally, Jim is involved in several local organizations, frequently offering his guidance. Jim was a member of the 20-30 Club and acted as the president in 1959. As a fifty-eight year member of Elks Lodge, Jim served as Lodge Leader in 1959. Jim also holds fifty-five years of membership with the Rotary Club and served as the organization's president in 1965. Finally, in 1966, Jim was appointed to the Corona-Norco Unified School District Board of Trustees. Due to his exceptional work, he was elected twice more to continue to build a strong foundation for the Corona-Norco Unified School District.

In light of all Jim has done for the community of Corona, it is clear he fully deserves the Corona Chamber of Commerce's Lifetime Achievement award. Jim's tireless passion for community service has contributed immensely to the betterment of Corona, California. He

has been the heart and soul of many community organizations, and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he receives this prestigious award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call vote on Thursday, January 8, 2015 and Friday, January 9, 2015, I was absent after returning to El Paso due to a shooting that occurred on Tuesday, January 6, 2015 at the El Paso VA Clinic and subsequent visit by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs Robert McDonald to the clinic.

Had I been present, on roll call number 14, I would have voted Nay.

On roll call number 16, I would have voted Nay.

LEADING THE WAY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jillian Ross for being elected to the Columbia University Senate for a two-year term through 2016. Jillian is a 2012 graduate of Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas and a chemical/biomedical engineering junior at Columbia University.

Ms. Ross is the first African-American woman elected to represent Columbia's Fu Foundation School of Engineering in the department's 150-year history. Through her position in the university's senate, Jillian will work with the school's president and faculty to shape policy on issues that affect the student body and greater Columbia University community.

I commend Jillian Ross for her dedication to serving the interests of her fellow students and taking on the responsibilities that leadership brings. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Jillian for winning a seat in the Columbia University senate.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE KEITH

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Corona, California are exceptional. Corona has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make

their communities a better place to live and work. Wayne Keith is certainly one of these individuals. On Thursday, January 15, 2015, Wayne will be honored with the Lifetime Achievement Award at the Corona Chamber of Commerce Installation Dinner.

Following his graduation from Iowa State College, Wayne took his Bachelor's Degree in Mechanical Engineering to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, known today as NASA. Following his time there, Wayne then took a position with the Aluminum Company of America, ALCOA, in 1945, where he would remain for forty years. After dedicating his time and efforts to offices in Cleveland, Detroit, New Kensington and Pittsburg, Wayne found his home in Corona where he acted as general manager until his retirement from the plant in 1986.

In addition to his strong work ethic, Wayne also exemplifies what it means to be a volunteer. After moving to Corona in 1969, Wayne immediately involved himself in the growing Corona community in a variety of capacities. Wayne took on many leadership positions with organizations such as the United Way, Corona Rotary Club, Good Samaritan Boys Home, First Congressional Church, Navy League, Peppermint Ridge, YMCA, The Greater Corona Chamber of Commerce, Corona Community Hospital, Norco-Corona Unified School District, California Manufacturer's Association and the Wagner Foundation. Few citizens can match the years of service Wayne has generously donated to the Corona community.

Given all of the contributions Wayne has made, he has received many prestigious honors. In 1975, Wayne was deemed Citizen of the Year by the Corona Chamber of Commerce. Wayne has also been the recipient of other prominent awards such as the Corona Chamber's "George" Award, the Corona Community Hospital Volunteers Award, Peppermint Ridge's Golden Hinge Award and the Ira D. Calvert Distinguished Service Award due to his outstanding leadership and significant contributions to the Corona community.

In light of all that Wayne has done for the community of Corona, it is clear he fully deserves the Corona Chamber of Commerce's Lifetime Achievement award. Wayne's tireless passion for community service has contributed immensely to the betterment of Corona, California. He has been the heart and soul of many community organizations, and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he receives this prestigious award.

DEDICATION TO CHARACTER AND SERVICE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ruben Ruiz and Shelby Lowe for being named Pearland's 2014 Employees of the Year by Pearland city management. This award is given to the public servants who best

exemplify the city's core mission—to provide those who live in Pearland with the best quality of life.

Mr. Ruiz, a utility billing specialist, and Ms. Lowe, a recreation attendant, went above and beyond in performing their duties and improving the systems on which the city runs. Their dedication to service and character provide a shining example of public service and set an example we can all follow. The residents of Pearland, Texas already know what a great place they live, work and raise their families. These dedicated city employees are part of what makes Pearland special.

I thank Ruben Ruiz and Shelby Lowe for their tireless work in ensuring the Pearland community gets the customer service it deserves. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Mr. Ruiz and Ms. Lowe for being named Pearland's 2014 Employees of the Year.

TO MAKE IT A TOP PRIORITY TO EXTRADITE WILLIAM MORALES TO THE UNITED STATES IMMEDIATELY

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the actions taken by the Obama Administration in December to re-establish relations with Cuba. Among other reasons, Castro's Cuba has been entirely uncooperative with the United States by providing safe harbor to numerous American fugitives, with offenses ranging from hijacking to murder.

One of the most notable fugitives hiding out in Cuba is the known terrorist William Morales. Morales was a leader of the terrorist organization FALN, which has committed numerous terrorist attacks on United States soil, including the 1975 bombing of Fraunces Tavern in lower Manhattan. This attack killed 4 and injured more than 60 others.

I urge the Administration to reevaluate its stance towards Cuba and make it a top priority to extradite William Morales and other fugitives evading justice in Cuba to the United States immediately.

CUBA A SPONSOR OF TERROR

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

[From National Review Online, Jan. 6, 2015]

YES, CUBA IS A STATE SPONSOR OF TERROR

(By Yleem Poblete & Jason I. Poblete)

The most senior U.S. delegation in decades will soon be in Havana to engage a declared enemy of the United States in discussions about "normalizing" relations. Covering much more subject matter than routine mi-

gration issues, these meetings stem in large measure from the December 17 return of spies to Cuba who are responsible for American deaths.

Obama sent three Cuban spies back to the island, trading them for the release of American Alan Gross. Mr. Gross had been held hostage for five years for the "crime" of teaching Jewish Cubans how to connect to the Internet. As part of this lopsided deal, the Obama administration also declared American policy a failure and offered a large basket of potential economic and diplomatic benefits.

This was a significant ideological and political victory for the Communist regime. And there are more rewards in the offing. Administration officials are reportedly considering removing Cuba from the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism—a request Raul Castro made in May 2014 and one that the Cuban regime has made many times in recent years. Under Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act, a country's designation as supporting acts of international terrorism may be rescinded in only two ways. Cuba is not ready to come off that list. Quite the opposite.

In the first instance, the President must certify to the Congress that there has been a fundamental change in the leadership and policies of the government in question, as was the case with Iraq after the removal of Saddam Hussein. There is no legitimate way that administration officials can make such a claim with respect to Cuba. Moreover, the criteria for determining such a systemic transformation is clearly defined in the LIBERTAD Act, known as the Helms-Burton law. For starters, as stated in the law, Fidel and Raul Castro cannot be part of the governing structure.

That leaves only the second option for removal from the list. To remove Cuba's terrorism designation, the president would need to submit a report to Congress, 45 days prior to the proposed removal, certifying that 1) the regime has not provided any support for international terrorism during the preceding six months and 2) the government has provided assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future. Most would agree that Cuba fails on both counts.

Cuba has supported and provided safe haven to members of the Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA) and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). Both are U.S.-designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTOs). The Obama administration would therefore need to remove ETA and FARC from the FTO list, before removing Cuba from the state-sponsors-of-terrorism list. Both actions are untenable at this time. Unless Spain's foreign-policy establishment is about to make a radical shift in thinking, ETA remains a terrorist organization and there are ETA sympathizers in Cuba who are wanted for terrible crimes against the Spanish people. As for FARC, despite the faux peace process in Havana the past few months, it continues to carry out violent acts in Colombia, has no plans to lay down arms anytime soon, and has links to al-Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM).

The "April 2014 State Department Country Reports on Terrorism," however, implied that the only role the Castro regime had with FARC was facilitating travel for the "peace talks" between these terrorists and the Colombian government. It further stated that the ETA presence in Cuba is diminished. It would appear that a kinder-and-gentler

Cuba narrative is being written to accommodate a preconceived policy outcome.

Administration officials have reportedly spent the last two years creating a foundation for Obama's Cuba announcement on December 17—all the while denying any such activity when asked by Congress about related news reports. If this sounds familiar, it's because it closely parallels the script used in the negotiations leading to the release of five Taliban leaders held at Guantanamo in exchange for Bowe Bergdahl.

The State Department terrorism report also makes references beyond ETA and FARC—most significantly that Cuba harbors several fugitives of U.S. justice. Terrorists, murderers, and other violent criminals are being protected, well fed, and supported by the Communist regime. Among these is a woman convicted of first-degree murder, Joanne Chesimard. Also known as Assata Shakur, she is on the FBI's Most Wanted Terrorists list for executing a New Jersey State Police trooper. With the help of the Black Liberation Army, she broke out of prison and found refuge in Cuba. According to the FBI, Chesimard "continues to profess her radical anti-U.S. government ideology." New Jersey governor Chris Christie said recently that he wants her back in New Jersey. He'll be waiting a long time.

Basing the decision to remove Cuba from the state-sponsors-of-terrorism list solely on these above-referenced examples (there is probably a great deal more in classified form), the president would need to prove that for the six months prior to the proposed rescission, the Cuban dictatorship did not provide any assistance to terrorists and had unconditionally returned U.S. fugitives. But Communist-party officials have already stated publicly that Cuba considers Chesimard a political asylee and, as such, not to be released into U.S. custody.

The president would also have to accept as credible the "assurances" from the Havana regime that it would not provide support in the future for international terrorism—a difficult task given intelligence gaps highlighted in the State Department's terrorism report. The pertinent section states: "There was no indication that the Cuban government provided weapons or paramilitary training to terrorist groups," but it provides no further data or analysis on these activities. It also fails to address the relationship and cooperation between Cuba and other state sponsors of terrorism such as Iran, or other entities listed on the PTO List.

And then there is the question of intelligence tainted and manipulated by Americans spying for the Cuban regime. One of the most notorious of these traitors, Ana Belen Montes, used her position at the Defense Intelligence Agency to provide Cuban handlers copious amounts of highly sensitive data, including military contingency plans, details of intelligence-gathering efforts, and profiles of a broad spectrum of U.S. officials.

Congress must therefore require a comprehensive appraisal of the range of Cuba's activities against the U.S. and its interests and priorities before the White House can make any decision on whether Cuba will remain on the terrorism list. The review must cover no less than a 20-year period and include a fresh appraisal of all available raw data used in the Clinton-era Pentagon assessment spearheaded by Montes. The review should include detailed intelligence and analysis of unconventional threats and programs that have dual-use application, such as Cuba's biotech capabilities.

The congressional national-security and judiciary committees must be given full ac-

cess to all files pertaining to the WASP spy network, including data related to the 1996 Brothers to the Rescue shoot-down, as well as damage assessments for all Americans and non-Americans convicted of spying for the Cuban regime.

However, if President Obama chooses to proceed irrespective of the aforementioned conditions and determines that Cuba should be removed from the state-sponsors-of-terrorism list, Congress would have only 45 days from the submission date to evaluate the rescission proposal and act accordingly.

Members of the House and Senate must therefore be proactive in countering the executive action outlined on December 17 and in preventing further damage. Failure to do so would make Congress complicit in the administration's acquiescence to Cuba's Communist regime; it would undermine American interests and reinforce a message of weakness to other enemies of freedom and security.

SUPPORT FOR THE CUBAN PEOPLE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong support for the Cuban people, who have suffered for so many decades under the brutal regime of the Castro brothers, and to thank my colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her leadership in preparing for statements on the record on the deplorable human rights situation in Castro's Cuba.

Her leadership and moral clarity on this issue stands in contrast to that of the Obama Administration, which once again has demonstrated its fecklessness. The events of this past weekend—where the absence of our President among so many bold Heads of State who marched in Paris for freedom and against extremism was so glaring—underscores how this Administration scorns our friends while coddling this country's enemies. The disregard this Administration showed for the people of France is part of a pattern, a pattern of contempt which includes disrespect to our great ally Canada and Prime Minister Harper over the crucial Keystone pipeline, which includes allowing Administration spokesmen to insult Israel's courageous Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu in the most juvenile fashion, and which includes abandonment of our Polish and Czech allies when they sought to base a missile shield in their countries in 2009.

By this move to normalize relations with Cuba without consultation with either Congress or the State Department, and without holding the Castro regime to minimum standards of protection of human rights and commitment to democracy as prerequisites to negotiations, the Administration betrays the aspirations of the Cuban people while embracing the brutal dictators and oligarchs who turned an island paradise into a gulag.

Again, there is a pattern here, a pattern of embracing our enemies, be it Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, the mullahs of Iran, or the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, whose rise this Administration helped facilitate. And with each embrace of dictatorships and murderous regimes,

the Administration showed its contempt for the downtrodden of these countries—the masses of people in Venezuela who suffered first under the dictator Chavez and now suffer under his understudy in oppression, Nicolas Maduro, who continues to persecute democracy advocates such as Leopoldo Lopez.

This Administration was also silent when the Muslim Brotherhood Morsi regime oppressed the Coptic minority in Egypt, and it lifted no fingers to support the people of Iran during their peaceful Green Revolution protests in the wake of the 2009 election in that country, which were met with batons and pepper spray.

And now the President embraces the Castro brothers, who were tutors to Hugo Chavez in the ways of oppression and whose support of so-called revolutionary movements has brought so much suffering to countries in Latin America and around the world. Let's be clear about this: Cuba has been a state sponsor of terrorism, supporting violence against allies of the United States such as Colombia.

I have been a consistent supporter of the Cuban people in resisting tyranny. I am fortunate to have known many great Cuban dissidents, first and foremost Armando Valladares, whose autobiography *Against All Hope* was a first-hand account of Castro's tyranny, on par with the great work of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. I have also stood with the Ladies in White, or Las Damas de Blanco, and courageous leaders such as Ivonne Malleza Galano, and with heroes such as Dr. Oscar Biscet, a medical doctor and courageous human rights advocate who testified before our human rights subcommittee in February 2012 on "Further Human Rights Violations in Castro's Cuba: The Continued Abuse of Political Prisoners."

Dr. Biscet's story is far too commonplace to ignore. For the QUOTE UNQUOTE "crime" of organizing meetings on behalf of human rights, Dr. Biscet was first arrested and detained by Cuban police in 1999 along with two dozen other advocates. He was released after 5 days, but was rearrested again later that year, this time spending three years in prison. After he got out, he was rearrested a third time in December 2002, beaten and released. Presumably, the Castro regime saw his beating as sufficient warning not to speak out in defense of liberty and human dignity. When he continued to do so, however, the Castro regime arrested him a fourth time, in March 2003, and sentenced him to 25 years in prison.

Fortunately, the Catholic Church intervened to secure his release and that of 50 other unjustly-jailed dissidents in March 2011. He was able to testify via phone at our hearing from Cuba from the US mission. To this day he is unable to leave the Island, prevented by the Castro Brothers.

Dr. Biscet is just one example of the many who suffer under the Castro Brothers. I join my voice with those of my colleagues to express my dismay that the Administration would squander so much leverage in seeking this rapprochement with Cuba, and not doing more to gain concessions from the Castro regime to advance the cause of human rights, offering so much in exchange for so little.

Despite today's news confirming that Cuba released 53 dissidents, which we welcome,

since the Administration announced that it would seek normalization of relations with Cuba, hundreds have been arrested, and critics of the government who thought this might signal a new openness continue to be suppressed. This includes Cuban artist Tania Bruguera, who along with other freedom advocates was detained following her attempt to speak and assemble freely in Havana's Revolutionary Square.

There should be no easing of the pressure until Cuba has met definitive and concrete human rights and democratic milestones. Among this is the release of all political prisoners, the end of harassment and a policy of releasing and then re-jailing, the ending of restrictions on freedom of speech and the press, and on the rights of Assembly. Moreover, the Church must be allowed to conduct its affairs fully and freely without government interference.

And, finally, the Castro regime must be held to account for their harboring of some seventy fugitives from justice, including Joanne Chesimard, who was convicted of killing a state trooper from my home state of New Jersey in 1973, Werner Foerster, leaving his then-young wife a widow. The events of the past several weeks remind us how political violence done in the name of ideology destroys lives and creates deep divisions in the fabric of our society. That this Administration would fail to condition normalization upon the return of fugitives such as Joanne Chesimard, who is on the FBI's Most Wanted Terrorist list, shows where its priorities are.

In closing, I want to assure the Cuban people that I will do everything to make sure that human rights milestones are met before our government makes concessions that are effectively unilateral, squandering leverage. Mind you, this lifeline thrown by the Obama Administration to the Castro regime came at a time when Cuba's oil patrons, Russia and Venezuela, were themselves hurting for cash, and unable to continue subsidizing the regime in Cuba.

To that end, I plan to hold a hearing on the human rights situation in Cuba, focusing in particular on the plight of Afro-Cubans. I also intend to seek a visa to go to Cuba, so I can meet with political prisoners languishing in jail and visit churches, which are spheres independent of government control. I have on multiple occasions sought a visa, only to never have one granted. I say to the Cuban regime—if today marks a new day of openness, then prove it, and let one of your most consistent critics visit Cuba and have freedom of movement to meet with victims of the regime.

And, finally, I will introduce legislation to make sure that human rights are not forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
DR. DALE PATTERSON, PASTOR
OF EAST BRENT BAPTIST
CHURCH IN PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 12, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Dale Patterson, Pastor of East Brent Baptist Church, upon the occasion of his retirement after 33 years at East Brent Baptist Church in Pensacola, Florida, and for more than 50 years of ministry.

Pastor Patterson is a native of Sumrall, Mississippi, and he started his long and distinguished career in the ministry in Mississippi, where he served congregations in Hattiesburg, Mendenall, Shuqualak, and Picayune, while also pursuing his education at Mississippi College, William Carey College, Mississippi State University, and the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, where he received his master's and doctoral degrees.

In 1981, Pastor Patterson and his family moved to Northwest Florida, where he took the important position of Pastor of East Brent Baptist Church. During his three-plus decades in Northwest Florida, Pastor Patterson became a staple of the community, leading his ministry based on a simple plan to minister to those within the church, while also reaching out to spread the Gospel to all the members of the community in need of the Lord's guidance.

Under Pastor Patterson's leadership, and with the grace of God, East Brent Baptist Church has grown significantly over the past decades. Pastor Patterson supervised the purchase of property surrounding East Brent Baptist Church to expand the grounds and facilitate the construction of many new facilities, including the Family Life Center, the Worship Center, the G Building—used to house various events from Sunday School classes to GED classes and weddings—as well as the reutilization of existing property to provide recreational opportunities for children in the church community. In addition, during his tenure, East Brent Baptist launched Care Ministries, Inc. to help further spread the word of Jesus Christ far and wide.

There is no question that Pastor Patterson's record of leadership and accomplishments at East Brent Baptist are myriad; however, he

has also served in important leadership positions throughout the state and in the larger Southern Baptist Community. During his time in ministry, Pastor Patterson has served as President of the Associational Pastor's Conference, Moderator of Association and has served on State Board of Missions for Florida Baptist Convention. Pastor Patterson has also held the chairmanship of various committees, including: the Evangelism Committee, Mission's Committee, Sunday School Committee, Program Committee, State Order of Business, State Nomination Committee, State Loans and Grants Committee, Budget and Allocations Committee, and the Health and Hope Committee.

Pastor Patterson's many accomplishments, however, are only a small window into the exceptional work that he has done serving the Lord and the congregation of East Brent Baptist Church, and his many successes in life are a testament to what can be achieved through faith and adherence to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, my wife Vicki and I wish Pastor Patterson, his wife Louise, and the entire Patterson family all the best as Pastor Patterson enjoys his retirement years spending time with his family and the many friends he has made throughout the Northwest Florida community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 13, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

SENATE—Tuesday, January 13, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, You are sovereign and in good and in bad times our eyes turn to You. Fulfill Your purposes for our Nation and world by using our Senators as instruments of Your providence.

Lord, have Your way in our lives for You are the potter and we are the clay. Mold and make us as You desire, working for our good in all things for we are called according to Your purposes. Inspire our lawmakers to seek first Your guidance so that everything in time will fall into proper place. As they seek greater intimacy with You, empower them to relate honestly with themselves and one another.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 13, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COTTON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will continue to debate the motion to proceed to the Keystone XL Pipeline bill, with the time equally divided until 12:30 p.m.

Some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to filibuster the motion to proceed to the bill. All Senators should know that we will get on this bill today and begin the amendment process. We can do it the easy way or we can do it the hard way. Either we will get on it this afternoon by consent or shortly after midnight without consent. But we will get on it today.

It is surprising to me that some Democratic Senators are choosing to exercise their procedural rights in order to block their own colleagues from offering amendments to the bill, although at this point the only Senators who have filed amendments at the desk are Republican Senators.

I want to make it clear to everybody that we are committed to an open amendment process but not an open-ended one. So we are hopeful—I have read that Democrats have a number of amendments—that we will be given a chance to get on the bill and begin to offer amendments so the Senate can work its will.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Democrats and Republicans cooperated last night to bring the Keystone Pipeline another step closer to construction. Thanks to that bipartisan cloture vote, the Senate can finally begin an open floor debate on this committee-vetted and approved legislation.

It is a debate many of us have actually been looking forward to—and not just because of the substance of what we are considering. But we have also been waiting a long time to have a debate where individual Senators actually matter again, which is why earlier I suggested that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle allow us to get on the bill and let us offer amendments. This is going to be an open process, but as I indicated, not an open-ended process.

This is a debate where Senators can offer amendments and have them considered by the Senators. It is a debate where Senators can make the voices of their constituents heard. That is just the kind of serious legislating many of us have been waiting a long time for, and the fact that we are finally seeing it today is a direct consequence of our constituents' calls for a functioning

Congress. It is the latest example of the new Republican majority putting Congress back to work.

Getting Congress back to work means working to pass legislation that is good for jobs and for the middle class, and that is why we are focused on getting measures such as the bipartisan infrastructure bill over to the President's desk.

Even though he may not sign it—and we all know that he may not sign everything we pass—we are getting the Congress out of the business of protecting the President from good ideas. That is our commitment to the American people.

When it comes to the bipartisan Keystone bill, it is hard to see a serious reason why President Obama would veto these jobs anyway. The Nebraska Supreme Court just cleared away the last pretense many of us could imagine. So we hope President Obama will listen to the American people, and we hope in the end, after due consideration, he will decide to sign it. But, no matter, we will not be dissuaded from our path of working for the middle class. The new Republican Congress is not going to stop working for more jobs and more opportunity.

Let's get the debate started. Let's see what Members of both parties can accomplish by actually working together, and let's continue trying to pass as many good ideas as we can, starting with this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure bill.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is true that we are in the process of negotiating and discussing on the Democratic side the amendments that will be offered, and yes, there will be amendments offered. Senator BOXER has been part of this effort—and I just got off the phone with her—and she is now working with her staff to come up with amendments she believes will withstand any procedural challenge on the floor and, hopefully, those amendments will be brought up to the floor soon.

Senator CANTWELL, who is the floor leader on our side on this particular measure, is also open. There is no question that we will be prepared to and will offer amendments. We are trying

to finalize the language at this point and the order in which the amendments will be offered.

We will be working with the Republicans once we have our own set of amendments in place. There is no effort to obstruct this process. We generally agreed that we would not be voting today on amendments. It is possible—before the end of the day—that we will have an agreement to move forward in terms of the submission and debate on the amendments and the votes to occur perhaps next week. But that is still unresolved, and we are still talking about it.

What is interesting is to put this in perspective. We are talking about S. 1. This is the very first bill offered by the new Republican majority in the Senate. It is a bill, as they say, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The Republicans' highest priority and their No. 1 bill now that they have majority status in the Senate is the approval of a pipeline project to benefit one company—a Canadian company—and create 35 permanent jobs. The highest priority of the Republican majority in the Senate is to debate and pass a bill to benefit a Canadian company to create 35 permanent jobs.

This special interest, small-ball effort, is not a national economic or energy policy or a plan to make America energy independent. The Keystone XL Pipeline, sadly, is going to have a negative impact on the environment—and not just in the United States. It will literally affect all adjoining countries.

The tar sands that will be carried in this pipeline will increase the amount of pollution, greenhouse gas emissions—first when they are mined in Canada and later when they are refined. We know this because tar sands are currently coming into the United States—Canadian tar sands—and are being processed at a refinery in Wood River, IL. It is a refinery now owned by the Phillips oil company, and their refined product is distributed throughout the Midwest.

So the Keystone XL Pipeline is not the first Canadian tar sands pipeline. We already have a pipeline, and that existing pipeline—in the course of cleaning up Canadian tar sands so it can be made into products that can be sold on the market—generates something called petcoke. Petcoke is the waste product—the dirty part of the Canadian tar sands—that needs to be removed before they become viable petroleum products.

If you don't believe this petcoke is a danger, you only need to come to the great city of Chicago, which I am honored to represent. I visited the south-east side of Chicago. The British Petroleum refinery, which is at the end of Lake Michigan in the northern part of Indiana, refines the Canadian tar sands and generates, as part of the refining process, literally hills of petcoke—this

black, sooty, nasty product they stack up near the refinery. Unfortunately, many times it ends up within the boundaries of the city of Chicago.

What impact do hills of petcoke have on a neighborhood? When the wind blows, this nasty, dirty product blows all over the homes, the families, and the children who live in that neighborhood. I have seen it. I have visited mothers with small children who try to seal the windows of their homes because this petcoke can get through any crack and into their homes, leaving a sooty deposit around them.

For those who argue that these Canadian tar sands pose no environmental threat, come take a look at these petcoke hills that are generated now by the process of refining this product.

Additionally, the Keystone XL Pipeline doesn't move us away from the dangerous tipping point which we face when it comes to climate change and global warming. In fact, it is going to speed up the day of reckoning. Leading scientists warn us that we are running out of time. As a Nation and as a world, if we do not accept the reality of what is happening to our environment, we are going to pay a heavy price.

According to the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, at least half of the world's energy supply will need to come from low-carbon sources in the future—wind, solar, even nuclear—by 2050, if we are going to avoid catastrophic climate changes. That barely gives us 35 years to do something for our kids and grandkids. This Keystone bill does not even acknowledge that reality.

I have come to the floor many times and offered the challenge which I will renew today. I believe the Republican Party of the United States of America represented in the Senate is the only major political party in the world today that denies global warming and climate change. It is the only major political party which refuses to accept the premise that is well established in science, well established by our departments, such as the Department of Defense, that our activity as human beings on Earth is changing the world we live in—and not for the better.

One Republican pulled me aside off the floor, after I made this challenge several times, and said: DURBIN, you are wrong. There is actually a political party in Australia that denies global warming as well. Well, that may be true, but the fact that they have such little company when it comes to this position suggests that our Republicans are denying reality. This bill denies that reality as well.

If it is about jobs, I suggest—not only to the majority leader but to the labor unions and to others interested in creating American jobs—that there are better alternatives in the energy sector. Solar power is already generating 3.4 million jobs in the United States.

Remember, the Keystone XL Pipeline generates 35 permanent jobs, and, according to some estimates, maybe 40,000 temporary supply jobs for the construction of the pipeline. The Keystone XL Pipeline will create 35 permanent jobs while solar power is generating 3.4 million jobs in America. By the end of 2013, 24,000 of them were created just that year. Jobs were created in the solar industry at a growth rate of 20 percent over 2012. It is a growth industry for clean, green jobs. In Illinois, 9 solar projects employ almost 4,000 workers.

Solar isn't the only energy source we can invest in. Fuel cell technology doesn't get much attention but supports 11,000 jobs versus 35 permanent jobs for the Keystone XL Pipeline. The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that with the rapid increase in fuel cells, 180,000 new domestic jobs can be created by 2020 and 685,000 by 2035.

The International Renewable Energy Agency found the renewable energy industry in the United States responsible for 625,000 direct and indirect jobs in solar, biofuels, wind, biomass, hydropower, and geothermal industries. That is a conservative estimate. So if we are interested in clean energy, if we want to do the right thing by our environment for our kids and grandkids and we want to create American jobs—this isn't 35 jobs, which is the highest priority of the Senate Republican Caucus; this is looking at alternative sources of energy, which will create jobs and not destroy the planet.

The Keystone XL Pipeline will produce oil with a process that produces 17 percent more carbon than any conventional crude oils. That oil is going to be shipped, if the Republicans have their way, through a pipeline from Canada all the way to Texas, over and near thousands of lakes and aquifers that Americans rely on for clean drinking water.

After it reaches Port Arthur, TX—the original plan, which I think is still the case—it will be exported, so even the refined product is not going to be used here in America. So we ask our Republican colleagues: Where is your plan to make sure America leads the world in creating good-paying, green jobs for the future? Where is your plan to increase America's production of wind, solar, thermonuclear, cellulosic, and other forms of renewable energy? In fact, when it came to debating the extension of some tax benefits to these industries, many Republicans opposed it. They instead wanted to see us move toward initiatives such as the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So this is an important debate, and it is one that we ought to take in the context of the challenges our generation faces. We will either acknowledge the global environmental reality and deal with it, or we will have to answer to our children and grandchildren why we

put the profits of 1 Canadian company and why we put 35 jobs ahead of a meaningful discussion about a national energy policy that is consistent with a clean and strong environment for years to come.

IMMIGRATION FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this evening I am joining with the Center for American Progress to host a screening of "Spare Parts," a new movie that tells the story of four students at Carl Hayden High School in Phoenix, AZ. These students were undocumented immigrants brought to the United States as kids. They started a robotics team at their high school that went on to great success. The movie itself was produced by actor and comedian George Lopez. He stars in it as the coach of the team; Jamie Lee Curtis as the high school principal; Carlos Pena, as Oscar Vazquez, one of the students; and Alexa Vega, as Oscar's girlfriend Karla.

I am especially excited about seeing the movie because I have known one of these students, Oscar Vazquez, for some time. Five years ago, I told Oscar's story here on the floor of the Senate. He dreamed of enlisting in the military and spent his high school years in junior ROTC. At the end of his junior year, a recruiting officer told him he could never serve in the military because he was undocumented. So Oscar found another outlet for his talent. He helped to start the robotics club at Carl Hayden High School.

Oscar and his three teammates entered a college-level robot competition, despite the fact they were high school kids, sponsored by NASA. They worked for months in a storage room in their high school to produce their competitive robot. They were competing against students from MIT and similar universities. The Carl Hayden High School team won first place in the robotic competition.

After high school, Oscar Vazquez went to Arizona State University, and in 2009 graduated with a degree in mechanical engineering. He was one of the top three students in his class. Following his graduation, he took a brave step. He voluntarily returned to Mexico, a country where he had not lived since he was a small child. He said, "I decided to take a gamble and do the right thing."

In 2010, the Obama administration gave him a waiver to reenter the United States. Otherwise, he would have been barred for 10 years. He would have been separated from his wife Karla and their daughter Samantha, both of whom are American citizens.

Oscar returned to the United States with the waiver from President Obama and he did two things: He applied for citizenship and he enlisted in the United States Army.

Oscar served as a cavalry scout in Afghanistan, fulfilling the dream he had

as a child, and when he became a citizen of this country he was obviously willing to risk his life for it.

Last year, Oscar testified at a hearing I held about the benefits of allowing immigrants to enlist in the military. The Falcon Robotics Team, which Oscar and his friends started, is now a fixture at Carl Hayden High School.

I have told the story about two other members of that team.

Dulce Matuz graduated from Arizona State University with a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering and as a senior received an internship to work at the NASA space station. After graduation, Dulce couldn't work as an engineer, so she cofounded the Arizona DREAM Act Coalition. As a result of her leadership, she was named one of the 100 most influential people in the world by Time Magazine.

Angelica Hernandez served in junior ROTC and was president of the National Honors Society. She graduated from high school with a 4.5 GPA and graduated from Arizona State University with a mechanical engineering degree herself.

Why am I telling my colleagues about a movie called "Spare Parts" and the Carl Hayden robotics team? Because it puts a human face on what is happening today on Capitol Hill. It puts into perspective what the Republican-led House of Representatives wants to achieve this week. They are preparing to pass a bill in the House that would defund the President's immigration policies, including the very program—the DACA Program—that President Obama created by Executive order.

The DACA Program puts on hold the deportation of immigrant students such as those I have just described who grew up in this country and simply want a chance to be a part of our future. These young people—immigrants such as Oscar, Dulce, and Angelica—are known as DREAMers. They were brought to the United States as little kids. They didn't make a conscious effort to come across the border; they were brought here by their parents. They grew up in this country and they have overcome great obstacles to succeed. They are our future leaders. They will serve in the military. They will be doctors and engineers and lawyers and business leaders, if they are given the chance. The House of Representatives is determined not to give these DREAMers a chance to be part of America's future.

In the last 2 years, more than 600,000 DREAMers have stepped up, paid their fees, gone through the background checks, and were given this temporary status where they can't be deported. With that temporary status, they have gone on to do extraordinary things in this country. Many of them are already contributing. I mentioned Angelica, a former member of the Carl Hayden ro-

botics team. She is working for Nexant Corporation where she specializes in renewable energy.

The Center for American Progress tells us that if we give legal status to these DREAMers, it will dramatically help our economy. These are great young people who want a chance to be a part of America's future. They can put \$329 billion into our economy, according to the studies, and create about 1.4 million new jobs. These are the sparks, the catalysts, the leaders who can help us build this economy.

But the Republicans in the House of Representatives want to deport them. They want to turn them away after they have had these educational opportunities in America. They don't want us to take advantage of their skills and talents. They are wrong.

Why do they want to eliminate DACA? Why are the House Republicans so determined to eliminate it? Because that is their way of getting back at this President. That is their way of trying to make us forget that the House Republicans refused for 2 years to call up immigration reform legislation. They refused to fix our broken immigration system, and when the President stepped in on an emergency basis, now they are resisting him and trying to deport these DREAMers. How can they explain this? How can they explain this to these young people who, through no fault of their own, were brought to the United States and who have not had an opportunity to succeed, as we all hope they will? This is obstructionism on the part of the Republicans in the House. We did pass the bill on a bipartisan basis in June of 2013, 68 to 32, for comprehensive immigration reform. The House had ample opportunity—over a year and a half—to call up this measure and they refused. They refused because they knew it would pass. And that is why it is important for us to stand up and tell the American people what is at stake.

One of the most important things we can do is to face the reality that our immigration system is broken. And to fix this immigration system, we need to work together on a bipartisan basis. Let us not do it with a negative feeling toward these young people. Give the DREAMers a chance.

I will tell my colleagues this. If this bill comes over from the House of Representatives and this bill eliminates DACA, fate puts 1.6 million young DREAMers into the legal jeopardy of facing deportation, and then eliminates the rights of their parents who have children who are citizens or legal residents to stay in this country, then we are going to see a fight on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I think it is the responsible thing to do for us to stand up for these young people who had the courage to step out of the shadows, to register with their government, to submit themselves to a background check.

The right and responsible thing to do is for us to stand behind them. There are so many amazing stories about these young people and to ignore them is to ignore America's legacy and roots.

We are a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country and I stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate honorably, I hope, representing the great State of Illinois, and really I hope a testament to what the sons of immigrants can do across America, and daughters as well. That is why this is an important issue for us to deal with and to do it forthrightly, and I urge my colleagues to resist this effort by the Republicans to deport 1.6 million eligible DREAMers and others who may stand the chance to make America a better and stronger nation.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.

Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to an hour to discuss the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to address my comments to the Keystone XL Pipeline approval bill—the legislation currently before the Senate—which is the motion to proceed to this legislation. The cloture on the motion to proceed to this legislation was passed 63 votes in favor to 32 votes against last night. I thank my colleagues for that tremendous bipartisan vote, and of course the good news is that the vote advances us to the bill. We have to have another vote now to actually move to the bill today, and we are working through an agreement to hold that vote. Then we will be on the bill and in a position where all Members of this body can offer amendments—Republicans and Democrats alike.

We will have an open amendment process. We will have regular order. We

can have an energy debate. Members of this body are going to get to do what they haven't been able to do in some time, which is offer their amendments, bring forward their ideas, and let's have that energy discussion, let's have these amendments brought forward and debated, and if they can garner 60 votes, they will be passed and attached to the legislation. This is how the Senate is supposed to work and I encourage my colleagues to participate by offering their amendments to have the debate and do the work of this body—the important work for the people of this great Nation.

I would like to begin the discussion today in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline, the Keystone XL approval legislation, which is the bill we have in front of us, S. 1.

I note that my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Utah, is here. He is a Senator who leads us on a variety of issues and has for many years in our caucus, as the chairman of the Finance Committee. He certainly understands tax policy and fiscal policy for this country.

This legislation we are considering is a jobs bill. It is about energy. It is about jobs. It is about economic growth. It is about national security.

The Senator from Utah is working on reforming our Tax Code and how we can stimulate economic growth in this country. So I wish to turn to him right at the outset and ask—as someone who truly understands how our economy works and how we have to build a good business climate in this country and how we have to empower the development of infrastructure, roads, and rails, pipelines and transmission lines as part of building an energy policy that will truly make this Nation energy secure—if he would take a few minutes and address not only this project on the broad basis of its merits, but particularly some of the economic aspects that are so important when we are talking about growing our economy and putting our people in this country to work in good jobs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished colleague for leading this fight. He has been leading it for years now. It is such a no-brainer. It is amazing to me that we have to go through this again. I thank him for yielding to me, and I would like to associate myself with the many persuasive arguments that have been made here by my colleagues—both Democratic and Republican—urging the speedy passage of this legislation.

To me, the decision to approve this pipeline is an obvious one for a host of reasons:

It will support more than 42,000 good-paying jobs. I didn't quite get what the assistant minority leader was saying today on how few jobs it will create. It

actually will support more than 42,000 good-paying jobs during its construction phase.

It will contribute more than \$3.4 billion to our gross domestic product.

It will aid in the goal of North American energy independence.

As the State Department's environmental impact statement found, building the Keystone XL Pipeline will actually be better for the environment than not building it. The energy resources the Canadians produce will reach the market regardless of whether this pipeline is built, and Keystone XL is by far the safest, cleanest, and most efficient means of doing so. What are the arguments against it other than phony environmental arguments? That was the State Department, controlled by them.

As a commonsense, bipartisan jobs and infrastructure measure, this bill is exactly the sort of legislation the Senate should be considering as its first order of business in this new Congress, but it should not have to be. The story here is about more than a single pipeline, no matter how many jobs its construction will create, no matter how important it is for our energy independence, and no matter how environmentally sound it is. This is a story about a regulatory process that is clearly broken. This is a story about special interests manipulating the bureaucracy to muck up a process that should be very simple and uncontroversial. This is a story about just one of many examples of tragically missed opportunities to create good-paying jobs and provide relief for household budgets across the country.

The application for approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline was first filed in September of 2008—more than 6 years ago. U.S. Senators have served more than a full term during that time. Children born after the application was filed are now in first grade.

The notion that any infrastructure project should be held up for such a long period is disturbing not just to me but I think to anybody who carefully looks at this, but the delay of Keystone XL is even worse. Given the strong and well-documented economic and environmental case for the pipeline, Keystone is the sort of project that should have been quickly and easily approved for construction. But for some committed environmentalists inside and outside the Obama administration, common sense and balanced consideration of the facts no longer matter. Instead, to them, this simple pipeline has become a political symbol, regardless of what the science tells us. They have directed their ample energies at throwing up every procedural roadblock imaginable to the approval of the pipeline. As a result, this project has endured delay after delay.

Over the past few years, the American people have rightly developed the

impression that Washington is broken. There can be no better example of the consequence of this dysfunction than the Keystone XL Pipeline sitting in bureaucratic purgatory.

When a project such as this—which is good for jobs, good for families, and good for families' budgets—gets bogged down in the Obama administration's redtape, it is absolutely the responsibility of Congress to act. Unfortunately, for years the Senate became a place where good ideas such as approving Keystone XL came to die, where control of the calendar and the amendment process prevented the consideration of so many good, bipartisan issues and ideas. Not only was the administrative process broken, but the Senate was also paralyzed and unable to step in and fix it.

By taking up this important bill as our first matter of consideration in the new Congress, we are taking steps to restore the Senate to the great legislative body it is meant to be, the place where Senators work across the aisle to meet the needs of the American people.

By coming together to propose a commonsense solution to get back on track this project which has become such a symbol of what is wrong with Washington, my friends from North Dakota and West Virginia are demonstrating exactly the sort of thoughtful, inclusive, and bipartisan leadership the American people have been demanding as they watched this greatest deliberative body in the world become the laughingstock of the world because we haven't gotten very much done. We haven't gotten very much done because of the way it has been run over the last number of years.

It is my sincere hope that we move quickly and desperately and deliberately to approve this measure and that we soon begin considering serious regulatory reform to prevent the sorts of abuses we have seen bedevil the Keystone XL project. The American people deserve an efficient and effective regulatory process that works for them. It is time for the Senate to deliver.

Having said these few words, I wish to personally thank my distinguished colleagues from North Dakota and my colleagues from West Virginia for the leadership they have provided on this issue.

Senator HOEVEN is a former Governor. He knows what he is talking about. He is one of the most reasonable, decent, and honorable people in this body. He has shown a great willingness to work with both sides. He has continued to fight for this even though it has been uphill for more than 6 years. He has continued to fight for it because it is right. It is the right thing to do, and it is in our best interest to do it and to do it now.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Utah for his leadership both today and over the past many years on this floor. I would like to pick up on a point he emphasized and did so very eloquently. He is in a unique position to comment on it, and that is the importance of having this open amendment process; having regular order on the Senate floor; allowing Senators, Republican and Democratic alike, to come forward and bring their ideas forward, bring their amendments forward, have this discussion, and do it in an open way.

The whole effort here is to produce good energy legislation that will help this country move forward but also to foster bipartisanship—to foster bipartisanship on this bill and other legislation so that we can get the work done that this body needs to get done on behalf of the American people. That is what this is all about. This is about getting the work done for the American people on the important issues our country faces.

That is why this bill is S. 1—not just because it is important energy infrastructure legislation, not just because we need to have this debate on energy, not just because we need to advance legislation to help build our energy future, but because it is truly an effort to get this body working in a bipartisan way on this and other important issues for the American people. That is what the American people want. They want us to get the job done.

Again, I thank the Senator from Utah for bringing out the important fact and discussing why it is so important that we approach legislation in that way.

I would like to turn to my good friend, the senior Senator from the great State of Arkansas, somebody who I think really has a good understanding of how our economy works and what needs to be done, somebody who has good relationships on both sides of the aisle, which is so important as we try to build support for this and other legislation, and somebody whose State is directly affected by this project. I know he will agree with me that it is very important on behalf of the State of Arkansas that we move forward with the Keystone XL Pipeline project. I think a very high percentage of the pipe that goes into this project—about a 1,200-mile-long project—is actually manufactured and made in Arkansas. So that is a clear benefit for the manufacturing industry and workers in the State of Arkansas that correlates directly to this project and to this legislation.

So I would like to turn to the senior Senator from Arkansas and ask him about that and ask him to tell us about the importance of this project in terms

of what it means to the great State of Arkansas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to talk about the Keystone Pipeline. I also wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his tireless efforts and his leadership on behalf of getting the Keystone Pipeline project moving.

For the past 6 years I have urged the administration to approve the project. I voted for legislation to speed up the pipeline construction. This pipeline makes sense for job creation and the future of our Nation's energy supply.

In a recent email survey sent to more than 30,000 Arkansans, I asked what issues the new majority in the Senate should focus on in the 114th Congress. Participants told me that one of their top priorities is an "all of the above" energy policy that addresses current and future energy needs.

The Senate has an opportunity to pass legislation that is a commonsense plan to improve our Nation's energy supply by approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. Tapping into these Canadian oil sands will offer us a reliable source of energy from one of our strongest allies and trading partners. This is good news as we work to reduce our dependence on oil from regions of the world that are hostile toward our country, and it is good news for Arkansas. Here is why.

Approval of this infrastructure project will mean jobs. This is one reason it has the support of both parties. Organized labor has been very vocal in support of the pipeline. Unions understand that this infrastructure project will create well-paying jobs for skilled laborers, and it will do so at no expense to the taxpayers. And it is not just unions; certainly businesses are supportive of the pipeline too, as well as an overwhelming majority of Americans.

Last month, as the Senator from North Dakota alluded to, I toured the Welspun Tubular Company, the Little Rock-based company hired to produce hundreds of miles of pipeline for the project. Company officers estimate that 150 jobs will be created just to load the pipe onto the railcars for shipment when the project finally gets the green light.

The economic impact has wide reach to Arkansans. Blytheville's Nucor Corporation was slated to make some of the steel for the pipeline, and there is a trickle-down impact throughout the State.

A central Arkansas Caterpillar employee wrote to me about the importance of this project to his job because of its impact on his livelihood. "The Keystone pipeline project would be a huge boost to us," he wrote.

Once built, the infrastructure will provide a safe and reliable supply of energy. Currently, this oil is transported

from Canada to refiners by rail and truck. A new, modern pipeline poses less risk to the environment than these current modes of transportation. The project will help maintain lower fuel prices, which is good for all Americans.

At every hurdle, using science and common sense, this project gets the green light. Last week Nebraska's Supreme Court upheld the State's law approving a route for the pipeline through the State.

Time and again this project passes the test, but the President has threatened to veto the bill. This isn't surprising considering the administration spent more than 6 years analyzing this and punting a decision down the road until further studies have been conducted. The pipeline is being studied literally to death. It is ready to go. Yet the President is still looking for ways to stop it.

The American people deserve this affordable energy. They deserve well-paying jobs. Both can be accomplished by building the Keystone Pipeline.

Again, I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his tireless efforts in the past 6 years trying to get this project off the ground. The good news is I think we have made real progress.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Arkansas and once again point out this is another State that will benefit from this project. This is a State far removed from the route of the project. As I pointed out in earlier debate on this floor, all of the States on the route, from Montana to Texas, have approved the project—all of them. They have all approved it. The only entity still holding up the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline is the Federal Government, the Obama administration.

All of the States have approved it. Those States on the route will realize tremendous benefits from the construction—from the construction jobs, from the hundreds of millions of dollars they will receive in tax revenues, payment in lieu of taxes at the State and local level. They will receive tremendous benefit from this project, not to mention of course the benefit the whole country receives as we become more energy independent by working with Canada to truly achieve North American energy security.

But here is a State, Arkansas, far removed from the route of the pipeline. I do not think the oil will—I do not know about refineries in Arkansas. I do not think there are refineries there that it will go to. It will go to refineries in States such as Louisiana and Texas and so forth.

But even still, Arkansas will benefit directly from this project because they manufacture much of the pipe that goes into the project. Those are good

manufacturing jobs that not only benefit those workers, but then you have the secondary impacts. Once again I thank the Senator from Arkansas for coming down to the floor and taking a few minutes to point that out.

We will continue over the next several weeks to talk about the benefits in other States as well. I thank the good Senator from Arkansas at this time. Even though I have floor time reserved until about 11:15 or a little more, I would like to actually stop and allow the Senator from Washington to talk about her views on it. I know she is not—of course, I work with her on the energy committee. She is our ranking member. I enjoy and appreciate working with her, but I understand she shares different views in this case.

I ask unanimous consent that her time for the next 10 to 15 minutes, as she needs, not be counted against my time. I would be willing to defer so she can speak at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I know we are going to be going back and forth on this issue and that we have other people coming. Later this morning we are going to have time divided. But I appreciate the Senator from North Dakota allowing us to join in the debate this morning and make a few points.

I do want to say I appreciate the hard work of the Senator from North Dakota on the energy committee in general. I look forward to working with him on many energy policies. He and I have worked together on a couple of different agricultural issues. I certainly appreciate his due diligence, but needless to say I do not agree with the process of moving forward with this motion to proceed to the Keystone XL Pipeline bill.

Many of my colleagues are going to be coming down and talking about the issues. Two of my colleagues, including the Senators from Utah and Arkansas, along with the Senator from North Dakota, brought up a couple of different points. But in my mind, they are talking about a 19th century energy policy and fossil fuel instead of us focusing on what should be a 21st century energy policy for our country.

It is unfortunate that S. 1 is a very narrow, specific, special interest measure for a pipeline that did not go through the proper channels of a permitting process and because of that is flawed. As people are heralding it as the new Congress.

This process continues today with people saying: Let's just give it more special interest attention and approve it. I believe America should be a leader in energy policy and that our job creation is dependent upon that energy policy for the future. We want to see America be a leader in this. I applaud

the fact that the President reached a climate and clean energy agreement with China.

We are over 60 percent of the world's energy consumption. If the two countries can work together on a clean energy strategy, I guarantee that will be good business for the U.S. economy. In fact, I read a statistic that something like 50 percent of all energy is going to be consumed by the buildings in China—there is huge growth in building development, but they do not have good building standards so those buildings consume too much energy. So there is a lot to do on energy efficiency that will grow U.S. jobs and help us. That is why we would rather see us focusing on some of the energy policies that we did in 2005 and 2007. Those things unleash huge opportunities for American jobs and huge opportunities for American consumers to get a better deal and not be subject to price spikes.

The 2007 bill had fuel efficiency standards in it and laid the foundation for the growth of the hybrid electric car industry and has added over 263,000 jobs in the last 5 years. That is the kind of smart policy we should be pursuing. We also have had energy bills that made investments in clean energy tax credits, something I was just talking about with my colleague from Utah, saying we needed to move forward on energy tax credits. If there is nothing else that we should be doing, we should be doing that as S. 1, because the predictability and certainty we would be giving to that industry would certainly unleash many jobs.

So the 2005 and 2007 energy bills that we did in a bipartisan fashion helped foster an energy-efficient economy and helped support 450,000 jobs according to a 2011 Brookings Institution report.

These are examples of the types of things we have done in the past that have unleashed investment, and have grown jobs in the United States of America. They are important milestones in the type of clarity Congress can give to the private sector to spur growth and development. I can guarantee this is the opposite of that. This is about a special interest deal and overriding a process, including the White House process and local government process, that is so essential.

Two examples of what we should be doing instead: As I said, the energy tax credits which have been delayed. As my colleagues from Oregon pointed out at the end of last year, we basically authorized them for about 2 more weeks in December. That was about all the certainty we gave the industry. A McKinsey report has estimated that providing the right incentives for retrofitting buildings and energy efficiency would help employ 900,000 people over the next decade; that the wind energy tax credit would employ 54,000 people, and there are other issues about modernizing our grid and new technology storage.

There is also very important work to be done in the manufacturing sector; that is, to help unleash innovation by making sure we set standards on improving efficiency and focusing on lightweight materials for both automobiles and aviation. We have seen huge job growth in the Pacific Northwest because we were able to transform aerospace into lighter weight materials. We are also working on a biojet fuel.

So all of these things mean we have to get the R&D right, we have to get the tax credits right, and we need to help protect consumers from spiking energy prices. This is the evolution. I do not think anybody in America thinks we are going to hold on to a 19th century fossil fuel economy forever. The question is, Whether Congress is going to spend its time moving forward on a 21st century plan that gives the predictability and certainty to unleash that leadership and capture the opportunities in developing markets around the globe or whether we are going to hold on to the last elements of fossil fuel forever and leave our constituents more at risk.

But I would like to take a few minutes and talk about this process my colleagues are trying to describe as to why we need to hurry. Because I can guarantee that is what people have been trying to do all along, hurry this along for a special interest. I do not believe that is good for the American people. I do not think it is good for this process.

If we think about where we have been, this process is about people who are trying to push a route through no matter what the circumstances. Every State, people are saying, has approved this process. I can guarantee there are a lot of people in Nebraska and a lot of people in South Dakota who do not agree with that. They are very concerned about the public interest.

Unfortunately, in the case of the Keystone XL project, landowners and ranchers in Nebraska affected by the pipeline did not feel they were afforded equal opportunity before the law. In their view the process was set up to benefit a special interest, the TransCanada Corporation. On three separate occasions, beginning in 2011, the Nebraska Legislature passed carve-outs to circumvent the role of the public service commission to approve the Keystone Pipeline.

If this was such a great deal, why can't it go through the normal process, as in every other State, with a transportation and utilities commission ruling on siting? Why do we have to take the public interest out of it? The first carve-out included the Major Oil Pipeline Siting Act of 2011. So this bill laid out the rule that the public service commission determined whether a new pipeline project was in the public interest. In making this decision, the legis-

lature required that the commission consider eight criteria.

Among them: the environmental impact of water and wildlife and vegetation, the economic and social impact, the alternative route, the impact to future development in the pipeline's proposal, and the views of counties and cities. OK. That all sounds great, right? That is what the legislature says they should be considering. But the legislature also required the commission to hold public hearings and have public comment—OK, we are still on the right track—and importantly required the commission to establish a process for appealing the decision, so that any aggrieved party could have due process rights under the Administrative Procedures Act.

Here is the punch line. Tucked away in that Nebraska legislation was a special interest carve-out that exempted TransCanada—Keystone XL—from having to comply with the public service commission process. Specifically, the legislation stated, “. . . shall not apply to any major oil pipeline that has submitted an application to the US Department of State pursuant to Executive Order 13337 prior to the effective date of this act.”

There was only one company that qualified for this special interest exemption at the time of that legislation; that was TransCanada. So you got it. The legislature basically exempted them from that process, even though they were stating that these are the processes that you should go through. So at the very time the legislature created new rules for due process on the pipeline, it exempted them from those rules. I do not understand why TransCanada cannot play by the rules, but I guarantee you Congress does not have to join in and make S. 1 a special interest bill. They should make sure every-one plays by the rules.

In this same legislative session, the Nebraska legislature also passed the Oil Pipeline Route Certification Act. This bill provided Keystone XL with an expedited review process by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality and gave the sole authority to approve the project to the Governor. Unfortunately, for the legislature and for TransCanada, these carve-outs quickly became irrelevant because President Obama denied the application in 2012. That is in part due to the fact that Congress had decided to try to intervene in the matter. That is when Congress said this is important and we should go ahead and do this.

I am going to get into more detail on that in a second. This is important to understand because the initial Nebraska legislation was so narrowly tailored, it was designed to benefit the TransCanada pipeline and its pending date of enactment. What happened next? The legislature went back to the drawing board and created a third new

special carve-out for the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The day following the President's denial of TransCanada's application, a new bill was introduced in the Nebraska Legislature. This bill was yet another path around the existing due process afforded to citizens in that State. The legislation allowed the company to choose whether to go through a formal process with the public service commission or seek expedited review with the Governor. I am sure a lot of U.S. companies would love to have that opportunity.

These are U.S. companies that have to pay lawyers, go through environmental processes, make sure all of the issues are addressed. I am sure American companies would love to know any day of the week they can just go past a utility commission and get the Governor to stamp “approved” on their project. Under this expedited approach, the legislature authorized the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality to independently conduct an environmental impact report. However, unlike due process required by the public service commission, this process required only token outreach to the public.

There was just one public hearing in 2012. This special process provided no recourse for aggrieved parties. There was no formal appeals process. Other than the courts, there was no administrative process with the ability for stakeholders to challenge the facts as a matter of record to base their formal appeal on. These are fundamental differences between an expedited consideration within the Governor's office and a process requiring a public interest determination by relevant decision-makers at a commission.

I know my colleagues here would like to argue that somehow this has been a long, drawn-out process. This has really been a process by one company constantly circumventing the rules on the books and trying to get a special deal for approval. We have to ask ourselves why. Why do they want to proceed this way?

I know my colleagues always like to talk about their neighbors. My neighbors in British Columbia are not so thrilled about tar sands pipeline activity. They are not interested in it. So maybe that is why TransCanada wants to hurry and get this process through in the United States.

I ask my colleagues, do you have confidence the public interest was really taken into consideration—that you run over the interests of private property owners on these issues? Was the department of environmental quality evaluation comprehensive?

I can say one Nebraska landowner described the report as “an incomplete evaluation of a natural resource with the magnitude of the Ogallala Aquifer, and now it is left in the hands of TransCanada to do their own policing.”

Another family, who has been ranching for more than five generations in Nebraska, said the process left landowners with nowhere to turn with their concerns of erosion, water contamination or eminent domain.

Another landowner had this to say about circumventing the process in Nebraska:

I feel it is not in the best interest of Nebraska, nor the citizens of Nebraska, to have our legislators crafting special legislation to meet the specific demands of an individual corporation.

I couldn't agree with them more. That is exactly what we are trying to do today.

The same stakeholders in Nebraska have also questioned the appearance of conflict of interest associated with the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality report since it was prepared by a contractor who also worked for TransCanada and Exxon on different joint pipeline projects.

Meanwhile, a majority of the State Supreme Court, 4 out of 7 justices, just last week ruled that the legislature and the Governor's actions were unconstitutional.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator has consumed 15 minutes.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that I be given an additional 2 minutes to wrap up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. My colleague has already given me some time this morning—and I can certainly come back and add more to the debate—but what I am outlining is exactly how this process has circumvented the laws of this land. One more action by this body is exactly what this special interest company is seeking.

If Congress had succeeded in pushing the President of the United States into agreeing to the original route through Nebraska in 2011, the route would have been right through the Ogallala Aquifer. Even TransCanada had already agreed that it needed to change the route. I don't know why we are being asked to push something through when we really should allow the State Department to do its job.

I will have much more to say on this process of the circumventing of public interest; about the devastating spill in the Kalamazoo River, and the fact that we don't know all we need to know about tar sands cleanup in water; and the fact that Midwest gasoline prices could be affected if this pipeline is approved.

There are many issues. So I will gladly debate this with my colleagues throughout the rest of this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to resume my time for the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. I will take a couple of minutes to respond to the points that my colleague on the energy committee just brought up with regard to both the process and also in regard to the timeline for approval of this project. Then I will turn to my cosponsor, the Senator from West Virginia, and get some of his input on the project.

Now we are starting to get into the kind of debate that we have wanted from day one. I had the good fortune to serve as Governor of my great State of North Dakota, and the good Senator on the floor with me from West Virginia was Governor at the same time of his State of West Virginia. We worked together many times on issues. I am a Republican, and he is a Democrat. We found common ground as Governors, and we found common ground in the Senate.

This is what this is all about. This is what we want to have happen among our colleagues so we can get this and other important legislation addressed, passed, and help our country.

But before I turn to my colleague from West Virginia, I wish to touch briefly on a couple of points that the ranking member of our energy committee brought up a moment ago. As she said, she opposes the project. I understand and respect her views, but she talked about the length of time the approval process takes.

What I have to point out is that we have been in this approval process now for more than 6 years. So when she talks about needing more time to get the project approved, it is hard to understand how we are going to have a working, functioning economy, how we are going to get the private sector to invest the billions of dollars it takes. This project alone is the largest shovel-ready project that is ready to go—just under \$8 billion, \$7.9 billion—and it has been held up for more than 6 years.

America got into World War II and won the war in less than 6 years. Building the Hoover Dam, I believe, took less than 6 years. If we are going to create the kind of environment where we stimulate investment by the private sector, get our economy growing and growing and get people back to work, we can't hold private investment up.

Remember, not one penny of Federal spending—almost \$8 billion, almost all private investment that will help create jobs, help grow our economy, create hundreds of millions in tax revenue, help us to build our energy future, help us with national security by being energy secure—all those things—and the Federal Government has held them up for more than 6 years.

How can we argue that there is any process there that works in any kind of a realistic or commonsense way when it has been up for more than 6 years.

Specifically—as regards the State of Nebraska—in 2012 I put forward legisla-

tion which we passed in this body attached to the payroll tax holiday that required the President to make a decision.

We didn't tell them what decision to make. We just said: Hey, you have to make a decision. At that point the project had been under review for 4 years—long enough, Mr. President, to make a national interest determination. That is what the legislation said that we attached to the payroll tax holiday. It passed with 73 votes.

The President at that time said: No, I am not going to make a decision on the project now because of what he perceived to be the problem with the route in Nebraska.

Remember, this project goes through States from Montana to Texas. Here it is. Remember, it is not carrying only Canadian crude. It carries crude from my State of North Dakota and the State of Montana. Light, sweet Bakken crude goes into this pipeline as well.

Everyone talks about the Canadian crude, but they forget that this moves domestic crude as well. My State alone produces 1.2 million barrels of oil a day, and we are moving 700,000 of barrels a day on trains because we can't get enough pipelines. Here we want to put 100,000 barrels a day into this pipeline, and we have been waiting for 6 years putting more and more oil on rail cars, congestion on the rails. We can't move our agriculture products, and we have been held up for 6 years. But in 2012 we passed that bill.

This body passed it, then the House, and it went to the President. Then he turned it down because he said the routing wasn't right in Nebraska. There is an objection here. Here we see the pipeline goes through Nebraska.

He said: No, I am not going to approve it at this point because they have to square it away in Nebraska.

In Nebraska, the State legislature, the elected body of the people, went to work with Governor Dave Heineman, a good friend of mine, and the Senator from West Virginia as well. We served with Governor Dave Heineman.

The elected body of the people, the legislature, went to work with the Governor. They went through a long process. They rerouted the pipeline to address any concerns regarding the Ogallala Aquifer and any other concerns that had been brought—a long laborious process—and approved it.

Every State on the route has approved the project. They have all approved it. They have had 6 years to do it. So it wasn't like they had to hurry, but they all approved it. Yet the Federal Government continues to hold it up and say: Oh, well, we have concerns.

Now, my esteemed colleague from Washington, who opposes the project, said that she was concerned about the supreme court decision.

Well, remember, the supreme court decision came up because after the

State of Nebraska approved the project, then opponents challenged it, forced it into court, and it went to the Nebraska Supreme Court. The Nebraska Supreme Court found in favor of the Governor and the legislature for the State of Nebraska. They found in favor of the route, and the State of Nebraska said that is as it should be—OK.

So that is all that was covered at great length by the elected representatives of the State of Nebraska and the Nebraska Supreme Court. I mean, how much more does this take? Furthermore, there is the point that my colleague was making: Well, if we had rushed, somehow this would have been a problem.

We put it in the legislation in section 2, under the private property savings clause, to make sure that if there is any issue such as that it is addressed in this legislation. So the very concern that she has raised is in the legislation.

The reason it is in there is because the good Senator from Montana—which is also on the route—Mr. TESTER, wanted this provision in the bill. He is also a Democrat. In showing the bipartisanship of the bill, he said: Well, let's make sure we take care of that. So we put language in the bill to make sure that the language we just addressed on the floor is addressed. It is very short, and I will read it—section 2, subsection (e):

PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in section (a).

So we tried to make sure—and furthermore—let me also read judicial review. That section is long, and I won't read it. But we also provided for judicial review so that if any of those issues are a concern—in addition to the language we put in to protect States rights—you also have judicial review. I don't know how much more we can do to make sure any and all concerns she just raised in regard to the process of the individual States is protected.

Again, I make the case today that we have all gone through great lengths to approve the project. The only entity blocking it now after more than 6 years is the Federal Government.

There is one other point I would make briefly before turning to the Senator from West Virginia. The good Senator from Washington talked about alternative energy sources, renewable energy sources, other energy resources, and how we need to develop them. They create jobs, and that is great.

This is a note on which I will turn to my cosponsor, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. We are for “all of the above” energy approach, but we have to get over the idea that somehow they are mutually exclusive. We go forward and build important infra-

structure so that we can make sure that we don't have to import oil from OPEC or from countries such as Venezuela or from other parts of the world, to ensure that we can be secure in energy and that we can produce as much or more oil than we consume—both domestic oil production and in Canada. We need the infrastructure.

But that in no way precludes the development of any other sources of energy. They are not mutually exclusive. So to say that we should be doing one and not the other—how does that make sense? Let's do them both.

On that note, I turn to my colleague. Ask anybody in this body, particularly those coming to the Senate as a former Governor. He is somebody who not only is very bipartisan in his approach to all of these issues, somebody who has not only advocated for producing all of the above in terms of energy, but somebody who has done it in his time as Governor.

So I turn to my colleague and say: Can't we do both? Isn't approving this part of doing it all?

Mr. MANCHIN. First, I thank the Senator from North Dakota, my friend, for taking the lead and working with me so closely. I am very excited about the process, the open amendment process.

We are learning a lot in debates, a lot of good ideas are coming out of this. When all is said and done, we will have a better piece of legislation. That is what this is all about.

Let me make sure everyone understands this is not all about pipelines. If this is about an XL pipeline or any other pipeline, we wouldn't have a hundred thousand miles of pipeline in America already. Since the Industrial Revolution we would not have built all the pipelines needed to carry the energy that we need to run this country. This is not about pipeline.

This is about the concerns we all have with greenhouse gas emissions and the development of the oil sands in Canada—nothing to do with the pipeline.

With that being said. We have to be very clear that Canada is going to develop the oil sands whether or not the Keystone pipeline is built. That is a fact, and we have talked about this.

The State Department—our own State Department in this great country of ours, the United States of America—has conducted five environmental assessments of the Keystone Pipeline and have found in all of them that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Now these are the things we have to be cognizant of.

The State Department also found the pipeline is unlikely to significantly affect the rate of extraction in Canadian oil development. That means whatever we do here is not going to change the rate of development in the oil sands.

The State Department also examined alternatives to the proposed XL Pipeline. These alternatives included what would happen if no action were taken at all. Let's say we do nothing here; that nothing comes about with this pipeline. Likely, the crude would be shipped westward by rail or by tanker. That is happening today. So they are going to ship it anyway. And if that continued, it would be considered no action. If we take no action here and don't build this pipeline for whatever reason, the greenhouse gas emissions—which we are all concerned about, and our debates are about that, really—will be between 28 to 42 percent higher if we do nothing.

So those people who are concerned about greenhouse gas emissions should say: Well, OK, why do we want to contribute to more? The pipeline decreases that. If we don't do it, we have 28 to 42 percent more emissions by how we will move this oil. So the pipeline addresses our energy security limits, and I have talked about that before, and our dependence on foreign oil.

I have said this many times. We all are entitled to our opinions, and I think we are all going to hear all those opinions in the next couple of weeks. But what we are not entitled to is our own set of facts, because the facts are what they are. I have said this before, and I will repeat it again, and I will continue to repeat: We buy, as of the 2013 figures from the Department of Energy's EIA, we—the United States of America—buy 7 million barrels of crude oil a day. Whether we like it or not, we are buying it. Now, I am sure people say: I wish we didn't. Well, that is what it takes for our economy to run. We are buying that oil—7 million barrels a day.

Then we need to look at where the oil is coming from. If you are upset with Canada producing oil, we already buy 2½ million a day from Canada right now. We are already dependent upon Canada for 2½ million barrels a day.

We also buy oil from other countries, and I think we should all question why we are buying oil from these other countries, especially when we look at Venezuela. We buy 755,000 barrels a day from Venezuela. They are an authoritarian regime that impoverishes their citizens. We know that. They violate their human rights and have shown their willingness to put down political protest with horrific violence. Yet we are supporting that by purchasing a product from them which they then use the resources from to continue this type of regime.

The same here: In 2013, we bought 1.3 million barrels from Saudi Arabia. Now I don't know about my colleagues, but I question whether the resources from that or the proceeds from that oil that we paid Saudi Arabia for were used for the betterment of the United States of America, for our best interests. I have my doubts about that.

We also buy over 40,000 barrels a day from Russia. I don't need to say anything about what is going on there. I think we all know that.

The Keystone Pipeline would allow us to safely import more oil from a stable ally and one of our best trading partners. In fact, it is the No. 1 trading partner of 35 of our 50 States in the United States of America. Our No. 1 trading partner is Canada. It is also the most stable regime we have, the best ally we have ever had.

The pipeline will have a final capacity of a little more than 800,000 barrels a day. So right there we could stop buying any oil from Venezuela or cut down dramatically the amount of oil we buy from Saudi Arabia and become less dependent. We can continue to produce energy in North America while stabilizing global supply as well as benefiting Americans and our allies.

In fact, last year, one of President Obama's former national security advisors—one of the President's former national security advisors, Retired Marine Gen. James Jones—told the Foreign Relations Committee:

The international bullies who wish to use energy scarcity as a weapon against us all are watching intently. If we want to make Mr. Putin's day and strengthen his hand, we should reject the Keystone.

Let me repeat that:

If we want to make Mr. Putin's day and strengthen his hand, we should reject the Keystone. If we want to gain an important measure of national energy security, jobs, tax revenue and prosperity to advance our work on the spectrum of energy solutions that don't rely on carbon, it should be approved.

So you have to decide which side you are on. Do you want to make Mr. Putin's day or do you want to find alternatives and use all of the above and be less dependent on foreign oil?

In addition to our national security interests and energy independence, this bill will also create thousands of jobs. I think we have talked about that. I hear the argument: Well, yes, but they are not going to be permanent. You know, we have built a lot of bridges in America, a lot of infrastructure, and a lot of roads. I don't know of any permanent jobs we have after we build a bridge, but we have a lot of good construction jobs when we are building the bridge. I don't know of any permanent jobs after we build a road, but we have a lot of good construction and high-paying jobs. And when you start looking at that, the building and construction trades, the teamsters, the AFL-CIO, all of our friends of working Americans, the middle class—the hard-working Americans—support this piece of legislation. They want these jobs.

Our own State Department says it will create about 42,000 jobs to construct the pipeline and thousands of other related jobs. So why don't we seize the opportunity?

We talk about amendments. This is an open amendment process. A lot of

my colleagues, a lot of my Democratic colleagues on my side of the aisle, have some great ideas and I am going to work with them. I agree with my Democratic friends that companies shipping oil through this pipeline should pay the excise tax to the oilspill trust fund. There is no reason they should be exempted from these payments. I am going to work with them to put that amendment in. It is a good amendment and it will strengthen the bill. That is what the amendment process is about.

I agree also with my colleagues on the Democratic side that any steel needed in the future on this product should be bought from American steel companies. That is great. That is promoting more jobs in America: Buy American steel. Don't let them dump on us. We should be supporting American jobs.

I also agree with our friends we shouldn't export any of our oil abroad. If that oil comes to America, it should be subjected to the same laws as all the oil that is extracted in America. So if we extract in the Balkans, if we extract in Texas, we treat them all the same. Those are all good amendments.

I would like to think this process will strengthen a piece of legislation and hopefully give us 68, 70 votes. That would really give us a good piece of legislation for the American people.

We have been promised an open amendment process, and I am so thankful for that. This presents an incredibly valuable opportunity to accomplish some of our Democratic priorities—some of our Democratic priorities that we talk about all the time on my side of the aisle. I believe the process will improve the bill, and I hope to convince my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Let us get the needed votes we need to make sure we move our country forward, become less dependent on foreign oil and more self-sufficient and more secure as a nation.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I know we have several colleagues who want to come and speak on other issues this morning, and then we have some Members who want to join back in on this debate, but I want to make a few points and finish up my remarks from earlier and then yield to our other colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask the Senator to yield for the purpose of a question. I want to understand the time. I need about 3, 4 minutes to wrap up. I did relinquish 15 minutes for the other side, so I would request 3 to 4 minutes to wrap up and then I would certainly yield the floor to her.

Ms. CANTWELL. Go right ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. I just want to wrap up.

I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia. I am glad we are engaged in this debate. I think we should debate all aspects of it, as we are, and I look forward to that continuing effort.

I do, though, want to wrap up on a point as to the environmental impact. We have talked about a number of different aspects of this pipeline project. We are talking about taking great care in the approval process to address all the issues at the State level. We have talked about making sure we put provisions in the bill to respect that State process. That has been going on for more than 6 years and, obviously, it is now well past time for the Federal Government to move forward and make its decision.

But again, back to that process. If the President continues to oppose this legislation—and he has indicated he will veto it because he has a process and he hasn't finished the process—then he needs to demonstrate and finish the process. He indicated he was holding out for the decision in Nebraska. Well, the decision in Nebraska has been completed. So if there is a process, if there is a real process, then he needs to make a decision and he needs to tell us when he is going to make that decision. And if the President follows his process, he needs to make a decision in favor of the project. Because as I am pretty sure we are going to hear from some of the opponents of the project, they will say: Oh, well, based on environmental issues, that is why he should turn it down.

I understand and respect their views on some of the climate change issues, and they are certainly entitled to those opinions, but based on five studies—three draft environmental impact statements and two final environmental impact statements done on this project—the Obama administration's State Department in those environmental impact statements found this will result: As a result of this project, “no significant environmental impact.”

I understand they are going to spend a lot of time talking about their views on climate change, and that is fine. I understand that. But there is a difference between opinion and that general discussion and the science of this project. That is the finding by the Obama administration.

We will have more discussion on this issue, in addition to the fact that Canada is working to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from oil production in their country and in the oil sands. Since 1990, on a per-barrel basis, they have reduced greenhouse gas emissions by about 28 percent, and they are continuing to do more. So they are addressing the environmental

issue by doing what? Investing in technology that not only produces more energy but does it with better environmental stewardship.

So instead of empowering that investment, here we want to block it? That is not the way to address better environmental stewardship. The way to do it is by encouraging the investment that not only produces more energy but does it with better environmental stewardship.

Again, I want to thank my colleague and fellow member of the energy committee for deferring so I could wrap up, and I look forward to continuing this debate and discussion on this important issue.

With that, I yield the floor.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, as I said, I know we have other colleagues here, so I will wrap up my opening remarks on the debate, then turn it over to other colleagues who are wanting to speak on this subject and other matters this morning.

I want to respond to a couple of things, because I know our colleagues keep thinking this is something we have to do and we have to expedite. But the reason why this project hasn't been approved to date is because we haven't followed the process, and people keep bringing up objections to that process.

Along those lines, I want to turn back to congressional involvement in this matter during the back-and-forth with Nebraska on the pipeline route change in the Sandhills region.

During the time from 2008 until 2012, the U.S. State Department was reviewing TransCanada's initial pipeline application. This process requires a national interest determination by the President. It is worth reminding my colleagues this was a process laid out by President Bush. But in the review of that process, in their initial application, the State Department, in 2011, announced that an alternative route through Nebraska needed to be found to avoid the uniquely sensitive terrain of the Sandhills area.

The President and the State Department said we need to go a different route. So what happens next? One would think that most people would stop and listen and say: Oh, my gosh, there is a concern about this aquifer. But that is not what happened. That is not what happened. People came to Congress and said: We should get the old route approved in the aquifer that provides 30 percent of the groundwater for irrigation through the United States—where a spill would have been disastrous.

At the same time the State Department was telling the company, we have real concerns; you need to re-route the pipeline. The company was coming here to Congress trying to push the old route through at the same time the State Department was negotiating. So

I would say to my colleagues, if you think you are helping this process, you are hurting it. You are trying to take away the negotiating power of the State Department to make sure that environmental and public interest issues are addressed here.

Now I know my colleague, whom I look forward to working with on the energy committee, thinks his legislation has protected something in the area of property rights, but let me be clear: This legislation ensures that the status quo in Nebraska under the Supreme Court decision last week will stand. It simply affirms that the use of eminent domain on behalf of TransCanada will be the law. So we are not doing anything in this legislation to protect them. Jamming Keystone XL onto the temporary payroll tax cut bill was a mistake, and the bill today is also a mistake. This bill says, "Don't try to answer all of these questions that we think the State Department should decide in our national interest." The President should have the ability to say yes or no on this.

I would like the President to answer these questions as they relate to the tar sands oil in water, only because I had a chance to ask the Commandant of the Coast Guard a year ago about this issue. We are very concerned about the transport of tar sands out of the Pacific Northwest. The commandant at that time said we have no solution—no solution. So when my colleague from Michigan talked about the \$1.2 billion that was spent on tar sands cleanup because it sank in the Kalamazoo River, I think these are issues that the State Department has every right to raise with the company to get answers on.

Just recently TransCanada has been redoing some of its pipeline in other areas because it has also found that the welds in the pipeline were not properly done. So in the State Department's Environmental Impact Statement, it required TransCanada to get a third-party validator to validate whether it was actually meeting the standards we want to see on the pipeline; but, no, our colleagues would like to interrupt that and say: We know best, just like we were ready to make it right with the Sandhills aquifer. We know best.

So I ask my colleagues not to rush a process that has been failed from the beginning, that did not allow for the public interest to be adequately afforded its right.

I don't understand what the hurry is. I do want to hurry on energy policy, but it has much more to do with getting the tax credits and clean energy incentives in place that will unleash thousands of more jobs and give predictability. That is the prerogative and the responsibility of Congress, to look at these tax incentives to establish economic incentives. It is not our job to site pipelines when the local process has not played out. At least don't stop

the President from making sure these environmental issues are addressed.

My colleague from Massachusetts has been waiting, and I know he was a leader in the House of Representatives prior to his time in the Senate making sure that tar sands should pay into the oilspill liability trust fund, and I certainly appreciate his leadership on that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I rise for recognition to speak on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Presiding Officer very much and I thank the Senator from Washington for her great leadership on this issue.

We are having the beginning of an historic debate here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We are debating whether the dirtiest oil in the world, the tar sands from Canada, is going to be brought through the United States in a pipeline, like a straw, and brought right down to Port Arthur, TX, to a tax-free export zone so that it can be exported out of the United States.

What is in it for our country?

Well, when you think about it, we are going to take the environmental risk, but the benefits flow to the Canadian companies. The benefits flow to the oil companies. This whole argument that it deals with American energy independence is false, and the way in which we are going to ensure that we are protected is that we are going to bring an amendment out here on to the Senate floor to debate whether this oil should stay in the United States. We export young men and women overseas to protect these ships coming back from the Middle East with oil. Why should we export the oil that is already in the United States when it can reduce our dependence? That is our challenge, and we must deal with that.

As well, the Canadians under existing law are exempt from paying a tax into an oilspill liability fund. That can no longer continue as well. That is upwards of \$2 billion over 10 years to deal with oilspills in the United States created by Canadian oil, and they are exempt. That is wrong. That is just plain wrong. So this is a very important debate, but it goes right to the heart—let's admit it—of energy independence in the United States. That oil should not come to our country, go right through it and out. We have a responsibility to the young men and women we send around the world to not provide any false advertising about this oil and where it is going to go.

NET NEUTRALITY

Secondly, I want to talk a little bit about net neutrality. We are coming up to the first anniversary of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals striking down the rules the Federal Communications

Commission had put on the books to protect the Internet, to ensure that it is open, that it is entrepreneurial. Network neutrality is just a fancy word for nondiscrimination, just a fancy word for saying that it is open, that entrepreneurs, that smaller voices have access, so they cannot be blocked by communications behemoths. This is an issue that goes right to the heart of job creation in the United States of America.

Consider this. In 2013, 60 percent of all of the venture capital funds invested in the United States of America went toward Internet-specific and software companies. That is all you have to know. That is 60 percent of all venture capital money. That is why 4 million people have registered with the Federal Communications Commission their views that net neutrality is central to this entrepreneurial activity in our country. The FCC is going to promulgate or announce the beginning of the promulgation of new regulations in February. We are on the first anniversary right now of the rules having been struck down. There are none.

From my perspective, this goes right to the heart of the new generation of companies. Yes, we have Google and eBay and Amazon and YouTube and all rest of these first-generation companies, but there are new companies like Dwolla and Etsy that are at the heart of the new job creation, and we have to make sure they and others like them are not denied access.

So, in both of these issues, net neutrality and on the pipeline issue coming down from Canada, it is all about job creation. It is all about making sure that if America is going to take the risk, America should get the benefit. And it is not going to on the pipeline issue. It is not. This is the dirtiest oil in the world. This is going to contribute to dangerous global warming.

Yet the oil companies are going to be able to sell it out on the open market. And why? Because the price of a barrel of oil on the open market is \$17 higher than it is in Canada. You don't have to go to a business school to figure out this model. Get it out and onto the open seas, sell it to China, sell it to Latin America, sell it to other countries around the world. That is what this is all about. That is what is at the heart of this entire Keystone Pipeline agenda.

It is wrong for us to be short-circuiting a process that will guarantee that the environment of our country, the environment of our planet is, in fact, protected by the President and by the process that has been put in place.

I am so glad we are finally having this debate to make sure we put all of the facts out on the table.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 4 minutes, followed by Senator SHAHEEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. ISAKSON and Mrs. SHAHEEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 150 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak, I have two unanimous consent requests: No. 1, that Senator WHITEHOUSE be allowed to follow me and, No. 2, that my remarks not break up the debate on the pipeline bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, with all of the issues our country faces, here we are debating a Canadian pipeline. What are we doing? A new majority has taken over the Senate and their first bill—their opening gambit—is the Keystone Pipeline. What is going on?

Is it about jobs? There has been an awful lot of talk about jobs over the last couple of days, but this opening gambit—both obviously and demonstrably—has nothing to do about jobs. If this were about jobs, instead bring up the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, the bipartisan bill the Republicans spiked last year. That bill has been estimated to produce nearly 200,000 jobs, more than quadruple the 42,000 jobs supported by the construction of the pipeline.

If this were about jobs, bring up the highway bill, which came out of EPW unanimously last year. That bill was estimated to support 3 million jobs a year, 70 times the number of jobs the Keystone Pipeline will produce. Forty-two thousand is a pittance compared to that.

Right now the economy is adding over 70,000 jobs every week. In the 3 weeks we spend arguing about this bill, we will add five times as many jobs as the Keystone Pipeline would provide. We matched Keystone in just 4 average days of job growth. Yet we are going to spend 3 weeks on this issue?

If this were truly about jobs, bring up an infrastructure bill—the kind our Republican friends have relentlessly stymied when they were in the minority. Set up an infrastructure fund. God knows wherever we look American infrastructure is crumbling. Schools, airports, trains, water, health information infrastructure, smart grids, and broadband are all yearning for activity.

We could do very big things on jobs. We get 13,000 jobs on average for every \$1 billion spent on infrastructure, and

we need the infrastructure, but instead we are doing this. It is definitely not about jobs.

Is it about the merits of the pipeline? Hardly. With oil prices at \$50 per barrel, it is not even clear that the pipeline is viable. The State Department calculated that crude oil prices below \$75 per barrel would limit the development of tar sands crude.

According to a recent report from the Canadian Energy Research Institute, due to a steep increase in production costs, new tar sands projects require crude prices of at least \$85 per barrel to break even. We are around \$50 per barrel. The U.S. Energy Information Agency predicts that crude oil prices will average below \$65 well into 2015.

Shell, Total, and Statoil have all canceled or postponed major tar sands expansion projects. Southern Pacific Resources has nearly gone broke transporting heavy crude to the gulf by rail. The Canexus terminal in Alberta has run far below capacity, plagued by logistical problems, lost contracts with developers, and has been put up for sale. At \$50 per barrel this pipeline could already be a zombie pipeline—dead man walking.

Moreover, Keystone XL would be an environmental disaster. Notwithstanding the talking points to the contrary, the facts prove otherwise. As a source of carbon pollution alone, it will produce the equivalent of as many as 6 million added cars on our roads for 50 years. That is enough added carbon pollution to erase 70 percent of the carbon reductions from the recent motor vehicle emission standards that the automobile companies agreed to.

The cost of that carbon pollution adds up. Using official U.S. estimates of the social cost of carbon, the economic damage of the emissions from the Keystone Pipeline will amount to \$128 billion in harm over the lifetime of the project. These are enormous costs that we will pay, borne out as parched farmland, harms to our health, and flooded businesses and homes. It is not about jobs and it is not about the merits of this pipeline. Unfortunately, it is not even a venue for a serious discussion about climate change—for a conversation about what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans.

In all of last week's conversation about the Keystone Pipeline tar sands bill, the number of times Republicans mentioned climate change was exactly one time, and that was only when Chairman MURKOWSKI summarized testimony submitted to her energy committee by an opponent of the pipeline. She used the term while describing the witness's testimony. There was one reference to a Democratic witness's committee testimony, and that is it. There were "zero" serious conversations.

We are long past time for a serious bipartisan conversation about carbon pollution and climate change. What a

great thing it would be if part of the new majority's new responsibility was just to take an honest look at those issues. But for sure this isn't that. Republicans remain politically incapable of addressing climate change. Forget addressing climate change, Republicans remain politically incapable of even discussing it.

It is not jobs, it is not the merits of the pipeline, it is not an opening on carbon pollution and climate change, and the President has already told us he is going to veto this bill.

What the heck are we doing? I will tell you what I think we are doing—and I think the facts support this conclusion—but first what you have to understand to understand what is going on is that the Republican Party has become the political wing of the fossil fuels industry. There has always been a trend of this within the Republican Party, but since the Republican appointees on the Supreme Court gave the fossil fuel industry the great, fat, juicy gift of its Citizens United decision, fossil fuel industry control over the Republican Party in Congress has become near absolute.

According to the Center for American Progress, the fossil fuel industry spent nearly three-quarters of \$1 billion over the last 2 years on lobbying and direct and third-party campaign contributions. That is just what is reported. That doesn't even count the anonymous dark money that is preferred by many special interest donors. It certainly doesn't include the pungent fact that even if a special interest never spends the money, just quiet, private, backroom threats of attack ads can influence political behavior.

We can argue this point more on another day. I have talked about it frequently, and I think I have made the case pretty convincingly in other "Time to Wake Up" speeches that the evidence points to this as the present state of affairs within the Republican Party. So for purposes of this discussion, take it as my premise, anyway, that the Republican Party in Congress is now effectively the political wing of the fossil fuel industry.

That premise clarifies what is happening here. The fossil fuel industry has a shiny new Republican Senate majority, and it wants to take it out for a spin. It wants to take its new Republican-controlled Congress out for a spin. That is what this Keystone opening gambit is all about. This is somewhere between performance art, a show of obedience, and a show of force.

Well, fine. Take us out for a spin. Have your fun. But the laws of nature that turn carbon pollution into climate change and into ocean acidification aren't going away. God laid down those laws, and they are not subject to repeal by man. Ignore them all you want. Worship at the altar of the fossil fuel Baal all you want, but there will be a

price to pay for this negligence and inaction. It is truly time for this body to wake up.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUBA POLICY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to say that nothing has changed in Cuba since Cuban arms were captured on this North Korean ship going through the Panama Canal a year and a half ago, just after the Obama administration started its secret negotiations with the Cuban Government—not the regime, not its mindset, nor its oppression of its people.

This is the essence of the regime. They put this missile system and MiGs in a container ship going through the Panama Canal, hid them under tons of sugar in violation of U.S. Security Council resolutions. It was the most significant violation of security council resolutions as it relates to North Korea in quite some time, and certainly the biggest violator in all of the Western Hemisphere.

We could not trust the Castro regime then, and we cannot trust it now. What we can trust are the voices of those who promote human rights and democracy who have been arrested and re-arrested time and time again, year after year, for demanding nothing more than their ability to speak their minds freely, openly, and without fear.

Voices such as Berta Soler, the leader of the Ladies in White—the Ladies in White are a group of women who each Sunday travel to mass dressed in white, normally holding a gladiola—peacefully. These are women whose husbands or sons languish in Castro's jail simply because of their political views. And as they march to church, they are savagely beaten by state security.

Berta Soler, the leader of the Ladies in White, said:

Sadly, President Obama made the wrong decision. The freedom and democracy of the Cuban people will not be achieved through these benefits that he's giving—not to the Cuban people—but to the Cuban government.

The Cuban government will only take advantage to strengthen its repressive machinery, to repress civil society, its people and remain in power.

Or the voice of Yoani Sanchez, a prominent Cuban blogger and independent journalist, who said, "Alan Gross was not arrested for what he did but for what could be gained for his arrest. He was simply bait and they were aware of it from the beginning. Cas-

troism has won, though the positive result is that Alan Gross has left alive the prison that threatened to become his tomb."

Or the voice of Rosa Maria Paya, the daughter of Oswaldo Paya, the island's most prominent and respected human rights advocate, who was killed in what the regime calls an automobile accident, what many of us call an assassination. His whole effort was under the existing Cuban Constitution to petition his government under that constitution for changes in the government, of which he amassed thousands of signatures of average Cubans across the island, and the regime saw that as such a threat that he was run off the road and, sadly, killed.

His daughter Rosa Maria Paya said:

The Cuban people are being ignored in this secret conversation, in this secret agreement that we learned today. The reality of my country is there is just one party with all the control and with the state security controlling the whole society.

If this doesn't change, there's no real change in Cuba. Not even with access to Internet. Not even when Cuban people can travel more than two years ago. Not even that is a sign of the end of the totalitarianism in my country.

Or another voice, the voice of Sakharov prize winner Guillermo Farinas, who spoke for many Cuban dissidents when he said this:

Alan Gross was used as a tool by the Castro regime to coerce the United States. Obama was not considerate of Cuban citizens and of the civil society that is facing this tyrannical regime.

In Miami, Obama promised he would consult Cuba measures with civil society and the non-violent opposition. Obviously, this didn't happen. That is a fact, a reality. He didn't consider Cuba's democrats. The betrayal of Cuba's democrats has been consummated.

As you can see, Farinas is in the midst of being arrested by state security simply for a peaceful protest.

Or the powerful voice of the husband of Berta Soler, Angel Moya, a former political prisoner of the Black Spring in 2003 when Fidel Castro imprisoned 75, including 29 journalists along with librarians and democracy activists. He said this:

The Obama Administration has ceded before Castro's dictatorship. Nothing has changed. The jails remain filled, the government represents only one family, repression continues, civil society is not recognized and we have no right to assemble or protest.

The measures that the government of the United States has implemented today, to ease the embargo and establish diplomatic relations with Cuba, will in no way benefit the Cuban people. The steps taken will strengthen the Castro regime's repression against human rights activists and increase its resources, so the security forces can keep harassing and repressing civil society.

These are the voices of those who languished inside the belly of the beast. These are the voices not of this romantic image that some have of Castro's Cuba but of the reality, the harsh

reality—people who, simply to be able to promote the basic freedoms that we enjoy here in the United States and most people in the Western world, are constantly thrown into jail for long periods of time, beaten and oppressed.

Those are the voices of freedom inside of Cuba. These are the men and women who have been arrested and suffered under the oppressive hand of the Cuban regime for the belief in the right of all Cubans to be free. These are the people who know that nothing—nothing—has changed. The regime, after reaping the benefits of what in my view is a bad deal, is still arresting peaceful protesters, including more than 50 at the end of December.

As a matter of fact, on New Year's Eve when most of us were celebrating the advent of the new year, there was an effort inside of Cuba. Tania Bruguera and a series of other human rights activists and political democracy activists were going to hold in Revolution Square a 1-minute opportunity for any Cuban who wanted to come forth and talk about what they aspired to for their freedom, what they aspired to for the Cuba of tomorrow to be. It was going to be a peaceful demonstration and an exposition of the hopes and dreams and aspirations of Cuba's political dissidents and human rights activists inside their country. In that peaceful effort, dozens of human rights activists and political dissidents, including the organizers, were arrested before they ever got to the event. The event was totally suppressed.

Weeks after the administration's deal with the Castro regime—even then—the simple act of speaking for 1 minute about what your views would be of the future were repressed. So let me say that while I welcome the news that Cuba has released 53 political prisoners and that the administration has finally shared the list of names it negotiated with the Castro regime, this entire process has been shrouded in secrecy.

Reuters reports that the administration officials said the list was created in June or July. But some of the 53 were released well before June, before the list was supposedly put together. As a matter of fact, 14, to be exact, were released 6 to 8 months before the December 17 announcement. One was released over a year ago.

So, clearly, the list that supposedly was put together by the administration with the regime could not have envisioned or could not take credit for those who were released well before the list was put together. Many had simply finished their unjust prison terms. Clearly, keeping the list secret provided the regime the flexibility to define "mission accomplished." The fact is, the release of 53 political prisoners does not mean there are no longer political prisoners inside of Cuba. Human rights groups had stated, prior to the

President's speech in December, that there were over 100 long-term political prisoners in the country, and there were 8,900—to be exact, 8,889—political detentions in Cuba last year—an appalling number—8,889.

In short, while 53 political prisoners have been let out of jail, the same corrupt jailer is still ruling the country. The Castros have a long history. I have followed this not only for all of my career of 23 years in the Congress, but even before that. They have a long history of rearresting these political and human rights activists whom they previously released.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute remaining under Democratic control.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask unanimous consent to be able to continue for about 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the fact is that as someone who has spoken out time and again on the brutal repression of the Cuban people under the Castro regime, someone whose family has suffered the consequences, I believe the agreement this administration has reached with the Castro regime is one-sided and misguided. It fails to understand the nature of the regime that has exerted its authoritarian control over the Cuban people for over 55 years. Now, no one wishes that the reality in Cuba were more different than the Cuban people and Cuban Americans that have fled the island in search of freedom.

In December, the same month that the President announced changes to U.S. policies, the Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a group that works within Cuba, documented 489 political arrests, bringing the total number of political arrests during the first 11 months of 2014 to nearly 8,900.

This is the regime that imprisoned an American citizen for 5 years for distributing communications equipment on the island. Releasing political prisoners today in Cuba is meaningless if tomorrow these individuals can be arrested again and denied the right to peacefully pursue change in their own country. It is a fallacy that Cuba will change just because an American President believes that if he extends his hand in peace, the Castro brothers will suddenly unclench their fists.

As you see from the quotes I have read, a majority of democracy activists on the island, many whom I have met with in the past, have been explicit that they want the United States to become open to Cuba only when there is a reciprocal movement by the Castro brothers. They understand that the Castros will not accede to change in any other way. In my view and in

theirs, the United States has thrown the Cuban regime an economic lifeline. With the collapse of the Venezuelan economy, Cuba is losing its main benefactor, but it will now receive the support of the United States, the greatest democracy in the world.

This is a reward that a totalitarian regime does not deserve. It is a reward that at the end of the day perpetuates the Castro regime's decades of repression. The regulatory changes the regime has won, which are clearly intended to circumvent the intent and spirit of U.S. law and the U.S. Congress, present a false narrative about Cuba that suggests that the United States and not the regime is responsible for its economic failure. So let's be clear. Cuba's economic struggles are 100 percent attributable to a half century of failed political and economic experiments that have suffocated Cuban entrepreneurs. In Cuba private business is controlled by the Cuban government—most significantly the military—with the benefits flowing directly to the regime's political and military leaders.

Cuba has the same political and economic relations with most of the world. But companies choose not to engage because of political, economic, and even criminal risks associated with investment on the island, as exhibited by the arbitrary arrests of several foreign investors from Canada, England, and Panama in just recent years.

To also suggest that Cuba should be taken off the list of state sponsors of terrorism is alarming while Cuba harbors American fugitives such as Joanne Chesimard, a cop killer who is on the FBI's list of most wanted terrorists for murdering New Jersey State Trooper Werner Foerster. She is not the only one who is a cop killer inside of Cuba from the United States. There is also Cuba's colluding with North Korea, as I showed before, to smuggle jets, missile batteries, and arms through the Panama Canal in violation of the U.N. Security Council resolution, and for giving refuge to members of FARC from Colombia and members of ETA from Spain, groups that the State Department has recognized as foreign terrorist organizations.

Now, finally with respect to the President's decision to attend the Summit of the Americas, I am extraordinarily disappointed that we intend to violate our own principles laid down in the Inter-American Democratic Charter in 2001, on the Summit being a forum for the hemisphere's democratically elected leaders. This action disavows the charter, and it sends the global message about the low priority that we place on democracy and respect for human and civil rights.

So in this new Congress I urge my distinguished colleague, the now chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, to hold

hearings on this dramatic and mistaken change in policy. I will keep coming to this floor to address at length all of the issues I have raised. I will come to this floor again and again to expose one of the most oppressive, repressive, and undemocratic regimes in the world.

To those of my colleagues who herald this agreement and for those in the press who still live with the mistaken romanticism of the Castros' revolution and who speak out about human rights abuses and democratic movements all over the world, it is so hypocritical to be so silent—a deafening silence when it comes to the democratic and human rights movement inside of Cuba.

I have listened to many eloquent speeches of my colleagues about human rights violations and democracy movements in many parts of the world. But on Cuba their silence is deafening.

This does not end here. It does not end today with one speech. It surely will not end until the people of Cuba are truly free.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I wish today to address S. 1, which would approve construction of the Keystone Pipeline to transport tar sands heavy oil from Canada to the gulf coast. The key consideration is whether this bill, by authorizing the pipeline, would contribute significantly to global warming, which is already damaging our rural resources and our future economic prospects with profound consequences for families in America and around the world.

Also, are there better ways to create jobs that would enhance rather than damage our economy? In the words of President Theodore Roosevelt, "Of all the questions which can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us."

Let's start by examining the impact of the Keystone Pipeline on atmospheric carbon dioxide pollution and global warming. This chart displays the variations in carbon dioxide that have occurred over time, back through the last 800,000 years. We have seen that carbon dioxide levels have gone up and down within a modest range until modern times and the Industrial revolution.

At that point, where they continued to oscillate as they have in the past, we see a steady, upward progress into a realm not seen within these last 800,000 years. This is the impact simply of

human kind pulling up a lot of fossil fuel out of the ground and burning it—whether it comes in the form of coal or it comes in the form of oil or it comes in the form of gas.

Now, let's take a look and see how the temperature of the planet has corresponded with the levels of carbon dioxide. What we find, going back in time, is a very strong correlation with the carbon dioxide in red and temperature change in blue—a very close correlation between carbon dioxide around our planet and the temperature of the planet.

Well, this makes enormous sense since any high school student can establish in the laboratory that carbon dioxide has thermal properties in trapping heat. As less heat radiates from the Earth, the Earth warms. Well, this certainly bears upon our stewardship of this planet. By many estimates, to contain global warming to 2 degrees Celsius—that is just shy of 3.9 degrees Fahrenheit—human civilization must transition aggressively and rapidly away from conventional fossil fuels and toward the use of nonfossil, renewable energy.

Now, this shift is within our power. It is a challenge presented by this circumstance and by our stewardship of human civilization on this planet. But are we up to the task? Do we have the political will to undertake responsible stewardship of our beautiful blue-green Earth? That is the test that stands before this body—this Senate—at this very moment.

Building the Keystone Pipeline, which opens the faucet to rapid exploitation of massive new unconventional fossil reserves—the tar sands—takes us in the exact opposite direction from where we need to go. It locks us into the dirtiest fossil fuels on the planet for a generation. It accelerates human civilization down the road to catastrophic climate change.

That is why building the Keystone Pipeline is a mistake. There is a lot at stake. Global warming is not some imaginary concept based on computer models or something that might happen 50 to 100 years from now. Indeed, global warming is not only present right now, but it is already making vast changes in State after State, and nation after nation.

The warmest 10 years on record for global average surface temperature have occurred in the last 12 years. Let me repeat that. The warmest 10 years on record for global average surface temperature have occurred in the last 12 years. That is pretty powerful evidence that something dramatic is occurring. The effects can be seen in every State. The average forest fire season in the United States is getting longer. Since the 1980s the season has grown by 60 to 80 days. That is 2 to 3 months of additional fire season. The average amount of acres consumed an-

nually by wildfires has doubled to more than 7 million acres.

One study estimates that global warming, through the combined impact of greater pine beetle infestation and the greater number of forest fires and more severe forest fires will decimate the western forests of the United States by the end of this century. That is not the only impact that we are seeing. In addition, the snowpack in our mountains—in our Cascade Mountains—is decreasing, which means smaller and warmer trout streams. That is not good for fishing.

It means less water for irrigation—not good for farming. The Klamath Basin, a major agricultural basin in Oregon, has suffered through many years and three horrific droughts just since 2001, in substantial part, because of the lower snowpack.

This chart, which shows Washington State, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, shows the areas of intensity of the decrease in snowpack. The decreases are circled in red and the increases in the snowpack are circled in blue. As you can see, the decreasing snowpacks vastly, vastly outweigh the occasional spots where there have been reported increases.

This translates to the types of droughts we have been seeing in the Klamath Basin, in this area of southern Oregon, and the droughts we have seen in northern California, a very significant impact on agriculture.

So when some are critical on this floor—some climate deniers who choose to ignore all of the facts on the ground and say there is no impact and no harm—well, they simply are putting forth a myth designed to serve the oil, fossil fuel, and coal industries in order to advance those powerful special interests.

Well, I have a special interest. That special interest is the people of Oregon, who are being impacted by the longer forest fires, who are being impacted by the droughts. I have a special interest. It is called planet Earth. That trumps the Koch brothers, that trumps the coal industry, that trumps the oil industry.

There are other impacts that we are seeing. One is the impact on our oceans. As the high levels of carbon dioxide in the air interact through wave action with the ocean, the ocean absorbs some of that carbon dioxide. As it absorbs that carbon dioxide, it becomes carbonic acid. Here we see some charts from Hawaii. In the purple here we have the change in atmospheric carbon dioxide over a 50-year period.

Then we have measurements of carbon dioxide in blue in the water. Then we have the measurements, over that same period, of the pH or acidic content of the oceans. What we are seeing is that as the pH level drops, that means that the oceans are more acidic. Now, what happens when the ocean is

more acidic? It affects the coral reefs, for one. Coral reefs are very sensitive to this. We have seen, from scientists who are studying coral reefs, significant damage both from water temperatures and from increasing acidity.

One scientist from Oregon State University who studies coral reefs around the world came here to DC and presented a series of slides showing the reefs he studied. He said: These are my babies and my babies are dying. Those coral reefs are the basic food chain for a significant amount of sea life that is harvested for human consumption. To put it differently, fishing families around the world often depend on the coral reefs to sustain the foundation of their livelihood.

Off the Pacific coast, we are seeing a big impact on our oysters. The Whiskey Creek shellfish hatchery started having trouble in 2008 with the growth of its baby oysters that are known as oyster seeds. I visited that hatchery 3 months ago to hear their story about what they had faced.

At first they thought: Well, maybe this problem is from a bacteria. Maybe this problem is from a virus. Maybe this is from something else. They brought in Oregon State University to research and they figured out that it was, in fact, the acidity of the water, the very acidity that I just showed you the chart about.

The acidity does not happen in just one place. It is happening broadly across the world. The oyster seed—if they are having trouble fixing their shells because of the high acidity in the water, well then what else is going on? The oysters—here are some headlines related to the oysters.

Up in Washington State, the Seattle Times reported: “Oysters dying as coast is hit hard.” In fact, I was flipping through channels a month or 2 ago, and there was the Governor of Washington over at a hatchery on the coast of Washington, just like I visited Whiskey Creek Hatchery in Oregon. It is the same story. Oysters are dying. Why? Because of the acidity of the water.

This is a headline from the Los Angeles Times: “Oceans’ rising acidity a threat to shellfish—and humans.”

From Oregon: “Researchers scramble to deal with dying Northwest oysters.”

So for my colleagues who want to wreak this kind of harm to our farms, to our fisheries, and to our forests, how about you figure out how to pay for the damage being done throughout the United States and throughout the planet. You want to unleash the dirtiest oil in the world from the tar sands and increase this damage? Tell me how you are going to compensate those who are injured across this Nation and across the world.

I hear a lot of comments about responsibility. I hear a lot of comments from my colleagues across the aisle about accountability. Put your actions where your statements are and show us some accountability for the damage you are wreaking by approving this pipeline, by voting for this pipeline.

Does this bill before us, which would open the faucet on a massive new reserve of fossil fuels, advance the stewardship of the planet? Does it advance our rural economy? Clearly the answer is no. Stewardship, accountability, and responsibility would insist that we not open this faucet to further damage of the kind we are seeing right now, that we not unlock the tar sands.

But proponents of the pipeline say: Wait, we have some arguments on our side. Let’s examine those arguments.

First they say: You know, this will create 4,000 construction jobs.

Well, let’s take a look at this chart. This is a chart that shows the Keystone—roughly 4,000 construction jobs. That represents this little tiny line at the bottom, if you can even see it.

Now let’s talk about the Rebuild America Act, which colleagues across the aisle filibustered in order to kill it even though it was revenue neutral. That is how many jobs the Rebuild America Act would create.

If you want to talk jobs, let’s talk about a jobs bill. Let’s substitute the Rebuild America Act for the Keystone act. Let’s have a real jobs bill, a real stimulus bill, a bill that would put people to work in construction across this Nation in a way more intense fashion than would the Keystone bill.

Proponents have a second argument. They say that bringing this additional oil from Canada down to the Gulf of Mexico will increase our national security because all that oil will be refined and utilized in the United States.

Well, my colleagues are a little confused about this. They haven’t thought about why it is Canada wants to ship it to a gulf port—so that it can have access to world markets, so that it can get the world market price. Our refineries in the gulf coast are largely fully occupied now. An additional supply of crude means additional crude you can export to other countries that have refineries that are short of supply. Well, that is profitable to Canada, but that doesn’t mean the oil will get used in the United States.

They say: But wait a minute, some of it might get refined and utilized in the U.S. system.

Well, let’s acknowledge that some of it might get refined, albeit it is clear why the oil is being shipped to the gulf coast because it is being shipped there to get into the world market and be available for export to the world. Let’s say some of it might happen to be utilized in the United States. That little bit of impact is nothing compared to what we can do by investment in re-

newable energy that would decrease our reliance on fossil fuels. So a far better solution would be investing in renewable, non-fossil fuel energy that doesn’t have the impact on the fishing, the farming, and the forests.

But, say proponents, if the Keystone Pipeline is not built, an alternative pipeline will be built through Canada.

Well, that is certainly highly questionable. If it were easier and cheaper to go through Canada, TransCanada would not be seeking to build the Keystone Pipeline.

Oh, they say, they will figure out a way to run a pipeline west to the Pacific.

But you know that has to pass through First Nation lands, and it has to have all kinds of approvals. And there are folks in Canada who actually feel as deeply and passionately about being good stewards of our planet and not contributing to the assault on our forests, our farming, and fishing as many of us here feel, and there is going to be intense opposition. That is why TransCanada wants to push this through the United States in order to reach the world market and the gulf coast. It is cheaper and easier, and they have no confidence they can build a pipeline to substitute.

Opponents say: If it is not shipped by pipeline, it will be shipped by railroad—which, of course, is again way off the fact track because the railroads are already congested, making additional capacity modest at best. In addition, the price point for shipping by rail is much higher than the price point for shipping by pipeline. If you change the price of the pipeline, you change the supply and demand curve, and you don’t end up producing the same amount of oil.

So these arguments made are thin efforts to camouflage a fundamental fact that this is a great deal for TransCanada, it is a great deal for the oil industry, and it is a terrible deal for Americans depending on rural resources, a terrible deal for our oceans and our fisheries, a terrible deal for our forests, and a terrible deal for our farming.

So if you care about the future economy of the United States, if you care about rural America, if you care about all of us who depend on rural America for these wonderful and important resources, then you will oppose this pipeline.

There is no question, this is a sweetheart deal. Talk about accountability? TransCanada won’t even have to pay into the oilspill liability fund. They are being exempted from that fund. They do not have to pay into the insurance fund that will help clean up when their pipeline leaks. And they all leak. That is outrageous. You want accountability? Put forward the amendment that says they would have to pay into the oilspill liability fund, the same as

any other person or group pumping oil through a pipeline in the United States. Say that they would be fully responsible for every bit of damage that local governments and State governments and the U.S. Government have to pay for to compensate for the damage created by those oil spills. Let's hear some responsibility and accountability from the proponents of this pipeline, not this sweetheart deal for a Canadian company.

Tackling carbon pollution—global warming—is going to take an enormous amount of international cooperation. Just recently, the United States and China entered into an agreement to address global climate change. President Obama announced the goal of cutting American net greenhouse gas emissions 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. The Chinese President announced that China would invest heavily in renewable energy to generate 20 percent of China's energy from nonfossil sources by 2030 and would seek to decrease China's CO₂ emissions thereafter.

These goals will require significant efforts by the United States and massive investments by China. Do they go far enough? No, not in the context of the challenge faced because of our elevated carbon dioxide levels around the world, but this agreement by the two biggest carbon polluters among nations is a significant step forward. It is the type of leadership the world has been asking for.

We cannot simply wish for nations to work together, we have to do our part. That is why we should be talking today not about how to turn on the tap for the dirtiest oil on the planet but how to work with other nations to invest in energy conservation, to invest in non-fossil fuel renewable energy.

Let's turn back to the test President Theodore Roosevelt put before us. He said that there is no more important mission than "leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us." That is the challenge. Let's rise to that challenge.

Mr. President, let's rise to that challenge. Help lead your colleagues—all of us—in stopping this assault on our farms, our fishing, and our forestry. Stop this sweetheart deal for a Canadian company, and let's substitute a real jobs bill, a rebuild America jobs bill that will create more than a hundredfold more construction jobs than the jobs we have before us.

When we think about the complete lack of accountability and responsibility embedded in this bill, when we think about the enormous damage that comes from turning on the faucet to the dirtiest oil in the world, there really is only one way to vote on this bill, and that is to vote no.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:56 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

HELP COMMITTEE AGENDA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the work of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. It is an important committee. Senator Ted Kennedy, who served for many years as the chairman of the HELP Committee, as we call it, once said that the HELP Committee had 30 percent of the legislative jurisdiction of the Senate. If you think about it, health, education, labor, and pensions—the work we do touches the lives of virtually every American.

During the last 2 years, I had the privilege of being the ranking Republican on the committee. The Senator from Iowa, Tom Harkin, was the chairman. I think most people would agree we have as ideologically diverse a committee as any committee in the Senate, but we worked very well together. Where we disagreed, which was often, we simply stated our piece and we voted. But we looked for opportunities to agree, and last Congress, we passed 25 bills through the committee that became law. I am not sure any other committee can say that.

I look forward to a similar productive working relationship with the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY. She is an experienced legislator, cares deeply about education, health, labor, and pensions, and has proven she knows how to successfully negotiate. We are operating today under a budget agreement that she helped negotiate with Congressman PAUL RYAN in the House. I am hopeful Senator MURRAY and I can work together in the same successful manner that I did with Senator Harkin last Congress.

I have now visited with almost all of the members of the committee, Democrat and Republican, and I feel confident we can successfully work together.

Here are my goals for the next 2 years. I have the privilege of being the chairman of the committee. The job of the chairman is to set the committee's agenda and work with all members of the committee on that agenda. This Congress, all members, before and during hearings, will have a full chance to discuss and amend legislation related to the agenda. When we report a bill to the floor, there will be an opportunity

for a robust amendment process, as Senator MCCONNELL has said. Then, I hope we will go to conference with the House of Representatives on our bill, where there will be further discussion. The challenge in passing legislation is there will have to be 60 votes to move a bill out of the Senate, 60 votes to move to conference on the bill, and 60 votes to pass a bill in the end. To accomplish that takes working with all Senators, including those on the other side of the aisle.

I also know if we want a bill to become law, President Obama must sign it. On the major issues we plan to address, we hope to work with him to gain his signature.

My first priority as chairman will be to fix No Child Left Behind. The law is over 7 years expired, and we have been working to reauthorize it for 6 years. The law has become unworkable. States are struggling. As a result, we need to act.

The Secretary of Education gave a fine speech yesterday saying we need to act on No Child Left Behind. I agree with him. I intend to finish this work in the first few months of this year.

Second, we need to reauthorize the Higher Education Act and deregulate higher education. We need to simplify and streamline the regulations that are imposed on 6,000 colleges and universities. One of the committee members is ELIZABETH WARREN, the Senator from Massachusetts. When she was at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, she said she would like a one-page mortgage application. A multipage mortgage application is not consumer friendly, but a two or three page one provides the consumer with information in a more easily understood manner. I think we could do the same with the application for federal aid, and there is substantial room for bipartisan agreement on this in higher education.

Just last week, I introduced legislation with Senators BENNET of Colorado, BOOKER of New Jersey, KING of Maine, ISAKSON of Georgia and BURR of North Carolina, to make it easier for students to go to college by simplifying the complicated, dreaded FASFA. The FASFA is the 108-question application form that 20 million American families fill out every year. The President talked about it on his visit to Tennessee on Friday. He also thinks it is too long and wants to simplify it. I think higher education is an area on which we can work together in the Senate and with the President.

The third thing I would like to do is to modernize the Food and Drug Administration. Now, there is a great opportunity, working with the House and with the President, to take a good look at the FDA, to take a good look at the modern world of medical devices and personalized medicines, and to say: What do we need to do to make it easier to get treatments, medical devices,

and cures through the FDA process quickly and effectively while ensuring those treatments, medical devices, and cures are safe so they can help people? This sort of work literally would affect every single American.

Fixing No Child Left Behind would affect 50 million schoolchildren, millions of teachers, and 100,000 public schools. Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act and making its regulations simpler would affect 6,000 institutions of all kinds and over 20 million students across this country. If we worked together with the House and the President to reform the FDA, we could affect the lives of every American and people all over the world by the kinds of treatments and devices and cures we bring to market.

Those are my top 3 priorities. Of course, we also want to deal with the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare. On this side of the aisle, we would like to repeal it, and I am sure there will be that vote. I also hope, in the words of the Senator from Wisconsin, RON JOHNSON, we move as rapidly and as responsibly as we can to repair the damage that ObamaCare has done. One example to improve ObamaCare would be to redefine full-time work from 30 hours to 40 hours. That would give about 2.5 million low-wage employees in America a pretty big pay raise when they go from 27 hours or 28 hours to 37 or 38 hours, which is what they would be able to do if full-time work were defined, as it is for everything else, as 40 hours.

We will have our first hearing on that on a bipartisan bill in the HELP Committee on next Thursday—a week from Thursday. It is a bill introduced by Senators COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, DONNELLY, and MANCHIN. It is a bipartisan bill.

Our committee has a great interest in this bill. The technical jurisdiction is with the Finance Committee. But by agreement with the Finance Committee, we will have this hearing, and then we will send to the Finance Committee our opinions, and it will be up to the Finance Committee how to report the bill, whether to report it, or what version of it to report. It helps, at least on the Republican side of the aisle, that six of the members of the Finance Committee are also members of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

Mr. President, let me talk about the first item on the HELP Committee agenda; the plan to fix No Child Left Behind.

I see the Senator from Washington on the floor today. She will be speaking next, and I look forward to hearing her comments. I said before she came to the floor how much I look forward to working with her. She is an experienced legislator, proven leader, and has a demonstrated record of results. I hope we are able to work together to pass No Child Left Behind.

No Child Left Behind was passed in 2001—a year before I became a Senator. It has become unworkable because Congress and the President failed to reauthorize and amend the law when it expired over 7 years ago.

Under the terms of the law, the original provisions continue, but that is what has made it unworkable. Those original provisions, if strictly applied, would label as a failing school almost every one of our 100,000 public schools. This is clearly an unintended result of the those who passed No Child Left Behind.

To avoid that unintended result, the U.S. Secretary of Education has granted waivers from the law's provisions to 42 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. This has created a second unintended consequence. In exchange for the waiver, the Secretary has told those States what their academic standards should be, what accountability systems they should use to set performance standards, how many and what tests shall be used to measure the progress of students, how to evaluate teachers, and how to identify and intervene in low-performing schools. The Department has become, in effect, a national school board.

We have been working over the last 6 years to fix the problems of No Child Left Behind. Over the last 6 years, the Senate HELP Committee held two dozen hearings on No Child Left Behind and K-12 education. Twice the committee reported legislation to the Senate floor. In the Congress before last, we reported the Democratic majority's bill. I did not particularly like it, but Senator KIRK, Senator ENZI, and I all voted for it so we could move it to the floor, continue to work on it, and then replace the law. But it did not come to the floor. In the last session of Congress, the committee reported a bill again.

This Congress, we need to start with a specific proposal. I will put forward a Chairman's staff discussion draft, consult with all the members of the committee on the proposal, and see if we can ultimately get bipartisan agreement on the proposal.

I have already distributed to all the committee members, Republican and Democrat, copies of the Chairman's staff discussion draft. This is not a chairman's bill; it is not a Republican bill; it is the Chairman's staff discussion draft put forward as a place to start discussions.

We would like for staff of the various members of the committee to meet every day for the rest of this week and next week. They can discuss and provide feedback on each section of the bill. This will help determine areas where we agree and disagree.

Former Chairman George Miller gave some good advice on fixing No Child Left Behind. He said: Let's pass a lean bill to fix No Child Left Behind. Discus-

sions have highlighted there are about eight or nine problems with the law. We probably can agree quickly on about four or five of those problems. There are real differences of opinion on the other three or four areas. I hope we can come to agreement on those issues in the committee, and I am going to do my best to lead that process. I am willing to spend all the time we need over the next several weeks to reach agreement.

If we cannot reach agreement in committee, then we should vote on a bill, and bring that bill to the floor. We can amend the bill there, and pass it with 60 votes. Then we can go to conference with the House, and ultimately send a bill to the President for him to sign.

I look forward to the process. A week from tomorrow, we will hold a hearing on testing and accountability. Every member of the committee is interested in this topic. Here are the questions to be examined in the hearing: are there too many tests? Who should decide how many and what tests should be administered? We need to answer some questions before we make decision to be put into a bill. In the Chairman's staff discussion draft I have circulated, I have included two options for discussion: current law testing requirements and another option that gives more flexibility to the States to decide what to do on testing.

On fixing No Child Left Behind, I plan to set realistic goals, keep the best portions of the law, and restore to States and communities the responsibility to decide whether schools and teachers are succeeding or failing.

The Chairman's staff discussion draft relies on and respects the 30 years of work by Governors and chief State school officers to develop higher standards, better tests, stronger accountability systems, and fair and effective teacher and principal evaluation programs that will allow parents and communities to know how children in our country's public schools are performing.

I have watched the development of goals, standards, tests, and teacher evaluation systems for a long period of time. I was Governor of Tennessee in 1983 when Secretary Terrell Bell in the Reagan administration issued a report called: "A Nation at Risk." The report said that if a foreign country had created schools in the condition of our nation's schools, we would have considered it an act of war. At this time, Governors all over the country were working to fix state education systems, understanding that while the Federal Government has some involvement in elementary and secondary education, it only pays for about 12 percent of state budgets. Most Americans feel as though they should be in charge of their local schools, not Washington.

In 1985 and 1986, every Governor spent an entire year focused on improving

schools—the first time in the history of the Governors association that it happened. I was chairman of the National Governors Association that year. The Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton, was the vice chairman.

In 1989, the first President Bush held a national meeting of Governors and established national education goals. Then in 1991–1992, President Bush announced Goals 2000 to help move the nation toward those goals. I was the Education Secretary at that time. States worked together to develop challenging education standards that were voluntary. States discussed teacher evaluation systems that were adopted by states such as Tennessee. In 1984, Tennessee became the first State to pay teachers more for teaching well. Washington did not dictate to Tennessee how to pay its teachers based on performance and other States began to model teacher policies in the same way. Governors began to work together on higher standards, on accountability systems, and on teacher evaluation systems.

President George W. Bush brought many of his education ideas as Governor of Texas to Washington. A large portion of those ideas were included in No Child Left Behind, such as the requirement for annual testing to determine student achievement in every school and disaggregated reporting.

President Obama created Race to the Top to give States incentives to adopt certain standards and certain tests and certain teacher evaluation systems. Since much of No Child Left Behind became unworkable in his term, Secretary Duncan provided waivers to certain aspects of the law in exchange for telling states and districts what their academic standards should be, what their accountability system should be, how to evaluate teachers, and how to intervene in low-performing schools.

These actions have created, in essence, a national school board. We need to reverse the trend toward a national school board and put responsibilities for education back with States and local communities. There is a difference of opinion about the proper balance between the federal and state role in education. I hope we can come to agreement on that balance in the committee. We need to start discussions. We have been working on fixing No Child Left Behind for 6 years, have held multiple hearings, and have reported a bill twice to the floor. 20 of the 22 members of the committee were members last year when we had hearings and reported a bill.

I think we need to identify the seven or eight issues to fix in the law, discuss each other's points of view, and see if we can fix No Child Left Behind. I look forward to that process.

The chairman's staff discussion draft, already distributed to committee members today, will be on the committee

Web site tonight so that people can see it. We will solicit feedback. Staff will work together over the next few weeks, Senators will talk, and we will see we can turn that discussion draft into a bipartisan bill. If we can, we will mark it up in committee, have amendments, and see if we can get a bipartisan result. We will then bring it to the floor for further discussion and debate. If we can't get a bipartisan bill in committee, we will still bring a bill to the floor knowing we will have to get a bipartisan vote to get it off the floor.

I am ready to get started on this process. I have talked to almost all my colleagues on the committee, and I believe they are as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a list of the nine problems the chairman's staff discussion draft identifies as the problems we should work on in trying to fix No Child Left Behind. These problems generally come from the discussions we have had over the last 6 years with the House of Representatives, and with the Secretary of Education. Identifying and discussing these problems should help us move along more rapidly.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN TO FIX "NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND"

"No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) was passed in 2001. It has become unworkable because Congress and the President failed to reauthorize and amend the law when it expired over seven years ago. NCLB's original provisions, which continue in place today, would label as a "failing school" almost all of America's 100,000 public schools. To avoid this unintended result, the U.S. Secretary of Education has granted waivers from the law's provisions to 42 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. This has created another unintended result: in exchange for the waiver, the Secretary has told these states what their academic standards should be, what accountability systems shall be used to set performance standards, how many and what tests shall be used to measure the progress of students, how to evaluate teachers and how to identify and intervene in low performing schools.

The Department has become, in effect, a national school board.

For the last six years, the Senate and the House have worked together to try to fix "No Child Left Behind." In each of the last two Congresses, the Senate HELP Committee has held numerous hearings and reported legislation to fix the problems with "No Child Left Behind." In 2015, the Senate HELP Committee will spend the first six weeks concluding this work and, in former Rep. George Miller's words, report a "lean bill fixing No Child Left Behind" ready to move to the Senate floor on Feb 23. The House of Representatives is pursuing a similar schedule.

The plan is to set realistic goals, keep the best portions of the original law, and restore to states and local communities the responsibility to decide whether local schools and teachers are succeeding or failing. The HELP Committee's bill will seek to build on thirty years of work by governors and chief state

school officers to develop higher standards, better tests, stronger accountability systems, and fair and effective teacher and principal evaluation programs that will allow parents and communities to know how children in our country's public schools are performing.

1. New Goals—The 2001 goal is unworkable. Set new, realistic but challenging goals to help all students succeed.

2. High Standards—Require states to have high and challenging standards that promote college and career readiness for all students, but the federal government may not dictate or get involved with what those standards should be, or require states to submit their standards to the federal government for review or approval.

3. Reporting Progress Toward State Standards—Continue and improve disaggregated school-by-school reporting so that parents, teachers, schools, legislators, and communities know what progress schools are making.

4. State Accountability Systems—Free all public schools from the federal requirement of conforming to a federally-defined adequate yearly progress mandate and, in exchange, require states to establish accountability systems to measure school performance toward meeting the each state's standards.

5. Federal Support for the Lowest-Performing Schools—The federal government will continue to support states and local school districts in fixing schools that states determine are lowest performing.

6. Better Teaching—Encourage the creation of state and local school district teacher and principal evaluation systems, but the federal government may not dictate or get involved with the design of those systems. This will replace the current federal "highly qualified teacher" requirements.

7. More Local Authority To Transfer Federal Funds—Allow school districts to transfer funds more efficiently among the largest federal education programs.

8. Consolidate and Streamline Programs—Consolidate and streamline more than 60 programs within NCLB. Eliminate those that are duplicative.

9. Empower Parents—Encourage the creation and expansion of high-quality charter schools that give teachers more freedom to teach and opportunities that give parents more choices of schools for their children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, a century ago, President Lyndon Johnson returned to his old elementary school in rural Texas with a major piece of legislation. At a picnic table on the lawn of his school and sitting beside his very first teacher, President Johnson signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA.

Our Nation has always held the ideal of education for everyone. In 1786, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

By far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness.

The idea of a strong public education for every child was woven into the fabric of this Nation. But ESEA put that idea into action. It aimed to close the

gaps between rich and poor, black and white, children growing up in the crowded neighborhoods of Philadelphia, to the rural districts of Texas, children with every advantage in the world and kids with disabilities. This law moved our country in the right direction, but we still have a long way to go to close those gaps.

In the coming weeks and months, Congress will have the opportunity to make sure we continue moving our country toward this ideal and to work together to fix the broken No Child Left Behind law, because we as a nation still believe every student should have access to a quality public education, regardless of where they live or how they learn or how much money their parents make.

Education and fighting on behalf of children is what drew me to public service in the very first place. When my kids were much younger, I found out their wonderful preschool program might close because of budget cuts. I knew how valuable that program was and how much it was helping our local children, so I put my two young kids in my car and I drove off to the State capitol to explain to our legislators why they couldn't just cut this program. When I got there and was finally able to get one of the legislators to listen to me, he said something I will never forget. He said to me: You can't make a difference. You are just a mom in tennis shoes.

Well, I couldn't believe that, and I was furious. I drove all the way home telling my two little kids in the car that I was going to change that. So I got home, picked up the phone and started calling other parents, and they called other parents, and we held rallies, and we wrote letters. Finally, after it was all said and done, the legislature voted to keep the funding for that preschool program.

Throughout my career, as a preschool teacher, to serving on the local school board, the Washington State Senate, and here in the U.S. Senate, I have been committed to expanding educational opportunities and making sure every kid has someone fighting for them and their future. But that battle is far from over. Now is the time to take another big step forward, putting the ideals of our Nation into action.

The current law, No Child Left Behind, is badly broken and it is time to fix it. The good news is this doesn't have to be a partisan issue. Nearly everyone—Democrats, Republicans, teachers, parents, business leaders—agrees this law needs to be rewritten. So today I wanted to come to the floor to lay out some pretty basic but very important principles I think should guide any bill to fix No Child Left Behind.

For one, we need to work to reduce redundant and unnecessary testing so educators focus on preparing students

for college and their career and also ensure we know how all of our students are progressing. We need to continue to hold schools and States accountable for delivering on the promise of a quality education for all our kids so they can compete in the 21st century economy. We need to improve our schools and give them the resources they need so every student does have the opportunity to reach their potential. And I believe we need to expand access to early childhood education so students can go to kindergarten ready to learn.

What is clear to nearly everyone is that No Child Left Behind is not working. For one, the law requires States to set high standards for schools, but it didn't give them the resources they needed to meet those achievement goals. In effect, this law set up our schools for failure. It sets teachers up for failure. It set our students up for failure. That needs to change.

I have heard from parent after parent and teacher after teacher in Washington State who have told me that not only are students taking too many tests, oftentimes the tests are of low quality and are redundant. That needs to change too.

We are still facing inequality in our education system, where some schools simply don't offer the same opportunities. For example, African-American and Latino students are significantly less likely to attend a high school that offers advanced math classes. According to the Department of Education, 30 percent fewer students from low-income backgrounds reach proficiency or higher on assessments compared to their peers of affluent backgrounds. On average, kids from low-income neighborhoods don't have access to qualified and experienced teachers, as do students from wealthier neighborhoods. That needs to change.

The current law is not working for our States either. I have seen firsthand how No Child Left Behind is not working for my State of Washington. The law is so bad the Obama administration began issuing waivers to exempt States from the law's requirements. Washington State had received a waiver but last year it lost it. As a result, most of the schools in my home State are now categorized as failing. That means that hard-working parents sending their kids to schools in communities such as Spokane in eastern Washington, the Tri-Cities in central Washington, and Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, and many others in western Washington are receiving a letter in the mail that says their children aren't getting the type of education we expect in this country.

Not only that, but Washington now has less flexibility in how to use Federal investments in education. That needs to change.

I recently heard from a woman—her name is Lillian, who lives in Shoreline,

WA—last year whose son was going into the fourth grade in the same school district where I used to serve as a school board member years ago. Her son has a learning disability. With the help of teachers and specialists in his elementary school he has shown great signs of progress. But then Lillian said she got a letter in the mail 2 weeks before school started describing the school as failing, and that left her worried about her son's education.

Because No Child Left Behind is broken, so many parents and schools and districts across the State of Washington are facing a similar uncertainty, and that is not fair to our students. That needs to change too.

It is time to rewrite No Child Left Behind with something worthy of this Nation's children and their future. In the coming weeks and months, these are some of the core principles I am going to be fighting for. Let us work with our States and districts to reduce unnecessary testing, especially by targeting redundant and low-quality tests. This is an obvious step we need to take and one you won't find much disagreement on.

That doesn't mean we should roll back standards or accountability for schools to provide a good quality education. We need to make sure we establish expectations for our students that put them on a path to competing in the 21st century global economy.

And let me be clear on assessments. We know if we don't have ways to measure students' progress, and if we don't hold our States accountable, the victims will invariably be the kids from poor neighborhoods, children of color, and students with disabilities. These are the students who too often fall through the cracks, and that is not fair. True accountability makes sure we are holding our schools up to our Nation's promise of equality and justice. This is a civil rights issue, plain and simple.

Another reason assessments are important is they help parents monitor their kids' progress. If a school is consistently failing to provide a quality education year after year, parents deserve to know. We shouldn't forget this law provides the Nation's largest Federal investment in K-12 education. It would be irresponsible to ask our taxpayers to spend billions of dollars on education without knowing if it is making a difference in our students' lives. That is a good government principle which Democrats and Republicans should be able to agree on and which the taxpayers should have every right to expect.

So let's maintain strong accountability that measures the students' growth with statewide assessments. I believe annual assessments are one of the most important tools we have to make sure our schools are working for every student. We need to make sure

these assessments don't lead to unintended consequences. But I would be very concerned about any proposal that rolls back this key student and taxpayer protection and accountability tool.

I believe we need statewide assessments that give parents, civil rights groups, and policymakers the ability to see how students are doing from district to district.

Furthermore, to make sure we are meeting our obligations to all of our students, let's increase funding for schools that have high numbers of children from low-income backgrounds. Rich or poor, every child should get a high-quality education.

The ones who are on the frontlines of this noble work—let's make sure our teachers and principals have the resources they deserve to continue to build their skills so they can best help the students about whom they care so much. Let's improve schools through innovation and with coursework that challenges our students—not just so they earn a diploma but so their diploma means they are truly college- and career-ready.

I believe Congress should only pass an education bill that expands access to preschool programs. This is a particularly important issue to me. As a mom and when I was a preschool teacher, I saw firsthand the kind of transformation early learning can inspire in a child not just to start kindergarten ready to learn but to succeed later in life. That is why law enforcement, business groups, military leaders, and so many others support expanding access to early childhood education.

Congress needs to catch up with the Democratic and Republican Governors and legislators around the country who support investments in early learning, and we need to make sure the investments in our youngest kids that will pay off for generations to come are part of this bill.

Those are just some of the core principles I am going to be focused on as we work together to revamp our Education bill.

Providing an excellent education to all students is a national priority—not just because our children deserve it but because it is one of the best investments we can make to ensure long-term and broad-based economic growth. Businesses and entrepreneurs need the next generation of workers to come in and help them innovate, invent, build, and grow. That is something I hear from my Washington State businesses all the time.

Making sure all students are able to take on the jobs of the 21st century is the only way our Nation will stay economically competitive in the years to come. Other countries are investing massively in education and their students, and we cannot afford to fall behind in this country.

Let me be clear on another point. The only way Congress will be able to fix this law is by working in a bipartisan way. That means Republicans should come to the table ready to work with Democrats to get this done. I know the Republicans are the majority in the Congress, and I welcome our new committee chair, Senator ALEXANDER. I listened carefully to his remarks and thank him for reaching out to begin this process. But parents across the country are expecting us to put partisanship aside and work together for the good of our children.

Secretary Duncan, President Obama, and so many of us here in Congress have made it very clear that we aren't going to accept a bill that hurts students or doesn't live up to the ideals of our great Nation.

There is no question, as Senator ALEXANDER said, that there are some serious differences in the way the two parties approach this, but I am confident, just as we did with the budget last Congress, we can find common ground and move forward if both sides are willing to leave their partisan corners and work across the aisle. Everyone should be able to agree that this law needs to provide every student in every school in every State with a quality education, and that is what I am going to be fighting for.

When President Johnson signed the Education bill, he said he envisioned "full educational opportunity as our first national goal." Our Nation's commitment to that ideal is so important to me and my family. I would not be here in this Senate Chamber without it. When I was 15 years old, my dad was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. In just a few short years he could no longer work at the five-and-dime store he ran. Without warning, my family fell on hard times. But instead of falling through the cracks, my six brothers and sisters and I got a good education because of our public schools, and we all went to college with the support from the program we now know as Pell grants. My mother was able to get the skills she needed to get a job through a worker training program at Lake Washington Vocational School.

Today I believe we need to continue to make education a national priority so more families can seize the opportunities that are only possible with access to a good education. So I am glad to be here on the floor today with the chairman of our committee, and I call on Democrats and Republicans to work together to fix this law.

For the child who may not live in the best neighborhood or the kid whose parents are struggling to make ends meet, for every student who deserves the chance to learn, grow, and thrive—I hope we can work together to write a bill to make sure every child in this country gets a quality education. Let's

make sure our country continues to have the best workforce the world over. Let's deliver on Jefferson's promise of education as the foundation for freedom and happiness.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Washington for her remarks. In the spirit of her remarks, I am delighted to have the privilege of working with her in Congress because of her leadership position, her background, her caring for children, and her reputation for getting results. I like all of those things.

I neglected to mention that our first hearing will be on the 21st—a week from Wednesday—on testing and accountability. I am working with Senator MURRAY to see if perhaps we can agree on the witnesses. The purpose of the hearing is to ask the questions she asked: Are these the right tests? Are they redundant tests? Are there too many tests? What are we hearing from across the country?

I thank the Senator for her comments. I took careful notes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the law enforcement in Pennsylvania and throughout the country.

We just finished the holiday season, and in my family—as with many of us, I am sure—we had a wonderful Christmas in our homes, had a wonderful meal, and got to watch the kids open their presents.

There are a lot of Pennsylvanians and Americans who didn't have the chance to do what we got to enjoy, and they were the law enforcement men and women who were out on the streets, in the cold, protecting us as they do day in and day out because their work goes on 24/7, 365 days a year.

Just this past Saturday a number of us gathered on Independence Mall in Philadelphia. Several hundred people braved a very cold and windy day to let the law enforcement officials of Pennsylvania and beyond know just how much we appreciate the sacrifice they make for us day in and day out. We had a terrific turnout. It was a very enthusiastic crowd who rallied in support of our police officers.

But being a police officer is not just often inconvenient; sometimes it is very dangerous. Last year 115 police officers died in the line of duty. So far we are 13 days into a new year and 10 officers have already been shot and wounded.

Often these police officers have been targeted and shot just because of the uniform they wear. Unfortunately, Pennsylvania is not immune to this problem. Last year on September 12,

late at night, two Pennsylvania State troopers were coming in for their shift at work, and Eric Frein was lying in wait, hiding in the woods, with a high-powered rifle. He shot and killed Corporal Bryon Dickson, and he shot Trooper Alex Douglass, who was grievously wounded. The killer, Eric Frein, didn't know either Corporal Dickson or Trooper Douglass; he shot the two police officers simply because they were police officers. He thought that somehow by killing a cop he would help spark a revolution. Such is the madness police officers have to face on a regular basis. On any given day they don't know that they won't run into that kind of insanity.

It is important for us to remember that these victims—in this case, Corporal Dickson—aren't just numbers and badges. Corporal Dickson was a dad, the father of two young boys. He used to enjoy making toys for his sons. He was a devoted husband who had recently celebrated his 10th wedding anniversary. He was a proud Marine Corps veteran.

I am proud, as Pennsylvanians generally are, of the response of law enforcement to the savage and despicable shooting of these two State troopers. Officers from all across Pennsylvania and surrounding States and even around the country joined in a very intensive, tireless, 7-week-long manhunt. In the end they found Eric Frein, and they brought him into custody wearing the handcuffs of Corporal Dickson. He will meet justice.

But, of course, the story doesn't end there. There was another terrible tragedy just last month in Brooklyn. Just 5 days before Christmas, Officer Rafael Ramos and Officer Wenjian Liu were both murdered in the line of duty. In the middle of the afternoon, in broad daylight, a gunman approached their marked police vehicle while they sat in the vehicle and shot each police officer point-blank range in the head, killing them both instantly. The motivation of the gunman was very clear: He just wanted to kill any police officer he could. That day, the gunman posted messages such as "They Take 1 of Ours . . . Let's Take 2 of Theirs." Another message he posted used the hashtag advocating "Shoot the Police."

Officers Ramos and Liu were not just nameless people in uniforms either.

Officer Ramos was described by his family and friends "as a Puerto Rican kid who grew up on these streets" in Queens and never stopped trying to help the people in his community. Officer Ramos had spent the last 10 years of his life studying to become a chaplain. He was murdered just an hour before his graduation ceremony. Office Ramos joined the police force at the age of 37. He explained that he saw the streets as his ministry and that by protecting and serving his community, he was serving God as well. Office Ramos

left behind his wife and two sons, 19-year-old Jaden and 13-year-old Justin.

Officer Liu was the other victim that day. In many ways, Officer Liu was the epitome of the American dream. He was a young boy who at age 12 came from China to America with his family. He was a teenage boy who left playground basketball games occasionally so he could do the shopping for his family's groceries. He was a young man who was so inspired by the heroism he saw on September 11 that he decided he would become a police officer. He was the police officer who called home every night to let his dad know he had finished a day of work safely—every night, that is, except December 20, when the phone call never came. Officer Liu is survived by his wife, whom he married just 3 months before.

The response of law enforcement to the savage murders of Officer Ramos and Officer Liu should make every American proud. Over 25,000 police officers traveled from across America and from parts of Canada to attend the funeral services last month.

We can never really fully repay the debt of the men and women who sacrifice their very lives protecting us, but there are small things we can do to help the families they leave behind. I want to call on Congress to take one small step toward that goal. We should pass the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act, and we should do so soon.

The Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act simply provides that any child whose parent dies in the line of duty as a member of the armed services or as a public safety officer would be entitled to the maximum permissible scholarship under the Pell Grant Program for their attendance in college.

Five years ago the House of Representatives unanimously passed this legislation. My fellow Pennsylvanian Senator BOB CASEY plans to reintroduce this legislation. I would be co-sponsoring this legislation, and I call on Congress to pick up where it left off back in 2010 and enact the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act.

I also want to take a moment to address the recent spate of protests we have seen. People have gone out on to the streets and across the country, often harshly criticizing the officers. I want to be clear, if people want to protest, they have the right to protest; and I would never challenge their right to say what is on their minds or to convey whatever message they would like to convey. But I would hope they would keep a few basic facts in mind as they consider, or in fact carry out, the protests.

No. 1, any human institution is going to be imperfect. That is the nature of humanity. It consists of human beings. So it therefore will be imperfect. But the fact is that the overwhelming majority of police officers are honest,

hard working, decent Americans, and they are motivated by the desire to serve and protect the community in which they live, and they don't have a racist bone in their bodies.

So my message to law enforcement is I understand how demoralizing it must have been recently to see some of these protests, to hear some of the outrageous and slanderous statements that have been made. But these protestors don't speak for most Americans. The fact is, a big majority of Pennsylvanians and, I suspect, a big majority of Americans know that every day 780,000 men and women across America who put on their blue uniforms and put on their badges are answering to the call of the people in need when they need them the most, and they put themselves in great danger to serve all of us. When other people choose to run away from danger, they are the ones who have to run toward it.

So just as the law enforcement community has stood by the families of all the victims, and that of Officer Dickson, Officer Ramos, and Officer Liu, I want you to know that America stands with you.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Alabama.

MR. SESSIONS. First, I would like to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his thoughtful remarks. As one who has been involved in law enforcement for a number of years and having great friends in the law enforcement community, I am well aware of what their duties are like.

I remember we had a dangerous event here at our Capitol, and one of the police officers raced around the building to the scene of the event. Did he know what could happen to him? Could there be a team of terrorists waiting to assassinate him when he came around that corner?

What if a police officer responds to a domestic violence call at a home? They don't know what is behind that door and what might happen to them. It is a tough job. They have a right to come home to their family and their children. They do not have to allow themselves to be murdered by someone who is a danger. It is a tough issue. Police departments work at it very hard.

I thank Senator TOOMEY for his beautiful remarks. I think they are very appropriate at this time.

Mr. President, with regard to the Keystone Pipeline issue and the discussion we have been having here, I want to associate myself with a series of very important and balanced concerns raised in support of that pipeline.

We have pipelines that criss-cross my State, as the Presiding Officer does in Oklahoma. We don't have problems with them. I cannot remember when

somebody raised a problem, environmentally, about a pipeline. We know they are less likely to cause environmental damage than transportation by train or truck. We know they are less likely to be accessed. We know there is less energy consumed in that process. So I want to associate myself with that.

But there is something that has been bothering me for quite a long time, and I want to raise that point today because I think it is so valid and I think it is important for all of us to understand. The reason this Senator and I think others have advocated for more production of American energy, advocated for these issues and for more production is not to benefit some oil company, as we have been wrongly accused, not to benefit some rich group, it is to benefit the American consumer. The more energy we produce in America, the more the American people benefit.

We import a great deal of oil today. It is less now because we are producing more through the new technology of fracking and other technology. We have seen a reduction in the amount we import. Much of it has been imported from places such as Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Libya—many places with which we have not had very good relations. So we have made a transfer of wealth from the American people to foreign nations—weakening us and strengthening them. Many of them have not been friendly to us over the years, as I have said. So we have a choice in this vote to help supply a shortage we have from our—perhaps—closest ally in the world, Canada.

I was at the Canadian-American Interparliamentary Group. I was surprised how deeply our Canadian friends feel about this pipeline. They cannot imagine why we wouldn't want to buy oil from them as opposed to other countries around the world. They purchase all kinds of products from us. We have a good, fair, and honest trading relationship with Canada. They support us throughout the world, consistently in the U.N. and in other places, on important issues—important to the American people. We have so many common interests.

No. 1, I just want to say if we are going to import oil from around the world to meet our needs, there is no better country we could ever choose to import from than Canada, our friend and neighbor.

No. 2, it has been said that this is being done to help some big business. That is not the way this system works. In a free market system, bringing in this oil provides another source of oil for consumers. They don't have to buy the Canadian oil if it is not cheaper. They wouldn't build this pipeline if they didn't think they could sell the oil cheaper than Saudi Arabia and Venezuela could produce it or even America could produce it. They believe they

can sell it, and they have to sell it for a lower cost or they won't sell it.

What would the lower cost mean? It means good things for mothers, for children, for families, and for businesses. All over America we have lower cost energy to make America a stronger, more vibrant world-class economy. We are able to compete in the world market if our energy costs are below other nation's energy costs. It helps us overcome the wage differences that Americans have compared to other places around the world. This reliable source of energy is important.

I guess what I wish to say to my colleagues is that this is an opportunity for us to make a statement. The statement is we are going to help the American people by reducing the cost of their energy so they may have more money each month to maybe go out to a movie, to go out to eat—and it can make quite a difference.

Well, they say the price is fixed. You know, these guys have got these powers, and try to manipulate prices. I don't deny that goes on in the world. But one of the most powerful forces in the world is supply and demand. If the oil companies are so powerful, why has oil fallen from \$110 a barrel this summer to now \$46 a barrel today? Why did this happen? Because there is a supply from fracking, from other sources around the world. It has brought up the supply, created some surplus, and the prices have collapsed. There are a lot of oil companies out there that are hurting today.

So if you don't like big oil and you don't like the big oil companies, why would you want to oppose importing oil that would be cheaper? This is the way the free market system works. I would say the market system is working. I saw an expert yesterday in *Baron's* indicating that oil could fall to \$20 a barrel. That would be great for the American consumer.

I spoke with an oilman. I teased him a little bit. I said: I hope you saved some money, because I like this low-priced oil. Don't come in here and ask me to have oil go up on my constituents, on American consumers.

I mean, I appreciate the fact that people go out there and they drill these multimillion dollar wells and sometimes they are dry and sometimes they hit. That is the great American free market system. Some people have gotten rich. A lot of them have gone broke. There has been boom and bust in the oil industry since the beginning of time, as it is documented by Daniel Yergin in the book *"The Prize"* and by other writers. This is the way it has always been.

We benefit when the price falls, and importing a good source of oil from our neighbor Canada at a competitive price provides one more source that helps keep the price down and gives more options to the American people. It is the

right thing to do, colleagues. I cannot imagine that we would want to favor importation of oil from other countries over Canada.

I believe we should go forward with this, and I am concerned that the President and his allies are not in agreement. But look, this is a true fact, as many of us who have been involved in these issues for several years have come to understand. There is a large group of folks out there—activists, environmental extremists, and not just good environmentalists but people who have extreme views—who want the price of energy to go up. President Obama even said it in the campaign when he ran the first time. He said the price of electricity would necessarily skyrocket. That is not my policy. That is not the policy of a good public servant, in my view, for America, for the American workers. Personally, I want the electric bill as low as we could possibly keep it, consistent with good environmental and clean activities, and I want that gasoline bill as low as we can get it. That is what we should do, and that is how we can make this country better. It will make it tougher for a lot of these guys who have been sitting on oil at \$100 a barrel and now it is \$46.

So who is the loser with more supply? The guys who have been sitting on the energy. I don't bear any grief for them. I am happy if they make money. They have to go through tough times just as everybody else does.

I want to thank Senator HOEVEN and others who worked so hard on this legislation. I believe we are in a position to see some positive action occur in the next few days and look forward to creating an additional supply of oil from an ally of the United States that will bring down the price of oil perhaps even further in the world and in the U.S. market.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to speak about an amendment that I will be offering as part of the Keystone Pipeline legislation. It is an extremely simple, straightforward amendment. It is a brief amendment, but it basically raises a very fundamental issue, and that issue is whether the Senate will abide by scientific evidence, will come down on the side of science as we debate this enormously important issue of climate change.

The amendment is very brief, and I wish to read it and then explain why I

believe it is such an important amendment. This is what it says:

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that, No. 1, climate change is real; No. 2, climate change is caused by human activities; No. 3, climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world; No. 4, a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and No. 5, it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is it. That is the entire amendment. I would say that for the scientific community around the world, there is nothing in that statement that smacks of controversy. These are simple statements of fact, agreed to by the overwhelming majority of scientists who have written and studied climate change.

Climate change is, in fact, one of the great threats facing our country and the entire planet. It has the capability of causing severe harm to our economy, to the food supply, to access to water, and to national security.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—the leading international scientific body on this issue—reported yet again this past fall that “warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice and rising global average sea level.”

More than 97 percent of the scientific community in the United States and across the globe agrees with these findings, including, among many other organizations, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Meteorological Society, and the American Geophysical Union, to name just a few. In fact, at least 37 American scientific organizations, 118 international scientific organizations and national academies, and 21 medical associations all agree that climate change is real and is being caused by human activities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations, 21 medical associations, and some religious and teacher organizations that understand that climate change is real and that it is caused by human activity.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Virtually every major scientific organization in this country and throughout the world have said that climate change is real, climate change is caused by carbon emissions and human activity, and that climate change is already causing devastating problems in the United States of America and around the world.

This list includes at least:

37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations, 21 medical associations, 4 religious organizations.

37 AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS

American Anthropological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Association of Geographers, American Association of State Climatologists, American Astronomical Society, American Chemical Society, American Fisheries Society, American Geophysical Union, American Institute of Biological Sciences, American Institute of Physics, American Meteorological Society, American Physical Society, American Quaternary Association, American Society for Microbiology, American Society of Agronomy, American Society of Plant Biologists, American Statistical Association, Association of American Geographers, Association of Ecosystem Research Centers, Botanical Society of America, California Academy of Sciences.

Crop Science Society of America, Ecological Society of America, National Academy of Engineering, National Academy of Sciences (USA), National Association of State Foresters, New York Academy of Sciences, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Society of American Foresters, Society of Systematic Biologists, Soil Science Society of America, The Geological Society of America, The Wildlife Society, United States National Research Council, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

135 INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC ASSOCIATIONS

Academia Brasileira de Ciências (Brazil), Academia Chilena de Ciencias (Chile), Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa (Portugal), Academia de Ciencias de la República Dominicana, Academia de Ciencias Físicas, Matemáticas y Naturales de Venezuela, Academia de Ciencias Médicas, Físicas y Naturales de Guatemala, Academia Mexicana de Ciencias, Academia Nacional de Ciencias de Bolivia, Academia Nacional de Ciencias del Perú, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, China, Académie des Sciences et Techniques du Sénégal, Académie des Sciences (France), Academy of Athens, Academy of Science for South Africa, Academy of Science of Mozambique, Academy of Sciences Malaysia, Academy of Sciences of Moldova, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Academy of Sciences of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology, Egypt, Accademia dei Lincei (Italy), Africa Centre for Climate and Earth Systems Science.

African Academy of Sciences, Albanian Academy of Sciences, Amazon Environmental Research Institute, Australian Academy of Science (Australia), Australian Coral Reef Society, Australian Institute of Marine Science, Australian Institute of Physics, Australian Marine Sciences Association, Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society, Bangladesh Academy of Sciences, Botanical Society of America, British Antarctic Survey, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Cameroon Academy of Sciences, Canadian Association of Physicists, Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences, Canadian Geophysical Union, Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society, Canadian Society of Soil Science, Canadian Society of Zoologists, Caribbean Academy of Sciences, Center for International Forestry Research, Chinese Academy of the Sciences, Colombian Acad-

emy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (Australia).

Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cuban Academy of Sciences, Delegation of the Finnish Academies of Science and Letters, Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina (Germany), Ecological Society of Australia, European Academy of Sciences and Arts, European Federation of Geologists, European Geosciences Union, European Physical Society, European Science Foundation, Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Societies, Geological Society of Australia, Geological Society of London, Georgian Academy of Sciences, Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, Indian National Science Academy, Indonesian Academy of the Sciences, Institute of Biology (UK), Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Institute of Marine Engineering, Science and Technology, Institution of Mechanical Engineers, UK.

InterAcademy Council, International Alliance of Research Universities, International Arctic Science Committee, International Association for Great Lakes Research, International Council for Science, International Council of Academies of Engineering and Technological Sciences, International Research Institute for Climate and Society, International Union for Quaternary Research, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, Islamic World Academy of Sciences, Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Kenya National Academy of Sciences, Korean Academy of Science and Technology, Kosovo Academy of Sciences and Arts, Latin American Academy of Sciences, Latvian Academy of Sciences, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Madagascar National Academy of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, Mauritius Academy of Science and Technology, Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts.

National Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, Argentina, National Academy of Sciences of Armenia, National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic, National Academy of Sciences, Sri Lanka, National Council of Engineers, Australia, National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research, New Zealand, Natural Environment Research Council, UK, Nicaraguan Academy of Sciences, Nigerian Academy of Science, Norwegian Academy of Sciences and Letters, Organization of Biological Field Stations, Pakistan Academy of Sciences, Palestine Academy for Science and Technology, Polish Academy of the Sciences, Romanian Academy, Royal Academies for Science and the Arts of Belgium (Belgium), Royal Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences of Spain, Royal Astronomical Society, UK, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Royal Irish Academy, Royal Meteorological Society, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Royal Scientific Society of Jordan, Royal Society of Canada.

Royal Society of Chemistry, UK, Royal Society of New Zealand, Royal Society, UK, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences, Science Council of Japan, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Society of Biology, UK, Society of Systematic Biologists, Sudanese National Academy of Science, Tanzania Academy of Sciences, The Geological Society (UK), The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS) for the developing world, Turkish Academy of Sciences, Uganda

National Academy of Sciences, Union der Deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften, World Meteorological Association, Zambia Academy of Sciences, Zimbabwe Academy of Sciences, Sudan National Academy of Sciences.

21 MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Lung Association, American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Thoracic Society, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Australian Medical Association, Children's Environmental Health Network, Health Care without Harm, Hepatitis Foundation International, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Association of Local Boards of Health, National Environmental Health Association, Partnership for Prevention, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Trust for America's Health, World Federation of Public Health Associations, World Health Organization.

4 RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Interfaith Power and Light, National Association of Evangelicals, Presbyterian Mission Agency, The Pope.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for Wildlife Veterinarians, American Society of Civil Engineers, International Association for Great Lakes Research, Institute of Professional Engineers New Zealand, Natural Science Collections Alliance, Organization of Biological Field Stations, The Institution of Engineers Australia, The World Federation of Engineering Organizations, World Forestry Congress.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me read from an excerpt of a letter signed by virtually every major scientific organization in this country that was sent to the U.S. Senate way back in 2009. This is what the letter states:

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science. Moreover, there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change will have broad impact on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increased risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and a disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

Let me repeat that one sentence:

The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

We know that the Earth's climate is warming and warming quickly as a result of industrial greenhouse gas emissions. The 2014 National Climate Assessment reported:

The most recent decade was the nation's warmest on record. U.S. temperatures are expected to continue to rise.

According to NOAA, October, August, June, and May were the hottest months ever recorded. And 2012 was the warmest year on record in the contiguous United States and saw at least 69,000 local heat records set.

The consequence of this rapid and dramatic rise in global temperatures—what does that mean? What is going to happen? The answer is, it is going to mean more severe storms, more flooding and destructive storm surges, heat waves, drought, forest fires, and the inundation of water supplies and agricultural land with saltwater.

As the New York Times reported in August, droughts in the West and Southwestern United States appear to be intensifying as a result of climate change.

Over the past decade, droughts in some regions have rivaled the epic dry spells of the 1930s and 1950s. . . . The country is in the midst of one of the most sustained periods of increasing drought on record.

China's heat wave a year and a half ago was the worst in at least 140 years. Fire-suppression costs in the United States have increased from roughly \$1 billion annually in the mid-1990s to an average of more than \$3 billion in the last 5 years, adjusted for inflation, reports the National Climate Assessment.

Our oceans are not just warming, they are becoming more acidic, threatening fish, coral reefs, and other sea life.

A study published in the Journal of Science reported:

Carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere are driving a rate of change in ocean acidity, which is already thought to be faster than at any time in the past 50 million years.

The authors warn that we may be entering an unknown territory of marine ecosystem change.

Extreme storms are also becoming more common and more intense, with extraordinary impacts. For example, when Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines a year ago, it displaced over 4 million people, killed thousands, and cost the country at least \$15 billion in damages.

What will happen if we fail to cut back dramatically on greenhouse gas emissions and climate change continues to accelerate? What will that reality mean for our country and for the globe? The IPCC estimates that without additional efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, "warming is more likely than not" to exceed 4 degrees Celsius—7.2 degrees Fahrenheit—by the end of the century.

Let me repeat that. If we do not begin the process to dramatically reverse carbon emissions and slow down the warming of this planet by the end of the century, warming is more likely than not to exceed 4 degrees Celsius, which is 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit, resulting in a planet that is over 7 degrees Fahrenheit warmer.

Similarly, just last year the White House released the National Climate Assessment, emphasizing that global warming is already happening and warning that global warming could exceed 10 degrees in the United States by the end of the century—10 degrees Fahrenheit.

The World Bank, which is a pretty conservative organization, talked about a world in which temperatures increase by just 4 degrees Celsius, that that would be one of unprecedented heat waves, severe drought, and major floods in many regions, with serious impacts on many systems, ecosystems, and associated services. This is the warning we hear from the World Bank, which is a fairly conservative international organization.

The IPCC reports that sea levels are likely to rise another 10 to 32 inches by the end of the century. Some studies have reported projected increases of more than 6 feet during that time period.

As the New York Times reported, a rise of less than 4 feet would inundate land on which some 3.7 million Americans live. Miami, New Orleans, New York, and Boston are highly vulnerable.

Similarly, according to the IPCC, "many small island nations are only a few meters above present sea level. These states may face serious threat of permanent inundation from sea-level rise."

Reuters has reported that experts estimate that if the sea level rises by 1 meter over the next 50 years, 20 million additional people will be displaced from their land.

The Army Corps of Engineers has predicted that the entire village of Newtok, AK, could be underwater by 2017 and more than 180 additional Native Alaskan villages are at risk. Parts of Alaska are literally vanishing.

As reported in the journal Forest Ecology and Management, U.S. Forest Service researchers reported that wildfires are expected to increase 50 percent across the United States under a changing climate and over 100 percent in areas of the West by 2050. So huge increases in forest fires are expected.

The World Health Organization reported in August that the number of weather-related natural disasters has more than tripled since the 1960s, and more than 60,000 people now die each year in weather-related natural disasters. By 2020 food production is estimated to drop by 50 percent in some African countries, and by 2090, the World Health Organization anticipates, climate change will double the frequency of drought and the duration will be six times longer.

In 2003 a heat wave in Europe killed an estimated 70,000 people. As a study published in Nature Climate Change projects, however, Europe will likely

experience severe heat waves once every 5 years now, which is 10 times more frequent than just a decade ago.

The need to act quickly is profound and pronounced. In its fifth assessment, the IPCC found that “without additional mitigation efforts beyond those in place today, and even with adaptation, warming by the end of the 21st century will lead to high to very high risk of severe, widespread, and irreversible impacts globally.”

In order to prevent “irreversible and severe impacts,” we must quickly reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to keep warming below 2 degrees Celsius, and to do that we must transform our energy system away from fossil fuel and into energy efficiency and sustainable energy.

In the face of this overwhelming evidence, in the face of deep concerns all over this planet, what is the Senate going to do over the next few weeks? Well, I hope very much that we do not go forward with the Keystone Pipeline, which moves us exactly in the wrong direction by expanding the production and transportation of some of the dirtiest fossil fuel on this Earth. I think that would be a terrible mistake. But maybe more importantly, I hope the Senate goes on record in strongly supporting the overwhelming scientific evidence which tells us loudly and clearly that climate change is real, that climate change is caused by human activity and the emission of carbon, and that climate change is already causing devastating problems in our country and around the world.

We have a short window of opportunity in order to move dramatically to reverse climate change and cut carbon, and we must transform our energy system away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency and sustainable energy.

I intend to offer an amendment which basically urges the entire U.S. Senate to go on record in making it clear that they understand what scientists are talking about. They are going to listen to the scientific community, and they are going to take actions for which our kids and our grandchildren will be proud of them so that we do not leave them with a nation and a planet substantially less habitable than the planet on which we were born.

With that, I want to thank Senator BENNET and Senator CARPER for cosponsoring this amendment. I hope we can have more cosponsors and I look forward to seeing the adoption of this important amendment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

PERSONAL IDENTITY THEFT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to speak on the Keystone Pipeline, but before I do, I want to alert the Senate that I am filing legislation today to try to protect the average American from the breach of data in an individual

company and therefore the loss of their personal identification.

We have had a number of cases where there have been these wide data breaches in companies with hundreds of thousands of records being stolen. And, of course, woe to you if, in fact, your personal identity is stolen. It may manifest itself in so many different ways, not the least of which we have seen particularly in the Tampa and the Miami area of my State—the use of stolen Social Security numbers to file false income tax returns seeking refunds. Believe it or not, there was a ring in Tampa that was actually doing this so successfully that the street crime actually dropped—the burglaries, the robberies, the breakings and enterings, all of that dropped because suddenly the criminals found it was so easy to use a laptop instead, once they had secured the stolen ID, to generate these false income tax returns. That is just one example.

The fact is if your identity is stolen because of a breach in a corporation, you should have a right of having the knowledge that your security has been breached. Therefore, we are filing today, with a number of cosponsors, simple legislation that I have filed before in previous Congresses, that if data is stolen from a company, it is incumbent upon that company to notify its customers within 30 days that their secure information has been stolen. That is it. Plain and simple.

Mr. President, I want to talk about the Keystone XL. I would first remind anybody who is not familiar with this issue, this is the Keystone XL Pipeline. What does XL stand for? It stands for extra large. Well, if this is an extra-large pipeline, that would indicate there is a smaller pipeline, and in fact there is. There is a smaller pipeline that is in existence from Canada coming across the northern part of the United States, coming down to a terminal in southern Missouri.

It was about 2 years ago that the President announced he was going to start and allow the extension of that southern terminus all the way to the gulf where there are the refineries. That is under construction. I don't know the completion date. It may be already completed. So there is a pipeline from Canada all the way to the gulf coast.

If what the oil interests in Canada want is a larger pipeline, XL, a lot of this environmental debate could have been avoided if you simply ran it along the same route as the existing pipeline. In fact, there wouldn't have been all the controversy about all of the aquifer and the recharge area right across the middle of Nebraska that the State of Nebraska got so exercised about, and at first the Governor and the various State officials took the position they did not want this.

Finally, a new route was negotiated and the route was further to the east,

not right across the middle of the recharge area which supplies a lot of the aquifer not only in Nebraska but a lot of the Western States. Yet it is still running across part of the aquifer. We would have avoided all of that had you just run the XL pipeline right along the existing pipeline. There wouldn't have been all of this siting problem. The environmental problems associated with the pipeline wouldn't have been there.

But why was it done? This is all politics. It was done in the middle of the Presidential campaign going back—coming up to the 2012 campaign, and it was supposedly to show that the President was anti-energy, anti-energy independence because he wasn't in favor of creating more oil production in North America.

Well, that is clearly what played out. But along the way, then the question came: Well, assuming you put this pipeline there, what is going to happen to that Canadian oil? Where is it going to go? It was a legitimate question.

The answer to that was it was going to go right out to additional foreign countries. So this particular Senator said, now wait a minute, do I understand that you want Canadian oil to have a conduit right through the center of the United States to a port in the Gulf of Mexico, then to be exported to foreign countries? And the answer to that was yes.

I said, well, since it seems as though it would be in the interests of the United States that we at least keep part of that in the United States for consumption so it would lessen our dependence on foreign oil coming from the Middle East or coming from places where we used to get some 12 percent to 20 percent of our oil—thank goodness we don't today, but used to from a place such as Nigeria. You know how troubled that area is now.

My question was: Well, wouldn't it make sense that we keep some of that oil in the United States for domestic uses so we didn't have to rely on oil coming from Saudi Arabia, the Persian Gulf area, from the West Coast of Africa? The answer was that they would not entertain an amendment that would prohibit that oil from being exported. Likewise, if the oil is refined on the gulf coast, it is not prohibited from being exported.

I am just a country boy from Florida, but I can put two and two together. It simply does not make sense to me that you would want foreign oil to come in a conduit through the United States right through the heartland to go right out to other oil-thirsty nations in the world. If that were the case, then why doesn't Canada take an oil pipeline and build it themselves to the west, through the Pacific Coast? Or why wouldn't Canada use the existing structures and end up in the Great Lakes and send the oil out through the Great Lakes?

And yet, what did I say? This is politics.

Since the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed last night was passed, this is going to be in front of the Senate. There are going to be opportunities for amendments, and I can tell you that this Senator is going to support the amendment that prohibits this oil from being sent out to other countries.

If we are really interested in the security of the United States, national security, our independence from foreign oil, since Canada is such a close friend and ally, this would be in the interests of the United States.

The fact is that it is coming at an interesting time. It is getting all the more complicated. It used to be that oil—and you think back a half a year, three-quarters of a year ago, oil was selling in excess of \$100 barrel. Yesterday it was just over \$46 a barrel. It is said that Canada cannot efficiently produce this oil and have any breakeven point unless oil is selling in the range of \$70 a barrel. So why in the world would Canada even want to do this right now, particularly at a time that oil is at \$46 and may stay down for some period of time, even a year or two?

I think if we apply some country-boy logic to this, there are sufficient significant questions—first of all, to kill the bill, and if that is not possible, certainly to amend it so that it complies with the financial and national security interests of the United States. That is the intention of this Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the motion to proceed to S. 1 now be expired and the Senate proceed to a vote on the motion to proceed; that if the motion to proceed is adopted, the bill be reported and that Senator MURKOWSKI be recognized to offer a substitute amendment, the text of which is at the desk.

I further ask that the following amendments be in order to be offered during this week's session by Senators CANTWELL and MURKOWSKI or their designees: Markey amendment No. 13 related to oil exports; Portman amendment No. 3; a Franken amendment related to U.S. steel; and that the consideration of these amendments be in the order listed and the bill be for debate only during this week's consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I just want to note for my colleagues that this agreement has been worked out on both sides; that instead of staying until midnight and having a great deal of uncertainty as we approach the next 2 days for both of our caucuses to have

retreats, giving people predictability about Friday and next Monday being a holiday, working out a back-and-forth on these agreements I think is a good way to proceed.

I hope people will feel free on Friday to come and dialogue about these or other amendments. But this process is one I think we should pursue at this point, so I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have discussed the process going forward on this bill with our leader, the majority leader, and Senator CANTWELL. It is our intention to work together so the two bill managers or their designees continue to offer amendments in an alternating fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I call up my amendment No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO, proposes an amendment numbered 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act".

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the envi-

ronmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased we are at this point in time when we can start debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline. We have had some good conversation on this floor while we have worked through procedural issues. I appreciate that we have been able to avoid a midnight vote, that we were able to work out an agreement. I thank my colleague and the ranking member, Senator CANTWELL, for her assistance in getting us to this point, where we, during the daylight hours, can begin debate on amendments. These amendments, I think, are particularly timely and particularly important to where we are today from an economic perspective, from an energy perspective, and from an energy security perspective.

Keystone XL fits in with that. In front of us is the first amendment to the Keystone XL Pipeline, S. 1, and it is in the nature of a committee substitute. What I will assure Members is that the substitute we have in front of us is almost a mirror image of the bill we reported from the energy committee just last week. We reported it on a bipartisan basis. We had good discussion at that point in time.

But we have in front of us that substitute amendment. When we look to the amendment itself, it is pretty simple. We are truly talking about a two-page bill, a bill that is clear in content, a bill that is very readable in terms of what it does and what it does not do. Again, it spans just over two pages—pretty wide font, pretty wide margins.

One can read it in a couple of minutes—and better yet, understand it.

That is because the bill itself is very simple. What this measure does is approve the cross-border permit that is needed to construct the Keystone XL Pipeline. It does this with important provisions. It fully protects private property rights. It requires all State and local obligations be met, including those related to siting. There has been some discussion that somehow or other the Senate is engaging in routing, engaging in siting. This bill does not approve a pipeline route. We are not a planning board. Our bill only approves the pipeline's cross-border permit. It only does that because we have been waiting for 6 years for this cross-border permit.

Some have suggested this is somehow some big giveaway. There is no subsidy in this bill. It is not a giveaway. It does not evade any regulations. It does not preempt any environmental study. It will not cost taxpayers a single dollar. Again, I would encourage my colleagues to look critically at the language of this bill. What this bill does is authorize a cross-border permit.

There has been a lot of discussion about the jobs created and the environmental pros and cons on both sides. We have had good, strong debate already, just as we have moved through the procedural process of this. But what I think is important for us as a body to appreciate is the point we are at now, the point where we as Members can take this simple, straightforward bill and offer amendments we believe would make it better or enhance it.

As we go forward, I am encouraging Members on both sides to bring their amendments forward. Let us have the give and take, the back and forth for which the Senate was once so famous. I have been asked: How are you going to handle amendments on the floor? Is it going to be a situation where the majority determines what the minority will introduce, what we will have an opportunity to debate and decide?

That is not how we are handling amendments on this bill. The majority leader has promised a full debate. He has said: It is not unlimited. We are not going to be on this for months, but we are going to give Members an opportunity to speak to the issues of the day, the issues of the day that are so important to our Nation's economy.

The Presiding Officer comes from an energy-producing State, as do I. We know the significance of energy jobs that come to our States and our local economy. We know the independence that comes when we are not reliant on others, particularly others who wish us ill, for a resource that powers our country.

We are seeing firsthand the benefits of good energy production throughout the entire country. So why would we not want to allow for a piece of bene-

ficial infrastructure, a piece of infrastructure to cross a border from our closest friend and ally in Canada, moving a product to our refineries in the gulf coast where they are set up to handle this type of crude oil.

There has been a lot of discussion that this is just going to be a transference of oil from the north in Canada through the United States and exported to the rest of the world. But I think if we look to the facts that are laid out in the State Department's report, in their environmental assessment, we appreciate the fact that it makes no sense to use the United States just as a conduit, when our refineries, those refineries that are designed to handle the heavy crude, will be in a position to refine that crude for our benefit in this country, for those in Canada who are looking to again move their product.

What we are effectively going to be able to do is replace what we are currently receiving from Venezuela, which provides us with that heavy crude currently, which we refine in the gulf coast areas—in those refineries we will be able to replace that with oil from our friend and ally, Canada. I do not know about the Presiding Officer, but I would much rather have a relationship with Canada than Venezuela.

Again, the benefits, the merits of this legislation are very substantive. Keep in mind, this is not a case of first impression. This is not the first pipeline we have crossing the United States-Canadian border. There are 19 cross-border pipelines currently operating today. So as we work to develop not only a relationship around our energy, I think it is important to recognize the relationship we have with our friends to the north is important as well.

One of the issues we will see come forward for discussion on the floor is the environmental aspects of the Keystone XL Pipeline and the oil sands from which they stem. We will have an opportunity to discuss the issue of exports and the significance of our energy exports, in terms of the benefits to our economy, trade perspective, balance of payments, the significance of that, and the opportunities we have in other areas related to energy, energy efficiency.

I know my friend and colleague from Ohio wishes to speak to an amendment he will propose today. But this is a long time in the making for us to not only have the chance to talk energy but the opportunity for us to vote on energy-related amendments.

I have much I wish to relay and convey in response to some of the comments that have been made by colleagues on this floor in the past couple days. We will have an opportunity to speak directly.

As was noted in the agreement, we will have this measure in front of us. We will put some amendments forward

this afternoon. We will not be voting on any amendments today nor will we be voting on any amendments on Friday, but we will have an opportunity for good, concerted discussion on Friday and going into next week.

On behalf of the majority leader, I have been asked to announce that the next rollcall vote will occur on Tuesday, January 20.

But what that allows us is an opportunity again, beginning today, beginning now, to encourage Members to come forward with their amendments and based on the agreement we have outlined—two on the Republican side today, two on the Democratic side today—get those out there, get them on the table, get them up, let's talk about them. We will have the opportunity on Friday and will do more of the same on Tuesday. Then we can actually start moving through a process that I hope is good, robust, and encouraging—encouraging, not only for the American public—but also encouraging to members of this body.

I think it will be good for us in the Senate to get back to a habit of advancing amendments, of allowing the floor managers to work together to decide a process, to lay out initiatives, to have the back and forth, to take some tough votes—it is what we do or what we should do—and to get back to what we know to be regular order.

I want that to be a terminology all Members understand instead of just some who have been around for more years than others. Being able to get back to regular process feels pretty good today. I am pleased to begin this debate under regular process.

With that, Senator PORTMAN was on the floor as we began our unanimous consent request, but I understand we will defer to Senator MARKEY to first bring up his amendment and then turn to Senator PORTMAN for his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. I seek recognition, pursuant to the consent agreement, to call up amendment No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], for himself and Ms. BALDWIN, proposes an amendment numbered 13 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL pipeline into the United States is used to reduce United States dependence on Middle Eastern oil)

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), none of the crude oil and bitumen transported into the United States by the operation of the Keystone XL pipeline under the authority provided by subsection (a), and none of the refined petroleum fuel products originating from that crude oil or bitumen, may be exported from the United States.

(2) WAIVERS AUTHORIZED.—The President may waive the limitation described in paragraph (1) if—

(A) the President determines that a waiver is in the national interest because it—

(i) will not lead to an increase in domestic consumption of crude oil or refined petroleum products obtained from countries hostile to United States' interests or with political and economic instability that compromises energy supply security;

(ii) will not lead to higher costs to refiners who purchase the crude oil than the refiners would pay for crude oil in the absence of the waiver; and

(iii) will not lead to higher gasoline costs to consumers than consumers would pay in the absence of the waiver;

(B) an exchange of crude oil or refined product provides for no net loss of crude oil or refined product consumed domestically; or

(C) a waiver is necessary under the Constitution, a law, or an international agreement.

Mr. MARKEY. If I may speak briefly on the amendment, I thank the chair of the energy committee. I thank her for her courtesy and the Senator from Ohio as well.

While we will not be having the full debate at this time on the Senate floor, we are in fact beginning with a critical issue, an issue that relates to climate change, American energy independence, the impact that legislation can have upon consumers—drivers in our country in terms of how much they are paying at the pump.

It deals with actually the mission of young men and women in our country who go overseas in order to protect tankers of oil that are brought back to our country.

So the first question that will be asked in this debate is whether the oil, which is going to be delivered through this pipeline from Canada, is going to stay in the United States of America.

The Canadian tar sands oil is the dirtiest oil in the world.

The pipeline, similar to a straw, is going to be built through the United States down to Port Arthur, TX, a tax-free export zone. You don't have to have an MBA from business school to figure out what this 3-by-5 card looks like.

It is something that basically says, since the price of a barrel of oil on the global market is \$17 higher than what the Canadians can get for the tar sands oil—that they want to get it out of the country, which is why it is going to end in Port Arthur, TX, an export zone.

What the amendment I am going to be making on the floor of the Senate says is that if the oil is drilled for in Canada, put through a pipeline in the United States, that oil cannot be exported, that oil stays in the United

States, and that the promise of energy independence in our country is in fact what this agenda is all about. Because otherwise the United States is taking all of these environmental risks, the planet is taking all of these environmental risks, but the economic benefits are not flowing to consumers, drivers in the United States who finally feel some relief at the pump—that they are not feeling—that they are being tipped upside down and having money shaken out of their pockets on a daily basis.

The oil companies have made many claims about this pipeline. They have said it was for North American energy security, but it is about exporting oil. They have said it is about reducing prices, but it is about getting the highest profits. They said it would not harm the environment but it in fact will worsen climate change and risk dangerous oil spills.

They have been trying for 6 years to get this pipeline built, even when it is clear that we do not need it. So this is the Keystone “export” pipeline—the KXL.

So this first amendment that we will be debating is one that says: No, you cannot export it. We must keep that oil in the United States. We must ensure that it is in fact something that benefits the American people. Otherwise, the Canadians are just ripping this oil, this dirty oil from their soil in Canada and putting it into a pipeline that then will be exported, which will only ensure that the planet gets hotter, that it becomes more dangerous for future generations.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a very important debate. The planet is running a fever. There are no emergency rooms for planets. We have to engage in preventive care.

If this action takes place, and all we are doing is allowing Canadian oil to go through our country and out the other end, then we haven't done anything for the American consumer or for the planet.

I look forward to a more complete debate on this issue, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Purpose: To promote energy efficiency)

Mr. PORTMAN. I rise and call up amendment No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN, proposes an amendment numbered 3 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Monday, January 12, 2015, under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to thank Senator MURKOWSKI for giving me this opportunity. She spoke earlier about the fact that we are going to talk about Keystone in an open process, going to allow amendments, which seems very normal, but in the Senate it hasn't been over the past several years.

This amendment is one that results to energy efficiency. I strongly support the underlying bill, and we will talk about it in a moment, but I also support the strategy of saying let's produce more energy, but also let's use the energy that we have more efficiently. I believe those are complementary, and I believe it is consistent with creating more jobs in this country, making our businesses more competitive, and improving the environment. So I appreciate her willingness to allow us to move forward with this amendment.

This energy efficiency amendment we are talking about is a key part of the “all of the above” energy strategy that a lot of us discuss, whether it is nuclear, renewable, oil, coal or gas, efficiency ought to be a part of it.

It is an amendment that is the result of a lot of years of work by Senator SHAHEEN, who was mentioned earlier, myself but also Senator HOEVEN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator FRANKEN, and many other Members of this body.

Our cosponsors this afternoon are Senator SHAHEEN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator BENNET, Senator COLLINS, Senator GARDNER, and Senator MANCHIN.

This is legislation that is clearly bipartisan and legislation that shouldn't be controversial. It takes part of the broader Portman-Shaheen legislation that has already passed the House of Representatives and brings it to the floor.

This is also legislation that has passed the committees in the Senate and the committees in the House—energy committees—with wide bipartisan margins. Also, it was on the floor of the House last year and passed with a vote of 375 to 76, including with the support of the Presiding Officer. I thank the Presiding Officer.

There are four provisions and they are all pretty straightforward. None of them has a mandate, none of them has a cost curve. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, has told us they don't score. All of them are voluntary.

The first one is an important one. It is called Tenant Star. It establishes a voluntary market-driven approach to try and align the interests of commercial business owners and their tenants. This is important because a lot of the real estate folks would like to have the ability to say this has the Good Housekeeping seal of approval. It is like an Energy Star seal of approval that enables people to know it is an energy-efficient building.

This is broadly supported in part because it is voluntary. It is not a mandate, but it will help us in reducing energy consumption.

The second provision is one that is very timely. This is one that a lot of us have worked on over the years. Senator HOEVEN has talked about this. We talk sometimes in the Senate about the unintended consequences of regulations. This would be a great example.

Here we have the Department of Energy promoting a regulation that if we don't stop it now will actually make our country less energy efficient. It is unintended, perhaps, but it is something we need to deal with legislatively now.

If we don't, then we are not going to be able to help save these particular products, which are water heaters. Around the country there are hundreds of electric cooperatives that operate voluntary programs and use what we call electric resistance water heaters.

They use them to store energy at night, and then during a peak demand period they don't have to turn on these electric water heaters. So it is actually an energy efficiency effort.

It is the kind of grassroots, on-the-ground innovation we want to see more of. But this regulation that we have to stop—from the Department of Energy—establishes a new standard for water heaters that effectively undermines this program. How? Because it makes it impossible for these companies to produce these kinds of water heaters that the co-ops are using. So the legislation exempts these water heaters from business standards, allowing these co-op programs that are good for energy efficiency to continue.

People probably heard from their rural electric co-op—if they are a Member of this body—on this issue because it is important to them that it be handled and handled now. If it is not, then these companies will stop producing these water heaters and they will not be able to continue these programs.

The third provision has to do with the Federal Government. Basically it says the Federal Government ought to practice what it preaches.

The Federal Government talks a lot about energy efficiency. Yet it is probably the biggest energy user in the world and probably one of the most inefficient. This says simply that Federal agencies have to coordinate with the Office of Management and Budget, with the Department of Energy, and with the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an implementation strategy that includes best practices, measurements, and verifications for the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information and technology.

IT has been a source of great inefficiency in the government, and this legislation simply says let's require these Federal agencies to actually clean up

their act so they will be more energy efficient in the area of information technology.

Again, it is a nonpartisan approach. It is one that has been supported by both sides of the aisle.

Finally, along the same lines, the fourth provision requires that federally leased buildings without Energy Star labels benchmark and disclose their energy usage data. Again, these are not Federal buildings that have to report this information, but these are buildings that the Federal Government leases.

So in effect all of us as taxpayers should have an interest in being sure that these leased buildings also have the energy efficiency provision to avoid wasting taxpayer money.

I think these are very important provisions. These are not controversial provisions. I think they are consistent with the idea that, yes, let's produce more energy. Let's make sure we have the infrastructure to bring the energy to the consumer, but let's do it in a way where we are using more energy but also using it more efficiently.

I hope we will see the kind of strong bipartisan support on the floor we have seen in the past on these provisions as they are part of this underlying legislation.

I would like to talk for a moment about the underlying legislation. This is the Keystone XL Pipeline construction. It seems as if we have been talking about this forever. Frankly, we have. This has been going on for almost 7 years now, I believe. Think about that. This is just to get the approval of the pipeline—not to actually build it. Just to get the approval it has taken 7 years. It is time to stop talking about it and move forward on it.

The Keystone XL Pipeline has taken almost 7 years. In comparison, we built the Hoover Dam in less than 5 years. The entire Empire State Building was constructed in 1 year and 45 days. In fact, the entire transcontinental railroad was constructed by hand in 6 years. So there is no reason we shouldn't move ahead on this.

We have learned a thing or two about this Keystone XL Pipeline during this period of time we have been debating it, and everything we have learned leads us to the conclusion it just makes sense to move forward. We know we can do it safely. We know we can do it in an environmentally sound way. We know we can create thousands of good jobs during its construction. Yet as we stand here today, with the Keystone XL Pipeline a source of debate rather than a source of jobs, we are not moving the country forward. I think we have waited long enough.

There has been debate before. I have heard it over the last couple of days and last week. Is this going to create jobs? Yes, it will. The State Department has said it will. The State De-

partment is in the Obama administration, and they are the ones who tell us it is going to increase our economy by about \$3 billion, increase the GDP of America, and also create more than 40,000 jobs during its construction—both through the actual building of the pipeline and through the sourcing of pipeline projects to American manufacturers.

By the way, a bunch of those manufacturers are in my home State of Ohio. Ohio produces pipe. Ohio produces the kind of steel—the structural steel—that goes into the construction of the pipeline. Ohio also produces the monitors that go on this pipeline. We also produce other things, such as pumps and compressors. So this will create jobs in my home State of Ohio. I have toured these factories and talked to these workers. They are going to have the opportunity now to roll that steel, build these compressors and so on, and for them this is important too.

Some of the critics of the pipeline have attempted to undermine these numbers by claiming the jobs related to the pipeline are not permanent. I don't know what to say about that except are any construction jobs permanent, by that definition? We certainly want construction jobs. This administration—the Obama administration—talks all the time about the need for more infrastructure projects to create more jobs. This is an infrastructure project. By some measure it may be the biggest infrastructure project in America over the next couple of years if we approve this thing. It will create not just jobs but good jobs. This is the kind of work we want to have more of in this country.

This is why a lot of labor unions, including the building trades, are excited about this, because they know it is going to be able to lower unemployment and get the people back to work who have lost their jobs.

Others have expressed environmental concerns. Let's look at the facts. Let's look at the science. With every environmental study that has been conducted, the pipeline has passed. In fact, we know the pipeline is safer and more environmentally sound than the alternative. What is the alternative? What is happening now—it is transporting this oil by truck, transporting this oil by train. As we know, and as the CRS report has said, a lot of this oil actually doesn't even come from Canada. It comes from the Bakken. The Bakken is actually in America. It is in North Dakota and in other places. So some of that oil is now being moved by truck and train. It is better that it go by pipeline. It is more efficient, of course, and less costly, but it is also safer environmentally.

Let's debate this issue. I am happy to do that, but let's try to stick to the facts. The fact is this thing just makes

sense. For those who oppose it, I would ask: Why is it so different from all the other pipelines we have constructed in this country? In all our States we have pipelines. When we build this, it won't be the first pipeline to carry oil across international boundaries, by the way. It won't be the second or the third. It will actually be the 20th—the 20th pipeline to carry energy across international boundaries. It will be the fourth one to import oil—specifically oil from Canada.

Just to give some idea of how the permitting process of XL has been, of the three other Canadian pipelines that have been approved, it took the Federal Government 15 months on one, another was 24 months, and another was 28 months. The permitting process for this one—the Keystone XL—has now dragged on for over 76 months and counting.

So look, I have heard people on the floor say: What is the rush? Why are we rushing this? I don't think we are rushing. I think this makes sense. Just as we have approved other pipelines, we go through a process, and now we should have the ability to move forward on these jobs and the energy security that it provides.

By the way, when this debate is over, we also need to think about our permitting system. To me, this is really an indictment of our entire permitting system in this country. We need to do something about it, where you simply can't get a project approved. And by the way, I am not just talking oil and gas projects. I am talking about other energy projects—solar projects. I am talking about siting windmills. I am talking about hydro projects.

I first got involved in this issue because there was a hydro project on the Ohio River, of all places, that was being held up by Federal regulations. The folks who were trying to get this through came and said: We can't believe how complicated it is to get a permit from the Federal Government. As soon as we get one permit from one agency another agency comes in. They require it be done sequentially, and it is taking us forever, and we are losing investors. Those investors are going not just across the Ohio River to another State, they are going to another country because the Federal permitting system is so bad in this country.

That is why I intend to introduce bipartisan legislation called the Federal Permitting Improvement Act. Senator McCASKILL of Missouri is my cosponsor. We are hoping to bring that to the floor very soon too because the American government shouldn't be standing in the way of good projects, particularly these energy projects that are so important. The American Government shouldn't be standing in the way of good American jobs. That is exactly what is happening. We need to streamline the approval process. It can be done and be done in a bipartisan way.

So it comes down to this. We hear a lot about an “all of the above” energy strategy in the Senate. Everyone seems to be for it. It is a position the American people support, by the way, overwhelmingly. I have been to the floor many times to express my support for an energy policy that includes everything from nuclear to oil, natural gas, renewables, coal, and of course, increased energy efficiency, as we talked about earlier. We will need all of those if we want to continue to see energy prices fall and to continue to see our reliance on dangerous and unstable parts of the world decline.

An “all of the above” energy strategy includes the Keystone Pipeline and other projects like it. So if you want to say you support all of the above, you better support Keystone. If you don't support the pipeline, I think you have to explain to the American people why you stood in the way of 40,000 good-paying jobs, why you opposed a project that is more environmentally safe than the alternatives out there now, and you need to explain why you opposed an “all of the above” energy strategy that can keep prices low and help secure North American energy independence. That also affects our national security. For us not to be dependent on these volatile and dangerous parts of the world is good for our national security. Let's stop sending the money to the Mideast. Let us keep the money here in North America.

Let's stop the delay. Let's make construction of this pipeline a reality. The American people are watching. We have all spent time in our States over the last month. We have all heard over and over again that the American people want us to work together. They want us to cooperate where we can, particularly on issues that relate to jobs and the economy and getting things moving in this country. I think this current legislation can be a model for how the Senate can operate and a sign that we have heard the message the voters sent in November.

This final bill will be the model, as I said earlier, of an open process where people can come to the floor to debate, as I have today, and not just on the underlying legislation but on the amendments on energy efficiency. That is good. At the end of this process, it will likely contain some policies that I fully support. And by the way, the final bill will probably contain some policies I don't support, because that is what happens when you have an open process. People will be able to come out here, make their best argument, and people will vote yea or nay, depending on how they feel it affects them, their States, and their constituents. That is what is happening on the Senate floor, and that is a good thing for our country and a good thing for getting to the right policy.

When the amendment process is complete, I believe we will have produced a

bill that advances this goal of implementing a true “all of the above” energy policy, while creating more jobs for the American people and protecting our environment in better ways. That is what we all want, and that is why this legislation is a win for all Americans.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARIS UNITY RALLY

Mr. COATS. Madam President, throughout history a single picture has revealed the political reality of the moment.

Before we had photography, there were artist depictions of Caesar entering Rome, General Washington crossing the Delaware, and Napoleon crossing the Alps. When photography came, we could see the images that defined America's role in the pivotal moments of existential threats to our values, our faiths, and our way of life: Roosevelt and Churchill sitting beside Stalin in Tehran and later at Yalta, President Kennedy at the city hall in Berlin, and Ronald Reagan at the Brandenburg Gate.

The pictures that define the moment, the pictures that are seared into our minds, images that stay with us throughout our life are all powerful, and they have the common theme and the common purpose of confirming America's essential leadership role in global affairs.

In all of these examples and thousands of others, we can see the world looking on Americans with respect and with the expectation that we will be there at moments critical to the world's future—they are there not just to participate but there to lead where U.S. leadership is essential to the success of the endeavor.

Today, possibly the most powerful image that evokes most clearly a new reality is this image right here. Here, we see many of the world's leaders of major nations—some of the most significant, influential leaders—walking arm-in-arm down a Paris boulevard as a united protest against the grotesque barbarism that threatens us all. The leaders of Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and even those who in other circumstances are not united, are united arm-in-arm, marching in front of literally millions of Europeans from France and other countries.

Yet something is tragically missing. The most profound significance of this picture—which has been shown around the world and which has been seared into our minds as a defining moment—

is that America is nowhere to be seen, looking at this picture, with the world's leaders, some diametrically opposed ideologically to each other but united here. And we are told that throughout the millions of people who were there, if there was the presence of an American representative, that person was not seen.

If the world needs any further demonstration of America's decline and our growing irrelevance, it is this utter absence at this potentially defining moment of rallying the nations of the world to address this existential threat to the most basic of our values and our freedoms.

It is not just an image problem, although the image itself carries the message, it is a substance problem.

This group of world leaders and millions of others joined together in Paris last weekend to show the entire world that a threat to our principal freedoms is entirely unacceptable to us all and will be resisted by all of us, an unacceptable mortal threat to freedom of expression, freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press.

My friend and former colleague Joe Lieberman wrote a piece in today's Wall Street Journal that articulately defines this threat and how we must respond. In his piece, he wrote:

In rapid order, the three attacks in France last week showed more clearly than ever that the international movement of violent Islamist extremism has declared war on Western civilization's foundational values, which are embraced by so many people throughout the world. The murders of police officers, cartoonists and Jews were attacks against the West's most central values and aspirations—the rule of law, freedom of expression and freedom of religion. This radical extremism will continue to threaten what we hold dear unless it is fought and eventually defeated.

Millions gathered not only because 16 people died so tragically, they also gathered because those who would pervert their faith in order to lure deluded young people into violent extremism must know that we will all oppose them no matter what it takes.

So how can we reconcile this vital mission with America's utter absence? No excuses are sufficient. No apologies or explanations about bureaucratic ineptitude will be enough to undo the damage caused by our absence and depicted throughout the world.

Some may say the President didn't attend because of security concerns. Writing for the Wall Street Journal, Peggy Noonan said, "Life is a security concern, you must do what's right."

Sadly, the President's absence is an accurate reflection of how this administration sees our role in the world. During the past year we have seen a long list of foreign policy disasters—the rise of the most potent and violent terrorist organization in history; the continued disintegration of Syria;

American hostages beheaded in full public view; a resurgent Taliban conducting more attacks in Afghanistan; and the Government of Iraq losing control of a third of the country, including cities and provinces soaked with the blood of American troops. We have seen our old enemy Al Qaeda and its affiliates metastasize throughout the Middle East and north Africa to mount threats from Sudan, Somalia, Yemen, and now even France. We have seen the Islamic State mount media campaigns that have persuaded thousands of Americans, Europeans, and others to flock to their black banners. We have seen an ill-conceived and poorly prepared Middle East peace initiative collapse under the weight of unattainable expectations.

All of these problems and many others—some colossal disasters—have been aggravated by U.S. policy failures. Those failures have come from a White House isolated in a wasteland of confusion. The Obama administration has no coherent strategy for dealing with the world other than, in a now famous paraphrase, "Don't do stupid stuff." Shrouded in this fog of indecision and failures, is it any wonder that we could not find the vision to join with the rest of the world to show purpose in Paris?

It is deeply ironic and appropriate that the events in Paris were all generated by the power of imagery—cartoons, no less. Those events have now produced this new imagery, a picture of global common action in which the United States is tragically absent.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we are awaiting the arrival of Senator FRANKEN to bring up the amendment relating to U.S.-made steel that is part of the agreement we entered into just a little bit ago that would allow for a series of amendments to be brought forward to the floor. The first was my substitute amendment to S. 1; Senator MARKEY has brought forward his amendment No. 13; Senator PORTMAN, his energy efficiency bill.

What I would like to advise Members is that these are the matters pending before the body at this point in time. We certainly welcome debate on these issues.

Obviously, energy efficiency is very key to any energy debate. The aspect of export is one also that is worthy of discussion and, I hope, good debate on both sides as we go forward.

I would encourage Members to speak not only to these issues, but if there are other issues they would like to have brought to the floor—while we won't be in a position to allow other Members to offer their amendments at this time under this agreement, there is certainly plenty of time to be talking about them.

Prior to the entry of the agreement, Senator SANDERS came to the floor and

spoke about his intention to offer an amendment at a later point in time.

I again invite Members to be engaged, to be part of this open amendment process we are part of. I think for some it is new and it may take a little bit of getting used to, but that is a good thing. It is a good thing because these are areas that are worthy of debate on the Senate floor. When we are talking about jobs, when we are talking about our energy security, when we are talking about the strength of our economy, it is always timely to have this debate.

I will again remind colleagues that our next opportunity to discuss these issues will be Friday morning, when we will be in session to take them up.

I look forward to more discussion from across the aisle.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, on behalf of Senator FRANKEN, I call up his amendment No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL] for Mr. FRANKEN, proposes an amendment numbered 17 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the use of iron, steel, and manufactured goods produced in the United States in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilities)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . USE OF UNITED STATES IRON, STEEL, AND MANUFACTURED GOODS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Subject to subsection (b), to the maximum extent consistent with the obligations of the United States under international trade agreements, none of the iron, steel, or manufactured goods used in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilities approved by this Act may be produced outside of the United States.

(b) NONAPPLICATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the extent that the President finds that—

(1) iron, steel, and the applicable manufactured goods are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities with a satisfactory quality; or

(2) inclusion of iron, steel, or any manufactured good produced in the United States will increase the cost of the iron, steel, or any manufactured good used in the Pipeline and facilities by more than 25 percent.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, we have made some progress with proceeding to this very important issue

and Members are obviously coming to the floor to talk about their amendments and offer their viewpoints on this legislation.

I would just point out that I hope we have a chance to consider some of the other amendments we have been talking about, the issue of whether companies in the tar sands business should be paying into the oilspill liability trust fund. We talked earlier today about how the oilspill liability trust fund which U.S. companies are required to pay into and is critical for cleanup. I want to add some documents to the RECORD of this case we had in Kalamazoo where the company may have hit its cap and where it may—for that Kalamazoo spill on tar sands—be asking the oilspill liability trust fund to actually recoup the benefits they had to pay out.

To me this is a very important issue. Here is a company where we have tar sands spilling into the Kalamazoo River and actually costing, I think, something like \$1.2 billion, and instead of this company paying into the trust fund and paying for costs on this, they basically are going to take money that U.S. companies paid into the trust fund and be recouped because of this. So I just want to get this right, and I hope we can work with our colleagues on another amendment on that process.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article that just appeared in the paper from the AP about how TransCanada is said to offer landowners a price for their land in Nebraska at which point if they don't come to an agreement by this Friday the company can use eminent domain to take the land.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Associated Press, Jan. 13, 2015]

ATTORNEY: LANDOWNERS STILL HAVE OPTIONS
IN PIPELINE DISPUTE
(By Grant Schulte)

LINCOLN, NE (AP).—Nebraska opponents of the Keystone XL oil pipeline will continue to fight the project, even though the state's highest court allowed its planned route to stand, an attorney for the group said Monday.

Omaha attorney Dave Domina said landowners on the route can challenge the project again once pipeline developer TransCanada uses eminent domain to get access to their property. Once the company begins that process, Domina said individual landowners can fight the company in court battles that could take two to three years with appeals.

In addition, Domina said the landowners could file a new legal challenge against the law itself, using landowners who live directly on the route. Or they could lobby Nebraska lawmakers to try to change the law. It's too early to know which approach they'll choose, Domina said.

"This decision has simply been punted down the road, to be answered another day," Domina said in an interview. "It's up to TransCanada to make the next move."

The Nebraska Supreme Court on Friday ruled against three landowners who sought

to overturn Nebraska's 2012 pipeline-siting law, which they say violates the state constitution. Not all of the plaintiffs owned property along the route, but the group sought legal standing as Nebraska taxpayers challenging an illegal use of state money to review the project. TransCanada later reimbursed the state.

The Nebraska attorney general's office argued that, among other things, that the landowners didn't have legal standing to bring the case.

The high court ruled 4-3 that the plaintiffs had standing, and four judges also deemed the law unconstitutional. The remaining three declined to review the constitutional arguments, arguing that the landowners lacked the legal standing. A five-judge supermajority was needed to overturn the law because it raised a constitutional question.

Pipelines are generally reviewed by the Nebraska Public Service Commission, but the siting law allowed then-Gov. Dave Heineman to approve it after a review by the state's environmental department. Heineman, a Republican, supported the pipeline, and the environmental department is a part of the governor's administration. Public Service Commission members are elected.

TransCanada spokesman Shawn Howard said offers to landowners are set to expire on Friday, at which point the company can begin eminent domain proceedings. Howard said the company will continue to discuss deals with landowners who are still negotiating in good faith. When warning letters were sent in December, the company said it had voluntary agreements from 84 percent of landowners along the route.

The \$8 billion pipeline would carry oil from Canada through Montana and South Dakota to Nebraska, where it would connect with existing pipelines to carry more than 800,000 barrels of crude oil a day to refineries along the Texas Gulf Coast.

Environmentalists and other opponents argue that any leaks could contaminate water supplies, and that the project would increase air pollution around refineries and harm wildlife. But many Republicans, oil industry members and other backers say that those fears are exaggerated and that the pipeline would create jobs and ease American dependence on oil from the Middle East. They note a U.S. State Department report raised no major environmental objections.

Ms. CANTWELL. So while I think this is very interesting that Congress is trying to expedite a process here by which the TransCanada pipeline is approved and the Nebraska Supreme Court made a decision basically on standing and had four of the seven justices say that this was unconstitutional—what the legislature did in trying to take away the public interest standard—this company is not waiting one second to say that property owners who never got the public interest standard met are going to get short-shrifted again and they are just going to go ahead. So I don't see why Congress is trying to help a special interest hurry and make a decision when they are not trying to give any landowner the benefit of a process or give landowners the ability to negotiate. They are just going to go ahead with eminent domain.

So it is a very interesting tale we are going to talk a lot more about in the

ensuing days about all the special attempts that TransCanada has done to try move ahead with this pipeline without following due process.

As I noted earlier this morning I found it very interesting that at the very time the State Department was saying to TransCanada that their current proposal goes through an aquifer and really should go somewhere else, TransCanada was looking for support in Congress to go ahead and approve the pipeline through the aquifer by saying the State Department had to approve it. Clearly, here is somebody who just wants this pipeline no matter what, no matter where, and is going to use every attempt to not follow the rules. So we hope that we will have a very healthy debate about why Congress shouldn't be entering into this kind of special interest deal on behalf of this company.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY BISON ON WINNING THE 2014 NCAA DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE GAME

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I wish to make a number of points in regards to the Keystone XL pipeline approval bill, the legislation we are currently considering. But before I do so, I am planning to submit a resolution on behalf of the North Dakota State University Bison who won their fourth national championship on Saturday against the Illinois State Redbirds. It was a spirited and wonderful game in Frisco, Texas.

I know, Madam President, that you had a team that was in the hunt, so to speak, and played a tremendous game in New Hampshire against the Illinois State Redbirds. It is a testament to the quality of the teams in the FCS championship, the Division I playoff series. Teams such as the University of New Hampshire had a tremendous year of outstanding coaching and great student athletes.

I watched the game between the Illinois State Redbirds and the University of New Hampshire. It was a fantastic game that went right down to the wire. It just speaks to the fact that there are excellent teams in this division and tremendous athletes. A lot of teams had great seasons. So I certainly want to begin by commending all the teams that were in the playoffs, including our opponent in the championship game, the Illinois State Redbirds. They did a great job.

But North Dakota State University, the coaches, everybody on staff, the leadership of the North Dakota State University and these student athletes had just a fantastic year. So I want to congratulate them. Four years in a row is unprecedented. Nobody has won the national championship in Division I football in their division in the playoffs in history. So this was certainly a great achievement.

I am planning to submit the following resolution to honor the North Dakota State Bison. It says:

Whereas, the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as "NDSU") Bison won the 2014 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the "NCAA") Division I Football Championship Subdivision title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 10, 2015, in a hard fought victory over the Illinois State Redbirds by a score of 29 to 27;

Whereas, NDSU has won 12 NCAA football championships;

Whereas, NDSU has now won four consecutive NCAA Football Championships since 2011, an unprecedented achievement in Football Championship Subdivision history;

Whereas, the NDSU Bison have displayed tremendous resilience and skill over the past four seasons, with 58 wins to only three losses, including a streak of 33 consecutive winning games;

Whereas, Coach Chris Klieman and his staff, through their dedication and talent, have continued the excellence of the Bison football program;

Whereas, the leadership of President Dean Bresciani and Athletic Director Matt Larsen has helped bring both academic and athletic excellence to NDSU;

Whereas, an estimated 17,000 Bison fans attended the Championship game—

Including myself—a fantastic game—reflecting the tremendous spirit and dedication of the Bison Nation that has helped propel the success of the team; and

Whereas, the 2014 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title was a victory not only for the NDSU football team, but also for the entire State of North Dakota:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1), congratulates the North Dakota State University football team as the champion of the 2014 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title;

(2), commends the North Dakota State University players, coaches, and staff for their hard work and dedication; and

(3), recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans for supporting the Bison on the successful quest of the team to capture another Division I trophy for North Dakota State University.

I will be entering that resolution into the RECORD to honor and recognize the team in a program that has done just an incredible job this year. I know how hard those student athletes worked. It is a privilege to honor them with this resolution and commend them on their outstanding achievement this year winning their fourth consecutive national championship.

Thank you, Madam President.

Now I would like to shift to the continued discussion of the Keystone XL

Pipeline approval legislation that is currently pending on the floor. I am pleased to say that we have reached agreement now to proceed to the bill. In fact, we will be voting on amendments—not this week. But we can at least tee up amendments this week, and we will be starting votes on these amendments beginning next week.

That has been the idea all along—first, to advance to this bill; it is important energy infrastructure legislation—but also to have an open process to return to what we have referred to as regular order on the Senate floor in an effort to work truly in a more bipartisan way and to get the work of the Senate done for the American people.

That is the idea with this energy legislation—to make sure we are having the debate so we give everybody the opportunity to come forward and to present their amendments. We will debate them. They can then get a vote. For the amendments that can command 60 votes—it takes a bipartisan vote to pass anything because neither party has 60 votes—it requires bipartisanship. Any amendments that can garner 60 votes will be added to the legislation, and I hope that fosters the best legislation possible and enables us to get our work done on behalf of the American people—not only on this bill but on other important legislation to help move our country forward as well.

There are a number of arguments that have been made this afternoon by some of the critics of the bill, and while greatly respecting their right to come forward and present their opposition to the legislation and any criticisms they feel they want to present, I also want to take the opportunity to rebut a number of those. Of course, that is the whole focus and effort here in terms of the debate—to have this debate and hopefully convince people that what we have is good legislation. If we can make it better with amendments, great, but at the end of the day, we pass this legislation and get this project approved on behalf of the American people.

It is about energy, it is about jobs, it is about economic growth, and it is about national security. It is a great place to start in this new Congress, where we are focused like a laser on growing our economy and creating jobs for the hard-working taxpayers and people of our country, for the middle class, for the folks out there working every day. And for those not working and looking for a job, let's find ways to make sure we get this economy going and that we get jobs for them. This is a great example. This is the largest shovel-ready project—at almost \$8 billion—that we have, and it is ready to go. It doesn't cost one single penny of government money. It is privately financed, and it is all about creating the kind of business climate and powering the kind of investment that will help grow our economy.

One of the discussion points I have been hearing is this whole issue of, well, this somehow is just for Canada and not the United States or that we are doing this for Canada. I will start with the premise that our closest friend and ally in the world is Canada, so the idea of working with Canada makes a lot of sense to me. They are our largest trading partner. We work with them all the time. We have a unique and wonderful relationship that very few countries have.

So to start with this criticism that this is just for Canada and not for the United States, I am thinking: Yes, and it is a bad idea to work with your friends, why? It seems to me that that is a good selling point. If this is good for Canada, then great. I hope we are doing good things for Canada, and I hope they are doing good things for us. That is how friends and allies work together. The whole concept that somehow this is a bad idea is lost on me. To me it seems as though it is a positive when we can work together with Canada.

The fact is it is not just good for Canada—it is good for Canada, but it is really good for the United States too, and that is the whole point. In that line of argument that it is somehow good for Canada and not good for the United States—the critics say it is good for Canada because they produce oil up here in Alberta, and they are going to move that oil down to our ports and they are going to export it. Well, that is not the case.

Is it possible that some oil could be exported? Yes. But the reality is a lot of this oil is coming to our country and will be used in our country, and even more than that, it is not just Canadian oil. The argument that this is somehow just Canadian oil and it is going to be exported is wrong. It is wrong on both counts. I wish to take a minute to rebut that because that argument has been brought up a number of times.

As a matter of fact, I believe it is the focus of one of the first amendments that has been offered by the good Senator from Massachusetts. He wants to include a provision that says none of the oil can be exported because it is all Canadian oil and it is all going to be exported. Well, on both counts, that is wrong. Oil from North Dakota and Montana, out of the Bakken formation—our State oil in North Dakota produces 1.2 million barrels of oil a day. We are second only to the State of Texas. But because we don't have enough pipelines, we have to move 700,000 barrels a day on rail.

We are trying to move agricultural goods. We are the leader of 14 different major agriculture commodities. We have all kinds of other products that we produce, as do the States in our region, which includes Minnesota, South Dakota, and Montana. But we have tremendous congestion on our rails because we are putting more and more oil

on rail. We have 700,000 barrels a day going out on rail and growing as we continue to grow our production in this part of the country. So we need more pipelines.

What you see on this diagram is the original Keystone Pipeline that was constructed and built when I was Governor of North Dakota, and this yellow shows the sister pipeline we are trying to build.

As you can see, this goes right through our State, and the new pipeline goes right next to our State. The whole point is we want to put 100,000 barrels a day—at least for starters—of our light sweet Bakkan crude in this pipeline.

It is not just moving Canadian oil, it is moving domestic oil as well. It is moving U.S. oil. When you hear that it is just going to move Canadian oil, that is already wrong. How about we stick to the facts? How about we make sure we foster real understanding? How about we tell people what is really going on here? It is not just Canadian oil, it is Canadian and it is U.S. oil.

The whole point is this is the kind of infrastructure that helps us achieve North American energy security. What do I mean by that? I mean by the United States working with Canada, we can produce more energy than we consume, and that is energy security. That means we don't have to depend on importing it from OPEC, that means we don't have to depend on importing it from Venezuela. When push comes to shove, we produce more oil and energy than we consume. That is a national security issue.

When you drive up to the pump today to fill up your car, take a look and check out the price at the pump. It is less than \$2. It is about half of what it was maybe a year ago, right? That equates to \$100 billion to \$125 billion in savings for American consumers. Why is that happening? Is it that OPEC decided: Hey, let's give America a Christmas present? Is it because Vladimir Putin decided: Hey, let's get some energy over to America? Is it because Venezuela said: Hey, let's drop the price at the pump in America? Why is that happening? The reason it is happening is because we are producing so much more energy in our country in places such as North Dakota and Texas and the Bakkan and in the Eagle Ford. We are producing more natural gas in places such as the Marcellus and Utica, and the shale across our country, and because we are getting more oil from Canada because we have more supply, that is bringing the price down. More supply puts downward pressure on prices.

Every consumer is benefiting at the pump. A 60-cent drop in the price of gasoline translates from a \$100 billion to \$125 billion tax cut for the people of our great country, for the small businesses, and for all the industry sectors

that rely on energy, and that is most of them, right? That is the benefit we are creating by working together with Canada to produce more energy. It truly is more energy, lower prices for our energy, making us more competitive in a global economy, it is jobs for our people, economic growth, and it is a national security issue. It truly is a national security issue.

Back to the point it is all going to be exported. First, it is not just Canadian oil. It is Canadian and U.S. oil, and I have gone through that.

On the issue that it will be exported—they say, look, the pipeline goes from Hardisty in Alberta all the way down to these ports—Port Arthur. So that must mean it is all going to be exported. No. It is going from where it was produced to where it is refined and consumed. It comes from Hardisty, down to Steele City, and from there it can go to Patoka, IL. Why? Because there are refineries there and pipeline networks where it can go into the eastern part of the United States.

It also goes to Cushing, OK—a huge pipeline network that goes all over the country, and it is based out of Cushing, OK, so it can go almost anywhere.

The idea that building a pipeline is somehow an unusual or difficult thing to do—well, let's take a look at all the pipelines we have moving oil and gas around this country. The whole point is when you bring that pipeline through, you can interface with all of these networks so you can move it all over the country.

For somebody to look at this and say: Oh, gee, look, because it goes from Hardisty down to here, it will all be exported. Come on, let's tell people what is really going on. There is the pipeline. It can go through many different routes and across the country. Don't just take my word for it because I am an advocate for the pipeline. People say: Well, he is pushing for the pipeline, and that is what he says. Fine. Let's go to what the State Department and the Department of Energy say. Let's go to the Obama administration's State Department and the Department of Energy and see what they say.

Here in January of 2014, the State Department determined in its final environmental impact statement—

[The export of the oil] appears unlikely to be economically justified for any significant durable trade given transport costs and market conditions.

That was in the final environmental impact statement, section 1.4.6.2. I will repeat that statement.

[The export of oil] appears unlikely to be economically justified for any significant durable trade given transport costs and market conditions.

So there we have the State Department and the environmental impact statement saying they are going to use the oil in the United States.

How about the Department of Energy? In its report, the Department of

Energy determined that it does not make economic sense to ship the oil to China. Furthermore, any export would need to obtain a Department of Commerce license before it is exported. I am not saying that none of it will be exported, I am saying that according to the State Department and the Department of Energy, it will be used in this country, and before it could be exported, you would have to have the Secretary of Commerce say it is OK for some of that oil to be exported. The Obama administration would have to approve exporting some of that crude before it could be exported.

Furthermore, refiners that have contracts with TransCanada, which is Valero, have publicly confirmed that the oil that will be shipped through the Keystone XL Pipeline will be used for U.S. domestic needs. The United States retains 99 percent of all crude within the country and uses 97 percent of the gasoline refined in the country. A large majority—over 90 percent—of transportation fuel refined in the United States is for use in the United States.

Look, these are global markets. I am not saying that there is none that would be exported, but my point is we are going to use this oil in the United States, and if we don't build this pipeline, then one of two things will happen—again, according to the environmental impact statement that was done by the Obama administration.

If you can't build a pipeline, then it is going to have to be railed into this country, the same way I got done telling you that we rail 700,000 barrels a day out of my State of North Dakota. We will have to rail more of the domestic crude that I mentioned out of here, continuing the congestion on the rails, and we will have 1,400 railcars a day moving that oil because you can't move it on the pipeline. All of those locomotives produce emissions, right? We will either have to have 1,400 cars a day railing it or you are not going to build the pipeline and Canada is going to build pipelines to the west coast of Canada, and then they will load it on tankers and take it to China, thereby producing more greenhouse gas emissions, and refining the oil in Chinese refineries with higher greenhouse gas emissions.

And, by the way, since we are not getting that oil, we will have to bring more in from OPEC for us, right?

Under this scenario where they build the pipeline to the west coast and send it to China, how much of it will come to us then? Then it is all exported, isn't it?

This argument that some of it might get exported, then the converse of that—or the result is to say, we don't want the pipeline because some of it might get exported. So, in essence, we blocked it from coming here, and so then it will all be exported and it all goes to China. Wow. That makes sense?

Let's see, because some of it might get exported, then let's make sure we don't have the pipeline so make sure it all gets exported, but we don't want it exported.

What am I missing here? Where is the common sense? When push comes to shove and we are not in a situation like we are right now where prices are low, when prices start going back up based on supply and demand and all of those things, or when there is conflict in the world that disrupts supplies, would we rather have control of that supply of oil from Canada or would we rather make sure it all goes to China?

When push comes to shove and we need the energy, when prices are high, or when there is volatility or conflict in the world, do we want to make sure that all of those resources are going to China and then we can go hat in hand and ask them for it, or would we rather have control of it? That is why I wanted to take a few minutes to rebut the argument that, oh, gee, it is all going to be exported rather than a more commonsense view of, well, gee, some might be exported because it is a global economy, but if it is, they have to get the Obama administration's approval to do it.

If you don't build the pipeline, you are either going to have it all come by railcar or you are not going to have any of it, and 100 percent of it will be exported because we would force all of it to go to China. Under any of those scenarios, you are still producing the energy up there, aren't you?

I will shift to the environmental argument. I will go back to this chart. There is another argument I wish to rebut for a minute. The argument is, oh, gee, all of this might be exported so we don't want the pipeline because we are trying to prevent the oil sands from being produced because of the environmental aspect of greenhouse gas.

As I just pointed out, even without the pipeline, the oil is still going to be produced. Again, this is not me saying that. Go back to the environmental impact statement. Go back to the science. Go back to the report done not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, but five times by the Department of State and their environmental impact statements—three draft statements, two final environmental impact statements—five different studies. What they say is the oil is still going to be produced so if we don't build the pipeline, our emissions are going to be higher from greenhouse gases than if we build the pipeline. Why is that? I went through some of that already. No. 1, we will have it all moved through railcars, which produce more greenhouse gases than a pipeline—1,400 railcars a day. It will be shipped to China, which will refine it in refineries that have higher emissions than ours. And we are going to have to haul it in from other places such as Venezuela. So we

have greenhouse gas emissions from the ships as well. So the reality is—and the environmental impact statements show it—that we have lower greenhouse gas emissions with the pipeline than we would without it.

As we have talked about on the floor many times, everybody is entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts. Those are the facts as laid out very clearly, as I say, in not one or two environmental impact statements but in three draft environmental impact statements and two final environmental impact statements.

The other point I wish to make on the environmental aspect is that we produce oil in California and we import oil from Venezuela that has greenhouse gas emissions that are as high or higher than oil produced in the Canadian oil sands.

Another point I wish to make is that Canada is working to reduce both the greenhouse gas emissions and the environmental footprint of their production in the oil sands. Since 1990, on a per barrel basis, in Alberta, Canada, the producers of oil from the oil sands have reduced the greenhouse gas emissions by 28 percent—almost a third. So that is a 28-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in oil sands oil from 1990 to the present on a per barrel basis. So they have reduced it by almost a third, and they are continuing to find ways through better drilling techniques, through cogeneration, and through other efforts to improve the environmental stewardship of what they are doing there. That is the way it works. Rather than blocking investment in needed infrastructure, rather than blocking investment in new technologies, we need to encourage that investment because when we encourage that investment in our country and work with Canada, we produce more energy more cost-effectively with better environmental stewardship. When we block it, we don't get that technology, we don't get the energy, and we don't get the improvements in environmental stewardship.

That is the way we should be approaching this. We should be encouraging the investment.

As I said before, not one penny of government money is expended on the pipeline. We are simply allowing a project to go forward. Private companies invested almost \$8 billion in the largest shovel-ready project we have after the project has been held up by the Federal Government for more than 6 years—held up after every single State—all six States—every single one of them has approved it. But here we are 6 years later and the Federal Government is saying to those States that even though every single one of those States on the route has approved it, even though they want it, even though all the States will realize hundreds of

millions of dollars in cash revenues and benefits not only from construction but from property taxes and other sources of revenue in building the project, and even though it won't cost the government one single penny, the Federal Government said no. Even though we have studied it for 6 years, that is not good enough. Even though in poll after poll 65 percent of the American people want it built, even though Americans want energy security here at home and in Canada, even though a bipartisan majority in the House and in this Senate support it, the President says: No, that is not good enough somehow. We would rather keep importing oil from OPEC.

That has to be music to OPEC's ears. Oh, good, the Americans aren't going to get serious and work with Canada and make sure they are energy secure. They are going to keep getting oil from OPEC.

That has to be music to China's ears. They want it. They are trying to buy these oil resources in Canada. They are not only trying to buy the oil. They are trying to buy the resources in Canada. But last I checked, we work for the American people, and the American people want energy security.

So we have an absolute obligation to make sure that as we are talking about this project, we are talking about the facts. We are not talking about our opinions. I know we are striving for clarity and an understanding of what is really going on.

When it comes to the environmental aspects and when it comes to whether the energy is going to be exported or used here, when it comes to the economic impact, when it comes to the job creation, and to all of these different issues, let's debate them. If somebody has an amendment we can add, let's debate that, too. It needs to get 60 votes. But let's make sure we are fostering understanding of what is really going on here so we talk about climate change and that type of issue that is relative to this project. Let's make sure we are clear. Let's make sure we are telling the people that this project will have no significant environmental impact, according to the U.S. State Department—the Obama administration's State Department. According to the Obama U.S. State Department—the Obama administration—according to their environmental impact statements, including three draft statements and two final statements done over more than 6 years: no significant environmental impact. Then when we talk about greenhouse gas emissions and the oil that comes from the oil sands, let's be clear that this is not just Canadian oil. It is also domestic oil from our country, from States such as North Dakota and Montana. Let's also talk about how the investment in new technologies is reducing the environmental footprint and reducing the

greenhouse gas for oil sands production. There has been a reduction of 28 percent in greenhouse gas emissions since 1990 in the oil sands because of their investment in new technologies, in better drilling techniques, as well as their efforts going forward.

I do believe we are going to have officials from Alberta and from Canada coming during the next weeks to talk about what else they are going to do to make additional improvements in terms of environmental stewardship and the efforts they are undertaking to reduce further the environmental footprint and the greenhouse gas impact of the energy they are producing.

So with that, I wish to close. This really is an opportunity to work with our good friend Canada on a project of great mutual benefit, and that is energy security for North America and energy security for our country as well as for Canada. I think this is a project Americans very much want.

Again, I urge my colleagues to come forward to engage in this debate and, at the end of the day, let's get this done for the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, this is my first speech to the Senate.

It is interesting because as a child I would read about how the Senate was a great deliberative body. I would read of the debates in which issues were discussed that changed the course of our country's history. The key issue here is that it is a deliberative body.

I was in the Senate energy committee the other day and one of the opponents of this Keystone bill said we need to be guided by science. I like that thought. We are not to be guided by our prejudice. We are not to be guided by what we want to be the case. We are to be guided by the facts, because just as when I was a kid and I would read about how this great deliberative body would decide issues that would then decide our country's future, this Keystone bill decides the future for many issues.

With that said, let me also say that I just came over from the House of Representatives and one of the nice things I had the privilege to do was to enter a Keystone bill quite similar to this one, which passed. In the course of that being introduced, debated, passed, et cetera, I heard the arguments of those who were opposed to the Keystone bill, and I have been able to think about them.

I am pleased to say I think there actually is common ground. If the American people want the Senate to work together to come up with solutions on a bipartisan basis, and if we are to be guided by science and the facts and not by our prejudice, and if what we deliberate will help determine the future of

our country and the many families in our country, I am pleased to say that we have common ground.

The opposition is concerned about climate change, increased carbon emissions, the amount of oil that might be spilled, whether this encourages the use of fossil fuels, and are the jobs being created worth being created? We can address these factually, not by prejudice but by using, actually, President Obama's own State Department information. With that kind of source—it is President Obama's State Department providing the answer to these questions. So let's go through them.

First, the President's own State Department says that building the pipeline will decrease carbon emissions, there will be less oil spilled. By the way, it will not only create jobs, but it will also save workers' lives. We are deliberating a bill here which, according to President Obama's State Department, will save lives. That is truly changing the future of somebody.

In detail, on page 34 of President Obama's State Department report, it says that the pipeline would have no significant environmental impact. It will actually reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 28 to 42 percent relative to not building the pipeline at all.

President Obama's own State Department also acknowledges that these oil sands are going to be developed whether we build the pipeline or not. If they are not piped to the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas to be processed, they will be sent to overseas markets such as China, creating Chinese jobs instead of American jobs.

I think it is also safe to say—we read about how in China people can't see the blue sky. Their environmental standards are far more lax than ours. If it goes to the gulf coast, I can tell my colleagues I just came from Louisiana yesterday and I saw blue skies.

With all of our environmental standards, this will be processed in such a way which is most environmentally friendly. If it goes to China, there will be pollutants put out in the air which the jet stream will blow over the United States. If we are to be guided by science and not by prejudice, the science would say we should build the pipeline to allow the oil sands to be processed in the United States.

I heard one person say that he would be for the pipeline if he was sure the oil would not be exported. I don't quite know how to respond to that because if we don't build the pipeline it will absolutely be exported. It will be exported to China, and then quite likely we will buy the refined products that the Chinese then produce. On the other hand, again referencing President Obama's State Department, they have said that if we pipe that oil to the gulf coast, our gulf coast refineries are uniquely equipped to process that oil in an envi-

ronmentally safe way, and so it is unlikely that it will be exported. I will add to that, according to the World Trade Organization guidelines, if we accept an import from another country, we cannot not export it should there be higher value.

But I return to what President Obama's State Department said, which is that the gulf coast refineries' unique ability to refine this in an environmentally sensitive way means that despite World Trade Organization restrictions, it is unlikely that it will be exported.

There are other benefits as well. It is clear that it will diversify our energy security. Instead of buying our oil from the Middle East or from countries like Venezuela who don't care for us—in fact, use the money we pay them in some cases to finance terrorism—it will come from a trusted neighbor who will spend that money that we pay Canada for this commodity back into the North American economy creating jobs indirectly in the United States that otherwise would not be, which leads us to the question, Are these jobs worth having? In a word, the answer is absolutely. Now, we all know that creating better jobs for American families is what should be the Congress's priority.

For 6 years we have been talking about building the Keystone XL Pipeline and we have, if you will, postponed the creation of these jobs.

Let's just look at it. Refineries in my State of Louisiana and along the gulf coast would benefit because it would be roughly 100,000 barrels a day of crude oil transported to us. In Louisiana up to 12 percent of that oil would end up in our refineries, more than \$1 billion in revenue to our economy. It would create over 40,000 construction jobs over a 1-to-2 year period.

Some will oppose this and say these jobs only last for a week or two. I was outside the energy committee hearing room and there were a couple of fellows from trade unions who stopped me. They said, we need these jobs.

I said, what about the argument of the other side that the jobs will only last 2 weeks?

Those are the nature of our jobs. If you bring a master welder in, he or she will do their job for 2 weeks and then move on to another. But for our union members to get their union benefits, they have to work a certain number of hours per quarter or per month—I forget the unit of time—but this will allow them to meet that minimum requirement in order to continue to receive their union benefits.

I can tell you the crafts unions think that these jobs are worth having. These are well-paying jobs with good benefits. They are not the service sector in which hours might have been reduced from 40 to 30 hours a week. These are great jobs and great benefits.

The American people want Washington to work together. As I mentioned earlier, I introduced and passed Keystone legislation in the House of Representatives. Keystone has become a symbol for North American energy independence. Approving this pipeline is not the final step in this independence but it is the next step. It is a good step.

The case for approving this pipeline and other energy infrastructure projects is clear. I encourage my colleagues to join in approving the Keystone XL Pipeline and putting this debate to rest because I truly believe we have common ground, if we are to be guided by the science and the facts and not by prejudice. We know from President Obama's State Department that it reduces carbon emission, it will decrease the amount of oil spilled, it has minimal effect upon the environment, it will save the lives of the workers while strengthening our national security and enhancing our energy independence and creating 40,000 American jobs. That is why more than 60 percent of Americans support this bill. It is a jobs bill, a national security bill, and it is a bill which should be passed.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield back my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, might I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, he indicated this was his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate. If that is so, I urge him to make additional speeches. I don't think I ever heard a more concise summary with regard to the pipeline issue than he just gave. We can certainly see why the people of Louisiana sent him here. It was perfect, it was cogent, and it was short. It was interesting. He had a bill very similar to this and Senator CASSIDY passed it in the House and he is now in the Senate. We hope that with enough debate we can have truly a bipartisan effort with comity. This is a new beginning. We are so happy to have the Senator here. I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. CASSIDY. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 168 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are getting close to a time when we are

going to be able to see a reality here that we have been talking about—the Keystone Pipeline—for a long period of time now. When I go back to Oklahoma, people say: If you have something that no one is against who does not have a particular institutional reason to be against it—everyone is for it. When you see the jobs—no single thing we have dealt with in the last 3 or 4 years that I can recall has talked about 42,000 new jobs that otherwise are not going to be there, good-paying jobs.

I admit that I am biased a little bit because being from Oklahoma—Cushing, OK, is right in the center of the State. It is the hub of all of the pipelines going through America. But I see that there is really no logical reason—I heard someone on the floor just a few minutes ago saying: All those dirty oil sands up in Alberta are going to be—there is a great environmental risk from that. Yet they know full well that if for some reason the people who are opposed to fossil fuel altogether—such as President Obama—are successful, they are still going to produce that stuff up there.

China is chomping at the bit right now because China has a great need for the very ingredients in the pipeline that we do here in this country. They already have talked about transportation to the western part of Canada to get it to China. So it is going to happen. In fact, you could argue, if you are concerned about some of the environmental problems, if they do exist, they would be greater if China did it than if we did it. For example, China does not have any emission controls on all of the stuff that we are talking about the way we do in this country.

I think there are some things that are factual. I think everyone is aware of it. One is that President Obama has had a constant war on fossil fuels since the time before he was even President of the United States. When we look at what he has done and how he has committed—and we have heard all of those quotes from when he was talking to the far-left environmental groups, the Tom Steyers and others like him who have put in the money to fight fossil fuels. He is one who is solidly opposed and doing everything in his power to keep us from finishing the pipeline.

Having said that—I will put the chart up on what happened just a year ago in my State of Oklahoma. The only visit the President has made to my State of Oklahoma was about a year ago—2 years ago. He came in and was—in the background there, that is a picture of him in Cushing, OK, and those are the barrels—this is what is taking place right now in Cushing.

He was talking about—his quote there, as you can read:

I am directing my administration to make this project a priority—

He was talking about the Keystone Pipeline—

to go ahead and to get it done.

Well, he made that statement and he came down to hold that meeting in Cushing, OK, to try to make them believe he was actually for a pipeline. He went on to say that he was going to make sure that he was not going to do anything to keep the pipeline from going on further south.

Now, let's get the picture here. You have Cushing, OK, which is right in the middle of the United States, and the pipeline will continue to go south to the Texas coast. Well, he said he was not going to do anything to stop that. There is a good reason for this; that is, he cannot. He does not have any jurisdiction. That did not cross an international boundary. The borders—the international border that it has crossed is in Canada. So that is the area where he is still to this day doing all he can to keep that from being a reality. The southern leg could be finished and he cannot do anything about that.

I mentioned Tom Steyer. I want to put up that chart so people know—in case they have not been introduced. He is probably a very fine person. He has a strong commitment to try to stop fossil fuels. He is the one who made the statement back before the November elections that he was going to raise \$100 million—put in \$50 million of his own money and raise \$50 million in addition to that—and put it in eight campaigns—I think we know probably which campaigns they were—to see whether he could resurrect the issue of global warming and whether he could stop the pipeline.

Well, all that happened back then. I think it is important that people understand that he was not able to—he was willing to put his millions of dollars in, but he could not raise the 50. So instead of that, he put \$70 million of his money in the race. This is not me talking; this is all—he is very proud of it. Frankly, I appreciate the fact that he is not trying to hide what he is doing. I know he has some political interests. I know he has a commitment to try to stop the pipeline. I am not sure what that is based on other than just the people to whom he caters.

But nonetheless he has a great deal of influence with this administration. It was reported a couple of weeks ago that he had visited the Obama White House 14 times—that is as of that time—which led a member of the watchdog group Public Citizen to say, "Tom Steyer has not just got the ear of the President, but he clearly has the President's attention." Again, that is this watchdog committee making that statement.

So we are looking at it now. We know that the White House meetings were often with President Obama's counselor and chief environmental advisor, John Podesta. We remember John Podesta from the Clinton administration. He has been a lobbyist now for quite

some time. He is very actively involved in this issue. Reports have also surfaced that Steyer and Podesta met with billionaire liberal activist George Soros just days after Steyer made his commitment.

Anyway, that is behind us now. That affected the election, there is no question about that; however, they still lost. If I am guessing right on the races he was involved in, there is not one of those who won. Republicans took over 10 seats. That was quite a good year. So maybe he wasted several million dollars. But when we looked at it and if you think about what he has done to fossil fuels, that has been his war.

Twice today already I have heard people on the floor saying: Well, look at the success the oil industry has had under the Obama administration. Well, I have to suggest that it has been in spite of the Obama administration. The proof is very easy. The revolution that is going on right now within the oil industry is one that has been very successful. On private land and on State land, the amount of production since Obama has been in office has actually increased by 61 percent. That is incredible.

They say: Well, you must be really pro oil and gas because of that.

In reality, all of that, 100 percent of that 61-percent increase has been on State and private land. On public land, the Federal land that he has control over, there has not been an increase of 61 percent or even 6 percent. As a matter of fact, there has been a reduction of 6 percent.

So that is going on and it is all a part of this war that is taking place right now. I am very anxious to see how these votes turn out. I know that people, when they realize the number of jobs that are there, I get very excited about it, and I can't help but think we are going to be successful.

I wish to mention though—I wasn't going to—a person whom I consider to be a very good friend is on the floor, and we have philosophically disagreed with each other about as much as any two people can; that is, the Senator from Vermont.

He is sincere. He believes what he says. Yet some of the things he says I believe are wrong, but he believes them. I don't want to question whether he is telling what he believes is the truth—and others too.

Another good friend of mine is the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER. Frankly, I will miss her in the Senate. I understand she has announced her retirement.

But nonetheless, on the issue they are talking about on global warming, I listen and I think: Where do they come up with this stuff?

Because we know for a fact that many of the things that they talk about are not true. We keep hearing that 97 percent of the scientists are

saying they believe CO₂ is the cause of the catastrophic climate change, the world is coming to an end, and we are all going to die.

This goes back to about 2002 when this became an issue. I will remember this for a long time because that was when the first bills were introduced. At that time everybody thought global warming was true. They were all going to try to do what they could to stop it.

Frankly, at the very first I thought it must be true—that is what everybody said—until they did a study at the Wharton School. Some of their scientists, along with MIT, Charles Rivers and Associates, and others said what the cost would be. Because everybody was talking about the world coming to an end and they asked: But what is cost going to be?

They all agreed on a range, and that range has not been refuted by anyone. The range is between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year. I immediately went back to see. Whenever I hear a big number, I go back to Oklahoma and I count the number of people, families who file a Federal income tax return and then I do my math.

That would cost the average person and family in Oklahoma \$3,000. So we think: All right. Are we sure we are going to get something for the \$3,000?

I will share with you—because a lot of people have forgotten this—that Lisa Jackson was the first Administrator of the EPA who was appointed by President Obama. I asked her on the record, live on TV, in our committee, I said: Now let's assume we passed some of this legislation that puts in cap and trade or do it even by regulation. Is this going to stop CO₂ emissions or lower CO₂ emissions worldwide?

She said: No.

These are her words, not mine. She said: The reason is the problem isn't here in the United States, the problem is in China, it is in India, it is in Mexico, and it is in other places.

So in the event they were able to do that, then this would not lower it. In fact, we could use the same argument and say if we passed a cap and trade and did something—as they are talking about doing and we have heard on the floor today—then it would have the effect of not reducing but increasing CO₂ emissions, and this is why.

As we chase our manufacturing base overseas where they have to somehow find someplace where they can generate electricity, it will be in countries such as China and India where they don't have any of the restrictions in emissions.

So even if someone is a believer that the world is coming to an end, that global warming is going to kill everybody and it is all due to man-made gas, if they truly believe that still, even in spite of that, it is not going to reduce worldwide emissions. I guess that is what they want to do, so we hear about the consensus.

I remember at that time I made a speech on this floor questioning the science. I said: I assume there are scientists out there who are not a part of the IPCC—that is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—and that those scientists know better. They know what the reality is.

I started getting phone calls. I got phone calls from scientists. On this chart are recognized scientists. There are 58.

Richard Lindzen, I see his picture. He is a scientist at MIT. I think we could argue he would be in contention with the very best informed scientists.

Richard Lindzen said:

Controlling Carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.

Is that real, these people, or what? I remember how upset he was with Al Gore. Richard Lindzen made the statement again—this is him, not me, Richard Lindzen of MIT:

To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough. To do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse.

Now we have so many things that have happened. Just the other day—it wasn't long ago, I don't have the exact date—one of the universities did a survey of all the weathercasters, and they came back that 63 percent of weathercasters believe any global warming that is occurring is the result of natural variation and not human activities.

To say "97 percent of scientists" is just not true, but if you want to believe it badly enough you will. So we have a lot of information.

Nature journal, which is a well-respected journal, in their 2013 paper said that "there is considerable uncertainty as to whether [increases in extreme climate variability] is occurring.

Munich Reinsurance Company said: "Global weather related disaster losses have declined by 25% as a proportion of GDP."

We have all these statements.

The IPCC, they are the ones that are always being quoted, and it is a branch of the United Nations. That is where all this started and certainly it would enure to their benefit to have people believe that we have to look at some international organization such as the United Nations to protect us from all these droughts and all these things that they say are going to happen.

We had another little thing happen recently. I only mention this because nobody has yet on the floor. I think everyone used to believe that everyone was already aware of it, but remember Climategate?

Climategate was when they were having one of the big United Nations parties. It was going to be in Copenhagen. I remember a lot of our people went over there to tell the 191 countries that were participating that the United States was going to pass cap and trade,

they were going to do all of these things.

I went over at the very end of it, made my little talk, and assured them that in spite of the fact that President Obama had been there, Secretary Clinton at the time had been there and now-Secretary Kerry and all the rest of them—to say we are not going to be doing it in the United States of America. If anybody believes what they said, that we are going to pass cap and trade, we are not going to do it. They had tried it already. There were 35 Members—and at that time it was a much more liberal Senate than we have today—only 35 would actually vote for something like that.

Incidentally, it was at that time when Climategate came up. Climategate was when they analyzed some of the things IPCC had said, and they had all these quotes and emails that totally debunked the credibility of IPCC. Still today they are talking about it.

To give us an idea, Christopher Booker, with the UK Telegraph, said: “Worst scientific scandal of our generation.”

That scandal he is talking about is to try to have them make people believe climate change is going to destroy the world.

Clive Crook of the Financial Times said:

The closed mindedness of these supposed men of science . . . is surprising, even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

Again we are talking about Climategate. Nobody talks about it any more, but still this is a fact.

A prominent physicist from the IPCC, who is no longer there, said: “Climategate was a fraud on a scale I’ve never seen,” talking about how they are rigging the information to try to cook the science.

So we have all of these—this is Newsweek. It said: “Once celebrated climate researchers feeling like the used car salesman.”

“Some of the IPCC’s most quoted data and recommendations were taken straight out of unchecked activist brochures. . . .”

So these are the things that are going on, and I hope the people, as we develop this right now—we should be concentrating on the vote that is going to be coming up having to do with the pipeline. But as the committee of jurisdiction is looking at this, I can assure you we are going to be having hearings.

One hearing we are going to have is to get some of the best scientists around to evaluate and to see what the truth is on the global warming issue.

But in the meantime let’s go back to the pipeline. I can’t think of any argument against it that is overwhelming, and the mere fact that people say they don’t like the Alberta sands or the production, it doesn’t mean we in the

United States of America are going to stop them from doing it because they will just do it and ship it to China.

So we have a huge issue we are concerned with. I can’t think of anything I have seen in the past 4 or 5 years that is going to be producing more jobs in America than this issue.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES RULE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the issue of EPA regulation of waters of the United States rule. I see it as one of the biggest power grabs by an agency in a long time—particularly the EPA.

Before I speak on that issue, I wish to bring attention to some headlines that appeared both in Iowa and nationally on this issue. I will quote the Wall Street Journal: “Watch Out For That Puddle, Soon It Could Be Federally Regulated.”

The next quote is from an Iowa Farm Bureau spokesman: “Water rule is really about control of land.”

The next quote is from a Farm Bureau spokesman: “Water rule intrudes on property rights, hurts conservation.”

Farm Bureau spokesman said: “EPA proposal would regulate all water wherever it flows.”

Farm Bureau spokesman: “Water rule threatens U.S. agriculture.”

The last quote is also from the a Farm Bureau spokesman: “Rule is threat to conservation momentum . . . a flood of red tape.”

Last spring the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers published a proposed rule to define “waters of the United States.” This is part of a long history of attempts to determine the scope of the Federal Government’s jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. The latest proposal has generated no shortage of rhetoric from those concerned about the rule as well as those defending the rule. However, you would be hard pressed to call it a true debate.

Rather than making a serious attempt to address the numerous legiti-

mate concerns with the rule, the Environmental Protection Agency and their allies in the professional advocacy community have attempted to push a narrative that tries to portray critics of the rule as misinformed, nutty or in favor of water pollution.

They, the advocacy community, claim the rule simply clarifies the jurisdiction of Federal agencies, and they also claim it does not expand that jurisdiction in any way. The EPA also promises that it will not interfere with the farmer’s routine use of their own land.

Given its history of ignorance and indifference toward the needs of rural America, it is no wonder EPA’s assurances are met with skepticism by many in America, but it is particularly met with skepticism by America’s farmers.

The EPA will have another chance to consider the concerns of farmers and many other Americans as it reviews the formal comments it collected before issuing the final rule. Still, given the fact that EPA officials—starting with Administrator McCarthy—went out of their way to be dismissive of legitimate criticisms even while the comment period was still open, I am not going to hold my breath hoping for a change of heart on the part of the EPA.

First, it is important to understand that this debate is not about whether we should have clean water protections but which level of government is in the best position under our laws, and the intent of those laws, to manage which bodies of water.

Despite what some interest groups would have you believe, no one is arguing that farmers or anybody else should be allowed to dump pollutants in the waterway. There is also no question that there is a very important role for the Federal Clean Water Act to protect interstate bodies of water.

However, the Clean Water Act itself clearly states:

It is the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution, to plan the development and use (including restoration, preservation, and enhancement) of land and water resources, and to consult with the Administrator in the exercise of his authority under this chapter.

That is in the law right now, and it has been there a long time. The complicated Federal clean water permitting process is appropriate if a factory is looking to discharge waste into a river, but does it make sense to require a farmer to apply for a Federal permit to build a fence on his own land?

There is clearly a limit to where Federal regulation is appropriate, where Federal regulation is effective, and where Federal regulation is legal. In fact, expanding the cumbersome Federal permitting process to cover lands it was not designed for would actually

be counterproductive in my State of Iowa and probably a lot of other States as well.

Forcing farmers to file for a Federal permit would add significant redtape for Iowa farmers as they make routine decisions about how best to use their land. Ironically, that could delay or deter farmers from undertaking projects to improve water quality, and that is why I quoted some members of the Farm Bureau earlier.

There was one story that very specifically said farmers in Iowa were willing to spend a lot of their own money to do some conservation practices that everybody would be very happy with, but they are not going to spend their own money because they cannot even get an answer from the Corps and the EPA on whether they even need a permit. They are not going to pursue their conservation practices and invest all of their money if they could be violating a law, so you can see why they are very upset. Under the existing law, the EPA cannot even tell a farmer whether they need a permit, and they want to assume a lot more responsibility. It is kind of concerning considering that they cannot do their job right now.

Having to constantly apply for Federal permits just to farm their land would be unnecessarily burdensome to farmers, a waste of Federal resources, and an intrusion on State and local land use regulations. What about the EPA's assertion that its proposed rule simply clarifies its existing jurisdiction and restores it to what it used to be? The fact is that in the past, the EPA has attempted to claim nearly unlimited jurisdiction well beyond what the law says and well beyond even an expansive reading of the Federal Government's constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce. However, those attempts were repeatedly struck down by our U.S. Supreme Court.

The Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 made very clear that the Federal Government does not have unlimited authority over all bodies of water but left the precise division between State and Federal or local jurisdictions somewhat unclear.

In response, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA issued guidance in December 2008 in an attempt to comply with the Supreme Court's rulings but did not engage in any formal rulemaking. Significantly, legislation was routinely proposed in Congress by those who wanted to push aside the Supreme Court rulings and give the EPA unlimited jurisdiction, but it never garnered enough support.

While legislation would not have resolved the constitutional limitations to the EPA's authority, it is important to know Congress passed on several opportunities to amend the Clean Water Act to expand Federal jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, in April 2011, the Obama administration proposed to replace the existing guidance with revised guidance that provided a very expansive reading of Federal authority, leaving very little land under State and local control.

This unilateral reassertion of expansive authority—in defiance of the other two branches of government—was made even more egregious by being proposed through guidance outside of the formal rulemaking process. Fortunately, the outcry from the Republican Congress against this power grab caused the administration to scrap guidance and pursue a formal rule with public comment.

I do believe we need clarity about what is and is not covered by the Clean Water Act, and particularly its permitting process, and that a formal rule with public comments is the best route.

However, the proposed rule that was formally published in April of 2014 once again asserted an extremely expansive view of Federal authority. This would increase the Federal Government's jurisdiction to regulate waters that had previously been the sole jurisdiction of States and local governments. Moreover, rather than clarifying points of uncertainty remaining from original guidance, court decisions, and precedents, the proposed rule would create a whole new definition of waters of the United States that opens new areas of uncertainty and confusion.

Rather than fixing the problem, this rule would make it much worse. It would lead to another round of court cases and overwhelm the Federal agencies with requests for jurisdictional determinations, diverting scarce Federal resources away from enforcement in more critical areas.

The EPA and the Corps should withdraw the proposed rule and work collaboratively with the States and other stakeholders to craft a sensible rule that will ensure clean water and provide much needed clarity about the scope of the Federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

TRIBUTE TO TRISTRAM COFFIN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to publicly thank U.S. attorney Tristram Coffin for his service to Vermont and our country. I have known Tris for decades, and I am proud that Vermont has been served by someone as thoughtful and fair as Tris. I join my fellow Vermonters in thanking him for his service to our State.

Tris earned his undergraduate degree from Wesleyan University and his law degree from Columbia University. He worked for me as a staff attorney on the Senate Judiciary Committee from 1991 to 1994 before becoming an assistant U.S. attorney in Vermont's civil division from 1994 to 1998 and in their

criminal division from 1996 to 2006. He then worked in private practice in Burlington with the firm of Paul Frank & Collins, P.C. In 2009 I recommended Tris for the vacant U.S. attorney position, and he was unanimously confirmed by the Senate in August 2009 to be Vermont's 36th U.S. attorney.

Throughout his time as U.S. attorney, Tris has demonstrated thoughtful leadership in partnering with State and local law enforcement agencies and Vermont communities on a wide range of issues, including efforts to confront the crisis of heroin and opioid addiction. In September 2010 he convened a timely and constructive symposium in the State house in Montpelier to discuss the problem of opiate drug abuse. Impressed by his work, last year I invited Tris to deliver testimony at a Judiciary Committee field hearing in Rutland examining community solutions to the opioid crisis. At that hearing, I was moved by the dedication and passion Tris has brought to developing partnerships with Vermont schools to raise awareness and focus on prevention.

Vermont is a safer and better place because of dedicated public servants like Tris. I commend Tris for his years of service to the Green Mountain State and wish him the best in his future endeavors. He is a friend I treasure.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE PATRICK R. DONAHOE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the 73rd Postmaster General of the United States, Patrick "Pat" R. Donahoe, upon his retirement, for his leadership, vision and commitment to the U.S. Postal Service, and for his service to our Nation. During his 39-year career, Pat ascended the ranks of the Postal Service and went on to help lead the 239-year-old agency during one of its most challenging periods.

Pat's career with the agency began in 1975, when he started as trainee on a mail-sorting machine in his native Pittsburgh. In 1976 he was hired as a clerk at the same location, and from there he moved up the ranks and went on to hold several leadership positions. Over the years, he has served as Vice President of Allegheny Operations, Senior Vice President of Human Resources, Senior Vice President of Operations, Chief Operating Officer, and Deputy Postmaster General.

In his role as Chief Operating Officer, he helped the Postal Service navigate back-to-back tragedies and challenges to mail operations following the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the use of the mail to transmit anthrax. He also played a key role in the recovery efforts following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005.

Before he worked his way up the Postal Service's ranks, Pat graduated

from the University of Pittsburgh with a bachelor of science in economics. During his time with the Postal Service, he earned his master of science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management as a Sloan fellow.

In October 2010, Pat was appointed by his colleagues on the Postal Service Board of Governors to be the Nation's 73rd Postmaster General, PMG. At the time, the outlook for the Postal Service was bleak and its future uncertain. It was hemorrhaging billions of dollars and saw its workforce numbers slashed as it grappled with the rapid transition to electronic communication and the fallout from the great recession in 2009. It was teetering on the edge of collapse, and no one knew how long the Postal Service could hold on. But Pat Donahoe accepted the challenge.

During his 4-year tenure as Postmaster General, Pat proved himself to be a dedicated public servant, a strong leader, and an innovative chief executive with the willingness to make tough calls and hard decisions. He did what was necessary to help the Postal Service keep its lights on and compete in the age of the Internet. He did a remarkable job using limited resources to keep the Postal Service alive during the second worst financial crisis in its history. With the help of a strong team at Postal Service headquarters and in postal facilities across the country, he sought to keep prices competitive, reduced costs, rightsized the enterprise, and explored a number of innovative and successful business endeavors. His efforts have helped guide the centuries-old agency through a remarkable transition that has better prepared it to compete and remain a linchpin of our economy in the digital age. In fact, his work and his vision have put the Postal Service in a position where, with the right tools and authorities from Congress, it can remain competitive and viable for generations to come.

Pat Donahoe had a vision for what the Postal Service could become and never stopped working to build on its potential. During his tenure, the Postmaster General helped bring the Postal Service to a place where it could better meet the demands of the 21st-century customers it serves. He reimaged tried-and-true services to make them more user-friendly and more valuable, like flat-rate shipping and priority mail. He created more opportunities to innovate and grow using the Postal Service's unique distribution network by adding services like Sunday package delivery and by exploring innovative partnerships with companies such as Amazon, FedEx, and UPS.

As someone who has watched the Postal Service both soar and struggle, Pat provided guidance and leadership during tremendously challenging times. Despite the significant financial and legislative restraints that face the

Postal Service today, the Postmaster General kept the Postal Service on a course that would enable it to deliver on the high expectations set by the American public.

The PMG has also been a strong voice for the agency and an important partner to Congress during our efforts to pass comprehensive postal reform in the 112th and 113th Congress. He has worked tirelessly on behalf of the Postal Service's customers, employees, stakeholders, and the 7 to 8 million people whose jobs depend on a healthy and robust Postal Service.

As I worked with my former partner on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Dr. Tom Coburn from Oklahoma, in developing comprehensive postal reform legislation, Pat and his staff were indispensable. We could always rely on the PMG and his team to come with little notice to a meeting in the Capitol or to join a late-night or weekend conference call.

As he would probably admit, Pat also took plenty of abuse from some of my colleagues here in Congress, from the press, and from the public. He knew that some of the initiatives he put into place during his tenure as Postmaster General would be unpopular but stuck to his guns because he thought it was the right thing to do. Even in recent days, he has continued to press for what he knows is right and what he knows will sustain the Postal Service in the years to come.

Pat Donahoe has graciously shared decades of his life with the Postal Service and has served the American people well. I sincerely thank him for his dedication, and I deeply appreciate his tireless efforts to help the Postal Service and our country. While Pat is retiring from the Postal Service, his legacy will carry on, and the changes he made will continue to serve the Postal Service and its customers. I wish Pat, his wife Janet, their two sons, and their granddaughters Charlotte and Lucy all the best in the years to come. As we say in the Navy when people complete an especially difficult assignment and sail off into the sunrise, "Fair winds and following seas."

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL STEPHANIE RILEY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the exceptional service and the extraordinary life of Lt. Col. Stephanie Riley of Concord, NH.

Born and raised in Henniker, NH, Stephanie graduated from Henniker High School in 1984. An excellent student, Stephanie attended St. Paul's advance studies program the summer before her senior year and was the valedictorian of her high school class. In

1988, she graduated cum laude from Boston College's School of Nursing and in 1989 was commissioned into the U.S. Air Force, where she completed a 4-month nursing internship at Travis Air Force Base in California. Following her internship, she was stationed at the Barksdale Air Force Base in Louisiana for the remainder of her 3-year tour.

In 1992, Colonel Riley entered the Inactive Ready Reserve and became a civilian travel nurse. Showing both her love for the military and her home State, she returned to New Hampshire in 2000 and joined the U.S. Air Force Reserves in Westover, MA, and then the NH Air National Guard in 2003. She subsequently volunteered for a tour abroad and deployed to Qatar in support of both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. She held appointments in the Medical Group as officer in charge of staff development, assistant chief nurse, and the chief of education and training. Colonel Riley was employed by the New Hampshire Army National Guard as a case manager and was active on State and national committees. She became a voice for National Guard members and New Hampshire veterans and was a key member of New Hampshire's State Veteran's Advisory Committee, the Military Officers Association of America, and the national and State chapters of the National Guard Association. She served in key leadership positions on the New Hampshire Legislative Commission on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD and Traumatic Brain Injury, TBI.

In October 2013, Steph was diagnosed with early stage breast cancer, and in what may have been her most heroic effort, she channeled her energy into a personal and sustained effort to promote health screenings and cancer awareness. She posted openly on social media and spoke courageously about her decision to undergo a preemptive double mastectomy. She sparked a team, "Steph Strong," that helped raise several thousand dollars for Concord Hospital. Her important message for all was to take preventative health screening seriously.

From her extensive military service, to her work as a civilian nurse, Stephanie devoted her life to serving others—a commitment that endured even while battling her own illness. She was taken from us far too soon but her legacy of compassion and her inspiring dedication to caring for her fellow citizens will live on through all those whose lives she touched.

Steph leaves behind the love of her life, her husband Shawn Riley, a deputy fire chief with the Laconia Fire Department, and their son Shane, age 13, and daughter Sammie Riley, age 9. We are all deeply saddened by the loss of our friend Lt. Col. Stephanie Riley, an extraordinary woman and proud New Hampshire daughter who served our

State and Nation with honor, courage, and dedication. She represented the very best of our State, and I ask my colleagues to join me in sending Shawn and his family our deepest condolences and our gratitude for Steph's life and for her work.●

CONGRATULATING DICK GAMMICK

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Washoe County district attorney Dick Gammick, of Reno, on his retirement. After decades of service to the people of Washoe County, District Attorney Gammick retired from public service on January 3, 2015. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate him, not only as a colleague, but also as a friend, on his retirement after his years of hard work and dedication to the Silver State.

District Attorney Gammick stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted their life to the betterment of their community. A devoted husband and proud father, District Attorney Gammick's career in public service began in 1973 when he became a Reno Police Officer while attending the University of Nevada, Reno. After earning a degree in business administration, he went on to graduate from the McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento, CA, in 1982. District Attorney Gammick served as chief deputy district attorney for Washoe County for 10 years before serving as deputy Reno city attorney. Aside from dedicating his career to Washoe County, he has devoted much of his time and efforts to the betterment of his community through his roles as a board member of the Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows, a member of the Prospector's Club, and former president of the Reno Rotary Club.

In 1994, he was elected Washoe County District Attorney, a post he served in for 20 years. District Attorney Gammick's accomplishments, such as the opening of a sexual assault center for women and children, as well as the implementation of preventive programs to keep young people out of prison, have made Washoe County a stronger and safer community. A dedicated prosecutor and advocate of justice, District Attorney Gammick was recognized by his peers as the recipient of the 2013 William J. Raggio Award, as he has committed his career to the administration of justice throughout Washoe County.

His service to the Reno community extends far beyond the many positions he has held in the Silver State over the years. District Attorney Gammick also served his country and is a decorated veteran from his time serving as a captain in the U.S. Army and a major in the Nevada Army National Guard. I extend my deepest gratitude to District Attorney Gammick for his courageous contributions to the United States of

America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve America, but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

I am grateful for his dedication and commitment to the people of Washoe County and to the State of Nevada. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating District Attorney Gammick on his retirement, and I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Washoe County an even better place. I offer my best wishes to Dick and his wife Norma for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DOUG GILLESPIE

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I congratulate Clark County Sheriff Doug Gillespie of Las Vegas on his retirement. After more than three decades of service to the people of Clark County, Sheriff Gillespie retired from public service on January 5, 2015. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate him on his retirement after his years of hard work and dedication to the people of Southern Nevada.

Responsible for the safety of one of the world's top tourist attractions, Sheriff Gillespie stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted most of his life to serving his community. Born in Pennsylvania and raised in New York, Sheriff Gillespie's career in public service began in 1980 when he joined the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department as a patrol officer. Prior to serving as sheriff, he served in both SWAT and the K-9 unit, eventually working his way to undersheriff in 2003.

In 2006, he was elected Clark County sheriff, where he served for 8 years. Sheriff Gillespie's accomplishments, such as improving the Safe Strip Initiative to ensure tourist safety, civilianizing the LVMPD crime lab to ensure proper investigations, and establishing the Fusion Center to streamline and share information with different agencies, have made Clark County a stronger and safer community. I am proud to represent in the U.S. Senate. A dedicated police officer and public servant, Sheriff Gillespie was recognized by the National Sheriffs' Association as the 2014 Sheriff of the Year.

I am grateful for Sheriff Gillespie's commitment and dedication to the people of Southern Nevada. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Sheriff Gillespie on his retirement after 34 years, and I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done for Clark County. I offer my best wishes to Doug and his wife Louise, for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:54 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 203. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 203. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Finance and referred as indicated:

S. 32. A bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COATS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 150. A bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 151. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process to determine whether individuals claiming certain service in the Philippines during World War II are eligible for certain benefits despite not being on the Missouri List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 152. A bill to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian land in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 153. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 154. A bill to amend the Act of July 31, 1947, to provide for the termination of certain mineral materials contracts; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 155. A bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 156. A bill to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000 and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 157. A bill to repeal the medical device tax and the employer and individual responsibility requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 158. A bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 159. A bill to improve the operation of the Department of Homeland Security's Unmanned Aircraft System Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 160. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REID, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 161. A bill to ensure high-income earners pay a fair share of Federal taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation

of income of controlled foreign corporations attributable to imported property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 163. A bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 164. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 165. A bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KIRK, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 166. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BURR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 167. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 168. A bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow any deduction for punitive damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 171. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel in connection with

certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 172. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements relating to the immunization of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 173. A bill to modify the definition of "antique firearm"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 174. A bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 175. A bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 176. A bill to advance integrated water management and development through innovation, resiliency, conservation, and efficiency in the 21st century, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 177. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a breach of security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CASEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 178. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 179. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. ENZI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 26. A resolution commending Pope Francis for his leadership in helping to secure the release of Alan Gross and for working with the Governments of the United States and Cuba to achieve a more positive relationship; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 136

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 136, a bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 143

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes.

S. 145

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 145, a bill to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown.

S. 146

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 146, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at

the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 150. A bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to announce today that the biennial budget proposal introduced by Senators ISAKSON and SHAHEEN has been dropped. There are 21 cosponsors, 15 Republicans, 6 Democrats, and 1 Independent, and the number is growing as we speak.

Senator SHAHEEN and I started this initiative 2 years ago and it received 68 votes and a test vote on the budget in 2013. We believe it will receive the necessary votes to become the law of the land in the United States of America.

You might ask why a biennial budget or you might ask yourself why an \$18 trillion debt and why hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit. We don't have the oversight necessary with the spending that we do now to keep us from wasting money. It is time we ran our country like we run our home. It is time we held our agencies accountable. It is time our appropriations weren't just idle promises but our oversight was the rule of law in the United States Senate.

Twenty States out of fifty in the United States have biennial budgets. Countries around the world have biennial budgets. This Congress 3 years ago did a biennial budget for the Veterans' Administration just to ensure we wouldn't have a break in funding if the government shut down. Predictability of funding of government is critical, but the oversight of that funding is more critical.

Picture this. You get elected in an even-numbered year, 2014. Your first order of business in 2015 is to pass a 2-

year appropriations act and a 2-year budget. But then in the even-numbered year that comes up when you are running for reelection, your job is not spending, your job is oversight. Wouldn't it be nice, instead of going home and promising you are bringing home the bacon, instead you are bringing home the savings to see to it that taxpayers' money is better spent?

The biennial budget is an idea whose time has come. It is the only way we are going to measurably and sustainably reduce the deficits and reduce the debt in the United States of America and hold our spending more accountable.

Just last night on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clay bill was passed on suicide prevention, a new program in the VA, and the funding mechanism was existing funds and fungibility. We already know there is existing money in the appropriations to our agencies to pay for new ideas if we charge them to go find them. Some of the measures we have been funding for 40 or 50 years probably don't need to be done anymore and some of the things we are not doing probably need to be done. But the way to do it is not to spend more money and throw more money at the problem, but the way to do it is to do it the way the American taxpayers do it back home—sit around the kitchen table, set their priorities, make their funding predictable, and from time to time go back and look at where they are spending money and see if they can't improve it. This is an idea that will make America great.

Senator SHAHEEN is a former Governor of the State of New Hampshire. She had a biennial budget process in her State, and I wish to yield to her to describe her cosponsorship of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the Presiding Officer and I thank my colleague Senator ISAKSON, and I am pleased to join him on the floor today as we reintroduce this bipartisan legislation, the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act. I want to start by recognizing the good work of Senator ISAKSON because he started working on this issue when he came to the Senate in 2005, and he has introduced this legislation in every Congress since then. I have been pleased to be able to join him in the last two Congresses.

I think we have an opportunity in this Congress to pass this common-sense bipartisan reform. As Senator ISAKSON pointed out, there is no question that the budget process in Washington is broken. Since 1980 there have been only two budgets that have been finished on time, according to the process. In that timeframe Congress has resorted to more than 150 short-term funding bills or continuing resolutions, and we all remember what it was like when the government shut down in Oc-

tober of 2013. It cost the economy \$24 billion. It hurt small business. It hurt people across this country. That is no way to govern.

While we have made significant progress to reduce deficits in recent years, we need a new way to do business in Washington. Biennial budgeting won't fix everything, but as Senator ISAKSON said, it is an important reform that will allow us to work across the aisle not only to make more sense of the budget process but to be better stewards of taxpayer dollars.

We know that biennial budgeting works. I can attest to that personally, coming from the State of New Hampshire where we have a biennial budget. I served three terms as Governor. We were able in each of those bienniums to pass a budget that was balanced, that allowed us to get the budget done in the first year of the election cycle and in the second year to be able to have oversight. It works in New Hampshire, it works in 20 States around the country, and it can work in Washington.

Biennial budgeting offers a better process that encourages us to work together to pass budgets on time and to use taxpayer dollars more efficiently. As Senator ISAKSON says, in the first year congressional agencies would put together a 2-year budget. In the second year Congress would have time to conduct oversight to give agencies the ability to focus on achieving their missions.

As we all know, there are regular reports from the Government Accountability Office, GAO, that identify areas of waste, fraud, and duplicative programs within government.

For example, they have identified ways to reform the farm programs, to cut down on inefficiencies in defense, to reduce fraud in health programs, but the current budget process doesn't provide an effective mechanism to regularly review GAO's recommendations.

Under my annual budgeting, we would be able to take a close look at those recommendations to implement savings in the second year which will allow us to figure out how we can more effectively provide programs to the American people and eliminate those that don't work and support those that do.

As we said, in 2013 we had a very strong vote with 68 Senators voting to endorse the concept of biannual budgeting. It was a very strong bipartisan vote. A similar biannual budget bill passed the House last year with a bipartisan bill vote. It is clear the momentum is growing for this concept because people understand we have to do something to reform our budget process.

The bill we are introducing today has 22 bipartisan cosponsors. I know we are both working to get more bipartisan sponsors on the bill, and we think we have a great shot, with support from

this body, to pass biannual budgeting. We think there is support in the House to do that, and I look forward to working with Senator ISAKSON and my colleagues in the Senate to get this done.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator for her support, and I urge the other Members of the Senate to join us in this reform effort for the spending of the taxpayer's dollars.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 168. A bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. ROBERTS. I rise today to talk about a problem that affects virtually every American, and that would be government regulations; to be more accurate, government overregulation.

Let me point out something. In 2014, the administration issued 3,541 rules in 1 year. That cost \$181 billion. The first week of this new year brought us 35 new rules which added another 1,326 pages to the Federal Register. I would urge people back home in the business community or any other endeavor in which they are bothered by regulations to read the Federal Register as opposed to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD deals with natural gas. The Federal Register deals with facts and regulations.

Yet just last night we learned that President Obama has threatened to veto a significant regulatory reform proposal now being considered by the House of Representatives. It is interesting to me that the President is now threatening to veto his own ideas. Back in January of 2011, President Obama issued an Executive Order. It was entitled "Improve Regulation and Regulatory Review." That is in quotes. Unfortunately, despite claims otherwise, the Executive order has largely been ignored.

My bill takes this order and gives it the force of law. My bill would require that all regulations put forth by the current and future administrations consider the economic burden on American businesses and ensure stakeholder input during the regulatory process, thus promoting innovation and new jobs.

Just as the President said in his order, this egregious assault on our economy must stop; it must end.

Like many of my colleagues, I have had a longstanding concern with the regulatory process. Like other States, from every corner of Kansas, the No. 1 topic of concern for all businesses, including agriculture, energy, small

shops on Main Street, healthcare, education, lending—virtually every enterprise is harmed by overly burdensome and costly regulations. Whether it is the EPA'S Waters of the United States proposed rule or listing of the infamous lesser prairie chicken as an endangered species, the public is losing faith in our government.

Obamacare is a prime example of this administration's vast regulatory overreach. The bill, as signed into law by the President, as most of us know, was no short read. It was over 2,000 pages. But as the rollout continues, the administration has now expanded Obamacare into over 24,000 pages of regulations in the Federal Register.

Here is one example of the overly intrusive regulations this administration used the Affordable Health Care Act to implement. It is Health and Human Services' mandate requiring religious institutions to provide insurance coverage for contraceptives and emergency contraceptives.

Last year the U.S. Supreme Court had to intervene and determine that the HHS mandate placed an excessive burden on the religious freedom of owners of family business.

Regrettably, costly and intrusive regulations are not limited to HHS and Obamacare and CMS and all of those regulations. Not to be outdone by HHS, the Environmental Protection Agency has its own set of overly burdensome regulations.

Let's take the proposed Waters of the United States rule. For example, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows, this proposal has caused a firestorm of opposition all throughout farm country. The EPA claims that the proposed Waters of the United States rule simply clarifies their scope of jurisdiction.

Well, therein lies the problem.

Farmers and ranchers do not believe it. I don't believe it. They fear the rule would allow the EPA to further expand its control of private property under the guise of the Clean Water Act.

If finalized, this rule could have the EPA requiring a permit for ordinary field work, construction of a fence, or even planting crops near certain waters.

Kansans are justifiably worried the permits would be time consuming, costly, and that the EPA could ultimately deny the permits, even for longstanding and normal cropping practices.

This is another prime example of why many Kansans feel their way of life is under attack by the Federal Government's overreach and overregulation. Simply put, they feel ruled, not governed.

Let's not forget the burdensome carbon regulations now being proposed by the EPA. Over the last 6 years, this administration's EPA has pursued an agenda that can only be described as a war on fossil fuels and coal.

Just last week, in fact, the EPA announced that by June of this year it would finalize carbon reduction rules for both new and existing powerplants. That is going to be a move that will drive up the energy cost for all Kansans, all Americans, hoping to heat their homes during extremely cold winters or hot summers such as the ones we are experiencing now.

This decision, which the EPA itself admitted would do nothing to reduce global temperature if similar plans are not adopted by Russia, China, India and Brazil, will have unbelievable costs. According to a recent study about the American Action Forum which cites the administration's own estimates these rules are anticipated to cost industry \$8.8 billion to comply. That translates into a 6-percent rise in electricity prices. Sadly, these regulations will hurt low-income individuals the most—folks who can least afford it and who spend a greater percentage of their income to heat their homes and feed their families.

Now let's look at what the Department of Labor is trying to do with President Obama's pen-and-paper dictates. Currently the Department of Labor has a regulation to eliminate the companion care exemption put forth by this body 40 years ago. This important exemption allows seniors and the disabled community access to affordable in-home care. If eliminated, those who need in-home care the most, and their families, would be forced to determine which hours are the most crucial in the day they receive assistance. In addition, caregivers who currently work over 40 hours would see their hours and paychecks cut because of this rule.

As the Department of Labor issued this rule and geared up for implementation on January 1 of this year, benefit recipients, individual States, and Members of this Chamber stood together to shine a light on the negative effects this would have on communities all across the Nation.

At the same time, a judge issued a partial determination on this regulation, and he stated the following:

The fact that the Department issued its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking after all six of these bills failed to move is nothing short of yet another thinly-veiled effort to do through regulation what could not be done through legislation. Such conduct bespeaks an arrogance to not only disregard Congress's intent but seize unprecedented authority to impose overtime and minimum wage requirements in defiance of the plain language of Section 213. It cannot stand.

My legislation addresses these abuses. Far too often the good intentions of regulations lead to job loss and red-tape that strangles business. Worse still, the agenda of bureaucrats drives bad policies and stifles economy.

I have a solution. My comprehensive bill requires agencies to promote economic growth and job creation by ensuring the benefits outweigh the cost of regulations. It is as simple as that.

We need to be listening to the folks as well who have to live with and pay for the effects of these rules. I am hearing from stakeholders that they are weighing the time and expense of responding to regulations against the fact that this administration keeps giving them the minimum allowable time and then doesn't even consider their input. Bottom line, fewer Americans are bothering to participate in the comment period process.

Stakeholder input is crucial and needs to be considered. Right now, time varies on how long the comment period stays open. Sometimes it is as little as 2 weeks. My bill would ensure the period stay open for at least 60 days. My colleagues, as we all well know, sometimes the people who are most affected by these rules don't even know they are subject to the changes.

My bill would mandate that agencies provide warnings, appropriate default rules, and disclosure requirements to the public. Right now, just the opposite takes place. The administration skirts stakeholder input by issuing interim final rules—called IFRs—and they become effective immediately upon publication. My bill allows delay of implementation if that rule is challenged in court and until the court makes a decision. All too often new regulations are proposed and finalized while existing regulations are not being enforced.

I have heard from a lot of folks in Kansas that the problems these new regulations claim to fix could be solved if the current regulations were properly monitored. Simply put, the solution is not more rules and regulations; it is considering the existing ones.

My bill mandates an ongoing review of regulatory actions to identify those outmoded, ineffective, insufficient, or excessively burdensome rules—or, as the President himself once put it, “rules that are just plain dumb”—and allows agencies to streamline, expand, or repeal those regulations.

We need regulatory reform. My bill codifies the President's Executive order while closing the loopholes and gives it the rule of law. I do not know how the President could disagree with that.

The U.S. Chamber, the National Federation of Independent Business, the Farm Bureau, and the Competitive Enterprise Institute have all endorsed my bill.

Last year I had 35 cosponsors. We have about thirteen. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and stay engaged as this process continues.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow any deduction for punitive damages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that will

close a tax loophole that allows companies to write off the punishment they receive for corporate wrongdoing. Under current law, a corporation or individual business owner may deduct the cost of court-ordered punitive damages paid to victims as an "ordinary" business expense. For the victims of extreme corporate misconduct, there is nothing ordinary about this. It is simply wrong. This tax loophole allows corporations to wreak havoc and then write it off as a cost of doing business. That undermines the whole point of punitive damages.

Punitive damage awards are designed to punish the wrongdoers and to correct dangerous or unfair practices. These awards are reserved for the most extreme and harmful misconduct. Sadly, our country's history is replete with examples of serious corporate misconduct that resulted in injury and death to American citizens, but through our civil justice system and the thoughtful deliberations of our Nations' juries, this misconduct is not only punishable by assessing punitive damages, it has led to broad changes to improve the safety and security of American consumers. Unfortunately, our current tax laws shield the worst corporate misconduct. The No Tax Write-Offs for Corporate Wrongdoers Act would change that by making a simple fix to our tax code.

In 2010, the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig exploded and 11 Americans were killed in the worst oil spill in American history. That same year, an explosion in the Upper Big Branch Mine in West Virginia claimed the lives of 29 miners. In 2009 and 2010, Toyota recalled more than 10 million vehicles because of a faulty acceleration system that has been linked to at least 31 accidents and 12 deaths, and recently admitted to misleading the public about these dangers. Let us also not forget Exxon's misconduct in 1989, which led to an ecological and human disaster that affects Alaskans even today. Vermonters and all Americans deserve to have companies such as these held accountable for their actions. Why should hard-working taxpayers subsidize corporations who deserve to be punished?

In 1994, a jury awarded \$5 billion in punitive damages against Exxon for its actions which caused the Valdez spill that devastated an entire region, the livelihoods of its people, and destroyed a way of life. The role of the jury is enshrined in our Constitution, and nothing is more fundamental to the American justice system than our trust in the judgment of those who serve on them. Rather than accept this reality, Exxon paid its cadre of lawyers to fight the jury's measure of accountability all the way to the Supreme Court. In 2008, after 14 years of appeals, an activist majority on the Court invented a novel rule and held that in maritime

cases, punitive damage awards could not exceed twice the amount of compensatory damages, reducing Exxon's punitive damages to \$500 million. Adding insult to injury to the victims of the oil spill, Exxon was then able to use the federal tax code to write-off the punitive damages as an "ordinary" business expense. This is not how the system should work and it is long past time for Congress to fix it.

I have previously supported legislation by Senator WHITEHOUSE to overturn the Supreme Court's decision in Exxon, and I am disappointed that not a single Republican joined this commonsense effort. If we cannot get bipartisan support to ensure corporations pay the highest possible price for actions that cause serious harm to health and public safety, I hope we can at least agree that American taxpayers should not have to subsidize their misconduct once a jury has determined they should be punished.

The Obama administration requested eliminating this tax deduction in its 2014 budget proposal. The Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that ending this deduction loophole will result in increased revenues of \$355 million over 10 years. Members who have devoted so much of their focus to reducing the Federal deficit should support my legislation. Anyone who cares about protecting consumers should agree that extreme corporate misconduct should not be treated in our tax code simply as a cost of doing business.

Right now, the new Republican majority in Congress is pushing legislation to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Despite being billed as the safest pipeline in history, the existing Keystone pipeline has spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. This has a familiar ring: Before the Valdez spill in Alaska, Exxon executives told us their oil tankers were safe. I do not support Congress bypassing the environmental appeal process to fast-track further construction of the Keystone pipeline, which poses considerable safety and environmental risks. But anyone who does want this pipeline should at a minimum consider the communities and families who would be affected by its construction, and in the event of a spill, they should make sure taxpayers are not subsidizing the damage. This speaks to our basic notions of justice and fair play.

I hope all Senators will join me to end tax write-offs for corporate wrongdoers. When companies can write off a significant portion of the financial impact of punitive damages, the incentives in our justice system that promote responsible business practices lose their force. Corporate misconduct should no longer be treated as a cost of doing business.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr.

KIRK, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CASEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 178. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 178

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Domestic trafficking victims' fund.
- Sec. 3. Official recognition of American victims of human trafficking.
- Sec. 4. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.
- Sec. 5. Direct services for victims of child pornography.
- Sec. 6. Increasing compensation and restitution for trafficking victims.
- Sec. 7. Streamlining human trafficking investigations.
- Sec. 8. Enhancing human trafficking reporting.
- Sec. 9. Reducing demand for sex trafficking.
- Sec. 10. Using existing task forces and components to target offenders who exploit children.
- Sec. 11. Targeting child predators.
- Sec. 12. Monitoring all human traffickers as violent criminals.
- Sec. 13. Crime victims' rights.
- Sec. 14. Combat Human Trafficking Act.
- Sec. 15. Grant accountability.

SEC. 2. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3014. Additional special assessment

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of \$5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

"(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);

"(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);

"(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);

"(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

"(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

"(b) SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.—An assessment under subsection (a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines and

orders of restitution arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

“(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS’ FUND.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ‘Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Fund’), to be administered by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(d) **DEPOSITS.**—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, or any other law regarding the crediting of money received for the Government, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

“(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From amounts in the Fund, in addition to any other amounts available, and without further appropriation, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, use amounts available in the Fund to award grants or enhance victims’ programming under—

“(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

“(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

“(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(2) **GRANTS.**—Of the amounts in the Fund used under paragraph (1), not less than \$2,000,000 shall be used for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund, shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending of amounts described in sections 506 and 507 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 409) to the same extent as if amounts in the Fund were funds appropriated under division H of such Act.

“(f) **TRANSFERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, on September 30 of each fiscal year, all unobligated balances in the Fund shall be transferred to the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

“(2) **AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be available for any authorized purpose of the Crime Victims Fund; and

“(B) shall remain available until expended.

“(g) **COLLECTION METHOD.**—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

“(h) **DURATION OF OBLIGATION.**—The obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.”

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

“3014. Additional special assessment.”

SEC. 3. OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF AMERICAN VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) (as originally enacted), as subsection (h); and

(2) in subsection (f) (as added by section 213(a)(1) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-457)), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF AMERICAN VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receiving credible information that establishes, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a covered individual is a victim of a severe form of trafficking and at the request of the covered individual, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promptly issue a determination that the covered individual is a victim of a severe form of trafficking. The Secretary shall have exclusive authority to make such a determination.

“(B) **COVERED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘covered individual’ means—

“(i) a citizen of the United States; or

“(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(20))).

“(C) **PROCEDURE.**—For purposes of this paragraph, in determining whether a covered individual has provided credible information that the covered individual is a victim of a severe form of trafficking, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consider all relevant and credible evidence, and if appropriate, consult with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Secretary of Labor.

“(D) **PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the following forms of evidence shall receive deference in determining whether a covered individual has established that the covered individual is a victim of a severe form of trafficking:

“(i) A sworn statement by the covered individual or a representative of the covered individual if the covered individual is present at the time of such statement but not able to competently make such sworn statement.

“(ii) Police, government agency, or court records or files.

“(iii) Documentation from a social services, trafficking, or domestic violence program, child welfare or runaway and homeless youth program, or a legal, clinical, medical, or other professional from whom the covered individual has sought assistance in dealing with the crime.

“(iv) A statement from any other individual with knowledge of the circumstances that provided the basis for the claim.

“(v) Physical evidence.

“(E) **REGULATIONS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall adopt regulations to implement this paragraph.

“(F) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION; OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OPTIONAL.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to require a covered individual to obtain a determination under this paragraph in order to be defined or classified as a victim of a severe form of trafficking under this section.”

SEC. 4. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims’ services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

“(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

“(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

“(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

“(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

“(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

“(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking;

“(E) use laws that prohibit acts of child human trafficking, child sexual abuse, and child rape, and to assist in the development of State and local laws to prohibit, investigate, and prosecute acts of child human trafficking; and

“(F) implement and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer’s time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;

“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

“(iii) travel; and

“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not

more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims’ services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;
“(ii) social service agencies;
“(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;
“(v) legal services agencies; and
“(vi) non-governmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

“(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and
“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

“(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;
“(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—
“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

“(ii) life skills training;
“(iii) housing placement;
“(iv) vocational training;
“(v) education;
“(vi) family support services; and
“(vii) job placement;

“(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim’s cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

“(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

“(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

“(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and non-governmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

“(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(D) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) enter into a contract with a non-governmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section; and

“(2) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

“(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

“(1) 70 percent in the first year;

“(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

“(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING; FULLY OFFSET.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized to award not more than \$7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18;

“(2) the term ‘child advocacy center’ means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

“(3) the term ‘child human trafficking’ means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or unit of local government that—

“(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

“(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking;

“(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking, including—

“(i) the establishment of a shelter for victims of child human trafficking, through existing or new facilities;

“(ii) the provision of trauma-informed, gender-responsive rehabilitative care to victims of child human trafficking;

“(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of human trafficking, with a focus on domestic child human trafficking;

“(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving child human trafficking, including soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing human acts with children;

“(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth;

“(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or child, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

“(vii) cooperation or referral agreements with State child welfare agencies and child advocacy centers; and

“(D) provides an assurance that, under the plan under subparagraph (C), a victim of child human trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement officers to have access to any shelter or services provided with a grant under this section.

“(l) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY; SPECIALIZED VICTIMS’ SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—No grant funds under this section may be awarded or transferred to any entity unless such entity has demonstrated substantial experience providing services to victims of human trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of human trafficking victims.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 203. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.”.

SEC. 5. DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting “, including human trafficking and the production of child pornography” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.”.

SEC. 6. INCREASING COMPENSATION AND RESTITUTION FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—Section 1594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “that was used or” and inserting “that was involved in, used, or”; and

(ii) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking “used or” and inserting “involved in, used, or”; and

(B) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “any violation of this chapter”; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) TRANSFER OF FORFEITED ASSETS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall transfer assets forfeited pursuant to this section, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, to satisfy victim restitution orders arising from violations of this chapter.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have priority over any other claims to the assets or their proceeds.

“(3) USE OF NON-FORFEITED ASSETS.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not reduce or otherwise mitigate the obligation of a person convicted of a violation of this chapter to satisfy the full amount of a restitution order through the use of non-forfeited assets or to reimburse the Attorney General for the value of assets or proceeds transferred under this subsection through the use of non-forfeited assets.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “chapter 77 of title 18,” after “criminal drug laws of the United States or of”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 9703 (as added by section 638(b)(1) of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-393; 106 Stat. 1779)) as section 9705; and

(B) in section 9705(a), as redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (I)—

(aa) by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(bb) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(II) in subparagraph (J), by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) in clause (ii)—

(AA) in subclause (I), by striking “or” and inserting “of”; and

(BB) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(bb) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(cc) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to a violation of chapter 77 of title 18 (relating to human trafficking);”;

(II) in subparagraph (G), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) in subparagraph (H), by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CROSS REFERENCES.—

(i) TITLE 28.—Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “section 9703(g)(4)(A)(ii)” and inserting “section 9705(g)(4)(A)”;

(II) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(p)”;

(III) in paragraph (11), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”.

(ii) TITLE 31.—Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in section 312(d), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”; and

(II) in section 5340(1), by striking “section 9703(p)(1)” and inserting “section 9705(p)(1)”.

(iii) TITLE 39.—Section 2003(e)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(p)”.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“9701. Fees and charges for Government services and things of value.

“9702. Investment of trust funds.

“9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9705. Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund.”.

SEC. 7. STREAMLINING HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (a), by inserting a comma after “weapons”;

(B) in subparagraph (c)—

(i) by inserting “section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1591”; and

(ii) by inserting “section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, in-

voluntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1751”;

(iii) by inserting a comma after “virus”;

(iv) by striking “, section” and inserting a comma;

(v) by striking “or” after “misuse of passports,”; and

(vi) by inserting “or” before “section 555”;

(C) in subparagraph (j), by striking “pipeline,” and inserting “pipeline,”; and

(D) in subparagraph (p), by striking “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)” and inserting “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,” after “kidnapping”.

SEC. 8. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES TO INCLUDE HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘part 1 violent crimes’ shall include severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).”.

(b) CRIME CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and a photograph taken within the previous 180 days” after “dental records”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution; and”.

SEC. 9. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “or maintains” and inserting “maintains, patronizes, or solicits”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “or maintained” and inserting “, maintained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) by striking “knew that the person” and inserting “knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person”.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDED.—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking “or obtaining” and inserting “obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting”.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the amendments made by this section is to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking.

SEC. 10. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES AND COMPONENTS TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that—

(1) all task forces and working groups within the Innocence Lost National Initiative engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex; and

(2) all components and task forces with jurisdiction to detect, investigate, and prosecute cases of child labor trafficking engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the capacity of such components to deter and punish child labor trafficking.

SEC. 11. TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS.

(a) CLARIFYING THAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCERS ARE HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—Section 2423(f) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “means (1) a” and inserting the following: “means—

“(1) a”;

(2) by striking “United States; or (2) any” and inserting the following: “United States; “(2) any”; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; or

“(3) production of child pornography (as defined in section 2256(8)).”.

(b) HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.—Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”.

SEC. 12. MONITORING ALL HUMAN TRAFFICKERS AS VIOLENT CRIMINALS.

Section 3156(a)(4)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “77,” after “chapter”.

SEC. 13. CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement.

“(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503(c) of the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607(c)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims' Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting “, unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration” before the period; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “this chapter, the term” and inserting the following: “this chapter:

“(1) COURT OF APPEALS.—The term ‘court of appeals’ means—

“(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

“(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

“(2) CRIME VICTIM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term”;

(B) by striking “In the case” and inserting the following:

“(B) MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.—In the case”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms ‘district court’ and ‘court’ include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”.

(b) CRIME VICTIMS FUND.—Section 1402(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting “section” before “3771”.

(c) APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14. COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMERCIAL SEX ACT; SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS; STATE.—The terms “commercial sex act”, “severe forms of trafficking in persons”, and “State” have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) COVERED OFFENDER.—The term “covered offender” means an individual who obtains, patronizes, or solicits a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(3) COVERED OFFENSE.—The term “covered offense” means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(4) FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(6) STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “State law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TRAINING AND POLICY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, PROSECUTORS, AND JUDGES.—

(1) TRAINING.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on—

(i) effective methods for investigating and prosecuting covered offenders; and

(ii) facilitating the provision of physical and mental health services by health care providers to persons subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(B) FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice for United States attorneys

or other Federal prosecutors includes training on seeking restitution for offenses under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that each United States attorney or other Federal prosecutor, upon obtaining a conviction for such an offense, requests a specific amount of restitution for each victim of the offense without regard to whether the victim requests restitution.

(C) JUDGES.—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide training to judges relating to the application of section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to ordering restitution for victims of offenses under chapter 77 of such title.

(2) POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of covered offenders.

(d) MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “1594(c),” after “1591.”.

(e) BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(1) prepare an annual report on—

(A) the rates of—

(i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;

(ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Task Force;

(D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and

(E) the Attorney General.

SEC. 15. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered grant” means a grant awarded by the Attorney General under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as amended by section 4.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of a covered grant to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a covered grant during the following 2 fiscal years.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding covered grants the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a covered grant.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and covered grants, the term “non-profit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a covered grant to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts transferred to the Department of Justice under this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.

(D) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(iv) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(4) **PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts awarded under this Act, or any amendments made by this Act, may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) **PENALTY.**—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a covered grant has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another covered grant for not less than 5 years.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 26—COMMENDING POPE FRANCIS FOR HIS LEADERSHIP IN HELPING TO SECURE THE RELEASE OF ALAN GROSS AND FOR WORKING WITH THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA TO ACHIEVE A MORE POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ENZI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 26

Whereas Archbishop Jorge Mario Bergoglio of Buenos Aires, Argentina, was elected Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church on March 13, 2013;

Whereas his election marked the first time a Pope from the Americas and a Jesuit has been selected, as well as the first time a pope took the papal name of Francis, after St. Francis of Assisi;

Whereas Pope Francis has been recognized for his humility, dedication to the poor, and commitment to dialogue and reconciliation;

Whereas United States citizen and former United States Agency for International Development subcontractor Alan Phillip Gross traveled to Cuba five times in 2009, working to establish wireless networks and improve Internet and Intranet access and connectivity for the Cuban people;

Whereas Mr. Gross was arrested in Havana, Cuba, on December 3, 2009, charged with “actions against the independence or the territorial integrity of the state” in February 2011, and sentenced to 15 years in prison;

Whereas, on November 21, 2013, 66 United States Senators wrote to President Barack Obama urging him “to act expeditiously to take whatever steps are in the national interest to obtain [Alan Gross’s] release,” and pledging “to support [the] Administration in pursuit of this worthy goal”;

Whereas during Mr. Gross’s five years in prison, his health seriously deteriorated and his mother Evelyn Gross passed away;

Whereas Mr. Gross’s family remained tirelessly committed to ensuring his well-being and return to the United States;

Whereas, over the course of several years, the United States Government used a variety of channels to encourage the Government of Cuba to release Mr. Gross;

Whereas, in March 2012, during his visit to Cuba, then-Pope Benedict raised Mr. Gross’s detention with President Raul Castro;

Whereas, in 2013, the Governments of the United States and Cuba began 18 months of closed door talks on Mr. Gross’s detention and on improving the relations between the two countries;

Whereas, in October 2014, Pope Francis played a key role in the negotiations between the United States and Cuba, making personal appeals to both President Obama and President Raul Castro, pushing for reconciliation between the two countries, and hosting a diplomatic meeting at the Vatican between the United States and Cuba;

Whereas, on December 17, 2014, the Government of Cuba released Alan Gross on humanitarian grounds and allowed him to return to the United States;

Whereas, on December 17, 2014, President Obama also announced the reestablishment of diplomatic ties with Cuba;

Whereas, in this announcement, President Obama thanked Pope Francis for his involvement and the example he provides to the international community; and

Whereas, on December 18, 2014, Pope Francis said, “The work of an ambassador lies in small steps, small things, but they always end up making peace, bringing closer the hearts of people, sowing brotherhood among people.”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends its gratitude to Pope Francis for his extraordinary efforts in helping to secure the release of Alan Gross;

(2) commends His Holiness for his role in encouraging an improved relationship between the United States and Cuba; and

(3) warmly welcomes the return to the United States of Alan Gross.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill

S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 7. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 8. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 9. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 10. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 11. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 12. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 13. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 14. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 15. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 16. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S.

1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 17. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 18. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 19. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 20. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 21. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 22. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 23. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 24. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 25. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 26. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 27. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 28. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 29. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 30. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 31. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 32. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 33. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 34. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON COASTWISE TRADE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 12112(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A coastwise endorsement may be issued for a vessel that qualifies under the laws of the United States to engage in the coastwise trade.”

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard shall issue regulations to implement the amendment made by subsection (a) that require all vessels permitted to engage in the coastwise trade to meet all appropriate safety and security requirements.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TANK VESSEL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS.—Section 3703a(c)(1)(C) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking

"and is qualified for documentation as a wrecked vessel under section 12112 of this title".

(2) LIQUIFIED GAS TANKERS.—Section 12120 of such title is amended by striking ", if the vessel—" and all that follows and inserting a period.

(3) SMALL PASSENGER VESSELS.—Section 12121(b) of such title is amended by striking "12112,".

(4) LOSS OF COASTWISE TRADE PRIVILEGES.—Section 12132 of such title is repealed.

(5) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 12132.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

SA 5. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT TO CONGRESS ON AFFECTED LANDOWNERS.

Not less frequently than once each year for the duration of the construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Governors of the States in which the pipeline described in section 2(a) is constructed, shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

(1) the number of individual private landowners (referred to in this section as the "landowners") whose land is located in the planned path of the pipeline;

(2) the acreage of land located in the planned path of the pipeline that is held by each of the landowners;

(3) the amount of property of the landowners that has been transferred to TransCanada Corporation or TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P.; and

(4) the means TransCanada Corporation and TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. used to acquire the land described in paragraph (3).

SA 6. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that climate change—

- (1) is real;
- (2) is caused by humans;
- (3) is urgent; and
- (4) is solvable.

SA 7. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MUR-

KOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. FINDINGS; SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the combined average temperature over global land and ocean surfaces of the earth has increased over the past 150 years, and the increase is mostly due to human activities, such as burning fossil fuels;

(2) known as climate change, this increase in temperature has already begun affecting the weather in the United States;

(3) fighting climate change requires transitioning to clean energy, such as solar and wind power, and away from dirty energy, such as oil and coal; and

(4) stopping climate change will strengthen the health of families by reducing local air and water pollution.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

(2) encourage other countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

SA 8. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) climate change is solvable and urgent;

(2) stopping climate change will improve the health of all the people of the United States, especially children, the elderly, and people with chronic illnesses, by reducing air pollution and water pollution;

(3) families in the United States will benefit economically from transitioning to clean energy, such as solar and wind, and away from dirty energy, such as oil and coal, as soon as possible; and

(4) climate change—

(A) is real;

(B) is mostly due to human activities; and

(C) has already begun affecting the weather in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should—

(1) take action to reduce heat-trapping pollution; and

(2) encourage other countries to reduce heat-trapping pollution.

SA 9. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone

XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RENEWABLE ENERGY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the pipeline and facilities referred to in section 2(a) may not continue operation unless each year during the 10-year period beginning on commencement of operation of the pipeline referred to in section 2(a), the annual amount of non-hydro renewable energy capacity that is built in the United States is equal to or greater than the maximum annual capacity of the pipeline on an energy content basis.

SA 10. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . FINES FOR TRESPASS AND DRILLING WITHOUT APPROVAL.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) TRESPASS OR DRILLING WITHOUT APPROVAL.—The term "trespass or drilling without approval" has the meaning given the term in the report of the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior entitled "Inspection Report—BLM Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Trespass and Drilling Without Approval" and dated September 29, 2014.

(b) SHUT DOWN OF WELLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall conduct a due process hearing for any owner or operator of a well who has been detected as potentially committing trespass or drilling without approval.

(2) SHUT DOWN.—After providing the due process hearing under paragraph (1), the Director shall shut down any well the owner or operator of which has been found to have intentionally committed trespass or drilling without approval.

(c) FINES; ROYALTY RATE PAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An owner or operator of a well that has been found to have committed trespass or drilling without approval (intentional or unintentional) under subsection (b) shall be subject to the following fines:

(A) MONETARY FINE.—The owner or operator shall be fined an amount equal to the cost the owner or operator incurred to drill and complete the well.

(B) ROYALTY RATE.—The owner or operator shall be fined an amount equal to the royalty rate the owner or operator would have paid to the Federal Government had the owner or operator secured approval to drill the well from the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) USE OF FINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall use 25 percent of the revenues raised from the imposition of monetary fines under paragraph (1)(A) to fund programs in the Bureau of Land Management that increase prevention and enforcement of trespass or drilling without approval on Federal land.

(B) MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT STANDARDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Director shall standardize the monitoring and enforcement policies of the Bureau of Land Management, to be implemented across the regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management, to increase monitoring of drilling on Federal land.

(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Director in carrying out clause (i).

(d) LIABILITY.—The owner or operator, including any subcontractor of the owner or operator, shall be liable for any claim or cause of action arising from the trespass or drilling without approval.

SA 11. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) rural communities are critical to the food supply and recreation opportunities of the United States;

(2) farming, fishing, forestry, and recreation in the rural communities of the United States are particularly vulnerable to changes in climate;

(3) the overwhelming majority of the scientific community agrees that global warming is real and predominantly attributable to human activity;

(4) climate change is already having devastating impacts to the rural communities of the United States;

(5) winter snow pack is decreasing, impacting agricultural producers who depend on irrigation;

(6) ocean acidity levels are increasing and ocean water temperatures are rising, impacting coastal fishermen; and

(7) the fire season in the Western United States is growing longer, impacting loggers and mill owners.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) the rural communities of the United States are and will be significantly impacted by climate change; and

(3) the United States should make it a priority to protect the rural communities and natural resources from the worst impacts of climate change.

SA 12. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) agree that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(2) the National Academy of Sciences agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(3) the American Association for the Advancement of Science agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(4) the American Chemical Society agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(5) the American Geophysical Union agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(6) the American Medical Association agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(7) the American Meteorological Society agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity;

(8) the American Physical Society agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity; and

(9) the Geological Society of America agrees that global warming is real and due to human activity.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should take under due consideration advice from the leading scientific institutions in the United States; and

(2) global warming is real and due to human activity.

SA 13. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), none of the crude oil and bitumen transported into the United States by the operation of the Keystone XL pipeline under the authority provided by subsection (a), and none of the refined petroleum fuel products originating from that crude oil or bitumen, may be exported from the United States.

(2) WAIVERS AUTHORIZED.—The President may waive the limitation described in paragraph (1) if—

(A) the President determines that a waiver is in the national interest because it—

(i) will not lead to an increase in domestic consumption of crude oil or refined petroleum products obtained from countries hostile to United States' interests or with political and economic instability that compromises energy supply security;

(ii) will not lead to higher costs to refiners who purchase the crude oil than the refiners would pay for crude oil in the absence of the waiver; and

(iii) will not lead to higher gasoline costs to consumers than consumers would pay in the absence of the waiver;

(B) an exchange of crude oil or refined product provides for no net loss of crude oil or refined product consumed domestically; or

(C) a waiver is necessary under the Constitution, a law, or an international agreement.

SA 14. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ CRUDE OIL EXPORTS.

(a) REPEAL OF PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT OIL EXPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 12 of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 719j) is amended—

(i) by striking “and section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act”; and

(ii) by striking “such Acts” and inserting “that Act”.

(B) The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(i) in section 251 (42 U.S.C. 6271)—

(I) by striking subsection (d); and

(II) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d); and

(ii) in section 523(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 6393(a)(1)), by striking “(other than section 103 thereof)”.

(b) REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON EXPORTS OF OIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (u); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (v) through (y) as subsections (u) through (x), respectively.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 1107(c) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3167(c)) is amended by striking “(u) through (y)” and inserting “(u) through (x)”.

(B) Section 23 of the Deep Water Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1522) is repealed.

(C) Section 203(c) of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (43 U.S.C. 1652(c)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “(w)(2), and (x))” and inserting “(v)(2), and (w))”.

(D) Section 509(c) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 2009(c)) is amended by striking “subsection (w)(2)” and inserting “subsection (v)(2)”.

(c) REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON EXPORT OF OCS OIL OR GAS.—Section 28 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1354) is repealed.

(d) TERMINATION OF LIMITATION ON EXPORTATION OF CRUDE OIL.—Section 7(d) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2406(d)) (as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) shall have no force or effect.

(e) CLARIFICATION OF CRUDE OIL REGULATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 754.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to crude oil) shall have no force or effect.

(2) CRUDE OIL LICENSE REQUIREMENTS.—The Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce shall grant licenses to export to a country crude oil (as the term is defined in subsection (a) of the regulation referred to in paragraph (1)) (as in effect on the date that is 1 day before the date of enactment of this Act) unless—

(A) the country is subject to sanctions or trade restrictions imposed by the United States; or

(B) the President or Congress has designated the country as subject to exclusion for reasons of national security.

SA 15. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c) For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRY.—In this subsection, the term ‘World Trade Organization member country’ has the meaning given the term ‘WTO member country’ in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

“(2) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—For purposes”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by inserting “or to a World Trade Organization member country” after “trade in natural gas”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 16. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “North American Energy Infrastructure Act”.

SEC. 202. FINDING.

Congress finds that the United States should establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

SEC. 203. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and section 207, no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment under this section.

(b) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a cross-

border segment for which a request is received under this section, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment unless the relevant official finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment is not in the national security interest of the United States.

(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing for the request under paragraph (1), that the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(A) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(B) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—This section shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico—

(1) if the cross-border segment is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) if a permit described in section 206 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued;

(3) if a certificate of crossing for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has previously been issued under this section; or

(4) if an application for a permit described in section 206 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which such application is denied; or

(B) July 1, 2016.

(d) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(1) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section or section 207 shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment is sought under this section.

(2) NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this section or section 207 shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

SEC. 204. IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “No order is required under subsection (a) to authorize the export or import of any natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico.”

SEC. 205. TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is

amended by striking “insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission’s powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)”.

(2) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a-4(b)) is amended by striking “the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.”

SEC. 206. NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.

No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order No. 12038, Executive Order No. 10485, or any other Executive order shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any cross-border segment thereof.

SEC. 207. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.

No certificate of crossing under section 203, or permit described in section 206, shall be required for a modification to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility—

(1) that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) for which a permit described in section 206 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(3) for which a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility has previously been issued under section 203.

SEC. 208. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Sections 203 through 207, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official described in section 203(b)(2) shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of section 203; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of section 203.

SEC. 209. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “cross-border segment” means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at the national boundary of the United States with either Canada or Mexico;

(2) the term “modification” includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnection, or adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations);

(3) the term “natural gas” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a);

(4) the term “oil” means petroleum or a petroleum product;

(5) the terms "Electric Reliability Organization" and "regional entity" have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o); and

(6) the terms "Independent System Operator" and "Regional Transmission Organization" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

SA 17. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . USE OF UNITED STATES IRON, STEEL, AND MANUFACTURED GOODS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Subject to subsection (b), to the maximum extent consistent with the obligations of the United States under international trade agreements, none of the iron, steel, or manufactured goods used in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilities approved by this Act may be produced outside of the United States.

(b) **NONAPPLICATION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the extent that the President finds that—

(1) iron, steel, and the applicable manufactured goods are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities with a satisfactory quality; or

(2) inclusion of iron, steel, or any manufactured good produced in the United States will increase the cost of the iron, steel, or any manufactured good used in the Pipeline and facilities by more than 25 percent.

SA 18. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF NEW FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) **DEFINITION OF FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.**—In this section, the term "federally protected land" means any area designated or acquired by the Federal Government for the purpose of conserving historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, developmental, or biological resources.

(b) **FINDINGS REQUIRED.**—New federally protected land shall not be designated unless the Secretary, prior to the designation, publishes in the Federal Register—

(1) a finding that the addition of the new federally protected land would not have a negative impact on the administration of existing federally protected land; and

(2) a finding that, as of the date of the finding, sufficient resources are available to effectively implement management plans for existing units of federally protected land.

SA 19. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CONSIDERATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IN NEPA REVIEWS.

In completing an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), a Federal agency shall not take into consideration greenhouse gas emissions.

SA 20. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN CONSERVATION AREAS.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not use Federal funds to acquire any land or interests in land for the Niobrara Confluence and Ponca Bluffs Conservation Areas unless the Secretary of the Interior solicits input from, and receives the consent of, the Governor and legislature of the State in which the land is located with respect to the acquisition.

SA 21. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGULATION OF PETROLEUM COKE AS A HAZARDOUS WASTE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3001(e) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) **PETROLEUM COKE.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this paragraph and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Administrator shall list as a hazardous waste under subsection (b)(1) petroleum coke."

(b) **REQUIREMENTS FOR HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM COKE.**—Section 3003 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6923) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) **HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM COKE.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall promulgate regulations to ensure that any handler or transporter of petroleum coke stores the petroleum coke at all times in an enclosed building or container."

(c) **DEFINITION OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE.**—Section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(14)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting "(other than petroleum coke)" after "petroleum".

SA 22. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) **PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act authorizes the use of condemnation to acquire land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

(2) **WILLING SELLERS.**—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired from willing sellers.

SA 23. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REBATES FOR PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEMS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM.**—The term "photovoltaic system" includes—

(A) solar panels;

(B) roof support structures;

(C) inverters;

(D) an energy storage system, if the energy storage system is integrated with the photovoltaic system; and

(E) any other hardware necessary for the installation of a photovoltaic system.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) **REBATES FOR PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall provide rebates to eligible individuals or entities for the purchase and installation of photovoltaic systems for residential and commercial properties in order to install, over the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, not less than an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems in the United States (as compared to the number of photovoltaic systems installed in the United States as of the date of enactment of this Act) with a cumulative capacity of not less than 60,000 megawatts.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible for a rebate under this subsection—

(i) the recipient of the rebate shall be a homeowner, business, nonprofit entity, or State or local government that purchased and installed a photovoltaic system for a property located in the United States; and

(ii) the recipient of the rebate shall meet such other eligibility criteria as are determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(B) **OTHER ENTITIES.**—After public review and comment, the Secretary may identify other individuals or entities located in the United States that qualify for a rebate under this subsection.

(3) **AMOUNT.**—Subject to paragraph (4)(B) and the availability of appropriations under

subsection (c), the amount of a rebate provided to an eligible individual or entity for the purchase and installation of a photovoltaic system for a property under this subsection shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 15 percent of the initial capital costs for purchasing and installing the photovoltaic system, including costs for hardware, permitting and other “soft costs”, and installation; or

(B) \$10,000.

(4) **INTERMEDIATE REPORT.**—As soon as practicable after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, and publish on the website of the Department of Energy, a report that describes—

(A) the number of photovoltaic systems for residential and commercial properties purchased and installed with rebates provided under this subsection; and

(B) any steps the Secretary will take to ensure that the goal of the installation of an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems in the United States is achieved by 2025.

(5) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.**—The authority provided under this subsection shall be in addition to any other authority under which credits or other types of financial assistance are provided for installation of a photovoltaic system for a property.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SA 24. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) climate change is caused by human activities;

(3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;

(4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and

(5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

SA 25. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INCLUSION OF OIL DERIVED FROM TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of section 4612(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986, which may be established either by an Act of Congress or any regulations, rules, or guidance issued by the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service or the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate).

SA 26. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FINDINGS; SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds that—

(1) the oil and gas found on Federal land is a national resource that belongs to the American public;

(2) the Government Accountability Office has found that significant volumes of public resources are wasted unnecessarily through the venting, flaring, and leaking of natural gas in the production of oil and gas on Federal land;

(3) the Government Accountability Office has found that approximately 40 percent of that vented, flared, and leaked natural gas is economically recoverable with available technologies;

(4) the Department of the Interior does not, in general, require royalties to be paid on vented, flared, and leaked natural gas from oil and gas production on Federal land;

(5) the Government Accountability Office has estimated that about \$23,000,000 in revenue is lost annually because of royalties not paid to the Federal Government on vented, flared, and leaked natural gas; and

(6) methane is a greenhouse gas 86 times more potent than carbon dioxide when measured over a 20-year period.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the oil and gas produced on Federal land should be produced with minimal waste and air pollution; and

(2) taxpayers should receive full value for the use of public oil and gas resources.

SA 27. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CLARIFICATION OF TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL FOR EXCISE TAX PURPOSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 4612(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **CRUDE OIL.**—The term ‘crude oil’ includes crude oil condensates, natural gasoline, synthetic petroleum, any bitumen or bituminous mixture, any oil derived from a bitumen or bituminous mixture, and any oil derived from kerogen-bearing sources.”

(b) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Paragraph (2) of section 4612(a) of such Code is amended by striking “from a well located”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to oil and petroleum products received, entered, used, or exported during calendar quarters beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 28. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) **DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **INITIAL DISCLOSURE.**—Every covered entity which has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date that is 165 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(B) **SUBSEQUENT DISCLOSURES.**—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements (other than covered disbursement reported under subparagraph (A)) and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

“(2) **CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.**—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

“(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

“(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

“(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than \$200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

“(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

“(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to that account during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in

such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

“(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

“(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered entity’ means—

“(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

“(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person—

“(i) holds one or more tar sands leases, or

“(ii) has received revenues or stands to receive revenues of \$1,000,000 or greater from tar sands production, including revenues received in connection with—

“(I) exploration of tar sands;

“(II) extraction of tar sands;

“(III) processing of tar sands;

“(IV) building, maintaining, and upgrading the Keystone XL pipeline and other related pipelines used in connection with tar sands;

“(V) expanding refinery capacity or building, expanding, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

“(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

“(VII) refinement of tar sands;

“(VIII) importing crude, refined oil, or byproducts derived from tar sands crude;

“(IX) exporting crude, byproducts, or refined oil derived from tar sands crude; and

“(X) use of production byproducts from tar sands, such as petroleum coke for energy generation.

“(C) TAR SANDS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘tar sands’ means bitumen from the West Canadian Sedimentary Basin.

“(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered disbursement’ means a disbursement for any of the following:

“(A) An independent expenditure.

“(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

“(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

“(ii) is made—

“(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

“(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of

a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and

“(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

“(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

“(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000; and

“(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

“(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.”.

SA 29. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

SA 30. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 3, line 10, and insert the following:

(d) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing

SA 31. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE ON GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) human activity significantly contributes to climate change; and

(2) economically reasonable steps should be taken to generate energy with less carbon pollution.

SA 32. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

“(A) TIMELINE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit to drill not later than 30 days after receiving an application for the permit.

“(ii) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may extend the period in clause (i) for up to 2 periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant.

“(iii) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Written notice under clause (ii) shall—

“(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

“(II) include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

“(B) NOTICE OF REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

“(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies; and

“(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

“(C) APPLICATION CONSIDERED APPROVED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application is considered approved, except in cases in which existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are incomplete.

“(ii) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—Existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 180 days after receiving an application for the permit.

“(iii) FAILURE TO COMPLETE.—If all existing reviews are not completed during the 180-day period described in clause (ii), the project subject to the application shall be considered to have no significant impact in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) and section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2))

and that classification shall be considered to be a final agency action.

“(D) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

“(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10-day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

“(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date the application is submitted to the Secretary.

“(E) FEE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall collect a single \$6,500 permit processing fee per application from each applicant at the time the final decision is made whether to issue a permit under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) RELATIONSHIP TO RESUBMITTED APPLICATIONS.—A fee collected under clause (i) shall not apply to any resubmitted application.

“(iii) TREATMENT OF PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—Of the total amount of fees collected under this subparagraph, 50 percent shall be transferred to the field office at which the fees are collected and used by the field offices to process protests, leases, and permits under this Act subject to appropriation.

“(F) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary carried out in accordance with this paragraph shall not be subject to judicial review.”.

SA 33. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AWARD OF LITIGATION COSTS TO PREVAILING PARTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXISTING LAW.

Section 11(g)(4) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)(4)) is amended by striking “to any” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting “to any prevailing party in accordance with section 2412 of title 28, United States Code.”.

SA 34. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DISCLOSURE OF EXPENDITURES UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO DISCLOSE.—Section 13 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87

Stat. 902; relating to conforming amendments which have executed) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 13. DISCLOSURE OF EXPENDITURES.

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall—

“(1) not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate an annual report detailing Federal Government expenditures for covered suits during the preceding fiscal year (including the information described in subsection (b)); and

“(2) make publicly available through the Internet a searchable database of the information described in subsection (b).

“(b) INCLUDED INFORMATION.—The report shall include—

“(1) the case name and number of each covered suit, and a hyperlink to the record or decision for each covered suit (if available);

“(2) a description of the claims in each covered suit;

“(3) the name of each covered agency whose actions gave rise to a claim in a covered suit;

“(4) funds expended by each covered agency (disaggregated by agency account) to receive and respond to notices referred to in section 11(g)(2) or to prepare for litigation of, litigate, negotiate a settlement agreement or consent decree in, or provide material, technical, or other assistance in relation to, a covered suit;

“(5) the number of full-time equivalent employees that participated in the activities described in paragraph (4); and

“(6) attorneys fees and other expenses (disaggregated by agency account) awarded in covered suits, including any consent decrees or settlement agreements (regardless of whether a decree or settlement agreement is sealed or otherwise subject to nondisclosure provisions), including the bases for such awards.

“(c) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INFORMATION.—The head of each covered agency shall provide to the Secretary in a timely manner all information requested by the Secretary to comply with the requirements of this section.

“(d) LIMITATION ON DISCLOSURE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, this section shall not affect any restriction in a consent decree or settlement agreement on the disclosure of information that is not described in subsection (b).

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—

“(1) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means any agency of the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, or the Southeastern Power Administration.

“(2) COVERED SUIT.—The term ‘covered suit’ means any civil action containing a claim against the Federal Government, in which the claim arises under this Act and is based on the action of a covered agency.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to such section and inserting the following:

“Sec. 13. Disclosure of expenditures.”.

(c) PRIOR AMENDMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—This section shall not be construed to affect the amendments made by section 13 of such Act, as in effect before the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 13, 2015, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Joseph Majkut, who is an American Association fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic leader, I ask unanimous consent that Neysa Call, a fellow in Senator REID’s office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 7, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) was agreed to.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 33

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 32

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 32 be discharged from the Committee on Finance and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, January 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1 as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. We were able to reach an agreement to proceed to the Keystone bill this afternoon and start processing amendments to this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure bill. There are several amendments pending from Senators on both sides of the aisle, and I would encourage everyone to work with Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL to get in the queue for consideration.

The next votes will occur on Tuesday, January 20, following the weekly conference meetings.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2015, AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:36 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 16, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ALISSA M. STARZAK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, VICE BRAD CARSON, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

JAY NEAL LERNER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, VICE JON T. RYMER, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

MARIO CORDERO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DANIEL R. ELLIOTT III, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CARLOS A. MONJE, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE POLLY TROTTERBERG, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

JOYCE A. BARR, OF WASHINGTON
ROBERT F. CODEC, JR., OF VIRGINIA
PATRICIA M. HASLACH, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL WAYNE JONES, OF NEW YORK
SCOTT ALAN MARCIEL, OF VIRGINIA
NANCY E. MCELLOWNEY, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER-MINISTER:

KAREN L. FREEMAN, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD S. GREENE, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN GROARKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
THOMAS CHRISTOPHER MILLIGAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MONICA STEIN-OLSON, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION INTO AND WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

JEFFREY N. BAKKEN, OF MINNESOTA
DAVID J. BARTH, OF VIRGINIA
JERRY PAUL BISSON, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRE DEPREZ, OF FLORIDA
AZZA EL-ABD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUSAN KOSINSKI FRITZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEPHANIE A. FUNK, OF FLORIDA
R. DAVID HARDEN, OF MARYLAND
STEPHEN M. HAYKIN, OF WASHINGTON
KAREN LOUISE RUFFING HILLIARD, OF FLORIDA
SARAH-ANN LYNCH, OF MARYLAND
PETER R. NATIELLO, OF FLORIDA
DIANA B. PUTMAN, OF CONNECTICUT
JAMES E. WATSON II, OF VIRGINIA
MARK ANTHONY WHITE, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

R. DOUGLASS ARBUCKLE, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTIAN D. BARRATT, OF WASHINGTON
CAROLYN B. BRYAN, OF VIRGINIA
FERNANDO COSSICH, OF FLORIDA
AMAN S. DJAHANBANI, OF MARYLAND
BRUCE GELBAND, OF VIRGINIA
ERIN HOLLERAN, OF MISSOURI
F. CATHERINE JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN M. JONES, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW JAMES KARAS, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL CHADWICK MOORE II, OF CALIFORNIA
JO LESSER-OLTHETEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHN A. PENNELL, OF FLORIDA
NEIL GERARD PRICE, OF VIRGINIA
LAWRENCE M. RUBEY, OF MARYLAND
JOEL B. SANDEFUR, OF CALIFORNIA
JOHN H. SEONG, OF FLORIDA
MONICA SMITH, OF NEW YORK
JOHN DIXON SMITH-SREEN, OF FLORIDA
JAMES IRWIN STEIN, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN DAVIS STEVENS, OF VIRGINIA
JENE CLARK THOMAS, OF TEXAS
SARA R. WALTER, OF KANSAS
ELLEN MARIE ZEHRE, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION INTO AND WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASSES INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

GREGORY ADAMS, OF VIRGINIA
LARRY EDWARD ANDRE, JR., OF TEXAS
ELIZABETH MOORE AUBIN, OF MARYLAND
CHARLES EDWARD BENNETT, OF WASHINGTON

GLORIA F. BERBENA, OF CALIFORNIA
RENA BITTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHARLES KEVIN BLACKSTONE, OF FLORIDA
JAMES A. BOUGHNER, OF WASHINGTON
MICHAEL B. BRETTZ, OF VIRGINIA
DUANE CLEMENS BUTCHER, JR., OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM BRENT CHRISTENSEN, OF VIRGINIA
SANDRA ELIANE CLARK, OF VIRGINIA
MARK J. DAVIDSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHN PAUL DESROCHER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BENJAMIN BEARDSLEY DILLE, OF MINNESOTA
BRUCE E. DONAHUE, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM H. DUNCAN, OF TEXAS
JOHN MARTIN EUSTACE, JR., OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER FITZGERALD, OF IOWA
LAWRENCE W. GERSON, OF TEXAS
THOMAS B. GIBBONS, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM KEVIN GRANT, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN M. HAGERSTROM, OF LOUISIANA
MATTHEW TRACY HARRINGTON, OF GEORGIA
BRENT R. HARTLEY, OF MARYLAND
DEBRA P. HELEN, OF HAWAII
SIMON HENSHAW, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER PAUL HENZEL, OF NEW YORK
L. VICTOR HURTADO, OF COLORADO
MAKILA JAMES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KATHY A. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS
PATRICIA K. KABRA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEVEN B. KASHKETT, OF FLORIDA
GLEN C. KEISER, OF CALIFORNIA
LAURA JEAN KIRKCONNELL, OF FLORIDA
JOHN M. KUSCHNER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
PATRICIA A. LACINA, OF CALIFORNIA
ALEXANDER MARK LASKARIS, OF MARYLAND
TIMOTHY LENDERKING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
EARLE D. LITZENBERGER, OF CALIFORNIA
NAOMI EMERSON LYEWE, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW JOHN MATTHEWS, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL MCCARTHY, OF VIRGINIA
ELISABETH INGA MILLARD, OF VIRGINIA
JUDITH A. MOON, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD WALTER NELSON, OF CALIFORNIA
HILARY S. OLSEN-WINDECKER, OF NEW YORK
JOSEPH S. PENNINGTON, OF FLORIDA
ANN E. PFORZHEIMER, OF NEW YORK
H. DEAN PITTMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOAN POLASCHIK, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH M. POMPER, OF CONNECTICUT
MICHAEL A. RATNEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
THOMAS G. ROCAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
CHRISTOPHER JOHN ROWAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ERIC N. RUMPF, OF WASHINGTON
MICHAEL R. SCHIMMEL, OF MICHIGAN
JEFFREY R. SEXTON, OF FLORIDA
LAWRENCE ROBERT SILVERMAN, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN N. STEVENSON, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN KING SULLIVAN, OF VIRGINIA
LYNNE M. TRACY, OF OHIO
BRUCE IRVIN TURNER, OF FLORIDA
CONRAD WILLIAM TURNER, OF VIRGINIA
KAREN L. WILLIAMS, OF FLORIDA
BRIAN WILLIAM WILSON, OF WASHINGTON
CHARLES E. WRIGHT, OF CALIFORNIA
HOYT B. YEE, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

ANGELA PRICE AGGELER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEFANIE AMADEO, OF MARYLAND
COURTNEY E. AUSTRIAN, OF TEXAS
MARY RUTH AVERY, OF FLORIDA
DAVID A. BEAM, OF FLORIDA
RICHARD K. BELL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DOUGLASS R. BENNING, OF MARYLAND
JOSEPH A. BOOKBINDER, OF NEW YORK
MARTINA T. BOUSTANI, OF CALIFORNIA
KENT C. BROKENSHIRE, OF MARYLAND
ROXANNE J. CABRAL, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE J. CHUNG, OF CALIFORNIA
DOUGLAS PAUL CLIMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC SCOTT COHAN, OF FLORIDA
SHAWN P. CROWLEY, OF TEXAS
DARIA LEIGH DARNELL, OF VIRGINIA
KAREN KASKA DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES PATRICK DEHART, OF VIRGINIA
PUSHPINDER S. DHILLON, OF OREGON
MICHAEL S. DIXON, OF IOWA
STEVEN H. FAGIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JULIE DAVIS FISHER, OF TENNESSEE
ELIZABETH ANNE NOSEWORTHY FITZSIMMONS, OF VIRGINIA
ELLEN JACQUELINE GERMAIN, OF NEW YORK
NICHOLAS JOSEPH GIACOBBE, JR., OF VIRGINIA
ROBIN LORENE HAASE, OF FLORIDA
LISA L. HELLING, OF COLORADO
ROBERT BUTLER HILTON, OF NEW YORK
COLLEEN ANNE HOBY, OF CALIFORNIA
DERECK JAMAL HOGAN, OF NEW JERSEY
GEORGE HAMILL HOGEMAN, OF VIRGINIA
ERIK ANDERS HOLM-OLSEN, OF NEW JERSEY
JOEY ROBERT HOOD, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
PAUL HOROWITZ, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN A. HUBLER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
SHARON HUDSON-DEAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
J. BAXTER HUNT, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES J. JESS, OF COLORADO
EDGARD DANIEL KAGAN, OF VIRGINIA
HARRY RUSSELL KAMIAN, OF CALIFORNIA

KAREN D. KELLEY, OF HAWAII
 RAYMOND J. KENGOTT, OF FLORIDA
 ELISE H. KLEINWAKS, OF FLORIDA
 JOHN MICHAEL KOWALSKI, OF WISCONSIN
 KRISTINA A. KVIRN, OF CALIFORNIA
 PHILIP G. LAIDLAW, OF FLORIDA
 WILLIAM SCOTT LAIDLAW, OF WASHINGTON
 KARIN MELKA LANG, OF VIRGINIA
 JESSICA E. LAPENN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 KAYE-ANNE LEE, OF VIRGINIA
 MARK W. LIBBY, OF VIRGINIA
 PAUL RAMSEY MALIK, OF CALIFORNIA
 NICHOLAS JORDAN MANRING, OF WASHINGTON
 ERVIN JOSE MASSINGA, OF WASHINGTON
 PAUL OVERTON MAYER, OF VIRGINIA
 DEBORAH RUTLEDGE MENNUITI, OF VIRGINIA
 THOMAS ELEUTERIO MESA, OF FLORIDA
 BENJAMIN WARD MOELING, OF VIRGINIA
 VIRGINIA E. MURRAY, OF NEW JERSEY
 JENNIFER W. NORONHA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 RICHARD CARLTON PASCHALL III, OF VIRGINIA
 THOMAS JOSEPH NICHOLAS PIERCE, OF NEW YORK
 KARYN ALLISON POSNER-MULLEN, OF FLORIDA
 WOODWARD CLARK PRICE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 VANGALA S. RAM, OF VIRGINIA
 HOWARD VERNE REED, OF MARYLAND
 SONJA KAY RIX, OF NEBRASKA
 TIMOTHY P. ROCHE, OF VIRGINIA
 KAREN H. SASAHARA, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 NORMAN THATCHER SCHARPF, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JULIE LYN SCHECHTER-TORRES, OF MARYLAND
 TIMOTHY MARTIN SCHERER, OF VIRGINIA
 ROBERT KENNETH SCOTT, OF MARYLAND
 NICOLE DAYAN SHAMPAINE, OF CALIFORNIA
 BRIAN WESLEY SHUKAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 ROBERT SILBERSTEIN, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM RYON SILKWORTH, OF VIRGINIA
 MARCO AURELIO RIBERIO SIMS, OF NEW YORK
 ANTON KURT SMITH, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 TIMOTHY M. STATER, OF FLORIDA
 MARK TESONE, OF CALIFORNIA
 HOWARD ANDREE VAN VRANKEN, OF CALIFORNIA
 HALE COLBURN VANKOUGHNETT, OF RHODE ISLAND
 STEVEN CRAIG WALKER, OF HAWAII
 JAN LIAM WASLEY, OF NEW JERSEY
 SCOTT D. WEINHOLD, OF VIRGINIA
 STACY ELIZABETH WHITE, OF TEXAS
 ANDREW TOWNSEND WIENER, OF TEXAS
 SAU CHING YIP, OF VIRGINIA
 ANDREW ROBERT YOUNG, OF CALIFORNIA
 DAVID J. YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA
 RICARDO F. ZUNIGA, OF VIRGINIA

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

RICARDO COLON CIFREDO, OF VIRGINIA
 DANIEL SYLVESTER CRONIN, OF VIRGINIA
 CHAYAN C. DEY, OF FLORIDA
 PETER T. GUERIN, OF NEW MEXICO
 DAVID W. HALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 JAMES O. INDER, OF FLORIDA
 JEANNE PERSCHY KINNETT, OF MARYLAND
 BRIAN J. MCCARTHY, OF VIRGINIA
 ERIC N. MILSTEAD, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL J. MORRIS, OF VIRGINIA
 KAREN E. MUMMAW, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL J. OLSON, OF VIRGINIA
 ALEXANDER L. RALEY, OF VIRGINIA
 DOMINIC A. SABRUNO, OF FLORIDA
 JOANNE RIZZO SILVA, OF FLORIDA
 SUSAN M. WELSBY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 K. ANDREW WRUBLEWSKI, OF VIRGINIA
 STEPHEN ARTHUR YOUNG, OF FLORIDA
 TODD R. ZICCARELLI, OF NEW YORK

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED, EFFECTIVE APRIL 15, 2014:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

DOUGLAS A. KONEFF, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR

PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2012:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

DANIEL MENDO HIRSCH, OF MARYLAND

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RODRICK A. KOCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES F. RICHEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

CYNTHIA AITAHOLMES

ANN BEHRENDIS

STEPHANIE CALHOUNJAMISON

MYUNGSOOK CHO

KENNETH J. ERLEY

TINA R. JONESFAISON

STACY L. LARSEN

ADAM J. MCKISSOCK

NEIL E. MOREY

JASON C. STRANGE

MICHAEL S. THOUT

RYAN J. WANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

DONALD W. ALGEO

DOUGLAS A. BADZIK

RICARDO M. BURGOS

MARK G. CARMICHAEL

MARIO CAYCEDO

MATTHEW A. CODY

JAMES V. CRAWFORD

SCOTT R. DALTON

COLIN Y. DANIELS

KEPLER A. DAVIS

ROBERT W. DAVIS

ALAN J. DEANGELO

RHONDA DEEN

JAMES A. DICKERSON II

JESS D. EDISON

MICHAEL W. ELLIS

LISA M. FOGLIA

JASON A. FRIEDMAN

DAVID Y. GAITONDE

VINAYA A. GARDE

STEVEN J. GAYDOS

RODNEY S. GONZALEZ

SCOTT R. GRIFFITH

DAVID D. HAIGHT

KATRINA D. HALL

MARLA R. HEMPHILL

DUANE R. HENNIN

DAVID S. HEPPNER

MARC E. HUNT

ANTHONY E. JOHNSON

JEREMIAH J. JOHNSON

ANDREW C. KIM

CHRISTINE E. LANG

CHRISTOPHER J. LETTIERI

FELISA S. A. LEWIS

PETER A. LINDENBERG

YINCE LOH

ROBERT L. MABRY

MARSHALL J. MALINOWSKI

JAMES D. MANCUSO

BRYANT G. MARCHANT

STEWART C. MCCARVER

COLIN A. MEGHOO

JOHN S. OH

ROBERT C. OH

ERIK C. OSBORN

JOHN J. OSBORN

BRETT D. OWENS

LAURA A. PACHA

MAUREEN M. PETERSEN

SCOTT M. PETERSEN

ROBERT C. PRICE

TRAVIS B. RICHARDSON

MARK A. ROBINSON

RICHARD C. RUCK II

SCOTT A. SALMON

RICHARD R. SMITH

TIMOTHY M. STRAIGHT

JONATHAN C. TAYLOR

CHRISTOPHER E. TEBROCK

SIMON H. TELIAN

BRIGILDA C. TENEZA

CREIGHTON C. TUBB

TODD C. VILLINES

WENDI M. WAITS

CHRISTOPHER H. WARNER

CHRISTOPHER E. WHITE

AMY L. H. YOUNG

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSHUA B. ROBERTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MORRIS A. DESIMONE III

RONALD J. ROSTEK, JR.

ANDREW R. STRAUSS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN P. HULSE

ANTHONY C. LYONS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

HENRY C. BODDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIAN L. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM E. LANHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN R. LUCAS

JAMES N. SHELSTAD

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 13, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 13, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CONCESSIONS TO CUBA ARE JUST THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as an 8-year-old child, I was forced to flee Havana, Cuba, with my family for the shores of the United States of America, this shining city on a hill and a beacon of hope and freedom to the world.

The Cuban American Members of Congress are all united by our love of this great country and our love and respect for freedom, for democracy, and the rule of law because of where we come from and whom we represent. For us, these principles aren't concepts that we take for granted. We cherish them because we know the alternative.

We need look no further than just 60 miles south of the United States to see the alternative, where the Castro regime has been entrenched for over 55 years and ruling the island with an iron fist.

This is Berta Soler, one of the leaders of Las Damas de Blanco, the Ladies in White, a peaceful dissident group. Berta has been detained so many

times, she says to me, that she has lost count. That is why we stand united in a bipartisan manner, in steadfast opposition to any attempts by the Obama administration to normalize relations with the Castro regime.

President Obama's audacity of hubris has resulted in one exercise in folly after another, and engagement with Cuba is the height of that folly. What have we gotten in return? Let me turn to the next poster. This poster has a list of some of the many wanted criminals who have sought refuge and have gotten it in Castro's Cuba. We haven't gotten any reforms from this deal.

We haven't gotten the return of these dozens of criminals that Castro has been harboring because they have fled from justice in America, like convicted New Jersey State trooper killer Joanne Chesimard. After this deal was announced, the Castro regime said: Oh, no, all of these people, we will give them asylum. The FBI has put her on the most wanted terrorist list; yet Castro says: We will give them asylum.

What have the Cuban people received as a result of this administration's concessions? Well, 53 political prisoners supposedly were released, Mr. Speaker, like some of these activists, who were rounded up in a catch-and-release program of the Castro regime.

The administration hails this list of 53 as a victory, ignoring the fact that hundreds of political and anti-regime activists like these were arrested and detained immediately before and after the announcement of the changes, and almost 2,000 people were arrested or detained last year alone. This infamous list of 53 that has been praised by this administration and the Castro regime is another ruse.

Over a dozen individuals on that list were released prior to the December 17 announcement, including Carlos Andres Sanchez Perez. He was released over 1 year ago. Some were arrested even before June. Catch-and-release is the new program, the new playbook of the Castro regime, and Obama deliberately has fallen for that ruse.

Now, the regime will feel emboldened because the United States has just signed off on its mistreatment of its citizens, and President Obama has extended an economic lifeline to the regime that will allow it to continue this repression.

Before there can be any discussion of changing our policy toward Cuba, Mr. Speaker, all political prisoners must be released, not this fake list of 53; fair and multiparty elections must be held;

and the fundamental human rights of every Cuban must be respected.

Mr. Speaker, I warn my colleagues to pay close attention to what the Obama administration is attempting to do in Cuba because this will track with its attempts at reconciliation with Iran, another rogue nation and state sponsor of terrorism. The administration's efforts in Cuba have been the test case for Iran, and the two have paralleled each other.

While the administration was holding secret talks with the Castro regime, we know that he was penning secret letters to Iran's Supreme Leader Khamenei and conceding to Iran the right to enrich uranium.

These concessions to Cuba are just the tip of the iceberg, and it will open the doors to similar measures in Iran where the Supreme Leader will see what is happening in Cuba and says: Hey, we can get away with that as well.

Both have serious consequences for our national security as other nations see that we lack the courage of our convictions, and they will be willing to test us. In fact, Nicolas Maduro after the prisoner exchange said, "We will exchange Leopoldo Lopez," a human rights activist whom Nicolas Maduro has imprisoned in Venezuela, for one of the criminals in prison here in the United States. They want to test us; they want to see what they can get for holding innocents in prison.

Just look at the appeasements that this administration has made to Russia, to Iran, to North Korea. These rogue regimes will continue to act with impunity, and our allies have turned away from us because, instead of working with our allies, we have been appeasing our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like for this Congress to take a close look at that list of 53 prisoners and remember that even if that were a true list, which it is not, it is not about 53. It is about freedom for all political prisoners, some of whose names we will never know.

WE NEED A NEW AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are now in our 6th month of war against ISIS, and make no mistake about it, we are at war in Iraq, though I do not recall a debate or a vote in this Chamber authorizing that.

I would respectfully remind the President, who is well-versed in constitutional law, of something he already knows but appears unwilling to address: the executive is not permitted under the articles of the Constitution to unilaterally authorize military action in a situation that does not constitute an imminent threat.

There is no doubt that ISIS is a depraved and repugnant organization, but our intelligence community has repeatedly said it does not imminently threaten the United States. Even if that assessment were to change following the horror we witnessed in Paris, we would still need a clear authorization and a serious debate about yet another American war in Iraq.

I and several of my colleagues in both Chambers have been calling for such a debate since last August. In November, the President said he intended to work with the Congress to craft a new Authorization for Use of Military Force, or an AUMF, in the anti-ISIS campaign.

Before it adjourned last year, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations drafted and passed a new, if vague, AUMF against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

Mr. Speaker, the 113th Congress abrogated its responsibility to acknowledge that the ongoing military campaign in Iraq and Syria cannot be sustained on the back of war powers notifications of two outdated AUMFs.

The start of this new Congress is a perfect time to actually do something about this urgent need by debating and voting on something required of us 6 months ago. Over 3,000 American troops have been deployed to retrain Iraqi Army brigades that will allegedly be the new and improved force to take over against ISIS.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff declined to say over the weekend how long this training would take, so the Prime Minister of Iraq volunteered a guess: 3 years. In 3 years, which seems awfully optimistic, Iraq may be able to rebuild and restructure its military.

Does this mean 3 more years of coalition airstrikes, if we even have a coalition by then? Does that mean 3 more years of military advisers to train forces that will never be ready? Does that mean 3 more years of American troops sent out to reoccupy those decrepit bases that served as a stark reminder of the last time—more than 10 years ago—we went to war in Iraq without a strategy?

Mr. Speaker, apparently, the reading of the Constitution on the House floor last week was gratuitous, since the Congress has no intention of following a key section of the Constitution. When it comes to war and peace, Mr. Speaker, the authority remains firmly with the Congress; yet we have sent our country's sons and daughters to

war without a new bill, a serious debate, or a proper vote.

Where is our sense of priority, reading the Constitution or obeying it? Where is our sense of responsibility? We have already had 6 months of unilateral war against ISIS. Another 3 years is intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to you to invite the President to come up here and address this House, all 535 Members of Congress, to tell us what he needs and what he has decided is worth the sacrifice. It cannot be done, it should not be done, without an authorization from this Congress. To fail to do that is eroding to the very Constitution that we say we support in this House.

We have a civilian control of the military, not by one man, but by 535 Members of Congress. That is the way it is supposed to work. We need to have this debate now.

HELP FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we were sent to Washington by our constituents to work together to encourage accountability, transparency, and limited government. Bigger government does not necessarily mean more responsive government, but it has come to mean more costly government.

When our small businesses and entrepreneurs, the backbone of our economy, are forced to divert resources to costly new mandates, it means less capital for growing their business, less capital to hire more employees, less money to raise employee wages.

Two statistics, to me, jump out. First, 64 percent of the new jobs created in this country in the past 15 years have been through small businesses. Last year alone, new regulations cost our economy \$67 billion.

We are going to be dealing with several regulatory reform measures this week, bipartisan pieces of legislation that will modernize the Federal rule-making process and put more power back in the hands of job creators.

We need to help those who are too often squeezed by regulation the most: small businesses. We need to give them a larger voice in the process. We need to be a country that continues to welcome new ideas and innovation, not a nation that overregulates from Washington and inhibits our full economic potential.

I look forward to forthcoming regulatory reform measures to help streamline our government, get Washington out of the way, bring stability and certainty to small businesses, and help grow our economy.

□ 1015

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor today to give a voice to those who are hungry, to share their struggles, and to challenge my House colleagues to take meaningful action to end hunger now.

Last week the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities released a troubling new report estimating that roughly 1 million unemployed Americans will be cut off from SNAP benefits over the course of 2016. The report anticipates that those affected will lose between \$150 and \$200 per person per month in food benefits—cuts that will cause serious hardship. Mr. Speaker, this is shameful, and it deserves our attention. We should be working to end hunger now, not making it worse.

The 1996 welfare law limits individuals aged 18 to 50 who are not disabled or caring for young children to 3 months of SNAP benefits in any 36-month period if they aren't employed or in a work training program for 20 hours or more a week. That sounds reasonable, but when jobs and job training are not available, it isn't so reasonable.

During times of high unemployment, Governors can request a waiver to the 3-month time limit for their State. During the Great Recession, Governors, both Republicans and Democrats, in 46 States have requested and have been granted some type of waiver from the 3-month time limit. This enabled unemployed adults to continue to look for a job in a tough job market without going hungry.

Mr. Speaker, our economy continues to improve and unemployment rates across the country are falling, but we are not out of the woods yet. The most vulnerable among us—those with limited education and skills—continue to struggle to find work.

In October 2014, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimated there were two unemployed workers for every available position. By that measure, even if every available job were filled by an unemployed individual, there still would not be enough jobs for everyone who needed one.

When the current 3-month time limit waivers expire, the problem is that most States offer few, if any, job training programs. They aren't required to do so. And in States that do offer work programs, the number of individuals who need them far outnumbers the available slots. Come 2016, an unemployed adult actively looking for work, no matter how many job postings they respond to or how many resumes they send out, will arbitrarily be cut off from receiving food benefits through no fault of their own.

The 3-month time limit as it is drafted is a severe penalty that hurts an already vulnerable population. According to USDA data, those who would be affected have an average monthly income of only 19 percent of the poverty line. They often do not qualify for any other types of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that 1 million of the poorest Americans would be cut off from food benefits because their State does not offer job training programs or does not have the capacity to meet the demand for those who need help improving their skills. These individuals would be left on their own at an already difficult time. They may be forced to choose between food and rent or other necessities.

Mr. Speaker, we need to adequately fund our job training programs, which this Congress has consistently failed to do, and we need to ensure that unemployed adults who are diligently searching for a job do not go hungry while they look for work.

I am concerned—deeply concerned—about reports that Republican leaders want to launch yet another assault against SNAP. They want to cut the program even more. That would be a mistake and a disservice to one of the most efficiently and effectively run Federal programs. Even more important, it would be a disservice to so many of our citizens who are struggling in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about a Republican majority that is more interested in adhering to a political sound bite than in pursuing sound policy. Let's focus on ending hunger and ending poverty. Let's bring to an end the nasty, cruel, and negative rhetoric that has been used to demagogue SNAP and those who rely on the benefit that was so evident in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is tough to be poor in America. It is hard work. We in Congress should be part of the solution, not part of the problem. We can do better. We can and we should do more to end hunger now.

IN THE LINE OF DUTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that I stand at the podium today to thank two Members of Congress who last week took the lead on LEAD. LEAD is Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. I want to thank Congresspersons JOLLY and REICHERT for what they did on last Friday in paying a special tribute, if you will, to the 900,000-plus who serve us as peace officers in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that in my family I had an uncle who was a peace officer, and he had an in-

fluence on my life that literally changed the course of my life and set me on the course that I currently am pursuing. My uncle and I were riding along together, and I was asking a lot of questions. He made a statement that became indelible with me. He said: This boy is asking so many questions, I think he is going to be a lawyer.

I was younger than 10. I don't think I knew what a lawyer was. I am not sure how old I was. I remember I was very young. But I also remember that if my uncle thought that being a lawyer was a good thing for me, then that was a thing that I should do.

This was a peace officer, a police officer, a deputy sheriff that had a lasting impact on my life. I am so grateful for his service to his community and the way he has been an outstanding citizen in his community. His name is Dallas Yates.

I am proud to tell you that when I saw these Congresspersons paying tribute to peace officers, police officers, I concluded that I would have to add to the RECORD some thoughts because there is a phrase that we use quite often when we reference peace officers. It is styled, "in the line of duty"—"in the line of duty." And officers do so many things in the line of duty. Some of these things, quite frankly, are not things that they are expected to do, but they do them anyway.

The Washington Post reported that two officers delivered a baby on Christmas Day in the line of duty. They were on duty when they did it. Officers are not trained to deliver babies, but when called upon, they take the lead to do what needs to be done.

Think of the thousands of people who have been stranded and who were helped by peace officers: flood victims helped by peace officers, persons with something as simple as a flat tire helped by police officers, all in the course and scope of their duty. And then, of course, we have officers who have literally gone into fires to save lives. It has been reported that officers have done this. In fact, the Tulsa World recently reported that an officer saved a life from a fire in the line of duty, in the course and scope of duty.

That phrase means a lot more than simply lending a helping hand. "In the line of duty" means sometimes that officers lose their lives. In this country, we had 27 officers die in 2013 as a result of felonious incidents all occurring in the line of duty. We had 49 that died from accidents in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, when this term is used now, "in the line of duty," to refer to these officers who make the ultimate sacrifice so that others may have a better life, you have better appreciation for what "in the line of duty" means. It is more than mere words. It means sacrifice. Many families have had to mourn the loss of a loved one in the line of duty.

So I am proud to salute the officers—the 900,000-plus—and I thank the Congresspersons who led the discussion celebrating, appreciating, and commemorating those who have served and have gone on to make their transition in the line of duty.

I think it appropriate to close with these words that express some thoughts about how we measure our lives and how the life of a person is measured and appreciated. Ruth Smeltzer reminds us:

Some measure their lives by days and years,
Others by heartthrobs, passion, and tears.

But the surest measure under the sun
Is what in your lifetime for others you have done.

I want to thank the 900,000-plus officers for what they have done for others in their lifetime in the line of duty. God bless you. God bless the United States of America.

THE GAS TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the momentum for an increase in the Federal gas tax continues to build. This weekend's excellent New York Times editorial made the case why the increase is needed and long overdue. Costs of repair increase dramatically the longer they are delayed. In the meantime, Americans paid billions of dollars for congestion, wasted gas, and repairing damage to their cars, and thousands of lives are lost due to unsafe roads. This followed an editorial in The Washington Post making the same argument, joining USA Today, L.A. Times, and a variety of newspapers across the country.

Recently, we have seen eight Senators from both parties who have been identified as stepping up, either supporting a gas tax or at least being open to it. We have seen leadership at the State level as eight States in the last 2 years have increased gas taxes, including some very red States like Wyoming and New Hampshire. Here in the House, there are already 136 Members who have signed a bipartisan letter urging the leadership to act on providing appropriate funding that is sustainable and dedicated.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we do have a solution. This issue has been studied extensively, including two Presidential commissions during the Bush administration. The conclusion was that there is no better, more effective solution than simply raising the gas tax, which hasn't been increased in 22 years.

People know America is falling behind as it is falling apart. The concern about the financial impact of a gas tax increase on families is waning. As gas prices plummet, my corner gas station is selling gasoline at \$1.60 per gallon less than its peak last year.

I will be reintroducing the funding proposal I had in the last Congress. That legislation was widely supported by a range of interests that included labor, business, the professions, local government, transit, environmentalists, truckers, AAA, and cyclists. They all agreed that there is a critical need to fund investments in rebuilding and renewing America.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments today are basically the same that were used by President Ronald Reagan in his Thanksgiving Day address in 1982. He used his nationwide radio speech 33 years ago to call for an increase that more than doubled the Federal gas tax. He pointed out that that tax is actually for the people who benefit from using it, that the user fee would cost less than the damage to repair their cars from damage due to poor conditions from roads and bridges. As President Reagan said, it would probably be less than a pair of shock absorbers.

He pointed out that the gas tax then, as now, had not been raised in more than two decades, and that repairing infrastructure that was failing would put hundreds of thousands of people to work while it protected the investment in our infrastructure as well as in our automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to step up. The States are doing their part. People are exploring innovative financing approaches involving the private sector. People are looking at creative ways to design and build projects, but there is no substitute for the 25 percent of infrastructure funding that comes from the Federal partnership. It is absolutely essential for projects that are multiyear, projects that are multimodal and that involve a number of jurisdictions, often a number of States.

This May we face the expiration of the short-term highway trust fund fix from last summer. We are back in the exact same situation we were then. Failing to address the funding issue head-on has meant that we haven't had a 6-year reauthorization approved by Congress since 1997. Since then, we have had two ever-shorter reauthorizations and 21 temporary extensions. Over \$60 billion of general fund money has been needed to just prop up our inadequate system.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, no country has become great planning and building its infrastructure 6 months at a time. It is time to capitalize on falling oil prices, on the momentum that is building around the country, and the realization that we need to act now.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me and, indeed, President Reagan in this long overdue action. America will be better off, the economy will be stronger, communities will be more livable and our families safer,

healthier, and more economically secure.

STRENGTH OF THE PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD MOVEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke about Puerto Rico's mission to discard its status as a U.S. territory and to become a U.S. State. Today, I rise to inform my colleagues about the most recent phase of this mission.

A brief word of background. Puerto Rico has been a territory since 1898. Its status is incompatible with the principles this Nation strives to uphold at home and promotes abroad. There are 3.6 million American citizens in Puerto Rico. My constituents cherish their U.S. citizenship and have made countless contributions to this country in law, science, business, government, the arts, the armed services, and every other field of human endeavor. Yet they cannot vote for President, have no U.S. Senators, and send one Delegate to the House who has a voice but no vote in this Chamber.

The people of Puerto Rico, beyond lacking democratic rights, are deprived of equality under law. Congress has a license to discriminate against the territories, and Puerto Rico is treated worse than the States under a range of Federal programs. To compensate for the shortfall in Federal funding, the Puerto Rican government has borrowed heavily in order to provide adequate public services. This disparate treatment is the principal reason why Puerto Rico has endured severe economic problems for decades.

Inequality, both political and economic, is driving thousands of my constituents to depart for the States every month. It is human nature to go where you believe you can secure a better future for yourself and your family. However, residents of Puerto Rico have finally said enough is enough. They demand a status that is democratic and dignified, a proud status for a proud people.

In a referendum organized by the local government in 2012, voters in Puerto Rico rejected territory status and expressed a clear preference for statehood. In response, Congress provided an appropriation of \$2.5 million to fund the first federally sponsored vote in Puerto Rico's history, with the clear goal of resolving the territory's status. This is the most significant step the Federal Government has ever taken to settle the status debate in Puerto Rico.

I have proposed that the funding be used to hold a federally sponsored "yes" or "no" vote on whether Puerto Rico should be admitted as a State.

Some have complained that Puerto Rico has already voted for statehood and should not have to vote again. This argument is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of history and how Washington works. After expressing a strong desire for statehood in local referenda, the territories of Alaska and Hawaii each held federally sponsored "yes" or "no" votes on admission that led to statehood. If Puerto Rico wants to become a State, it must do the same.

My proposal has broad congressional support, since a bill I filed last Congress that endorsed this approach obtained 131 cosponsors and led to the filing of an identical Senate bill. My proposal also has significant local support. Yesterday, in a remarkable display of unity and resolve, all 22 members of the statehood delegation in the Puerto Rico house and all eight members of the statehood delegation in the Puerto Rico Senate introduced identical bills that proposed to use the appropriation from Congress to conduct a federally sponsored vote on Puerto Rico's admission as a State. Now all that remains is for Puerto Rico's Governor, speaker of the house, and senate president—each a defender of the failed status quo—to show some courage and schedule this vote. Real leaders do not fear the democratic process or its results.

Meanwhile, statehood forces continue our forward march, expanding in size and strength. Indeed, today statehood supporters are rallying outside the White House and are holding meetings here in Congress. In the coming weeks and months, our advocacy efforts will only intensify. As individuals, our ability to effect change is inherently limited, but as a united movement, we are as strong as steel. We are fighting for equality, and we will not stop until we achieve it.

OPPOSING THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is still very young. This Congress that we are in right now began last week when we were gavelled in and we were sworn in. It has taken very little time for my Republican colleagues to begin to message to the American people just where they stand.

The things we have seen last week from the very beginning—one thing we saw was an effort in the rules package which prohibited Social Security from sending money over to the Social Security disability fund. This has been done many times before; it is routine. It will certainly create pressure and undermine and create real damage and a scary situation for people who are on Social Security disability payments and who survive on it based on their documented, recorded illness.

But they didn't stop there. The very next day they began to erode the financial protections that protect Americans from the massive collapse that took place on Wall Street in 2008. Already they want to dismantle and chip away at the Volcker rule, a very commonsense rule which says that big banks that hold collateralized loan obligations have to move these big assets, these big financial instruments, outside of their banking business, wherein they have protected assets by the FDIC.

No sooner than we did that, the very next day we moved on to dismantling the Affordable Care Act, making it so you don't get health care coverage, can't mandate health care coverage until someone works 40 hours, as opposed to 30, which meant that there will be people who will lose out on health care coverage from their employer.

And the next day, we were here with the Keystone pipeline. They tried to push that under a bill that wasn't really a pure Keystone bill. It didn't have things like spill protection.

And then here we are this week about to see a bill on the floor very soon which will essentially prioritize Republican gamesmanship over immigration. It will prioritize that over our homeland security. The Homeland Security bill, this bill we passed last year, late last year—you may recall something called the CR/Omnibus bill. It was a CR omnibus bill. We passed a whole series of funding bills for a year's time, except for one particular bill. And the bill that is due to expire is the Homeland Security bill.

Now in the wake of Paris happening just a few days ago, the horrific murder, carnage, and barbaric behavior by terrorists that happened just a few days ago, we now are facing a big fight on what of all things—homeland security? And why are we having this big fight? It's because the Republicans want to show President Obama that they are not going to allow him to use executive authority that is well within his power to do.

Presidents have always used executive authority. The Emancipation Proclamation issued by President Lincoln was executive authority. The bills that Ronald Reagan passed used executive authority many more times than President Obama has. So has George W. Bush. It is routine. Presidents issue executive orders.

President Obama has done some because the Republican majority has refused to move on comprehensive immigration reform. He has used his authority to prioritize the deportation of criminals, people who have committed crimes, over kids who are valedictorians, and he has done this well within his right as the chief executive officer of this country.

And because the Republicans don't like the executive orders, because they

have very divisive views, in my opinion, on immigration, they have decided to have a very short Homeland Security funding bill, which is putting us in a position where we are either going to capitulate and back off on things that the President wants to do or we are going to pass a Homeland Security bill with a lot of things in it that would be damaging to the action that the President has already taken.

Let me tell you, some of the things in the Homeland Security bill are of huge concern to me. I will just share just a few of them. One of them is the Blackburn amendment. The Blackburn amendment would prohibit the use of funds to continue for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program.

Pay close attention to this bill. This is not what the American people want. We urge the American people to pay close attention, and I intend to vote against these Republican measures.

TERRORISM AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the new year has come with many blessings, but it has also come with a major wake-up call. I rise again to express my deepest sympathy to the people of France, the loss of lives, including our Jewish brothers and sisters targeted simply because of their faith and other innocents.

I stand as well to recognize my friends in the Muslim community who have all come together, to thank them for standing against violent and reckless terrorism. Their voices were loud and present and noted.

I recognize the heads of state, the work of the United States in standing alongside France, our early and longstanding partner in democracy and liberty. Yesterday, some of us had the privilege, hosted by the Foreign Affairs Committee, to greet the French Ambassador and to offer to the people of France our personal regrets and sympathy.

As we look to the incidents that are coming to our attention around the world, let me bring up again the girls in Nigeria, who were taken almost a year ago, 300 innocent school girls. The only thing that they wanted to do was to take their exams.

In the spring of 2014, I led a delegation of Members of Congress to the northern state of Borno. I met the pleading and crying and broken families. I met some of the girls who gave a harrowing story of how they escaped, sliding through the wooded forests, escaping for their lives with just the clothes on their back. Only through a light from a house along the road were they able to get some refuge, and then three of them escaped on a motorcycle with a hero whose name probably will never be noted.

But these girls have no more identity. We are saying bring the girls back, but maybe they are married and impregnated and indoctrinated in this instance with doctrines that were not their life. They were Christian.

□ 1045

The focus on Africa must be enhanced. I thank my good friend Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who has been working tirelessly as the ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee and had a brilliant meeting this morning.

I come now to announce that we cannot stand by as Boko Haram pillages violently, recklessly, with inhumanity, kills with reckless abandonment, with no one stopping them, 2,000 people along Lake Chad, bodies that people are tripping over and finding under bushes and trees. This is a cry for mercy; this is an outrage. The world cannot stand by idly and not look to this.

Nigeria cannot fight this alone, and just as we have announced a concerted global effort against ISIL and al Qaeda, we must do this against Boko Haram. They are not simply a group of thugs. They have connected to this vile institution of terrorism, and they are going up against ill-prepared military forces.

We could point the finger, and I am asking for the Government of Nigeria to stand and ask for help. There is no shame in asking for help. I am asking the United Nations to do more than it is doing. I am asking the African Union to collaborate with the forces that they have at their side with the collaboration of African countries to go to the rescue of the innocent persons in northern Nigeria.

How can we stand by when a 10-year-old girl who needs to be playing with dolls and going to school and looking into the sunshine for an aspirational light of things that she can do in 2014, probably a brilliant little girl, unbeknownst to her, strapped with a horrible bomb and now in death, with her little body splintered by a bomb—a suicide bomber—how can she even understand what they had told her she was doing?

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying that I am calling upon the world to join in a global effort to fight the terrorist dastardly behavior of an uncaring Boko Haram, and I close by saying that we must reach out to young Muslim boys in northern Nigeria for an alternative to that life.

May God rest in peace those who have died at the hands of terrorists, and we ask for a unified global response.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this people's House. Help them to walk in the light, to share their strengths, and to build upon their common desire for the good of our Nation that they might better attend to the important issues of our day.

May they think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously to make our Nation better today than it was yesterday. If it be Your will, we ask that men and women of good will from both sides of the political aisle might cooperate in the forming of law and policy.

May we be forever grateful for the blessings our Nation enjoys and appropriately generous with what we have to help those among us who are in need.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BOUSTANY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 29

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Goodlatte; Mr. Lucas; Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. Neugebauer; Mr. Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania; Mr. Gibbs; Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia; Mr. Crawford; Mr. DesJarlais; Mr. Gibson; Mrs. Hartzler; Mr. Benishek; Mr. Denham; Mr. LaMalfa; Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois; Mr. Yoho; Mrs. Walorski; Mr. Allen; Mr. Mike Bost of Illinois; Mr. Rouzer; Mr. Abraham; Mr. Emmer of Minnesota; Mr. Moolenaar; and Mr. Newhouse.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Frelinghuysen; Mr. Aderholt; Ms. Granger; Mr. Simpson; Mr. Culberson; Mr. Crenshaw; Mr. Carter of Texas; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Cole; Mr. Diaz-Balart; Mr. Dent; Mr. Graves of Georgia; Mr. Yoder; Mr. Womack; Mr. Fortenberry; Mr. Rooney of Florida; Mr. Fleischmann; Ms. Herrera Beutler; Mr. Joyce; Mr. Valadao; Mr. Harris; Mrs. Roby; Mr. Amodei; Mr. Stewart; Mr. Rigell; Mr. Jolly; Mr. Young of Iowa; and Mr. Jenkins of West Virginia.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Jones; Mr. Forbes; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Bishop of Utah; Mr. Turner; Mr. Kline; Mr. Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Franks of Arizona; Mr. Shuster; Mr. Conaway; Mr. Lamborn; Mr. Wittman; Mr. Hunter; Mr. Fleming; Mr. Coffman; Mr. Gibson; Mrs. Hartzler; Mr. Heck of Nevada; Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia; Mr. Palazzo; Mr. Brooks of Alabama; Mr. Nugent; Mr. Cook; Mr. Bridenstine; Mr. Wenstrup; Mrs. Walorski; Mr. Byrne; Mr. Graves of Missouri; Mr. Zinke; Ms. Stefanik; Ms. McCally; Mr. Knight; and Mr. MacArthur.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Ms. Foxx; Mr. Hunter; Mr. Roe of Tennessee; Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania; Mr. Walberg; Mr. Salmon; Mr. Guthrie; Mr. Rokita; Mr. Barletta; Mr. Heck of Nevada; Mr. Messer; Mr. Byrne; Mr. Brat; Mr. Carter of Georgia; Mr. Bishop of Michigan; Mr. Grothman; Mr. Russell; Mr. Curbelo of Florida; Ms. Stefanik; and Mr. Allen.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Barton; Mr. Whitfield; Mr. Shimkus; Mr. Pitts; Mr. Walden; Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania; Mr. Burgess; Mrs. Blackburn; Mr. Scalise; Mr. Latta; Mrs. McMorris Rodgers; Mr. Harper; Mr. Lance; Mr. Guthrie; Mr. Olson; Mr. McKinley; Mr. Pompeo; Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois; Mr. Griffith; Mr. Bilirakis; Mr. Johnson of Ohio; Mr. Long; Mrs. Ellmers of North Carolina; Mr. Bucshon; Mr. Flores; Mrs. Brooks of Indiana; Mr. Mullin; Mr. Hudson; Mr. Collins of New York; and Mr. Cramer.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. King of New York; Mr. Royce; Mr. Lucas; Mr.

Garrett; Mr. Neugebauer; Mr. McHenry; Mr. Pearce; Mr. Posey; Mr. Fitzpatrick; Mr. Westmoreland; Mr. Luetkemeyer; Mr. Huizenga of Michigan; Mr. Duffy; Mr. Hurt of Virginia; Mr. Stivers; Mr. Fincher; Mr. Stutzman; Mr. Mulvaney; Mr. Hultgren; Mr. Ross; Mr. Pittenger; Mrs. Wagner; Mr. Barr; Mr. Rothfus; Mr. Messer; Mr. Schweikert; Mr. Dold; Mr. Guinta; Mr. Tipton; Mr. Williams; Mr. Poliquin; Mrs. Love; and Mr. Hill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Smith of New Jersey; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. McCaul; Mr. Poe of Texas; Mr. Salmon; Mr. Issa; Mr. Marino; Mr. Duncan of South Carolina; Mr. Brooks of Alabama; Mr. Cook; Mr. Weber of Texas; Mr. Perry; Mr. DeSantis; Mr. Meadows; Mr. Yoho; Mr. Clawson of Florida; Mr. DesJarlais; Mr. Ribble; Mr. Trott; Mr. Zeldin; and Mr. Emmer of Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. King of New York; Mr. Rogers of Alabama; Mrs. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Duncan of South Carolina; Mr. Marino; Mr. Palazzo; Mr. Barletta; Mr. Perry; Mr. Clawson of Florida; Mr. Katko; Mr. Hurd of Texas; Mr. Carter of Georgia; Mr. Walker; Mr. Loudermilk; Ms. McCally; and Mr. Ratcliffe.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Sensenbrenner; Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Issa; Mr. Forbes; Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. Franks of Arizona; Mr. Gohmert; Mr. Jordan; Mr. Poe of Texas; Mr. Chaffetz; Mr. Marino; Mr. Gowdy; Mr. Labrador; Mr. Farenthold; Mr. Collins of Georgia; Mr. DeSantis; Mrs. Mimi Walters of California; Mr. Buck; Mr. Ratcliffe; Mr. Trott; and Mr. Bishop of Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Young of Alaska; Mr. Gohmert; Mr. Lamborn; Mr. Wittman; Mr. Fleming; Mr. McClintock; Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Lummis; Mr. Benishek; Mr. Duncan of South Carolina; Mr. Gosar; Mr. Labrador; Mr. LaMalfa; Mr. Byrne; Mr. Denham; Mr. Cook; Mr. Westerman; Mr. Graves of Louisiana; Mr. Newhouse; Mr. Zinke; Mr. Jody Hice of Georgia; Mrs. Radewagen; Mr. MacArthur; Mr. Mooney of West Virginia; and Mr. Hardy.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Mica; Mr. Turner; Mr. Duncan of Tennessee; Mr. Jordan; Mr. Walberg; Mr. Amash; Mr. Gosar; Mr. DesJarlais; Mr. Gowdy; Mr. Farenthold; Mrs. Lummis; Mr. Massie; Mr. Meadows; Mr. DeSantis; Mr. Mulvaney; Mr. Buck; Mr. Walker; Mr. Blum; Mr. Jody Hice of Georgia; Mr. Russell; Mr. Carter of Georgia; Mr. Grothman; Mr. Hurd of Texas; and Mr. Palmer.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Sensenbrenner; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Lucas; Mr. Neugebauer; Mr. McCaul; Mr. Palazzo; Mr. Brooks of Alabama; Mr. Hultgren; Mr. Posey; Mr. Massie; Mr. Bridenstine; Mr. Weber of Texas; Mr. Johnson of Ohio; Mr. Moolenaar; Mr. Knight; Mr. Babin; Mr. Westerman; Mrs. Comstock; Mr. Newhouse; Mr. Palmer; and Mr. Loudermilk.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. Luetkemeyer; Mr. Hanna; Mr. Huelskamp; Mr. Rice of South Carolina; Mr. Gibson; Mr. Brat; Mrs. Radewagen; Mr. Knight; Mr. Hurd of Texas; Mr. Curbelo of Florida; Mr. Mike Bost of Illinois; and Mr. Hardy.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Young of Alaska; Mr. Duncan of Tennessee; Mr. Mica; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Graves of Missouri; Mrs. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Hunter; Mr. Crawford; Mr. Barletta;

Mr. Farenthold; Mr. Gibbs; Mr. Hanna; Mr. Webster of Florida; Mr. Denham; Mr. Ribble; Mr. Massie; Mr. Rice of South Carolina; Mr. Meadows; Mr. Perry; Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois; Mr. Sanford; Mr. Woodall; Mr. Rokita; Mr. Katko; Mr. Babin; Mr. Hardy; Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania; Mr. Graves of Louisiana; Mrs. Mimi Walters of California; Mrs. Comstock; Mr. Curbelo of Florida; Mr. Rouzer; and Mr. Zeldin.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Lamborn; Mr. Bilirakis; Mr. Roe of Tennessee; Mr. Benishek; Mr. Huelskamp; Mr. Coffman; Mr. Wenstrup; Mrs. Walorski; Mr. Abraham; Mr. Zeldin; Mr. Costello of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Radewagen; and Mr. Mike Bost of Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas; Mr. Brady of Texas; Mr. Nunes; Mr. Tiberi; Mr. Reichert; Mr. Boustany; Mr. Roskam; Mr. Tom Price of Georgia; Mr. Buchanan; Mr. Smith of Nebraska; Mr. Schock; Ms. Jenkins of Kansas; Mr. Paulsen; Mr. Marchant; Mrs. Black; Mr. Reed; Mr. Young of Indiana; Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania; Mr. Renacci; Mr. Meehan; Mrs. Noem; Mr. Holding; and Mr. Smith of Missouri.

Mr. MESSER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING ERIC GRANT ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of my friend Eric Grant, an extension agent for the University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture who will retire this week after 28 years of service to agriculture in my home county, Craighead County.

For nearly three decades, Mr. Grant has faithfully dedicated himself to all aspects of agriculture, including row crops, livestock, horticulture, family and consumer sciences, and 4-H. While Mr. Grant has rightfully earned a reputation throughout northeast Arkansas for knowing his trade, he has done so while cultivating meaningful and lasting relationships as well. Our region's agricultural producers and families have not only contacted him seeking information from a trusted adviser, they have also reached out to him as friends.

I can speak from experience about how Mr. Grant has helped me through-

out the years, whether it involved my service as a TV news reporter, a farm broadcaster on the radio, or a legislator in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As Mr. Grant prepares to retire on Thursday, I wish him many days that reflect his outstanding service to Craighead County agriculture. Mr. Speaker, please join me and all of northeast Arkansas in honoring the service of Eric Grant and wishing him a happy retirement.

THE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM NEEDS TO BE REAUTHOR- THORIZED

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the House to immediately take up legislation to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools program.

For more than 100 years, the Federal Government has recognized the financial stresses that national forest land puts on local communities. The failure of Congress to reauthorize this program at the end of the last Congress has resulted in significant budget gaps and enormous uncertainty for county governments in my State and throughout the country.

School districts across the country are poring over their books, figuring out how to scale back essential services that they provide to students, to our kids, and to their families.

In Washington State, one county has seen its budget for the sheriff's office cut in half, making layoffs inevitable. The region I represent, Jefferson County, is now struggling to repair a key access road that was washed out from a storm.

Without Secure Rural Schools funding to complete the repairs, the county is left hoping a State emergency declaration will provide needed funds. Other counties are facing similar projects in limbo.

Mr. Speaker, let's maintain our Federal obligation to rural and timber communities and work in a bipartisan fashion to pass legislation that reauthorizes and funds this critical program as soon as possible.

CONGRESS NEEDS TERM LIMITS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is a true honor to be here today, and I am humbled to serve in Washington following the Honorable Howard Coble. Before ever arriving in these hallowed Halls, I made a promise to always put the people before the politics.

Each day upon entering this most historic place, I am reminded that this

House belongs to the people. This past November, these same individuals voiced their strong desire for change—real change—with fresh faces and new ideas.

As part of my commitment, I have joined several of my colleagues in supporting term limits for Members of Congress. As Members, we must always stay connected with our constituents without falling prey to special interests.

It is not always the most popular of choices, but I was sent to Washington to serve the people, and I believe that term limits are needed to ensure that we never lose sight of why we are here.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE NOW

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 29 States, including my home State of New York, and the District of Columbia guarantee a minimum wage higher than that required by Federal law. These States recognize that \$7.25 an hour is not enough to support an individual or a family of four's basic needs. No American who works full time should have to live in poverty.

Because the minimum wage has not kept pace with inflation, today, it holds less buying power than it did in 1981. This is unacceptable. Raising the minimum wage will not only increase earnings for millions, but it will also increase consumer demand by bolstering the purchasing power of low-income Americans.

Eighty-eight percent of those who would benefit from a Federal minimum wage increase are 20 years old or older and 55 percent are women. While New York is on track to increase its minimum wage to \$9 by 2016, State-by-State increases are not enough. Sixteen States remain at or below the Federal level, and disparities between the States creates economic uncertainty.

The time to raise the Federal minimum wage is now.

THE PRESIDENT'S IMMIGRATION ACTIONS

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our opportunity as a Congress to stop an unconstitutional action by the President and allow Congress to perform its constitutional responsibilities: to write and create the laws of this great land.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution is clear. It is Congress' responsibility to write the law; the President's job is to simply enforce those laws.

Unfortunately, President Obama has initiated some of the largest executive

power grabs in American history by unilaterally rewriting our Nation's immigration laws. These actions have ignored the will of the American people.

This week, the House will address those reforms and prevent the President and future Presidents from abusing that authority, breaking the law, and ignoring the Constitution at the expense of resolving a national crisis.

HONORING THE OHIO STATE BUCKEYES

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say congratulations to the Ohio State Buckeyes for their victory last night for the first College Football Playoff National Championship game.

Mr. Speaker, I have the proud honor of representing the Third Congressional District of Ohio, home of the victorious Buckeyes football team.

Mr. Speaker, last night, I joined my Ohio congressional delegation and others to cheer for the Buckeyes. Mr. Speaker, football is definitely a bipartisan activity.

The most valuable player, Ezekiel Elliott, broke national championship records for rushing yards and rushing touchdowns; and to our winning quarterback, Cardale Jones—who made the victory possible last night—to all the players, fans, the band, coaches, and athletic directors, I say, “Congratulations.”

Go, Bucks.

GOOD SAMARITAN SEARCH AND RECOVERY ACT

(Mr. HECK of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 3 years since Las Vegas taxi driver Keith Goldberg was abducted, killed, and his body dumped in the Lake Mead Recreation Area.

When law enforcement searches for Keith's body were ended due to limited resources, the Goldberg family turned to Red Rock Search and Rescue, a non-profit group of trained professionals, to continue the search.

They immediately hit a Federal regulatory roadblock. The team from Red Rock was told they needed to obtain a \$1 million insurance policy for a special use permit to gain access to Federal lands.

It took 9 months for the group to raise the funds necessary to obtain the insurance. When they finally entered the park almost 1 year after Keith first went missing, it took the team all of 2 hours to locate Keith's remains.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, I introduced legislation to allow Good Samar-

itan search groups to waive Federal liability and access public lands to conduct missing persons searches. It passed this House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 394-0. Unfortunately, time expired on the session before the Senate could take action.

I come to the floor today to announce that tomorrow I will, once again, introduce the Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act. I urge the House to take swift action on this legislation because unnecessary red tape must not continue to get in the way of providing closure for families like the Goldbergs.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in December, Congress passed a spending bill to keep the government open, finally providing some certainty to our economy.

Another shutdown was the last thing anyone needed, but we cannot forget that one agency was left out: the Department of Homeland Security. Creating uncertainty at Homeland Security is reckless because it threatens our national security.

The tragic events in France remind us that we need to be as vigilant as ever. So why is this funding held back? So the majority can try to force its immigration policy on the President and the full Congress.

We can and we should have the immigration debate, but it should not hold hostage the hardworking men and women who guard our ports and protect our borders.

Mr. Speaker, let's do the right thing. Let's fund Homeland Security and have a proper debate on immigration. This is not an either/or situation; it is a both/and.

THE CBP NEEDS TO PAY WHAT IT OWES

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to an issue with serious implications for Louisiana.

Over the past 20 years, Customs and Border Protection has not only failed to collect \$2.3 billion in antidumping duties, it has doubled down by refusing to pay collected interest owed to American industries like Louisiana's crawfish processors.

Last October, CBP promised this Louisiana industry it would disburse \$6 million in interest, only to reverse its decision 1 month later. This is just unacceptable.

While I was able to include language in the Homeland Security Appropria-

tions bill to address this issue, I still don't believe it goes far enough to ensure that CBP is forced to follow through on paying what it owes under the law.

It is vitally important that Congress hold CBP accountable. This industry is not only an important job creator, it has deep Louisiana roots in Louisiana's culture.

Mr. Speaker, I will not allow CBP to run over this industry without a fight.

□ 1215

WE WILL NOT ALLOW THE WORLD TO STAND BY WHILE BOKO HARAM KILLS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today again to join my colleagues whom you will hear from to challenge this dastardly act of our 300 girls that remain captured, abused, violated, impregnated, and maybe even married into the horrors of Boko Haram. These women and these voices that you see are the very women that we met when we went to Borno State just last year as they pleaded to be able to bring the girls back, but now their voices were turned toward the 2,000 who have been killed by the horrors of Boko Haram.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I join my colleagues today, I ask for a global response in the war on Boko Haram, a global response from the African Union, a global response from the United Nations, and a global response from the world to fight against Boko Haram and, at the same time, to save the boys that are being recruited by this violent and horrible leader. This leader is turning these young boys into violent killers. 2,000 dead bodies are all over the ground, and our girls now are still suffering.

So to these beautiful women who are now still in the midst saying bring the girls back, I want to tell them that we are coming to the rescue. We will not allow the world to stand by while Boko Haram kills.

THE RULE OF LAW

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, late last year we saw the President knowingly act to ignore Federal immigration law, claiming to grant legal status to millions who entered the country illegally—which looks a lot like amnesty to many Americans—an action done in complete defiance of our Nation's rule of law.

This week the House will act to defund the President's plan. Some have claimed this plan is funded by fees and fines and that Congress can't prevent it. I have one answer for them:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

These are words straight out of Article I, section 9 of the Constitution. There are no exceptions, no asterisks, and no fine print.

The unilateral attacks on our rule of law and unprecedented power grabs from this President need to end. These measures included in H.R. 240 are important steps in doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that will stop the President's executive overreach and defend the will of the American people.

DHS FUNDING BILL

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues to stop toying with our Nation's security. Disrupting funding to the Department of Homeland Security is an extreme and reckless form of partisan politics. Even Senate Republicans have expressed concern over the tactics used by their House colleagues.

Defunding key security infrastructure is unacceptable. Republican Senator MARK KIRK said it best: cooler heads must prevail, and we must defend critical security infrastructure.

In recent days both France and Nigeria experienced tragic terrorist attacks. These attacks highlight the threat here at home. Now is not the time to weaken our defenses.

Mr. Speaker, shutting down any government agency is irresponsible. House Republicans should have learned their lesson in 2013. When will they stop the partisan politics and start legislating?

HONORING THE MEMORY OF HUGH TARBUTTON

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Hugh Tarbutton. Hugh will be fondly remembered and sorely missed.

During his life, Hugh was many things: a husband, a father, a philanthropist, and an entrepreneur. Mr. Tarbutton attended the Sandersville high school and went on to Emory Oxford College.

Among his many accolades, Hugh received the Emory Medal, which is the highest medal given and honor granted to Emory alumni. In addition to advancing education, Mr. Tarbutton championed economic growth in Georgia while serving as president and CEO of the Sandersville Railroad Company.

Mr. Tarbutton is survived by his wife of 53 years, Gena, and their four chil-

dren—Hugh, Jr., Charles, Ben, and Loulie—and their eight grandchildren.

Hugh will be remembered in many ways, but to those who knew him best, he will be remembered as a great friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Hugh Tarbutton.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since last year's kidnapping of over 200 Nigerian schoolgirls, Boko Haram's violence and attacks have not stopped. Instead, they have become more violent, more deadly, and more frequent.

Mr. Speaker, last week Boko Haram attacked the Nigerian town of Baga, killing 2,000 men, women, and children. Furthermore, as recently as Sunday, there have been reports of young girls as young as 10 years old being used as suicide bombers and sent into crowded markets by Boko Haram militants.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer stand by idly and watch as innocent little girls are strapped with explosives and civilians are slaughtered by the thousands. Too many lives have been lost and innocent people murdered at the hands of those who use religion to propagate hate and oppression. My heart goes out to the victims and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me and members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in condemning the devastating actions of Boko Haram. We must keep fighting those that would use terrorism and fear to oppress us, and we must keep tweeting, as I have for 273 days—[#BringBackOurGirls](#) and [#JoinRepWilson](#)—to show that we have not and we will not forget.

Tweet, tweet, tweet, tweet.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO WORK WITH REPUBLICANS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge President Obama to work with Republicans in this new Congress.

After being sworn in last week, we immediately got to work voting on legislation to boost job creation, provide relief from ObamaCare, increase America's energy security, and create more job opportunities for veterans. All these bills passed with strong bipartisan support. Yet for some reason the President has already said he will veto at least two of them.

Mr. Speaker, building the Keystone pipeline will put Americans back to

work and help secure our energy future. Restoring ObamaCare's definition of full-time employment from 30 hours to 40 hours will increase take-home pay for hourly workers.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to solve problems and deliver positive results for the American people. For the good of America, I hope the President will put down his veto pen and join us in that effort.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I think they have reached a new low. The Republican majority has decided that they are willing to shut down the agency that detects, deters, and responds to threats in our homeland.

With an elevated terror alert status and in light of what just happened in Paris, they must have a good reason; right? Wrong. They are holding essential antiterrorism funding hostage because they want to deport the DREAM kids. They are putting our homeland security and our entire way of life at risk because they want to separate mothers from their children.

Mr. Speaker, there is a phrase in Spanish for this: "no tienen vergüenza," which means, "they have no shame."

Stop playing games with our homeland security and put forward a clean funding bill.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss President Obama's recent expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, which will protect a large number of unlawfully present aliens from deportation. In addition to constitutional concerns and national security implications, the action poses a range of unintended consequences.

Because illegal immigrants who are granted deferred action are exempt from being counted under the 2010 health care law's employer mandate, which requires employers with 50 or more employees to offer health insurance or pay a penalty, the President's policy, in effect, creates an incentive to hire illegal immigrants over lawfully present workers.

Mr. Speaker, the President's policy disadvantages the hiring of American citizens and those lawfully present in the United States—the men and women

who have come through legal channels, worked hard, and played by the rules—by making it economically advantageous to hire workers who came to the country illegally.

This week Congressman MATT SALMON of Arizona and I intend to offer an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations that will address this injustice. I encourage my colleagues to join in support of the commonsense, necessary check on the Obama administration.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE SETS HOLIDAY RECORD

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize a Federal agency that I am proud to say that I was a part of for many years: the United States Postal Service. I recall the pride and the sense of responsibility in delivering the U.S. mail.

I am honored to share the most recent achievement of the postal service with you. Sunday deliveries and other adjustments to mail processing were instrumental in allowing the United States Postal Service to set holiday season records, with 524 million packages delivered in December. That is up 18 percent from 2013.

The United States Postal Service has reported it delivered more than 28 million packages on December 22, the busiest day and the largest single day for package delivery in its history. The package delivery record on December 22 was set while the United States Postal Service also delivered about 463 million pieces of mail.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to recognize and applaud the hardworking individuals who made this possible and to also say another 118,000 packages were delivered on Christmas Day.

RENEWED OPTIMISM FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today humbled and thankful for the opportunity to represent the people of the great State of Kansas for a third time.

As we begin the 114th Congress, we start with renewed optimism for a fresh start for the American people. I am proud to join my colleagues here in the people's House from both sides of the aisle from across our great Nation as we work together to try to repair this institution and to represent the voices of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, last week we took steps to create jobs and unleash our economy

by authorizing construction of the Keystone pipeline, rolling back job-killing portions of ObamaCare, and helping our heroic veterans get back to work.

This week we will move decisively to stop the flow of illegal immigration into our country and to reestablish the rule of law and to adhere to the Constitution that governs our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are counting on us. Now is the time for bold leadership to do great things. Now is the time for the people's House to rise to the challenge and to stand up for the American people.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF HAITI EARTHQUAKE

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the devastating earthquake that struck the nation of Haiti. Monday marked 5 years since a magnitude 7.0 earthquake struck some 15 miles southwest of Port-au-Prince, Haiti's population center and the seat of its government.

Mr. Speaker, the aftermath of the quake was unimaginable. Estimates of as many as 316,000 people perished, and nearly 1.3 million were displaced. This tragedy struck in a nation already hobbled by grinding poverty, health disparities, and food insecurity. It crippled the infrastructure of government, destroyed the National Palace, ministry buildings, and tragically robbed the nation of some of its most talented civil servants.

In spite of the many challenges, once again, the Haitian people rose to the occasion, and our Nation, to date, has contributed billions to recovery efforts, along with donors around the world. The American people and the Haitian people deserve that this aid be delivered in the most effective way.

My bill, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act, had bipartisan support and was signed into law by President Obama. This bill—now this law—provides critical oversight and reporting. And this week, along with my colleague Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON, we are asking our colleagues to join us to reintroduce a resolution commemorating this tragic earthquake.

□ 1230

BOKO HARAM KILLS IN THE NAME OF RELIGION

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, a 10-year-old girl walked

into a crowded Nigerian market with a bomb strapped around her body. She walked through a metal detector, and the bomb exploded, killing her and dozens around her. The device reportedly was controlled by Boko Haram terrorists.

Days earlier, Boko Haram invaded the town of Baga, Nigeria, armed with grenades, explosives, and assault rifles. News reports say up to 2,000 bodies have been found, many of them children and the elderly who could not escape.

Boko Haram means “Western education is sinful.” They have inflicted genocide in their reign of terror in Nigeria. Their goal is to impose shari’a law in that country.

This al Qaeda-affiliated group of thugs, bandits, and outlaws slaughter both Christians and Muslims in the name of religion. 10,000 people were killed last year in Boko Haram terror. Boko Haram abducted 200 Nigerian girls and made sex slaves out of them. These girls are still missing.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram is not going away. They are part of the cancer of radical Islamic terror that has to be eliminated.

And that is just the way it is.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my Republican colleagues to just stop it; stop endangering the American public, stop endangering our national security and get to work for the American people.

The Department of Homeland Security should have been properly funded when the CR/Omnibus bill passed. Homeland Security is supposed to ensure our local law enforcement, emergency responders, antiterrorism experts, and border security professionals have the resources they need to keep our country safe. Instead, House Republicans continue to talk about deporting kids and pushing their anti-immigrant agenda against Dreamers and compromising our national security.

This way of thinking, this type of exclusion is what divides our Nation. In a time when we need to be strong and stand together, Republican House leadership continues to turn their backs on opportunities to work together. The only way to fix our broken immigration system is by passing true immigration reform that secures our borders, protects our workers, unites our families, and provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

It is time to pass a clean DHS funding bill and bring comprehensive immigration reform to a vote.

CONGRATULATING THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alma mater, the Ohio State University, on being the first team to win the college football playoff. Go, Bucks.

After beating the number one-ranked University of Alabama team in the Sugar Bowl, the Ohio State University beat the number two-ranked team, the University of Oregon, last night 42-20 to become the first undisputed national champion. Go, Bucks.

This Buckeye team has heart, talent, and teamwork on their side. In fact, they are the first team in history to be ranked outside the top 10 in November and go on to win a national championship. Go, Bucks.

This championship is a result of coaches like Urban Meyer, Luke Fickell, and Chris Ash, and impressive scholar-athletes like Braxton Miller, J.T. Barrett, Cardale Jones, Ezekiel Elliott, Tyvis Powell, Darron Lee, Joey Bosa, as well as the entire Buckeye squad. Go, Buckeyes.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I want to leave you with this: O-H.

ADMINISTRATION URGED NOT TO PROSECUTE GENERAL PETRAEUS

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be circulating a letter for signature urging the administration not to prosecute General Petraeus. It will ask Eric Holder to use his prosecutorial discretion to close the file now. And if Attorney General Holder will not do so, to urge the President to immediately pardon General Petraeus.

Keep in mind that General Petraeus has an incredible record of service to our Nation. The items he disclosed, if any, were to an Army Reserve Officer who had security clearance, and the disclosure has not gone any further. Given his record to our country, we should not be spending taxpayer dollars in this prosecution.

But here is the delicious irony. While the prosecutors accuse General Petraeus of mistakenly disclosing confidential information—maybe they are right, maybe not—they themselves have clearly and intentionally violated law and disclosed confidential information, namely that they are making a recommendation to the Attorney General that he prosecute General Petraeus. So if the Justice Department has unlimited funds to investigate and prosecute, perhaps they should start with their own ranks and at least purge

their ranks of those who violate their employment responsibilities and leak confidential information.

STOPPING EXECUTIVE AMNESTY

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about my amendment that is going to be offered to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. It is part of our effort to stop President Obama's executive amnesty.

The amendment would freeze the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program by prohibiting any Federal funds or resources from being used to consider or adjudicate any new renewal or previously denied application for any alien requesting consideration for the deferral. Individuals currently in the program would be allowed to continue through the remainder of their deferral period.

Last year, I had the opportunity to visit the UAC facility at Fort Sill and also to spend some time on the southern border, where agents briefed me. The visits confirmed what we have known all along: DACA is the magnet for drawing Central American children here. Unaccompanied alien children believe they are going to receive amnesty. That is a false hope. There are also problems with the Office of Refugee Resettlement, with physical abuse of these children, and we know that the American people want us to take this action. Seventy-five percent reject executive amnesty.

I encourage the body to join me today in passing the Blackburn amendment.

DEFEAT DIVISIVE ANTI-IMMIGRATION AMENDMENTS

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, almost every day I hear from the families in my district who are frustrated by the disconnect between what they need and the discussions that we have here in Congress and Washington. Only 1 week into the 114th Congress, the Republican majority is back with the same divisive agenda that is at the root of the public's frustration.

Instead of focusing on policies that help families succeed, House Republicans have introduced legislation that not only risks our national security but tears families apart. In this time of increased terrorism, what do these amendments target? American Dreamers, young people who were brought to this country as children. These amend-

ments jeopardize our national security and do nothing to fix our broken immigration system. These amendments represent dangerous, mean-spirited, divisive politics at its worst, and I hope they are defeated.

ENDING EMBARGO AGAINST CUBA

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, for more than four decades the United States has pursued a policy of an embargo against our neighboring nation to the south, Cuba. President Obama has taken the first steps towards moving towards the end of isolating the Cuban people and the Cuban nation.

I applaud his efforts to reengage in a diplomatic way and through tourism with the country of Cuba. Clearly the policy of an embargo has failed to bring down the regime of Fidel and Raul Castro. Let's instead try a policy of engagement where the ideas of democracy and human rights can spread across Cuba and across much of the world after the ending of the cold war.

The time for the embargo is over. I call upon Congress to continue to pursue a repeal of the embargo and establishment of normal trade and diplomatic relations with the nation of Cuba so we can continue to, where appropriate, criticize their human rights record and engage them in respecting the rights of all people, and in trade, create jobs on both sides.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 37, PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 185, REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 240, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 27 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 27

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to

final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the

conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than January 14, 2015, such material as he may deem explanatory of H.R. 240.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because of failed liberal policies of the President of the United States. Through his unilateral executive actions taken in November and through policies pursued throughout his administration for a number of years, the President's policies have harmed the American taxpayer.

Specifically, that is why we are here today as part of this funding bill, to make sure that we address those problems that we see. Today, the House of Representatives will fight the President's failed liberal Democratic dogma and provide for a Homeland Security bill that actually protects the homeland and the American taxpayer.

This past summer, the American people saw what happens when the executive branch pursues policies that are not in the best interests of the American people. Over 70,000 unaccompanied minors from South and Central America entered our country illegally. They did this because they believed that this administration would allow them entry into the United States—and, by the way, it looks like it worked.

This influx was a costly mistake for the taxpayer and for communities all across this country. Federal taxpayers paid \$553 million. We put local schools at risk and stretched the resources of communities all across this country to a tipping point.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here engaged in this fight. This bill represents conservative Republican solutions on how to protect the homeland

and the rule of law. Within this rule is a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security, as well as five amendments that represent a united fight against the President's executive amnesty plan.

Let me be perfectly clear. I believe that the President's actions on executive amnesty are unwise and unconstitutional, and they must be stopped. This package provides this body with the opportunity to effectively block and reverse the President's unilateral amnesty, reassert the rule of law, and uphold our Constitution.

America became the laughing stock of the world by the way we dealt with this issue, and it lands directly at the feet of the President of the United States. That is why we are here today and are issuing this bill to the United States Senate, to have them take the appropriate action that is necessary, so that we may work together so that America is safe and that we do not have actions that America should not undertake.

We have a number of Republicans who wish to speak on this rule today. I look forward to hearing their thoughts, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

First of all, when we have spending bills that make it here to the floor of the House, we traditionally have had an open amendment process for those appropriations bills. That allows Members on both sides of the aisle to offer cuts to move things around.

At the time of bloated budget deficits, why aren't the Republicans allowing any cuts to be made from this bill? They are not allowing Democrats or Republicans under a closed rule to offer savings to the Federal Government from bloated budgets.

They are limiting amendments on two other bills, a completely unrelated anti-regulatory bill and also a bill with regard to Financial Services that I offered an amendment along with Mr. ISSA to improve are not allowed under this rule as well.

It is a very bad precedent for congressional procedure here in our second week to shut down ideas from both sides of the aisle to make either of these bills better beyond a select few ideas that have apparently been blessed by the Republican majority.

I heard in the Rules Committee last night—and my friend, the chair, did as well—a number of very good amendments that were offered, some that I didn't agree with, but I still thought we ought to be able to discuss and debate—I offered a few myself—but hardly any of these are actually allowed to be debated or voted on by the Members of this body.

Instead, what the Republicans have done is effectively hijack the discussion of homeland security and safety to instead have a discussion about our broken immigration system. Well, I was ready to go for that.

I offered an amendment that would have allowed us to vote on an immigration reform bill as part of the rule, one that passed the Senate with more than two-thirds support last session, one that I believe would still carry the support of more than 60 Senators—I think it would likely pass the House if it had been made in order—but I was shut down.

Instead of allowing a discussion about a solution to our broken immigration crisis, the Republicans seek to keep it alive, conflict for the sake of conflict, and to somehow lump families and children in with criminals for the same enforcement priority, which makes no sense to any law enforcement professional or any of our communities, which is why we have a broad coalition of the business community, the faith-based community, the law enforcement community, all outraged over the most recent Republican actions, which seem to cater to the far rightwing of their party, rather than seek pragmatic practical solutions to replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

With regard to the Financial Services bill, I offered a bipartisan amendment along with my colleagues, Mr. ISSA and Mr. ELLISON, to improve transparency, to modernize our financial reporting standards, to ensure that digital data was available and searchable by investors everywhere, to increase transparency with regard to public companies. Unfortunately, it was not allowed to be debated or voted on here on the floor of the House to improve this bill.

This is truly an obstructive and undemocratic approach to governing. Instead of the Members of this body—Democrat and Republican—being able to work together and propose ideas to improve bills, we are presented with bills that are “our way or the highway,” bills that will never become law, bills that have the threat of veto from the President of the United States, and are presumably only being done to appease the rightwing Republican base.

Well, we should have started off this Congress with a fresh sensibility. We could have brought forward a clean Homeland Security Appropriations bill, allowed Members to improve it, to make cuts, to balance our budget deficit, to move things from programs that didn't work to programs that did. We could have brought forth a real jobs bill addressing the needs of working families.

Instead, what the Republicans have chosen to do is to play politics and jeopardize the safety of our country and our homeland security over a debate that they want to have with re-

gard to immigration without offering any solutions.

One of the things that I took away from the meeting in the Rules Committee last night, in the testimony from Members on both sides of the aisle, is that nobody thought—Democrats or Republicans—that this Republican bill that defunded DACA and undid the executive action would actually solve our broken immigration system. Republicans and Democrats acknowledged it wouldn't.

So rather than playing politics with our defense of our homeland, why don't we roll up our sleeves and get to work to actually fix our broken immigration system and replace it with one that works?

Now, look, the bill provides for consideration of the Homeland Security bill, but everybody knows it is not a serious attempt at funding the Department of Homeland Security. There is a manufactured crisis, the first step in a sure-to-fail legislative process that the President himself has said he would veto.

Why is anybody in this body—reasonable lawmakers, all of them—placing the funding of Homeland Security at a time of increased national threat—we saw the events in France this last week—putting our defense of our homeland at risk?

Yes, our President took action. Some agree with it; some disagree with it. He used the authority that he has been given by this body to establish enforcement priorities with regard to the 10, 11, 12 million people who are here illegally.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker, if we don't solve our broken immigration system, there is only going to be more people here illegally; instead of 10 or 11 million, there could be 12 million, 14 million, 15 million, until we get serious about border security, about enforcement, about restoring the rule of law.

This bill doesn't do it. This bill says let's support children rather than criminals; let's prevent people that have registered, gotten right by the law, paid a fee, had a background check, had their fingerprints taken, let's prevent them from legally working or going to school; let's hang the threat of tearing them apart from their American kids over their heads.

Both sides acknowledge that is not the answer to fixing our broken immigration system. So let's move past this discussion, let's secure our homeland, and let's get to the discussion of how to fix our broken immigration system, which both sides agree this debate is not about.

This bill also provides for consideration of the Regulatory Accountability Act, another recycled bill from the last Congress. It is not an immigration reform bill; it is not a jobs bill. It is actually a bill that makes government function even less efficiently than it currently does.

It adds 84 new bureaucratic hurdles to make sure our food is toxin-free and safe to eat. It would bury agency rule-making under a bureaucratic blizzard of hurdles and documentation requirements. This is a paperwork creation bill, this is a government inefficiency bill, the opposite of the direction we should be moving with regard to making government streamlined and more efficient.

Finally, this rule provides for consideration of the Financial Services bills, which this body considered last week, but again, when something doesn't pass under suspension, a procedure that requires two-thirds, the rule should hopefully enable Members on both sides of the aisle to improve upon the bill. I offered just such an improvement, as did some of my colleagues.

If the goal was to get to two-thirds rather than just pass this bill with a Republican majority, why don't we begin the difficult work of making this bill better, of improving on it, of taking ideas from Democrats and Republicans, to get this bill to the point where two-thirds of this body support it? Unfortunately, that did not occur, and this bill is being brought under a very restrictive rule.

We can do better. We can do better than closing down the traditional open process we have around amending appropriations bills. We can restore regular order and allow bills to actually be considered through the committee process here in this Congress, instead of appearing with 48 hours to read for Members of Congress, without even giving the opportunity to amend them. Unfortunately, in the second week here, the Republican majority is already making good governance a farce.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule, to show that Congress can and will do better if you give the Democrats and Republicans who serve in this body the ability to legislate, to offer their ideas, to work with Members on their side of the aisle and the opposite side of the aisle, and to get to a point where we can present a bill that the President of the United States will sign and will become the law of the land.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman LOU BARLETTA, who came to the Rules Committee last night to speak about the importance of this bill, the former mayor of Hazleton, Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the amendments offered to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill, including the amendment I coauthored with my colleagues, Congressman ADERHOLT of Alabama and Congressman MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Our amendment defunds President Obama's unlawful executive amnesty program for illegal immigrants.

Now, when I was mayor of my hometown of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, I saw firsthand how illegal immigration can affect a community. I believe that my stance against illegal immigration was why I was elected to Congress in the first place.

I am someone who has dealt with this as a smalltown mayor. I know what it looks like on the back end when the Federal Government doesn't do its job. Very simply, we are making sure that, at long last, we enforce the law.

First, it prevents the funding of carrying out the President's actions announced on November 20 of last year.

□ 1300

But let's be clear about something. The President's amnesty program did not just begin all of a sudden 2 months ago. It goes back much further than that, to the so-called Morton memos of 2011. They instructed immigration officers to ignore broad categories of illegal immigrants and halt deportation proceedings for them. In short, these memos told immigration officers to view the law the way that President Obama wished it had been written rather than how Congress actually wrote it.

We defund the implementation of the Morton memos. We also say that no funds can be used to implement any similar amnesty policies. That simply means that this or any other President cannot try to tweak their policies or try more trickery to try another end around past Congress without our approval.

Mr. Speaker, this states unmistakable congressional intent. The amendment says that the President's policies have no basis in law and are not grounded in the Constitution. We prevent anyone who receives such executive amnesty from being awarded any Federal benefits.

There are other amendments being considered, including stopping the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA, which was born out of the Morton memos. I support that amendment and all of the others as well.

Mr. Speaker, our Constitution is clear: the President of the United States does not have unilateral power. In America, we also have a legislature. As such, the President cannot simply make laws on his own. The Aderholt-Mulvaney-Barletta amendment makes that clear.

I urge support of the rule and the accompanying amendments to the DHS Appropriations bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this unfair rule.

Here we are, just 2 weeks into the brandnew Congress, and the Republican leadership has decided to combine three major controversial bills into one rule. They aren't content to exclude amendments. Now they also want to stifle debate. It is ridiculous, it is shameful, it is undemocratic, and it needs to stop.

And why are they doing all of this? To what end? So they can attach poison pill amendments to the Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

We had a perfectly fine bipartisan bill ready to go last year, but no, the Republicans would rather play Russian roulette with our homeland security. They are being driven by the most extreme anti-immigrant voices in the Republican caucus. So we are going to waste at least this entire week and maybe even more weeks to come debating ugly anti-immigrant amendments that are likely dead on arrival in the Senate and will most certainly be vetoed by the President.

I say to my Republican friends: I get it. You can't stand this President, and it is making you irrational to the point that you are doing real harm to this country. And I understand that you would rather tear immigrant families apart than keep them together. But you had the opportunity last Congress—for months and months and months—to legislate on this issue. You chose not to. Instead, you have chosen to make a mess of a very important Homeland Security Appropriations bill. You have chosen to demagogue rather than legislate. With all that is going on in the world and with what happened in France, I ask my Republican friends: What are you thinking, playing politics with our national security?

For 6 years, the Republicans have blocked all efforts to fix our broken immigration system, and then they keep wailing and whining about it being broken. They keep punishing individuals and families who have been in our country for years, working hard, paying taxes, raising families. Enough is enough.

I urge my colleagues to choose fairness and compassion and to vote down this shameful rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas, Dr. BURGESS, from the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage people on both sides of the dais, both sides of the aisle, to support the rule and the underlying appropriations bill with its attached amendments.

I do tire of hearing people talk about our broken immigration system. Mr. Speaker, last year, in the United States of America, 1.1 million people came into this country, raised their right hand, took the oath of citizen-

ship, and came in legally. And it has been that way every year that I have been in Congress since 2003. So, by my arithmetic, that is well over 12 million people that have become naturalized United States citizens in the last 10 or 12 years.

Does that sound like a system that is broken?

For comparison, let's look at other countries. The fact of the matter is, when you combine every other country on the face of the Earth, they don't match half of the number of people that are allowed to come into the United States and take the oath of citizenship.

But I will tell you what is broken. What is broken is the enforcement of our immigration laws, and we have seen that demonstrated time and again.

The President made some unilateral decisions in June of 2012, and we in Texas, particularly in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, understand very much what happens when someone makes adjustments without going through the rule of law. As a consequence, in late 2013, and then throughout the spring and summer of last year, we saw unprecedented amounts of unaccompanied minors simply coming across the border and turning themselves in to Customs and Border Patrol.

Now, why did they do that? Did someone just suddenly wake up one day in Honduras or Guatemala and say: I'm going to make that dangerous trek across the Mexican desert? No, it is because child traffickers, coyotes, saw what the President did, and said: Here's a business plan. Let's go to these families, charge them thousands of dollars, with the admonition that if you don't do it now, this door is going to close. But right now the President has got the door open for you to come up and get your amnesty. Step up and get it while you can.

So what did the President do in November? He doubled down on that. The message to the child traffickers around the world is: Y'all come. Y'all come and it will be all right.

But the fact of the matter is it is not all right. In fact, our homeland security is threatened.

This is an important bill. Judge CARTER has done enormous work to bring this bill to the floor. For that, I thank him. The bill is important, along with the amendments. I urge adoption of the rule, and I urge adoption of the underlying bill with its accompanying amendments.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule.

Let us be perfectly clear about what is happening here today. House Republicans are holding our national security hostage to the extreme policies of

their most radical Members. I speak from experience, having been one of the three or four that started this committee back after 9/11. You know that.

A vote for this rule and the poison pill amendments that will follow is a vote to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, plain and simple. It is a vote against the brave men and women in our Border Patrol, Secret Service, Coast Guard, and local public safety departments who put their lives on the line every day.

As the cochair of the Congressional Fire Caucus and the Public Safety Caucus, I am outraged that this stunt will jeopardize important funding under the Fire and SAFER grants programs. It provides community firefighters with the equipment they need and the ability to hire additional firefighters to help keep the risk of loss of life and property damage at a minimum.

I welcome a debate about immigration, but this is another ruse. This is an exact ruse. Whether you are talking about border security or whether you are talking about "amnesty," it is a ruse. It doesn't matter whether it is this or something else to stop immigration, House Republicans have done nothing but run from that conversation.

Speaker BOEHNER has been sitting on a bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill since June of 2013. He has done nothing to move the bill through the House. He hasn't proposed an alternative. And if you don't like the President's executive actions to help address our broken immigration system, why haven't you put your own on the table?

Policies like the President's executive order provide responsible solutions to prevent families from being torn apart. Don't we want family unification? Don't we support that? In the bowel of our values, don't we support that more than anything else: keeping families together?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Republicans have no solutions for these families—and they are out there. They are all over. It is quite simply unbelievable that they are willing to put politics before national security and shut down the Department of Homeland Security to block the President from implementing his solutions.

Let's end this charade now. You want to have a debate about immigration? Great. We welcome it. But we will not play along with this dangerous plan to jeopardize the safety and security of the American people. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ranger, Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you a few quotes. First:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed.

Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws.

The problem is that I'm the President of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed.

I can't do it by myself. We're going to have to change the laws in Congress.

I am President. I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself.

I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law.

I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers. There are some things we can't do.

Congress has the power of the purse, for example.

These are the words and the statements of the President of the United States. And words matter. But, even after the President said all of this in a politically motivated action last November, he pursued a course that could allow up to 5 million undocumented immigrants to remain in the United States illegally and without consequence.

Like my constituents, I am outraged. President Obama defied the will expressed by the American people last November and blatantly contradicted his own statements about the limits of the executive branch.

Now, let's be clear, lest others confuse this issue today. This is not a debate about immigration. That will come later. But this is about the rule of law. This is about the constitutional separation of powers. This is about the respect we owe the American people.

In this appropriations bill, we are exercising the power of the purse and we are taking a strong, narrow approach that will, first and foremost, provide security to our homeland and, secondly, deny any funds whatsoever from being used to carry out the President's unwise and, in my opinion, unconstitutional actions.

Now, I have to say, the President was right about a couple of things. He is not an emperor, and he is surely not a king. House Republicans are united in making sure that he doesn't get away with acting like one either. And yet before the debate even begins, last night the President has already issued threats. He is threatening to shut down the Department of Homeland Security because this bill prevents him from implementing his own ideology.

But make no mistake: a veto threat is a threat to our national security; a veto threat is an open invitation to our enemies. In the wake of the horrific terrorist attack this week in France, is the President really willing to compromise the safety of 320 million Americans to appease his base and score political points? God help us if that is the case.

Today, it is up to us in the House. Let us vote to defend the constitutional role of this legislature, let us vote to stop the President's blatant overreach, and let us vote to secure our homeland.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think my good friends who are on the floor today, my good friends on the Republican side of the aisle, have failed to read the Constitution, which includes, clearly, the President's authority for executive actions and not, as they have articulated, an executive order.

And it says in the "take care clause" that he has the ability to manage this government, as Presidents Reagan and Eisenhower did.

What I would offer to say is, there is nothing in what the President has done but to exercise executive action. But I will say to them that Secretary Johnson of Homeland Security has said that we are placing ourselves in a dangerous position, not because of the President's actions, not because of the appropriations bill, but because of these enormous poison pills that are stamping and stomping on the President's right to executive action.

I oppose all of the bills that are presently in this rule, including the regulatory bill, the Financial Services—all of them have poison pills. The regulatory bill, for example, wants 70 criteria before any agency can pass a regulation.

Yes, to my Republican friends, we are in a moment, a historic moment. France was more than a wake-up call. But what I will say to you is that we can pass a clean Homeland Security appropriations bill and we can end this dangerous condition that we are in.

I would ask my colleagues to eliminate the poison pills of pulling back on the President's constitutional authority.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 240, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

I oppose the rule because, if passed, the five Republican amendments made in order by the Rules Committee guarantee the bill will be vetoed by the President at a time when ensuring that the agencies charged with securing our border and protecting the homeland have the resources needed to keep us safe should be our highest priority.

House Republicans are playing a dangerous game of Russian Roulette with the security of America's homeland by recklessly adding this "poison pill" to legislation needed to fund the agencies and programs charged with securing the border and protecting the homeland.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to H.R. 240 made in order by the Rules Committee are

simply the latest attempt by House Republicans to prohibit the executive branch from exempting or deferring from deportation any immigrants considered to be unlawfully present in the United States under U.S. immigration law, and to prohibit the administration from treating those immigrants as if they were lawfully present or had lawful immigration status.

The rule we are being asked to accept makes in order an amendment that seek to block the executive actions taken by President Obama to address our broken immigration system by providing smarter enforcement at the border, prioritize deporting felons—not families—and allowing certain undocumented immigrants, including the parents of U.S. citizens and lawful residents, who pass a criminal background check and pay taxes, to temporarily stay in the U.S. without fear of deportation.

Mr. Speaker, the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, who is the nation's Chief Executive, "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the Take Care Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., *Arizona v. United States*; *Bowsher v. Synar*; *Buckley v. Valeo*; *Printz v. United States*; *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has "prosecutorial discretion"—the power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), may develop discretionary policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Executive authority to take action is thus "fairly wide," indeed the federal government's discretion is extremely "broad" as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written by Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal. (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in *Arizona v. United States*, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deporta-

tion may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as "[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families" or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns.

Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama has acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama not done anything that is novel or unprecedented.

Here are a just a few examples of executive action taken by several presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

1. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

2. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

3. In 1992, President George H.W. Bush granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, because of the President's leadership and far-sighted executive action, 594,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas are eligible for deferred action.

If these immigrants are able to remain united with their families and receive a temporary work permit, it would lead to a \$338 million increase in tax revenues, over five years.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges. Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

And as shown by the success in the last Congress of H.R. 1417, the bipartisan "Border Security Results Act, which I helped to write and introduced along with the senior leaders of the House Homeland Security Committee, we can do this without putting the nation at risk or rejecting our national heritage as a welcoming and generous nation.

This legislation has been incorporated in H.R. 15, the bipartisan "Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act," legislation which reflects nearly all of the core principles announced proffered last year by House Republicans.

As a nation of immigrants, the United States has set the example for the world as to what can be achieved when people of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and experiences come together.

We can and should seize this historic opportunity pass legislation to ensure that we have in place adequate systems and resources to secure our borders while at the same preserving America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world and to reap the hundreds of billions of dollars in economic productivity that will result from comprehensive immigration reform.

President Obama has acted boldly, responsibly, and compassionately.

If congressional Republicans, who refused to debate comprehensive immigration reform legislation for more than 500 days, disapprove of the lawful actions taken by the President, an alternative course of action is readily available to them: pass a bill and send it to the President for signature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote against the rule so we can put an end to the dangerous game of playing Russian Roulette with the security of America's homeland.

Let us defeat this rule and bring to the floor a clean Homeland Security spending bill that the President can sign into law.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), one of our brand new freshmen.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this combined rule and the underlying bills. Specifically, I came to the floor to speak in support of H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015.

First, I applaud House leadership for bringing up this clean legislation in a timely fashion and allowing the full House of Representatives the opportunity to work the will of the body, which is, in fact, the will of the American people.

The amendments approved in this rule are vital to protecting the constitutionally mandated separation of powers between Congress and the executive branch, while keeping the Department of Homeland Security funded through fiscal year 2015.

I would like to remind my colleagues who are opposed to this bill, just last week, Members of the House read on this floor the Constitution of the United States, myself included, and renewed our commitment to defending the principles in our Nation's founding document.

In that Constitution, article I gave all legislative powers and authority to Congress and established the framework of our legislative process.

The President's executive action on immigration threatens this separation of powers, ignores our Constitution, disregards the right of the American people to have a voice in important legislation through their elected representatives.

Americans sent a clear message on November 4. They did not want the President to act alone on immigration. Now, this bill and the accompanying amendments are sending a strong message that Congress will not stand by as

the President attempts to rewrite our Nation's laws.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. Just over 1 month ago, I stood on this floor urging the majority to allow Members of this Chamber to fund the Department of Homeland Security in the omnibus. The majority did not listen.

In the past month, even as the majority plotted to punish the Department for the President's action on immigration, a series of terrorist incidents across the globe have brought into sharp focus the need for a fully funded and fully functional DHS.

First, in Sidney, Australia, we witnessed a terrorist attack on a cafe where, at the end of a lengthy standoff, two innocent people lay dead.

The crippling cyber attack on Sony Pictures Entertainment's network raised awareness of the damage that hacks can do.

Then, last week in Paris, there were a series of terrorist attacks that have sent shock waves beyond the borders of France.

The execution-style murders of 12 members of the creative team of Charlie Hebdo, followed by the indiscriminate killing at a Jewish supermarket, are not simply tragic incidents; they serve as a reminder that the terrorist threats we face are evolving, and they are evolving quickly.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to give the Department of Homeland Security the resources it needs to be dynamic and agile in response to these evolving threats.

The underlying DHS appropriations bill under consideration today, although not perfect, could certainly pass both Chambers and be enacted into law with the President's signature.

However, the likelihood, dare I say inevitability, that one or more of the poison pill amendments that the Rules Committee approved will get attached ensures a DHS shutdown or slowdown continues.

And to what end?

The majority decries the administration's immigration actions but offers no solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for the additional 30 seconds.

The majority decries the administration's immigration actions, but offers no solution or alternatives of its own.

Instead, it plays and replays the game of we will or we won't fund the government.

Mr. Speaker, the game of chicken has come and run its course. It is time to provide full-year funding to DHS so it can continue its critical mission.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the First District of Georgia, Pooler, Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding some of his time.

This bill is necessary to make sure that the negative effects associated with the President's actions do not cause long-term damage to our country.

As a new Member of Congress, I was sent to Washington to represent the people of southeast Georgia against the numerous harmful actions taken by the President and his administration.

From the time that I have been here, I have been shocked by the actions of the President and the way he directly ignores the will of the American people, statutory law, and, most importantly, the Constitution of this country.

This bill makes sure that no funds will be used to implement the President's executive order that allowed thousands of illegal immigrants to stay in this country.

This bill also makes sure that no funds will go to implement any rule or regulation that has been issued by the administration over the last several years.

It is time to stand up to the President and say, no more. No more, Mr. President. No more rewarding bad behavior. No more rules that ignore the will of the American people. No more ignoring statutory law. And most importantly, no more ignoring the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 240. It is sad, Mr. Speaker, that just 2 weeks into this new Congress, Republicans have turned a bipartisan issue, funding our Department of Homeland Security, into a cesspool of despicable amendments that cater to the most extremist anti-immigrant fringe.

There is the Blackburn amendment mandating that we deport thousands of students who are as American in their hearts as you or I.

There is the Aderholt amendment prohibiting DHS from prioritizing whether we deport hardworking parents or hardened criminals.

And there is the Schock amendment decrying the legal immigration back-

log but doing nothing, absolutely nothing, to fix it.

Guess whose amendment wasn't accepted?

The Deutch-Foster amendment, which would save taxpayers over \$1 billion a year by ending the detention bed mandate, effectively an earmark that requires 34,000 beds be filled by immigrants every single day inside for-profit detention centers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here to solve problems. What this bill reveals instead, unfortunately, is a majority with no interest in solving our broken immigration system. If they had that interest, we would have passed comprehensive immigration reform 2 years ago.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Monroe, Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 240, the fiscal year 2015 Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, the primary responsibility of the President of the United States is to faithfully carry out the laws sent to him by Congress. Unfortunately, this President, over the past several years, has chosen time and time again to ignore our immigration laws in order to achieve his executive amnesty objectives.

His actions continue to fundamentally threaten the separation of powers set forth by the Constitution that was read on this floor last Friday, and it needs to stop.

This rule will provide the House with the opportunity to completely defund and end this executive amnesty. With the adoption of the amendments made in order under this rule, H.R. 240 will responsibly fund the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of the fiscal year and ensure the protection of our borders, while, at the same time, restoring the boundaries between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

In addition to defunding this power grab by the President, we will also consider an amendment that will express the sense of Congress that we should stop putting the interests of illegal immigrants above legal immigrants, who are being punished for simply obeying the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you trample on democracy and discard regular order, you can run a remarkably efficient House of Representatives.

This rule is an abomination of procedure, wrapped in another abomination of procedure, all wrapped up in a third abomination. It deals with three bills, but one of those bills contains 11 bills. Add it up. One rule, 14 bills.

Let's look at the 11 Financial Services bills. Eleven bills, zero amendments allowed. Why? We are told that, well, all 11 of those bills have gone through the committee without controversy or gone to the floor without controversy. Not true.

One of those bills extends until 2019 when banks have to comply with an important part of the Volcker rule. Has that extension to 2019 ever been voted on in committee? No. Has it ever been discussed on the floor? No.

And when the Rules Committee was asked, can we have an amendment to deal with this new matter, which has never been subject to a markup or a discussion on this floor, the answer is "no." Why is that?

Because we need to improve Dodd-Frank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Financial Services bill contains quite a number of noncontroversial provisions that will improve Dodd-Frank, and we could improve our economy today and have a bill on the President's desk by the end of the month.

But no, the majority has structured this to force Democrats to vote against nearly a dozen good provisions so that they can say, look at those Democrats; they won't help the economy.

They are playing politics instead of legislating. It is morally wrong. Vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, that is a very sad way to explain what we are doing here today. The gentleman knows that these 11 bills have all been heard, most of them voted on the floor, overwhelming majorities, if not—

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a point of truth?

Mr. SESSIONS. No, sir. We covered this yesterday in the Rules Committee, and we intend to move forward. And they are great bills that will help the economy and jobs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield—

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have the time and I appreciate that.

□ 1330

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Is there any method that allows me to object when a Member says something demonstrably false?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is under recognition and has not yielded for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Cassville, Georgia, Congressman LOUDERMILK, a freshman Member of this delegation.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, John Adams, as President of these United States, stated:

Our Constitution is for religious and moral people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

What John Adams was referencing is that our Constitution is only as solid—it is only as resolute—as the willingness of the people to uphold the limits of its power.

What has sustained the United States of America as the longest continual constitutional republic in the history of the world is our commitment to recognizing and our respecting the limits of power inscribed in this Constitution. A clear and distinct division of those powers among the three separate branches of government is what we have all sworn to uphold.

The President through his recent executive orders has seized the constitutional authority of the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill does not bring an immediate end to the President's pattern of executive overreach, it does, within the rule of law, begin to restore the constitutional authority of this governing body.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible time for Republicans in Congress to play political games with America's homeland security. Our country and its citizens must remain safe and secure. International travel, border crossings, and our transportation systems must be protected. In Florida, this is an economic issue as well.

In a recent Gallup Poll, Americans named politicians as their top concern over even the economy and jobs, and this Republican bill is a fine example of why that is: at the heart of the House Republicans' obstruction of homeland security is their inattention to bipartisan solutions and their continued dodging of needed immigration reform.

Remember last session? The Senate passed a bipartisan bill. It was passed overwhelmingly, but it hit a roadblock here in the House, and this roadblock continues to be a drag on the economy. One particularly heartless amendment will be offered by Republicans that directs young DREAM Act students to pack their bags and leave America, even though America is the only country they have ever known.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am perplexed with the heartless amendments from the Republicans in Congress because, in the State of Florida, our Republican legislature passed a law last year to provide instate tuition to the same DREAM Act students.

Now, the Republican Congress wants to send them packing. This is unnecessarily harsh, and it is inconsistent with our American values. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Seventh Congressional District of Texas, Congressman CULBERSON, the gentleman from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Today, Mr. Speaker, the Republican House takes an important step in restoring the trust of the American people in their elected Representatives and in restoring the rule of law in our Nation.

Two of the most important principles underlying our entire system of government are trust and the rule of law. The American people in the election last November decisively rejected the aggressive, liberal agenda of this President and of the Democrats in Congress.

They elected this Republican majority to stop the President from doing further damage to our system of laws and further damage to our Constitution. The American people elected us to preserve and protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, but that work begins with trust.

We, today, are doing what the voters of America asked us to do in enforcing our laws on the border to ensure that our laws are respected, to ensure that our immigration law is fair, and that it treats everyone equally as the Constitution requires.

We are keeping our word to the American people to do precisely what we said we would do, and that is to overturn these illegal executive memos that are attempting to ignore what the law says the President must do. Not even King George III had the authority to waive a law enacted by the Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, once we have begun this path today of restoring that bond of trust, we will restore the rule of law in America because, without the law, there is no liberty.

In fact, the first design on one of the first coins ever minted in the Republic of Mexico, a coin which I have here with me, shows the liberty cap—liberty and law. There is no liberty without law enforcement, and the House today is doing what the American people hired us to do: to restore their trust and to restore the rule of law.

This is a law enforcement issue. Border security and immigration, these are matters of law enforcement. We trust the good hearts and the good sense of the officers in the field to do the right thing for the right reasons,

which is to enforce our laws fairly and equally, because the people on the Rio Grande understand better than anyone else that if the law is not enforced, there cannot be safe streets and that you cannot have good schools and a strong economy without law enforcement.

We in Texas understand better than anyone else that this debate is far larger than it just being about immigration or border security. It is far larger than just these individual issues we will debate today.

Today, we in the Republican House are honoring the will of the American people. We will keep our word. We will make sure that the laws of the United States are enforced equally and fairly for all.

Above all, we will preserve and protect the Constitution and the America that we know and love. That was the message of the election last November.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, the world is mourning. Millions have marched in Paris in memory of the victims and to stand against terrorism; yet, at a time when we should strengthen our response against terrorism, Republicans are playing games.

By hijacking this bill with measures that dismantle the President's executive action, Republicans are threatening to endanger the security of our entire Nation for the sole purpose of playing partisan politics.

Despite claims of support for reform, we are not being asked to vote for a better immigration system; we are being asked to vote for a crueler one—a system of mass deportation, one that tears parents away from children, disrupts communities, and weakens our economy, one that replaces the open hands of the Statue of Liberty with a sign that reads: You are not welcome here.

Worse, Republicans know that this will not become law, so today's debate serves only to placate an extreme wing of their party while making millions of hardworking and aspiring Americans afraid and unsettled.

Undocumented or not, immigrants are integrated into our communities, and pulling a thread once woven just weakens the fabric. I urge my colleagues to vote against this toxic bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina, Congressman HOLDING.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the underlying DHS bill and relevant amendments.

Already, the United States admits 1 million legal permanent immigrants per year, so long as they follow our Nation's legal immigration process. Unfortunately, like those coming to the

United States illegally, this administration wants to ignore our Nation's immigration laws and immigration process.

The problem is twofold, Mr. Speaker. This not only undermines the rule of law in our country, but it also unfairly treats those who follow our legal immigration process, as complicated as it is.

After this administration established DACA in 2012, unilaterally granting amnesty to illegal minors, the number of unaccompanied children at the border increased almost tenfold in just 3 years.

The President's most recent amnesty actions send a resounding message to wishful immigrants that our Nation may have immigration laws, but that it is just not important that they are respected.

Simply put, this is wrong, so I support this rule, and I support restoring the rule of law.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to the bill.

For over 500 days, Republican leadership refused to bring comprehensive immigration reform for a vote, this despite ample support from both sides of the aisle to pass bipartisan legislation from the Senate.

In the face of Republican inaction, however, President Obama made the appropriate and the lawful move to expand the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and to create deferred action for parents. Now, Republicans have decided to hold our national security hostage in order to placate the anti-immigrant fringe.

Make no mistake, this rule and bill have nothing to do with our national security and have everything to do with tearing down the President's legal executive action on immigration.

It has been clear to me, though, that whatever this President puts forward, Republicans will oppose; but it is hard to believe, given the dangers we face, that Republicans won't work in a bipartisan manner to keep our country safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Thank you for the additional time.

This is cynical. It is anti-immigrant. We should defeat this rule, and we should defeat the underlying legislation if these poison pill amendments are adopted.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Appleton, Wisconsin, REID RIBBLE.

Mr. RIBBLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, but the President has dropped a poison pill

with his executive amnesty—of his own choosing, I might add—into the well of goodwill in this Chamber.

Now, before anything even gets sent over to him, he is issuing a veto threat on the front end. The President has now made it abundantly clear that he is willing to risk national security to protect those who have come here illegally.

What the President should be doing is exactly what the gentlewoman just mentioned a moment ago: working in a bipartisan fashion with Congress, through the rule of law, to pass immigration reform.

This debate is no longer about immigration reform. The debate, unfortunately, isn't even about homeland security. The debate has become about choices and the President's choices, about the choices that the President, himself, has made in regard to this issue. He will soon have another choice to make.

I wish this were just about immigration reform because I believe, quite frankly, that we can find a path forward on immigration reform, Mr. Speaker. We need to fix our immigration system. Every single person here, unless Native American, is a son or a daughter of an immigrant.

We need to address our immigration system to make it easier for people to enter our Nation legally and to make it more difficult to come here illegally. This appropriations bill does that very thing: it puts more guards on the border than ever before, and it creates security that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the President not to veto this piece of legislation but to work with this Congress to do this in the correct way, which is within the confines of the Constitution.

I encourage my fellow colleagues to pass this bill as fast and as quickly as possible.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is both risky and callous. It asks Americans to give into their worst instincts. If you or someone you know is out of a job, blame an immigrant; if an undocumented person commits a crime, they are all like that.

We are at a moment when there are growing security threats to our Nation, and Republicans in this House of Representatives are willing to play Russian roulette with the security of the American people. The American people know better.

Wide majorities support comprehensive immigration reform, including those in my home State of Texas. Majorities disagree with taking away DACA for young kids who came here through no fault of their own.

□ 1345

I will leave with you with this question to ponder, Mr. Speaker: What do you tell somebody who was 3 years old when they were brought here to the United States of America, knows no other country and no other language but the English language, what do you tell that person when you tell them that they have got to leave here? This is the only life that they have ever known. How are they not as American as you and I?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Gainesville, Georgia, Congressman COLLINS, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this rule and the underlying bills, many of which have not been discussed because we have been discussing the one that is, frankly, the most effective and have been discussing what the President has done and the funding issues. But the one thing that I want to emphasize is what is not being discussed here, and what is not being discussed is the simple opportunity to restore constitutional checks and balances.

My friends across the aisle have talked about what question would you want to talk about. Well, let's talk about immigration. When they had the opportunity, they punted on that issue, so I wouldn't want to talk about it if I were them either.

They want to talk about how we are going to leave the country in jeopardy. No, we are not. The President can sign this bill, get back to proper constitutional order, and then everything is funded; and there, order is restored.

What I find amazing is the blame on running other things. And even when we bring up this, some of my friends from across the aisle will bring up, well, other Presidents have done it. Well, that reminds me of what my mother used to say: If everybody jumped off the roof, would you?

Just because it was wrong then does not make it right now.

It is time. And what people in America tell us all the time is it is time for Congress to reassert its congressional authority. That is what this is about. Throw the blame anywhere you want to, try to direct us, but you are not deceiving the American people, as the speaker just said. The American people do know the difference when you are trying to misdirect them.

So this package of rules, these bills underneath, they get at the heart of restoring constitutional order, of taking back regulations that need to be rolled back so that our businesses can function, our markets can function, and we can get back to doing exactly what we are supposed to be in here doing.

So as long as we hear the distractions, I know the American people

aren't fooled because I am not fooled. I did what I have said I would do—I came here to fight—back at the first of the year: to fight what was being done around Congress and around this executive order. I will continue that fight. That is the promise that we made to the American people. That is the promise the Republicans are bringing forth. Jobs, people, and kitchen table. That is what we are about. It is about what the Founding Fathers said we would do.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans offer a very clear immigration plan today: Deportation now. Deportation tomorrow. Deportation forever.

They don't just want to roll back what the President has recently done with pro-family action; they would roll back previous protection for our DREAMers, young adults brought here as children, who have so much to offer. Republicans would deny them that opportunity, just as they would deny an opportunity for families that pay their taxes, work hard, and pass a criminal background check—they would deny them an opportunity to stay together.

Republicans want to deport Pedro. Pedro is a young man who came to America at age three. He excelled in school. He graduated near the top of his class at the University of Texas. And he hopes to work for the district attorney's office, securing our community from crime, or in some other public service. This bill does not just deny opportunity to Pedro; it denies our entire community the opportunity to benefit from his talents. I say let these DREAMers help us build a better and stronger America.

Sadly, we have had so many broken promises in this House that the day would come when people of goodwill in both parties could come together and consider broader reform. Yet we are still denied that opportunity. Republican leaders have apparently given up on resolving the broken immigration system. They will stop at nothing to avoid doing anything.

This amended bill would deny the right to learn, the right to work. It would deny hope for so many of these young people who pledge allegiance to America, who have so much to offer. Pandering to angry isolationists is not a sound immigration policy. It is not what this country, where the Statue of Liberty stands so tall, is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Vote for the dream, Mr. Speaker, and vote "no" on this nightmare of an amended bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I would like to ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Republicans are playing partisan games with our country's border security and our safety. By tacking on unrelated immigration measures to a basic funding bill for Homeland Security, they are putting us on a path that could shut down our Department of Homeland Security and endanger the people of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider a clean version of the Homeland Security bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. We do not need to start this new Congress going down a path of legislative brinkmanship and crises of our own making. We shouldn't be treating funding for our national security like a political pawn.

There are differences of opinion about how to solve immigration. There are differences of opinion about the President's actions. The venue for taking out those disagreements is not to put the homeland security of our country at risk. We don't have to attach these controversial amendments to a must-pass bill to keep our borders secure. We have no shortage of other things we should be focusing on.

There seems to be pent-up frustration about our broken immigration system. I share that. Let's address our broken immigration system and fix it and pass immigration reform. I tried to do that in the Rules Committee yesterday. Unfortunately, that discussion is not allowed under this rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote down the rule.

Instead, we are spending our time here in Congress with yet another crisis of our own making. Instead of solving pressing issues, instead of creating jobs, instead of protecting our homeland, we are putting a bipartisan, important appropriations bill right smack in the middle of an unrelated political fight.

The American people can no longer afford an immigration enforcement system that spends extraordinary sums of money every year detaining and deporting individuals with strong ties to their community and who pose no meaningful threat to anyone. We should focus on criminals rather than

children. That is exactly what the President's actions do.

If the Republicans don't like it, we are happy to work with them to address the underlying issues of immigration and why we have 11 million people living here illegally in the first place. Until we do, this bill doesn't solve a thing. But let's not get hung up over the side issue and make sure that we continue to protect our homeland against a terrorist threat.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because the law requires that the House of Representatives pass funding bills. Today we are here because we are going to fund Homeland Security, and that we are. We are going to fund Homeland Security because every single member of this Republican Conference, and I believe every single Member of this House, understands how important Homeland Security funding is to protect this country and our citizens.

But we also need to understand that the President of the United States last year, and perhaps the year before, took actions which we disagreed with, which I believe embarrassed this country, which I believe we were unprepared to fulfill the responsibilities, and that is directly related to issues of executive orders and ideas that he had about illegal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because we feel passionately about the rule of law and the Constitution of the United States. It is the President of the United States who we believe has gone well past not only his constitutional authority, but the authority that I believe is vested in him: well and faithfully executing the laws of the country, which is his oath of office.

So we have gathered together, united in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. We are also going to follow the Constitution and pass it here today and tomorrow with the bill and send it to the United States Senate and let them deal with it.

Thank goodness we have Republican control in the Senate; otherwise, it might not even be heard with the other 360 pieces of legislation that the former head of the Senate decided not to take up in that body to debate or to have a vote on.

So we stand today prepared to fight the President's unwise and unconstitutional executive amnesty plan. It is time for this House to fight, I believe, for what is a constitutional issue, and we are going to politely do this. There was no screaming and yelling on our side. We have great resolve. We have an understanding about what is in the best interest of the United States.

So I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 27 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Strike section 3 and insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. When the Committee of the Whole rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 240.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Black	Buchanan
Amodei	Blackburn	Buck
Babin	Blum	Bucshon
Barletta	Bost	Burgess
Barr	Boustany	Byrne
Barton	Brady (TX)	Calvert
Benishek	Brat	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Reichert	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Chabot	Issa	Renacci	Green, Gene	(NM)	Rush	Denham	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble	Grijalva	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda	Dent	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)	Gutiérrez	(NM)	T.	DeSantis	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Rigell	Hahn	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta	DesJarlais	Kline	Rohrabacher
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Roby	Hastings	Maloney,	Sarbanes	Diaz-Balart	Knight	Rokita
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Roe (TN)	Heck (WA)	Carolyn	Schakowsky	Dold	Labrador	Rooney (FL)
Collins (NY)	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Higgins	Maloney, Sean	Schiff	Duffy	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Comstock	Jordan	Rogers (KY)	Himes	Matsui	Schrader	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Roskam
Conaway	Joyce	Rohrabacher	Hinojosa	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Duncan (TN)	Lance	Ross
Cook	Katko	Rokita	Honda	McDermott	Scott, David	Ellmers	Latta	Rothfus
Costello (PA)	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Hoyer	McGovern	Serrano	Emmer	LoBiondo	Rouzer
Cramer	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Huffman	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Farenthold	Long	Royce
Crawford	King (NY)	Roskam	Israel	Meeks	Sherman	Fincher	Loudermilk	Russell
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross	Jackson Lee	Meng	Sinema	Fitzpatrick	Love	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Kline	Rothfus	Jeffries	Moore	Sires	Fleischmann	Lucas	Salmon
Curbelo (FL)	Knight	Rouzer	Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Fleming	Flores	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Royce	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Flores	Forbes	Lummis	Scalise
Denham	LaMalfa	Russell	Kaptur	Nadler	Forbes	Fortenberry	MacArthur	Schock
Dent	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)	Keating	Napolitano	Marchant	Foxx	Marchant	Schweikert
DeSantis	Lance	Salmon	Kelly (IL)	Neal	Marino	Frank (AZ)	Marino	Scott, Austin
DesJarlais	Latta	Sanford	Kennedy	Nolan	Sensenbrenner	Massie	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Scalise	Kildee	Norcross	Torres	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Sessions
Dold	Long	Schock	Kilmer	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)	Garrett	McCaul	Shimkus
Duffy	Loudermilk	Schweikert	Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)	Gibbs	McClintock	Shuster
Duncan (SC)	Love	Scott, Austin	Kirkpatrick	Payne	Torres	Gibson	McHenry	Simpson
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Sensenbrenner	Kuster	Pelosi	Tsongas	Gohmert	McKinley	Sinema
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	Langevin	Peters	Van Hollen	Goodlatte	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Emmer	Lummis	Shimkus	Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Vargas	Gosar	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	MacArthur	Shuster	Larson (CT)	Pingree	Veasey	Gowdy	McSally	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	Marchant	Simpson	Lawrence	Pocan	Vela	Granger	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Smith (MO)	Lee	Polis	Velázquez	Graves (GA)	Meehan	Stefanik
Fleischmann	Massie	Smith (NE)	Levin	Price (NC)	Viscosky	Graves (LA)	Messer	Stewart
Fleming	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)	Lewis	Quigley	Walz	Graves (MO)	Mica	Stivers
Flores	McCaul	Smith (TX)	Lieu (CA)	Rangel	Waters, Maxine	Griffith	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Forbes	McClintock	Stefanik	Lipinski	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman	Grothman	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Fortenberry	McHenry	Stewart	Loeb sack	Richmond	Welch	Guintha	Moolenaar	Thornberry
Foxx	McKinley	Stivers	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)	Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Tiberi
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Stutzman	Lowenthal	Ruiz	Yarmuth	Hanna	Mullin	Tipton
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)	Lowey			Hardy	Mulvaney	Trott
Garrett	McSally	Thornberry		NOT VOTING—10		Harper	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Gibbs	Meadows	Tiberi	Cleaver	Nugent	Titus	Harris	Neugebauer	Upton
Gibson	Meehan	Tipton	Duckworth	Nunnelee	Wasserman	Hartzler	Newhouse	Valadao
Gohmert	Messer	Trott	Garamendi	Perlmutter	Schultz	Heck (NV)	Noem	Walberg
Goodlatte	Mica	Turner	Hardy	Ryan (OH)		Hensarling	Nugent	Walden
Gosar	Miller (FL)	Upton				Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Walker
Gowdy	Miller (MI)	Valadao				Hice (GA)	Olson	Walorski
Granger	Moolenaar	Wagner				Hill	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walberg				Holding	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walden				Hudson	Paulsen	Webster (FL)
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Walker				Huelskamp	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Griffith	Murphy (PA)	Walorski				Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Wenstrup
Grothman	Neugebauer	Walters, Mimi				Huntgren	Pittenger	Westerman
Guintha	Newhouse	Weber (TX)				Hunter	Pitts	Westmoreland
Guthrie	Noem	Webster (FL)				Hurd (TX)	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Hanna	Nunes	Westerman				Hurt (VA)	Poliquin	Williams
Harper	Olson	Westmoreland				Issa	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)
Harris	Palazzo	Whitfield				Jenkins (KS)	Posey	Wittman
Hartzler	Palmer	Williams				Jenkins (WV)	Price (GA)	Womack
Heck (NV)	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)				Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Hensarling	Pearce	Wittman				Johnson, Sam	Reed	Yoder
Herrera Beutler	Perry	Womack				Jolly	Reichert	Yoho
Hice (GA)	Pittenger	Woodall				Jones	Renacci	Young (AK)
Hill	Pitts	Yoder				Jordan	Ribble	Young (IA)
Holding	Poe (TX)	Yoho				Joyce	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)
Hudson	Poliquin	Young (AK)				Katko	Rigell	Zeldin
Huelskamp	Pompeo	Young (IA)						
Huizenga (MI)	Posey	Young (IN)						
Hultgren	Price (GA)	Zeldin						
Hunter	Ratcliffe	Zinke						
Hurd (TX)	Reed							

NAYS—181

Adams	Cartwright	Delaney
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Ashford	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bass	Chu (CA)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Cicilline	Deutch
Becerra	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Beyer	Clay	Doyle (PA)
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Edwards
Blumenauer	Cohen	Ellison
Bonamici	Connolly	Engel
Boyle (PA)	Conyers	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Esty
Brown (FL)	Costa	Farr
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Fattah
Bustos	Crowley	Foster
Butterfield	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)
Capps	Cummings	Fudge
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Galleo
Carney	DeFazio	Graham
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Grayson

□ 1421

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LUMMIS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—242

Abraham	Boustany	Chaffetz
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Allen	Brat	Coffman
Amash	Bridenstine	Cole
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barietta	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barr	Buchanan	Comstock
Barton	Buck	Conaway
Benishak	Bucshon	Cook
Bilirakis	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Byrne	Cramer
Black	Calvert	Crawford
Blackburn	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw
Blum	Carter (TX)	Culberson
Bost	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)

Adams	Clark (MA)	Engel
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Ashford	Clay	Esty
Bass	Clyburn	Farr
Beatty	Cohen	Fattah
Becerra	Connolly	Foster
Bera	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Beyer	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Courtney	Galleo
Bonamici	Crowley	Graham
Boyle (PA)	Cuellar	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Green, Al
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Bustos	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DeGette	Hahn
Capps	Delaney	Hastings
Capuano	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	DelBene	Higgins
Carney	DeSaulnier	Himes
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Deutch
Cartwright	Doggett	Hondra
Castor (FL)	Doyle (PA)	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Huffman
Chu (CA)	Ellison	Israel
Cicilline		Jackson Lee

Jeffries	McDermott	Sarbanes	Castro (TX)	Jolly	Richmond	Gallego	Latta	Renacci
Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schakowsky	Chabot	Katko	Roby	Garrett	Lee	Rice (NY)
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Schiff	Chu (CA)	Keating	Roe (TN)	Gibson	Levin	Rice (SC)
Kaptur	Meeks	Schrader	Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Rogers (AL)	Graves (GA)	Lewis	Rigell
Keating	Meng	Scott (VA)	Clark (MA)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo	Rooney (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott, David	Clay	Kennedy	Rohrabacher	Green, Al	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Kennedy	Moulton	Serrano	Cole	Kildee	Rokita	Green, Gene	Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)	Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Roskam	Griffith	MacArthur	Rush
Kilmer	Nadler	Sherman	Comstock	King (NY)	Ross	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda
Kind	Napolitano	Sires	Conyers	Kline	Rothfus	Hahn	Marchant	T.
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Slaughter	Cook	Knight	Rouzer	Hanna	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Kuster	Nolan	Smith (WA)	Cooper	Kuster	Royce	Hartzler	McGovern	Sarbanes
Langevin	Norcross	Speier	Courtney	Labrador	Ruiz	Heck (NV)	McKinley	Schakowsky
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)	Cramer	LaMalfa	Ruppertsberger	Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Schrader
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Takai	Crawford	Lamborn	Russell	Hice (GA)	Meeks	Schaffner (AL)
Lawrence	Pascarella	Takano	Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (WI)	Hill	Moore	Sires
Lee	Payne	Thompson (CA)	Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Salmon	Holding	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Levin	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)	Culberson	Lawrence	Sanford	Honda	Murphy (FL)	Stivers
Lewis	Peters	Tonko	Cummings	Lieu (CA)	Scalise	Hoyer	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Lieu (CA)	Peterson	Torres	Curbelo (FL)	Lipinski	Schiff	Hudson	Newhouse	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pingree	Tsongas	Davis (CA)	Loebach	Schock	Huffman	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Loebach	Pocan	Van Hollen	Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Schweikert	Huizenga (MI)	Norcross	Thompson (PA)
Lofgren	Polis	Vargas	DeGette	Long	Scott (VA)	Israel	Nugent	Tiberi
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Veasey	DeLauro	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin	Issa	Palazzo	Tipton
Lowey	Quigley	Vela	DelBene	Love	Scott, David	Jackson Lee	Pallone	Turner
Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Velázquez	Dent	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner	Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Valadao
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Visclosky	DesJarlais	Lucas	Serrano	Jenkins (WV)	Payne	Vargas
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Walz	Deutch	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	Johnson (OH)	Pearce	Veasey
(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Doggett	Diaz-Balart	Lujan Grisham	Sherman	Jones	Perry	Velázquez
Lynch	Ruiz	Doyle (PA)	Doyle (PA)	(NM)	Shimkus	Jordan	Peters	Visclosky
Maloney,	Ruppertsberger	Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Luján, Ben Ray	Shuster	Joyce	Peterson	Walberg
Carolyn	Rush	Duncan (TN)	Edwards	(NM)	Simpson	Kaptur	Pittenger	Walker
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)	Ellison	Lummis	Sinema	Kilmer	Poe (TX)	Waters, Maxine
Matsui	T.	Yarmuth	Emmer	Maloney,	Smith (NE)	Kind	Poliquin	Weber (TX)
McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta		Engel	Carolyn	Smith (NJ)	Kinzing (IL)	Price (GA)	Woodall
			Eshoo	Marino	Smith (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Ratchliffe	Yoder
			Farr	Massie	Smith (WA)	Lance	Reed	Young (AK)
			Fattah	McCarthy	Speier	Langevin	Reichert	
			Fleischmann	McCaul	Stefanik			
			Fortenberry	McClintock	Stewart			
			Foster	McCollum	Stutzman			
			Frankel (FL)	McHenry	Takai			
			Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Takano			
			Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Thornberry			
			Gabbard	McNerney	Tonko			
			Gibbs	McSally	Torres			
			Goodlatte	Meadows	Trott			
			Gosar	Meng	Tsongas			
			Gowdy	Messer	Upton			
			Graham	Mica	Van Hollen			
			Granger	Miller (FL)	Vela			
			Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)	Wagner			
			Grayson	Moolenaar	Walden			
			Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Walorski			
			Guinta	Moulton	Walters, Mimi			
			Guthrie	Mullin	Walz			
			Hardy	Murphy (PA)	Wasserman			
			Harper	Nadler	Schultz			
			Harris	Napolitano	Watson Coleman			
			Hastings	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)			
			Heck (WA)	Noem	Welch			
			Hensarling	Nunes	Wenstrup			
			Higgins	O'Rourke	Westerman			
			Himes	Olson	Westmoreland			
			Hinojosa	Palmer	Whitfield			
			Huelskamp	Pascarella	Williams			
			Hultgren	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)			
			Hunter	Pingree	Wilson (SC)			
			Hurd (TX)	Pitts	Wittman			
			Hurt (VA)	Pocan	Womack			
			Jeffries	Polis	Yarmuth			
			Johnson (GA)	Posey	Yoho			
			Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Young (IA)			
			Johnson, Sam	Quigley	Young (IN)			
				Rangel	Zeldin			
				Ribble	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei	Garamendi	Titus
Bishop (UT)	Nunnelee	Wasserman
Cleaver	Perlmutter	Schultz
Duckworth	Ryan (OH)	Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1430

Mr. DESAULNIER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. STEFANIK changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 160, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—261

Abraham	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Adams	Bishop (MI)	Brown (FL)
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Amodei	Black	Bustos
Babin	Blackburn	Butterfield
Barletta	Blumenauer	Byrne
Barr	Bonamici	Calvert
Barton	Boustany	Capps
Beatty	Brady (TX)	Cárdenas
Becerra	Brat	Carson (IN)
Beyer	Bridenstine	Carter (TX)
Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)	Cartwright

Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Delaney
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Denham
Amash	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Ashford	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Bass	Clawson (FL)	Dingell
Benishak	Clyburn	Dold
Bera	Coffman	Duffy
Bost	Cohen	Ellmers
Boyle (PA)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Brady (PA)	Conaway	Fincher
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Buck	Costa	Fleming
Bucshon	Costello (PA)	Flores
Burgess	Crowley	Forbes
Capuano	Davis, Rodney	Fox
Carney	DeFazio	Fudge

NAYS—160

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—11

Blum	Grijalva	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Nunnelee	Slaughter
Duckworth	Perlmutter	Titus
Garamendi	Pompeo	

□ 1437

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY
ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 27 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 185.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1439

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 185) to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, with Mr. WESTMORELAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The American people are now four elections and more than 6 years into the worst period after an economic crisis since the Great Depression. Despite some encouraging recent signs, jobs have not truly recovered. Wages have definitely not recovered. The rate of new business startups has not recovered. Instead, permanent exits from the labor force are at historic levels, real wages have fallen, and dependency on government assistance has increased. People have been giving up because they can't find a confident path forward.

In this recovery, we are not recovering; we are losing something precious. We are losing what has allowed this Nation to contribute more to human happiness than any other nation in history. We are losing the opportunity to live the American Dream. What is that dream? It is the dream that if you work hard, if you take responsibility for your life, if you reach for the opportunity that your human potential makes possible, you will be free to succeed. You will be free to pursue your happiness. And as you achieve that happiness, your children will have a better chance in life than you did.

All across this country, people who have been struggling, people whose jobs and wages have been disappearing, people who have been leaving the labor pool for the dependency pool, people who have seen no way possible to start a new business, can feel in their bones that this American Dream, the dream that they cherish and their children need, is slipping away.

What is killing the American Dream?

It is not ordinary Americans. It is not foreign enemies. It is not global phenomena. It is not natural disasters. More than anything else, it is the endless drain of resources that takes working people's hard-earned wages to Washington, and Washington's endless erection of regulatory roadblocks in the path of opportunity and growth.

Today, the combined economic burden of Federal taxation and regulation is over \$3 trillion, almost 20 percent of our economy. Of that, the larger part is the burden of regulation—now estimated to reach at least \$1.86 trillion. That Federal regulatory burden is larger than the 2013 gross domestic product of all but the top 10 countries in the world. It is half the size of Germany's entire gross domestic product. It is more than one-third the size of Japan's. Most important, that burden is \$15,000 per American household, nearly 30 percent of average household income in 2013.

No one says we need no regulation, but who can credibly say we need regulation that costs this much.

□ 1445

America cannot possibly retain its competitive position in the world and

create opportunity and prosperity for all Americans if the Federal Government continues to drop such a crushing weight on our economy.

My Regulatory Accountability Act addresses head on the problem of endlessly escalating, excessive Federal regulatory costs, and it addresses it in clear, commonsense ways that we can all support because it is based on principles proven in bipartisan practice from Presidents of both parties since Ronald Reagan.

What are those principles? Here are some of the most important: require agencies to choose the lowest cost rule-making alternative that meets statutory objectives; if needed to protect public health, safety, or welfare, allow flexibility to choose costlier rules, but make sure the added benefits justify the added costs; improve public outreach and agency factfinding to identify better, more efficient regulatory alternatives; require agencies to use the best reasonably-obtainable science; provide on-the-record but streamlined administrative hearings in the highest-impact rulemakings—those that impose \$1 billion or more in annual costs—so interested parties can subject critical evidence to cross-examination; require advanced notice of proposed major rulemakings to increase public input before costly agency positions are proposed and entrenched; strengthen judicial review of new agency regulations to make sure the Federal Courts can enforce these requirements.

In a nutshell, this bill says to every agency: Fulfill the statutory goals the United States Congress has set for you. Protect health. Protect safety. Protect consumers. Protect the vulnerable. You are free to do that, and you should do that whenever Congress gives you those orders, but as you achieve those goals, make sure you do it with better public input, better-tested information, and in the least-costly way.

The minute this bill becomes law, what will start to happen? America will start to save hundreds of billions of dollars it doesn't need to spend. That is real money that can be put to better use creating jobs and wages for our constituents, real money that hardworking Americans can use to start and grow their own businesses, real money that can be used to restore the American Dream, all without stopping a single needed regulation from being issued.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Members of the House, I strongly oppose H.R. 185, the so-called Regulatory Accountability Act. Under the guise of attempting to improve the regulatory process, H.R. 185 will, in truth, undermine that process. It invites increased industry intervention and imposes more than 60—60—new analytical requirements that could add years to the regulatory process.

They make no bones about it in this bill. As a result, H.R. 185 would seriously hamper the ability of government agencies to safeguard public health and safety, as well as environmental protections, workplace safety, and consumer financial protections. That is what we are debating at this moment.

My greatest concern is that H.R. 185 will undermine the public health, safety, and well-being of Americans. The ways in which it does it are almost too numerous to list here, but I will mention a few.

First, H.R. 185 would override critical laws that prohibit agencies from considering costs when public health and safety are at stake. Imagine, we would pass a law that would override critical laws that prohibit agencies from considering costs when public health and safety are at stake, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

This means that agency officials will now be required to balance the costs of an air pollution standard with the costs of anticipated deaths and illnesses that will result in the absence of such regulations.

At a hearing on an earlier version of this bill in the 112th Congress, one witness—our witness—testified that if this measure were in effect in the 1970s, the government “almost certainly would not have required the removal of most lead from gasoline until perhaps decades later.”

This explains why numerous respected agencies, consumer organizations, public interest groups, labor movements, and environmental organizations all strongly oppose this dangerous legislation.

For example, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards—consisting of more than 70 national public interest, labor, consumer, and environmental organizations—say the bill will “grind to a halt the rulemaking process at the core of implementing the Nation's public health, workplace safety, and environmental standards.”

Another organization, very much respected, the Natural Resources Defense Council, adds that the practical impact of the measure before us now, H.R. 185, “would be to make it difficult, if not impossible, to put in place any new safeguards for the public, no matter what the issue.”

Now, I am not sure if the authors of this measure understand the deep criticism and reservation that the scientific and academic community have about the practical impact of this measure.

Another, the Consumer Federation of America states that H.R. 185 “would handcuff all Federal agencies in their efforts to protect consumers” and that it “would override important bipartisan laws that have been in effect for years, as well as more recently-enacted laws to protect consumers from unfair

and deceptive financial services, unsafe food, and unsafe consumer products.”

Do we understand what it is we are dealing with here this day?

Further, the AFL-CIO warns that the bill’s procedural and analytical requirements add years to the regulatory process—adds years to the regulatory process—delaying the development of major workplace safety rules and will “cost workers their lives.”

As more than 80 highly-respected administrative law academics and practitioners observe, the bill’s many ill-defined new procedural and analytical requirements will engender “20 or 30 years of litigation before its requirements are clearly understood.” What do we have in mind? What is trying to be accomplished here?

My next concern is that this legislation would give well-funded business interests the opportunity to exert even greater influence over the rulemaking process and agencies.

We already know that the ability of corporate and business interests to influence agency rulemaking far exceeds that by groups representing the public. In other words, the groups representing the public already have less influence to influence agency rulemaking, and we are here proposing in broad daylight to make it even worse, much worse.

But rather than leveling the playing field, this measure will further tip the balance in favor of business interests by giving them multiple opportunities to intervene in the rulemaking process, including through less differential judicial review.

Finally, this measure is based on the faulty premise that regulations result in economically stifling costs, kill jobs, and promote uncertainty.

While supporters of H.R. 185 will undoubtedly cite a study claiming the cost of regulation exceed \$1.8 trillion, the Congressional Research Service, Center for Progressive Reform, and the Economic Policy Institute all found that a prior iteration of this study was based on incomplete and irrelevant data.

In fact, the majority’s own witnesses at a hearing on nearly identical legislation clearly debunked this argument. Mr. Christopher DeMuth, who appeared on behalf of the conservative think tank American Enterprise Institute, testified that the employment effects of regulation “are indeterminant.”

The other central argument put forth by proponents of this legislation—that regulatory uncertainty hurts businesses—has similarly been debunked.

Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations observes:

Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

That is from a Bush administrator, who was a senior policy analyst in the Reagan administration, Bruce Bartlett.

Not surprisingly, the administration issued a strong veto threat just yesterday, stating that the bill “would impose unprecedented and unnecessary procedural requirements on agencies that will prevent them from efficiently performing their statutory responsibilities.”

Rather than heeding these serious concerns, the supporters of H.R. 185 simply want to push forward without any hearings, markups, or deliberative process in this Congress with a bill that has absolutely no political viability.

I urge, I plead with my colleagues to oppose this very dangerous legislation, and, Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), who has worked with us across the aisle on this legislation for the last two Congresses. This issue goes back far before that as well. I want to thank him for his work on this.

□ 1500

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 185, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015. This is common-sense legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Our farmers, ranchers, and businesses are all feeling the burden of increased regulation, and we need to act to ensure that they are not regulated out of business.

We all understand how difficult it is to pass legislation, but it is sometimes even harder to get the regulations written correctly. Sometimes you don’t recognize the legislation that passed when they are done with it. Rather than following the intent of the law, we have seen interest groups using the regulatory process to interpret the law in their best interests. This should not be the case.

H.R. 185 will create a more streamlined, transparent, and accountable regulatory process and give the American people a stronger voice in agency decision-making. Specifically, the bill requires agencies to choose the lowest cost rulemaking alternative, streamlines administrative hearings to provide for more stakeholder input, and provides for more judicial review of new agency regulations.

Similar legislation received bipartisan support in the House in previous Congresses, and I urge my colleagues to again support these commonsense reforms.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, HANK JOHNSON, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 185, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, and on behalf of my amendment to protect jobs.

H.R. 185 is a sweeping revision of the Administrative Procedure Act that convolutes the agency rulemaking process through numerous analytical requirements. These requirements, which are largely opposed by the Nation’s leading administrative law experts, would cause years of delays in rulemaking or deregulate entire industries through rulemaking avoidance by agencies.

As a result of this deregulation, H.R. 185 would seriously undermine the critical role of agencies in protecting public health and safety, undermining protections across every regulated industry, from consumers’ health and product safety, environmental protections, workplace safety, to consumer financial protections.

The only basis for this bill is the unsupported claims that regulations erode employment and economic growth. Contrary to my Republican colleagues’ assertion that regulations kill jobs, a wealth of unimpeachable, bipartisan evidence has repeatedly and effectively debunked this claim.

The Office of Management and Budget estimated over the last decade that major regulations benefited the economy between \$217 billion and \$863 billion a year, at a mere cost of \$57 billion to \$84 billion.

Regulations don’t cause economic loss, ladies and gentlemen. Instead, they have produced billions of dollars in economic gains. In fact, a 2013 study from the San Francisco Federal Reserve found that since the recession, there is zero correlation between job growth and regulations. Moreover, the San Francisco Federal Reserve also found that there is no evidence showing that increased regulations and taxes have any effect on the unemployment rate. If anything, weak growth was due to weak consumer demand, not cost of regulations. Earlier studies by the New York Federal Reserve made similar findings.

So what is the evidence that regulations harm the economy? The only evidence—literally, the one study supporting the faulty premise that regulations harm the economy—relied on for the absurd figures repeated by the proponents of this bill derives from a study roundly unproven by the non-partisan Congressional Research Service, which found that the study’s cost figures were cherry-picked, inaccurate, and based on evidence from decades ago without contemporary value.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Indeed, the very authors of this study have since

repudiated its use in policy debates, and any of their claims should be discredited as ideologically driven.

Under President Obama, the economy has roared back to life. Unemployment is falling at the fastest rate in three decades. Consumer and business spending have catalyzed the most growth in over a decade. Our Nation's gross domestic product grew at 5 percent between July and September last year—the fastest since 2003—and that will continue to grow throughout this year.

Granted, the bottom 99 percent of Americans have not felt the economic uptick that the top 1 percent have enjoyed, but that fact is not due to the cost of regulation but, rather, stagnant wage growth.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that our economy is growing at its fastest rate. I would ask that my amendment, which has been ruled to be in order, will rule the day. I ask for your support.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 185, the proposed Regulatory Accountability Act. Simply put, this legislation requires Federal regulatory agencies to choose the lowest cost rulemaking alternative that meets the statutory objectives.

In the 113th Congress, members of the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law heard over and over again how these regulatory costs have been key factors that hold back our economic recovery and stand in the way of job creation. Our regulatory reform agenda for the 114th Congress begins today with the passage of the Regulatory Accountability Act. It is a good place to start. After all, it has been almost 70 years since enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act. Unfortunately, the act has never been modernized nor even amended in any material way.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law, it is my honor to support Chairman GOODLATTE, and I urge Members to support H.R. 185, a bill that passed with strong bipartisan support in both the 112th and 113th Congress, so the bill can finally be given serious consideration in the new House, the U.S. Senate, and reach the President's desk.

If the President is serious about job creating, helping small businesses, and growing our economy, he will work with us and sign the Regulatory Accountability Act and other important regulatory reform measures into law.

Mr. Chairman, it is about time that we deliver real and permanent regu-

latory solutions to create jobs. Doing that starts with passage of the Regulatory Accountability Act.

I want to leave the American people with one thought. It is an example how the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, is doing what this bill tries to prevent.

I live in the middle of five farms. I have been there for almost two decades. Just recently, the EPA has attempted to get more control over farmland by saying that if there is a rainstorm and there is a puddle, or a farmer even spills milk, through the Navigable Waters Act, EPA has control over that land. As I said, I have been living in the middle of five farms for a couple of decades, and I have yet to see as much as a rowboat go through those farmlands.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), one of our most effective members of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would almost attempt to bring back "Swanee River," or some old song that reflects "here we go again."

This is a bill that has been recycled. It has been recycled and it has been recycled. I believe the underlying premise of the bill is contrary to the values of the American people. This is proposed as a Regulatory Accountability Act to generate jobs and opportunity. I rise in opposition to a bill that stymies progress, hinders clean water and clean air, and provides mountainous obstacles to the national security of America.

What is the underlying premise of H.R. 185? The underlying premise of this bill is to require 70 new analytical requirements to the Administrative Procedure Act, and it requires Federal agencies to conduct an estimate of all indirect costs and benefits of proposed rules and all potential alternatives without providing any definition of what constitutes or does not constitute an indirect cost.

Mr. Chairman, is there logic to saying that you are streamlining the APA process when you are adding a mountainous, tall, multifloor skyscraper of requirements? Is it accurate to suggest that you are making the process better when you are causing agencies of varying sizes already suffering from the restraints of the budget-cutting process of my friends on the other side of the aisle, are you suggesting that they can then analyze indirect costs and actually save money?

We live in a climate and an era of difficult times. As a member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee, as our Secretary of Homeland Security has said, these are dangerous times. We have already indicated our sympathy

for the people of France and viewed it as a wake-up call. Do you realize that some of the agencies facing this crisis will be Homeland Security, Health and Human Services? Does anyone recall the tragedy of Ebola and how quickly action was needed?

This undermines the integrity of the process by increasing the procedural burdens for Federal agencies when they try to carry out their mandates. In fact, this is not helpful when we entrust our agency personnel to help protect the American people against threats near and far.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am asking the question: What are we saving here? What money are we saving? Why are we undermining the very protection of this Nation?

Again, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, and, again, homeland security, all of these very important elements of safety for the American people will be undermined by H.R. 185. Today, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to stand on the side of the American people and vigorously oppose H.R. 185.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 185, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015.

This bill modifies the federal rule-making process by codifying many requirements included in presidential executive orders and requiring agencies to consider numerous new criteria when issuing rules, including alternatives to any rule proposal, the scope of the problem that the rule is meant to address, and potential costs and benefits of the proposal and alternatives.

In essence though—this H.R. 185 only adds to the procedural burdens of federal agencies—making it harder for them to effectively carry out their missions.

THE REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT:

Creates confusion and delay by adding over 70 new analytical requirements to the Administrative Procedure Act and requires federal agencies to conduct an estimate of all the "indirect" costs and benefits of proposed rules and all potential alternatives without providing any definition of what constitutes or does not constitute an indirect cost.

Mr. Chair, the tragedy last week in France was a wake-up call—and we simply cannot delay, obfuscate, and slow down the regulatory process.

Slows down the rulemaking process by significantly increasing the demands on already constrained agency resources to produce the analysis and findings that would be required to finalize any new rule.

Undermines the integrity of the process by increasing the procedural burdens for federal agencies when they try to carry out their mandates. Mr. Chair, this is not helpful legislation when we entrust our agency personnel to help protect the American people against threats near and far such as franchise terrorism, keep our water clean, and our food safe.

Allows any interested person has the ability to petition the agency to hold a public hearing on any "genuinely disputed" scientific or factual conclusions underlying the proposed rule.

HINDERS THE PRODUCTION OF GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

"Super-mandates" cost-benefit analysis measures for major guidance documents. In addition it makes it much harder for agencies to issue guidance, thus leading to increased regulatory uncertainty.

Provides regulated industries and companies multiple opportunities to challenge agency data and science and thus further stretch out the already lengthy rulemaking process—again—undermining the process.

MAKES THE LEAST COSTLY RULE THE DEFAULT CHOICE

Requires that an agency default to the "least costly" rule unless it can demonstrate—out of all the possible alternative rules—that additional benefits justify any additional costs and offer a public health, safety, environmental, or welfare justification clearly drawn from the authorizing statute including such critical measures as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, and the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act.

EXPANDS JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY JUDGMENTS

This bill discourages agencies from rulemaking and from being able to do their jobs because judges are emboldened to substitute their own opinions for the findings of agencies.

Expands the scope of judicial review.

The Regulatory Accountability Act is designed to further obstruct and hinder rulemaking rather than improve the regulatory process.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to VOTE AGAINST the Regulatory Accountability Act and ensure that progress is not thwarted and government operations not unnecessarily delayed by this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a new member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. TROTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Today, this House will vote on important bipartisan legislation designed to rein in costly Federal regulations. The Regulatory Accountability Act will modernize the Federal rulemaking process by directing the executive branch to fulfill its statutory goals in the least costly method and requires agencies to solicit input from, of all places, the public to find the most efficient regulatory solutions.

The Regulatory Accountability Act is necessary because ineffective, inefficient regulations from Washington have increased prices, lowered wages, killed jobs, and made our Nation less competitive. There is no question that these regulations are hurting hard-working families in Michigan's 11th District and throughout our great Nation.

The facts on Washington's overregulation are shocking. Federal regulations now impose an estimated burden of \$1.86 trillion. That burden is suffocating America's job creators. It equals roughly \$15,000 per household and 11 percent of our gross domestic product. To make matters worse, the new regulations cooked up in Washington are

often unnecessary and have unintended consequences.

I spent 30 years in business and have seen firsthand the devastating impact overregulation from Washington can have on our economy. We cannot expect our job providers to grow and hire more employees if Washington is creating uncertainty, surprises, and continuing to bury our businesses in costly regulations.

Every dollar that is spent complying with needless regulations is one less dollar that can be spent by families who are trying to put food on the table and make ends meet in a challenging economy.

Mr. Chairman, the American people sent us here to work together to address the many challenges facing our Nation. They sent us here to craft solutions to create jobs and make opportunities for all Americans.

□ 1515

So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Regulatory Accountability Act so we can begin to lift the burden of Federal regulations off the American people. It is time to get the government out of the way.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I am pleased now to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a man who has served the House Judiciary Committee with great distinction.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise against the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about job growth. We just want to remind people that our economy has experienced job growth in excess of 200,000 for 11 consecutive months, a record that hadn't been seen since the Clinton administration, and 58 consecutive months of private sector job growth, a string that hasn't been seen in recorded history.

So, continued economic growth and strong regulatory protections are not mutually exclusive. In fact, regulations are often necessary to protect the investments the American taxpayer makes in our economy and to ensure stability, order, and safety inside and outside of the workplace.

Unfortunately, this legislation will impose unnecessary burdens and delays on agencies seeking to issue or improve rules and regulations, burdensome delays that can threaten taxpayer dollars and the lives and health of workers.

Mr. Chairman, I offered two amendments that would have improved the bill, but neither was accepted by the Rules Committee. The first would have insured that inspector general recommendations would not be subject to the potentially dangerous delays and extra hurdles found in the bill.

Inspectors general are taxpayers' independent watchdogs who investigate

and seek out problems and inefficiencies in our government. For example, two alarming audits issued last year by the Department of Education's inspector general found that criminal fraud rings were preying on money available through distance learning programs and that expensive, bank-sponsored debit cards were used to perpetuate waste, fraud, and abuse in the financial aid program.

Fortunately, in both of these situations the inspector general urged the Department of Education to quickly issue new rules to ensure that billions of dollars aren't wasted.

Unfortunately, without my amendment, this bill would deeply impair the ability of the Department of Education and other agencies to address similar known abuses of taxpayers' funds.

Delays in inspector general recommendations can also threaten the lives and health of workers. For example, the Department of Labor's inspector general found that the Mine Safety and Health Administration had a regulatory gap that allowed mine operators who habitually violated mine safety standards to easily avoid sanctions and continue to operate unsafe mines.

The unfortunate consequence of these loopholes was seen at the Upper Big Branch mine in West Virginia, where 29 mine workers were killed in the largest coal mine disaster in the United States in 40 years.

Following that disaster, the inspector general recommended fixes that would close these loopholes, and the administration quickly adopted new regulations that are estimated to prevent about 1,800 miner injuries every 10 years. Had this bill been in effect, these regulations might not have ever been adopted in a timely manner.

My second amendment, Mr. Chairman, would have also strengthened protections of workers' health and safety. The amendment would have exempted regulations or guidance proposed by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to prevent health care workers from contracting infectious diseases.

As it stands, the legislation could possibly delay OSHA's workforce protections and make it far more difficult for OSHA to prevent health care workers from contracting lethal infectious diseases.

Under current regulations that govern OSHA's rulemaking, it takes OSHA an average of 7 years to issue standards, and this bill could add another 3 years, possibly delaying and essentially shutting down OSHA's ability to issue rules altogether.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will seriously compromise the ability of agencies to protect both taxpayers and workers, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3

minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Regulatory Accountability Act. It is funny to me to stay here and listen to claims that the sky is going to fall if we just bring some common sense into how our Federal agencies promulgate rules. I want to ask, really?

Let me show you something. What I have in my hand is the Federal Register. It is not the Federal Register for the year or for a number of months. This is the Federal Register and the rules that have been promulgated just for this first week of January, just a week.

See, this first one here is for January 2. It is a little slim, but you know, they had just gotten back in the office.

This second one right here, this is for January 6, so I think they are making up for it.

This is just for the rest of the week. And believe it or not, that is actually a small stack compared to what happens when the juices really get flowing.

Now, here is the challenge with this stack. My challenge is, say I have a small business—and I do, actually. There are several small businesses in Lewis County, for example. It is a small area compared to the State of Washington, and they have got a lot of rural folks who work very hard, whether it is farms or family-owned businesses that they have been passing down.

Now, that small business in Centralia, they are responsible to know what is in this and the ones that come every single day after it for the entire year.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about big corporations with legal departments and government affairs folks who are hired to comb through this. We are talking about mom-and-pop shops. We are talking about 50 people or less. They have to dedicate a whole employee to knowing what is in here or they could be in violation of a Federal rule.

I have heard it said that you are 400 times more likely to come into contravention or violation of a Federal rule than a Federal law. So actually, it doesn't just apply to small businesses. It applies to all of us. We better know what is in here.

Or, time out: we could just create a little bit of space for some common sense, and that is exactly what this bill does.

This bill says, hey, Federal agencies, you just have to take a few extra things into account, like the impacts on the economy, like the impacts on the cost for taxpayers. Do you know we are talking about \$1.86 trillion on the U.S. economy every year?

That is about \$15,000 per every American household. That is real money. Fifteen, grand is a lot of money. That

could provide a family of four in Castle Rock with groceries for 62 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, we are not trying to bring down this Federal bureaucracy, although some would appreciate it if we did. We are simply trying to bring some common sense into how they operate.

Look, the Regulatory Accountability Act delivers the reform that will make lives better for hardworking Americans and, hopefully, it will help them begin to recover a little bit of that \$15,000 they are spending on unnecessary regulations. We can do this, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I thank the gentleman.

I believe this is what people need to understand. The bill is very simple. It leaves intact and supports consumer protections and reasonable environmental impacts. It doesn't jeopardize the health of our kids.

Come on. Let's use some common sense. It simply makes it easier for that family of four. It really does try and connect the Federal regulations with real lives of real Americans, and that is why this act is so important.

That is why it is bipartisan, Mr. Speaker. This isn't some extreme idea. This is something that brings good government to the people. We are trying to serve the people, not be their masters, and I think this bill does just that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the ranking member for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 185, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, a bill that puts us all in danger by making it harder for Federal regulators to do their job.

This bill would delay regulations that prevent big banks from gambling with our economy. Just as seriously, it would weaken the implementation of laws such as the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act that protect our environment, natural resources, and the public health of the American people.

Supporters of this bill tell us that regulations impose huge costs and prevent economic growth. As other speakers have noted, these claims are not just untrue, they are fabrications.

Choosing not to regulate polluting industries doesn't save taxpayers money. When we fail to prevent pollution, we impose more costs on the public. Allowing unchecked emissions from coal-fired power plants, for example, would mean more mercury and smog polluting our air and water, causing respiratory ailments and premature death.

To see what happens when a government chooses to allow polluters to have their way, one need only to look at China. By burning coal without adequate air quality regulations, China caused an additional 670,000 deaths in 2012 alone, this according to a recent study by the National Resources Defense Council.

The failure to regulate is causing a massive drag at this time on the Chinese economy. This bill leads us down the same path. The Chinese model of economic growth at the expense of public health and the environment is not sustainable and does not represent American values.

We have laws on the books today mandating environmental conservation and natural resource management through regulation. This bill does not repeal those laws, which have been a major benefit to the Nation, to the American people since they were enacted. Today's bill just makes their implementation less efficient, more costly, more time-consuming to the very industries it is allegedly trying to help.

If this bill were to become law, annual regulations needed to open a fishery or establish fishing industry catch levels would be endlessly delayed.

If this bill were to pass, it would delay the Forest Service regulations needed to allow thinning projects and increase the potential for costly and deadly wildfires throughout the West. Each year, new fire seasons seem to break the record for financial costs and acres burned. This bill, if enacted, would make that cycle worse.

The bill fails to appropriate any new money to the agencies facing these unnecessary, burdensome requirements. Instead, agencies like NOAA and the Department of the Interior will be forced to divert existing resources to develop and implement the regulations needed to fulfill this new congressional mandate.

The results? For example, permits for energy development on Federal lands, currently at an all-time high, will be delayed, as will be permits for other activities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield Mr. GRIJALVA another minute.

Mr. GRIJALVA. This is not about making government more efficient. It is about making it impossible for many government agencies to do their jobs on behalf of the American people. In the name of regulatory reform, Republicans are intentionally cutting off the people who oversee our lands and waters at their knees.

Those who claim that this bill is a good idea ignore China's example at their own peril. Federal agencies trying to keep us safe cannot do more with less. Instead of placing more burdens on Federal agencies, we should provide them with the resources they

need to do their jobs better and faster and protect the American people.

For all these reasons, I urge opposition to H.R. 185.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, the Obama administration released 300 new rules and regulations in the first 7 days of 2015. This is on top of over 3,500 new rules and regulations the administration created last year.

We have got a problem in our country. Unelected regulators in Washington, D.C., are out of control. From your mortgage to your health care plan to your child's lunchroom, and even your own backyard, the regulatory arms of this Capital are encroaching every facet of American life.

□ 1530

Agencies are churning out hundreds of thousands of pages of regulations, many of which have a substantial effect on particular communities and industries across western Pennsylvania. Washington's central planners are regulating solid, good-paying jobs right out of existence.

The legislation under consideration includes a provision I offered in the last Congress with my friend Mr. BARR of Kentucky. Our provision simply says that if a regulation decreases employment or wages by 1 percent or more in an industry, it will be subjected to heightened review and transparency requirements.

The principle is simple: if bureaucrats implement rules that harm Americans' wages or jobs, they must take responsibility for it.

I am proud to support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 185 and in holding Federal agencies accountable.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I notice that my friends on the other side have not named one person, academic scholar, or organization that supports this measure. I would now like to identify the letters that we have received on our side that have been very critical—very disturbed—by the gross approach of the authors of this measure.

Supporting us and opposing the bill is the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees. The AFL-CIO is opposed to this measure. The American Bar Association is opposed. The Americans for Financial Reform is opposed.

The Center for Effective Government is opposed. The Center for Progressive

Reform is opposed. The Center for Responsible Lending is opposed. The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, representing more than 70 national consumer, public interest, labor, and environmental organizations and more than 80 State and local organizations and affiliates is opposed.

The Consumer Federation of America is opposed. The Consumers Union is opposed to this measure. The Natural Resources Defense Council does not support this measure. Public Citizen is opposed to this. United Steelworkers is opposed. The Union of Concerned Scientists is opposed. The United States PIRG, which is the Public Interest Research Group, is opposed.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think that our case against this measure has been well-made.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased that my colleague from Michigan has raised the issue of support for this legislation because there is a lot of it. I have in front of me a list of 156 organizations that support this legislation. They cover a wide array of organizations, of groups, of businesses, of small business associations, and of chambers of commerce.

I will name just a few: the 60 Plus Association, the Indoor Environment & Energy Efficiency Association, the Aggregate and Ready Mix Association of Minnesota, the American Architectural Manufacturers Association, the American Chemistry Council, the American Coatings Association, the American Composites Manufacturers Association, the American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, the American Council of Engineering Companies, the American Council of Independent Laboratories, the American Exploration & Mining Association, the American Forest & Paper Association, the American Foundry Society, the American Fruit and Vegetable Processors and Growers Coalition, the American Highway Users Alliance, the American Iron and Steel Institute, the American Loggers Council, the American Road & Transportation Builders Association, the American Subcontractors Association, the American Supply Association, the American Trucking Associations, the American Wholesale Marketers Association, the American Wood Council.

We haven't even gotten all the way through the A's on this list which covers, as I say, a wide array of organizations that is interested in manufacturing good-quality products for Americans and in providing services, like architectural services and others. I want to make sure that everyone understands that there is broad-based support for this.

I also want to correct a misimpression left by some of the speakers on the other side who have

pointed to a study that we have not relied upon for the basis of this legislation. I want to call to everyone's attention—in fact, at the appropriate time, I will request that it may be made a part of the RECORD—a study from the Competitive Enterprise Institute, CEI, entitled—not the 10 Commandments, which we are all familiar with—but “Ten Thousand Commandments, An Annual Snapshot of the Federal Regulatory State,” by Clyde Wayne Crews, Jr., which has provided valuable information with regard to this.

Another thing people have said is, Oh, this is going to add a tremendous burden to the regulators when they write these regulations.

I can tell you we don't have 160 different organizations supporting this legislation because they think their regulatory burden is too low; they think the burden is too high and that not enough energy and effort is going in on the part of those regulators to pay attention to what they are doing when they write regulations.

They have complained about the new things that this bill requires, and let me just read a few of them to you.

It requires documentation that the agency has considered the specific nature and significance of the problem the agency may address with a rule . . .

It seems to make pretty good common sense that, if you are going to write a regulation, you should be studying and understanding the nature of the problem you are supposed to be addressing with the regulation.

. . . documentation that the agency has considered whether existing rules could be amended or rescinded to address the problem in whole or in part; documentation that the agency has considered reasonable alternatives for a new rule or other response identified by the agency or interested persons; documentation that the agency has considered the alternative of no Federal response . . .

In other words, they may not need to do anything.

. . . documentation that the agency has considered the potential direct costs and benefits associated with potential alternative rules and other responses; documentation that the agency has estimated impacts on jobs that are associated with potential alternative rules and other responses.

The requirements are like that throughout, and they are commonsense reforms. In fact, they are so common sense that many of these were initiated by President Reagan, and many of these have been carried forward by subsequent administrations, including the current administration.

What we are asking for today is don't hide the ball on the American people when you write regulations. Provide the documentation of how you wrote the regulation, what you considered when you wrote the regulation, whether or not that regulation is the most cost-effective way to do it, and whether or not the regulation is even needed at

all. These are commonsense reforms, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, last evening, the President of the United States indicated that he will not sign this bill, that he will veto it if it were to pass, and I am hoping that that doesn't happen.

The measure fails in a great way. It would create needless regulatory and legal uncertainty and would further impede the implementation protections for the American public.

This bill would make the regulatory process more expensive, less flexible, and more burdensome, dramatically increasing the costs of regulation of the American taxpayer and working class families.

This is an incredible situation that we have to debate here. I am hopeful that the logic, the rationale, the threat of the executive branch to veto the bill will all cause us to carefully consider how unnecessary this measure is. I urge that we not support H.R. 185.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), the vice chairman of the Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law Subcommittee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015.

There is no question that the Federal Government and Federal regulations take a heavy toll on businesses of all sizes. That toll isn't just financial; it is also stress, it is also time, it is also emotional. Dealing with the government is difficult. Just the dollars-and-cents cost of Federal regulation has been estimated at \$1.86 trillion—or so the expert tells me. That adds up to roughly \$15,000 per household.

It is simply not right for unelected bureaucrats to put that much weight on the shoulders of the American people without making all efforts to minimize the costs and give the people of south Texas and everywhere in this country the opportunity and a chance to weigh in.

In Texas in particular, we have seen how onerous EPA and Department of the Interior and other regulations have slowed job growth and the American energy boom, costing our domestic energy companies millions of dollars.

This bill would put public discussion back on the table when it comes to regulations and would ensure that the economic costs are fully considered and minimized. We have a lot of work to do to peel back some of the needless, overburdensome regulations that are strangling our businesses, but this bill will

help us plug the hole in the boat while we get rid of—start pumping out—some of the water.

The other side likes to say that it is going to make it more difficult to regulate. It is supposed to be difficult to enact laws and regulations. We have to pass something out of the House, and we have got to pass something out of the Senate and get it signed by the President to enact a law; but a bureaucrat can do it, basically, with the stroke of a pen and a publication in the Federal Register.

This act is going to do something to curb that. We need less government, fewer laws, fewer regulations—and not more.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MARINO. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, right now, we have the worst of both worlds: more regulation and less scrutiny.

In looking at a recent 7-year period, the Government Accountability Office found that 35 percent of major rules were issued without the opportunity for public comment. The GAO also found a lack of responsiveness. In the case of one ObamaCare regulation—one—4,627 comments were received, but no responses were issued.

Regulatory costs disproportionately hit small manufacturers, which incur regulatory costs of \$34,671 per year, per employee—more than three times that of the average American economy. Our energy boom is a perfect example of failed regulatory policy.

Oil and natural gas resources do not know Federal versus State boundaries, but it takes 10 times as long for the Federal Government to issue a permit as it does the States. As a result, oil and gas production is going up sharply on State lands and down on Federal lands.

Finally, ObamaCare is an epicenter of red tape. In its first 4 years, ObamaCare's effects on small business amounted to \$1.9 billion in regulatory costs and in 11.3 million hours of compliance. This amounts to a regulatory tax of 3 to 5 percent. Again, this is the cost of just one law's regulations.

□ 1545

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation which will help to rein in the excessive power of the executive branch of the Federal Government and provide for common sense being brought to the writing of Federal Government regulations, saving American taxpayers and consumers billions if not trillions of dollars. It is badly needed. It is long overdue.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

TEN THOUSAND COMMANDMENTS: AN ANNUAL SNAPSHOT OF THE FEDERAL REGULATORY STATE 2014 EDITION

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(By Clyde Wayne Crews Jr.)

In February 2014, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported outlays for fiscal year (FY) 2013 of \$3.454 trillion and projected spending for FY 2014 at \$3.543 trillion. Meanwhile, President Barack Obama's federal budget proposal for FY 2015 seeks \$3.901 trillion in discretionary, entitlement, and interest spending. In the previous fiscal year, the president had proposed outlays of \$3.778 trillion. Despite high debt and deficits, we have been unable to avoid entering the era of \$4 trillion in annual spending.

We experienced trillion dollar deficits between 2009 and 2012, and CBO projects that deficits will exceed \$1 trillion again by FY 2022. Trillion dollar deficits were once unimaginable. Such sums signified the level of budgets themselves, not of shortfalls. Yet at no point is spending projected to balance in the coming decade. President Obama's 2015 budget projects deficits that are smaller than recent heights—with 2014's claimed \$649 billion to fall to \$413 billion in 2018—before heading back into the CBO-predicted stratosphere.

Many other countries' government outlays make up a greater share of their national output, compared with 20 percent for the U.S. government, but in absolute terms, the U.S. government is the largest government on the planet. Only four other nations top \$1 trillion in annual government revenues, and none but the United States collects more than \$2 trillion.

REGULATION: THE HIDDEN TAX

The scope of federal government spending and deficits is sobering. Yet the government's reach extends well beyond Washington's taxes, deficits, and borrowing. Federal environmental, safety and health, and economic regulations cost hundreds of billions—perhaps trillions—of dollars annually in addition to the official federal outlays that dominate policy debate.

Firms generally pass the costs of some taxes along to consumers. Likewise, some regulatory compliance costs that businesses face will find their way into the prices that consumers pay and out of the wages workers earn. Precise regulatory costs can never be fully known because, unlike taxes, they are unbudgeted and often indirect. But scattered government and private data exist about scores of regulations and about the agencies that issue them, as well as data about estimates of regulatory costs and benefits. Compiling some of that information can make the regulatory state somewhat more comprehensible. That compilation is one purpose of the annual Ten Thousand Commandments report, highlights of which follow:

Among the five all-time-high Federal Register page counts, four have occurred under President Obama.

The annual outflow of more than 3,500 final rules—sometimes far above that level—means that 87,282 rules have been issued since 1993.

There were 51 rules for every law in 2013. The "Unconstitutionality Index," the ratio of regulations issued by agencies to laws passed by Congress and signed by the president, stood at 51 for 2013. Specifically, 72 laws were passed in calendar year 2013, whereas 3,659 rules were issued. This disparity highlights the excessive delegation of lawmaking power to unelected agency officials.

This author's working paper, "Tip of the Costberg," which is largely based on federal government data, estimates regulatory compliance and economic impacts at \$1.863 trillion annually.

U.S. households "pay" \$14,974 annually in regulatory hidden tax, thereby "absorbing" 23 percent of the average income of \$65,596, and "pay" 29 percent of the expenditure budget of \$51,442. The "tax" exceeds every item in the budget except housing. More is "spent" on embedded regulation than on health care, food, transportation, entertainment, apparel and services, and savings.

The estimated cost of regulation exceeds half the level of the federal budget itself. Regulatory costs of \$1.863 trillion amount to 11.1 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP), which was estimated at \$16.797 trillion in 2013 by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

When regulatory costs are combined with federal FY 2013 outlays of \$3.454 trillion, the federal government's share of the entire economy now reaches 31 percent. The regulatory "hidden tax" surpasses the income tax. Regulatory compliance costs exceed the 2013 estimated total individual income tax revenues of \$1.234 trillion.

Regulatory compliance costs vastly exceed the 2013 estimated corporate income tax revenues of \$288 billion and approach corporate pretax profits of \$2.19 trillion.

If it were a country, U.S. regulation would be the 10th largest economy, ranked between India and Italy.

U.S. regulatory costs exceed the GDPs of Australia and Canada, the highest-income nations among the countries ranked most free in the annual Index of Economic Freedom and Economic Freedom of the World reports.

The Weidenbaum Center at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, and the Regulatory Studies Center at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., jointly estimate that agencies spent \$57.3 billion (on budget) to administer and police the federal regulatory enterprise. Adding the \$1.863 trillion in off-budget compliance costs brings the total regulatory enterprise to \$1.92 trillion.

The Federal Register finished 2013 at 79,311 pages, the fourth highest level in history.

Federal Register pages devoted specifically to final rules rose to a record high of 26,417. The 2013 Federal Register contained 3,659 final rules and 2,594 proposed rules.

Since the nation's founding, more than 15,177 executive orders have been issued. President Obama issued 181 as of the end of 2013.

President George W. Bush averaged 63 major rules annually during his eight years in office; Obama's five years so far have averaged 81.

Although there are over 3,500 rules annually, public notices in the Federal Register exceed 24,000 annually, with uncounted "guidance documents" among them. There were 24,261 notices in 2013 and 477,929 since 1995.

According to the fall 2013 "Regulatory Plan and the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions" (which lists federal regulatory actions at various stages of implementation), 63 federal departments, agencies, and commissions have 3,305 regulations at various stages of implementation.

Of the 3,305 regulations in the pipeline, 191 are "economically significant" rules, which the federal government defines as imposing at least \$100 million in annual costs. Assum-

ing that those rulemakings are primarily regulatory implies roughly \$19 billion yearly in future off-budget regulatory effects.

Of the 3,305 regulations now in the works, 669 affect small businesses. Of those, 391 required a regulatory flexibility analysis: 278 were otherwise noted by agencies to affect small businesses.

The five most active rule-producing agencies—the Departments of the Treasury, Interior, Commerce, Transportation, and Health and Human Services—account for 1,451 rules, or 44 percent of all rules in the Unified Agenda pipeline.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which was formerly consistently in the top five, is now sixth, but adding its 179 rules brings the total from the top six rule-making agencies to 1,630 rules, or 49.3 percent of all federal rules.

The most recent Small Business Administration (SBA) evaluation of the overall U.S. federal regulatory enterprise estimated annual regulatory compliance costs of \$1.752 trillion in 2008. Earlier SBA reports pegged costs at \$1.1 trillion in 2005 and at \$843 billion in 2001. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) agreed with those figures at the time. Meanwhile, a subset of 115 selected major rules reviewed during 2002–2012 by the OMB notes cumulative annual costs of between \$57 billion and \$84 billion.

The short-lived series of budget surpluses from 1998 to 2001—the first since 1969—seems like ancient history in today's debt and deficit-drenched policy setting, as the CBO projects annual deficits of hundreds of billions of dollars over the coming decade. When it comes to stimulating a limping economy, reducing deficits and relieving regulatory burdens are key to the nation's economic health. Otherwise, budgetary pressures can incentivize lawmakers to impose off-budget regulations on the private sector, rather than add to unpopular deficit spending. A new government program—for example, job training—would require either increasing government spending or imposing new regulations requiring such training. Unlike on-budget spending, the latter regulatory costs remain largely hidden from public view, which makes regulation increasingly attractive to lawmakers.

THE DISCLOSURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IMPERATIVES

Cost-benefit analysis at the agency level is already neglected; thus, at minimum, some third-party review is needed. Like federal spending, regulations and their costs should be tracked and disclosed annually. Then, periodic housecleaning should be performed.

A problem with cost-benefit analysis is that it largely relies on agency self-policing. Having agencies audit their own rules is like asking students to grade their own exams. Regulators are disinclined to emphasize when a rule's benefits do not justify the costs involved. In fact, one could expect new and dubious categories of benefits to emerge to justify an agency's rulemaking activity.

A major source of overregulation is the systematic overdelegation of rulemaking power to agencies. Requiring expedited votes on economically significant or controversial agency rules before they become binding would reestablish congressional accountability and would help affirm a principle of "no regulation without representation."

Openness about regulatory facts and figures can be bolstered through federal "regulatory report cards," similar to the presentation in Ten Thousand Commandments. These could be officially issued each year to distill information for the public and policy

makers about the scope of the regulatory state.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 185

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 551 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(15) 'major rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose—

"(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

"(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local, or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions;

"(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

"(D) significant impacts on multiple sectors of the economy;

"(16) 'high-impact rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to impose an annual cost on the economy of \$1,000,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

"(17) 'negative-impact on jobs and wages rule' means any rule that the agency that made the rule or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines is likely to—

"(A) in one or more sectors of the economy that has a 6-digit code under the North American Industry Classification System, reduce employment not related to new regulatory compliance by 1 percent or more annually during the 1-year, 5-year, or 10-year period after implementation;

"(B) in one or more sectors of the economy that has a 6-digit code under the North American Industry Classification System, reduce average weekly wages for employment not related to new regulatory compliance by 1 percent or more annually during the 1-year, 5-year, or 10-year period after implementation;

"(C) in any industry area (as such term is defined in the Current Population Survey conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) in which the most recent annual unemployment rate for the industry area is greater than 5 percent, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Current Population Survey, reduce employment not related to new regulatory compliance during the first year after implementation; or

"(D) in any industry area in which the Bureau of Labor Statistics projects in the Occupational Employment Statistics program

that the employment level will decrease by 1 percent or more, further reduce employment not related to new regulatory compliance during the first year after implementation;

“(18) ‘guidance’ means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect, other than a regulatory action, that sets forth a policy on a statutory, regulatory or technical issue or an interpretation of a statutory or regulatory issue;

“(19) ‘major guidance’ means guidance that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs finds is likely to lead to—

“(A) an annual cost on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;

“(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, local or tribal government agencies, or geographic regions;

“(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

“(D) significant impacts on multiple sectors of the economy;

“(20) the ‘Information Quality Act’ means section 515 of Public Law 106-554, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001, and guidelines issued by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs or other agencies pursuant to the Act; and

“(21) the ‘Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs’ means the office established under section 3503 of chapter 35 of title 44 and any successor to that office.”.

SEC. 3. RULE MAKING.

(a) Section 553(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “(a) This section applies” and inserting “(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies”.

(b) Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (b) through (e) and inserting the following:

“(b) RULE MAKING CONSIDERATIONS.—In a rule making, an agency shall make all preliminary and final factual determinations based on evidence and consider, in addition to other applicable considerations, the following:

“(1) The legal authority under which a rule may be proposed, including whether a rule making is required by statute, and if so, whether by a specific date, or whether the agency has discretion to commence a rule making.

“(2) Other statutory considerations applicable to whether the agency can or should propose a rule or undertake other agency action.

“(3) The specific nature and significance of the problem the agency may address with a rule (including the degree and nature of risks the problem poses and the priority of addressing those risks compared to other matters or activities within the agency’s jurisdiction), whether the problem warrants new agency action, and the countervailing risks that may be posed by alternatives for new agency action.

“(4) Whether existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency may address with a rule and whether those rules could be amended or rescinded to address the problem in whole or part.

“(5) Any reasonable alternatives for a new rule or other response identified by the agency or interested persons, including not only responses that mandate particular conduct or manners of compliance, but also—

“(A) the alternative of no Federal response;

“(B) amending or rescinding existing rules;

“(C) potential regional, State, local, or tribal regulatory action or other responses that could be taken in lieu of agency action; and

“(D) potential responses that—

“(i) specify performance objectives rather than conduct or manners of compliance;

“(ii) establish economic incentives to encourage desired behavior;

“(iii) provide information upon which choices can be made by the public; or

“(iv) incorporate other innovative alternatives rather than agency actions that specify conduct or manners of compliance.

“(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(A) the potential costs and benefits associated with potential alternative rules and other responses considered under section 553(b)(5), including direct, indirect, and cumulative costs and benefits and estimated impacts on jobs (including an estimate of the net gain or loss in domestic jobs), wages, economic growth, innovation, and economic competitiveness;

“(B) means to increase the cost-effectiveness of any Federal response; and

“(C) incentives for innovation, consistency, predictability, lower costs of enforcement and compliance (to government entities, regulated entities, and the public), and flexibility.

“(c) ADVANCE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING FOR MAJOR RULES, HIGH-IMPACT RULES, NEGATIVE-IMPACT ON JOBS AND WAGES RULES, AND RULES INVOLVING NOVEL LEGAL OR POLICY ISSUES.—In the case of a rule making for a major rule, a high-impact rule, a negative-impact on jobs and wages rule, or a rule that involves a novel legal or policy issue arising out of statutory mandates, not later than 90 days before a notice of proposed rule making is published in the Federal Register, an agency shall publish advance notice of proposed rule making in the Federal Register. In publishing such advance notice, the agency shall—

“(1) include a written statement identifying, at a minimum—

“(A) the nature and significance of the problem the agency may address with a rule, including data and other evidence and information on which the agency expects to rely for the proposed rule;

“(B) the legal authority under which a rule may be proposed, including whether a rule making is required by statute, and if so, whether by a specific date, or whether the agency has discretion to commence a rule making;

“(C) preliminary information available to the agency concerning the other considerations specified in subsection (b);

“(D) in the case of a rule that involves a novel legal or policy issue arising out of statutory mandates, the nature of and potential reasons to adopt the novel legal or policy position upon which the agency may base a proposed rule; and

“(E) an achievable objective for the rule and metrics by which the agency will measure progress toward that objective;

“(2) solicit written data, views or argument from interested persons concerning the information and issues addressed in the advance notice; and

“(3) provide for a period of not fewer than 60 days for interested persons to submit such written data, views, or argument to the agency.

“(d) NOTICES OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING; DETERMINATIONS OF OTHER AGENCY COURSE.—

(1) Before it determines to propose a rule, and following completion of procedures under subsection (c), if applicable, the agency shall consult with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. If the agency thereafter determines to propose a rule, the agency shall publish a notice of proposed rule making, which shall include—

“(A) a statement of the time, place, and nature of public rule making proceedings;

“(B) reference to the legal authority under which the rule is proposed;

“(C) the terms of the proposed rule;

“(D) a description of information known to the agency on the subject and issues of the proposed rule, including but not limited to—

“(i) a summary of information known to the agency concerning the considerations specified in subsection (b);

“(ii) a summary of additional information the agency provided to and obtained from interested persons under subsection (c);

“(iii) a summary of any preliminary risk assessment or regulatory impact analysis performed by the agency; and

“(iv) information specifically identifying all data, studies, models, and other evidence or information considered or used by the agency in connection with its determination to propose the rule;

“(E)(i) a reasoned preliminary determination of need for the rule based on the information described under subparagraph (D);

“(ii) an additional statement of whether a rule is required by statute; and

“(iii) an achievable objective for the rule and metrics by which the agency will measure progress toward that objective;

“(F) a reasoned preliminary determination that the benefits of the proposed rule meet the relevant statutory objectives and justify the costs of the proposed rule (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)), based on the information described under subparagraph (D);

“(G) a discussion of—

“(i) the alternatives to the proposed rule, and other alternative responses, considered by the agency under subsection (b);

“(ii) the costs and benefits of those alternatives (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6));

“(iii) whether those alternatives meet relevant statutory objectives; and

“(iv) why the agency did not propose any of those alternatives; and

“(H)(i) a statement of whether existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the proposed rule; and

“(ii) if so, whether or not the agency proposes to amend or rescind any such rules, and why.

All information provided to or considered by the agency, and steps to obtain information by the agency, in connection with its determination to propose the rule, including any preliminary risk assessment or regulatory impact analysis prepared by the agency and all other information prepared or described by the agency under subparagraph (D) and, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, information provided by that Office in consultations with the agency, shall be placed in the docket for the proposed rule and made accessible to the public by electronic means and otherwise for the public’s use when the notice of proposed rule making is published.

“(2)(A) If the agency undertakes procedures under subsection (c) and determines thereafter not to propose a rule, the agency

shall, following consultation with the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, publish a notice of determination of other agency course. A notice of determination of other agency course shall include information required by paragraph (1)(D) to be included in a notice of proposed rule making and a description of the alternative response the agency determined to adopt.

“(B) If in its determination of other agency course the agency makes a determination to amend or rescind an existing rule, the agency need not undertake additional proceedings under subsection (c) before it publishes a notice of proposed rule making to amend or rescind the existing rule.

All information provided to or considered by the agency, and steps to obtain information by the agency, in connection with its determination of other agency course, including but not limited to any preliminary risk assessment or regulatory impact analysis prepared by the agency and all other information that would be required to be prepared or described by the agency under paragraph (1)(D) if the agency had determined to publish a notice of proposed rule making and, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, information provided by that Office in consultations with the agency, shall be placed in the docket for the determination and made accessible to the public by electronic means and otherwise for the public's use when the notice of determination is published.

“(3) After notice of proposed rule making required by this section, the agency shall provide interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making through submission of written data, views, or arguments with or without opportunity for oral presentation, except that—

“(A) if a hearing is required under paragraph (4)(B) or subsection (e), opportunity for oral presentation shall be provided pursuant to that requirement; or

“(B) when other than under subsection (e) of this section rules are required by statute or at the discretion of the agency to be made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing, sections 556 and 557 shall apply, and paragraph (4), the requirements of subsection (e) to receive comment outside of the procedures of sections 556 and 557, and the petition procedures of subsection (e)(6) shall not apply.

The agency shall provide not fewer than 60 days for interested persons to submit written data, views, or argument (or 120 days in the case of a proposed major or high-impact rule).

“(4)(A) Within 30 days of publication of notice of proposed rule making, a member of the public may petition for a hearing in accordance with section 556 to determine whether any evidence or other information upon which the agency bases the proposed rule fails to comply with the Information Quality Act.

“(B)(i) The agency may, upon review of the petition, determine without further process to exclude from the rule making the evidence or other information that is the subject of the petition and, if appropriate, withdraw the proposed rule. The agency shall promptly publish any such determination.

“(ii) If the agency does not resolve the petition under the procedures of clause (i), it shall grant any such petition that presents a prima facie case that evidence or other information upon which the agency bases the proposed rule fails to comply with the Information Quality Act, hold the requested hearing

not later than 30 days after receipt of the petition, provide a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination at the hearing, and decide the issues presented by the petition not later than 60 days after receipt of the petition. The agency may deny any petition that it determines does not present such a prima facie case.

“(C) There shall be no judicial review of the agency's disposition of issues considered and decided or determined under subparagraph (B)(ii) until judicial review of the agency's final action. There shall be no judicial review of an agency's determination to withdraw a proposed rule under subparagraph (B)(i) on the basis of the petition.

“(D) Failure to petition for a hearing under this paragraph shall not preclude judicial review of any claim based on the Information Quality Act under chapter 7 of this title.

“(e) HEARINGS FOR HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—Following notice of a proposed rule making, receipt of comments on the proposed rule, and any hearing held under subsection (d)(4), and before adoption of any high-impact rule, the agency shall hold a hearing in accordance with sections 556 and 557, unless such hearing is waived by all participants in the rule making other than the agency. The agency shall provide a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination at such hearing. The hearing shall be limited to the following issues of fact, except that participants at the hearing other than the agency may waive determination of any such issue:

“(1) Whether the agency's asserted factual predicate for the rule is supported by the evidence.

“(2) Whether there is an alternative to the proposed rule that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at a lower cost (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)) than the proposed rule.

“(3) If there is more than one alternative to the proposed rule that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at a lower cost than the proposed rule, which alternative would achieve the relevant statutory objectives at the lowest cost.

“(4) Whether, if the agency proposes to adopt a rule that is more costly than the least costly alternative that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)), the additional benefits of the more costly rule exceed the additional costs of the more costly rule.

“(5) Whether the evidence and other information upon which the agency bases the proposed rule meets the requirements of the Information Quality Act.

“(6) Upon petition by an interested person who has participated in the rule making, other issues relevant to the rule making, unless the agency determines that consideration of the issues at the hearing would not advance consideration of the rule or would, in light of the nature of the need for agency action, unreasonably delay completion of the rule making. An agency shall grant or deny a petition under this paragraph within 30 days of its receipt of the petition.

No later than 45 days before any hearing held under this subsection or sections 556 and 557, the agency shall publish in the Federal Register a notice specifying the proposed rule to be considered at such hearing, the issues to be considered at the hearing, and the time and place for such hearing, except that such notice may be issued not later than 15 days before a hearing held under subsection (d)(4)(B).

“(f) FINAL RULES.—(1) The agency shall adopt a rule only following consultation

with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to facilitate compliance with applicable rule making requirements.

“(2) The agency shall adopt a rule only on the basis of the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other evidence and information concerning the need for, consequences of, and alternatives to the rule.

“(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the agency shall adopt the least costly rule considered during the rule making (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)) that meets relevant statutory objectives.

“(B) The agency may adopt a rule that is more costly than the least costly alternative that would achieve the relevant statutory objectives only if the additional benefits of the more costly rule justify its additional costs and only if the agency explains its reason for doing so based on interests of public health, safety or welfare that are clearly within the scope of the statutory provision authorizing the rule.

“(4) When it adopts a final rule, the agency shall publish a notice of final rule making. The notice shall include—

“(A) a concise, general statement of the rule's basis and purpose;

“(B) the agency's reasoned final determination of need for a rule to address the problem the agency seeks to address with the rule, including a statement of whether a rule is required by statute and a summary of any final risk assessment or regulatory impact analysis prepared by the agency;

“(C) the agency's reasoned final determination that the benefits of the rule meet the relevant statutory objectives and justify the rule's costs (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6));

“(D) the agency's reasoned final determination not to adopt any of the alternatives to the proposed rule considered by the agency during the rule making, including—

“(i) the agency's reasoned final determination that no alternative considered achieved the relevant statutory objectives with lower costs (including all costs to be considered under subsection (b)(6)) than the rule; or

“(ii) the agency's reasoned final determination that its adoption of a more costly rule complies with subsection (f)(3)(B);

“(E) the agency's reasoned final determination—

“(i) that existing rules have not created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the rule; or

“(ii) that existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the rule, and, if so—

“(I) why amendment or rescission of such existing rules is not alone sufficient to respond to the problem; and

“(II) whether and how the agency intends to amend or rescind the existing rule separate from adoption of the rule;

“(F) the agency's reasoned final determination that the evidence and other information upon which the agency bases the rule complies with the Information Quality Act;

“(G) the agency's reasoned final determination that the rule meets the objectives that the agency identified in subsection (d)(1)(E)(iii) or that other objectives are more appropriate in light of the full administrative record and the rule meets those objectives;

“(H) the agency's reasoned final determination that it did not deviate from the metrics the agency included in subsection

(d)(1)(E)(iii) or that other metrics are more appropriate in light of the full administrative record and the agency did not deviate from those metrics;

“(I)(i) for any major rule, high-impact rule, or negative-impact on jobs and wages rule, the agency’s plan for review of the rule no less than every ten years to determine whether, based upon evidence, there remains a need for the rule, whether the rule is in fact achieving statutory objectives, whether the rule’s benefits continue to justify its costs, and whether the rule can be modified or rescinded to reduce costs while continuing to achieve statutory objectives; and

“(ii) review of a rule under a plan required by clause (i) of this subparagraph shall take into account the factors and criteria set forth in subsections (b) through (f) of section 553 of this title; and

“(J) for any negative-impact on jobs and wages rule, a statement that the head of the agency that made the rule approved the rule knowing about the findings and determination of the agency or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs that qualified the rule as a negative impact on jobs and wages rule.

All information considered by the agency in connection with its adoption of the rule, and, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, information provided by that Office in consultations with the agency, shall be placed in the docket for the rule and made accessible to the public for the public’s use no later than when the rule is adopted.

“(g) EXCEPTIONS FROM NOTICE AND HEARING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Except when notice or hearing is required by statute, the following do not apply to interpretive rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice:

“(A) Subsections (c) through (e).

“(B) Paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (f).

“(C) Subparagraphs (B) through (H) of subsection (f)(4).

“(2)(A) When the agency for good cause, based upon evidence, finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rules issued) that compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of this section before the issuance of an interim rule is impracticable or contrary to the public interest, including interests of national security, such subsections or requirements to render final determinations shall not apply to the agency’s adoption of an interim rule.

“(B) If, following compliance with subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the agency adopts an interim rule, it shall commence proceedings that comply fully with subsections (d) through (f) of this section immediately upon publication of the interim rule, shall treat the publication of the interim rule as publication of a notice of proposed rule making and shall not be required to issue supplemental notice other than to complete full compliance with subsection (d). No less than 270 days from publication of the interim rule (or 18 months in the case of a major rule or high-impact rule), the agency shall complete rule making under subsections (d) through (f) of this subsection and take final action to adopt a final rule or rescind the interim rule. If the agency fails to take timely final action, the interim rule will cease to have the effect of law.

“(C) Other than in cases involving interests of national security, upon the agency’s publication of an interim rule without com-

pliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of this section, an interested party may seek immediate judicial review under chapter 7 of this title of the agency’s determination to adopt such interim rule. The record on such review shall include all documents and information considered by the agency and any additional information presented by a party that the court determines necessary to consider to assure justice.

“(3) When the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rules issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are unnecessary, including because agency rule making is undertaken only to correct a de minimis technical or clerical error in a previously issued rule or for other noncontroversial purposes, the agency may publish a rule without compliance with subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f)(1)–(3) and (f)(4)(B)–(F). If the agency receives significant adverse comment within 60 days after publication of the rule, it shall treat the notice of the rule as a notice of proposed rule making and complete rule making in compliance with subsections (d) and (f).

“(h) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR HEARINGS.—When a hearing is required under subsection (e) or is otherwise required by statute or at the agency’s discretion before adoption of a rule, the agency shall comply with the requirements of sections 556 and 557 in addition to the requirements of subsection (f) in adopting the rule and in providing notice of the rule’s adoption.

“(i) DATE OF PUBLICATION OF RULE.—The required publication or service of a substantive final or interim rule shall be made not less than 30 days before the effective date of the rule, except—

“(1) a substantive rule which grants or recognizes an exemption or relieves a restriction;

“(2) interpretive rules and statements of policy; or

“(3) as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause found and published with the rule.

“(j) RIGHT TO PETITION.—Each agency shall give an interested person the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.

“(k) RULE MAKING GUIDELINES.—(1)(A) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall establish guidelines for the assessment, including quantitative and qualitative assessment, of the costs and benefits of proposed and final rules and other economic issues or issues related to risk that are relevant to rule making under this title. The rigor of cost-benefit analysis required by such guidelines shall be commensurate, in the Administrator’s determination, with the economic impact of the rule.

“(B) To ensure that agencies use the best available techniques to quantify and evaluate anticipated present and future benefits, costs, other economic issues, and risks as accurately as possible, the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall regularly update guidelines established under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

“(2) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall also issue guidelines to promote coordination, simplification and harmonization of agency rules during the rule making process and otherwise. Such guidelines shall assure that each agency avoids regulations that are in-

consistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, its other regulations and those of other Federal agencies and drafts its regulations to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.

“(3) To ensure consistency in Federal rule making, the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall—

“(A) issue guidelines and otherwise take action to ensure that rule makings conducted in whole or in part under procedures specified in provisions of law other than those of subchapter II of this title conform to the fullest extent allowed by law with the procedures set forth in section 553 of this title; and

“(B) issue guidelines for the conduct of hearings under subsections 553(d)(4) and 553(e) of this section, including to assure a reasonable opportunity for cross-examination. Each agency shall adopt regulations for the conduct of hearings consistent with the guidelines issued under this subparagraph.

“(4) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall issue guidelines pursuant to the Information Quality Act to apply in rule making proceedings under sections 553, 556, and 557 of this title. In all cases, such guidelines, and the Administrator’s specific determinations regarding agency compliance with such guidelines, shall be entitled to judicial deference.

“(l) INCLUSION IN THE RECORD OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION.—The agency shall include in the record for a rule making, and shall make available by electronic means and otherwise, all documents and information prepared or considered by the agency during the proceeding, including, at the discretion of the President or the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, documents and information communicated by that Office during consultation with the Agency.

“(m) MONETARY POLICY EXEMPTION.—Nothing in subsection (b)(6), subparagraphs (F) and (G) of subsection (d)(1), subsection (e), subsection (f)(3), and subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (f)(5) shall apply to rule makings that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.”

SEC. 4. AGENCY GUIDANCE; PROCEDURES TO ISSUE MAJOR GUIDANCE; PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO ISSUE GUIDELINES FOR ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 553 the following new section:

“§ 553a. Agency guidance; procedures to issue major guidance; authority to issue guidelines for issuance of guidance

“(a) Before issuing any major guidance, or guidance that involves a novel legal or policy issue arising out of statutory mandates, an agency shall—

“(1) make and document a reasoned determination that—

“(A) assures that such guidance is understandable and complies with relevant statutory objectives and regulatory provisions (including any statutory deadlines for agency action);

“(B) summarizes the evidence and data on which the agency will base the guidance;

“(C) identifies the costs and benefits (including all costs to be considered during a rule making under section 553(b) of this title) of conduct conforming to such guidance and assures that such benefits justify such costs; and

“(D) describes alternatives to such guidance and their costs and benefits (including all costs to be considered during a rule making under section 553(b) of this title) and explains why the agency rejected those alternatives; and

“(2) confer with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs on the issuance of such guidance to assure that the guidance is reasonable, understandable, consistent with relevant statutory and regulatory provisions and requirements or practices of other agencies, does not produce costs that are unjustified by the guidance's benefits, and is otherwise appropriate. Upon issuing major guidance, or guidance that involves a novel legal or policy issue arising out of statutory mandates, the agency shall publish the documentation required by subparagraph (1) by electronic means and otherwise.

“(b) Agency guidance—

“(1) is not legally binding and may not be relied upon by an agency as legal grounds for agency action;

“(2) shall state in a plain, prominent and permanent manner that it is not legally binding; and

“(3) shall, at the time it is issued or upon request, be made available by the issuing agency to interested persons and the public by electronic means and otherwise.

Agencies shall avoid the issuance of guidance that is inconsistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, the agency's governing statutes or regulations, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.

“(c) The Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs shall have authority to issue guidelines for use by the agencies in the issuance of major guidance and other guidance. Such guidelines shall assure that each agency avoids issuing guidance documents that are inconsistent or incompatible with, or duplicative of, the law, its other regulations, or the regulations of other Federal agencies and drafts its guidance documents to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 553 the following new item:

“553a. Agency guidance; procedures to issue major guidance; authority to issue guidelines for issuance of guidance.”

SEC. 5. HEARINGS; PRESIDING EMPLOYEES; POWERS AND DUTIES; BURDEN OF PROOF; EVIDENCE; RECORD AS BASIS OF DECISION.

Section 556 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e)(1) The transcript of testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, constitutes the exclusive record for decision in accordance with section 557 and shall be made available to the parties and the public by electronic means and, upon payment of lawfully prescribed costs, otherwise. When an agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, a party is entitled, on timely request, to an opportunity to show the contrary.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, in a proceeding held under this section pursuant to section 553(d)(4) or 553(e), the record for decision shall also include any

information that is part of the record of proceedings under section 553.

“(f) When an agency conducts rule making under this section and section 557 directly after concluding proceedings upon an advance notice of proposed rule making under section 553(c), the matters to be considered and determinations to be made shall include, among other relevant matters and determinations, the matters and determinations described in subsections (b) and (f) of section 553.

“(g) Upon receipt of a petition for a hearing under this section, the agency shall grant the petition in the case of any major rule, unless the agency reasonably determines that a hearing would not advance consideration of the rule or would, in light of the need for agency action, unreasonably delay completion of the rule making. The agency shall publish its decision to grant or deny the petition when it renders the decision, including an explanation of the grounds for decision. The information contained in the petition shall in all cases be included in the administrative record. This subsection shall not apply to rule makings that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.”

SEC. 6. ACTIONS REVIEWABLE.

Section 704 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Agency action made” and inserting “(a) Agency action made”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “Denial by an agency of a correction request or, where administrative appeal is provided for, denial of an appeal, under an administrative mechanism described in subsection (b)(2)(B) of the Information Quality Act, or the failure of an agency within 90 days to grant or deny such request or appeal, shall be final action for purposes of this section.

“(b) Other than in cases involving interests of national security, notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, upon the agency's publication of an interim rule without compliance with section 553(c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of section 553, an interested party may seek immediate judicial review under this chapter of the agency's determination to adopt such rule on an interim basis. Review shall be limited to whether the agency abused its discretion to adopt the interim rule without compliance with section 553(c), (d), or (e) or without rendering final determinations under subsection (f) of section 553.”

SEC. 7. SCOPE OF REVIEW.

Section 706 of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(1) by striking “To the extent necessary” and inserting “(a) To the extent necessary”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A) of subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section), by inserting after “in accordance with law” the following: “(including the Information Quality Act)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) The court shall not defer to the agency's—

“(1) interpretation of an agency rule if the agency did not comply with the procedures of section 553 or sections 556–557 of chapter 5 of this title to issue the interpretation;

“(2) determination of the costs and benefits or other economic or risk assessment of the action, if the agency failed to conform to guidelines on such determinations and assessments established by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs under section 553(k);

“(3) determinations made in the adoption of an interim rule; or

“(4) guidance.

“(c) The court shall review agency denials of petitions under section 553(e)(6) or any other petition for a hearing under sections 556 and 557 for abuse of agency discretion.”

SEC. 8. ADDED DEFINITION.

Section 701(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end, and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ‘substantial evidence’ means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion in light of the record considered as a whole, taking into account whatever in the record fairly detracts from the weight of the evidence relied upon by the agency to support its decision.”

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act to—

(1) sections 553, 556, and 704 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) subsection (b) of section 701 of such title;

(3) paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 706(b) of such title; and

(4) subsection (c) of section 706 of such title, shall not apply to any rule makings pending or completed on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–2. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–2.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 8, strike “and economic competitiveness” and insert the following: “economic competitiveness, and impacts on low income populations”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It ensures that agencies must take into consideration the impacts on low-income communities when they develop regulations.

This amendment is based on a 1994 executive order from President Clinton that was intended to protect low-income populations from the negative effects of regulations.

Burdensome regulations have a real impact on families, regardless of their race or ethnicity. What makes sense on a bureaucrat's desk in Washington does not always work in the real world. In fact, these regulations are hurting people, especially in economically depressed communities. People have lost jobs and are facing increasing prices for energy, food, health care, and more.

The families who bear the brunt are not just statistics. They are fellow Americans. We need to show compassion towards them, especially those most vulnerable.

Regulations, as you have heard, are costing our economy \$1.8 trillion each year, costing the average family \$15,000. So what does that mean for the farmer in San Joaquin Valley, California, or the coal miner in Hazard, Kentucky, or the widow on a fixed income in Marietta, Ohio? They are worried about providing for their families. What happens if they lose their livelihood because of a new regulation?

The bureaucrats in Washington who are writing these excessive regulations are seemingly focused on saving the world but are forgetting what is happening to American families. I want them to understand the impact they are having on people's lives.

The costs of these regulations are born by people who can least afford it, not by the agencies writing the regulations. These bureaucrats should get out from behind their desks and come to communities in West Virginia and Georgia and Montana and across the Nation that are still struggling economically.

This is not just about coal miners and the energy industry. Excessive regulations are hurting farmers, manufacturers, health care workers, and small businesses of every kind.

Rather than blindly issuing regulations in pursuit of an ideological goal, agencies should stop and consider what they are doing, be more empathetic, take into account what would happen to a family that is living paycheck to paycheck or a senior on fixed income.

Too often, Americans all across this country believe that no one in Washington really cares about them. This amendment will help change that perception. Let's show some compassion to people and families that are struggling.

Plain and simple: we must ensure that the Federal agencies truly, truly take into consideration those that bear the burden of these regulations.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, for his support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the McKinley amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the McKinley amendment—as bad as

things already are in the bill—adds an additional requirement to the bill's more than 60 analytical new requirements for the rulemaking process by requiring agencies to also consider economic competitiveness and impact on low-income populations in the rulemaking process. Now, the AFL-CIO, Public Citizen, and Coalition for Sensible Safeguards all oppose this amendment because it is redundant and inflexible.

This amendment is largely redundant of existing requirements. Executive Order 12898 already protects both low-income communities and communities of color. That executive order already requires agencies to take into account distributional impacts on these populations. So I want you to know that this is not the way to go. This amendment makes a totally unacceptable bill even more unacceptable.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would have devastating impacts and consequences for minority and low-income populations. Under Executive Order 12898, agencies already must account for the impact of rulemaking on both of these communities.

The amendment, which makes no accommodation for minority populations, would override existing protections while the underlying bill would override every law protecting the public interest in the rulemaking process.

In short, these sweeping policy changes would be a nightmare for vulnerable populations and endangered communities. That is why the AFL-CIO, along with 70 other public interest groups, opposes this amendment and the underlying bills.

I listened to the list of supporters rattled off by the other side for this bill. They were all trade groups that would benefit financially from this bill. No academics or others of objective opinions were mentioned, and I think the public should note that.

My colleague from Illinois, Representative BOBBY RUSH, offered an amendment to this bill specifically to protect these communities by promoting environmental justice. If the majority was serious about protecting these communities, they would have accepted the Rush amendment instead of attempting to mislead the public through a gotcha amendment such as this.

If the majority was serious about protecting the American people, we wouldn't be considering this dangerous, misguided, and ideologically driven piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I hear from the other side of the aisle about how low-income people are being taken care of already because the President of the United States has told these agencies to "take into account their status." But guess what? That has no judicial enforceability. So if a low-income person really wants to seek redress of their grievances through a regulation that is going to cost them their job, cost them their business, whatever the case might be, they have no recourse to the courts. Among those who suffer most unfairly from overreaching regulations are lower-income families and individuals.

The other side has criticized our list of entities supporting this. But these are all job-creating organizations. I haven't heard of many job-creating organizations who are opposed to this legislation.

New regulations often represent the policy preferences of elites and pro-regulatory advocates. Recent regulations aimed at driving down the use of coal and other fossil fuels are an example of this.

What growing research shows, and what policy elites too often ignore, is that the costs of new regulations often have regressive effects on those with lower incomes. For example, when electricity rates go up because Federal regulators clamp down on the use of cheap energy, real money that lower-income households need to secure better housing, better educational choices, or other essential needs goes instead to pay for unnecessarily excessive regulations.

This is unfair. Agencies should be required to identify and reveal the unseen adverse effects of proposed new regulations on low-income households. The gentleman's amendment accomplishes this important goal.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, in closing, we just heard the chairman talk about, this is an executive order. And I have heard from folks on the other side that this is an executive order. Perhaps it is time to codify this executive order.

If it had merit back in 1994, let's make it the rule; make it a law. This amendment will accomplish that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It would not change the bill's overarching regulatory purpose, nor does it address the many concerns expressed by scores of public interest groups that strenuously oppose the bill.

I think the President is very sensitive to the working class, the poor, and minorities especially, and I enjoy hearing this commentary coming from the other side of the aisle.

If the majority were serious about protecting the low-income population, it would have made in order the amendment offered by our colleague from Illinois, BOBBY RUSH, to promote environmental justice. The Rush amendment would have safeguarded existing protections while mitigating the devastating consequences of H.R. 185 on both minority and low-income populations.

I repeat, AFL-CIO, Public Citizen, and the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards all oppose the McKinley amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114-2.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 10. EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES AND GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 553a (as inserted by section 4 of this Act) the following new section:

“§ 553b. Exemption for certain rules and guidance

“Sections 551, 553, 556, 701(b), 704, and 706, as amended by the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, and section 553a shall not apply in the case of any rule or guidance proposed, issued, or made that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation. Sections 551, 553, 556, 701(b), 704, and 706, as in effect before the enactment of the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, shall apply to such proposed rules, final rules, or guidance, as appropriate.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 553 the following new item:

“553b. Exemption for certain rules and guidance.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

It is clear the economy is growing at its fastest pace in years, while unem-

ployment is dropping rapidly. According to the most recent reports from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employers added 252,000 jobs in December, exceeding expectations and driving the unemployment rate down to 5.6 percent, the lowest level since the recession.

There have been actually 54, 55 straight months of positive jobs growth over the last 6 years, Mr. Chairman. And this is an important consideration when you consider the faulty premise being offered in support of the underlying legislation here, that regulations hurt business and hurt job growth. They do not.

□ 1600

My amendment would ensure that this rapid growth and progress continues by exempting from H.R. 185 all rules that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation.

Several of my Republican colleagues have complained in today's debate about a regulatory system that costs American families \$15,000 in annual costs. These figures rely on debunked sources from studies that do not assume current economic conditions or even account for the benefits of regulations.

We even had a display of 1 week's worth of so-called regulations by one of my colleagues on the other side a short while ago purporting to show the sheer volume of regulations that were issued in 1 week when, in fact, a lot of those papers had to do with 34 final rules published during that period, 31 proposed rules—many of which were minor in nature—and 277 notices of administrative minutia such as public meetings, when and where public meetings were to be held, and also the availability of letters regarding sunscreen products.

So it really tries to mislead by holding up a stack and contending that one business in one particular area has to comply with all of these so-called regulations that are purported to be in a stack of papers. That is just not true. It is misleading to the public.

In many cases, rules issued in 2015 have been largely administrative and minor. For instance, the Federal Aviation Administration has issued rules concerning airworthiness directives while the Coast Guard has issued its routine rules for bridge opening schedules.

Now, if we didn't have rules for when bridges should be opening and how to open and how to warn people, do you think we could claim ourselves to be living in such a civilized society as the one we live in?

We have got to have rules. I will take note of the fact that when I went to kindergarten, we had a set of rules up on the board. Everywhere you go, you are going to have a set of rules: the rules of the Federal Government—

which are vast and broad—foreign policy, domestic policy, space, cyberspace.

I mean, this country that we live in is not a great country because it chose simplicity as its model. We have a lot of rules that we have to live by, and those are the things that help make America a great country.

Guess what, ladies and gentlemen, it is you and your family members and friends who populate this Federal Government. You are the ones who are the rulemakers. They want to try to turn you into people who are trying to do something to hurt others when the only thing you are trying to do is do your job that will help others be able to live lives and create a better America for ourselves and, most importantly, our children.

Don't get it twisted. Don't think that regulations are hurting you. Regulations are causing what benefits you are taking advantage of now. These are the very rules that undergird our Nation's regulatory system and successful day-to-day operations.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, to the point just raised by the gentleman from Georgia, I want to quote Daniel Webster, who is also quoted right up there above us in the Chamber.

He says, “It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions. There are men in all ages who mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters.”

I share and welcome the gentleman from Georgia's concerns about the impact of regulations on the people and on their jobs, but the right way to address that concern is to join me in supporting this bill. It includes the Rothfus-Barr amendment added to the legislation in the 113th Congress that requires agencies to do a much better job identifying adverse job impacts before they impose the regulations.

The gentleman's amendment represents the wrong way to address job concerns. That is because it would give the executive branch a strong incentive to manipulate its jobs impact and cost-benefit analysis to avoid the requirements of the bill, including the Rothfus-Barr amendment, rather than comply with that requirement.

The amendment also puts the cart before the horse, offering carve-outs from the bill, based on factors that cannot be determined adequately unless the important analytical requirements in the bill are applied in the first place.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I would like to submit the following articles:

[From the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, July 21, 2011]

ECONOMIC UNCERTAINTY AND POOR SALES HELP EXPLAIN SMALL FIRMS' DISPROPORTIONATE JOB LOSSES DURING DOWNTURN

Note To Editors

NEW YORK.—The Federal Reserve Bank of New York today released *Why Small Businesses Were Hit Harder by the Recent Recession*, the latest article in the *Current Issues in Economics and Finance* series from the Research and Statistics Group.

Uncertainty about economic conditions and poor sales were the main reasons why small firms experienced steeper job declines than large firms during the 2007–09 downturn, according to analysis in the article. Furthermore, although tightened access to credit and adverse financial conditions also constrained small firms, a more pressing factor was the decline in new investment and associated financing brought on by low consumer demand for the firms' products and services.

Between December 2007 and December 2009, jobs declined 10.4 percent in small firms (those with fewer than fifty employees), compared with 7.5 percent in large ones.

In this article, Ayşegül Şahin, Sagiri Kitao, Anna Cororaton and Sergiu Laiu seek to account for the downturn's disproportionate effect on small firms. The authors review data on employment patterns and industry composition of firms by size. They also explore possible links between credit availability and firm performance by analyzing national surveys and established data series on economic activity and business conditions.

The authors determine that industry composition of job losses fails to explain the deeper job declines among small firms, as these businesses were hit harder than large ones regardless of industry. And while some small firms indeed experienced limited credit availability, this factor was a secondary driver of the difficulties they encountered.

Rather, the authors concluded that demand factors—notably, economic uncertainty and poor sales owing to reduced consumer demand—were the most important reasons for the weak performance and sluggish recovery of small firms.

Ayşegül Şahin is an assistant vice president, Sagiri Kitao a senior economist, and Anna Cororaton an assistant economist in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York's Research and Statistics Group; Sergiu Laiu is an associate business support analyst in the Markets Group.

Why Small Businesses Were Hit Harder by the Recent Recession

[From the FRBSF Economic Letter, February 11, 2013]

AGGREGATE DEMAND AND STATE-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT

(By Atif Mian and Amir Sufi)

What explains the sharp decline in U.S. employment from 2007 to 2009? Why has employment remained stubbornly low? Survey data from the National Federation of Independent Businesses show that the decline in state-level employment is strongly correlated with the increase in the percentage of businesses complaining about lack of demand. While business concerns about government regulation and taxes also rose steadily from 2008 to 2011, there is no evidence (hat

job losses were larger in states where businesses were more worried about these factors.

Understanding the large and persistent decline in employment in the United States during the Great Recession of 2007–09 remains one of the most vexing challenges in macroeconomics. While there are many potential explanations, three have garnered substantial support among economists:

The aggregate demand channel, in which job losses were driven by a sharp decline in consumer spending due to high debt levels and the housing crash (Mian and Sufi 2012).

Government-induced uncertainty, in which business uncertainty about taxes and regulation fostered reluctance to hire (Baker, Bloom, and Davis 2013; Leduc and Liu 2012a, b). For example, Hubbard et al. (2012) write that “uncertainty over policy—particularly over tax and regulatory policy—limited both the recovery and job creation.”

Business financing problems, in which businesses were unable to get credit because of continued troubles in the banking sector. Credit-starved businesses can't pursue potentially profitable projects, reducing their hiring.

This Economic Letter tests these alternative views using state-level data from National Federation of Independent Businesses (NFIB) monthly small business surveys (Dunkelberg and Wade 2012). One enlightening survey question asks what is the single most important problem facing the respondent's business. Potential answers include taxes, inflation, poor sales, financing and interest rates, cost of labor, government requirements and red tape, competition from large businesses, quality of labor, costs or availability of insurance, and other. The NFIB has generously provided us quarterly responses by state.

AGGREGATE EVIDENCE

Figure 1 plots the percentage of respondents by quarter citing poor sales, regulation and taxes, or financing and interest rates as their most important problem. The regulation and taxes category includes businesses citing either “taxes” or “government requirements and red tape.” Figure 1 also plots the employment-to-population ratio, which declined sharply from 2007 to 2009 and has remained persistently low during the recovery.

The sharp decline in the employment-to-population ratio corresponds closely to the big increase in the percentage of businesses citing poor sales as their most important problem. From the beginning of 2007 to the end of 2009, this group increased from 10% to over 30%. The trend is broadly consistent with the aggregate demand channel. Employment collapsed precisely when businesses began worrying about poor sales.

In contrast, the percentage of businesses citing financing and interest rates as their top concern has hardly budged. It was low in 2006 and has remained low throughout the recession and recovery. This is especially surprising in the NFIB survey, since small businesses are the enterprises most likely to suffer during a period of tight credit. The survey results do not support the view that availability of financing for small businesses was a major reason for the employment decline.

The percentage of businesses citing regulation and taxes as their most important concern rose steadily from the last few quarters of the recession through 2012. This is consistent with Bloom, Baker, and Davis (2013), who find that policy uncertainty has been unusually high in recent years. Meanwhile, the percentage citing poor sales has declined

since its recession peak, but remains well above its pre-recession level.

STATE-LEVEL SUPPORT FOR THE DEMAND CHANNEL

Using aggregate data to test hypotheses about cause and effect is notoriously difficult. For example, it could be argued that the drop in employment and heightened business concerns about poor sales both reflected a shock from a large decline in productivity. Likewise, the increase in measures of policy uncertainty could be associated with the weak recovery in job growth. Which is cause and which is effect might not be obvious. Examining the timing of these variables can help. But it's still possible that expectations regarding one variable could be driving the other. For example, expectations of poor economic conditions could raise business uncertainty about policies today.

One solution is to use cross-sectional data across geographic regions. Mian, Rao, and Sufi (2012) show that 2006 county-level household debt-to-income ratios were one of the strongest predictors of household spending decline during the Great Recession. Mian and Sufi (2012) found that losses among jobs catering to the local economy, such as positions in retail and restaurants that we refer to as nontradable sector jobs, were concentrated in counties with high debt levels, where spending dropped sharply during the recession. By contrast, losses among jobs catering to the broader economy, such as manufacturing of durable goods, were spread throughout the country. The authors argue that this indicates that a large decline in household spending, driven by household financial weakness stemming largely from the collapse in house prices, explains a large proportion of Great Recession job losses.

Does the NFIB survey evidence support this argument? In Figure 2, we show state-level correlations between 2006 household debt-to-income ratios and changes in the percentage of businesses citing poor sales as their top concern from 2007 to 2009. The percentage of businesses citing poor sales increased more in high-household-leverage states, precisely where the largest spending and employment declines in the nontradable sector occurred. This is consistent with the household spending evidence in Mian, Rao, and Sufi (2012).

To extend this analysis, we performed a regression, a statistical test of the relationship between state-level job losses in the nontradable sector from 2007 to 2009 and the percentage of businesses in that state citing poor sales. The test showed a significant negative correlation. In other words, states in which businesses cited poor sales also registered disproportionately sharp drops in jobs and household spending. This supports the view that a drop in aggregate demand led to job losses during the recession.

REGULATION AND TAXES: STATE-LEVEL EVIDENCE

Figure 1 confirms the pattern in Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2013) that small business concerns about regulation and taxes rose after the Great Recession and remained elevated in 2012. Can this explain the job market's current weak performance? The state-level NFIB survey responses may help answer this question.

We focus on the rise from 2008 to 2011 in the percentage of businesses citing regulation or taxes as their primary problem, the period when this concern increased the most. The increase varied significantly from state to state. For example, Rhode Island saw a rise of over 30 percentage points, while New Jersey saw a decrease of almost 10 percentage points.

Figure 3 shows there was almost no correlation between job growth in a state from 2008 to 2011 and the increase in the percentage of businesses citing regulation and taxes as their primary concern. In fact, if anything, the correlation is positive.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-2.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 10. EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES AND GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 553a (as inserted by section 4 of this Act) the following new section:

“§ 553b. Exemption for certain rules and guidance

“Sections 551, 553, 556, 701(b), 704, and 706, as amended by the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, and section 553a shall not apply in the case of any rule or guidance proposed, issued, or made by the Secretary of Homeland Security. Sections 551, 553, 556, 701(b), 704, and 706, as in effect before the enactment of the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, shall apply to such proposed rules, final rules, or guidance, as appropriate.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 553 the following new item:

“553b. Exemption for certain rules and guidance.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the chairman and rise to support the Jackson Lee amendment with a little journey down memory lane of just a few days ago.

Just a few days ago in northern Nigeria, a heinous terrorist group by the name of Boko Haram killed 2,000 people. Pillaging and killing has been their mantra, their definition.

A few days before that, we watched in horror as three terrorists killed 17 people in the nation state of France,

our ally for many, many, many years—our partner, if you will, in the virtues of liberty and democracy.

My amendment speaks to the diminishing impact that this present legislation would have on the security of our Nation. My amendment simply asks that those issues dealing with Homeland Security be exempted from this rule.

The rule itself causes there to be some 70 particulars that have to be met when rulemaking begins. Can you imagine subjecting national security to that kind of criteria?

As indicated, this bill modifies a Federal regulatory or rulemaking process by codifying many requirements included in Presidential executive orders and requiring agencies to consider numerous new criteria when issuing rules, including alternatives to any rule. We mentioned that in my earlier discussion.

My amendment would simply exempt from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security.

As a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, having served previously as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I am concerned about legislation that throws a monkey wrench in the footsteps of Customs and Border Protection, Border Patrol, ICE, the Coast Guard, Secret Service, and many others.

I am concerned when our Secretary of Homeland Security indicates that we live in dangerous times and, therefore, calling upon America not just to see something and say something, but to be conscious of these dangerous times.

Can you imagine the necessity of a rulemaking that then must be burdened with 70 new levels of criteria defining the budget analysis or cost benefit?

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do think we have oversight responsibilities, and I do think that we should be responsible in those oversight responsibilities and fiscally conservative or fiscally responsible, but I do not think that this legislation that has come to us time and time again and obviously failed is any answer to what we are trying to do.

Let me, first of all, say that this bill does not do as the Constitution has asked, and that is the “We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union” in the beginning of our Constitution.

This does not adhere to that, and I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I respectfully rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, every member of this body and our constituents know that, as we speak, the Department of Homeland Security is in the midst of an unprecedented overreach to change this Nation's immigration laws through regulation and guidance, bypassing Congress and the will of the American people.

How can we support excluding that very effort from the requirements of this good bill? What is more, the amendment seeks to shield the Department of Homeland Security—a Department in need of good government reform—from all of the good government rulemaking and guidance reforms in the bill. We should not do that.

The bill does not threaten needed regulation in DHS' jurisdiction, but simply assures that DHS will avoid unnecessary and overreaching regulation and issue smarter, less-costly regulation and guidance when necessary.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I want to say to my colleague on Judiciary, Ms. JACKSON LEE, that this amendment is very important. It exempts any rule promulgated by Homeland Security, and as a result of this amendment, current law would apply to the Department of Homeland Security.

This is a very perceptive and important part of us moving forward on a really critical consideration because H.R. 185 will stall or prevent rulemaking, and it is essential that the Department of Homeland Security not be encumbered by such burdensome requirements.

Summary: This amendment exempts any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) from H.R. 185. As a result of this amendment, current law would apply to DHS.

This amendment is necessary because H.R. 185 will stall or prevent rulemaking and it is essential that the DHS not be encumbered by such burdensome requirements.

Effective rulemaking is a critical tool for DHS to be able to protect the Nation from acts of terrorism and to help communities recover from natural disasters, among many other things.

For instance, DHS has already proposed several rules to safeguard maritime security, as well as a rule proposed by the Coast Guard to revise regulations relating to the construction, design, equipment of deep-water ports that are used as terminals for importing and exporting oil and natural gas. This rule would provide for regulatory flexibility, while also preventing another environmental catastrophe like Deepwater Horizon.

DHS has also proposed a series of rules to protect against discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex. This rule guarantees the equal treatment of persons in all DHS programs under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

These proposed rules clearly demonstrate the need for this amendment, which underscores the importance of rulemaking across a wide spectrum of concerns.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the remaining time.

Sally Katzen, formerly of the Obama and Clinton administration, mentioned how valuable regulations can be to helping the American people.

This is an impediment. I don't want to impede a regulatory scheme to help with cybersecurity; I don't want to impede the Coast Guard if it has intelligence about an attack on the Houston port with some regulatory scheme that doesn't allow it to move forward or to be able to address that question.

What we are suggesting is there are obstacles being put in front of national security. I ask that you support this amendment by exempting the Department of Homeland Security that is entrusted with the security, domestic security of the United States of America.

I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

WHAT DOES THE REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT DO?

This bill modifies the federal rule-making process by codifying many requirements included in presidential executive orders and requiring agencies to consider numerous new criteria when issuing rules, including alternatives to any rule proposal, the scope of the problem that the rule is meant to address, and potential costs and benefits of the proposal and alternatives.

In addition, the measure creates statutory thresholds for regulations to be deemed "major" rules and "high impact" rules—i.e., rules likely to cost more than \$100 million or \$1 billion a year—and requires that these rule proposals be subject to additional criteria and procedural steps.

WHAT DOES THE AMENDMENT DO?

My amendment would exempt from the bill's Congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security.

As a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I am very concerned about any legislation that would hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to respond to emergencies.

The bill would add new review requirements to an already long and complicated process, allowing special interest lobbyists to second-guess the work of respected scientists and staff through legal challenges, sparking a wave of litigation that would add more costs and delays to the rulemaking process, potentially putting the lives, health and safety of millions of Americans at risk.

The Department of Homeland Security simply does not have the time to be hindered by frivolous and unnecessary litigation, especially

when the safety and security of the American people are at risk.

According to a study conducted by the Economic Policy Institute, public protections and regulations "do not tend to significantly impede job creation", and furthermore, over the course of the last several decades, the benefits of federal regulations have significantly outweighed their costs.

In our post 9/11 climate, homeland security continues to be a top priority for our nation. As we continue to face threats from enemies foreign and domestic, we must ensure that we are doing all we can to protect our country. DHS cannot react to the constantly changing threat landscape effectively if they are subject to this bill.

Professor Sally Katzen, a former Obama and Clinton Administration official, discussed the benefits of regulation which an agency like the Department of Homeland Security demonstrates, and that is brought home by the tragic events in Nigeria and France, where terrorists struck with horrible efficiency last week. Professor Katzen stated:

Moreover, while we hear a lot about the costs of regulation, we rarely hear about the benefits of regulation—for example, improving our health or the air we breathe or the water we drink protecting our safety in our homes, our automobiles, or our workplaces; or increasing the efficiency of our markets.

Those who embrace cost/benefit analysis should speak to the benefits as well as the costs of regulation. Here, there are data—incomplete as they may be—which clearly show that the benefits of rules issued during the Obama Administration have been substantially greater than the costs of those rules. For example, the 2012 Report to Congress on the Benefits and Costs of Federal Regulations showed that for FY2011 (the most recent fiscal year for which data are available), the rules "were estimated to result in a total of \$34.3 billion to \$89.5 billion in annual benefits and \$5.0 billion to \$10.1 billion in annual costs.

And make no mistake about Mr. Chair, the Department of Homeland Security is tasked with a wide variety of duties under its mission. One example of an instance where DHS may have to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations is the protection of our cyber security, an issue that should be at the forefront of everyone's legislative agenda in this new Congress.

In the past few years, threats in cyberspace have risen dramatically. The policy of the United States is to protect against the debilitating disruption of the operation of information systems for critical infrastructures and, thereby, help to protect the people, economy, and national security of the United States.

We are all affected by threats to our cyber security. We must act to reduce our vulnerabilities to these threats before they can be exploited. A failure to protect our cyber systems would damage our Nation's critical infrastructure. So, we must continue to ensure that such disruptions of cyberspace are infrequent, of minimal duration, manageable, and cause the least possible damage.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the number of cyber incidents reported by Federal agencies to USCERT has increased dramatically over the past four years, from 5,503 cyber incidents reported in

FY 2006 to about 30,000 cyber incidents in FY 2009 (over a 400% increase).

The Department of Homeland Security is also tasked with combating terrorism, and protecting Americans from threats. With the current unrest in the Middle East, why would we want to limit DHS's ability to do its job?

The Department of Homeland Security is constantly responding to new intelligence and threats from the volatile Middle East and around the globe. We must not tie the hands of those trusted to protect us from these threats.

Hindering the ability of DHS to make changes to rules and regulations puts the entire country at risk. As the Representative for the 18th District of Texas, I know about vulnerabilities in security firsthand. Of the 350 major ports in America, the Port of Houston is one of the busiest.

More than 220 million tons of cargo moved through the Port of Houston in 2011, and the port ranked first in foreign waterborne tonnage for the 15th consecutive year. The port links Houston with over 1,000 ports in 203 countries, and provides 785,000 jobs throughout the state of Texas. Maritime ports are centers of trade, commerce, and travel along our nation's coastline, protected by the Coast Guard, under the direction of DHS.

Simply put, if Coast Guard Intelligence has evidence of a potential attack on the port of Houston, I want the Department of Homeland Security to be able to protect my constituents by issuing the regulations needed without being subject to the constraints of this bill.

The Department of Homeland Security deserves an exemption not only because they may need to quickly change regulations in response to new information or threats, but also because they are tasked with emergency preparedness and response.

There are many challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

On any given day the City of Houston and cities across the United States face a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as: terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters, and industrial accidents.

Cities and towns across the nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector.

We cannot hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to protect the safety and security of the American people. No mission is more sacrosanct—and by bottling up the process with bureaucratic red tape.

As Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson said recently:

Recent world events call for increased vigilance in homeland security.

H.R. 185 makes it much harder for agencies to issue guidance, thus leading to unnecessary regulatory uncertainty and undue delay—

something that the American people can ill afford. We cannot hamstring the Department when it is trying to cope with threats such as franchise terrorism. My amendment frees up Homeland Security to do its critical mission of protecting the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment in order to ensure that lifesaving regulations promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security are not unnecessarily delayed by this legislation.

This GOP bill is opposed by a long list of national organizations. National organizations opposing the bill include such organizations as the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which itself is a coalition of more than 70 consumer, environmental, health, and public interest groups:

Consumer Federation of America;
Consumers Union;
Americans for Financial Reform;
Better Markets;
Center for Responsible Lending;
American Association for Justice;
Center for Effective Government;
Public Citizen;
U.S. PIRG;
AFL—CIO;
AFSCME;
UAW;
United Steelworkers;
Union of Concerned Scientists, and
Natural Resources Defense Council.

Coalition for Sensible Safeguards strongly opposing the bill: In its letter strongly opposing the bill, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards points out, “[The bill] would undermine our public protections and jeopardize public health by threatening the safeguards that ensure our access to clean air and water, safe workplaces, untainted food and drugs, and safe toys and consumer goods. . . . The costs of deregulation should be obvious by now: the Wall Street economic collapse the Upper Big Branch mine explosion in West Virginia, various food and product safety recalls, and numerous environmental disasters including the recent Dan River coal ash spill in North Carolina and the Freedom Industries chemical spill in West Virginia demonstrate the need for a regulatory system that protects the public, not corporate interests.”

Americans for Financial Reform strongly opposing the bill: In its letter strongly opposing the bill, Americans for Financial Reform points out, “This legislation could instead be called the ‘End Wall Street Accountability Act of 2015,’ since this would be one of its major effects. This legislation would require the agencies charged with oversight of our largest banks and most critical financial markets to comply with a host of additional bureaucratic and procedural requirements designed to make effective action virtually impossible. By doing so it would tilt the playing field still further in the direction of powerful Wall Street banks, and against the public interest. It would paralyze the ability of regulators to protect consumers from financial exploitation and prevent another catastrophic financial crisis.”

Consumer Federation of America strongly opposing the bill: In its letter strongly opposing the bill, the Consumer Federation of America points out, “The Regulatory Accountability Act would handcuff all federal agencies in their ef-

forts to protect consumers. . . . Specifically, the RAA would require all agencies . . . to adopt the least costly rule, without consideration of the impact on public health and safety, or the impact on the financial marketplace. As such, the RAA would override important bipartisan laws that have been in effect for years, as well as more recently enacted laws to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive financial services, unsafe food and unsafe consumer products.”

Natural Resources Defense Council strongly opposing the bill: In its letter strongly opposing the bill, the Natural Resources Defense Council points out, “This is a bill that is designed to prevent the regulatory system from working, not to improve its operation. The practical impact of H.R. 185 would be to make it difficult if not impossible to put in place any new safeguards for the public, no matter what the issue. . . . The RAA’s purpose is abundantly clear. It is an effort to amend and weaken existing law and future statutes by overlaying a suffocating blanket of unnecessary process. The result will be fewer needed safeguards despite public support for protection and study and study showing that the benefits of regulation have far outweighed the costs.”

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114-2.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 10. EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES AND GUIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 553a (as inserted by section 4 of this Act) the following new section:

“§ 553b. Exemption for certain rules and guidance

“Sections 551, 553, 556, 701(b), 704, and 706, as amended by the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, and section 553a shall not apply in the case of a rule or guidance proposed, made, or issued which relates to health or public safety. Sections 551, 553, 556, 701(b), 704, and 706, as in effect before the enactment of the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, shall apply to such proposed rules, final rules, or guidance, as appropriate.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United

States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 553 the following new item:

“553b. Exemption for certain rules and guidance.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, as someone who comes from local government, I was encouraged last week to hear the Speaker call for us to find common ground. I know firsthand the music that can be made when elected officials allow their commitments to improving the quality of life for our neighbors to guide their actions rather than partisan ideology.

Sadly, we are only 2 weeks into the new Congress, and the House majority has brought to the floor a string of divisive bills. Last week we debated without amendment a plan to bypass the normal review process to expedite approval of the Keystone pipeline for the 10th time, and today we consider a repeat of anti-public health and safety legislation that was debated and defeated in the 112th and 113th Congresses.

The seductively titled Regulatory Accountability Act would actually effectively block new Federal regulation and is nothing more than a backdoor attempt to roll back important public health and safety protections. What is more, my friends on the other side claim they want to reduce regulatory burdens, but their bill adds more than 70 new analytical steps to the final rulemaking process while jeopardizing science-based methodology.

The Union of Concerned Scientists warns that if this bill becomes law, Mr. Chairman, agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission would all be subject to more special interest interference, would be much more vulnerable to legal challenges, and even if those challenges are crucial to protecting our air and water and safeguarding public health, they could prevail. That is why I offer what should be, I hope, a simple amendment to exempt any rule or guidance pertaining to public health or safety.

This bill directs agencies to adopt the least costly regulatory action, notwithstanding any other provision of law, meaning that the benefits of safeguards to protect the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the food we eat would be considered secondary to the cost of those safeguards, even if the benefits exceed the costs.

My friends falsely claim that regulations impose unreasonable costs on the economy and industry. The facts don’t justify that rhetoric. OMB’s latest report to Congress on Federal regulation

found the monetized benefits of Federal regulations over the past decade alone are significantly higher by a factor of 10 than the costs. But why let facts trump belief?

An American Lung Association survey found that three out of four respondents feel we should not have to choose between protecting health and safety and promoting the economy. They understand we must and can do both.

Mr. Chairman, I am curious if my friends on the other side have asked their constituents what they think. For example, I wonder if the residents near North Carolina coal ash spills—which is affecting drinking water there and in my home State of Virginia—share the same disdain for water quality regulation. Maybe we should ask the millions of parents who own a child car seat subject to a nationwide recall if they would feel better with less rigorous safety standards for their children.

My friends continue to perpetuate this notion that government regulation is a heavy boot on the throat of business, but a poll conducted by the American Sustainable Business Council found 78 percent of employers believe responsible regulation is important for protecting small businesses from unfair competition and leveling the playing field.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on his amendment.

Mr. Chair, this amendment would exempt from H.R. 185 all rules or guidance that relate to health or public safety, including food safety, workplace safety, consumer product safety, air quality, or water quality. Existing APA procedures would continue to apply to these types of rules.

The amendment highlights the real-world consequences of H.R. 185, which would be to stifle agencies' ability to promulgate rules that protect public health and safety.

Among other things, H.R. 185 requires agencies to perform cumbersome and lengthy cost-benefit analyses of all rules. Worst of all, it would override substantive provisions of numerous statutes, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Occupational Safety and Health Act, that prohibit or limit agencies from considering cost.

For instance, the Food and Drug Administration has begun proposing rules and guidance under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA), which was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Obama in 2011, representing the most substantial reform to food safety in over 70 years.

In November 2014, the FDA proposed rules to implement this Act to prevent foodborne illness outbreaks associated with contaminated produce, among other things.

According to the Center for Disease Control, one in six Americans get sick every year from

foodborne diseases, affecting about 48 million people yearly. Of these, 3,000 people die every year from these diseases, which are largely preventable.

Without this amendment, H.R. 185 would drown the FDA in additional requirements prior to issuing new rules to protect Americans from the contamination of produce and other rules that are critical to keeping the U.S. food supply safe.

The cumulative effect of these and the other changes wrought by H.R. 185 would be to substantially undermine agencies' ability to effectively regulate consumer health and product safety, environmental protection, workplace safety, and financial services industry misconduct, among other critical concerns, while doing little to help small businesses shape or comply with federal regulations.

Under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regularly has reported to Congress that the benefits of regulations far exceed their costs.

Effective rulemaking is a critical tool for agencies to protect the public health and safety, from clean air and water to emergency transportation rules designed to keep Americans safe while traveling abroad.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an important step to protecting public health and safety. It will ensure the lifesaving benefits of protecting air quality, water quality, and food safety so that they are not automatically ruled out because of the cost alone. It will ensure, for example, that the CFPB can proceed with Dodd-Frank regulations protecting Americans from risky practices that led to the financial crisis and save lives by allowing the FDA to continue implementing provisions of the bipartisan Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and protect the public health and safety of our communities.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from Virginia.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule or guidance pertaining to health or public safety. Health and public safety regulation done properly serve important goals, and the bill does nothing to frustrate the effective achievement of those goals.

But Federal health and public safety regulation constitutes an immense part of total Federal regulation and has been the source of many of the most abusive, unnecessarily expensive, and job-and-wage destroying regulations. To remove these areas of regulation from the bill would be to severely weaken the bill's important reforms to

lower the crushing cumulative costs of Federal regulation.

Consider, for example, testimony before the Judiciary Committee last term by Rob James, a city councilman from Avon Lake, Ohio, about the impacts of new and excessive regulation on his town, its workers, and its families.

Avon Lake is a small town facing devastation by ideologically driven, antifossil-fuel power plant regulations. These regulations are expected to destroy jobs in Avon Lake, harm Avon Lake's families, and make it even harder for Avon Lake to find the resources to provide emergency services, quality schools, and help for its neediest citizens—all while doing comparatively little to control mercury emissions that are the stated target of the regulations.

Let me point out to the gentleman and anyone else concerned that health and safety regulations are a tantamount concern of this legislation. In fact, I will quote from page 19 of the bill:

The agency shall adopt a rule only on the basis of the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other evidence and information concerning the need for, consequences of, and alternatives to the rule.

I will also point out that the American Council of Independent Laboratories supports this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114-2 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 168, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—254

Abraham	Fox	McHenry
Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	McKinley
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Amash	Garrett	Rodgers
Amodei	Gibbs	McSally
Ashford	Gibson	Meadows
Babin	Gohmert	Meehan
Barletta	Goodlatte	Messer
Barr	Gosar	Mica
Barton	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Benishek	Graham	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Granger	Moolenaar
Bishop (GA)	Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Black	Grayson	Murphy (FL)
Blackburn	Griffith	Murphy (PA)
Blum	Grothman	Neugebauer
Bost	Guinta	Newhouse
Boustany	Hanna	Noem
Brady (TX)	Hardy	Nugent
Brat	Harper	Nunes
Bridenstine	Harris	Olson
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Palmer
Buchanan	Hensarling	Paulsen
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Peterson
Burgess	Hill	Pittenger
Bustos	Holding	Pitts
Byrne	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Calvert	Huelskamp	Poliquin
Carter (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Carter (TX)	Hultgren	Posey
Chabot	Hunter	Price (GA)
Chaffetz	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Reed
Coffman	Issa	Reichert
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Ribble
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Conaway	Jolly	Roby
Cook	Jones	Roe (TN)
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cramer	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Katko	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Cuellar	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)
Culberson	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzing (IL)	Ross
Davis, Rodney	Klaine	Rothfus
Delaney	Knight	Rouzer
Denham	Labrador	Royce
Dent	LaMalfa	Russell
DeSantis	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	Lance	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Sanford
Dold	Lipinski	Scalise
Duffy	LoBiondo	Schock
Duncan (SC)	Long	Schrader
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Schweikert
Ellmers	Love	Scott, Austin
Emmer	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Fincher	Lummis	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	Shuster
Fleischmann	Marchant	Simpson
Fleming	Marino	Sinema
Flores	Massie	Smith (MO)
Forbes	McCarthy	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	McCaul	Smith (NJ)
Foster	McClintock	Smith (TX)

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Waltman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—168

Adams	Green, Gene	Nolan
Aguilar	Grijalva	Norcross
Bass	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hahn	Pallone
Becerra	Hastings	Pascarell
Bera	Heck (WA)	Payne
Beyer	Higgins	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Himes	Peters
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Pingree
Boyle (PA)	Honda	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capps	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Kaptur	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kildee	T.
Chu (CA)	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kind	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schiff
Clay	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Connolly	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lee	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takai
DeFazio	Lowe	Takano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Doggett	Carolyn	Vargas
Doyle (PA)	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Edwards	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Engel	McDermott	Visclosky
Eshoo	McGovern	Walz
Esty	McNerney	Wasserman
Farr	Meeks	Schultz
Fattah	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Moulton	Welch
Gabbard	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Neal	

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver	Guthrie	Roskam
Costa	Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)
Duckworth	Pearce	Titus
Garamendi	Perlmutter	

□ 1649

Messrs. DUNCAN of Tennessee, FARENTHOLD, and DELANEY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON)

on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

AYES—178

Adams	Graham	Neal
Aguilar	Grayson	Nolan
Bass	Green, Al	Norcross
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Becerra	Grijalva	Pallone
Bera	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Beyer	Hahn	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peters
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Honda	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Israel	Rangel
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Salmon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu (CA)	Kildee	T.
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clay	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lee	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu (CA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takai
DeGette	Lowe	Takano
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Tonko
Deutch	Lynch	Torres
Dingell	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doggett	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doyle (PA)	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Edwards	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McDermott	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Esty	McNerney	Walz
Farr	Meeks	Wasserman
Fattah	Meng	Schultz
Foster	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Gabbard	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOES—247

Abraham	Barr	Blum
Aderholt	Barton	Blumenauer
Allen	Benishek	Bost
Amash	Bilirakis	Boustany
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)
Ashford	Bishop (UT)	Brat
Babin	Black	Bridenstine
Barletta	Blackburn	Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Himes
Holding

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver
Cole
Duckworth

Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westen
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 249, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

AYES—176

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Ruiz
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodeli
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

NOES—249

Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westen
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver
Duckworth
Garamendi

Nunnelee
Olson
Perlmutter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. DEGETTE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1700

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 25 I was unavoidably detained during the time of this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 248, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

AYES—178

Adams	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguilar	Esty	(NM)
Bass	Farr	Lynch
Beatty	Fattah	Maloney,
Becerra	Foster	Carolyn
Bera	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Beyer	Fudge	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	McCollum
Blumenauer	Galleo	McDermott
Bonamici	Gibson	McGovern
Boyle (PA)	Graham	McNerney
Brady (PA)	Grayson	Meeks
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	Moore
Bustos	Grijalva	Moulton
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Capps	Hahn	Nadler
Capuano	Hastings	Napolitano
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Neal
Carney	Higgins	Nolan
Carson (IN)	Himes	Norcross
Cartwright	Hinojosa	O'Rourke
Castor (FL)	Honda	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Pascarell
Chu (CA)	Huffman	Payne
Cicilline	Israel	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Pingree
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Cohen	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Connolly	Keating	Quigley
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Cooper	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kildee	Richmond
Crowley	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kind	Ruiz
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Rush
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	T.
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Delaney	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lee	Schakowsky
DelBene	Levin	Schiff
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lieu (CA)	Scott, David
Dingell	Lipinski	Serrano
Doggett	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Doyle (PA)	Lowenthal	Sherman
Edwards	Lowe y	Sires
Ellison	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Engel	(NM)	Smith (WA)

Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver
Duckworth
Garamendi
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Rohrabacher
Ryan (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1705

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 185) to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and, pursuant to House Resolution 27, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Miss RICE of New York. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miss Rice of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 185 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SECTION ____ . PROTECTING AMERICANS FROM TERRORIST ATTACKS.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to rules or guidance that—

- (1) prevent terrorism and crime;
- (2) protect the wages of workers, including pay equity for women;
- (3) save tax dollars or provide refunds and rebates for taxpayers;
- (4) provide assistance and regulatory relief to small businesses; or
- (5) prevent discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill,

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

NOES—248

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce

Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Like many of you, especially my fellow freshman Members, I told my constituents of New York's Fourth Congressional District that I wanted to come to Washington to offer common-sense solutions.

As you heard, the amendment does important things that my friends on the other side of the aisle also find important, such as saving tax dollars and providing regulatory relief for small businesses. The amendment also ensures that H.R. 185 would not stymie protections of workers' wages, especially those of women, or weaken protections against workplace discrimination. But the most important provision in this amendment, in light of current events, would ensure that H.R. 185 won't apply to actions that prevent terrorism and crime.

As the former District Attorney of Nassau County, just outside of New York City, terrorism is not abstract for me and my constituents. It is very real and it is very personal. Thousands of Long Island residents commute to the city every single day. We all remember too clearly the September 11 attacks, and we all live with the reality that such a day could come again if we are not vigilant in our efforts to prevent terrorism.

The horrendous attacks in France last week serve as a tragic and chilling reminder that we must be on high alert here at home, and the best way to do that is to ensure that those who protect us have the resources they need to do their jobs. That is our job—to make sure they have the resources they need to do theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I will make one final point. A number of freshman Members, myself included, came to Congress with a mandate to find compromise and to govern. Passing H.R. 185 will not demonstrate such priorities. We should be working together to actually solve problems. We should be working to find new ideas and new solutions to our Nation's problems and creating legislation that will make our government work more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, we are more than 6 years into the Obama administration. Real unemployment is still a massive problem in this country. America's labor force participation has dropped to record lows. The nominal unemployment rate is down, but that is because desperate Americans dying for work are abandoning the workforce in droves.

The only real, long-term solution is to restart the engines of economic growth in this country. One way to do that is to pass the Regulatory Accountability Act. This bill promises real relief from our \$1.86 trillion-per-year regulatory cost nightmare. If enacted, it would change night to day in terms of the level of regulatory costs Washington imposes on American families—without stopping one needed regulation from being issued.

My friends across the aisle say that won't happen. They say the bill will bring all good rulemaking to a halt. My goodness, it is ObamaCare all over again. My friends across the aisle haven't read the bill. You have to read the bill to know what is in it. If you read the bill, you understand it. You see right there on page 27:

The agency shall adopt the least costly rule considered during the rule making . . . that meets relevant statutory objectives.

Take away a few key words and what does that say?

The agency shall adopt the . . . rule . . . that meets . . . statutory objectives.

So the rules will still be made and statutory goals will still be met, but they will be done in a cost-effective way that makes sure that all of the necessary cost-saving measures and all of the necessary considerations are taken into account before imposing new burdens on the American people.

□ 1715

Vote against this motion to recommit. Vote for this good, job-creating, dollar-saving bill for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 245, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

AYES—180

Adams	Beyer	Brownley (CA)
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Ashford	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Bass	Bonamici	Capps
Beatty	Boyle (PA)	Capuano
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Bera	Brown (FL)	Carney

Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pelosi
Cartwright	Israel	Peters
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Pocan
Chu (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Ciциlline	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rangel
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Kennedy	Richmond
Connolly	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Crowley	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cuellar	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Schiff
DeFazio	Lee	Schrader
DeGette	Levin	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Lewis	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lieu (CA)	Serrano
DeBene	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DeSaulnier	Loebach	Sherman
Deutch	Lofgren	Sinema
Dingell	Lowenthal	Sires
Doggett	Lowey	Slaughter
Doyle (PA)	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
Edwards	(NM)	Speier
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	(NM)	Takai
Eshoo	Lynch	Takano
Esty	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Foster	Matsui	Tonko
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Torres
Fudge	McDermott	Tsongas
Gabbard	McGovern	Van Hollen
Gallego	McNerney	Vargas
Graham	Meeks	Veasey
Grayson	Meng	Vela
Green, Al	Moore	Velázquez
Green, Gene	Moulton	Visclosky
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Wasserman
Hahn	Napolitano	Schultz
Hastings	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Heck (WA)	Nolan	Watson Coleman
Higgins	Norcross	Welch
Himes	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Hinojosa	Pallone	Yarmuth
Honda	Pascrell	
Hoyer	Payne	

NOES—245

Abraham	Conaway	Gowdy
Aderholt	Cook	Granger
Allen	Costa	Graves (GA)
Amash	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Amodel	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Babin	Crawford	Griffith
Barletta	Crenshaw	Grothman
Barr	Culberson	Guinta
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Billakis	Denham	Hardy
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Blum	Dold	Hensarling
Bost	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Hice (GA)
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hill
Brat	Ellmers	Holding
Bridenstine	Emmer	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Hunt
Buck	Fleischmann	Hurd (TX)
Bucshon	Fleming	Hurt (VA)
Burgess	Flores	Issa
Byrne	Forbes	Jenkins (KS)
Calvert	Fortenberry	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jolly
Chaffetz	Garrett	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Gibbs	Jordan
Coffman	Gibson	Joyce
Cole	Gohmert	Katko
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Kelly (PA)
Comstock	Gosar	

King (IA)	Nunes	Sessions	Denham	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	McGovern	Schakowsky
King (NY)	Olson	Shimkus	Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)	Kaptur	McNerney	Schiff
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Shuster	DesSantis	Kline	Rohrabacher	Keating	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Kline	Palmer	Simpson	DesJarlais	Knight	Rokita	Kelly (IL)	Meng	Scott, David
Knight	Paulsen	Smith (MO)	Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rooney (FL)	Kennedy	Moore	Serrano
Labrador	Pearce	Smith (NE)	Dold	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen	Kildee	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
LaMalfa	Perry	Smith (NJ)	Duffy	Lamborn	Roskam	Kilmer	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Lamborn	Peterson	Smith (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ross	Kind	Nadler	Sires
Lance	Pittenger	Stefanik	Duncan (TN)	Latta	Rothfus	Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	Slaughter
Latta	Pitts	Stewart	Ellmers	LoBiondo	Rouzer	Kuster	Neal	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Stivers	Emmer	Long	Royce	Langevin	Nolan	Speier
Long	Poliquin	Stutzman	Farenthold	Loudermilk	Russell	Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Thompson (PA)	Fincher	Love	Ryan (WI)	Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Takai
Love	Posey	Thornberry	Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Salmon	Lawrence	Pallone	Takano
Lucas	Price (GA)	Tiberi	Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Sanford	Lee	Pascarell	Thompson (CA)
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Tipton	Fleming	Lummis	Scalise	Levin	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Lummis	Reed	Trott	Flores	MacArthur	Schock	Lewis	Pelosi	Titus
MacArthur	Reichert	Turner	Forbes	Marchant	Schrader	Lieu (CA)	Peters	Tonko
Marchant	Renacci	Upton	Fortenberry	Marino	Schweikert	Lipinski	Pingree	Torres
Marino	Ribble	Valadao	Fox	Massie	Scott, Austin	Loeb sack	Pocan	Tsongas
Massie	Rice (SC)	Wagner	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner	Lofgren	Polis	Van Hollen
McCarthy	Rigell	Walberg	Frelinghuysen	McCaul	Sessions	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Vargas
McCaul	Roby	Walden	Garrett	McClintock	Shimkus	Lowe y	Quigley	Veasey
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walker	Gibbs	McHenry	Shuster	Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Vela
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walorski	Gibson	McKinley	Simpson	(NM)	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi	Gohmert	McMorris	Sinema	Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Visclosky
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)	Goodlatte	Rodgers	Smith (MO)	(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Walz
Rodgers	Rokita	Webster (FL)	Gosar	McSally	Smith (NE)	Lynch	Ruiz	Wasserman
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Wenstrup	Graham	Meadows	Smith (NJ)	Maloney,	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman	Granger	Meehan	Smith (TX)	Carolyn	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Meehan	Roskam	Westmoreland	Graves (GA)	Messer	Stefanik	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Messer	Ross	Whitfield	Graves (LA)	Mica	Stewart	Matsui	T.	Wilson (FL)
Mica	Rothfus	Williams	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Stivers	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)	Griffith	Miller (MI)	Stutzman	McDermott	Sarbanes	
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wittman	Grothman	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)			
Moolenaar	Russell	Womack	Guinta	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry			
Mooney (WV)	Ryan (WI)	Woodall	Guthrie	Mullin	Tiberi			
Mullin	Salmon	Yoder	Hanna	Mulvaney	Tipton			
Mulvaney	Sanford	Yoho	Hardy	Murphy (PA)	Trott			
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Young (AK)	Harper	Neugebauer	Turner			
Neugebauer	Schock	Young (IA)	Harris	Newhouse	Upton			
Newhouse	Schweikert	Young (IN)	Hartzler	Noem	Valadao			
Noem	Scott, Austin	Zeldin	Heck (NV)	Nugent	Wagner			
Nugent	Sensenbrenner	Zinke	Hensarling	Nunes	Walberg			
			Herrera Beutler	Olson	Walden			
			Hice (GA)	Palazzo	Walker			
			Hill	Palmer	Walorski			
			Holding	Paulsen	Walters, Mimi			
			Hudson	Pearce	Weber (TX)			
			Huelskamp	Perry	Webster (FL)			
			Huizenga (MI)	Peterson	Wenstrup			
			Hultgren	Pittenger	Westerman			
			Hunter	Pitts	Westmoreland			
			Hurd (TX)	Poe (TX)	Whitfield			
			Hurt (VA)	Poliquin	Williams			
			Issa	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)			
			Jenkins (KS)	Posey	Wittman			
			Jenkins (WV)	Price (GA)	Womack			
			Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Woodall			
			Johnson, Sam	Reed	Yoder			
			Jolly	Reichert	Yoho			
			Jones	Renacci	Young (AK)			
			Jordan	Ribble	Young (IA)			
			Joyce	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)			
			Katko	Rigell	Zeldin			
			Kelly (PA)	Roby	Zinke			
			King (IA)	Roe (TN)				

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver	Duckworth	Perlmutter
Clyburn	Garamendi	Ryan (OH)
Collins (GA)	Nunnelee	

□ 1721

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 175, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

AYES—250

Abraham	Bost	Clawson (FL)
Aderholt	Boustany	Coffman
Allen	Brady (TX)	Cole
Amash	Brat	Collins (GA)
Amodei	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Ashford	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Barletta	Buchanan	Cook
Barr	Buck	Costa
Benish	Bucshon	Costello (PA)
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Byrne	Crawford
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Cuellar
Black	Carter (TX)	Culberson
Blackburn	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)
Blum	Chaffetz	Davis, Rodney

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Esty
Aguilar	Clay	Farr
Bass	Clyburn	Fattah
Beatty	Cohen	Foster
Becerra	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Bera	Conyers	Fudge
Beyer	Cooper	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Courtney	Galleo
Bonamici	Crowley	Grayson
Boyle (PA)	Cummings	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Bustos	DeGette	Hahn
Butterfield	Delaney	Hastings
Capps	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Capuano	DeBene	Higgins
Cárdenas	DeSaunier	Himes
Carney	Deutch	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Honda
Cartwright	Doggett	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Doyle (PA)	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Israel
Chu (CA)	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	Engel	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)

NOES—175

Clarke (NY)	Esty
Clay	Farr
Clyburn	Fattah
Cohen	Foster
Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Conyers	Fudge
Cooper	Gabbard
Courtney	Galleo
Crowley	Grayson
Cummings	Green, Al
Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Davis, Danny	Grijalva
DeFazio	Gutiérrez
DeGette	Hahn
Delaney	Hastings
DeLauro	Heck (WA)
DeBene	Higgins
DeSaunier	Himes
Deutch	Hinojosa
Dingell	Honda
Doggett	Hoyer
Doyle (PA)	Huffman
Edwards	Israel
Ellison	Jackson Lee
Engel	Jeffries
Eshoo	Johnson (GA)

NOT VOTING—8

Barton	Garamendi	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Gowdy	Ryan (OH)
Duckworth	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1729

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 185.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 25

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that REID RIBBLE be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 30

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Mr. Kilmer.

(2) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Costa, Mr. Walz, Ms. Fudge, Mr. McGovern, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Vela, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Ms. Kuster, Mr. Nolan, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Aguilar, and Ms. Plaskett.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Cooper, Ms. Bordallo, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Speier, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Peters, Mr. Veasey, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Walz, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Takai, Ms. Graham, Mr. Ashford, Mr. Moulton, and Mr. Aguilar.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Ms. Moore, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. McDermott, Ms. Lee, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mrs. Dingell, and Mr. Lieu of California.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Mr. Hinojosa, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Polis, Mr. Sablan, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Takano, Mr. Jeffries, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Ms. Adams, and Mr. DeSaulnier.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Sires, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Higgins, Ms. Bass, Mr. Keating, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Bera, Mr. Lowenthal, Ms. Meng, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, and Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.

(8) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Keating, Mr. Payne, Mr. Vela, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Miss Rice of New York, and Mrs. Torres.

(9) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Nadler, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Pierluisi, Ms. Chu of California, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Gutiérrez, Ms. Bass, Mr. Richmond, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Cicilline, and Mr. Peters.

(10) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. Bordallo, Mr. Costa, Mr. Sablan, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Pierluisi, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. Beyer.

(11) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Ms. Norton, Mr. Clay, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Cartwright, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, and Mrs. Lawrence.

(12) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Lipinski, Ms. Edwards, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Bera, Ms. Esty, Mr. Veasey, and Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.

(13) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Chu of California, Ms. Hahn, Mr. Payne, and Ms. Meng.

(14) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—Ms. Norton, Mr. Nadler, Ms. Brown of Florida, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Capuano, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Sires, Ms. Edwards, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Hahn, Mr. Nolan, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Ms. Titus, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Ms. Esty, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Huffman, and Ms. Brownley of California.

(15) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Takano, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Titus, Mr. Ruiz, Ms. Kuster, and Mr. O'Rourke.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBMISSION OF MATERIAL EXPLANATORY OF H.R. 240, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 27, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations submitted explanatory material relating to H.R. 240. The contents of this submission will be published after the statement of Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 240 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 27 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 240.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1732

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Depart-

ment of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I am privileged to present to the House this bipartisan-bicameral agreement providing appropriations to the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, for fiscal year 2015.

Before I describe the details of this agreement, I want to thank everyone who has worked on this bill here today because, despite its importance to national security and public safety, its path to the floor has been far from certain.

First, to the Speaker and majority leader and your staffs, thank you for doing what is necessary to get this bill to this stage of the legislative process.

To Mr. ROGERS and the full committee staff, thanks for fighting for this bill. It wouldn't be on the floor without you.

To the House and Senate subcommittee staffs and to my personal staff—Derek Newby, Kris Mallard, Cornell Teague, Laura Cylke, Anne Wake, Steve Gilleland, Bill Zito, Jonas Miller, and Val Baldwin—thank you for your advice and counsel in crafting this agreement. Your work takes you away from home and from your families, and I appreciate your efforts.

Finally, to the Honorable DAVID PRICE, who is the ranking member of the subcommittee, much thanks to DAVID. Our partnership is critical to this bill's success. His experience and measured approach makes this agreement even better.

Thank you, DAVID, for your service and, more importantly, for your friendship.

As everyone knows, several amendments will be proposed to stop the President's recent executive actions on immigration. I plan to vote for these amendments because, like many Americans, I believe the President's actions exceed the authority provided to the Executive in the Constitution.

We need to have this debate, but after all of the arguments have been presented, the underlying appropriations bill must be enacted because it is critical to the Nation's security and to public safety.

Mr. Chairman, last week, we watched a terrible tragedy unfold in Paris as armed terrorists killed innocent French citizens who were doing nothing more than going about their daily

lives. Like 9/11, this event and others that have occurred this year remind us that our democratic values are under constant attack, and they serve as a warning that we must remain vigilant.

Make no mistake, what happened in Paris can happen anywhere, including in the United States, and we must provide the resources necessary to find and to root out the seeds of terrorism. Therefore, passing the Homeland Security Appropriations bill is an imperative we cannot fail to meet.

Mr. Chairman, this agreement is very good, and I am proud of it. It supports DHS' frontline personnel and its essential security operations and maintains fiscal discipline.

Specifically, for Customs and Border Protection: this agreement adds \$42 million above the request to assure the 24/7 surveillance of all land, sea, and air approaches; it increases air and marine flight hours from 74,000 to 95,000 per year; this agreement fully funds 23,775 CBP officers to continue efforts to reduce the wait times of passengers arriving at the Nation's international airports without resorting to burdensome user fees as proposed by the President; funds are included for 21,370 Border Patrol agents, the highest operational force in DHS history; funds for tactical communications equipment and border security technology are increased by \$20 million above the request; substantial increases are included for targeting systems and data analysis to support counterterrorism efforts.

For Immigration and Customs Enforcement: custody and deportation operations are increased by \$862 million above the request to ensure the full funding of 34,000 legislatively-mandated detention beds and to detain, deport, and deter the influx of families and children illegally crossing the southwest border. Included in this amount are 3,732 new family detention units to deter the illegal migration of families. Also included are 207 new enforcement officers to expedite the process of returning illegal immigrants to their countries of origin.

ICE's investigative capability is increased by \$82.4 million over the request, which will result in more convictions of child pornographers, drug smugglers, human traffickers, and other criminals; full funding is provided for E-Verify and all existing 287(g) agreements.

For the Transportation Security Administration: TSA screeners are capped at 45,000—1,000 below last year's level; privatized screening is increased by \$12.1 million over the request; funds are reduced from TSA's current request and prior year balances, saving the taxpayers almost \$300 million.

For the U.S. Coast Guard: operational hours in critical source and transit zones are increased by \$16.7 million over the request; depot level main-

tenance, which is crucial for the Coast Guard's readiness, is increased by \$52.7 million over the request; the eighth National Security Cutter is fully funded; and \$95 million over the request is added for an additional C-130J aircraft.

For the United States Secret Service: \$25 million in additional funds are provided to address training shortfalls highlighted by the White House fence jumper and to enhance perimeter security, including for additional K-9 teams.

For the National Protection and Programs Directorate: funds are provided so DHS can effectively manage the collection of biometrics and protect and enhance the resilience of the Nation's physical and cyber infrastructure.

For the Federal Emergency Management Agency: \$7 billion is provided to fully fund operational needs for disaster relief; first responder grants are increased by \$300 million above the President's request to sustain funding for State and local grants, firefighter assistance grants, and Emergency Management Performance Grants.

For Science and Technology: \$23.7 million above the request is provided for vital research efforts, including biological defense, cybersecurity, border security, and first responder technology; \$300 million is included to complete the construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility.

Finally, this agreement provides absolutely no discretionary funds or mandatory funds to implement the President's executive actions on immigration.

As you know, the costs of processing immigration applications are paid entirely by individual applicants when they submit their supporting documentation. Fees from those transactions are collected in a specific amount in the Treasury, as mandated by the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The hard-earned income of American taxpayers does not subsidize the costs of immigration applications, and the spending bill under consideration today has no funding for these purposes.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this Homeland Security bill meets the security needs of our Nation and the fiscal stewardship expected by the taxpayers. I believe it is worthy of every Member's vote, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the outset, I want to thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for their very hard work in putting the original bill together, which was negotiated by the House and the Senate and could be law right now.

As my colleagues are aware, our committee has not officially organized for the new Congress, which means we technically do not yet have a ranking

minority member for the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Again, I want to say to my colleagues that we could have completed action on this bill in the last Congress with the other 11 appropriations bills considered in the omnibus package. Unfortunately, the House majority kicked the can down the road and put these important programs under a continuing resolution in a misguided attempt to protest the President's executive order on immigration.

Today, instead of putting a clean bill on the floor, my majority colleagues have decided to further inject partisan politics into the appropriations process. We all know the outcome of this very dangerous game. The legislation in this form will not be enacted.

All we are doing is further delaying the enactment of a very good full-year bill. I am deeply disappointed that Republicans insist on making Congress play out this farce at the expense of our Nation's security. It has taken less than 2 weeks for the Republican Congress to prove that it cannot govern responsibly.

The Republican majority has already delayed this bill enough. With more than a quarter of this fiscal year already gone, we continue to play games with the funding for an agency that was created to protect the Nation from terrorist attacks.

□ 1745

Last week, terrorists brutally murdered 12 people at the office of a French satirical magazine, a police officer, and four individuals at a kosher grocery store. That is a tragic example of the kind of out-of-the-blue attack that the Department of Homeland Security, along with its other law enforcement partners, is working hard to prevent here in the United States.

Partisan games on immigration will delay grants to States and major urban areas, funding that is critical for supporting local first responders in our defense against homegrown terrorism and for fusion centers, where the Department of Homeland Security gathers, shares, and analyzes threat information with its State and local law enforcement partners.

The failure to enact a full-year bill will slow down efforts for the Secret Service to begin addressing problems with security at the White House.

The Department will be limited in its ability to move forward with the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative to make the Department more strategic and improve coordination among its components.

Resources to detain truly dangerous criminal aliens and to manage another rapid influx of unaccompanied children and families across the southwest border are in jeopardy.

Acquisition of the final National Security Cutter and other Coast Guard

assets will be delayed, as will construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my Republican colleagues to give up the partisan games that threaten our national security and allow the House to act today on the clean bill—again, that was negotiated by Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, a good bill—funding the Department of Homeland Security. We have already wasted enough time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the full committee

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank Chairman CARTER for his great work in putting this bill together and for yielding the time.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security.

In December, the House passed, on a bipartisan basis, an aggregated appropriations bill that funded most of the Federal Government, 11 of the 12 annual appropriations bills, and today we consider the last remaining of those bills.

The security of our homeland is one of our highest priorities. This bill provides \$39.7 billion for that purpose: to protect our borders, defend against the threats of terrorism, and enforce our Nation's laws.

Today we will also consider amendments to the bill that will reverse the President's declaration of executive amnesty for illegal aliens. One of these amendments would change existing law to prohibit any funding, including fees, from being used to implement the order. As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, there are no appropriations in this bill for the illegal amnesty decree—that is being funded by fees—and this amendment would get at that problem.

The American people have spoken loud and clear. They want our immigration laws enforced rather than unilaterally changed by executive decree in an unlawful way that undermines our Constitution and the integrity of our laws. I will vote for these amendments because the Presidential amnesty decree grossly exceeds this authority and violates the Constitution.

The base legislation before us ensures that our immigration laws are upheld, that our border is fortified, and that the men and women on our front line remain well equipped and trained. The bill provides \$10.7 billion for Customs and Border Protection. That is an increase of \$118-plus million above last year to support the largest operation force levels in the history of the country and to ensure around-the-clock border surveillance.

Funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, is also boosted

above last year, totaling \$5.96 billion, including significant increases to detention bed capacity for both individuals and families, and full funding for E-Verify to ensure companies are hiring employees who can legally work in the U.S.

In addition, the legislation provides funding to ensure the safety of our skies and our coasts. The Transportation Security Administration is funded at \$4.8 billion, targeting funding to passenger security, cargo inspections, and intelligence.

The Coast Guard receives \$10 billion, denying the President's proposed cuts that would have gutted vital operations of the Coast Guard.

The security of this Nation is also dependent on a secure cyber network, and recent headlines have only underscored our need to be prepared against new and advanced cyber attacks and foreign espionage. To improve our cybersecurity programs, the bill includes \$753.2 million for these activities in the National Protection and Programs Directorate.

The bill also includes increased funding to address critical lapses in Secret Service communications and training at the White House and to start preparations for the 2016 Presidential election.

In addition to providing for these important security efforts, the Department bill also provides funding for disaster recovery and response. There is \$7 billion in the bill for FEMA's programs, fully funding their requirements. It also provides \$2.5 billion for important first responder grants that help States and communities act in the critical early moments following a disaster.

And finally, Mr. Chair, in all, this legislation before us takes the necessary steps to ensure the responsible, transparent use of taxpayer dollars, including streamlining DHS operations, reducing overhead costs, and trimming funds for lower priority programs.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman CARTER, and the entire subcommittee and staff for their hard work in reaching that bipartisan agreement back in December which now is reflected in this bill on the floor, and to also thank the staff for their many hours putting this legislation into final form.

Nearly halfway into the fiscal year, it is high time we get this bill enacted to strengthen our homeland security efforts, ensure our personnel are well equipped and trained, and maintain our readiness for any threats that may come our way. We cannot put our security at risk with outdated funding levels and the uncertainty of a continuing resolution.

So I urge my colleagues to vote responsibly for the security of our country and the security of our borders. I urge Members to vote "yes" on the bill.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, REGARDING H.R. 240

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The following is an explanation of the effects of this Act, which makes appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2015. Unless otherwise noted, references to the House and Senate reports are to House Report 113-481 and Senate Report 113-198, respectively. The language and allocations contained in the House and Senate reports warrant full compliance and carry the same weight as language included in this explanatory statement, unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the bill or this explanatory statement. While repeating some language from the House or Senate report for emphasis, this explanatory statement does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. When this explanatory statement refers to the Committees or the Committees on Appropriations, this reference is to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security and the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security.

In cases where this explanatory statement directs the submission of a report or a briefing, such report or briefing shall be provided to the Committees not later than April 15, 2015, unless otherwise directed in the statement. Reports and briefings required by the House or Senate report are due on the dates specified; in instances where the date specified occurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the report or briefing shall be due not later than April 15, 2015.

This explanatory statement refers to certain laws and organizations as follows: the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, Public Law 110-53, is referenced as the 9/11 Act; the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, Public Law 93-288, is referenced as the Stafford Act; the Department of Homeland Security is referenced as DHS or the Department; the Government Accountability Office is referenced as GAO; and the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security is referenced as OIG. In addition, "full-time equivalents" shall be referred to as FTE; the DHS "Working Capital Fund" shall be referred to as WCF; "program, project, and activity" shall be referred to as PPA; and any reference to "the Secretary" shall be interpreted to mean the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Classified Programs

Recommended adjustments to classified programs are addressed in a classified annex accompanying this explanatory statement.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

A total of \$132,573,000 is provided for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management (OSEM). The funding provided addresses the Unity of Effort realignment requested by the Department.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$ 000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Immediate Office of the Secretary	\$3,950	\$7,939

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	1,751	1,740
Office of the Chief of Staff	2,112	2,782
Executive Secretary	7,719	5,589
Office of Policy	38,470	38,073
Office of Public Affairs	8,741	5,591
Office of Legislative Affairs	5,583	5,403
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs/Partnership and Engagement	2,429	9,848
Office of General Counsel	21,310	19,950
Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties	22,003	21,800
Citizenship and Immigration Services		
Ombudsman	6,428	5,825
Privacy Officer	8,273	8,033
Total, Office of the Secretary and Executive Management	\$128,769	\$132,573

DHS Unity of Effort

Throughout the bill, funds have been realigned to support the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative. The Department shall provide frequent updates on progress and adoption of new policies, procedures, and guidelines related to this evolving effort.

Unaccompanied Alien Children

The President's fiscal year 2015 budget request for DHS failed to include funds necessary to address the arrival of children and families who will be ferried to the Nation's borders by a network of illicit transnational criminal organizations and to manage the populations of these illegal migrants who cross our border. This bill rectifies these mistakes by adding \$553,589,000 for costs related to deterring such illegal migration, interdicting these migrants, caring for and transporting an estimated 58,000 undocumented children to the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and facilitating the movement of thousands of undocumented families through removal proceedings after they illegally cross the U.S. border during this fiscal year.

Both the House and Senate reports contain instructions relative to the humanitarian crisis and law enforcement nightmare created by the phenomenon of children crossing the Southwest border. That guidance, which is aimed at being prepared for another potential influx of children, remains as valid today as it was in June 2014. To assure the Committees that the directives are being carried out, DHS is directed to coordinate an interagency update with other responsible Federal agencies, including the Departments of State, HHS, and Justice, that addresses the activities each agency is undertaking to deter, prepare for, and manage a surge of illegally migrating children and families. Quarterly briefings to the Committees are required beginning January 15, 2015, to cover operational statistics on all apprehensions, including unaccompanied alien children (UAC) and families, detention, non-detention forms of supervision, and removals. Furthermore, DHS shall notify the Committees immediately in the event that UAC are held in U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) custody longer than 72 hours or if UAC apprehensions surpass fiscal year 2013 levels.

A general provision is included in Title V of this Act to ensure the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request addresses DHS needs related to UAC and families.

Reporting of Operational Statistics

The Department shall continue quarterly submission of the Border Security Status reports, as required by the Senate. The requirement for Detention and Removal Operations reports is discontinued, as further discussed under the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) heading later in this statement.

In addition, the Department is directed to continue improving its public reporting of immigration enforcement and border security operations statistics both in terms of completeness and timeliness. The Department shall ensure that immigration enforcement data is collected and reported to reflect the entire lifecycle from encounter through removal and return, not just starting with apprehension and arrest. As directed in the Senate report, the Department and the relevant components shall brief the Committees on these efforts.

Joint Requirements Council

An additional \$4,000,000 is provided in the Immediate Office of the Secretary for the newly created Joint Requirements Council. The Department shall brief the Committees regularly on the status and activities of the Council.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection and Coast Guard Aviation Commonality

As referenced in the House report, the Department shall continue to pursue joint aviation requirements, as applicable, for the Coast Guard and CBP. Both components shall maximize commonality between their aircraft fleets. Further, CBP shall develop a flying hour program using the Coast Guard program as a model.

Over-Classification of Information

When the Department submits a document to the Committees that is classified for official use only (FOUO), the document shall include specific reasons for the classification based on requirements detailed in DHS Management Directive 11042.1, which provides guidance for safeguarding sensitive but unclassified FOUO information. The signatory of each document will be held accountable for verifying the classification.

International Costs Reduction

As referenced in the Senate report, the Department is to develop a plan with the goal of reducing international operations costs by up to 10 percent in fiscal year 2015. DHS shall brief the Committees not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act on this plan, including efforts to reduce unnecessary overlap and redundancies in its attaché laydown while maintaining a strong presence internationally.

Expenditure Plans in Budget Justification

As part of the justification accompanying the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary shall include expenditure plans for fiscal year 2016 for the Office of Policy, the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs/Partnership and Engagement, the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (OCRCL), the Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman, and the Office of Privacy.

Situational Awareness of Illegal Border Activity

As directed in both the House and Senate reports, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees the results of a review and draft plan for situational awareness along the Southwest border and in the associated maritime environment not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The effort may include attaining a common operating picture but must include enabling operational control through full and persistent situational awareness.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

A total of \$187,503,000 is provided for the Office of the Under Secretary for Management (USM). The funding provided fully incor-

porates the Unity of Effort realignment requested by the Department. Each office shall prioritize efforts within the amount provided.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Management	\$2,757	\$2,740
Office of the Chief Security Officer	63,597	64,308
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer	64,036	60,107
Subtotal	130,390	127,155
Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:		
Salaries and Expenses	21,253	20,944
Human Resources Information Technology	9,878	6,000
Subtotal	31,131	26,944
Office of the Chief Readiness Support Officer:		
Salaries and Expenses	29,272	28,911
Nebraska Avenue Complex	4,493	4,493
Subtotal	33,765	33,404
Total, Office of the Under Secretary for Management	\$195,286	\$187,503

Headquarters Consolidation

Pursuant to a general provision in Title V of this Act, \$48,600,000 is provided for headquarters consolidation and associated operational support. Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the USM shall submit to the Committees an expenditure plan detailing how this funding will be allocated, including revised schedule and cost estimates for the headquarters consolidation project. Quarterly briefings are required on headquarters and mission support consolidation activities, which should highlight any deviation from the expenditure plan. The briefings shall also discuss progress on lease replacement and consolidation efforts.

Program Accountability and Risk Management

In lieu of direction in the House report regarding a new PPA for the Office of Program Accountability and Risk Management, the Department shall display funding levels and a program justification for this office within the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016.

Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report

The Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report shall be submitted as a part of the justification documents accompanying the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 and shall contain all programs on the major acquisition oversight list and others of special interest. Funding amounts shall be displayed by appropriation and PPA. Further, the Department shall work with the Committees to post a non-FOUO version to the Department's website not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Procurement of Secure Credentials

As described in the House report, there is an ongoing GAO study regarding the production of secure credentials across the government. To that end, the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer (OCPO) shall brief the Committees within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act on the Department's process for procuring secure credentials, including how OCPO decides whether to procure such products from either a private entity or a government agency and how it considers both cost and the security features of the products. Prior to the completion of the GAO study, per section 507 of this Act, the Department shall notify the Committees in

writing three days prior to contracting with a private entity or signing an agreement with a government agency to requisition secure credentials and, if applicable, to provide an analysis showing how the security of the products will be equal to or greater than that of products that could be procured from private industry at a similar cost.

GAO Review of Major Acquisition Programs
As directed in the Senate report, GAO shall develop a plan for ongoing reviews of DHS' major acquisition projects.

Procurement Process

As directed in the Senate report, the Under Secretary shall outline the procurement process from the beginning when a need is identified through contract award, extension, or modification, including any protest actions or other delays. The Under Secretary shall provide a briefing on the effort to the Committees not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act. As directed in the Senate report, the role of the Component Acquisition Executive shall also be addressed.

Hiring Delays

DHS shall report to the Committees not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act on a strategy for reducing the time required for hiring personnel, and shall provide quarterly data on hiring timelines by component, as directed in the Senate report.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

A total of \$52,020,000 is provided for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), which includes staffing and funds realigned to support the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative. It is assumed that any cost of living adjustment for Federal employees directed by the President for fiscal year 2015 will be funded from within the amounts provided for each appropriation in this Act.

Obligation and Expenditure Plans

The statement includes directives for specified components to brief the Committees on obligation and expenditure plans. The briefings shall reflect enacted appropriations; include the allocation of undistributed appropriations among and within PPAs; and specify completed transfer and reprogramming actions (pursuant to section 503 of this Act and previous appropriations Acts for DHS), including funds that have been reprogrammed below the notification threshold.

Funding in the briefs shall be designated by PPA and cost code by quarter, and shall include the amount of funds planned to be carried over into the next fiscal year. For multi-year appropriations, the briefs shall detail the status of each appropriation by

source year. In addition, the briefs shall identify the current numbers of onboard personnel by PPA, along with delineations of the numbers of personnel newly hired or lost to attrition since the beginning of the fiscal year or since the most recent report, as appropriate. These briefings shall be provided not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act and on a quarterly basis thereafter to compare actual obligations against the initial plans.

Financial Systems Modernization

The CFO is directed to maintain frequent communications with the Committees on its Financial Systems Modernization (FSM) efforts, as directed in the House and Senate reports. A general provision is included in Title V of this Act to fund FSM activities, enabling the Secretary to allocate resources according to fluctuations in the FSM program execution plan. In lieu of the direction in the House report, the CFO shall submit a detailed expenditure plan for FSM not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

A total of \$288,122,000 is provided for the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO), of which \$189,094,000 is available until September 30, 2016. The funding provided fully incorporates the realignment to support the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative. An additional \$1,000,000 is provided for the DHS Data Framework initiative, and an additional \$500,000 is provided for cyber remediation tools, as outlined in the House report. The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Salaries and Expenses	\$95,444	\$99,028
Information Technology Services	38,627	68,298
Infrastructure and Security Activities	52,140	52,640
Homeland Secure Data Network	70,132	68,156
Total, Office of the Chief Information Officer	\$256,343	\$288,122

Unity of Effort

To support the Department's Unity of Effort initiative, a total of \$32,621,000 and 25 FTE are realigned from Analysis and Operations to OCIO for the Homeland Security Information Network Program and the Common Operating Picture.

Sharing and Safeguarding Classified Information

As directed in House and Senate reports and not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the CIO shall brief the Committees on its program execution

and strategy to protect national security information held by DHS, including the cost and schedule details of the Homeland Secure Data Network, Identity Credential Access Management programs, and other large or multi-agency projects. The briefing shall also include details on other steps the Department is taking to safeguard classified information.

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

A total of \$255,804,000 is provided for Analysis and Operations, of which \$102,479,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016. The funding provided fully incorporates the Unity of Effort realignment requested by the Department. Other funding details are included within the classified annex accompanying this explanatory statement.

Criminal Intelligence Enterprise

The Committees encourage Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) to coordinate with the Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs from the Nation's major urban areas to strengthen the Criminal Intelligence Enterprise, which is aimed at integrating state and local criminal intelligence and counterterrorism operations. I&A is to brief the Committees not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act on its efforts to date and plans for fiscal year 2015.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

A total of \$142,617,000 is provided for the OIG, including \$118,617,000 in direct appropriations and \$24,000,000 transferred from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) for audits and investigations related to the DRF. The level of OIG funding has been reduced from the budget request for reasons outlined in the Senate report as well as to reflect more realistic expectations for hiring in fiscal year 2015. The OIG is directed to submit an expenditure plan for all fiscal year 2015 funds not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and, for fiscal year 2016 and future years, to submit an expenditure plan within its annual budget justification. The OIG is directed to include DRF transfers in the CFO's monthly budget execution reports submitted to the Committees, which shall satisfy the requirements for notification of DRF transfers under a general provision in Title V of this Act.

TITLE II—SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

A total of \$8,459,657,000 is provided for Salaries and Expenses. The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Headquarters, Management, and Administration:		
Commissioner	\$27,245	\$27,151
Chief Counsel	45,663	45,483
Congressional Affairs	2,514	2,504
Internal Affairs	140,141	139,493
Public Affairs	13,064	13,009
Training and Development	71,926	71,585
Technology, Innovation, and Acquisition	25,374	25,277
Intelligence/Investigative Liaison	61,512	62,235
Administration	386,793	382,870
Rent	409,490	598,593
Subtotal, Headquarters, Management, and Administration	1,183,722	1,368,200
Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation:		
Inspections, Trade, and Travel Facilitation at Ports of Entry	2,830,872	2,810,524
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection (Trust Fund)	3,274	3,274
International Cargo Screening	69,173	68,902
Other International Programs	25,706	25,548
Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism	40,841	41,619
Trusted Traveler Programs	5,811	5,811
Inspection and Detection Technology Investments	123,866	122,811
National Targeting Center	70,592	74,623

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Training	33,906	33,880
Subtotal, Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation	3,204,041	3,186,992
Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry:		
Border Security and Control	3,882,015	3,848,074
Training	56,608	56,391
Subtotal, Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry	3,938,623	3,904,465
Total	\$8,326,386	\$8,459,657

Headquarters, Management, and Administration

CBP's Chief Financial Officer is directed to brief the Committees on a plan for the obligation and expenditure of funds for all CBP accounts, as specified under Title I of this statement, to include data previously provided in its financial plans. As proposed by the House, \$1,000,000 is provided to the Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison (OIIL) for additional analysts to support the Air and Marine Operations Center's (AMOC) activities, particularly analysis of feeds from unmanned aircraft systems (UAS). CBP shall ensure that such activities are aligned with other situational awareness efforts at CBP and the DHS Unity of Effort initiative.

The total amount provided reflects a transfer from the Construction and Facility Management account into the Rent PPA because the Administration has determined that GSA will not delegate authority to CBP to manage certain land ports of entry.

Conduct and Integrity Oversight

The Secretary announced the delegation of criminal misconduct investigative authority on September 18, 2014. This authority permits CBP to work side by side, as appropriate, with other Federal investigative agencies looking into alleged criminal conduct by CBP employees, which should increase workforce accountability and enable CBP leadership to have greater awareness of conduct and integrity issues. CBP is directed to provide regular updates as it converts internal affairs investigators to criminal investigators as part of this transition. Further, the Deputy Secretary shall continue to oversee joint coordination of integrity oversight, as discussed in the Senate report.

Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation

Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation is funded at \$3,186,992,000, of which \$2,810,524,000 is for Inspections, Trade, and Travel Facilitation at Ports of Entry, including sufficient funding to support a base of 23,775 CBP officers. The bill provides \$30,000,000 as two-year funding based on CBP's current hiring schedule. As requested, \$8,300,000 is provided for the CBP Mobile Program and \$3,000,000 is added for a Biometric Exit Mobile application demonstration at two airports. To expand the Arrival and Departure Information System, \$9,900,000 is included instead of \$11,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. A total of \$41,619,000 is provided for the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) program, which provides sufficient funds to proceed with the web portal project. As discussed in the Senate report, of the total amount provided for CBP Salaries and Expenses, \$10,000,000 shall be used for sustaining traveler process enhancements initiated in Public Law 113-76. To support counter-network capabilities at the National Targeting Center (NTC), \$4,500,000 is provided for advanced analysis and visualization tools and requirements development in-

stead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House. While funded in the NTC PPA, this investment shall support strategic analysis capabilities across CBP.

To deal with the fluctuations of facilitating trade and securing travel, CBP's staffing practices—to include hiring, training, and assignments—must be flexible and nimble. While the resource allocation model has greatly improved CBP's ability to make informed staffing decisions, CBP shall update its resource allocation model, taking into account any newly identified gaps, the onboarding of 2,000 CBP officers added by the fiscal year 2014 Act, and the timeline for training and deploying the new personnel to their respective assignments. An updated model shall specifically identify CBP officer staffing requirements for the Northern border. Any modifications to the model shall be described in the fiscal year 2016 budget submission.

Both the House and Senate reports include extensive language about ways to reduce wait times at ports of entry. As always, this objective must be carefully balanced against U.S. security interests and the need to safeguard travelers and the general public from terrorism. To underscore the importance of these missions, the agreement highlights the following guidance in both the House and Senate reports. CBP shall carry out the following within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act:

1) Develop a plan to accelerate the hiring process for CBP officers, as directed in the Senate report.

2) Brief the Committees on the implementation and execution of the public-private partnership and donation authority pilots authorized under section 560 of Public Law 113-6 and section 559 of Public Law 113-76 and continued in this Act, with semi-annual briefings thereafter.

3) Provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Homeland Security, and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs describing the effects of business transformation initiatives on reducing passenger wait times, including the impact of technologies that are not dependent on the activity of CBP personnel. The report should provide an analysis of the effectiveness of such initiatives and identify locations CBP would prioritize for expansion.

4) Brief the Committees on efforts to improve commercial vehicle wait time data collection and trade facilitation at land ports of entry.

5) Brief the Committees on the status of implementing section 571 of Public Law 113-76, which requires the development of passenger wait time performance metrics and operational work plans to reduce passenger wait times at ports of entry with the highest passenger volume and wait times. The briefing shall include an action plan and proposed timelines for innovative activities, as proposed in the Senate report.

6) Brief the Committees on the effect of the Beyond the Border Action Plan on reducing wait times at, and streamlining the flow of trade across, the Northern border.

7) Brief the Committees on the status of the Air Entry/Exit Re-engineering project, its implications for land and sea ports in urban and rural areas, and how CBP is working with the Office of Biometric Identity Management (OBIM) to examine new technologies that can be integrated with DHS' backend biometric system, IDENT.

8) Provide an update on the effectiveness of non-intrusive inspection (NII) technology at ports of entry, including seizures resulting from NII exams, in the multi-year investment and management plan for inspection and detection technology required by Public Law 112-74 and continued in a general provision in Title V of this Act.

Trade Enforcement

The House and Senate reports contain guidance on cargo inspection and commercial fraud enforcement, including directives related to circumvention of duties and misclassification of entries of goods from China; collection of outstanding duties; the use of single entry transaction bonds; coordination with the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce on the use of new shipper reviews and improvement of liquidation instructions; membership on the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations; uncollected antidumping and countervailing duty orders on duties in excess of \$25,000,000 assessed by single transaction bonds; and enhanced trade enforcement efforts. CBP shall adhere to these directives and, to the extent practicable, publish the required report on the collection of outstanding duties on the CBP website.

The Commissioner is directed to pursue, through all possible means, the dispersal of interest payments owed to injured parties who have obtained funds under the Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act. That law states that "the Commissioner shall distribute all funds from assessed duties received in the preceding fiscal year to affected domestic producers," which has been understood to mean interest accrued from past duties identified and dispersed to injured parties. CBP shall provide a report on all interest payments owed to injured parties between the beginning of 2001 and the end of 2014, along with a path forward for dispersing such funds to the injured parties.

Jones Act

CBP is directed to brief the Committees on the steps it is taking to adhere to the guidance in the Senate report with regard to the Jones Act.

Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry

Border Security and Control between Ports of Entry is funded at \$3,904,465,000, which includes \$3,848,074,000 for Border Security and Control and \$56,391,000 for training. As proposed by the House, \$499,000 is included for an additional Horse Patrol Unit. The total

funding level supports the legislatively-mandated floor of not less than 21,370 Border Patrol agents. Because CBP is currently well below the mandated level, CBP is directed to take all possible steps to reach the funded and operationally necessary staffing level. Recognizing that the Administration failed to request funds sufficient to care for UAC and family units while in Border Patrol custody, CBP shall utilize excess funding currently allocated to Salaries and Expenses within this PPA to support that need.

As proposed by the Senate, \$10,000,000 is for the development and operation of the National Border Geo-Intelligence Strategy (NBGIS). CBP must continue to improve its situational awareness and analytic capabilities to secure the border at and between the ports of entry and along the approaches to the United States by land, air, and sea. CBP shall ensure that the investments made in the NBGIS align with other critical investments in the NTC, AMOC, and OIIL, and shall brief the Committees on how data collected through the NBGIS will assist CBP and other government entities.

As directed in the House report, CBP shall continue to issue statistics on individuals held in CBP custody and to publish such statistics in the DHS annual statistical yearbook.

Both the House and Senate reports included direction to DHS to review ICE and CBP repatriation policies and practices to ensure deportations of vulnerable individuals are conducted humanely and safely. The review shall be completed within 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act instead of 180 days as proposed by the House and 120 days as proposed by the Senate.

Recently, CBP initiated a pilot program to determine whether using body-worn cameras can reduce the use of unnecessary force and protect officers and agents from allegations of abuse that may be unfounded. As required in the House report, CBP shall provide a report to the Committees on the results of the pilot within 60 days of its completion.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

A total of \$808,169,000 is provided for Automation Modernization. CBP and ICE shall brief the Committees semi-annually on TECS modernization, and CBP shall brief the Committees on Automated Commercial Environment modernization semi-annually. The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Information Technology	\$365,700	\$362,094
Automated Targeting Systems	109,273	109,230
Automated Commercial Environment (ACE)/International Trade Data System (ITDS)	141,061	140,970
Current Operations Protection and Processing Support (COPPS)	196,376	195,875
Total	\$812,410	\$808,169

BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

A total of \$382,466,000 is provided for Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology (BSFIT). As requested, \$12,200,000 is provided for Northern border technology and \$35,600,000 is provided for tethered aerostat radar systems. An additional \$15,000,000 for Development and Deployment and \$5,000,000

for Operations and Maintenance is provided for unfunded priorities cited in the House report. Within the resources provided, CBP shall resume and complete the communications study referenced in the House report. CBP shall also detail the allocation of BSFIT funds in its obligation and expenditure plan briefings, as specified under Title I of this statement.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Development and Deployment	\$110,594	\$125,594
Operations and Maintenance	251,872	256,872
Total	\$362,466	\$382,466

AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

A total of \$750,469,000 is provided for Air and Marine Operations. The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Salaries and Expenses	\$293,016	\$299,800
Operations and Maintenance	362,669	397,669
Procurement	53,000	53,000
Total	\$708,685	\$750,469

The amount provided for Salaries and Expenses includes \$5,900,000 to increase staffing at the AMOC to levels sufficient to maintain 24/7 air and marine surveillance coverage of the United States as well as \$350,000 for Intelligence Research Analysts; and \$3,000,000 to support 95,000 flight hours. The Operations and Maintenance PPA is increased by \$28,300,000 to support this number of flight hours. In addition, \$3,000,000 is for multi-role enforcement aircraft (MEA) spare parts, \$2,000,000 is for upgrades to unmanned aircraft system ground control stations, and \$1,350,000 is for enhancements to AMOC's Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination cell and Air and Marine Operating Surveillance System. As requested, \$43,700,000 is provided for procurement of two MEA and \$9,300,000 is for sensor upgrades.

The bill continues a provision included in the Senate bill requiring CBP to submit any changes to its five-year Strategic Air and Marine Plan not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Based on concerns addressed in both the House and Senate reports, CBP initiated a review of how to improve its air and marine readiness posture to adequately support mission needs. In coordination with the Department's Aviation Governance Board (AGB), CBP shall establish policies and define responsibilities for the development and management of a CBP aircraft flight hour and marine vessel underway hour program, which shall be finalized not later than December 31, 2015. In addition, CBP shall continue to work with the AGB to formalize and institutionalize a joint requirements process tailored to meet law enforcement operational needs and leverage existing capabilities across the Department, including depot level maintenance facilities. CBP shall provide quarterly progress reviews on this endeavor to the Committees beginning not later than February 1, 2015.

CBP's AMOC is a national asset, critical to fulfilling the needs of the United States for

air and marine domain awareness. It is clear, however, that the Department has not fully utilized this critical resource. Therefore, the DHS Deputy's Management Action Group (DMAG) shall review AMOC's current mission and its roles and responsibilities to determine whether they require modification to support DHS' strategic objective of protecting all approaches—air, land, and sea—to U.S. borders. By December 1, 2015, the DMAG shall make recommendations to the Secretary on how to rectify identified gaps in capability and provide guidance to all DHS components on how best to leverage AMOC's existing capabilities so they enhance DHS' operational Unity of Effort. The DMAG review and recommendations shall also address direction in the House report regarding personnel requirements and full staffing of AMOC, as well as finalization of an AMOC charter, although no report on the charter is required. The Department and CBP are instructed to provide quarterly progress reviews to the Committees beginning March 1, 2015, which shall include an update on progress made to connect AMOC to SIPRnet, as directed in the House report.

CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

A total of \$288,821,000 is provided for Construction and Facilities Management, including \$5,100,000 for upgrading Border Patrol facilities instead of \$4,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. No increase is provided for the McAllen Border Patrol Station, as it has already been reactivated for use in transitioning UAC to HHS custody.

The amount provided reflects a transfer from this account of \$189,103,000 to the Rent PPA in the Salaries and Expenses appropriation because the Administration has determined that GSA will not be delegating authority to CBP for management of certain land ports of entry. The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Facilities Construction and Sustainment	\$385,137	\$205,393
Program Oversight and Management	97,068	83,428
Total	\$482,205	\$288,821

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

A total of \$5,932,756,000 is provided for Salaries and Expenses, which reflects significant increases above the request totaling \$944,691,000. These increases are provided to address excessive shortfalls in the President's budget request due to poor budgeting practices, deal with needs related to the surge in unaccompanied children and families with children coming across the Southwest border, and restore proposed cuts to staffing, operations, investigations, and other programs critical to national security.

ICE is directed to brief the Committees on a plan for the obligation and expenditure of funds and provide quarterly updates, as specified under Title I of this statement. As a part of these briefings, ICE shall continue to provide data on investigative activities and expenditures.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$ 000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Headquarters Management and Administration:		
Personnel Compensation and Benefits, Services, and Other Costs	\$198,602	\$197,002
Headquarters Managed IT Investment	150,927	150,419
Subtotal, Headquarters Management and Administration	349,529	347,421
Legal Proceedings	214,731	217,393
Investigations:		
Domestic Investigations	1,644,552	1,699,811
International Investigations:		
International Operations	101,228	110,682
Visa Security Program	31,854	49,526
Subtotal, International Investigations	133,082	160,208
Subtotal, Investigations	1,777,634	1,860,019
Intelligence	77,045	76,479
Enforcement and Removal Operations:		
Custody Operations	1,791,913	2,532,593
Fugitive Operations	131,591	142,615
Criminal Alien Program	322,407	327,223
Alternatives to Detention	94,106	109,740
Transportation and Removal Program	229,109	319,273
Subtotal, Enforcement and Removal Operations	2,569,126	3,431,444
Total, Salaries and Expenses	\$4,988,065	\$5,932,756

Legal Proceedings

A total of \$217,393,000 is provided for Legal Proceedings, including funds to hire 12 full-time personnel to process Freedom of Information Act submissions, as requested. In addition, an increase of \$4,500,000 is provided to hire additional attorneys to expedite the immigration court docket.

Domestic Investigations

A total of \$1,699,811,000 is provided for Domestic Investigations, including an increase of \$5,700,000 to annualize the costs of investigative staffing enhancements funded in fiscal year 2014. The bill provides an increase of \$62,000,000 to hire additional agents and mission support staff to enhance ICE's ability to conduct investigations in high-priority mission areas, such as human smuggling and trafficking, including Operation Torrent Divide; child exploitation, including Operation Angel Watch; antidumping and countervailing duties, including illegally dumped seafood; counter-proliferation; gang activity; and drug smuggling. ICE shall submit a fiscal year 2016 budget request that includes funds sufficient to annualize the costs of prior year staff enhancements. In addition, ICE is directed to develop a workforce model to better inform requirements for investigative staffing, including the necessary balance of special agents and mission support personnel.

ICE is directed to train at least two classes of veterans through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child-Rescue Corps to support child exploitation investigations and to brief the Committees on its efforts not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, including efforts to hire HERO graduates or to help place them with other Federal, state, or local agencies with related missions.

Within the total, the bill provides not less than \$15,000,000 for intellectual property rights and commercial trade fraud investigations, including activities at the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center.

In lieu of the operational reporting requirement in the House report, ICE is directed to work with the Committees on a format for submitting quarterly updates on operations not later than 15 days after the end of each quarter.

International Investigations

A total of \$160,208,000 is provided for International Investigations. Within the total, an increase of \$7,113,000 is included to fund in-

creased State Department service fees; an increase of \$12,000,000 is provided to expand the Visa Security Program to high-threat countries; and an increase of \$3,500,000 is provided to support enhancements to the PATRIOT information technology system for visa vetting. In support of ICE's international efforts to counter the humanitarian crisis caused by the influx of UAC, the bill also provides increases of \$1,764,000 to double the number of vetted units in Central America and \$3,373,000 to expand human smuggling investigations.

Enforcement and Removal Operations

A total of \$3,431,444,000 is provided for Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO), including full funding to support all 287(g) memoranda of understanding.

The bill does not include funds for ICE's efforts to establish a unified career path for ERO frontline law enforcement positions and ensure pay parity in the ERO workforce. Such funds were not requested by the President and are not affordable due to other immigration enforcement and border security budget shortfalls.

In lieu of the ERO quarterly data required by the Senate report, ICE is directed to provide regular updates on the detained and non-detained populations subject to removal proceedings, including details on enforcement priority level, and to work with the Committees on the format and content of such updates.

ICE is directed to continue to submit semi-annual reports on the deportation of parents of U.S.-born citizens.

Custody Operations

A total of \$2,532,593,000 is provided for Custody Operations. Because the fiscal year 2015 budget request assumed an artificially low cost per detention bed, it failed to propose funding sufficient to support even the 30,539 beds included in the request, much less the 34,000 detention beds required in annual appropriations Acts. This type of flawed budgeting practice is not credible, and forces the Committees to rectify the shortfall at considerable expense to other critical ICE and DHS priorities. Consequently, an increase of \$385,103,000 above the request is required to maintain 34,000 beds. DHS is directed to present a fiscal year 2016 budget request for ICE that uses accurate cost estimates, and to include details in the budget justification material that rigorously support those estimates. The Department must stop employing misleading and operationally harmful budgeting gimmicks.

The bill also provides an increase of \$362,155,000 to support additional staffing and detention capacity secured by ICE in response to the significant growth in family units crossing the Southwest border illegally during fiscal year 2014, which is intended to serve as a deterrent to future illegal migration. ICE shall ensure these facilities meet all ICE Family Residential Standards and shall immediately notify the Committees of any material violations of such standards.

Fugitive Operations

A total of \$142,615,000 is provided for Fugitive Operations, including \$12,100,000 above the request to hire additional officers and restore staffing to fiscal year 2013 levels.

Criminal Alien Program

A total of \$327,223,000 is provided for the Criminal Alien Program, including an increase of \$7,500,000 to mitigate the potential public safety challenge posed by the growing number of jurisdictions choosing not to honor ICE detainers on illegal aliens in their custody. Of primary concern is the release of aliens subject to removal who may pose a danger to the community, requiring ICE to expend additional resources and putting ICE personnel at greater risk when bringing the aliens back into custody. ICE is directed to publish on its website the list of jurisdictions failing to honor ICE detainers and to include details on individuals released as a result of these decisions, segmented by jurisdiction and level of criminality.

Alternatives to Detention

A total of \$109,740,000 is provided for the Alternatives to Detention (ATD) program, including an increase of \$15,878,000 to support the supervision of family units placed into removal proceedings after illegally crossing the border.

In recent years, ICE has taken steps to improve ATD cost-effectiveness through better guidance to ERO officers and agents on the factors to consider when determining appropriate placements in ATD. This has included guidance on when enrollment in ATD, transition to lower levels of supervision, or re-enrollment in ATD may be more or less effective depending on the particular stage in the removal process. ICE has also established additional performance measures to assess compliance with program requirements.

Beginning 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, ICE shall provide semi-annual briefings to the Committees on compliance rates for both the full-service and the technology-only ATD programs. These briefings shall include evaluations of the ATD

program by field office; a description of any plans for expansion of the program to additional field offices; and an update on the status of responding to recommendations by GAO (GAO-15-26) to collect additional compliance data and make better use of collected data to assess field office implementation of program guidance. In addition, in order to increase transparency on the use of ATD, ICE is expected to post on its website any contractor evaluations or OIG reports related to the program.

Transportation and Removal Program

A total of \$319,273,000 is provided for the Transportation and Removal Program. The amount includes an increase of \$26,000,000 to support the requirement to maintain 34,000 detention beds, and an increase of \$64,220,000

to support the transportation and removal costs for UAC and family units anticipated to enter the United States illegally in fiscal year 2015.

License Plate Readers

ICE is directed to establish, in coordination with OCRCL, an internal review process for any solicitation or request for proposal of a National License Plate Recognition database or other similar project, and to brief the Committees on this review process not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act. ICE is directed to include in the review process notification to the Committees prior to obligation of any funds for such a database or any similar project. Further, for any such database being established, ICE

shall undertake the required privacy impact assessment.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

As requested, a total of \$26,000,000 is provided for Automation Modernization.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

AVIATION SECURITY

A total of \$5,639,095,000 is provided for Aviation Security. In addition to the discretionary appropriation for Aviation Security, a mandatory appropriation totaling \$250,000,000 is available through the Aviation Security Capital Fund. Statutory language reflects the collection of \$2,065,000,000 from aviation security fees, as authorized.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Screening Partnership Program	\$154,572	\$166,666
Screener Personnel, Compensation, and Benefits	2,952,868	2,923,890
Screener Training and Other	226,290	225,442
Checkpoint Support	103,469	88,469
EDS Procurement/Installation	84,075	83,933
Screening Technology Maintenance	294,509	294,509
Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement	348,653	349,821
Airport Management and Support	591,734	587,657
Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew Training	20,000	22,365
Air Cargo	106,920	106,343
Federal Air Marshals	800,214	790,000
Aviation Security Capital Fund (Mandatory)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Total, Aviation Security	\$5,683,304	\$5,639,095

Screening Partnership Program

A total of \$166,666,000 is provided for the Screening Partnership Program (SPP), which reflects the estimated funding requirement for current and recently awarded SPP airports. TSA is expected to more proactively utilize the SPP, expeditiously approve the applications of airports seeking to participate in the program that meet legislatively mandated criteria, plan and manage toward a 12-month timeline for awarding applicable contracts for each new airport, and notify the Committees if it expects to obligate less than the appropriated amount.

TSA is directed to implement generally accepted accounting methodologies for cost and performance comparisons. As detailed in the House report, this includes, but is not limited to, appropriate, comprehensive, and accurate comparisons of Federal employee retirement costs and the administrative overhead associated with Federal screening services.

As detailed in the Senate report, TSA is directed to adjust its PPA lines and notify the Committees within 10 days to account for any changes in private screening contracts, including new awards under the SPP or the movement from privatized screening into Federal screening. TSA is to provide the Committees semi-annual reports on its execution of the SPP and the processing of applications for participation.

Screener Training and Other

A total of \$225,442,000 is provided for Screener Training and Other, including \$99,600,000 for Transportation Security Officer Training.

Checkpoint Support

A total of \$88,469,000 is provided for Checkpoint Support. The reduction below the request reflects the availability of balances that have remained unobligated for over seven years.

Explosives Detection Systems

A total of \$83,933,000 is provided for Explosives Detection Systems (EDS) Procurement and Installation. Including the existing man-

datory Aviation Security Capital Fund appropriation of \$250,000,000, the total appropriation for fiscal year 2015 for EDS procurement and installation is \$333,933,000.

For airports that are more than 12 months from construction and are able to demonstrate that certain high-speed EDS for checked baggage would be more efficient and result in long term cost savings compared to medium-speed systems, TSA shall consider lifting the current prohibition on the use of TSA funding for design and construction of such systems not yet on TSA's Qualified Products List.

Investment Plans for Air Cargo, Checkpoint Security, and EDS

As described in the Senate report and in lieu of language in the House bill, TSA is directed to brief the Committees, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on its fiscal year 2015 investment plans for checkpoint security and EDS refurbishment, procurement, and installation on an airport-by-airport basis. The briefing shall address specific technologies intended for purchase, program schedules and major milestones, a schedule for obligation of the funds, recapitalization priorities, the status of operational testing for each passenger screening technology under development, and a table detailing current unobligated balances and anticipated unobligated balances at the close of the fiscal year. The briefing shall also include details on passenger screening pilot programs that are in progress or being considered for implementation in fiscal year 2015. Further, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, TSA is directed to brief the Committees on its fiscal year 2015 investment plans for air cargo security. The expenditure plan briefings described under this heading are separate and distinct from the obligation and expenditure guidance noted in Title I of this statement.

Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement

A total of \$349,821,000 is provided for Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement.

Within this total, \$129,900,000 is provided for the National Explosives Detection Canine Team Program and \$70,550,000 is provided for Airport Law Enforcement and Assessments.

Federal Air Marshals

A total of \$790,000,000 is provided for the Federal Air Marshals (FAMS). The amount provided under this heading reflects current attrition rates, the consolidation of FAMS into Aviation Security, and the realignment of the remaining FAMS funding into the Surface Transportation Security appropriation.

The Department is required to deploy Federal Air Marshals on flights determined to present high security risks, and to make nonstop, long distance flights, including inbound international flights, a priority, as per 49 U.S.C. 44917. Therefore, TSA is expected to utilize personnel and deployment patterns to optimize coverage of flights to address known threats, minimize risk, and complement the full range of security resources deployed by the U.S. government. TSA is to brief the Committees on the optimal mix of FAMS personnel and the types and frequency of flights for which coverage should be provided. Other details are included within the classified annex.

As detailed in the Senate report, FAMS is to brief the Committees, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on its efforts to implement recommendations made in a recent study of operations and staffing by the Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

A total of \$123,749,000 is provided for Surface Transportation Security. Within the amount appropriated, \$94,519,000 is for the Surface Inspectors and Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response (VIPR) PPA, including a reduction of \$3,000,000 below the request to reduce the number of VIPR teams to 31, compared to the 33 requested in the budget.

INTELLIGENCE AND VETTING

A total of \$219,166,000 is provided for Intelligence and Vetting. To facilitate oversight,

TSA shall brief the Committees not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of

this Act on efforts to modernize vetting and credentialing infrastructure.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Direct Appropriations:		
Intelligence	\$51,801	\$51,545
Secure Flight	112,543	99,569
Other Vetting Programs	68,182	68,052
Subtotal, Direct Appropriations	232,526	219,166
Fee Collections:		
Transportation Worker Identification Credential Fee	34,832	34,832
Hazardous Material Fee	12,000	12,000
General Aviation at DCA Fee	350	350
Commercial Aviation and Airport Fee	6,500	6,500
Other Security Threat Assessment Fee	50	50
Air Cargo/Certified Cargo Screening Program Fee	7,173	7,173
TSA Pre-Check Application Program Fee	13,700	13,700
Alien Flight School Fees	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Fee Collections	79,605	79,605
Total, Intelligence and Vetting	\$312,131	\$298,771

Secure Flight

A total of \$99,569,000 is provided for Secure Flight. Due to delays in implementing the Large Aircraft and Charter Screening Program, the funding requested is not provided.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

A total of \$917,226,000 is provided for Transportation Security Support.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Headquarters Administration	\$275,891	\$269,100
Information Technology	451,920	449,000
Human Capital Services	204,215	199,126
Total, Transportation Security Support	\$932,026	\$917,226

The bill withholds \$25,000,000 from obligation until TSA submits to the Committees a report providing evidence that behavioral indicators can be successfully used to identify passengers who may pose a threat to aviation security, as well as a report addressing GAO's concerns with TSA's Advanced Imaging Technology program. TSA shall also brief the Committees on the specific actions being taken to address recent allegations of unethical activity involving the purchase and sale of firearms within FAMS.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

A total of \$7,043,318,000 is provided for Operating Expenses, including \$553,000,000 for defense activities, of which \$213,000,000 is designated for overseas contingency operations (OCO) and the global war on terrorism (GWOT). Funds provided in support of GWOT and OCO under this heading may be allocated without regard to section 503 in Title V of this Act. Pending the submission of the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) with the President's budget, the bill withholds from obligation \$85,000,000 of the appropriation.

The appropriated amount includes the following increases to the budget request: \$50,000,000 to reduce the backlog in critical depot level maintenance; \$7,800,000 to maintain one of the two High Endurance Cutters proposed for decommissioning; \$15,000,000 to restore operational hours and critical depot maintenance reductions; \$4,200,000 for counterdrug surge operations; \$2,200,000 to restore a Bravo Zero response capability; \$7,500,000 to restore unjustified cuts to mili-

tary special pays; \$1,000,000 to restore cuts to vessel boarding teams; \$2,500,000 to restore cuts to information technology programs; and \$2,740,000 to address an anticipated shortfall in small boat purchases. The appropriated amount also includes the request for the 2015 military pay increase.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Military Pay and Allowances	\$3,433,594	\$3,449,782
Civilian Pay and Benefits	787,372	781,517
Training and Recruiting	197,800	198,279
Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance	991,919	1,008,682
Centrally Managed Accounts	335,262	335,556
Intermediate and Depot Level Maintenance	1,003,786	1,056,502
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism	---	213,000
Total, Operating Expenses	\$6,749,733	\$7,043,318

Overseas Contingency Operations and Global War on Terrorism Funding

The bill includes funding for OCO/GWOT within the Coast Guard Operating Expenses appropriation instead of within funding provided to the Department of Defense. The Coast Guard is directed to brief the Committees not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act on any changes expected in the funding requirement for OCO/GWOT activities during fiscal year 2015. Further, the Coast Guard is directed to include details of its current and future support to Central Command in the classified annex of the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

Coast Guard Yard

The Coast Guard Yard located at Curtis Bay, Maryland, is recognized as a critical component of the Coast Guard's core logistics capability that directly supports fleet readiness. Sufficient industrial work should be assigned to the Yard to sustain this capability.

The Coast Guard shall provide a report on drydock facilities at the Coast Guard Yard, as directed in the Senate report.

National Housing Assessment

The Coast Guard shall submit, as part of the fiscal year 2016 budget request, the information directed in the Senate report concerning the National Housing Assessment.

Mission Needs Statement

Not later than July 1, 2015, the Commandant shall submit to the Committees a

new Mission Needs Statement (MNS), which will be used to inform the out-year CIP. The MNS should assume that the Coast Guard requires the capability to continue to carry out all of its eleven statutory missions.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Commandant shall submit to the Committees a revised Concept of Operations (CONOPS), which, in conjunction with the MNS, will be used as a planning document for the Coast Guard's re-capitalization needs. The CONOPS shall determine the most cost effective method of executing mission needs by addressing gaps identified in the MNS, addressing the funding requirements proposed in the five-year CIP, and providing options for reasonable combinations of alternative capabilities of air and surface assets, to include icebreaking resources and fleet mix.

Small Boat Purchases

The Department shall submit a report on fiscal year 2015 small boat purchases, as detailed in the Senate report. For fiscal year 2016, such information shall be included within the congressional budget justification. Further, the Coast Guard shall work with industry partners to outline annual small boat requirements and to better understand the cost implications of indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity purchase agreements.

Command and Control Aircraft

As directed in the Senate report, the Coast Guard shall notify the Committees of any changes in the type or number of its command and control aircraft. Further, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coast Guard shall brief the Committees on the path forward for future leases or purchases of such aircraft.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

A total of \$13,197,000 is provided for Environmental Compliance and Restoration.

RESERVE TRAINING

A total of \$114,572,000 is provided for Reserve Training.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

A total of \$1,225,223,000 is provided for Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements. The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$ 000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Vessels:		
Survey and Design—Vessel and Boats	\$500	\$500
In-Service Vessel Sustainment	24,500	49,000
National Security Cutter	638,000	632,847
Offshore Patrol Cutter	20,000	20,000
Fast Response Cutter	110,000	110,000
Cutter Boats	4,000	4,000
Polar Ice Breaking Vessel	6,000	—
Polar Icebreaker Preservation	—	8,000
Subtotal, Vessels	803,000	824,347
Aircraft:		
H-60 Airframe Replacement	—	12,000
HC-144 Conversion/Sustainment	15,000	15,000
HC-27J Conversion/Sustainment	15,000	20,000
HC-130J Acquisition/Conversion/Sustainment	8,000	103,000
HH-65 Conversion/Sustainment	30,000	30,000
Subtotal, Aircraft	68,000	180,000
Other Acquisition Programs:		
Program Oversight and Management	18,000	18,000
CAISR	36,300	36,300
CG—Logistics Information Management System	3,000	5,000
Subtotal, Other Acquisition Programs	57,300	59,300
Shore Facilities and Aids to Navigation:		
Major Construction: Housing; ATON; Survey & Design	19,580	19,580
Major Acquisition Systems Infrastructure	16,000	16,000
Minor Shore	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Shore Facilities and Aids to Navigation	40,580	40,580
Military Housing	—	6,000
Direct Personnel Costs	115,313	114,996
Total, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements	\$1,084,193	\$1,225,223

National Security Cutter

A total of \$632,847,000 is provided for the National Security Cutter (NSC) program. The total reflects a reduction of \$7,500,000 based upon previous production cost savings and updated execution data from the Coast Guard and \$3,953,000 for close out and other costs requested well ahead of need. Within the NSC total, \$6,300,000 is included for small unmanned aircraft systems.

Polar Icebreaker Preservation

As detailed in the Senate report, \$8,000,000 is included for the preservation of the Polar Sea in anticipation of a potential, future year reactivation.

Polar Ice Breaking Vessel

No additional funding is provided for the polar icebreaking program. Current program efforts for fiscal year 2015 are fully funded from prior year appropriations.

H-60 Airframe Replacement

A total of \$12,000,000 is provided to allow for the continued work on the remanufacture of H-60 helicopters.

HC-130J Aircraft

An additional \$95,000,000 is provided for one fully missionized HC-130J aircraft.

HC-27J Conversion/Sustainment

A total of \$20,000,000 is provided for the HC-27J Spartan aircraft program, to include an additional \$5,000,000 for aircraft spares.

Military Housing

A total of \$6,000,000 is provided for the recapitalization, improvement, and acquisition of housing to support military families. The Coast Guard shall provide to the Committees an expenditure plan for these funds in the shore facilities report required to be submitted not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(\$ 000)

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

A total of \$17,892,000 is provided for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation.

RETIRED PAY

A total of \$1,450,626,000 is provided for Retired Pay. The Coast Guard's Retired Pay appropriation is a mandatory budget activity.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

A total of \$1,615,860,000 is provided for Salaries and Expenses. Included in the amount is \$21,500,000 to begin preparation and training for presidential candidate nominee protection for the 2016 presidential election, including for protective vehicles and communications technology; and \$4,000,000 to establish the protective detail for the next former President.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Protection:		
Protection of Persons and Facilities	\$874,885	\$892,685
Protective Intelligence Activities	68,234	67,536
National Special Security Event Fund	4,500	4,500
Presidential Candidate Nominee Protection	25,500	25,500
Subtotal, Protection	973,119	990,221
Investigations:		
Domestic Field Operations	332,395	338,295
International Field Office Administration, Operations and Training	34,361	34,195
Support for Missing and Exploited Children	—	8,366
Subtotal, Investigations	366,756	380,856
Headquarters, Management and Administration	189,191	188,380
Rowley Training Center	55,868	55,378
Information Integration and Technology Transformation	1,036	1,025
Total, Salaries and Expenses	\$1,585,970	\$1,615,860

White House Complex Security

Recent incidents at the White House have raised serious concerns about the leadership and management of the Secret Service. In its Security Report on the White House Incur-sion Incident of September 19, 2014, the Department highlighted critical failures in information sharing and communications, confusion about operational protocols, and gaps in training at the White House Complex.

While some of these problems can be attributed to insufficient resources requested by DHS and the Office of Management and Budget, others are systemic and appear to reflect broader cultural challenges within the Secret Service. To begin addressing some of these shortfalls, the bill provides an additional \$25,000,000 in the Protection of Persons and Facilities PPA. These resources shall be used in part to support additional tactical

canine units and staff, assess and bolster security infrastructure at both the White House Complex and Vice President's Residence, and fund overtime and training. The Secret Service is directed to brief the Committees not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act on its plans for using these additional resources to provide the necessary security enhancements and training.

Professionalism Within the Workforce

As described in the House report, recurring allegations of misconduct within the Secret Service are deeply disappointing. The Secret Service is expected to take all steps necessary to ensure that it has in place the proper training and protocols to prevent similar incidents and to hold violators accountable for their actions. Accordingly, the bill withholds \$10,000,000 from obligation for Headquarters, Management and Administration until the Secret Service submits to the Committees, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report providing evidence that the Secret Service has sufficiently reviewed its professional standards of conduct; issued new guidance for the procedures and conduct of employees when engaged in overseas operations and protective missions; and instituted a professional standards policy consistent with the agency's critical missions and unique position of public trust.

Electronic Crimes Investigations and State and Local Cybercrime Training

As detailed in the House and Senate reports, a total of \$108,437,000 is provided for the Secret Service's various cyber activities, including electronic crimes investigations and state and local cybercrime training. Within this total, not less than \$12,000,000 is provided for the robust support and expansion of basic and advanced training for state and local law enforcement personnel, judges, and prosecutors to combat cybercrime.

National Special Security Event Fund

A total of \$4,500,000 is provided to defray costs associated with the Secret Service's statutory responsibility to direct the plan-

ning and coordination of National Special Security Events (NSSEs). As described in the House report, the Secret Service shall provide periodic updates on NSSEs planned for fiscal year 2015 prior to and following each event.

Technology Activities

The bill provides a total of \$1,025,000 for Information Integration and Technology Transformation activities of the Secret Service. The Secret Service is directed to brief the Committees on all Secret Service information technology activities to include the information previously required in the multi-year investment plan.

Strategic Human Capital Plan

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secret Service is directed to provide a strategic human capital plan for fiscal years 2015 through 2019 that aligns mission requirements with resource projections and delineates between protective and investigative missions. The plan shall address how projected resources can provide the appropriate combination of special agents and Uniformed Division officers to avoid routine leave restrictions, enable a regular schedule of mission-critical training, and provide appropriate levels of support staffing.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

A total of \$49,935,000 is provided for Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses, including \$5,380,000 for facilities and \$44,555,000 for investments in Information Integration and Technology Transformation programs.

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Infrastructure Protection:		
Infrastructure Analysis and Planning	\$63,999	\$64,494
Sector Management and Governance	63,136	64,961
Regional Field Operations	57,034	56,550
Infrastructure Security Compliance	86,976	85,027
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection	271,145	271,032
Cybersecurity and Communications:		
Cybersecurity:		
Cybersecurity Coordination	4,330	4,311
US Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) Operations	98,794	98,573
Federal Network Security	171,500	171,000
Network Security Deployment	377,690	377,000
Global Cybersecurity Management	17,613	25,873
Critical Infrastructure Cyber Protection and Awareness	70,963	70,919
Business Operations	5,554	5,524
Subtotal, Cybersecurity	746,444	753,200
Communications:		
Office of Emergency Communications	36,480	37,335
Priority Telecommunications Services	53,381	53,324
Next Generation Networks	69,571	53,293
Programs to Study and Enhance Telecommunications	10,106	10,092
Critical Infrastructure Protection Programs	10,439	10,403
Subtotal, Communications	179,977	164,447
Subtotal, Cybersecurity and Communications	926,421	917,647
Total, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security	\$1,197,566	\$1,188,679

Infrastructure Protection

It is critical that NPPD maintain a robust infrastructure information and analysis capability to guide decision-making that helps prevent and respond to incidents. Within the amount provided for Infrastructure Analysis and Planning, \$17,150,000 is for the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center; \$15,500,000 is for Vulnerability Assessments; and \$9,000,000 is for the Office of Bombing Prevention.

NPPD shall expand its efforts to strengthen the ability of government and private sector critical infrastructure partners to assess risks, coordinate programs and processes,

and execute risk management programs and activities. Accordingly, a total of \$64,961,000 is provided for Sector Management and Governance, which includes \$2,000,000 above the request to define agency needs, identify requirements for community-level critical infrastructure protection and resilience, and rapidly develop, test, and transition to use technologies that address needs and requirements.

As described in the Senate report, NPPD shall provide semi-annual reports on the implementation of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) program that include the numbers of facilities covered; inspectors; completed inspections; inspections

TITLE III—PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

A total of \$61,651,000 is provided for Management and Administration (M&A) of the National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD). The request to transfer 18 FTE from OBIM to the NPPD M&A PPA is denied; therefore, the \$2,914,000 for these FTE is included in the total provided for OBIM. The bill includes a new provision requiring NPPD to submit its fiscal year 2016 budget request by office and PPA. All information shall be submitted in the congressional budget justification and clearly demonstrate funding levels and projected program outcomes. NPPD is directed to brief the Committees quarterly on a plan for the obligation and expenditure of funds for all accounts, as specified under Title I of this statement.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

A total of \$1,188,679,000 is provided for Infrastructure Protection and Information Security (IPIS), of which \$225,000,000 is available until September 30, 2016.

A provision is included permitting the use of funds for Next Generation Networks activities if there are delays due to contract actions in other programs. The provision is provided to promote the best use of funds only if there are unavoidable delays in other critical activities.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

completed by region; pending inspections; days inspections are overdue; enforcement actions resulting from inspections; and enforcement actions overdue for resolution.

As described in the House and Senate reports, NPPD's excessive use of administratively uncontrollable overtime (AUO) was inappropriate. As a result, the President's budget request for Infrastructure Security Compliance has been reduced. NPPD shall brief the Committees on implementation of its new overtime policies and on overtime year-to-date and anticipated expenditures, not later than May 1, 2015.

Federal System Cybersecurity

The process of instituting base capabilities to secure the .gov domain remains onerous, prohibiting efficient implementation and the opportunity to make protections more broadly available to critical infrastructure operators and state and local governments. NPPD is directed to move as expeditiously as possible, working with the Tier I internet service providers, other partners, and Federal departments and agencies, to deploy intrusion prevention security systems and continuous diagnostics capabilities. As part of NPPD's quarterly briefings on obligations and expenditures, NPPD shall keep the Committees apprised of the deployment schedules associated with its major cybersecurity programs.

DHS has made progress through its collaborative efforts with Federal agencies in overcoming obstacles and implementing cybersecurity tools while safeguarding sensitive information. A recent agreement with the Census Bureau to use EINSTEIN services and the U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team should be used as a template for other Federal agencies that have been reticent to take advantage of EINSTEIN services because of concerns about protecting sensitive data.

Cybersecurity Workforce

A total of \$25,873,000 is provided for Global Cybersecurity Management, of which no less than \$15,810,000 is for cybersecurity education. As described in the Senate report, NPPD is directed to conduct a review of the feasibility and benefit (including cost savings and security) of using cybersecurity personnel and facilities outside of the National Capital Region to serve Federal and national needs. Findings of this review shall be reported to Congress not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

A total of \$1,342,606,000 is provided for the Federal Protective Service (FPS), as requested. This amount is fully offset by collections of security fees. Pursuant to the Senate report, the Secretary is directed to certify, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act that FPS will collect sufficient revenue and fees to fully fund operations and 1,371 FTE, including no less

than 1,007 in law enforcement, as requested in the budget. A provision is included requiring that a strategic human capital plan be submitted with the President's fiscal year 2016 budget proposal.

OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

A total of \$252,056,000 is provided for the Office of Biometric Identity Management (OBIM). The request to transfer 18 FTE from OBIM to the NPPD M&A PPA is denied; therefore, the \$2,914,000 for these FTE is included in the total provided for OBIM. Not less than \$25,382,000 is provided for IDENT system improvements and modernization efforts. OBIM is directed to brief the Committees on a plan for the obligation and expenditure of funds, as specified under Title I of this statement.

OBIM is directed to continue to brief the Committees semi-annually on its workload and service levels, staffing, modernization efforts, and other operations, with the first briefing not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. These briefings shall include an update on the estimated costs and schedule for replacing the current IDENT system and the schedule for enrolling TSA's special vetted populations and DHS employees and contractors into IDENT.

OBIM shall also continue semi-annual briefings on interagency coordination with the Departments of Justice, Defense, and State, and progress towards integrating the various biometric systems, including Unique Identity.

OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

A total of \$129,358,000 is provided for the Office of Health Affairs (OHA). Of the total amount, \$86,891,000 is for BioWatch; \$824,000 is for the Chemical Defense Program; \$10,500,000 is for the National Biosurveillance Integration Center (NBIC); \$4,995,000 is for Planning and Coordination; and \$26,148,000 is for Salaries and Expenses.

Biosurveillance Activities

The bill provides an increase of \$2,240,000 to begin replacement of aging BioWatch equipment to maintain current biodetection capabilities. OHA and the Science and Technology Directorate are directed to brief the Committees not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the path forward for BioWatch and biosurveillance programs.

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Administrative and Regional Offices	\$245,218	\$244,183
Office of National Capital Region Coordination	—	(3,400)
Preparedness and Protection	185,000	180,797
Response	167,376	175,986
Urban Search and Rescue Response System	(27,513)	(35,180)
Recovery	56,030	55,789
Mitigation	25,782	28,876
Mission Support	141,809	145,316
Centrally Managed Accounts	103,449	103,449
Total, Salaries and Expenses	\$924,664	\$934,396

Budget Justification

As directed in Title I of this explanatory statement, FEMA shall include funding and FTE information in the budget justifications for fiscal year 2016, to include the prior year actual funding level, an estimate for current year funding, and the request for the budget year for all PPAs, programs, and sub-programs.

Training Assessment

As directed in the Senate report under the State and Local Programs appropriation, FEMA shall brief the Committees on the results of the review of its training programs when completed. The briefing shall include

the requirements for attaining the personnel qualification levels dictated in the recent 2014–2018 FEMA Strategic Plan.

Automation Modernization

A total of \$4,000,000 is provided for automation modernization. In lieu of the direction by the Senate, the Administrator of FEMA and the DHS CIO shall brief the Committees on the expenditure plan for automation modernization to include the prior year actual funding level, an estimate for current year funding, and the request for the budget year.

National Biosurveillance Integration Center

The bill provides \$10,500,000 for NBIC, \$2,500,000 above the amount requested, including a total of \$3,400,000 to operationalize successful pilots funded in prior years. Prior to obligating this operationalization funding, OHA shall brief the Committees on its evaluation of the NBIC pilot projects and its proposal to operationalize successful pilots, including the resulting capability enhancements and funding requirements for those activities in fiscal year 2015 and future years.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

A total of \$934,396,000 is provided for Salaries and Expenses. Within the total, not less than: \$2,000,000 is for the Emergency Management Assistance Compact; \$4,199,515 is for the National Hurricane Program; \$8,500,000 is for the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program; \$9,100,000 is for the National Dam Safety Program; and \$4,000,000 is for automation modernization. Of the total, \$30,000,000 is for capital improvements to the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center. A provision is included providing funding related to modernization of automated systems.

It is noted that the reprogramming notification requirements delineated in section 503 of this Act apply to the movement of funds between and among programs, projects, or activities (PPAs). In that regard, while the funding table included at the end of this statement provides guidance on reprogramming control levels, section 503 notification requirements also apply to funding amounts referenced in budget justification materials, Committee reports, and “new starts,” defined as any significant new activity that has not been explicitly justified to the Congress in budget justification material and appropriated by the Congress during the normal budget process. When determining which movements of funds are subject to section 503, FEMA is reminded to follow GAO's definition of “program, project, or activity” as detailed in the GAO's A Glossary of Terms Used in the Federal Budget Process.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

Roles and Missions Review of Regional Offices

The FEMA Administrator is encouraged to conduct an assessment that shall provide advice and recommendations regarding the appropriate roles and missions of the FEMA Regional Offices for the purpose of maximizing the Agency's ability to carry out authorized activities and determining budgetary requirements. The assessment will seek to identify and distinguish, in consideration of each region's unique requirements due to geography, demographics, and other factors, which FEMA Regional Office roles, missions, and functions might be added or

enhanced; maintained at current levels of performance; reduced, eliminated, or moved; or better performed by private organizations (by contract or otherwise), public authorities, local or state governments, or other Federal agencies. The assessment will be completed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

DHS Unity of Effort

Associated with the Department's Unity of Effort initiative, \$1,138,000 is realigned from the DHS Office of Policy to the Mitigation PPA for the Resilience STAR program; \$900,000 is realigned from the DHS Office of Operations Coordination and Planning (OPS) to the Response PPA for the Very Small Ap-

erture Terminal (VSAT) project; and \$500,000 is realigned from OPS to the Response PPA for the Interagency Modeling and Atmospheric Center.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

A total of \$1,500,000,000 is provided for State and Local Programs, to be distributed by PPA as follows:

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
State Homeland Security Grant Program	---	\$467,000
Operation Stonegarden	---	(55,000)
Urban Area Security Initiative	---	600,000
Nonprofit Security Grants	---	(13,000)
Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance	---	100,000
Amtrak Security	---	(10,000)
Over-the-Road Bus Security	---	(3,000)
Port Security Grants	---	100,000
Subtotal, Discretionary Grants	---	1,267,000
Education, Training, and Exercises:		
Emergency Management Institute	---	20,569
Center for Domestic Preparedness	---	64,991
National Domestic Preparedness Consortium	---	98,000
National Exercise Program	---	19,919
Continuing Training	---	29,521
Subtotal, Education, Training, and Exercises	---	233,000
National Preparedness Grant Program	\$1,043,200	---
First Responder Assistance Program:		
Emergency Management Performance Grants	350,000	---
Fire Grants	335,000	---
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants	335,000	---
Training Partnership Grants	60,000	---
Education, Training, and Exercises	102,269	---
Subtotal, First Responder Assistance Program	1,182,269	---
Total, State and Local Programs	\$2,225,469	\$1,500,000

¹ Funds appropriated in separate accounts.

Provisions are included specifying timeframes for grant awards, limiting grantee administrative costs to five percent of the total amount of each grant, permitting the construction of communication towers under certain conditions, requiring reports from grantees as necessary, and permitting the use of certain funds for security buffer zones at FEMA facilities.

Education, Training, and Exercises

A total of \$233,000,000 is provided for Education, Training, and Exercises. Within the total, \$29,521,000 is for Continuing Training, including \$3,500,000 for rural first responder training and not less than \$2,000,000 for hazardous materials training.

Urban Area Security Initiative

Consistent with the 9/11 Act, FEMA shall conduct risk assessments for the 100 most populous metropolitan areas prior to making Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant awards. Because most of the cumulative national terrorism risk to urban areas is focused on a relatively small number of cities, it is expected that UASI funding will be limited to urban areas representing up to 85 percent of such risk and that resources will continue to be allocated in proportion to risk.

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

A total of \$680,000,000 is provided for Firefighter Assistance Grants, including \$340,000,000 in grants for firefighter equipment, protective gear, emergency vehicles, training and other resources, and \$340,000,000 for firefighter staffing grants.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

A total of \$350,000,000 is provided for Emergency Management Performance Grants.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

Statutory language is included providing for the receipt and expenditure of fees collected, as authorized by Public Law 105-276.

UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

A total of \$44,000,000 is provided for the United States Fire Administration.

DISASTER RELIEF FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

A total of \$7,033,464,494 is provided for the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF), of which \$6,437,792,622 is designated as being for disaster relief for major disasters pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. A provision is included transferring \$24,000,000 to the OIG for audits and investigations related to all disasters.

A general provision is included in Title V of this Act rescinding \$375,000,000 from amounts provided for non-major disaster response in prior years due to the significant balances carried over from fiscal year 2014 and amounts recovered from previous disasters during project closeouts. The remaining balances, combined with the amount appropriated in this bill, fully fund all known requirements, to include recovery from Hurricane Sandy, the Colorado wildfires, the Oklahoma tornadoes, and other previous disasters, as well as an estimate of relief efforts for future disasters.

In lieu of direction in the House report directing FEMA to provide a report on the Public Assistance Alternative Procedures Program to certain committees, FEMA shall provide the report to Congress.

As directed in Title I of this statement, FEMA shall include in the budget justification for fiscal year 2016 a detailed justification for all categories funded with base discretionary funding, including a detailed obligation plan for the Disaster Readiness Support (DRS) program. Additionally, FEMA shall provide briefings on the obligation and expenditure of DRS funding not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act and semi-annually thereafter.

FEMA is directed to continue rigorous efforts to prevent improper payments to citi-

zens seeking disaster assistance. Reclaiming funds from individuals during a financially fragile time is destructive and can leave families in ruin. If an improper payment is made, FEMA shall implement the appeals process efficiently and pay diligent attention to overpayments made due to FEMA's error. If the improper payment cannot be forgiven, FEMA shall work with individuals based on ability to make the repayment.

FEMA shall make every effort to assist Federal agencies, including HUD, to find acceptable proof of work for completion of home elevations.

FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING AND RISK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

A total of \$100,000,000 is provided for Flood Hazard Mapping and Risk Analysis.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

A total of \$179,294,000 is provided for the National Flood Insurance Fund, for which administrative costs shall not exceed four percent.

FEMA is encouraged to promote more extensive use of the Community Rating System (CRS) nationwide. FEMA is directed to dedicate resources for robust implementation of CRS and to continue working with institutions with expertise in floodplain management and disaster risk management that can provide direct technical assistance to communities to develop applications.

NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND

A total of \$25,000,000 is provided for the National Predisaster Mitigation Fund, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

A total of \$120,000,000 is provided for the Emergency Food and Shelter (EFS) program, of which administrative costs shall not exceed 3.5 percent. A provision, as proposed in the budget request, is not included for the FEMA Administrator to transfer the funding and administrative responsibility for EFS to

the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). While the proposal to transfer EFS to HUD has merits, outreach with appropriate stakeholders is required to ensure a successful transition. Should such a transfer be proposed in future budget requests, it is expected that FEMA and HUD will have a comprehensive outreach strategy as well as a full transition plan as part of such proposal.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES
UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES
E-Verify

A total of \$124,435,000 is provided in discretionary appropriations for E-Verify.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

A total of \$230,497,000 is provided for Salaries and Expenses. The amount available for official reception and representation expenses, \$7,180, reflects recent historic expenditures for this purpose. FLETC is directed to brief the Committees on a plan for the obligation and expenditure of funds, as specified under Title I of this statement.

ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

A total of \$27,841,000 is provided for Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses. FLETC shall submit, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, an updated five-year comprehensive master plan for its four training centers.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

A total of \$129,993,000 is provided for Management and Administration. This amount includes funds realigned from the DHS Office of Operations Coordination and Planning for the S&T NextGen Air Transportation System, as part of the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

A total of \$973,915,000 is provided for Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations. In lieu of quarterly reports, the Science and Technology Directorate (S&T) is directed to provide semi-annual briefings to the Committees on the review and prioritization of each S&T-funded R&D project, including documentation on how each newly-funded project meets S&T's prioritization and funding criteria.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Research, Development, and Innovation ..	\$433,788	\$457,499
Laboratory Facilities	435,180	434,989
Acquisition and Operations Support	41,703	41,703
University Programs	31,000	39,724
Total, Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations	\$941,671	\$973,915

Research, Development, and Innovation

A total of \$457,499,000 is provided for Research, Development, and Innovation. S&T is directed to brief the Committees not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the proposed allocation of funds by project and thrust area, and to provide quarterly status briefings on the plan and any changes from the original allocation.

Cybersecurity Research
The House and Senate reports both emphasized cybersecurity research as a strong pri-

ority. In addition, the Department is strongly encouraged to expand its work with cyber research infrastructure test beds and accompanying cyber education.

Apex Projects

As directed in both the House and Senate reports, S&T shall brief the Committees not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the Apex funding allocation by project and on progress made to field improved technologies.

National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility
The bill provides \$434,989,000 for Laboratory Facilities, of which \$300,000,000 is for construction of the National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility.

Component Liaison Program
Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, S&T shall submit a plan to the Committees on the proposed structure of a liaison program that establishes a permanent mechanism for interaction between S&T and the components.

University Programs
A total of \$39,724,000 is provided for University Programs, which will allow S&T to fund all existing centers at an appropriate level and the new center expected to be awarded in fiscal year 2015. S&T shall brief the Committees not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the status of competitively selecting the new center.

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

A total of \$37,339,000 is provided for Management and Administration. As directed in the Senate report, in lieu of an annual report, DNDO shall brief the Committees annually on the Department's strategic investment plan, including DNDO's ability to surge capabilities with Federal, state, and local level assets to respond to suspected radiological threats.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATIONS

A total of \$197,900,000 is provided for Research, Development, and Operations. Included in this amount is an increase of \$1,000,000 above the request to restore cuts to the National Nuclear Forensics Expertise Development Program.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Systems Engineering and Architecture	\$17,924	\$17,000
Systems Development	22,000	21,400
Transformational Research and Development	69,500	69,500
Assessments	38,079	38,000
Operations Support	31,565	31,000
National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center	20,000	21,000
Total, Research, Development, and Operations	\$199,068	\$197,900

SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

The bill provides a total of \$72,603,000 for Systems Acquisition.

The amount provided for this appropriation by PPA is as follows:

(\$000)

	Budget Estimate	Final Bill
Radiation Portal Monitor Program	\$5,000	\$5,000
Securing the Cities	12,000	19,000
Human Portable Radiation Detection Systems	50,861	48,603
Total, Systems Acquisition	\$67,861	\$72,603

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 501. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that no part of any appropriation shall remain available for obligation beyond the current year unless expressly provided.

Section 502. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that unexpended balances of prior appropriations may be merged with new appropriation accounts and used for the same purpose, subject to reprogramming guidelines.

Section 503. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that limits authority to reprogram appropriations within an account and provides authority to transfer up to five percent between appropriations accounts with 15-day advance notification to the Committees. Congressional control levels for reprogramming purposes include, but are not limited to, the amounts identified in the detailed funding table located at the end of this statement. These reprogramming guidelines shall be complied with by all agencies funded by this Act.

The Department shall submit reprogramming requests on a timely basis and provide complete explanations of the reallocations proposed, including detailed justifications of the increases and offsets, and any specific impact the proposed changes will have on the budget request for the following fiscal year and future-year appropriations requirements. Each request submitted to the Committees should include a detailed table showing the proposed revisions at the account, program, project, and activity level to the funding and staffing (full-time equivalent position) levels for the current fiscal year and to the levels requested in the President's budget for the following fiscal year.

The Department shall manage its programs and activities within the levels appropriated. The Department should only submit reprogramming or transfer requests in the case of an unforeseeable emergency or situation that could not have been predicted when formulating the budget request for the current fiscal year. When the Department submits a reprogramming or transfer request to the Committees and does not receive identical responses from the House and Senate, it is the responsibility of the Department to reconcile the House and Senate differences before proceeding and, if reconciliation is not possible, to consider the reprogramming or transfer request not approved.

Unless an initial notification has been provided, the Department is not to submit a reprogramming or transfer of funds notification after June 30 except in extraordinary circumstances that imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property. If a reprogramming or transfer is needed after June 30, the submittal should contain sufficient documentation as to why it meets this statutory exception.

Section 504. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that prohibits funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department to make payment to the Working Capital Fund (WCF), except for activities and amounts allowed in the President's fiscal year 2015 request. Funds provided to the WCF are available until expended. The Department can only charge components for direct usage of the WCF and these funds may be used only for the purposes consistent with the contributing component. Any funds paid in advance or reimbursed must reflect the full cost of each service. The Department shall submit a notification for the addition or removal of any activity to the fund and shall submit quarterly execution reports with activity level detail.

Section 505. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining at the end of fiscal year 2015 from appropriations made for salaries and expenses shall remain available through fiscal year 2016 subject to section 503 reprogramming guidelines.

Section 506. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized during fiscal year 2015 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2015.

Section 507. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and modified requiring notification of the Committees three days before grant allocations, grant awards, contract awards, other transactional agreements, letters of intent, a task or delivery order on a multiple contract award totaling \$1,000,000 or more, a task or delivery order greater than \$10,000,000 from multi-year funds, or sole-source grant awards, are announced by the Department, including contracts covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation. The Department is required to brief the Committees five full business days prior to announcing the intention to make a grant under State and Local Programs. Notification shall include a description of the project or projects to be funded, including city, county, and state.

Section 508. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease additional facilities for Federal law enforcement training without advance approval of the Committees.

Section 509. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that none of the funds may be used for any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required under chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, has not been approved.

Section 510. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that consolidates by reference prior year statutory bill language into one provision. These provisions relate to contracting officer's technical representative training; sensitive security information; and the use of funds in conformance with section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Section 511. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that none of the funds may be used in contravention of the Buy American Act.

Section 512. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued regarding the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 513. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and modified requiring the Chief Financial Officer to submit monthly budget execution and staffing reports within 30 days after the close of each month.

Section 514. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and modified directing that any funds appropriated or transferred to TSA's Aviation Security, Administration, and Transportation Security Support appropriations in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 that are recovered or deobligated shall be available only for procurement and installation of explosives detection systems, air cargo, baggage, and checkpoint screening systems, subject to notification. Semi-annual reports must be submitted identifying any funds that are recovered or deobligated.

Section 515. A provision proposed by the Senate is included regarding competitive

sourcing for USCIS. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 516. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued for fiscal year 2015 requiring that any funds appropriated to the Coast Guard's 110–123 foot patrol boat conversion that are recovered, collected, or otherwise received as a result of negotiation, mediation, or litigation, shall be available until expended for the Fast Response Cutter program.

Section 517. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued classifying the functions of the instructor staff at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center as inherently governmental for purposes of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act.

Section 518. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued regarding grants or contracts awarded by any means other than full and open competition. The Inspector General is required to review Departmental contracts awarded noncompetitively and report on the results to the Committees.

Section 519. A provision proposed by the House is included that prohibits funding pertaining to the Principal Federal Official during a Stafford Act declared disaster or emergency, with certain exceptions. The Senate proposed no similar provision.

Section 520. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that precludes DHS from using funds in this Act to carry out reorganization authority. This prohibition is not intended to prevent the Department from carrying out routine or small reallocations of personnel or functions within components, subject to section 503 of this Act. This language prevents large scale reorganization of the Department, which should be acted on legislatively by the relevant congressional committees of jurisdiction.

Section 521. A provision proposed by the Senate is included prohibiting the Secretary from reducing operations within the Coast Guard's Civil Engineering Program except as specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 522. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that prohibits funding to grant an immigration benefit to any individual unless the results of the background checks required in statute, to be completed prior to the grant of the benefit, have been received by DHS.

Section 523. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued extending other transactional authority for DHS through fiscal year 2015.

Section 524. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued requiring the Secretary to link all contracts that provide award fees to successful acquisition outcomes.

Section 525. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued regarding waivers of the Jones Act.

Section 526. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued related to prescription drugs.

Section 527. A provision proposed by the Senate is included prohibiting funds from being used to reduce the Coast Guard's Operations Systems Center mission or its government-employed or contract staff. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 528. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued requiring the Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury, to notify the Committees of any proposed transfers from the Department of Treasury Forfeiture Fund to any agency

within DHS. No funds may be obligated until the Committees approve the proposed transfers.

Section 529. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting funds for planning, testing, piloting, or developing a national identification card.

Section 530. A provision proposed by the Senate is included prohibiting funds to be used to conduct or implement the results of a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 with respect to the Coast Guard National Vessel Documentation Center. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 531. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that requires a report to be posted on the FEMA website summarizing damage assessment information used to determine whether to declare a major disaster.

Section 532. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued directing that any official required by this Act to report or to certify to the Committees on Appropriations may not delegate any such authority unless expressly authorized to do so in this Act.

Section 533. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting the use of funds for the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Section 534. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting funds in this Act to be used for first-class travel.

Section 535. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting funds to be used to employ illegal workers as described in Section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 536. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and made permanent relating to the proper disposal of personal information collected through the Registered Traveler program.

Section 537. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to pay for award or incentive fees for contractors with below satisfactory performance or performance that fails to meet the basic requirements of the contract.

Section 538. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that requires any new processes developed to screen aviation passengers and crews for transportation or national security to consider privacy and civil liberties, consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.

Section 539. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that permits the allocation of funds for an immigrant integration grants program. The grants shall be used to provide services to individuals who have been lawfully admitted into the U.S. for permanent residence.

Section 540. A provision proposed by the Senate is included providing a total of \$48,600,000 for consolidation of the new DHS headquarters at St. Elizabeths and related mission support activities. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 541. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for DHS to enter into a Federal contract unless the contract meets requirements of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 or chapter 137 of title 10 U.S.C., and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the contract is otherwise authorized by statute without regard to this section.

Section 542. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified providing \$34,072,000 for financial systems modernization activities to be allocated by the Secretary and allowing the Secretary to transfer financial systems modernization funds made available by this Act between appropriations after notifying the Committees 15 days in advance. Funding is available for two years.

Section 543. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued providing flexibility to the Department in responding to an immigration emergency, subject to notification.

Section 544. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued permitting the Department to sell ICE-owned detention facilities and use the proceeds from any sale for improvement to other facilities provided that any such sale will not result in the maintenance of fewer than 34,000 detention beds.

Section 545. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and modified pertaining to multi-year investment and management plans for certain activities within CBP and ICE.

Section 546. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and modified stating that the Secretary shall ensure enforcement of all immigration laws.

Section 547. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified regarding Federal Network Security.

Section 548. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued regarding restrictions on electronic access to pornography, except for law enforcement purposes.

Section 549. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued regarding the transfer of firearms by Federal law enforcement personnel.

Section 550. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued prohibiting any funds from this or any other Act to be used for creation of the National Preparedness Grant Program or any successor grant programs unless explicitly authorized by Congress.

Section 551. A provision proposed by the House is included prohibiting funds for the position of Public Advocate or a successor position within ICE. The Senate proposed no similar provision.

Section 552. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified amending Division F of Public Law 113-76, and Division D of Public Law 113-6, regarding reimbursable public-private partnerships and donation authority related to CBP port of entry operations.

Section 553. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued regarding funding restrictions and reporting requirements related to conferences occurring outside of the United States.

Section 554. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that prohibits funds made available by this Act to reimburse any Federal department or agency for its participation in a NSSE.

Section 555. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified

requiring certification to Congress for new air preclearance operations.

Section 556. A provision proposed by the House is included prohibiting any funds from this or any other Act to be used to require airport operators to provide airport-financed staffing to monitor exit points from the sterile area of any airport at which TSA provided such monitoring as of December 1, 2013. The Senate proposed no similar provision.

Section 557. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued providing the Secretary discretion to waive certain provisions of law related to requirements for Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grants.

Section 558. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that prohibits the collection of new land border fees or the study of the imposition of such border fees.

Section 559. A provision proposed by the Senate is included pertaining to the temporary reemployment of administrative law judges for arbitration dispute resolution. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 560. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued that clarifies that fees collected pursuant to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement are available until expended.

Section 561. A provision proposed by the Senate is included related to user fee proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to submission of the budget. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 562. A provision proposed by the House is included requiring the Secretary to report on the Department's requirements for and usage of weapons. The Senate proposed no similar provision.

Section 563. A provision proposed by the House is included which prohibits funds from being used for environmental remediation of LORAN support in a specified location. The Senate proposed no similar provision.

Section 564. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included directing the inclusion of budget justification for any structural pay reform that affects more than 100 FTE positions or costs more than \$5,000,000.

Section 565. A provision proposed by the Senate is included and modified directing the Department to post on a public website reports required by the Committees on Appropriations unless public posting compromises homeland or national security or contains proprietary information. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 566. A provision proposed by the Senate is included repealing section 605 of Public Law 110-161 related to land border port of entry technology demonstration projects. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 567. A provision proposed by the Senate is included regarding a transfer to the Disaster Relief Fund from the Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program. The transfer has no impact on ongoing loan determinations. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 568. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included deeming a

Transportation Security Officer, who died as the direct result of an injury sustained in the line of duty on November 13, 2013, as having been a public safety officer for the purposes of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Section 569. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included requiring OMB and DHS to include in budget justifications budget estimates for costs related to UAC.

Section 570. A provision proposed by the Senate is included regarding the Fire Management Assistance Grant Program. The House proposed no similar provision.

Section 571. A new provision is included regarding reprogramming and transfer authority for CBP and ICE Salaries and Expenses accounts related to the care and transportation of unaccompanied alien children.

Section 572. A new provision is included making costs of providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and to alien adults and their minor children an eligible use for certain Homeland Security grants to Southwest border recipients for fiscal years 2013 and 2014. State and local costs to include the costs of personnel, overtime and travel related to enhancing border security are already eligible expenses under the major Homeland Security grant programs; however, costs associated with the immediate care and transportation of UAC and families that were incurred by state and local jurisdictions would otherwise not be eligible.

The influx of UAC and families that came across the Southwest border overwhelmed Federal resources and put a burden on state and local jurisdictions, particularly small counties along the border. This created not only a humanitarian crisis but also a greater vulnerability to terrorism and other security risks to our Nation.

RESCISSIONS

Section 573. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified rescinding unobligated balances from specified programs.

Section 574. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified rescinding specified funds from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund.

Section 575. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is included and modified rescinding unobligated balances from legacy programs.

Section 576. A new provision is included rescinding unobligated lapsed balances from DHS programs.

Section 577. A provision proposed by the House and Senate is continued and modified rescinding unobligated balances from FEMA DRF.

Section 578. A new provision is included that allows that the explanatory statement regarding this Act, printed in the House of Representatives section of the Congressional Record, shall have the same effect with respect to the allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS					
Departmental Operations					
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	4,050	3,950	7,939	+3,889	+3,989
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	1,750	1,751	1,740	-10	-11
Office of the Chief of Staff.....	2,050	2,112	2,782	+732	+670
Executive Secretary.....	7,400	7,719	5,589	-1,811	-2,130
Office of Policy.....	36,500	38,470	38,073	+1,573	-397
Office of Public Affairs.....	8,550	8,741	5,591	-2,959	-3,150
Office of Legislative Affairs.....	5,350	5,583	5,403	+53	-180
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs / Partnership and Engagement.....	2,250	2,429	9,848	+7,598	+7,419
Office of General Counsel.....	19,750	21,310	19,950	+200	-1,360
Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.....	21,500	22,003	21,800	+300	-203
Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman.....	5,250	6,428	5,825	+575	-603
Privacy Officer.....	7,950	8,273	8,033	+83	-240
Subtotal.....	122,350	128,769	132,573	+10,223	+3,804
Office of the Under Secretary for Management:					
Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Management.....	2,700	2,757	2,740	+40	-17
Office of the Chief Security Officer.....	64,000	63,597	64,308	+308	+711

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer.....	65,000	64,036	60,107	-4,893	-3,929
Subtotal.....	131,700	130,390	127,155	-4,545	-3,235
Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	22,000	21,253	20,944	-1,056	-309
Human Resources Information Technology.....	7,815	9,878	6,000	-1,815	-3,878
Subtotal.....	29,815	31,131	26,944	-2,871	-4,187
Office of the Chief Readiness Support Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	30,000	29,272	28,911	-1,089	-361
Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC).....	4,500	4,493	4,493	-7	---
Subtotal.....	34,500	33,765	33,404	-1,096	-361
Subtotal, Office of the Under Secretary for Management.....	196,015	195,286	187,503	-8,512	-7,783
DHS Headquarters Consolidation:					
Mission support.....	---	15,300	---	---	-15,300
St. Elizabeths.....	---	57,700	---	---	-57,700
Total, DHS Headquarters Consolidation.....	---	73,000	---	---	-73,000

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	46,000	94,626	52,020	+6,020	-42,606
Office of the Chief Information Officer:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	115,000	95,444	99,028	-15,972	+3,584
Information Technology Services.....	34,000	38,627	68,298	+34,298	+29,671
Infrastructure and Security Activities.....	45,000	52,140	52,640	+7,640	+500
Homeland Secure Data Network.....	63,156	70,132	68,156	+5,000	-1,976
Subtotal.....	257,156	256,343	288,122	+30,966	+31,779
Analysis and Operations.....	300,490	302,268	255,804	-44,686	-46,464
Total, Departmental Operations.....	922,011	1,050,292	916,022	-5,989	-134,270
Office of Inspector General:					
Operating Expenses.....	115,437	121,457	118,617	+3,180	-2,840
(by transfer from Disaster Relief).....	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	-	-
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	139,437	145,457	142,617	+3,180	-2,840
Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations.....	1,037,448	1,171,749	1,034,639	-2,809	-137,110
(by transfer).....	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	-	-

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request

TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS					

U.S. Customs and Border Protection					

Salaries and Expenses:					
Headquarters, Management, and Administration:					
Commissioner.....	23,656	27,245	27,151	+3,495	-94
Chief Counsel.....	42,921	45,663	45,483	+2,562	-180
Congressional Affairs.....	2,466	2,514	2,504	+38	-10
Internal Affairs.....	149,061	140,141	139,493	-9,568	-648
Public Affairs.....	11,934	13,064	13,009	+1,075	-55
Training and Development.....	76,082	71,926	71,585	-4,497	-341
Tech, Innovation, Acquisition.....	22,788	25,374	25,277	+2,489	-97
Intelligence/Investigative Liaison.....	60,747	61,512	62,235	+1,488	+723
Administration.....	403,473	386,793	382,870	-20,603	-3,923
Rent.....	405,802	409,490	598,593	+192,791	+189,103
Subtotal.....	1,198,930	1,183,722	1,368,200	+169,270	+184,478

Border Security Inspections and Trade Facilitation:					
Inspections, Trade, and Travel Facilitation					
at Ports of Entry.....	2,856,573	2,830,872	2,810,524	-46,049	-20,348
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection (trust fund)...	3,274	3,274	3,274	---	---
International Cargo Screening.....	67,461	69,173	68,902	+1,441	-271
Other International Programs.....	24,000	25,706	25,548	+1,548	-158
Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism					
(C-TPAT).....	40,912	40,841	41,619	+707	+778
Trusted Traveler Programs.....	5,811	5,811	5,811	---	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Inspection and Detection Technology Investments.	112,004	123,866	122,811	+10,807	-1,055
National Targeting Center.....	65,106	70,592	74,623	+9,517	+4,031
Training.....	40,703	33,906	33,880	-6,823	-26
Subtotal.....	3,215,844	3,204,041	3,186,992	-28,852	-17,049
Border Security and Control Between Ports of Entry:					
Border Security and Control.....	3,675,236	3,882,015	3,848,074	+172,838	-33,941
Training.....	55,558	56,608	56,391	+833	-217
Subtotal.....	3,730,794	3,938,623	3,904,465	+173,671	-34,158
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses.....	8,145,568	8,326,386	8,459,657	+314,089	+133,271
Appropriations.....	(8,142,294)	(8,323,112)	(8,456,383)	(+314,089)	(+133,271)
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.....	(3,274)	(3,274)	(3,274)	---	---
Small Airport User Fee (permanent indefinite discretionary appropriation).....	5,000	9,000	9,000	+4,000	---
Automation Modernization:					
Information Technology.....	358,655	365,700	362,094	+3,439	-3,606
Automated Targeting Systems.....	116,932	109,273	109,230	-7,702	-43
Automated Commercial Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS).....	140,762	141,061	140,970	+208	-91
Current Operations Protection and Processing Support (COPPS).....	200,174	196,376	195,875	-4,299	-501
Subtotal.....	816,523	812,410	808,169	-8,354	-4,241

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Border Security, Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology (BSFIT):					
Development and Deployment.....	160,435	110,594	125,594	-34,841	+15,000
Operations and Maintenance.....	191,019	251,872	256,872	+65,853	+5,000
Subtotal.....	351,454	362,466	382,466	+31,012	+20,000
Air and Marine Operations:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	286,818	293,016	299,800	+12,982	+6,784
Operations and Maintenance.....	392,000	362,669	397,669	+5,669	+35,000
Procurement.....	126,250	53,000	53,000	-73,250	---
Subtotal.....	805,068	708,685	750,469	-54,599	+41,784
Construction and Facilities Management:					
Facilities Construction and Sustainment.....	375,398	385,137	205,393	-170,005	-179,744
Program Oversight and Management.....	80,880	97,068	83,428	+2,548	-13,640
Subtotal.....	456,278	482,205	288,821	-167,457	-193,384
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection Direct Appropriations.....	10,579,891	10,701,152	10,698,582	+118,691	-2,570

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Fee Accounts:					
Immigration Inspection User Fee.....	(598,552)	(630,218)	(630,218)	(+31,666)	---
Immigration Enforcement Fines.....	(773)	(752)	(752)	(-21)	---
Electronic System for Travel Authorization Fee.....	(55,168)	(54,929)	(54,929)	(-239)	---
Land Border Inspection Fee.....	(42,941)	(43,931)	(43,931)	(+990)	---
COBRA Passenger Inspection Fee.....	(500,134)	(482,501)	(482,501)	(-17,633)	---
APHIS Inspection Fee.....	(355,216)	(464,514)	(464,514)	(+109,298)	---
Global Entry User Fee.....	(34,835)	(91,192)	(91,192)	(+56,357)	---
Puerto Rico Collections.....	(98,602)	(98,076)	(98,076)	(-526)	---
Virgin Island Fee.....	(11,302)	(11,789)	(11,789)	(+487)	---
Customs Unclaimed Goods.....	(5,992)	(5,992)	(5,992)	---	---
Subtotal, Fee Accounts.....	(1,703,515)	(1,883,894)	(1,883,894)	(+180,379)	---
Total, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.....	12,283,406	12,585,046	12,582,476	+299,070	-2,570
Appropriations.....	(10,579,891)	(10,701,152)	(10,698,582)	(+118,691)	(-2,570)
Fee Accounts.....	(1,703,515)	(1,883,894)	(1,883,894)	(+180,379)	---
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Headquarters Management and Administration:					
Personnel Compensation and Benefits, Services	191,909	198,602	197,002	+5,093	-1,600
and Other Costs.....	143,808	150,927	150,419	+6,611	-508
Headquarters Managed IT Investment.....					
Subtotal.....	335,717	349,529	347,421	+11,704	-2,108

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Legal Proceedings.....	205,584	214,731	217,393	+11,809	+2,662
Investigations:					
Domestic Investigations.....	1,672,220	1,644,552	1,699,811	+27,591	+55,259
International Investigations:					
International Operations.....	99,741	101,228	110,682	+10,941	+9,454
Visa Security Program.....	31,541	31,854	49,526	+17,985	+17,672
Subtotal.....	131,282	133,082	160,208	+28,926	+27,126
Subtotal, Investigations.....	1,803,502	1,777,634	1,860,019	+56,517	+82,385
Intelligence.....	74,298	77,045	76,479	+2,181	-566
Enforcement and Removal Operations:					
Custody Operations.....	1,993,770	1,791,913	2,532,593	+538,823	+740,680
Fugitive Operations.....	128,802	131,591	142,615	+13,813	+11,024
Criminal Alien Program.....	294,155	322,407	327,223	+33,068	+4,816
Alternatives to Detention.....	91,444	94,106	109,740	+18,296	+15,634
Transportation and Removal Program.....	276,925	229,109	319,273	+42,348	+90,164
Subtotal.....	2,785,096	2,569,126	3,431,444	+646,348	+862,318
Secure Communities.....	25,264	---	---	-25,264	---
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses.....	5,229,461	4,988,065	5,932,756	+703,295	+944,691

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Automation Modernization:					
Automation modernization.....	---	26,000	26,000	+26,000	---
IT Investment.....	8,400	---	---	-8,400	---
TECS Modernization.....	23,000	---	---	-23,000	---
Electronic Health Records.....	3,500	---	---	-3,500	---
Subtotal.....	34,900	26,000	26,000	-8,900	---
Construction.....	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Total, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Direct Appropriations.....	5,269,361	5,014,065	5,958,756	+689,395	+944,691
Fee Accounts:					
Immigration Inspection User Fee.....	(135,000)	(135,000)	(135,000)	---	---
Breached Bond/Detention Fund.....	(65,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	---	---
Student Exchange and Visitor Fee.....	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---	---
Subtotal.....	345,000	345,000	345,000	---	---
Total, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Appropriations.....	5,614,361	5,359,065	6,303,756	+689,395	+944,691
Fee Accounts.....	(345,000)	(345,000)	(345,000)	(+689,395)	(+944,691)

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request

Transportation Security Administration					
Aviation Security:					
Screening Operations:					
Screener Workforce:					
Privatized Screening.....	158,190	---	---	-158,190	---
Screener Personnel, Compensation, and Benefits.....	3,033,526	---	---	-3,033,526	---
Subtotal.....	3,191,716	---	---	-3,191,716	---
Screener Training and Other.....	226,857	---	---	-226,857	---
Checkpoint Support.....	103,309	---	---	-103,309	---
EDS/ETD Systems:					
EDS Procurement and Installation.....	73,845	---	---	-73,845	---
Screening Technology Maintenance.....	298,509	---	---	-298,509	---
Subtotal.....	372,354	---	---	-372,354	---
Subtotal, Screening Operations.....	3,894,236	---	---	-3,894,236	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Aviation Security Direction and Enforcement:					
Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement.....	354,437	---	---	-354,437	---
Airport Management and Support.....	587,000	---	---	-587,000	---
Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew Training.....	24,730	---	---	-24,730	---
Air Cargo.....	122,332	---	---	-122,332	---
Subtotal.....	1,088,499	---	---	-1,088,499	---
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory).....	(250,000)	---	---	(-250,000)	---
Total, Aviation Security (gross).....	4,982,735	---	---	-4,982,735	---
Aviation Security Fees (offsetting collections).....	-2,120,000	---	---	+2,120,000	---
Total, Aviation Security (net, discretionary)....	2,862,735	---	---	-2,862,735	---
Aviation Security:					
Screening Partnership Program.....	---	154,572	166,666	+166,666	+12,094
Screener Personnel, Compensation, and Benefits....	---	2,952,868	2,923,890	+2,923,890	-28,978
Screener Training and Other.....	---	226,290	225,442	+225,442	-848
Checkpoint Support.....	---	103,469	88,469	+88,469	-15,000
EDS Procurement/Installation.....	---	84,075	83,933	+83,933	-142
Screening Technology Maintenance.....	---	294,509	294,509	+294,509	---
Aviation Regulation and Other Enforcement.....	---	348,653	349,821	+349,821	+1,168
Airport Management and Support.....	---	591,734	587,657	+587,657	-4,077
Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew Training.....	---	20,000	22,365	+22,365	+2,365
Air Cargo.....	---	106,920	106,343	+106,343	-577

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Federal Air Marshals.....	---	800,214	790,000	+790,000	-10,214
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory).....	---	(250,000)	(250,000)	(+250,000)	---
Total, Aviation Security (gross).....	---	5,683,304	5,639,095	+5,639,095	-44,209
Aviation Security Fees (offsetting collections).....	---	-2,080,000	-2,065,000	-2,065,000	+15,000
Additional Offsetting Collections (leg. proposal).....	---	-570,000	---	---	+570,000
Total, Aviation Security (net, discretionary)...	---	3,033,304	3,574,095	+3,574,095	+540,791
Surface Transportation Security:					
Staffing and Operations.....	35,262	29,375	29,230	-6,032	-145
Surface Inspectors and VIPR.....	73,356	98,262	94,519	+21,163	-3,743
Subtotal.....	108,618	127,637	123,749	+15,131	-3,888
Intelligence and Vetting:					
Intelligence.....	---	51,801	51,545	+51,545	-256
Secure Flight.....	93,202	112,543	99,569	+6,367	-12,974
Other Vetting Programs.....	83,287	68,182	68,052	-15,235	-130
TWIC Fee.....	(36,700)	(34,832)	(34,832)	(-1,868)	---
Hazardous Material Fee.....	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	---	---
General Aviation at DCA Fee.....	(350)	(350)	(350)	---	---
Commercial Aviation and Airport Fee.....	(6,500)	(6,500)	(6,500)	---	---
Other Security Threat Assessments Fee.....	(50)	(50)	(50)	---	---
Air Cargo/Certified Cargo Screening Program Fee...	(5,400)	(7,173)	(7,173)	(+1,773)	---
TSA Precheck Application Program Fee.....	---	(13,700)	(13,700)	(+13,700)	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Alien Flight School Fee.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Subtotal.....	242,489	312,131	298,771	+56,282	-13,360
Direct Appropriations.....	(176,489)	(232,526)	(219,166)	(+42,677)	(-13,360)
Fee Funded Programs.....	(66,000)	(79,605)	(79,605)	(+13,605)	---
Transportation Security Support:					
Headquarters Administration.....	272,250	275,891	269,100	-3,150	-6,791
Information Technology.....	441,000	451,920	449,000	+8,000	-2,920
Human Capital Services.....	204,250	204,215	199,126	-5,124	-5,089
Intelligence.....	44,561	---	---	-44,561	---
Subtotal.....	962,061	932,026	917,226	-44,835	-14,800
Federal Air Marshals:					
Management and Administration.....	708,004	---	---	-708,004	---
Travel and Training.....	110,603	---	---	-110,603	---
Subtotal.....	818,607	---	---	-818,607	---
Total, Transportation Security Administration...	7,364,510	7,305,098	7,228,841	-135,669	-76,257
Offsetting Collections.....	(-2,120,000)	(-2,650,000)	(-2,065,000)	(+55,000)	(+585,000)
Aviation Security Capital Fund (mandatory).....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Fee Funded Programs.....	(66,000)	(79,605)	(79,605)	(+13,605)	---
Total, Transportation Security Administration (net).....	4,928,510	4,325,493	4,834,236	-94,274	+508,743

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Coast Guard					
Operating Expenses:					
Military Pay and Allowances.....	3,416,580	3,433,594	3,449,782	+33,202	+16,188
Civilian Pay and Benefits.....	782,874	787,372	781,517	-1,357	-5,855
Training and Recruiting.....	205,928	197,800	198,279	-7,649	+479
Operating Funds and Unit Level Maintenance.....	1,034,650	991,919	1,008,682	-25,968	+16,763
Centrally Managed Accounts.....	319,135	335,262	335,556	+16,421	+294
Intermediate and Depot Level Maintenance.....	1,012,840	1,003,786	1,056,502	+43,662	+52,716
St. Elizabeths Support.....	12,800	---	---	-12,800	---
Overseas Contingency Operations/ Global War on Terrorism.....	227,000	---	213,000	-14,000	+213,000
Subtotal.....	7,011,807	6,749,733	7,043,318	+31,511	+293,585
(Defense).....	(567,000)	(340,000)	(553,000)	(-14,000)	(+213,000)
(Nondefense).....	(6,444,807)	(6,409,733)	(6,490,318)	(+45,511)	(+80,585)
Environmental Compliance and Restoration.....	13,164	13,214	13,197	+33	-17
Reserve Training.....	120,000	109,605	114,572	-5,428	+4,967
Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements:					
Vessels:					
Survey and Design-Vessel and Boats.....	1,000	500	500	-500	---
Response Boat-Medium.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
In-Service Vessel Sustainment.....	21,000	24,500	49,000	+28,000	+24,500
National Security Cutter.....	629,000	638,000	632,847	+3,847	-5,153
Offshore Patrol Cutter.....	23,000	20,000	20,000	-3,000	---
Fast Response Cutter.....	310,000	110,000	110,000	-200,000	---
Cutter Boats.....	3,000	4,000	4,000	+1,000	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Polar Ice Breaking Vessel.....	2,000	6,000	---	-2,000	-6,000
Polar Icebreaker Preservation.....	---	---	8,000	+8,000	+8,000
Subtotal.....	999,000	803,000	824,347	-174,653	+21,347
Aircraft:					
H-60 Airframe Replacement.....	---	---	12,000	+12,000	+12,000
HC-144 Conversion/Sustainment.....	9,200	15,000	15,000	+5,800	---
HC-27J Conversion/Sustainment.....	24,900	15,000	20,000	-4,900	+5,000
HC-130J Acquisition/Conversion/Sustainment.....	129,210	8,000	103,000	-26,210	+95,000
HH-65 Conversion/Sustainment.....	12,000	30,000	30,000	+18,000	---
Subtotal.....	175,310	68,000	180,000	+4,690	+112,000
Other Acquisition Programs:					
Program Oversight and Management.....	10,000	18,000	18,000	+8,000	---
Systems Engineering and Integration.....	204	---	---	-204	---
C4ISR.....	40,226	36,300	36,300	-3,926	---
C6-Logistics Information Management System.....	1,500	3,000	5,000	+3,500	+2,000
Nationwide Automatic Identification System.....	13,000	---	---	-13,000	---
Subtotal.....	64,930	57,300	59,300	-5,630	+2,000

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Shore Facilities and Aids to Navigation:					
Major Construction; Housing; ATON; and Survey and Design.....	2,000	19,580	19,580	+17,580	---
Major Acquisition Systems Infrastructure.....	---	16,000	16,000	+16,000	---
Minor Shore.....	3,000	5,000	5,000	+2,000	---
Subtotal.....	5,000	40,580	40,580	+35,580	---
Military Housing.....	18,000	---	6,000	-12,000	+6,000
Personnel and Related Support:					
Direct Personnel Costs.....	112,956	115,313	114,996	+2,040	-317
Core Acquisition Costs.....	439	---	---	-439	---
Subtotal.....	113,395	115,313	114,996	+1,601	-317
Subtotal, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements.....	1,375,635	1,084,193	1,225,223	-150,412	+141,030
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation.....	19,200	17,947	17,892	-1,308	-55
Health Care Fund Contribution (permanent indefinite discretionary appropriation).....	201,000	176,970	176,970	-24,030	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Retired Pay (mandatory).....	1,460,000	1,450,626	1,450,626	-9,374	---
Total, Coast Guard.....	10,200,806	9,602,288	10,041,798	-159,008	+439,510
Appropriations.....	(9,973,806)	(9,602,288)	(9,828,798)	(-145,008)	(+226,510)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.....	(227,000)	---	(213,000)	(-14,000)	(+213,000)
(mandatory).....	(1,460,000)	(1,450,626)	(1,450,626)	(-9,374)	---
(discretionary).....	(8,740,806)	(8,151,662)	(8,591,172)	(-149,634)	(+439,510)
United States Secret Service					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Protection:					
Protection of Persons and Facilities.....	848,263	874,885	892,685	+44,422	+17,800
Protective Intelligence Activities.....	67,165	68,234	67,536	+371	-698
National Special Security Event Fund.....	4,500	4,500	4,500	---	---
Presidential Candidate Nominee Protection.....	---	25,500	25,500	+25,500	---
Subtotal.....	919,928	973,119	990,221	+70,293	+17,102
Investigations:					
Domestic Field Operations.....	329,291	332,395	338,295	+9,004	+5,900
International Field Office Administration, Operations and Training.....	30,811	34,361	34,195	+3,384	-166
Support for Missing and Exploited Children.....	8,366	---	8,366	---	+8,366
Subtotal.....	368,468	366,756	380,856	+12,388	+14,100

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Headquarters, Management and Administration.....	188,964	189,191	188,380	-584	-811
Rowley Training Center.....	55,118	55,868	55,378	+260	-490
Information Integration and Technology Transformation.....	1,019	1,036	1,025	+6	-11
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses.....	1,533,497	1,585,970	1,615,860	+82,363	+29,890
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses:					
Facilities.....	5,380	5,380	5,380	---	---
Information Integration and Technology Transformation.....	46,395	44,555	44,555	-1,840	---
Subtotal.....	51,775	49,935	49,935	-1,840	---
Total, United States Secret Service.....	1,585,272	1,635,905	1,665,795	+80,523	+29,890
Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations.....	32,563,840	31,278,903	33,199,167	+635,327	+1,920,264
Appropriations.....	(32,336,840)	(31,278,903)	(32,986,167)	(+649,327)	(+1,707,264)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.....	(227,000)	---	(213,000)	(-14,000)	(+213,000)
(Fee Accounts).....	(2,114,515)	(2,308,499)	(2,308,499)	(+193,984)	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request

TITLE III - PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY					

National Protection and Programs Directorate					
Management and Administration.....	56,499	65,910	61,651	+5,152	-4,259

Infrastructure Protection and Information Security:					
Infrastructure Protection:					
Sector Management Analysis and Planning.....	63,134	63,999	64,494	+1,360	+495
Regional Field Operations.....	62,562	63,136	64,961	+2,399	+1,825
Infrastructure Security Compliance.....	56,550	57,034	56,550	---	-484
	81,000	86,976	85,027	+4,027	-1,949
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection.....	263,246	271,145	271,032	+7,786	-113

Cybersecurity and Communications:					
Cybersecurity:					
Cybersecurity Coordination.....	4,320	4,330	4,311	-9	-19
US Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) Operations.....	102,000	98,794	98,573	-3,427	-221
Federal Network Security.....	199,725	171,500	171,000	-28,725	-500
Network Security Deployment.....	382,252	377,690	377,000	-5,252	-690
Global Cybersecurity Management.....	25,892	17,613	25,873	-19	+8,260

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
<hr/>					
Critical Infrastructure Cyber Protection					
and Awareness.....	73,013	70,963	70,919	-2,094	-44
Business Operations.....	5,089	5,554	5,524	+435	-30
Subtotal, Cybersecurity.....	792,291	746,444	753,200	-39,091	+6,756
<hr/>					
Communications:					
Office of Emergency Communications.....	37,450	36,480	37,335	-115	+855
Priority Telecommunications Services.....	53,372	53,381	53,324	-48	-57
Next Generation Networks.....	21,158	69,571	53,293	+32,135	-16,278
Programs to Study and Enhance					
Telecommunications.....	10,074	10,106	10,092	+18	-14
Critical Infrastructure Protection Programs...	9,409	10,439	10,403	+994	-36
Subtotal, Communications.....	131,463	179,977	164,447	+32,984	-15,530
Subtotal, Cybersecurity and Communications....	923,754	926,421	917,647	-6,107	-8,774
Subtotal, Infrastructure Protection and					
Information Security.....	1,187,000	1,197,566	1,188,679	+1,679	-8,887
Federal Protective Service:					
Basic Security.....	271,540	275,763	275,763	+4,223	---
Building-specific Security.....	509,056	600,615	600,615	+91,559	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Reimbursable Security Fees (Contract Guard Services).....	521,228	466,228	466,228	-55,000	---
Subtotal, Federal Protective Service.....	1,301,824	1,342,606	1,342,606	+40,782	---
Offsetting Collections.....	-1,301,824	-1,342,606	-1,342,606	-40,782	---
Office of Biometric Identity Management.....	227,108	251,584	252,056	+24,948	+472
Total, National Protection and Programs Directorate (gross).....	2,772,431	2,857,666	2,844,992	+72,561	-12,674
Offsetting Collections.....	(-1,301,824)	(-1,342,606)	(-1,342,606)	(-40,782)	---
Total, National Protection and Programs Directorate (net).....	1,470,607	1,515,060	1,502,386	+31,779	-12,674
Office of Health Affairs					
Biowatch.....	85,277	84,651	86,891	+1,614	+2,240
National Biosurveillance Integration Center.....	10,000	8,000	10,500	+500	+2,500
Chemical Defense Program.....	824	824	824	---	---
Planning and Coordination.....	4,995	4,995	4,995	---	---
Salaries and Expenses.....	25,667	27,297	26,148	+481	-1,149
Total, Office of Health Affairs.....	126,763	125,767	129,358	+2,595	+3,591

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Salaries and Expenses:					
Administrative and Regional Offices.....	249,855	245,218	244,183	-5,672	-1,035
Office of National Capital Region Coordination..	(3,400)	---	(3,400)	---	(+3,400)
Preparedness and Protection.....	173,406	185,000	180,797	+7,391	-4,203
Response.....	178,692	167,376	175,986	-2,706	+8,610
Urban Search and Rescue Response System.....	(35,180)	(27,513)	(35,180)	---	(+7,667)
Recovery.....	55,121	56,030	55,789	+668	-241
Mitigation.....	27,858	25,782	28,876	+1,018	+3,094
Mission Support.....	151,744	141,809	145,316	-6,428	+3,507
Centrally Managed Accounts.....	110,306	103,449	103,449	-6,857	---
Subtotal, Salaries and Expenses.....	946,982	924,664	934,396	-12,586	+9,732
(Defense).....	(74,000)	(76,000)	(72,000)	(-2,000)	(-4,000)
(Nondefense).....	(872,982)	(848,664)	(862,396)	(-10,586)	(+13,732)
Grants and Training:					
State and Local Programs:					
State Homeland Security Grant Program.....	486,346	---	487,000	+654	+487,000
Operation Stonegarden.....	(55,000)	---	(55,000)	---	(+55,000)

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Urban Area Security Initiative.....	600,000	---	600,000	---	+600,000
Nonprofit Security Grants.....	(13,000)	---	(13,000)	---	(+13,000)
Public Transportation Security Assistance and Railroad Security Assistance.....	100,000	---	100,000	---	+100,000
Amtrak Security.....	(10,000)	---	(10,000)	---	(+10,000)
Over-Road Bus Security.....	---	---	(3,000)	(+3,000)	(+3,000)
Port Security Grants.....	100,000	---	100,000	---	+100,000
Subtotal, Discretionary Grants.....	1,266,346	---	1,267,000	+654	+1,267,000
Education, Training, and Exercises:					
Emergency Management Institute.....	20,569	---	20,569	---	+20,569
Center for Domestic Preparedness.....	64,991	---	64,991	---	+64,991
National Domestic Preparedness Consortium.....	98,000	---	98,000	---	+98,000
National Exercise Program.....	21,094	---	19,919	-1,175	+19,919
Continuing Training.....	29,000	---	29,521	+521	+29,521
Subtotal.....	233,654	---	233,000	-654	+233,000

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
National Preparedness Grant Program.....	---	1,043,200	---	---	-1,043,200
First Responder Assistance Program:					
Emergency Management Performance Grants.....	---	350,000	---	---	-350,000
Fire Grants.....	---	335,000	---	---	-335,000
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants.....	---	335,000	---	---	-335,000
Training Partnership Grants.....	---	60,000	---	---	-60,000
Education, Training and Exercises.....	---	102,269	---	---	-102,269
Subtotal, First Responder Assistance Program..	---	1,182,269	---	---	-1,182,269
Subtotal, State and Local Programs.....	1,500,000	2,225,469	1,500,000	---	-725,469
(Defense).....	---	---	---	---	---
(Nondefense).....	(1,500,000)	(2,225,469)	(1,500,000)	---	(-725,469)
Firefighter Assistance Grants:					
Fire Grants.....	340,000	---	340,000	---	+340,000
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act Grants.....	340,000	---	340,000	---	+340,000
Subtotal.....	680,000	---	680,000	---	+680,000

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Emergency Management Performance Grants.....	350,000	---	350,000	---	+350,000
Subtotal, Grants and Training.....	2,530,000	2,225,469	2,530,000	---	+304,531
Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program.....	-1,272	-1,815	-1,815	-543	---
United States Fire Administration.....	44,000	41,407	44,000	---	+2,593
Disaster Relief Fund:					
Base Disaster Relief.....	594,522	595,672	595,672	+1,150	---
Disaster Relief Category.....	5,626,386	6,437,793	6,437,793	+811,407	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief Fund.....	6,220,908	7,033,465	7,033,465	+812,557	---
(transfer out to Inspector General).....	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief Fund (net).....	6,196,908	7,009,465	7,009,465	+812,557	---
Flood Hazard Mapping and Risk Analysis Program.....	95,202	84,403	100,000	+4,798	+15,597
National Flood Insurance Fund:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	22,000	23,759	23,759	+1,759	---
Flood Plain Management and Mapping.....	154,300	155,535	155,535	+1,235	---
Subtotal.....	176,300	179,294	179,294	+2,994	---
Offsetting Fee Collections.....	-176,300	-179,294	-179,294	-2,994	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
National Predisaster Mitigation Fund.....	25,000	---	25,000	---	+25,000
Emergency Food and Shelter.....	120,000	100,000	120,000	---	+20,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	9,980,820	10,407,593	10,785,046	+804,226	+377,453
(Appropriations).....	(4,354,434)	(3,969,800)	(4,347,253)	(-7,181)	(+377,453)
(Disaster Relief Category).....	(5,626,386)	(6,437,793)	(6,437,793)	(+811,407)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	---	---
Total, title III, Protection, Preparedness, Response and Recovery Directorate.....	11,578,190	12,048,420	12,416,790	+838,600	+368,370
Appropriations.....	(5,951,804)	(5,610,627)	(5,978,997)	(+27,193)	(+368,370)
Disaster Relief Category.....	(5,626,386)	(6,437,793)	(6,437,793)	(+811,407)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	---	---

TITLE IV - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING,
AND SERVICES

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services

Appropriations:					
E-Verify Program.....	113,889	124,755	124,435	+10,546	-320
Immigrant Integration Programs.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Subtotal.....	113,889	134,755	124,435	+10,546	-10,320

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Fee Accounts:					
Adjudication Services:					
District Operations.....	(1,544,380)	(1,539,859)	(1,565,903)	(+21,523)	(+26,044)
(Immigrant Integration Grants).....	(7,500)	---	(10,000)	(+2,500)	(+10,000)
Service Center Operations.....	(578,393)	(542,449)	(542,449)	(-35,944)	---
Asylum, Refugee and International Operations.....	(236,710)	(238,755)	(239,065)	(+2,355)	(+310)
Records Operations.....	(94,039)	(93,209)	(93,209)	(-830)	---
Business Transformation.....	(183,464)	(184,923)	(184,923)	(+1,459)	---
Subtotal.....	2,636,986	2,599,195	2,625,549	-11,437	+26,354
Information and Customer Services:					
Operating Expenses.....	(96,409)	(98,868)	(98,868)	(+2,459)	---
Administration:					
Operating Expenses.....	(339,421)	(342,308)	(342,308)	(+2,887)	---
Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE).....	(29,937)	(30,259)	(30,259)	(+322)	---
Subtotal, Fee Accounts.....	3,102,753	3,070,630	3,096,984	-5,769	+26,354
H1-B Visa Fee Account:					
Adjudication Services:					
Service Center Operations.....	---	(13,500)	---	---	(-13,500)

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
H1-B and L Fraud Prevention Fee Account:					
Adjudication Services:					
District Operations.....	---	(26,044)	---	---	(-26,044)
Asylum and Refugee Operating Expenses.....	---	(310)	---	---	(-310)
Service Center Operations.....	---	(14,646)	---	---	(-14,646)
Subtotal.....	---	41,000	---	---	-41,000
Total, Fee Accounts.....	3,102,753	3,125,130	3,096,984	-5,769	-28,146
Total, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services:					
Appropriations.....	(3,216,642)	(3,259,885)	(3,221,419)	(+4,777)	(-38,466)
Fee Accounts.....	(113,889)	(134,755)	(124,435)	(+10,546)	(-10,320)
	(3,102,753)	(3,125,130)	(3,096,984)	(-5,769)	(-28,146)
(Immigration Examination Fee Account)					
(H1-B Visa Fee Account).....	(3,048,753)	(3,070,630)	(3,042,484)	(-6,269)	(-28,146)
(H1-B and L Fraud Prevention Fee Account).....	(13,000)	(13,500)	(13,500)	(+500)	---
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	(41,000)	(41,000)	(41,000)	---	---
Salaries and Expenses:					
Law Enforcement Training.....	198,317	202,122	202,122	+3,805	---
Management and Administration.....	28,228	28,337	27,080	-1,148	-1,257
Accreditation.....	1,300	1,295	1,295	-5	---
Subtotal.....	227,845	231,754	230,497	+2,652	-1,257

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Acquisitions, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses.....	30,885	27,841	27,841	-3,044	---
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center..	258,730	259,595	258,338	-392	-1,257
Science and Technology					
Management and Administration.....	129,000	130,147	129,993	+993	-154
Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations:					
Research, Development, and Innovation.....	462,000	433,788	457,499	-4,501	+23,711
Laboratory Facilities.....	547,785	435,180	434,989	-112,796	-191
Acquisition and Operations Support.....	41,703	41,703	41,703	---	---
University Programs.....	39,724	31,000	39,724	---	+8,724
Subtotal.....	1,091,212	941,671	973,915	-117,297	+32,244
Total, Science and Technology.....	1,220,212	1,071,818	1,103,908	-116,304	+32,090
Domestic Nuclear Detection Office					
Management and Administration.....	37,353	37,494	37,339	-14	-155
Research, Development, and Operations:					
Systems Engineering and Operations.....	21,000	17,924	17,000	-4,000	-924
Systems Development.....	21,000	22,000	21,400	+400	-600
Transformational Research and Development.....	71,102	69,500	69,500	-1,602	---
Assessments.....	39,300	38,079	38,000	-1,300	-79
Operations Support.....	30,200	31,565	31,000	+800	-565

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center.....	22,700	20,000	21,000	-1,700	+1,000
Subtotal.....	205,302	199,068	197,900	-7,402	-1,168
Systems Acquisition:					
Radiation Portal Monitor Program.....	7,000	5,000	5,000	-2,000	---
Securing the Cities.....	22,000	12,000	19,000	-3,000	+7,000
Human Portable Radiation Detection Systems.....	13,600	50,861	48,603	+35,003	-2,258
Subtotal.....	42,600	67,861	72,603	+30,003	+4,742
Total, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office.....	285,255	304,423	307,842	+22,587	+3,419
Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training, and Services.....	1,878,086	1,770,591	1,794,523	-83,563	+23,932
(Fee Accounts).....	(3,102,753)	(3,125,130)	(3,096,984)	(-5,769)	(-28,146)
=====					
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
DHS Consolidated Headquarters Project.....	35,000	---	48,600	+13,600	+48,600
Financial Systems Modernization.....	29,548	---	34,072	+4,524	+34,072
Columbia Free Trade Act Collections.....	110,000	138,000	138,000	+28,000	---
CBP BSFIT (rescission).....	-67,498	---	-5,000	+62,498	-5,000
CBP OAM (rescission)(P.L. 113-76).....	---	---	-8,000	-8,000	-8,000
CBP Construction and Facilities Management (rescission).....	---	---	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000
TSA Aviation Security (70 x 0550) (rescission).....	-2,000	---	-13,300	-13,300	-15,300
TSA Aviation Security (rescission) (P.L. 113-76).....	---	---	-187,000	-187,000	-187,000

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
Coast Guard AC&I (rescission) (P.L. 112-10).....	-35,500	---	-2,550	+32,950	-2,550
Coast Guard AC&I (rescission) (P.L. 112-74).....	-79,300	---	-12,095	+67,205	-12,095
Coast Guard AC&I (rescission) (P.L. 113-6).....	-19,879	---	-16,349	+3,530	-16,349
Coast Guard AC&I (rescission) (P.L. 113-76).....	---	---	-30,643	-30,643	-30,643
FEMA Predisaster Mitigation (70 x 0716) (rescission)...	---	---	-24,000	-24,000	-24,000
Science and Technology, Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations (70 x 0800) (rescission).	---	---	-16,627	-16,627	-16,627
Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund (rescission).....	-100,000	---	-175,000	-75,000	-175,000
Rescission of Legacy Funds (rescission).....	-4,657	---	-1,476	+3,181	-1,476
Rescission of Unobligated Balances (nondefense).....	-13,593	---	-14,653	-1,060	-14,653
Rescission of Unobligated Balances (defense).....	---	---	-679	-679	-679
FEMA Disaster Relief Fund (rescission).....	-300,522	-200,000	-375,000	-74,478	-175,000
U-Visa Immigration proposal.....	---	13,000	---	---	-13,000
COBRA Passenger Inspection Fee (leg. proposal).....	---	(212,000)	---	---	(-212,000)
IUF Fee (leg. proposal).....	---	(229,000)	---	---	(-229,000)
Coast Guard AC&I (rescission) (P.L. 111-83).....	-14,500	---	---	+14,500	---
Data Center Migration.....	42,200	---	---	-42,200	---
USCIS Immigrant Integration Grants.....	2,500	---	---	-2,500	---
TSA Surface Transportation Security (rescission) (P.L. 113-6).....	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
TSA Aviation Security (rescission) (P.L. 113-6).....	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	---

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Final Bill	Final Bill vs FY 2014	Final Bill vs Request
TSA Research and Development (rescission).....	-977	---	---	+977	---
Total, title V, General Provisions.....	-474,178	-49,000	-673,700	-199,522	-624,700
Fee Accounts.....	---	(441,000)	---	---	(-441,000)
Appropriations.....	(219,248)	(151,000)	(220,672)	(+1,424)	(+69,672)
Rescissions.....	(-693,426)	(-200,000)	(-894,372)	(-200,946)	(-694,372)
Grand Total.....	46,583,386	46,220,663	47,771,419	+1,188,033	+1,550,756
Appropriations.....	(41,423,426)	(39,982,870)	(42,014,998)	(+591,572)	(+2,032,128)
Rescissions.....	(-693,426)	(-200,000)	(-894,372)	(-200,946)	(-694,372)
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.....	(227,000)	---	(213,000)	(-14,000)	(+213,000)
Disaster Relief Category.....	(5,626,386)	(6,437,793)	(6,437,793)	(+811,407)	---
(Fee Funded Programs).....	(5,217,268)	(5,874,629)	(5,405,483)	(+488,215)	(-489,146)
(by transfer).....	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	---	---
(transfer out).....	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	(-24,000)	---	---

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, before I yield to the next speaker, I want to make it very clear that the bill that was negotiated by the Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, would pass immediately today, and then we could look forward to a debate on comprehensive immigration reform.

I am very pleased to yield 9 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, who worked so hard with the Republicans in producing this outstanding bill. Unfortunately, the bill is very different with the additions that were added just in the last week.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the bill before us today, funding the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2015, has been ready for final passage for almost 2 months. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman CARTER, our Senate counterparts, as well as our dedicated committee staff for working cooperatively through November and December to negotiate a comprehensive and balanced measure.

Chairman CARTER has summarized the underlying bill very, very well. It provides necessary funding increases for the Secret Service to hire new agents for the 2016 Presidential campaign, as well as to make the necessary security adjustments at the White House.

It provides increased funding for the completion of the Coast Guard's eighth National Security Cutter, \$813 million more in disaster relief funding at FEMA, and funding for NPPD's efforts to continue enhancing our national cybersecurity capability.

But it pains me to say, Mr. Chair, that all of these positive efforts stand in stark contrast to the poison pill amendments that the Rules Committee has made in order for this bill, amendments designed to inject partisan anti-immigration politics into a bipartisan effort to keep our Nation safe.

Unfortunately, there is nothing new about adding highly inflammatory riders to appropriations bills in a way that wrecks months of cooperative work and makes bipartisan support impossible. We have seen this in middle-of-the-night Homeland Security anti-immigration amendments for 2 years running. But today we are seeing the most egregious and irresponsible abuse of the appropriations process yet.

Republican leaders have already delayed a full-year funding bill for Homeland Security by nearly a month longer than for the rest of the government despite the fact that this bill was fully negotiated and ready for consideration well before the omnibus bill was assembled at the end of the last Congress. Now, more than a quarter of the way through the fiscal year, the Republican

leadership is continuing to play dangerous and irresponsible games with the funding of this Department, the Department that was created to protect the Nation from terrorist attacks.

Members, of course, are aware of the horrendous murder of 17 individuals last week in France by terrorists. This is an alarming example of the kind of brutal and calculated attack that the Department of Homeland Security and its law enforcement partners are working hard to prevent here in the United States. It is the kind of attack that keeps Secretary Johnson up at night and should keep us up at night as well. This alone should make it unthinkable to dawdle on a full-year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Last Sunday, 3 million people participated in unity marches in France. But we are sending a very different message by delaying homeland security funding.

Six days removed from a heinous terrorist act, we are dawdling. We are holding back. We are refusing to immediately send to the President a bipartisan bill designed to keep the Nation safe. Instead, we are tacking on politically charged items that will rightfully ensure a veto.

Now, Mr. Chair, some Members seem to be under the mistaken impression that departments and agencies might make out just fine under a continuing resolution. Perhaps some Members even think that it would be okay for the Department's funding to expire for some amount of time beginning in late February so that they could underscore the political point they want to make. That is a patently false assumption.

In a few weeks, the fiscal year 2016 budget will be submitted by the President, and DHS still doesn't know how much money it will be spending in 2015. How can we expect the Department to effectively budget if it has no idea of what the baseline will be for its programs and activities? How can we expect an agency to effectively function when the availability of funding for critical new endeavors is undetermined for a quarter of the fiscal year or more? How can we, as a Congress, even perform effective oversight when we force ourselves to simultaneously finish 2015 funding as we consider the 2016 request?

□ 1800

Ironically, the two agencies that stand to lose the most from this flawed Republican strategy are the very agencies they purport to champion, agencies responsible for immigration enforcement: Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Under the House bill, these two agencies combined would receive nearly \$1 billion more than the current spending level, which a CR would reflect. The bill we are not passing would provide that additional funding. Republicans,

however, appear more interested in scoring political points than in actually making progress on the border.

Now, the apparent intent of the House majority in holding back full-year funding for DHS is to help them reverse the President's executive actions on immigration policy; but how is that going to really play out?

Without 60 votes in the Senate, the bill will go nowhere. Even if the Senate were to pass the bill with the poison pill riders intact, the President would certainly veto it with absolutely no chance the House or Senate could override that veto.

What is left of the majority's strategy? Would the Republican majorities in the House and Senate really be willing to let funding for the Department of Homeland Security lapse when the short-term continuing resolution expires? The vast majority of DHS employees are considered essential, so they would still need to show up for work.

Will the House majority really be willing to let frontline agents and officers at CBP and ICE work without pay? Would the House majority be willing to let the Coast Guard military personnel continue to risk their lives at sea without compensation?

Imagine the outrage—imagine—if a Democratic Congress ever held funding for the Department of Homeland Security hostage during the George W. Bush administration; yet that is precisely what House Republicans are doing with these poison pill amendments made in order under the rule.

Believe me, these pills really are poison. They cater to the Republican Conference's most extreme elements; one of them even targets the DREAM Act students, reversing the President's widely-acclaimed and -accepted decision to focus instead on the deportation of dangerous criminals.

A full-year DHS funding bill was negotiated in good faith on a bicameral, bipartisan basis, and it addresses the most pressing needs of the Department and works to protect the country from harm.

If Republicans want to make mean-spirited and destructive changes in immigration policy, there is a legislative process for doing that.

In the meantime, we should be passing a clean, full-year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security, just as we should have done in December. I urge defeat of the anti-immigration amendments and adoption of the underlying appropriations bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the honorable chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I first want to begin by thanking the chairman of the Subcommittee on

Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, the gentlemen from Texas and Kentucky, for their excellent work on this legislation.

It is important that we pass it, and it is important that we use the power of the purse in this process to stop the President's unconstitutional actions.

President Obama has embarked on some of the biggest executive power grabs in American history by unilaterally rewriting our Nation's immigration laws. These actions ignore the will of the American people who voted in November to change the way Washington operates, and these actions flout the United States Constitution.

They must be ended because these policies threaten the separation of powers between Congress and the executive branch and violate President Obama's obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Congress must fight to stop these unconstitutional actions from being implemented, and today, the House of Representatives is doing just that. We will consider amendments to this bill that will stop President Obama's executive overreach in its tracks.

Two of the amendments will completely defund President Obama's executive power grabs. One offered by Representatives ROBERT ADERHOLT, MICK MULVANEY, and LOU BARLETTA will defund the President's new deferred action program for over 4 million unlawful alien parents. It will also defund the other executive actions he announced on November 20 and DHS' so-called prosecutorial discretion memos that have gutted immigration enforcement within the United States.

Importantly, in addition to barring the use of appropriated funds to carry out these policies, the amendment will bar President Obama from using immigration user fees, the filing fees to accomplish his executive fiat, and it will prevent him and subsequent Presidents from carrying out similar policies in the future by whatever means, whether it be by memo, executive order, or regulation.

The other defunding amendment, offered by Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN, completely defunds DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, that has granted deferred action and work authorization to hundreds of thousands of unlawful aliens.

The third amendment will be offered by Representatives DESANTIS and ROBY. It will ensure that sex offenders and domestic violence perpetrators are top priorities for removal by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, something that is not the case in this current administration under the President's memos.

The fourth amendment will be offered by Representative SCHOCK. It ex-

presses the sense of Congress that the Obama administration should stop putting the interests of unlawful aliens ahead of legal immigrants.

Under the President's DACA program, legal immigrants playing by the rules and seeking to come to the United States the right way have paid the price; they have faced longer wait times even though they have paid the fees to have their applications processed and seeing those fees diverted to pay for people who entered the country unlawfully.

The fifth amendment will be offered by Representatives SALMON and THOMPSON. It expresses the sense of Congress that U.S. workers should not be harmed by the granting of deferred action and work authorization to unlawful aliens.

In many cases, businesses now have a \$3,000 incentive to hire an alien granted DACA benefits over a U.S. citizen or legal immigrant worker, since DACA recipients are not eligible for ObamaCare. So, in other words, an employer has an incentive, either not having to provide health insurance and not having to pay the fine, so a minimum of \$3,000 if they hire somebody who is not lawfully present in the United States until the President's executive memos take effect. That should be stopped.

If President Obama's unilateral immigration amendments are not stopped, future Presidents will continue to expand the power of the executive branch and encroach upon individual liberty.

The time is now for Congress to take a stand against these abusive actions. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and these important amendments and yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

To govern means to get things done. That is pretty simple, and quite honestly, that is about all the American people ask us to do on a daily basis: get things done.

Instead of bringing a clean Homeland Security funding bill to the floor of this House, our colleagues on the Republican side have decided to put our Nation's security at risk and cater to some of the most radical views in their party.

It is stunning that only a week after the tragic terrorist attacks in Paris, we are standing here on the floor of the House of Representatives talking about attempts to make it more difficult for the Department of Homeland Security in the United States of America to defend our Nation.

A good bill—and we have heard this, Republicans and Democrats alike say

that the underlying bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security is a good one; it is just all the poison pill amendments that have been forced into this bill.

So a good bill to fund our government's Homeland Security and all of its obligations will come before us and become a victim of what has become known as shutdown partisan politics.

What is at stake? Border protection, customs enforcement, transportation security, Coast Guard protection, Secret Service protection, emergency management in the event of an attack or a natural or manmade disaster—all put in jeopardy to play partisan politics.

If the American people are going to believe that Congress is anything more than a graveyard for good ideas, then we need to get to work and not let a tiny minority of radical voices block progress. It is time for us to say to Americans: We get it; we heard you.

It is time to protect the homeland. It is time for us to act bipartisanly, and it is time for us to act as leaders for all Americans, not a political party.

We must pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security without delay, and then, yes, we can get to debate immigration and immigration reform and pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, but don't put the security of our people and our homeland at risk simply to game the system.

Let's pass a clean Homeland Security bill. Let us defeat all these amendments and get to work the way the American people expect us to.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JEB HENSARLING, the honorable chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this critical piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, every President in the history of our Republic, from George Washington to Barack Obama, has raised their right hand and said:

I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Clause 4, section 8 of article I of the Constitution says the Congress—the Congress—"shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." When we as a body read the Constitution on the House floor last week, I had the honor of reading this very section for all to hear.

Section 3, article II of the Constitution says the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed," but never in the history of our Republic has a President so blatantly ignored his oath. We know our President has a pen; we know he has a

phone. We just wonder when will he acquire a copy of the Constitution and read it.

His executive action on immigration is an unconstitutional power grab. It tramples on the authority that the Constitution gives Congress—the people's elected Representatives—over immigration. It ignores the separation of powers. We cannot let it stand.

Coequal branches of government, separation of powers, the rule of law—these must be preserved. In this bill, as amended, we do this by exercising the House's constitutional power of the purse. This DHS funding bill, as amended, will achieve this.

The debate is much bigger than immigration. It is much bigger than amnesty. It is about our Constitution. It is about the principle of separation of powers. It is the bedrock of our freedom and prosperity as Americans.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the work that he has done on this bill. I want to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and Mr. PRICE for working on this bill.

This bill is an appropriation bill. This bill funds the Department that is charged with the responsibility of keeping America safe and Americans safe. This bill is an appropriation bill. It is against the rules of the House of Representatives to put legislative language on an appropriation bill.

Now, frankly, having served there 20, 30 years, I know that that rule is not always followed; and you, therefore, need a waiver from the Rules Committee in order to effect this end. This is not, therefore, regular order.

We just had another demonstration of the clear and present danger to which every citizen in the free world is subject. We saw it in France, and 17 people lost their lives.

□ 1815

We, of course, lost over 3,000 lives on 9/11. This is an issue on which there ought to be no difference among the 435 of us who have the privilege and honor of serving in this country and in this Congress.

Mr. HENSARLING raised his right hand to preserve and protect, yes, the Constitution and laws thereof, but also to preserve and protect the general welfare of all of our people. That is what this bill seeks to do.

Mr. Chairman, there are many compelling reasons why the House must pass a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security without delay. I have spoken to some of them. We saw one of those reasons all too clearly last week, as I have said. Our Homeland Security agencies are hard at work every

day to prevent incidents like those from occurring here in the United States, and how extraordinarily successful they have been since 9/11.

Again, Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member LOWEY, I want to congratulate you for coming together and agreeing on a bill, agreeing on funding levels, and agreeing on the objects of expenditures to keep Americans and America safe. But with only a continuing resolution to fund it, as has happened in December, the Department does not have the full flexibility necessary to respond to every threat to the best of its ability. This leaves us vulnerable at a time when we cannot afford to be vulnerable. That is why it is so unfortunate that House Republicans have chosen to play political games.

If this is, in fact, unconstitutional, the courts are set forth, in article III, to resolve this issue. If you feel so strongly that you are right, that is where relief should be sought. But let us not hold America's national security and the safety of our people hostage to that political difference. In doing so, you have managed to snatch partisanship from the jaws of consensus. We have agreement. The underlying bill before us will have the support of over 400 Members.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Over 400 Members would support the underlying bill. Wouldn't it be wonderful to show to the American public that we come together not in a partisan way, but as Americans to make sure they are as safe and secure as we can make them? But, no, we have denigrated this debate to a political debate about a difference between the President and the Congress. Now, that is a significant debate to have, but not on this bill, not where we have consensus, not where the American security is at risk if we fail.

Two of the amendments are solely designed to undermine the executive actions President Obama took to address our broken immigration system. We think they are appropriate; you don't. That is fine. That is a political difference. Do not defeat consensus because we have differences on an unrelated issue.

You will say it is related because this is, after all, the agency that deals with immigration and border security. I get that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, we will vote against these amendments. But the sad truth is you know, all of you, that if those amendments are put on this bill, the

President of the United States will not sign it, and you will therefore have to take it him to court. And I see my friend back there—who is my friend—saying, yes, that is great, he won't sign it, and we will blame him for undermining Homeland Security.

In other words, you are going to hold hostage the security, and if he doesn't do what you say, security be damned. That is not the way we ought to be running America, particularly on this issue. Americans expect better of us. More importantly, and as importantly, we ought to expect better of ourselves.

The Appropriations Committee has agreed. The Senate and the House have agreed. There is consensus here. Americans are so frustrated by all of us grabbing defeat, obstruction, and disagreement from the jaws of consensus.

Vote against these amendments so that all of us can vote to pass this important, critical bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable PETER ROSKAM, my good friend and colleague.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I look at this from an entirely different perspective. I look at this as the House of Representatives asserting its will, speaking out, and saying, no, we are not going to be silent in the movement of the President of the United States. If we had done nothing, Mr. Chairman, then the subsequent argument in weeks to come would have been, well, you did nothing. You were silent. You waived your right to assert yourself. You have the power of the purse, and you did nothing.

Well, clearly, we are not doing nothing. Clearly, we are taking it up. And now here it is. We are coming together and we are saying that we don't believe the President has this authority. We are asserting that, and this bill will be debated.

But at the underlying level there is something absolutely incredibly significant and very bright that is happening, regardless of what side of the aisle you are on, because do you know what we are talking about? We are talking about defending a country that we all hold dear.

There was a story I heard from an exchange student, Mr. Chairman, who came to visit the United States. She was asked about her time here—this was a young college student—and they said: What made the biggest impression upon you during your time in the United States? She said this: The number of people who came up to me and said, "What do you hope to do for a living? What do you want to do?" And it was totally different for this girl, because the culture that she was coming from, that wasn't her experience, but she came to the United States and there was a brightness to it, an opportunity to it, and a freshness to it. She

found it so exciting and so dynamic. That is what we are fighting about. That is what we are fighting for. We are fighting for a nation, to defend a great nation, and to celebrate a great nation. That is worth taking up.

So, look, there are very big differences in this House in the direction to move. There are very deep differences in this House about how we need to deal with the immigration problem.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, we all need to realize the brightness of this moment.

So I respect my colleague and his differences. I respect the other side and their differences. I think we need to go back to Thomas Jefferson, who said this, Mr. Chairman. Jefferson wrote a letter in 1790 to a guy named Charles Clay. He said:

The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches, and we must be contented to secure what we can get from time to time and eternally press forward for what is yet to get. It takes time to persuade men to do even what is for their own good.

Mr. Chairman, this is a game of inches. We need to prevail, we need to move forward, and we need to come together.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield another 30 seconds to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend, as I observed, I think there is a legitimate question here. No one wants to see you silenced. Everyone thinks you have the right. You are a party, and you individually and collectively have the right to bring up this issue. What we urge you not to do is put at risk the passing of a Homeland Security bill which gives funding for a year's period so there will be stability and the ability to manage the national security of our country while, at the same time, on a parallel basis, raising legitimate questions that you want to take. So no one denies or wants to preclude you from the opportunity to do so.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to individual Members.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the House minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues who have commended the Appropria-

tions Committee on the fine work they have done under difficult circumstances on the Homeland Security bill. It had been our hope that their fine work would have been rewarded by its passage in December, but the Republican leadership in the House decided that we would not pass the bill then to give some certainty to how Homeland Security would be funded in this year and instead toss it over until the new year.

We take an oath to protect and defend the American people. Their safety is essential to everything else. And Homeland Security is a place where we have a very big component for protecting and defending the American people. That is why we were so disappointed that, of all bills, the Republicans would pull that one bill out of the pack and say we are just doing this for a matter of weeks. It came with the promise that after the first of the year we would, of course, pass a Homeland Security bill. That was December.

In December, the Republicans said, no, we don't want to have that certainty, not just yet. Then, along came January, Paris. "Je suis Charlie," around the world it is echoed, everybody coming together, heads of state, leaders of countries, whether you were present there or not, everybody present in the moment and the time since of support for protecting people throughout the world from terrorism.

It seems like that affected almost everybody, except it didn't penetrate the walls of this Chamber because here we are, once again, putting off, by other distractions, how we would pass as quickly as possible a homeland security bill. And what is interesting to me is that some of our colleagues are using immigration as the excuse.

But, Mr. Chairman, what further is interesting is that now they are saying it is not about immigration—which, of course, it has always been about passing an immigration bill and we don't even have to have this discussion. They are saying it is about the Constitution.

I have been here since President Reagan was President. I don't remember anybody calling up the Constitution when President Reagan used his executive action in the family fairness legislation. I don't remember anybody bringing up the Constitution when President George Herbert Walker Bush further expanded protections for people in our country—President Clinton and President George Herbert Walker Bush. So this is very interesting to hear it. But I do want to put this in perspective, and it will take a little time.

There is a strong legal and historical precedent to support the extension—we are just talking about deferred action here—to a broad category of people who have strong equities to our country. The Immigration and Nationality Act and the judicial precedent make clear that the Executive maintains

broad discretion to determine how immigration laws are to be enforced. Such discretion extends to decisions regarding whether to defer enforcement against entire categories of people, whether such categories are defined by nationality or some other common characteristic that makes them particularly deserving of an act of administrative grace.

This legal authority has existed since the INA, the Immigration and Nationality Act, was first enacted in 1952 and has been exercised in various ways and under various names over the past 62 years. Based upon the administration's expansive prosecutorial discretion authority, the President could extend deferred action to persons who would qualify for registered provisional immigration status under S. 744, which passed the U.S. Senate on June 27, 2013, by a vote of 68–32.

The President could similarly establish a separate deferred action for persons deemed essential for agriculture in recognition of the fact that our country's agriculture industry and millions of jobs that rely upon it are largely dependent on the labor of unauthorized workers as for the parents of young people who have already received deferred action under DACA.

When Congress first passed the INA, the Immigration and Nationality Act, in 1952, it charged the Attorney General with the administration and enforcement of immigration laws and authorized the Attorney General to "perform such other acts as he deems necessary for carrying out his authority under the provisions of this act."

Courts have relied upon this delegation of authority to support the principle that the act "commits enforcement of the INA to the Attorney General's discretion."

□ 1830

With the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, in the Homeland Security Act of 2002, which many of us were here for, Congress further entrusted the newly created Secretary of Homeland Security with the responsibility of "establishing national immigration enforcement policies and priorities."

In doing so, Congress acknowledged the inherent authority of enforcement agencies to decide whom to investigate, detain, charge, and prosecute under the law. The Supreme Court "has recognized on several occasions over many years that an agency's decision not to prosecute or enforce, whether through criminal or civil process, is a decision generally committed to an agency's absolute discretion."

That is the Court's decision. If you want me to read the further authorities on that I will, but in the interest of brevity, courts consistently have applied this principle in the immigration context, and, in particular, to grants of deferred action and extended voluntary departure.

In *Arizona v. United States*, the Supreme Court relied upon the broad discretion exercised by Federal immigration officials, including “whether it makes sense to pursue removal of all,” to strike down almost all of Arizona’s sweeping anti-immigration law. Because Arizona’s law could result in “unnecessary harassment of some aliens”—that is their term—for example, a veteran, a college student, or someone assisting with a criminal investigation whom Federal officials determine should not be removed, the law “violates the principle that the removal process is entrusted at the discretion of the Federal Government.”

The idea that immigration enforcement efforts should be focused on high-priority targets has not always been controversial. Guidance pertaining to the use of prosecutorial discretion in the immigration context has been issued at least as far back as 1976. Under President George W. Bush, in recent memory, the Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, reaffirmed prosecutorial discretion guidance issued during the Clinton administration and reiterated the responsibility of ICE agents and officers to use discretion in identifying and responding to meritorious health-related cases and caregiver issues.

Indeed, 15 years ago, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress joined together on a letter to then-Attorney General Janet Reno urging her to issue guidelines that would provide specific instructions to agency personnel in order to alleviate some of the hardship caused by our immigration laws. Democrats and Republicans signed it, and the letter accepted the premise that “the principle of prosecutorial discretion is well-established” and asked the INS to explain why it would pursue removal cases that would result in unjustifiable hardship rather than prioritizing enforcement efforts against more serious cases.

Although the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, program announced 2 years ago provides the most recent example of temporary relief from removal being offered to a substantial class of persons, it is the “Family Fairness” program adopted by President Ronald Reagan and President George Herbert Walker Bush that proves to be the strongest precedent for building upon DACA and offering deferred action to a larger class of persons who meet certain criteria.

This is very interesting, my colleagues, because in 1986, Congress passed and President Reagan signed into law the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, IRCA. The law provided a path to legal status for millions of undocumented immigrants but provided no relief to the children and spouses of such persons who were not themselves able to meet the requirements for legalization. Indeed, when

the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the bill to the floor, it wrote:

It is the intent of the committee that the families of legalized aliens will obtain no special petitioning right by virtue of the legalization. They will be required to “wait in line” in the same manner as immediate family members of other new resident aliens.

But on October 26, 1987—less than 1 year after IRCA was enacted into law—President Reagan made the decision to defer enforcement against some of the close family members of persons who obtained lawful status under IRCA.

Now this is President Reagan acting. President Obama is acting in the absence of congressional action; President Reagan is acting in the presence of congressional action and saying, “You didn’t go far enough.”

Under the Family Fairness program issued by then-INS Commissioner Nelson, the Reagan administration offered “indefinite voluntary departure”—along with the opportunity to apply for employment authorization—to undocumented children residing with their parents if both parents—or in the case of a single-parent household, the parent with whom the child resides—had obtained lawful status under the act. Spouses of persons who obtained lawful status could also be granted indefinite voluntary departure and work authorization by demonstrating the existence of certain compelling or humanitarian factors.

Would you be suing President Reagan for doing that, as some of you are friends of the court in the suit against the President, as you are using the Constitution as your argument here today?

In response to continuing concerns that the Family Fairness program was too narrowly defined, President George Herbert Walker Bush went further 3 years later, expanding the program to apply to all spouses and all children of persons who were legalized under IRCA, provided they met certain requirements. The memorandum issued by then-INS Commissioner Gene McNary clarified that voluntary departure and employment authorization would be granted to such persons for a 1-year period and would be subject to extensions without limit.

The Reagan administration—would you be taking the President to court, would you be arguing that he acted unconstitutionally on the floor of the House? People didn’t then.

The INS developed a new form—“Declaration, Ineligible Family Member of Legalized Alien”—precisely for the purpose of allowing undocumented persons who did not qualify for legalization under IRCA to affirmatively request relief from the threat of deportation and authorization to work lawfully. According to reports at the time, INS Commissioner McNary contemplated that the program could have affected as many as 1.5 million undocu-

mented immigrants. Explaining the rationale for expanding the earlier program, McNary stated:

It is vital that we enforce the law against illegal entry. However, we can enforce the law humanely. To split families encourages further violations of the law as they reunite.

In the end, only a fraction of the people eligible for relief under the Family Fairness program obtained such protection, but that is only because the Immigration Act of 1990 was enacted less than 1 year after the program was expanded by President Bush. Section 301 of that bill contained a family unity program that largely codified the executive actions taken by President Reagan and President Bush.

The parallels between the Reagan-Bush Family Fairness program and what is being proposed at the present time are uncanny. There are several lessons that can be drawn from this past precedent.

First, the authority to provide temporary relief from removal to a large percentage of the undocumented population has long existed, and past Presidents have exercised such authority.

Second, such authority existed even when the Executive’s authority would seem to be at its weakest—where Congress specifically declined to legislatively provide the relief granted administratively. The President is now being asked to take administrative action in the face of historic intransigence on the part of House Republicans after the Senate overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill buoyed by popular support, overwhelmingly supported in a bipartisan way in the Senate, but nothing happening in the House.

By contrast, the Reagan administration adopted the Family Fairness program less than 1 year after Congress enacted the last comprehensive immigration reform bill that contains specific criteria for legalization and knowingly excluded from protection the very people affected by the administration action.

Just as I said before, even when Congress acted, President Reagan said we can do better. Nobody argued the Constitution at the time. Well, if they did, history does not recall it.

Third, the scope of the relief now being considered by the administration is entirely consistent with the Family Fairness program after it was expanded by President George Herbert Walker Bush. According to demographic work performed by the Pew Research Center, there were an estimated 3.5 million unauthorized immigrants living in the U.S. in 1990. By extending the Family Fairness program to cover 1.5 million unauthorized immigrants at the beginning of that year, President Bush used executive authority to protect approximately 42.9 percent of the undocumented population from removal and offer them work authorization.

I don't remember any uproar in Congress. Many of us were here at that time.

Earlier this year, the Pew Research Center estimated that there were 11.7 million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States as of March 2012. If the administration takes steps to protect 5 million undocumented immigrants from removal, as a recent article suggested, that would extend temporary relief to 42.7 percent—a lower percentage than President Bush protected—of the undocumented population now in the country.

Finally, the most important lesson that can be learned from the Family Fairness program is that bold executive action can sometimes help change the legislative dynamic, helping to break the gridlock and pave the way to legislative reform. The only reason the Reagan-Bush Family Fairness program did not provide indefinite voluntary departure and employment authorization for many years without legislative approval—essentially a grant of deferred action—is that Congress did act and take steps, following the lead of the Presidents, to largely codify the President's program and provide such relief for removal and employment authorization itself.

At the time the Bush administration expanded family fairness, legislation to extend similar protections were stuck in Congress, having passed the Senate in 1989 but having seen no legislative action in the House. Less than 8 months after the administration's action, the House passed its version of the bill. A conference committee was convened, and IMMACT was quickly enacted into law. The same pattern can be observed in many of the cases described in which the administration granted extended voluntary departure, deferred enforced departure, or deferred action to a broad category of people defined by their nationality or some other compelling characteristic. And Congress subsequently enacted legislation to permit such people to obtain lawful permanent residence.

I hope that will happen. The President has executive orders. Hopefully, Congress will codify that.

The Reagan-Bush Family Fairness program is just one of the many examples of past Presidents deciding to defer removal efforts and offer employment authorization to large classes of people.

In 1960, the Kennedy administration granted extended voluntary departure to many Cubans who otherwise would have been subject to deportation. Over the next 20 years, the INS granted similar protections to nationals of more than a dozen other countries. Such grants have sometimes, but not always, resulted in the enactment of special legislation permitting extended voluntary departure beneficiaries to adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residents.

In 1966, Congress enacted such legislation for Cubans. Again, President Kennedy acted. In 1966, Congress enacted such legislation for Cubans granted extended voluntary departure.

Congress did the same in 1977 for Vietnamese, Laotians, and Cambodians who were permitted to remain in the country on EVD, extended voluntary departure; and again in 1987 for recipients from Poland, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Uganda.

I have personal experience on the initiative.

After Tiananmen Square, there were concerns that Chinese nationals residing in the United States, primarily as scholars and students, would face repression if forced to return home. Congress passed a bill to allow these Chinese nationals to remain, which President George Herbert Walker Bush vetoed.

This is my bill.

Then, in 1990, it passed the House and passed the Senate, went to his desk, and he vetoed it. It had strong bipartisan support. We could fight the veto in the House, but in the Senate, at the moment of truth, the Senate upheld the veto.

President Bush promised that he would issue an executive order extending deferred enforced departure, or DED, to an estimated 80,000 Chinese nationals. While the President did not want it to be an act of Congress for fear of what an insult it might be to the Chinese Government as they were crushing people in the streets in Tiananmen Square and arresting people, he did promise to do an executive order, which he did.

Following President Bush's executive order, Congress acted quickly to permit Chinese nationals granted protection from removal and employment authorization to adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residence.

In 1991, President Bush extended that to approximately 2,000 Persian Gulf evacuees of various nationalities who were airlifted from Kuwait the previous year during the Persian Gulf War. The persons evacuated were chosen because they had children who were U.S. citizens or because they provided protection to U.S. citizens during the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

In 2000, Congress enacted a private immigration law to permit those who had not already been permanent residents by other means to obtain permanent residence.

□ 1845

In 1992, President George Herbert Walker Bush also extended a DED, deferred enforced departure, to approximately 200,000 Salvadorans who fled civil war and previously had been protected from removal pursuant to a grant of temporary protected status, or TPS. President Bill Clinton later provided DED to Haitians in 1997, and President George Walker Bush extended DED to Liberians in 2007.

Finally, again, this administration has extended deferred action to broad categories of people on two prior occasions. First, in 2009, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services created a process in which surviving spouses of deceased U.S. citizens and the qualifying children of such spouses could apply for deferred action.

The process was created because it was the position of the Department of Homeland Security at the time that no immigration relief was available under the law to protect surviving members from removal and that action was needed to address the humanitarian concerns.

The DACA program announced by Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano on June 15, 2012, presented the second deferred action program created under this administration. As of June 30, 2014, over 580,000 persons had been granted deferred action under the program.

The use of Presidential "parole power" is one of the oldest and most-established provisions of Presidential authority in immigration matters. Parole was first used to allow the entry of refugees who would otherwise be excluded by the national origins quota system.

Presidential parole was codified in the original 1952 INA, Immigration and Nationality Act, which authorized the use of discretionary authority to parole aliens into the United States "for emergent reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest."

In 1956, President Dwight David Eisenhower first used his parole authority to allow 900 World War II orphans into the country and later paroled approximately 30,000 Hungarians. This use of parole power marks the first of many mass admissions by future administrations.

Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon collectively allowed approximately 600,000 Cubans to be paroled into the country; and Presidents Ford and Carter paroled approximately 300,000 Indochinese from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

In response to a concern that the parole power was being used to admit large numbers of persons not covered by international refugee laws, Congress enacted the Refugee Act in 1980, which amended the INA to provide a process for the admission of refugees. The act also limited the administration's ability to parole refugees into the country, absent compelling reasons in the public interest, but left untouched the general parole authority.

Nevertheless, several Presidents subsequently used the parole authority to allow the entry of groups of persons who arguably could have been considered "refugee populations."

President George Herbert Walker Bush in 1989 created a program that allowed individuals in Vietnam who were

ineligible for refugee status to enter the country as “public interest parolees,” if they were able to prepay their travel expenses and provide affidavits of support from sponsors in the United States.

In 1996, President Bill Clinton paroled approximately 7,000 Iraqi Kurds to Guam and allowed them to apply for asylum to the United States. In 2006, President George W. Bush created a program which allowed the United States to parole certain Cuban medical professionals who have been conscripted to study or work in a third country under the direction of the Government of Cuba.

In 1996, Congress once more amended the statutory parole authority to apply only on a case-by-case basis; nevertheless, as the terms are not defined by the statute, they are open to interpretation by the administration.

In fact, the several instances in which parole authority was used by past Presidents demonstrate that promoting family unity can serve humanitarian goals or provide a significant public benefit.

The Lautenberg Parole Program, implemented by President George Herbert Walker Bush in 1988, granted parole to individuals whose refugee claims were denied, but who had family reunification concerns.

In 2007, President George Herbert Walker Bush established the Cuban Family Reunification Parole Program to expedite the reunification of Cuban families by paroling into the United States beneficiaries of approved family-based immigrant petitions, so they might wait together with their family members until a visa became available.

In 2007, President Bush created a program to authorize the parole of certain refugee derivative family members who had aged out and, therefore, could not be eligible for refugee status.

Given the administration’s broad statutory parole authority, the lengthy visa backlogs that exist in most immigrant visa categories, and the humanitarian interests and significant public benefits that would attach to the unification of families, the President could make parole available to the spouses, sons, and daughters of American citizens and lawful permanent residents who face a separation of a year or more or, in the case of less than a year, when hardship is in addition to the separation.

This would not permit family members to skip the line, but would allow them to wait in the United States with their family members.

Authority for parole in place already is present in the country. The legal authority for parole in place was originally recognized in 1998. That opinion was endorsed the following year by the Commissioner of the INS, and it was reaffirmed in 2007 by the Bush administration DHS general counsel under President Bush, as I say.

According to these legal opinions, INA grants discretion to parole “any alien applying for admission to the United States,” and INA expressly defines an applicant for admission to include “an alien who is present in the United States who has not been admitted.” As a result, parole can be granted to persons who are present in the country without having previously been admitted to the country.

The list goes on and on, and I have so much more that I want to tell our colleagues, but what I am saying to you is that there is legal authority for the President to take action under the law. There is Presidential precedent, bipartisan since President Eisenhower, since these laws were passed, to do so.

To all of a sudden say we are having a debate now about the Constitution when we are supposed to be passing a law to protect and defend that Constitution and, instead, we are taking an exception to the interpretation of it—as I said, President Eisenhower, every President, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Nixon, the list goes on and on—all of the Presidents since President Eisenhower and certainly since President Reagan and both President Bushes and President Clinton, all acted in this way.

Many of us were Members of Congress in those Presidencies. If somebody wants to come forward and say that he was a voice in the darkness, but nothing significant ever emerged to challenge the constitutionality of what the Presidents did, so why now, especially now, December?

We are not going to protect and defend by extending this bill with certainty for Homeland Security. Paris, the whole world is in unity, galvanized by wanting to stop terrorism and to do everything in our power to do so, and we in this House are hesitating to do that.

If we want to take up an immigration bill and argue that the President doesn’t have the authority to do what he has done, but with an intention to act ourselves, that would be the appropriate place to have this debate, but to hold up the Homeland Security bill, which Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY and the subcommittee chairs—and we are very proud of DAVID PRICE on our side on that, and I am sure that all the Republicans are proud of their Members on their side, because they came up with, under difficult circumstances, a good bill—let us just pass it, why don’t we, and then let’s get on with passing an immigration bill and debate what authorities the President has, and if we don’t like them, then debate the merits of what he did and pass some of that into law.

But to say that he doesn’t have the authority to do it and this is about the Constitution really raises some serious questions.

Again, we should be talking about how we are creating good-paying jobs

in our country. That is what people want us to do. Let’s just pass this bill, get it done, and go on to how we can invest in better infrastructure and bigger paychecks for the American people.

Lifting the economy and the purchasing power of our workers really creates an atmosphere where immigration and other humanitarian initiatives are better received.

I took the time tonight because I just was listening to this debate and how people were saying that the President was acting outside the scope of the Constitution, that he had overreached.

Then I asked my colleagues: What are you thinking, that you would hold up the Homeland Security bill and that you would not question the authority of Republican Presidents—or even the Democratic Presidents when they had done this—but you are questioning the constitutionality of actions taken by President Obama?

The time is not right for this. The time is right for us to pass an immigration bill. The time is right for us to, right now, tonight, pass a clean—tomorrow morning, pass a clean—reject these amendments, reject these amendments and pass a clean Homeland Security bill, so we can get on with that and then have a clear debate about immigration.

I want to thank the staff of the Judiciary Committee for the important work that they have done, Chairwoman ZOE LOFGREN and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS for the work that they have done educating Members about what the history is on this subject—and it is a recent history. I thank them for their leadership and their service.

I ask our colleagues to reject these amendments, disabuse yourself of any notion—because it isn’t a full-fledged idea—but any notion that the President is acting in an unconstitutional way. Let’s get on with our work.

When we say, “Je Suis Charlie,” we are not just identifying with a magazine office in Paris—that would be important enough—but we are identifying with the entire effort to protect people from terrorism.

That is what the Homeland Security Committee was established to do. That is what this legislation will fund. Let’s remove all doubt that we are going to do it as soon as possible.

I urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JOHN CULBERSON, of the CJS Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, under the logic of the minority we have heard tonight, it would be that the President has taken this action because of the inaction of Congress in

order to fix a broken immigration system.

Under that logic, President George W. Bush would have been within his rightful authority, in order to fix a broken economy, to refuse to collect the capital gains tax, just to issue an executive order, a memorandum by the director of the IRS: Do not collect the capital gains tax, the capital gains tax is now effectively zero, no matter what the law says, to fix a broken economy.

I would also point out to my colleagues in the minority that the examples that we have heard tonight of previous Presidents taking action are all based on the President's very broad authority under the war powers, under his authority as Commander in Chief, and also his authority to make treaties and receive foreign ambassadors.

In fact, the Supreme Court, Madam Chair, has said that the President is essentially the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations; so the authority of other Presidents in the past who have taken these actions, they have done so under their authority as Commander in Chief in the area of foreign affairs.

We in the House tonight, the new Republican majority in the House, are listening to the voters. We are responding to the overwhelming rejection of President Obama's policies by the American people.

Two short months ago, when President Obama said his policies were on the ballot, America answered and said "no" and elected the largest Republican majority since the 1920s to stop President Obama from dismantling the America we know and love, to stop President Obama from ignoring the law and the Constitution.

We in the House are using our authority to be good stewards of our taxpayers' hard-earned tax dollars. Our system of checks and balances gives us that authority, our responsibility, to prevent our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars from being spent for illegal purposes.

The first amendment we are taking up tonight is one step of many in this bill tonight. We are taking up a whole series of amendments as steps to keep our word that we are listening to the American voters.

The first amendment is one based on a bill that I am proud to coauthor with Chairman ADERHOLT and other Members of the House that dismantles and defunds the President's illegal executive amnesty memos.

We have further taken action in this bill tonight to have the highest number of border patrol agents we have ever had before, keeping a minimum of 34,000 beds—detention beds—available for the purpose of enforcing the law.

The second critical part of this bill, Madam Chair, is that the Republican House is enforcing the law. This is a law enforcement issue because we un-

derstand in Texas, better than any other part of the Nation, you cannot have good schools, safe streets, and a strong economy without law enforcement.

We all know that our economy on the river, on the Rio Grande, is fundamental that the law be enforced to keep out the drug runners and the smugglers and the gunrunners and the criminals. No one has a stronger interest in safe streets and good schools and laws being enforced than those folks that live along the southern border.

□ 1900

President Obama's got this responsibility and he has refused to fulfill his constitutional responsibility as Commander in Chief to execute the laws faithfully. The House of Representatives is doing our job and honoring our word to the American people to preserve, protect, and defend the America we love by enforcing the law.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairwoman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 38 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 32½ minutes remaining.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, with this bill, the majority plays a dangerous game with our national security. We all know why they are doing this. They want to tie the President's hands on immigration because they do not agree with him there. But by acting this way, the majority has torn up what should be a fundamental rule of American politics: that we do not play politics with the security of our Nation.

The fact that the majority chooses to gamble with Homeland Security, of all budgets, is troubling, to say the least. At a time when we face a higher terrorist threat, these tactics are potentially deadly.

Let us recall that the Department of Homeland Security was born out of the searing attacks on this Nation on September 11, 2001. We created it to protect our country against further atrocities. Three thousand people died. We have seen what our enemies are capable of. We saw it in the Boston Marathon bombing last year. We saw it again over the past week in a shocking series of terrorist murders in Paris.

Funding for national security programs should be sacrosanct. Republicans and Democrats could so easily have come together to pass a full-year funding bill. Instead, the majority chooses tactics that put the security of American families at risk.

They have allowed three nongermane amendments. The American people know about this nongermaneness. They have added that to this bill. That seeks only to make life harder for immigrant families. I remember in 2007 when Chairman ROGERS, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, said on this floor:

There is no more important chore that the Congress has . . . than to protect the country as best we can from its enemies and from natural disasters. That is what this bill is all about.

Well, his party should take his advice now.

These games are dangerous. They are disgraceful. They are wrong. I will vote against this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, which Judge CARTER, Mr. PRICE, myself, and others helped draft in the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Homeland Security. This bill, despite what you may have heard, is a product of bipartisan compromise.

It provides \$47.8 billion to fund the agencies of the Department of Homeland Security through fiscal year 2015.

It includes \$7 billion for emergency disaster relief to assist those suffering the effects of severe winter snowstorms that have hit the northern United States; wildfires that have ravaged the West; floods; tornadoes; and other natural disasters.

The bill also provides \$213 million for OCO, or the Overseas Contingency Operations of the Coast Guard, as they continue to play a vital role in the support of our military abroad.

In our deliberations on this bill, the committee took very seriously the crisis that has unfolded on our southwestern border as we experience the surge of unaccompanied minors, primarily from the Central American countries of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. It is estimated that nearly 70,000 unaccompanied children entered illegally in 2014 alone. The bill also allows certain FEMA grants to be used to reimburse State and local governments for the excessive costs associated with humanely detaining and processing these unaccompanied minors. In response to the influx of families that have crossed the southwest border, it allocates an additional \$362 million for detention capability and capacity, including 3,732 new family detention beds.

This legislation fully funds CBP, or Customs and Border Protection, and its 21,370 agents who provide not only security at our northern and southern borders, but also at our many ports of entry where goods come and go from all over the world.

In light of the recent security incidents at the White House, the bill includes funding to improve security at the White House and Vice President's residence through additional fiscal infrastructure and resources such as tactical canine units.

It also direct resources for the Secret Service to begin preparations for the Presidential candidate protection ahead of the 2016 Presidential election.

We have all seen the recent events in the news that demonstrate the importance of being proactive on security in the cyber realm. Just yesterday, we saw social media accounts that the U.S. Central Command, or CENTCOM, was hacked by ISIS or their sympathizers. Last month, a major cyberattack allegedly perpetrated by North Korea compromised sensitive data belonging to the Sony Corporation.

This legislation provides an increase in funding for the National Protection and Programs Directorate to support infrastructure protection, information security, and cybersecurity. We cannot afford to take a passive approach to protecting critical network communications.

This bill also funds construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility to ensure the security of our Nation's food supply, something I think all too often we have taken for granted. This facility will strengthen our Nation's capability to conduct research and develop vaccines and other countermeasures to prepare and respond against diseases that could seriously threaten our crops and livestock.

Finally, this fiscally responsible appropriations bill reduces the administration overhead costs of the Department of Homeland Security by \$6 million below the fiscal year 2014 enacted level.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman CARTER, Mr. PRICE, and the staff of both sides of the aisle that worked really hard to get this legislation to the point where it is. The underlying bill is a good bill. Notwithstanding any of the amendments that are going to be considered tomorrow, this bill should be supported on its merits, and it has a strong bipartisan vote.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, I want to make it clear that I support the original bipartisan Homeland Security bill and oppose the majority's radical anti-immigrant amendments. These amendments pollute the bipartisan bill both Republicans and Democrats have carefully crafted to protect the American people.

Our clean Homeland Security bill provides the funds needed to protect our country. It invests in border security and prioritizes the detention and deportation of dangerous criminals.

The clean, bipartisan Homeland Security bill provides funds for new grants to State and local first responders, who are our first line of defense against homegrown terrorism. It invests in the Coast Guard's eighth National Security Cutter and additional Fast Response Cutters to help protect our ports. The bill also provides critical funds to hire new Secret Service agents to make essential security improvements at the White House.

These are just a few examples of why this bill is so important. Unfortunately, instead of bringing the clean, bipartisan bill for a vote, the majority is proposing several poison pill amendments that will jeopardize the bill's ability to become law. It is unconscionable to put our Nation's security at risk simply for the purpose of appeasing those who want to undermine President Obama's reasonable and lawful executive action to fix our broken immigration system in light of the fact that this House has not acted.

Current funding for DHS is set to run out at the end of February. The recent horrors in Paris are the latest reminder of why America needs Congress to pass the negotiated bipartisan Homeland Security bill that can become law and defeat the anti-immigrant poison pill amendments being proposed by the majority.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendments and to vote "yes" on the original bill to protect the homeland, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in support of the 2015 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Our subcommittee has worked diligently on this legislation, and I want to thank Chairman CARTER and the entire staff for countless hours they have put in crafting the bill before us today. This legislation

prioritizes our national security and strengthens border security, while addressing numerous issues that have arisen in the past year.

Last year, tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien children entered the United States illegally while the administration sat on its hands. Rather than deal with the crisis, the President further exacerbated the problem and encouraged more people to try to bypass the legal immigration process when he granted executive amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants.

Today, the House has the opportunity to correct these mistakes by passing this legislation. In addition to the responsible and deliberate funding levels laid out in the bill, House Republicans are offering key amendments to completely defund the President's executive actions and restore order to the legal administration process by ensuring that those who came here illegally will not be allowed to bypass those who sought to come here through the right and legal way.

I urge my colleagues to vote for these provisions and the underlying bill.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise to thank my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. I am a ranking member also. I know what type of work it takes to put together a \$39.7 billion expenditure to protect all of the entities of domestic homeland security. It is a good bill. It was worked out last year. For all the new Members coming, I am shocked that they have to go through this learning process about how we take a good thing and screw it up.

This bill has bipartisan support. I think if we voted on it tonight, the underlying bill would pass overwhelmingly. I don't even know if there would be a negative vote. But tomorrow morning on this floor amendments are going to be made to this bill. I understand the other side already has them, and I wish the people who are thinking about voting for those amendments and those that are proposing them had listened to the people that we are funding in Homeland Security, because the last thing they would tell you is that America is going to be less secure with those amendments.

There isn't going to be a college campus or university that isn't going to be in revolt when you try to deport the students who are there. Your wives, your families are going to be upset when you try to deport your gardener or somebody taking care of your house. Our faith-based communities are going to be hiding these people from deportation.

You are coming in and creating this ugly government that is going to go around and round up people who have

not committed a crime and deport them.

□ 1915

That doesn't make America more secure. In fact, it makes us ugly all over the world. So, I can't, for the life of me—when we go to such hard work to get such a great, balanced bill, to spend \$39.7 billion on the Department of Homeland Security, then want to make sure that it doesn't work.

The President has said he is going to veto it. He is going to veto it because you are mad at him for providing leadership.

Thank you, Mr. President, for providing that leadership. The House should have joined with the Senate and adopted a comprehensive immigration bill, but we didn't. We sat on that for 2 years, did absolutely nothing, and now we are attacking you.

Shame, shame on the House. Defeat those amendments.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of our committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 2015 Homeland Security Appropriations Act, as well as the amendments that will be offered to put the brakes on President Obama's executive overreach on illegal immigration.

My constituents are depending on the House and the Senate to send a strong message to the White House that their attempt to grant amnesty through executive action is an affront to the democratic process that has served our Nation well for more than 200 years.

The reason people are fleeing from south to north is that this side of the border, we have the rule of law, not men.

I want to thank Homeland Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHN CARTER, Chairman HAL ROGERS, and the rest of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for putting together a responsible bill that provides the funds for our Homeland Security personnel and the need to carry out their mission.

Specifically, the bill provides significant funding for our Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement to ensure both agencies have the ability to stem large flows of illegal immigration like we witnessed last summer in Texas.

Another important tool in tackling illegal immigration is the increased use of E-Verify, which remains the only and best way for employers to confirm that the employees that they hire are in this country legally. The underlying bill contains full funding for the E-Verify funding and will allow employers to continue to use this program in a free and efficient manner.

When it comes to patrolling our land, air, and sea, Homeland Security officials consistently rely on the aware-

ness and insights that are provided by assets operated by the Air and Marine Operations Center, or AMOC. In fact, AMOC, which is located in Riverside County, California, is the Nation's only Federal law enforcement center tasked to coordinate interdiction operations in the Western Hemisphere.

The FY15 bill fully funds the operations of AMOC and ensures that our law enforcement agencies will continue to benefit from their contributions.

Again, I want to thank Judge CARTER for his leadership, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for the FY15 Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the FY 2015 Homeland Security Appropriations Act because House Republicans are littering the bill with provisions that have nothing to do with homeland security but have everything to do with harming families and keeping our immigration system dysfunctional, risking our national security in the process.

I too serve as a ranking member on the Appropriations Committee and craft a bill and work in a bipartisan spirit, and I had an opportunity to work in a bipartisan spirit on this bill as well. So it is truly unfortunate that this bill is being poisoned by amendments that are really going to jeopardize our national security.

I reluctantly stand in opposition because the overall bill is "must-pass" legislation, and it includes very important measures to bolster our national security, including additional funding that I fought for and secured to protect children from online predators.

Many of my colleagues are in a similar situation; too many poison pills are set to be slipped in that make this legislation's passage unacceptable.

House Republicans are willfully driving us toward a partial government shutdown that jeopardizes our security at home, all just for the chance to further destabilize our immigration system, make it harder to secure the border, punish young people who have known no other country other than this one, and separate families in the process.

Now, how did we get here?

Because the extreme elements of the GOP became apoplectic when the President announced that he would move ahead with his legal executive actions to fix our broken immigration system. And everyone will recall, of course, that he did so due to this body's repeated unwillingness to pass comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

Now, as we debated the so-called CR/Omnibus legislation last year, House

Republicans put their cards on the table with temporary DHS funding. And with this bill being debated today, they are ready to gamble on our Nation's security and America's safety to satisfy their rightwing base.

This is not governing in good faith at the outset of a new Congress, with the opportunity we have to set aside differences and work together for the betterment of the country.

And this isn't just politics as usual from the other side of the aisle. Some of it is alarmingly personal and targeted.

Part of the President's executive action is intended to keep families together and support the educational and employment aspirations of millions of undocumented individuals.

Some of the amendments attached to this bill would, in fact, tear families apart, deporting thousands of so-called DREAMers and even revictimizing women already subjected to domestic violence by targeting them for removal.

The point of these games is to satisfy the anti-immigrant, extremist elements within the Republican party. But to what end?

Where is the sense of reality?

Though he has flip-flopped several times on the issue, even former Governor Jeb Bush, from my home State of Florida, has said as far back as 10 years ago that a policy that ignores that they are here is a policy of denial.

So where is the thoughtful policymaking our constituents sent us to Washington to engage in?

And quite frankly, where is the compassion?

I have held numerous meetings and events in south Florida recently, and to say that we are past due for comprehensive immigration reform is a gross understatement.

I have met so many workers and students who have made meaningful contributions to our community but who live in a constant state of uncertainty about their future, ranging from questions about their schooling and jobs to fearing deportation and separation from their loved ones.

Leoni, a high school valedictorian; Maria, a mother of DREAMers who has formed a support group for people in similar situations; and Cosmin, a father only seeking a permanent work permit to be able to better provide for his young daughter who is a citizen—these are real people with real stories, and our actions and inactions in Washington have real consequences for them.

Madam Chair, it is not too late to engage in bipartisan and comprehensive immigration reform. We can reintroduce and debate the legislation that was passed by a strong bipartisan majority in the Senate in 2013 and supported by diverse business, faith, legal, and community groups across the Nation.

That is the most effective way to legally and morally respond to the needs of immigration reform. It is practical. It is wide-ranging, and it speaks to our values as a Nation.

Or we could even sit down together and come up with a new comprehensive bill. But this is immoral and wrong, and we should reject it so that we can come together and do something that is reflective of the values of this country.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. POE), a colleague not only of this House but of the judiciary prior to that time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, "America is a Nation of laws, which means, I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That is part of my job.

"With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that is just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed.

"There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates, would not conform with my appropriate role as President."

Those are the words of the former constitutional law professor, and now President, on March 28, 2011. Those very words condemn executive amnesty.

The United States is ruled by law, not by one person. The United States is not a monarchy. If it were, we would have kept King George III.

The executive amnesty is not only unconstitutional, Madam Chair, it is at cross-purposes to security. The Department of Homeland Security cannot secure the U.S. border, no matter how many programs and how much money we spend on homeland security, as long as the Executive undermines law and security by unilaterally ignoring those very security laws.

We can give all the money we want to the Department of Homeland Security, but that doesn't do any good if we do not make sure the law is enforced.

Madam Chairman, we will use this example that has already been used by my friend, Mr. CULBERSON. We have tax laws in this country. God knows we have too many tax laws in this country.

But if the Executive makes a decision, I am just going to ignore these tax laws for a certain group of people, none of us would like that. The Executive doesn't have that authority to just ignore law for whatever reason, even if it is a good reason, because that does not establish the constitutional power of who the Executive is.

Madam Chair, those of us in Texas have a vested interest in homeland security. The United States border with Mexico is almost 2,000 miles. Sixty percent of the border is in Texas. Forty-five percent of the entire border is in one Member's district, Mr. WILL HURD.

The Texas border with Mexico is the distance from New Orleans to Washington, D.C. We have got a vested interest in border security and the rule of law, because failure to enforce the rule of law affects people on the border. It affects American citizens. It affects legal immigrants.

Now, there is a lot that has been said about immigration. I am for immigration. We do need some changes in immigration. The United States allows a million people to legally come into the United States. But when laws are enforced, there is order. When law is not enforced, there is chaos.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

When laws are not enforced, there is chaos, especially if the security laws are not enforced.

So Madam Chair, as the President said, I am obligated to enforce the law because, Madam Chairman, the Constitution is not a mere suggestion, whether the other side likes it or not.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, this is one of those moments where the best thing you can do is kind of scratch your head and say, What the heck are they thinking?

We have a bipartisan bill, a Homeland Security bill that, as was said before by Mr. FARR, if it was put up for a vote, would pass almost unanimously, if not unanimously.

But no, they couldn't help themselves. They had to take one more shot at the President and a bigger shot at immigrants. And so the bill is weighted down with attacks on immigrants. Mostly Latino immigrants, I would say, would be affected, and that is personal to me.

So what this bill now would say if it gets all these amendments to it—and, by the way, I want to say that I am opposed to the bill with the amendments and not opposed to the bill in its clean fashion, and I think that is the way most Members think.

What this bill now says is that, for instance, if you are in the military, serving our country, your spouse can be deported while you are away. That is really sad and insulting.

We are going to have now new bumper stickers on the other side on their cars that will say, "Support our troops

and deport the spouses." It will be sad, and it will be horrible what we are doing.

Now, our opportunity here is to defeat these amendments. Our opportunity here is to understand that if we have a gripe with the President using his constitutional power, deal with that. But don't take it out on every immigrant in the Nation.

Incidentally, nothing that the President did is outside the law. We have a Constitution, and what he did is constitutional. It is within his powers as our Chief Executive in this Nation.

This President waited and waited and waited for the majority party to do something about immigration. It refused to do something. You are upset that he took action on immigration. His action was due to your inaction on immigration. That is why we have this situation.

So these 2 days will probably go down in history as two of the saddest days in this House, and I have been here 25 years, starting this January, because we will go after a group of people, and we will say to the DREAMers, you can't dream anymore, and we will say to the spouses, you are in danger of being deported.

We will say to those who serve our country, we don't respect you anymore. And we will say to the whole world, we are not the Nation of immigrants; we are the Nation that doesn't want any more immigrants.

This is sad. This is it not the way to go, and we should really rethink this before we take a final vote.

□ 1930

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, before I proceed, may I ask how much time is left on both sides, please?

The Acting CHAIR. There are 21 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Texas, and there are 25 minutes remaining for the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), one of our new Members of the 114th Congress.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, the United States is a nation of immigrants. It is also a nation of laws, and our Nation's leaders have a sworn duty to abide by those laws. On countless occasions, President Obama said that he lacked the authority to grant broad amnesty; however, in November, he reversed his course and unilaterally declared amnesty.

I rise in strong opposition to his executive amnesty and in strong support of legislation to defund his unlawful and unconstitutional actions.

Changes in immigration law—or in any law for that matter—rest with the legislative branch of the government,

the United States Congress. Granting amnesty through unilateral executive action makes a mockery of our laws, and Congress must rein it in.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 191, the Repeal Executive Amnesty Act. Key provisions of this bill will be offered as amendments to this appropriations bill. We will deny the administration funding to implement his amnesty.

As a past mayor, a hospital staff member for many years, and a local school board member, I know firsthand how this administration's plan is taxing the budgets of our local governments, including our schools, our hospitals, and our jails. This massive unfunded mandate must be repealed.

Amnesty also undermines our national security by perpetuating open borders, making Americans less safe. Finally, it leaves behind millions of American citizens who are unemployed at this time, making it even harder for them to find good-paying jobs.

To make the United States stronger, we must rein in this President. We must repeal unilateral amnesty, and we must return to the rule of law. I call on my colleagues to support H.R. 240 and the Aderholt amendment and to pass the underlying legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a clean Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

We are just a week into the new Congress, and the Republicans are already back to their old games, but this time, they are playing politics with the security and safety of the Nation.

We get it. They are frustrated with the President's executive order which attempts to reunite families and bring a rational, priority-based approach to our immigration system. Given the Constitution, the laws, and the legal precedents, the President's actions are clearly well within his executive powers.

If they don't like it, they can pass an immigration bill, which would clearly supercede the actions of the President, but they wouldn't even try. That is what this is all about. It is about making false statements about the President, demonizing immigrants and their families, and trying to score political points back home. That is a disgrace, but it gets even worse.

Not only are the Republicans stalling on immigration reform and leaving millions of families in limbo, but they are holding up funding for the entire Homeland Security Department. They are threatening the safety of Americans at our airports. They are making our borders less secure and are potentially leaving us more vulnerable to attack. This is particularly shocking, given the tragic events in Paris last week.

Holding the security of the American people hostage to the demands of the anti-immigration fringe of their party is totally irresponsible. This is not the time for political games. We live in a dangerous world, and the security of the Nation is serious business. Reject this political stunt.

Pass a clean Homeland Security bill that we all agree on. Then, if you want to, pass an immigration bill that would supersede what the President has done; but don't give us all of this nonsense about blackmailing the country by threatening our safety and saying, "Unless we get the immigration provisions we want," which we know the President won't sign, "there will be no Homeland Security bill, potentially no Homeland Security Department funding, and no guards at our borders." That is absurd.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), another Member of the 114th Congress, a man who probably has more of the southern border of the United States than any other Member of Congress.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have taken an oath of office to uphold our Constitution twice: the first time as an undercover officer in the CIA and, just last week, I took that oath again as I was sworn in as a Member of this body.

This bill is about upholding our Constitution and protecting it from executive overreach, but we can't forget that immigration and legal immigrants are an asset to our Nation, not a liability.

Everyone knows that our immigration system is broken and that executive action that incentivizes illegal immigration just makes it worse. We need a long-term solution that protects American workers and fosters economic growth.

Our Nation has, for many decades, benefited from the "brain drain" from other countries, and we need to make sure that continues. I also want our Nation to benefit from a "hardworking drain," too. If you are going to be a productive member of our society, let's keep you here or get you here, but we must do it legally.

There is a long-term solution to our immigration problems. I am ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and with the President to find it.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important for us to focus on what we are discussing here today: Paris, 17 dead; Canada; Australia; Boko Haram, 2,000 dead, a 10-year-old suicide bomber; and, of course, 9/11.

This is the Homeland Security Appropriations. I have had the privilege

of serving on the authorizing committee since its creation, and every day we go to that committee, we know that the commitment is to secure the American people.

This is not a forum to battle one's agreements or disagreements with the Constitution and with the President's executive authority or to battle your disagreements with the idea of deporting felons over families—that debate can be had—but, tonight, we are wrongly jeopardizing the national security of the American people.

We do it on the basis, our Republican friends, of failing to even read the Constitution, for it is clear, as it is stated in the Constitution under article II, section 3, that the President can have the authority, "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

In essence, he has the right to make sure that we are treating persons fairly and that prosecutorial discretion is exercised in a fair manner.

Nothing that is in the executive actions of the President violates any law; but what it does do, as we are debating today with the poison pill amendments, is to take the inhumanity of some viewpoints and to throw it against people who have come to this country by no fault of their own, who have come to this country to do us not harm but good, who have come to this country to work hard and to help build this great Nation.

I am saddened by the fact that, because of this debate, the Coast Guard will suffer, that the Secret Service will suffer, that the airport and aviation security will suffer. Why? Because we will not have a bill.

I believe that this challenge for all of us is to raise the question of whether our Republican friends have come here to govern. The only thing I see is that they are using this Homeland Security bill for extreme positions that they want to foster over security.

Why would they want to defund DACA? Why would they want to capture the basic infrastructure of the funding of Homeland Security? It has worked over the years, the fees that have supported the Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection, Transportation and Security; yet they want to capture these dollars and cripple Homeland Security. They want to make sure we don't have enough Secret Service agents as we move forward into the election year.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, the Homeland Security Department has been entrusted by the United States Congress and the American people to give guidance to the security and the protection of their families. It is not families who, by chance, are considered undocumented; it is all families.

What the President did in his executive action is to define for America who is here in this country; not only that, he gave an economic engine by providing for fines and fees in order to get in regular order.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, these individuals are not getting in front of those who have been standing in line through the legal immigration process. They have a separate process that simply gives them status, not immigration status. He is not bestowing upon them immigration status.

As I close, I ask: Is there any heart and warmth to those who are debating these questions? First, do we understand family, and do we understand we are a nation of immigrants?

What has been established is an infrastructure of law to help them be established in regular order. What we are doing is undermining the national security of this Nation to cast against those who are innocent. I ask my colleagues to defeat these amendments and to vote for a clean Homeland Security bill. Let's support the national security of Americans.

Mr. Chair, while it is not perfect, I would support H.R. 240, the Fiscal Year 2015 Homeland Security Appropriations Act, as originally introduced because it provides adequate funding of the Department of Homeland Security, including support for important federal cybersecurity initiatives, disaster relief and recovery programs, and essential law enforcement activities that are critical for ensuring the Department can help keep our Nation safe from harm.

But I cannot support the bill on final passage if it contains any of the "poison pill" amendments made in order by the Rules Committee.

Those amendments are simply the latest attempt by House Republicans to prohibit the executive branch from exempting or deferring from deportation any immigrants considered to be unlawfully present in the United States under U.S. immigration law, and to prohibit the administration from treating those immigrants as if they were lawfully present or had lawful immigration status.

I oppose all of the amendments made in order by the Rules Committee because their inclusion will spell certain doom for the bill and needlessly put the security of the homeland at risk at a time when things are so perilous in the world.

The recent terrorist attacks in Paris and by Boko Haram in Nigeria given heightened urgency to the words of Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS that we need to get a clean Homeland Security spending bill "to the president's desk so we can get a signature funding Homeland Security at a very tedious time in the world."

Sending this bill to the president with the Republican poison pill amendments will result in a presidential veto rather than the signature needed for the bill to become law.

In addition, were the bill to become law with the poison pill amendments intact, it would inflict tremendous damage to the nation's economy and the economy of my home state of Texas.

According to an analysis conducted by the Council of Economic Advisors, the executive actions taken by the President to mitigate the damage caused by our broken immigration system would grow the U.S. economy by \$90 billion to \$210 billion over the next ten years.

And they would grow the GDP of my home state of Texas by \$8.2 billion to \$19.2 billion over that same period and increase Texas state revenues by \$770 million to \$1.8 billion.

I cannot and will not support a bill that would do such harm to our efforts to protect the homeland and expand the economy so that it creates jobs for all who seek employment at wages that will enable workers to provide for their families and their retirement, buy and keep their homes, and send their children to college.

I urge my colleagues to reject all of the amendments made in order by the Rules Committee and pass the bill as originally introduced by Chairman ROGERS.

There are many good things in that bill that are worthy of support, including the following:

1. \$39.7 billion in regular discretionary appropriations for Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in fiscal year 2015;
2. \$12.6 billion for Customs and Border Protection (CBP); DHS would be required to accelerate the hiring of CBP officers;
3. \$5.96 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) plus an additional \$345 million from the agency's fee funded accounts, bringing the total to \$6.3 billion;
4. \$553.6 million in funding to manage the influx of unaccompanied alien children, or "UAC," entering the U.S.; the funding would be used to interdict migrants, care for and transport approximately 58,000 undocumented children to the custody of Health and Human Services (HHS), and facilitate the movement of undocumented families through removal proceedings after crossing the U.S. border;
5. \$1.9 billion for both domestic and international investigations, including increases to combat human trafficking, child exploitation, cyber-crime, and drug smuggling, and to expand visa vetting capabilities;
6. \$4.8 billion for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA);
7. \$10 billion for the U.S. Coast Guard;
8. \$753.2 million for cybersecurity operations in the National Programs and Protection Directorate to fund and sustain improvements to the Federal Network Security and Network Security Deployment programs;
9. \$1.7 billion for the U.S. Secret Service—an increase of \$80.5 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level—to begin preparation and training for candidate protection for the 2016 presidential election and to address critical failures in communications and training at the White House Complex;
10. \$7 billion for disaster relief—fully funding FEMA's stated requirement; and
11. \$1.1 billion for Science and Technology, \$32.1 million above the President's request.

The White House has announced that the President will sign H.R. 240 as originally introduced but he will veto the bill if it contains any of the irresponsible and reckless amendments made in order by the Rules Committee.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting against all of the amendments and sending a clean Homeland Security funding bill that will

receive the presidential signature needed to become and law provide the resources needed to keep our homeland safe.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is Placer County Sheriff's Deputy Michael Davis, Jr. You may have heard of him. He was gunned down on October 24 of last year in one of the most shocking murder rampages in the history of that county. He was murdered on the 26th anniversary of the day that he lost his father, a Riverside County sheriff's deputy, in the line of duty.

The suspect, who also killed a Sacramento sheriff's deputy and wounded an innocent bystander, should never have been here. He was a convicted felon who had entered our country illegally from Mexico. He had been twice deported for his crimes, only to reenter time and again over our unsecured border.

I met with Michael Davis' grieving family this weekend, including his remarkable mother, Debbie, and his sole surviving brother, Jason, who also serves as a Placer County sheriff's deputy. The message they asked me to convey today is that this is not about immigration—in fact, Jason spends his free time working with at-risk Latino children, many from immigrant families—rather, this is about the rule of law, including respect for our immigration laws for which this family has sacrificed so much.

We pride ourselves on being a nation of laws and not of men. That means the President is sworn to enforce the laws, not to make them. He doesn't get to change or to repeal laws by decree or decide who must obey the law and who gets to live above it; yet that is precisely what he has done.

In so doing, he has placed the public safety and the Nation's security at great risk. This measure begins to walk back these unconstitutional orders, secure our borders, repair our Nation's sovereignty, and recover the rule of law.

Michael Davis died for these principles. The least we can do is to vote to restore them.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, some claim the President's actions are unconstitutional. That is not true.

I submit for the RECORD a letter signed by 135 law professors and confirmed by four former chief counsels for Immigration about why his action was lawful.

25 NOVEMBER 2014.
We write as scholars and teachers of immigration law who have reviewed the executive actions announced by the President on November 20, 2014. It is our considered view

that the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and establishment of the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) programs are within the legal authority of the executive branch of the government of the United States. To explain, we cite federal statutes, regulations, and historical precedents. We do not express any views on the policy aspects of these two executive actions.

This letter updates a letter transmitted by 136 law professors to the White House on September 3, 2014, on the role of executive action in immigration law. We focus on the legal basis for granting certain noncitizens in the United States “deferred action” status as a temporary reprieve from deportation. One of these programs, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), was established by executive action in June 2012. On November 20, the President announced the expansion of eligibility criteria for DACA and the creation of a new program, Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA).

PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION IN IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT

Both November 20 executive actions relating to deferred action are exercises of prosecutorial discretion. Prosecutorial discretion refers to the authority of the Department of Homeland Security to decide how the immigration laws should be applied. Prosecutorial discretion is a long-accepted legal practice in practically every law enforcement context, unavoidable whenever the appropriated resources do not permit 100 percent enforcement. In immigration enforcement, prosecutorial discretion covers both agency decisions to refrain from acting on enforcement, like cancelling or not serving or filing a charging document or Notice to Appear with the immigration court, as well as decisions to provide a discretionary remedy like granting a stay of removal, parole, or deferred action.

Prosecutorial discretion provides a temporary reprieve from deportation. Some forms of prosecutorial discretion, like deferred action, confer “lawful presence” and the ability to apply for work authorization. However, the benefits of the deferred action programs announced on November 20 are not unlimited. The DACA and DAPA programs, like any other exercise of prosecutorial discretion do not provide an independent means to obtain permanent residence in the United States, nor do they allow a noncitizen to acquire eligibility to apply for naturalization as a U.S. citizen. As the President has emphasized, only Congress can prescribe the qualifications for permanent resident status or citizenship.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND LONG-STANDING AGENCY PRACTICE

Focusing first on statutes enacted by Congress, 103(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA” or the “Act”), clearly empowers the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to make choices about immigration enforcement. That section provides: “The Secretary of Homeland Security shall be charged with the administration and enforcement of this Act and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens. . . .” INA §242(g) recognizes the executive branch’s legal authority to exercise prosecutorial discretion, specifically by barring judicial review of three particular types of prosecutorial discretion decisions: to commence removal proceedings, to adjudicate cases, and to execute removal orders. In other sections of the Act, Congress has explicitly recognized deferred action by name, as a tool that the executive branch may use,

in the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion, to protect certain victims of abuse, crime or trafficking. Another statutory provision, INA §274A(h)(3), recognizes executive branch authority to authorize employment for noncitizens who do not otherwise receive it automatically by virtue of their particular immigration status. This provision (and the formal regulations noted below) confer the work authorization eligibility that is part of both the DACA and DAPA programs.

Based on this statutory foundation, the application of prosecutorial discretion to individuals or groups has been part of the immigration system for many years. Long-standing provisions of the formal regulations promulgated under the Act (which have the force of law) reflect the prominence of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law. Deferred action is expressly defined in one regulation as “an act of administrative convenience to the government which gives some cases lower priority” and goes on to authorize work permits for those who receive deferred action. Agency memoranda further reaffirm the role of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law. In 1976, President Ford’s Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) General Counsel Sam Bernsen stated in a legal opinion, “The reasons for the exercise of prosecutorial discretion are both practical and humanitarian. There simply are not enough resources to enforce all of the rules and regulations presently on the books.” In 2000, a memorandum on prosecutorial discretion in immigration matters issued by INS Commissioner Doris Meissner provided that “[s]ervice officers are not only authorized by law but expected to exercise discretion in a judicious manner at all stages of the enforcement process,” and spelled out the factors that should guide those decisions. In 2011, Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the Department of Homeland Security published guidance known as the “Morton Memo,” outlining more than one dozen factors, including humanitarian factors, for employees to consider in deciding whether prosecutorial discretion should be exercised. These factors—now updated by the November 20 executive actions—include tender or elderly age, long-time lawful permanent residence, and serious health conditions.

JUDICIAL RECOGNITION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION IN IMMIGRATION CASES

Federal courts have also explicitly recognized prosecutorial discretion in general and deferred action in particular. Notably, the U.S. Supreme Court noted in its *Arizona v. United States* decision in 2012: “A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. . . . Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. . . .” In its 1999 decision in *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee*, the Supreme Court explicitly recognized deferred action by name. This affirmation of the role of discretion is consistent with congressional appropriations for immigration enforcement, which are at an annual level that would allow for the arrest, detention, and deportation of fewer than 4 percent of the noncitizens in the United States who lack lawful immigration status.

Based on statutory authority, U.S. immigration agencies have a long history of exercising prosecutorial discretion for a range of reasons that include economic or humanitarian considerations, especially—albeit not only—when the noncitizens involved have strong family ties or long-term residence in

the United States. Prosecutorial discretion, including deferred action, has been made available on both a case-by-case basis and a group basis, as are true under DACA and DAPA. But even when a program like deferred action has been aimed at a particular group of people, individuals must apply, and the agency must exercise its discretion based on the facts of each individual case. Both DACA and DAPA explicitly incorporate that requirement.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS FOR DEFERRED ACTION AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS FOR INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS

As examples of the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, numerous administrations have issued directives providing deferred action or functionally similar forms of prosecutorial discretion to groups of noncitizens, often to large groups. The administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush deferred the deportations of a then-predicted (though ultimately much lower) 1.5 million noncitizen spouses and children of immigrants who qualified for legalization under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986, authorizing work permits for the spouses. Presidents Reagan and Bush took these actions, even though Congress had decided to exclude them from IRCA. Among the many other examples of significant deferred action or similar programs are two during the George W. Bush administration: a deferred action program in 2005 for foreign academic students affected by Hurricane Katrina, and “Deferred Enforcement Departure” for certain Liberians in 2007. Several decades earlier, the Reagan administration issued a form of prosecutorial discretion called “Extended Voluntary Departure” in 1981 to thousands of Polish nationals. The legal sources and historical examples of immigration prosecutorial discretion described above are by no means exhaustive, but they underscore the legal authority for an administration to apply prosecutorial discretion to both individuals and groups.

Some have suggested that the size of the group who may “benefit” from an act of prosecutorial discretion is relevant to its legality. We are unaware of any legal authority for such an assumption. Notably, the Reagan-Bush programs of the late 1980s and early 1990s were based on an initial estimated percentage of the unauthorized population (about 40 percent) that is comparable to the initial estimated percentage for the November 20 executive actions. The President could conceivably decide to cap the number of people who can receive prosecutorial discretion or make the conditions restrictive enough to keep the numbers small, but this would be a policy choice, not a legal issue. For all of these reasons, the President is not “re-writing” the immigration laws, as some of his critics have suggested. He is doing precisely the opposite—exercising a discretion conferred by the immigration laws and settled general principles of enforcement discretion.

THE CONSTITUTION AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT DISCRETION

Critics have also suggested that the deferred action programs announced on November 20 violate the President’s constitutional duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” A serious legal question would therefore arise if the executive branch were to halt all immigration enforcement, or even if the Administration were to refuse to substantially spend the resources appropriated by Congress. In either of those scenarios, the justification based on resource limitations would not apply. But the Obama

administration has fully utilized all the enforcement resources Congress has appropriated. It has enforced the immigration law at record levels through apprehensions, investigations, and detentions that have resulted in over two million removals. At the same time that the President announced the November 20 executive actions that we discuss here, he also announced revised enforcement priorities to focus on removing the most serious criminal offenders and further shoring up the southern border. Nothing in the President's actions will prevent him from continuing to remove as many violators as the resources Congress has given him permit.

Moreover, when prosecutorial discretion is exercised, particularly when the numbers are large, there is no legal barrier to formalizing that policy decision through sound procedures that include a formal application and dissemination of the relevant criteria to the officers charged with implementing the program and to the public. As DACA has shown, those kinds of procedures assure that important policy decisions are made at the leadership level, help officers to implement policy decisions fairly and consistently, and offer the public the transparency that government priority decisions require in a democracy.

Hiroshi Motomura & Susan Westerberg Prager, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law; Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, Pennsylvania State University Dickinson School of Law; Stephen H. Legomsky, Washington University School of Law; David Abraham, University of Miami School of Law; Raquel Aldana, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law; Farrin R. Anello, Seton Hall University School of Law; Deborah Anker, Harvard Law School; Sabrineh Ardalan, Harvard Law School; David C. Baluarte, Washington and Lee University School of Law; Melynda Barnhart, New York Law School; Jon Bauer, University of Connecticut School of Law; Lenni B. Benson, New York Law School; Jacqueline Bhabha, Harvard Law School; Linda Bosniak, Rutgers University School of Law-Camden; Richard A. Boswell, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Jason A. Cade, University of Georgia Law School; Janet Calvo, CUNY School of Law, New York; Kristina M. Campbell, University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law; Stacy Caplow, Brooklyn Law School; Benjamin Casper, University of Minnesota Law School; Linus Chan, University of Minnesota; Howard F. Chang, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Michael J. Churgin, University of Texas at Austin; Marisa Cianciarulo, Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law; Evelyn Cruz, Arizona State University; Ingrid Eagly, UCLA School of Law; Philip Eichorn, Cleveland State—Cleveland Marshall School of Law; Bram T. Elias, University of Iowa College of Law; Stella Burch Elias, University of Iowa College of Law; Jill E. Family, Widener University School of Law; Niels Frenzen, University of Southern California; Maryellen Fullerton, Brooklyn Law School; César Cuauhtimoc García Hernández, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Lauren Gilbert, St. Thomas University School of Law; Denise L. Gilman, University of Texas School of Law; John F. Gossart, Jr., University of Maryland School of Law; P. Gulasekaram, Santa Clara University; Anju Gupta, Rutgers School of Law—Newark; Susan R. Gzesh, University of Chicago; Jonathan Hafetz, Seton Hall University; Dina Francesca Haynes, New England Law, Boston; Susan Hazeldean, Cornell Law School; Ernesto Hernández-López, Chapman

University; Laura A. Hernandez, Baylor Law School; Michael Heyman, John Marshall Law School; Barbara Hines, University of Texas School of Law; Laila L. Hlass, Boston University School of Law; Geoffrey Hoffman, University of Houston Law Center; Mary Holper, Boston College Law School; Alan Hyde, Rutgers University School of Law—Newark; Kate Jastram, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Kit Johnson, University of Oklahoma College of Law; Anil Kalhan, Drexel University Kline School of Law; Daniel Kanstroom, Boston College Law School; Elizabeth Keyes, University of Baltimore School of Law; Kathleen Kim, Loyola Law School Los Angeles; David C. Koelsch, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Jennifer Lee Koh, Western State College of Law; Kevin Lapp, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; Christopher Lasch, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Jennifer J. Lee, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Stephen Lee, University of California, Irvine; Christine Lin, University of California, Hastings College of the Law; Beth Lyon, Villanova University School of Law; Stephen Manning, Lewis & Clark College; Lynn Marcus, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law; Miriam H. Marton, University of Tulsa College of Law; Elizabeth McCormick, University of Tulsa College of Law; M. Isabel Medina, Loyola University New Orleans College of Law; Stephen Meili, University of Minnesota Law School; Vanessa Merton, Pace University School of Law; Andrew Moore, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Jennifer Moore, University of New Mexico School of Law; Daniel I. Morales, DePaul University College of Law; Nancy Morawetz, NYU School of Law; Karen Musalo, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Elizabeth Newman, CUNY School of Law; Noah Novogrodsky, University of Wyoming College of Law; Fernando A. Nuñez, Charlotte School of Law; Mariela Olivares, Howard University School of Law; Michael A. Olivas, University of Houston Law Center; Patrick D. O'Neill, Esq., University of Puerto Rico School of Law; Sarah Paoletti, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Sunita Patel, American University, Washington College of Law; Huyen Pham, Texas A&M University School of Law; Michele R. Pistone, Villanova University School of Law; Luis F.B. Plascencia, Arizona State University; Polly J. Price, Emory University School of Law; Doris Marie Provine, Arizona State University; Nina Rabin, James E. Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona; Jaya Ramji-Nogales, Temple University, Beasley School of Law; Renee C. Redman, University of Connecticut School of Law; Ediberto Roman, Florida International University; Victor C. Romero, Penn State Law; Joseph H. Rosen, Atlanta's John Marshall Law School; Carrie Rosenbaum, Golden Gate University School of Law; Rachel E. Rosenbloom, Northeastern University School of Law; Rubén G. Rumbaut, University of California, Irvine; Ted Ruthizer, Columbia Law School; Leticia M. Saucedo, UC Davis School of Law; Heather Scavone, Elon University School of Law; Andrew I. Schoenholtz, Georgetown Law; Philip Schrag, Georgetown University Law Center; Bijal Shah, NYU School of Law; Ragini Shah, Suffolk University Law School; Careen Shannon, Yeshiva University, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law; Anna Williams Shavers, University of Nebraska College of Law; Bryn Siegel, Pacific Coast University School of Law; Anita Sinha, American University, Washington College of Law; Dan R. Smulian, Brooklyn Law School; Gemma Solimene,

Fordham University School of Law; Jayashri Srikantiah, Stanford Law School; Juliet Stumpf, Lewis & Clark Law School; Maureen A. Sweeney, University of Maryland Carey School of Law; Barbara Szveda, Lincoln Memorial University Duncan School of Law; Margaret H. Taylor, Wake Forest University School of Law; David Thronson, Michigan State University College of Law; Allison Brownell Tirres, DePaul University College of Law; Scott Titshaw, Mercer University School of Law; Phil Torrey, Harvard Law School; Enid Trucios-Haynes, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law, University of Louisville; Diane Uchimiya, University of La Verne College of Law; Gloria Valencia-Weber, University of New Mexico School of Law; Sheila I. Vélez Martínez, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Alex Vernon, Ave Maria School of Law; Rose Cuisson Villazor, University of California at Davis School of Law; Leti Volpp, University of California, Berkeley; Jonathan Weinberg, Wayne State University; Deborah M. Weissman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Lisa Weissman-Ward, Stanford Law School; Anna R. Welch, University of Maine School of Law; Virgil O. Wiebe, University of St. Thomas School of Law, Minneapolis; Michael J. Wishnie, Yale Law School; Stephen Yale-Loehr, Cornell University Law School; Elizabeth Lee Young, University of Arkansas School of Law.

*all institutional affiliations are for identification purposes only

CONCLUSION

Our conclusion is that the expansion of the DACA program and the establishment of Deferred Action for Parental Accountability are legal exercises of prosecutorial discretion. Both executive actions are well within the legal authority of the executive branch of the government of the United States.

NOVEMBER 29, 2014.

HON. PATRICK LEAHY,
HON. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
HON. BOB GOODLATTE,
HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

We are writing as former General Counsels of the Immigration and Naturalization Service or former Chief Counsels of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. As you know, the President on November 20 announced a package of measures designed to deploy his limited immigration enforcement resources in the most effective way. These measures included an expansion of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and the creation of Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA). We take no positions on the policy judgments that those actions reflect, but we have all studied the relevant legal parameters and wish to express our collective view that the President's actions are well within his legal authority.

Some 135 law professors who currently teach or write in the area of immigration law signed a November 25, 2014 letter to the same effect. Rather than repeat the points made in that letter, we simply attach it here and go on record as stating that we agree wholeheartedly with its legal analysis and its conclusions.

Respectfully,

STEPHEN LEGOMSKY,
*The John S. Lehmann
University Professor,
Washington University
School of Law,
Former Chief Counsel,
U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services.*

ROXANA BACON,

*Former Chief Counsel,
U.S. Citizenship and
Immigration Serv-
ices.*

PAUL W. VIRTUE,
*Partner, Mayer Brown
LLP, Former Gen-
eral Counsel, Immi-
gration and Natu-
ralization Service.*

BO COOPER,
*Partner, Fragomen,
Del Rey, Bernsen &
Loew, Former Gen-
eral Counsel, Immi-
gration and Natu-
ralization Service.*

Ms. LOFGREN. I note also that a lawsuit is currently pending to challenge the constitutionality.

Why don't Republicans just wait and see what the judicial branch has to say, what they decide?

The amendments being offered are poison pills and should be defeated. The first amendment is meant to block all but one of the President's actions on immigration. This includes the temporary protection from deportation for parents of U.S. citizens and the expansion of temporary relief for people brought to the country as kids.

This would break apart families, hurt more communities, deport the parents of U.S. citizens, and send thousands of American children into foster care.

□ 1945

But the amendment does more damage. In the interest of time, I will touch on just a few examples. It prevents improving the provisional waiver of the 3-year and 10-year unlawful presence bars created by Congress in 1996 to prevent U.S. citizens from experiencing "extreme hardship." Ironically, the changes the administration intends would actually make the waiver align more closely to what Congress enacted.

It would stop actions to help capitalize on the innovation of job-creating entrepreneurs and increase job opportunities. It would block initiatives designed to promote the integration of immigrants and to promote citizenship. The only action not blocked is a pay raise for ICE agents.

The second amendment would block further implementation of the 2012 DACA memo and any additional efforts to save DREAM Act kids from deportation. In the past, there was confusion about what amendments did. But this one is very clear. It is a straight up-or-down vote on whether to deport hundreds of thousands of young people who came forward, passed background checks, received DACA, and followed the rule. It would deport the DREAM-ers.

The third amendment looks reasonable at first, as it requires that those convicted of sex offenses and domestic violence be the highest priority for enforcement. But the point is, the President's actions already make those criminals a priority for deportation,

and they are prohibited from getting any deportation relief.

The amendment is not only unnecessary, but it also endangers victims of domestic violence. How? It overturns the DHS policy of inquiry into whether a person convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence was actually the victim, not the perpetrators of the crime. This amendment is opposed by the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the American Immigration Lawyers Association, and law enforcement.

I will now place into the RECORD a letter from 14 sheriffs and police chiefs asking that we oppose the DeSantis amendment.

JANUARY 13, 2015.

Re H.R. 240, The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We, the undersigned law enforcement officers, write to express our opposition to various proposals under consideration in the House of Representatives that seek to override aspects of the Obama Administration's immigration policies.

While acknowledging that there is good-faith disagreement over certain aspects of the administration's immigration policies, several of the proposals under consideration by the House of Representatives would represent a step backward, lead to uncertainty in our immigration enforcement system, and make it harder for state and local law enforcement to police our communities.

The 114th Congress has a tremendous opportunity to fix our broken immigration system, advancing reforms that will help the economy and secure our borders. While we are encouraged by proposals that would secure our borders and reform outdated visa programs, we are concerned by reports of various proposals in the House that do not appear to have bipartisan support and could unnecessarily threaten a partial governmental shutdown affecting the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). As law enforcement officers, we regularly work with DHS and its component agencies and fear that an unfunded DHS will sow confusion and uncertainty.

We are also concerned about proposed substantive changes that would undercut existing protections for victims of domestic violence, undermine law enforcement's ability to focus on catching and deporting dangerous criminals, compel state and local law enforcement to hold low-level offenders without probable cause, and threaten long-established and necessary federal programs and funding that have long aided state and local law enforcement. We oppose proposals that (1) make law-abiding immigrants feel less safe in our communities, (2) focus federal law enforcement away from catching serious criminals and security threats, (3) increase the state and local role in immigration enforcement, and (4) threaten needed federal resources and funding used by state and local law enforcement.

1. WHEN IMMIGRANTS FEEL SAFE IN THEIR COMMUNITIES, WE ARE ALL SAFER

When immigrants feel safe in their communities, including immigrant victims of domestic violence, we are all safer. We oppose amendments that remove key protections from domestic violence victims and undermine the executive branch's ability to prioritize criminals over otherwise law-abiding immigrants.

One proposal under consideration by the House would scrap DHS's entire existing enforcement framework, because it does not treat "any alien convicted of any offense involving domestic violence, sexual abuse, child molestation, or child exploitation as within the categories of aliens subject to the Department of Homeland Security's highest civil immigration enforcement priorities."

While the amendment is intuitively appealing and directed toward protecting domestic violence victims, it actually has the opposite effect in many cases. By guaranteeing "highest" priority treatment of all domestic violence cases, the amendment raises the stakes for any report of domestic violence—a single report of domestic violence could lead to removal proceedings and deportation.

Immigrant victims are particularly vulnerable to being arrested and prosecuted for domestic violence, even when they are not the primary perpetrator of violence in the relationship, due to language and cultural barriers. Once in custody and/or facing trial, and desperate to be released and reunited with their children, these same factors—combined with poor legal counsel, may lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges. Currently, federal authorities have flexibility in separating victims from perpetrators in dual arrest situations. The proposed amendment would remove this flexibility, leading to the deportation of victims of domestic violence.

2. LAW ENFORCEMENT SHOULD REFOCUS ITS PRIORITIES TOWARD CATCHING SERIOUS CRIMINALS AND SECURITY THREATS

Federal immigration agencies, including Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), do not have the capacity or resources to remove all undocumented immigrants. Existing federal policies prioritize the removal of immigrants with criminal records over those who pose no threat to the community. We believe that law enforcement agencies should spend their limited time and resources focusing on pursuing truly dangerous criminals, not otherwise law-abiding members of the community.

Various amendments would seek to override these longstanding priorities. We oppose such amendments.

3. IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IS A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

We believe that immigration enforcement on the state and local levels diverts limited resources away from public safety and undermines trust within immigrant communities. State and local law enforcement agencies face tight budgets and often do not have the capacity or resources to duplicate the federal government's work in enforcing federal immigration laws. Rather than apprehending and removing immigrants who have no criminal background or affiliation and are merely seeking to work or reunite with family, it is more important for state and local law enforcement to focus limited resources and funding on true threats to public safety and security.

Various amendments would seek to foist additional enforcement responsibilities onto state and local law enforcement, including amendments that would reinstitute and codify the Secure Communities program. Some proposals also would impose a federal mandate on state and local law enforcement agencies to hold suspects even in the absence of probable cause, an action that raises serious constitutional and legal questions and would risk creating legal liability for state and local law enforcement agencies. We oppose such amendments.

4. STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT NEED ADEQUATE RESOURCES

To the extent that state and local law enforcement play a role in immigration enforcement, the federal government must provide adequate funding in line with these responsibilities.

Some proposals under consideration by the House would place needed federal funding to state and local law enforcement at risk. These proposals, including proposed amendments that would condition significant federal funding on holding suspects in the absence of probable cause, raise serious concerns. We oppose such amendments.

Additionally, as referenced above, we call on Congress to fund DHS, including valuable DHS programs that provide needed funding to state and local law enforcement. We support legislation to fully fund this crucial agency for the entire 2015 fiscal year.

CONCLUSION

As law enforcement officers, we believe that the 114th Congress has a tremendous opportunity to fix our broken immigration system, advance reforms that will help the economy and secure our borders. Any executive actions taken by the executive branch are temporary and limited—by themselves they will not fix a broken system, nor will their repeal fix a broken system.

We continue to recognize that what our broken system truly needs is a permanent legislative solution. It is our hope that DHS funding legislation passes promptly and without any of the shortcomings we flagged above. Passing such legislation opens the door for this Congress to work constructively towards necessary immigration reform legislation.

Sincerely,

Chief Richard Biehl, Dayton Police Department, Dayton, Ohio;

Sheriff Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff's Office, Pima County, Arizona;

Sheriff Tony Estrada, Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office, Santa Cruz County, Arizona;

Chief Randy Gaber, Madison Police Department, Madison, Wisconsin;

Chief Ronald Haddad, Dearborn Police Department, Dearborn, Michigan;

Chief James Hawkins, Garden City Police Department, Garden City, Kansas;

Chief Mike Koval, City of Madison Police Department, Madison, Wisconsin;

Chief Jose Lopez, Durham Police Department, Durham, North Carolina;

Sheriff Leon Lott, Richland County Sheriff's, Department Richland County, South Carolina;

Chief Thomas Manger, Montgomery County Police Department, Montgomery County, Maryland;

Sheriff William McCarthy, Polk County Sheriff's Office, Polk County, Iowa;

Lt. Andy Norris, Tuscaloosa County Sheriff's Office, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama;

Chief Mike Tupper, Marshalltown Police Department, Marshalltown, Iowa;

Sheriff Lupe Valdez, Dallas County Sheriff's Office, Dallas County, Texas.

Ms. LOFGREN. The final amendment also creates problems. It says that USCIS should adjudicate petitions of individuals in lawful status before adjudicating petitions of individuals in unlawful status. But that is too broad. There are many petitions filed by people in unlawful status that we would not want to delay: green cards for the wives and husbands of American citi-

zens; requests for U visas and T visas from crime victims or sex-trafficking victims; immigrant visa petitions filed by domestic violence victims. These are all people who would be harmed by the amendment.

I would note that the fourth amendment is based on the falsehood that the President's immigration actions created an incentive for employers to hire deferred action recipients instead of American workers. This is simply not true.

Now, we need to have a serious conversation about immigration policy in the House, but threatening to shut down the Department of Homeland Security is not the way to do that. These amendments are foolish and a step backwards, and not funding DHS is dumb and dangerous.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chair, this important legislation fulfills our promise to the American people to responsibly fund our Homeland Security Department while also stopping President Obama's unconstitutional actions. This is the clear will of the American people, which was expressed this past November.

Sadly, the President is ignoring the results of that election, with administration officials saying he will veto any bill we pass out of Congress that would end his illegal amnesty order and hold him accountable.

Consider that threat: a President would shut down the Department of Homeland Security, whose mission is to protect the American people, just to continue implementing a policy that he admitted on more than 20 occasions he did not have the legal authority to do.

I seriously hope he will not.

Continuing to defend his unauthorized and unconstitutional order by vetoing this bill would be more than reckless. It would confirm beyond any reasonable doubt that President Obama believes he is above the law.

I hope the Senate will join this House and not abdicate on the shared responsibility we have to preserve Congress' prerogatives to defend the Constitution and to stop the abuse of power happening under this President.

Let's get this amended bill to the President's desk immediately and see whether he is capable of putting the will of the American people and the Constitution ahead of his own self-serving agenda.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, House Republican leadership has chosen to play political games with the security and safety of our Nation by including extreme partisan poison pill amendments to this Homeland Security funding bill. Rather than putting country before party, House Republican leaders have chosen to advance an extreme agenda instead of doing what needs to be done to protect Americans.

This bill is a farce that puts scoring political points above safeguarding our communities. This is precisely the type of political gimmick people in the Coachella Valley and across the country are sick of.

The terrorist attacks in Paris last week demonstrate how critical it is that the men and women of our law enforcement agencies have the funding necessary to do their jobs and keep us safe.

That is why I urge House Republican leadership to allow a vote on a clean, bipartisan Homeland Security bill that ensures law enforcement, the Coast Guard, and the Secret Service have the resources they need to protect our communities.

It is time to end the political bickering and work toward sensible, pragmatic solutions to keep our homeland secure.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman CARTER, for his tremendous leadership, this important legislation, and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, tonight I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson, who once said: "Experience hath shown, that even under the best forms of government, those entrusted with power have, in time, and by slow operations, perverted it."

Mr. Chairman, we have heard repeatedly from our leader, our President, that he has said he is not king, he is not emperor, and that his powers, as President, are restricted. But his actions speak louder than words. Republicans are committed to holding the President accountable for his overreaching executive actions.

We have achieved remarkable success in this country because we are a Nation governed by the rule of law, not by the decrees of monarchs.

As recent events around the world have tragically reminded us, there are those who are still committed to destroying our way of life.

The Homeland Security Appropriations bill we are debating tonight supports the needs of the brave men and women who protect us each day and meets the requirements to keep us safe.

The amendments accompanying this legislation ensure we continue to be a

Nation governed by laws and prevents any funds from being used to implement the President's unconstitutional decrees of amnesty while it prevents further implementation of DACA, which led to the crisis at the border last summer.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to protect our great Nation and supporting the amendments to protect the rule of law.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and the amendments that go with it.

Now let's get to the facts. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle conveniently leave these facts out.

First of all, this has nothing to do with shutting down Homeland Security. Second of all, the total budget for Homeland Security is \$39.7 billion. That is \$1.3 billion over the President's request. That is \$400 million over last year.

Our amendments prevent the President from using any moneys—no matter from where—on amnesty.

There is no reason to shut down Homeland Security. If Homeland Security is shut down, it is due to the Democrats and President Barack Obama because he has more money for Homeland Security than he asked for.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 240 and the amendments.

President Obama released amnesty plans in November that include changes to border security, status of persons currently living in the United States unlawfully, and future legal immigration policy changes—all of which are directly under the purview of the legislative branch, not the executive branch.

In addition this President's executive order included several other changes that directly result in amnesty.

To be clear, democracy in this country was built on the foundation of a three branch federal government.

Our founding fathers saw the importance of checks and balances to prevent any branch from becoming all-powerful and exceeding its constitutional authority.

Furthermore, our Constitution specifically grants all lawmaking authority to Congress, and instead gives the executive branch the role of executing the laws passed.

The President's overreach in granting amnesty has left Congress with no choice but to exercise the power of the purse today to restore the Federal Government to one of balance, within the confines of the Constitution.

Last week I introduced the Defund Amnesty Act to ensure this type of change, and I applaud the leadership for bringing legislation to the floor to boldly put an end to the President's executive order on amnesty.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I would like to be very clear: this debate is not about immigration. This debate is about something much more, much more important than that. This is a generational conflict over something that is very clear. It is not about Presidential prerogative or Presidential arrogance.

As a military officer for 14 years, I had the honor of serving my country. Prior to doing that, I took a sacred oath of office, which is very similar to the oath that all of us took last week, to defend the Constitution of the United States. That is what this legislation is about. That is why this piece of legislation is so important.

This legislation seeks to restore the balance of powers. It seeks to conform that vision that our Founding Fathers had, that miracle that was created in Philadelphia that summer. It seeks to conform and to preserve the principles that so many people have died for.

The President is not a king. Congress is tasked to create the law. That is what this legislation is about. That is why it is so important that we support it.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, today I rise in support of H.R. 240, providing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of this fiscal year. This legislation provides the funding necessary to ensure that all of the Department's critical missions have the resources necessary to be dutifully executed.

But I also rise in support of the amendments to this legislation. And when considering the amendments that were made in order, I am reminded of the feelings of pride and patriotism that I witness when I attend naturalization ceremonies in my home district. When new citizens raise their right hand and recite the Oath of Allegiance, the aura of achievement and opportunity is palpable. These immigrants-turned-citizens have come to the country the right way. They have followed the rules, and they have earned that feeling of achievement.

But it is America that benefits. These immigrants embody and have displayed the values we hold most dear: hard work, integrity, perseverance, and a commitment to be a contributing member of the American society.

I strongly support these amendments because we are expressing the sense of

Congress in these amendments that we respect naturalized citizens; we honor their hard work and dedication to the legal immigration and naturalization process. We should hold these new citizens up as models for how to immigrate to this country the right way. We should not punish them by using their very processing fees that they paid to accommodate illegal immigrants hiding from the rule of law. And that is why the President's unilateral executive action is so destructive.

So I proudly join my colleagues not only in voting to defund the President's unconstitutional executive action but also to call upon his administration and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to stop putting the interests of unlawful immigrants ahead of legal immigrants. Let's reward those who come to this country the right way, not those who have broken the law.

In conclusion, Mr. Chair, I again thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for this important work vindicating legal immigration.

□ 2000

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, the security of the United States and the American people must be our top priority. I urge the majority to defeat the poison pill amendments that will prevent this bill from becoming law and to support a clean Homeland Security bill that will provide the resources that are needed to provide our great Nation with the protections that they need.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have no further speakers, so at this time, I am prepared to close.

I would just like to clarify a few things. Nobody is going to lose a paycheck, no agency is going to go broke, as we have this constitutional discussion and this constitutional debate that has taken place today and will probably take place tomorrow, when the amendments will actually be before this august body for a determination of whether they will be included or not included in this bill.

There has been some confusion, I think, that some may think these things are already here, but we will follow the regular process tomorrow on the amendments that have been made in order.

No one is trying to put the security of the United States at risk in this bill, and we will have a normal debate, as we do here. What better body to address constitutional issues than the Congress of the United States?

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, today the Majority has chosen to hold the Department of Homeland Security hostage with their extreme anti-immigrant policies. Rather than pass a bipartisan bill that would fund the agency tasked

with securing our border and protecting our citizens from terrorism and violence—the Majority will consider poison pill amendments to appease an extreme faction of their party.

Playing politics with our national security is not responsible governance.

First, the Republican party is playing politics with the lives, safety and security of the American people. In the wake of the recent Paris tragedy, it is all too apparent that we need smart enforcement policies that protect the American people and root out any terror threats. The Department of Homeland Security plays a central role in our fight against terror, both in the United States and around the world and we should fully fund their efforts as soon as possible. We should not be debating “poison pill” amendments that have no chance of becoming law and will only further delay the funding of DHS.

Second, the Republican party is showing the American people that they only immigration policy they believe in is “mass deportation.” They have attached several policy riders to this appropriations bill that would further separate families, including the families of military service members and U.S. citizens.

Third, the amendments that we will later consider will prevent DHS from implementing smart enforcement policies, including ones that prioritize deporting felons before families. These smart policies allow DHS to focus valuable resources on individuals with criminal convictions and not immigrants with U.S. citizen and legal permanent resident family members.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop playing politics with our national security and start governing.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, this legislation funds the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of the current fiscal year at \$39.7 billion, an increase of \$400 million compared to the FY2014 enacted level.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 240, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

This legislation is critically important to keeping our nation safe:

It provides vital funding for the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of the current fiscal year

It also prioritizes frontline security efforts, while reducing unnecessary spending on overhead costs

While there are many important programs that will receive funding through this legislation, I'd like to address just a few critically important areas:

Last November, President Obama through executive fiat granted amnesty to as many as five million illegal immigrants. His decision to circumvent the proper legislative process was not the right way to handle this important issue. The President himself even admitted that he did not have the legal authority to issue an executive notice of this nature. We made a promise to our constituents that one of the first things we would do this Congress would be to prevent the President's unconstitutional executive action from becoming our nation's de facto immigration policy. This legislation does just that.

Next, this bill increases funding for Customs and Border Protection in order to make our

border more secure. This increase will support a greater number of Border Patrol agents and officers, and provides them with the technologies they need to ensure around-the-clock surveillance of air, land and sea approaches to our nation.

And finally, this legislation includes important provisions that will allow the Coast Guard to continue operations without the cuts proposed by the President that would have greatly harmed the Coast Guard's operational abilities.

This bill prioritizes spending in a way that will better protect our country.

It is imperative that we pass this legislation to prevent the President's unconstitutional actions and to support the men and women who protect our borders.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chair, we need to be clear about what is happening here today. The Republican Majority in the House is putting our national security at risk by threatening to shut down the Department of Homeland in order to advance their mean-spirited, anti-immigrant agenda.

House Republicans don't like President Obama. We get it. The Majority also disagrees with the actions the President has taken on immigration.

Look, if you disagree with the President on immigration, let's hear your plan to fix our nation's broken immigration system. Bring your bill to the Floor and let's debate it. But we shouldn't let down our guard on national security by playing games with the bill that funds border security, immigrations and customs enforcement, FEMA, and the Coast Guard.

We have a bipartisan Homeland Security funding bill that could easily pass the House and Senate. We could pass that bill today and the President would sign it into law. Instead, the Republican Majority is preparing to load up the bill with a number of divisive, poison pill amendments that the President will never agree to. Unless House Republicans change course, funding for the entire Department of Homeland Security will cut off on February 27.

So the message to my Republican colleagues is clear. Stop playing politics with our national security and send the President a clean Homeland Security funding bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chair, I thank the Gentlewoman from New York, Ms. LOWEY, for yielding me time.

Mr. Chair, I rise to voice my opposition to the anti-immigration amendments that will be considered later this afternoon.

These poison-pill amendments were not drafted with an eye toward making our nation safer, but rather scoring political points against the President.

As Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am disturbed that some of my colleagues are willing to play partisan politics with national security.

Over the past month, we have seen major cyber-attacks at American companies and radicalized terrorists wreak havoc on the streets of Sydney and Paris.

Yet the amendments the Majority insists on attaching to DHS' funding bill have nothing to do with cybersecurity.

And they have nothing to do with keeping Americans safe from lone-wolf terrorists or other radicalized individuals.

Rather, the amendments are being considered to satisfy the far-right fringe contingency of the Republican Party who have amassed disproportionate influence over the past few years.

The Amendments we are considering today could force DHS to use its limited resources to remove law-abiding children brought to the country through no fault of their own before deporting those who pose a threat to our safety or security.

Similarly, the Blackburn Amendment would end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, setting in motion the deportation of those who have already come forward, paid the relevant fees and submitted to background checks, from America—the only home most of them have ever known.

In light of global terrorist events that occurred in recent months, the notion that we would remove individuals—who are known to, and have been vetted by, DHS—before focusing on those who may do us harm runs counter to common-sense and contradicts our risk-based approach to homeland security.

I urge my colleagues to reject the anti-immigration amendments that will be considered later this afternoon.

Instead, we should be voting on a clean DHS funding bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, when it comes to protecting our homeland, it is incumbent on all of us—Democrats and Republicans—to put politics aside and work together. Yet, the exercise we are going through today risks not funding the Department of Homeland Security.

We know that elements of this bill blocking the President's immigration reforms will not become law. Republican Senators are already expressing their skepticism about this approach. And, the President would veto this bill if it passed Congress with these provisions. So as the clock ticks down on funding for our homeland security agencies, why are we wasting time on this debate?

Sadly, the answer is that the majority party is catering to its extreme wing—anti-immigrant, tea party Republicans who are obsessively focused on blocking the President.

Mr. Chair, let's be clear—the President acted when this House did not. Last Congress, the Senate passed legislation to fix our broken immigration laws. However, this body dawdled, delayed and ultimately did nothing. Finally, the President was forced to move forward alone. He took sensible steps—backed by legal precedent and well within his authority—that will resolve some of the worst flaws in our broken immigration system.

Now, House Republicans are saying that unless they can block the President and punish immigrants, they will jeopardize funding for the Secret Service, for the Coast Guard and the TSA. At a time when the world is reeling from horrific terrorist attacks in Paris, how can my colleagues play politics with funding for these agencies? This is cynical politics at its worst—and we must reject it.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 240, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015. Without further action by Congress, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) will face a shutdown on February 28, 2015. Everyone agrees DHS should receive robust funding to carry out their

mission of keeping the American people safe, and I'm pleased to see there is bipartisan, bicameral agreement on funding levels for the agency. However, I am very disappointed that the Republican majority had decided to add poison-pill amendments to this legislation related to the President's actions on immigration. This is putting the American people at risk and is unacceptable.

Global tensions remain high following the terrorist attacks in France, and we should not be letting down our guard at this critical time. Yet this is exactly what we are doing by passing H.R. 240 today. This legislation has no chance of being signed into law, as President Obama has already said he would veto the bill. If my friends on the other side of the aisle are so concerned about immigration, they should work with Democrats in a bipartisan manner on comprehensive immigration reform. I stand ready to work with them on this critical issue.

I want to address the DeSantis Amendment to this legislation. As a woman who is active on domestic violence issues, I will always do everything in my power to protect victims of abuse. However, this amendment is misleading and I am afraid it could have unintended consequences if adopted. The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops stated that this amendment would discourage victims of domestic violence from reporting abuse to the proper authorities. I also spoke with domestic violence groups in Michigan, and they have pointed out the unintended consequences of this amendment as well. We need to make it easier to report incidents of domestic violence, not harder, which is why I am opposing the DeSantis amendment today.

In the meantime, we should pass a clean DHS appropriations bill so the operations of this critical department can continue uninterrupted. Their mission is simply too important to jeopardize. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 240.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, America is a nation of immigrants, but we are also a nation built on the rule of law, and those who enter our country illegally disregard those laws.

Unfortunately, our President does not feel the same way.

Upon discovering he could not get support from Congress, he decided to circumvent the legislative branch through executive action and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants.

He disregarded the separation of powers that our Founding Fathers laid out for our government, but more importantly he disregarded the American people.

That is why I am proud to stand here today with my colleagues to put a stop to this executive overreach, and to tell this President that he is not above the law.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, I will vote in favor of H.R. 240 and the amendments thereto, because the bill meets our nation's security needs while also maintaining fiscal discipline.

H.R. 240 prioritizes funding for border security at a time when it is badly needed and also checks the President's executive overreach. This bill holds the President accountable for exceeding his constitutional authority and upholds the rule of law.

Though I am opposed to the President's executive actions on immigration, I am committed to fixing our broken immigration system. The Constitution authorizes the legislature, not the executive, to reform our immigration laws, and that is why I will continue working with my colleagues to secure our borders and fix our legal immigration system. Rather than trying to go around Congress, I would encourage the President to work with Congress to achieve real, lasting reform.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARR) having assumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 27, I call up the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 37

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

Sec. 101. Margin requirements.

Sec. 102. Implementation.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 201. Treatment of affiliate transactions.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT

Sec. 301. Registration threshold for savings and loan holding companies.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKER-AGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 401. Registration exemption for merger and acquisition brokers.

Sec. 402. Effective date.

TITLE V—SWAP DATA REPOSITORY AND CLEARINGHOUSE INDEMNIFICATION CORRECTIONS

Sec. 501. Repeal of indemnification requirements.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

Sec. 601. Filing requirement for public filing prior to public offering.

Sec. 602. Grace period for change of status of emerging growth companies.

Sec. 603. Simplified disclosure requirements for emerging growth companies.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 701. Exemption from XBRL requirements for emerging growth companies and other smaller companies.

Sec. 702. Analysis by the SEC.

Sec. 703. Report to Congress.

Sec. 704. Definitions.

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

Sec. 801. Rules of construction relating to collateralized loan obligations.

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT

Sec. 901. Advisers of SBICs and venture capital funds.

Sec. 902. Advisers of SBICs and private funds.

Sec. 903. Relationship to State law.

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Sec. 1001. Summary page for form 10-K.

Sec. 1002. Improvement of regulation S-K.

Sec. 1003. Study on modernization and simplification of regulation S-K.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

Sec. 1101. Increased threshold for disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans.

TITLE I—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT

SEC. 101. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D)."

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4)."

SEC. 102. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

- (1) without regard to—
- (A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and
- (B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;
- (2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and
- (3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS**SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under subparagraph (A) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation of such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AMENDMENT.—Section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c-3(g)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under paragraph (1) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the security-based swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT SUPPORT MEASURE REQUIREMENT.—The requirements in section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a), requiring that a credit support measure or other mechanism be utilized if the transfer of commercial risk referred to in such sections is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant or a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, as appropriate, shall not apply with respect to swaps or security-based swaps, as appropriate, entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT**SEC. 301. REGISTRATION THRESHOLD FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES.**

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

- (1) in section 12(g)—
- (A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after “is a bank” the following: “, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act).”; and
- (B) in paragraph (4), by inserting after “case of a bank” the following: “, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act).”; and
- (2) in section 15(d), by striking “case of bank” and inserting the following: “case of a bank, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners’ Loan Act).”.

TITLE IV—SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT**SEC. 401. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.**

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

“(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

“(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

“(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

“(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) CONTROL.—The term ‘control’ means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

“(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

“(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

“(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

“(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term ‘eligible privately held company’ means a company that meets both of the following conditions:

“(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section

12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

“(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

“(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than \$25,000,000.

“(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than \$250,000,000.

“(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term ‘M&A broker’ means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

“(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

“(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent year-end balance sheet, income statement, statement of changes in financial position, and statement of owner’s equity of the issuer of the securities offered in exchange, and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, the related report of the independent auditor, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

“(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

“(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2014; and

“(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

“(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.”.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—SWAP DATA REPOSITORY AND CLEARINGHOUSE INDEMNIFICATION CORRECTIONS

SEC. 501. REPEAL OF INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DERIVATIVES CLEARING ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 5b(k)(5) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a-1(k)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the Commission may share information with any entity described in paragraph (4), the Commission shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(b) SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.—Section 21(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 24a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subsection (c)(7), the swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 8 relating to the information on swap transactions that is provided.”.

(c) SECURITY-BASED SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES.—Section 13(n)(5)(H) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(n)(5)(H)) is amended to read as follows:

“(H) CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT.—Before the security-based swap data repository may share information with any entity described in subparagraph (G), the security-based swap data repository shall receive a written agreement from each entity stating that the entity shall abide by the confidentiality requirements described in section 24 relating to the information on security-based swap transactions that is provided.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203) on July 21, 2010.

TITLE VI—IMPROVING ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES ACT

SEC. 601. FILING REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC FILING PRIOR TO PUBLIC OFFERING.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is amended by striking “21 days” and inserting “15 days”.

SEC. 602. GRACE PERIOD FOR CHANGE OF STATUS OF EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 6(e)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(e)(1)) is further amended by adding at the end the following: “An issuer that was an emerging growth company at the time it submitted a confidential registration statement or, in lieu thereof, a publicly filed registration statement for review under this subsection but ceases to be an emerging growth company thereafter shall continue to be treated as an emerging market growth company for the purposes of this subsection through the earlier of the date on which the issuer consummates its initial public offering pursuant to such registration statement or the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date the company ceases to be an emerging growth company.”.

SEC. 603. SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.

Section 102 of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act (Public Law 112-106) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SIMPLIFIED DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to an emerging growth

company (as such term is defined under section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933):

“(1) REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE NOTICE ON FORM S-1.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise its general instructions on Form S-1 to indicate that a registration statement filed (or submitted for confidential review) by an issuer prior to an initial public offering may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S-X (17 C.F.R. 210.1-01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

“(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S-1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

“(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S-X at the date of such amendment.”.

“(2) RELIANCE BY ISSUERS.—Effective 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, an issuer filing a registration statement (or submitting the statement for confidential review) on Form S-1 may omit financial information for historical periods otherwise required by regulation S-X (17 C.F.R. 210.1-01 et seq.) as of the time of filing (or confidential submission) of such registration statement, provided that—

“(A) the omitted financial information relates to a historical period that the issuer reasonably believes will not be required to be included in the Form S-1 at the time of the contemplated offering; and

“(B) prior to the issuer distributing a preliminary prospectus to investors, such registration statement is amended to include all financial information required by such regulation S-X at the date of such amendment.”.

TITLE VII—SMALL COMPANY DISCLOSURE SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 701. EXEMPTION FROM XBRL REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES AND OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.

(a) EXEMPTION FOR EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES.—Emerging growth companies are exempted from the requirements to use Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such companies may elect to use XBRL for such reporting.

(b) EXEMPTION FOR OTHER SMALLER COMPANIES.—Issuers with total annual gross revenues of less than \$250,000,000 are exempt from the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such issuers may elect to use XBRL for such reporting. An exemption under this subsection shall continue in effect until—

(1) the date that is five years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is two years after a determination by the Commission, by order after conducting the analysis required by section 702, that the benefits of such requirements to such issuers outweigh the costs, but no earlier than three years after enactment of this Act.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall re-

vise its regulations under parts 229, 230, 232, 239, 240, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, to reflect the exemptions set forth in subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 702. ANALYSIS BY THE SEC.

The Commission shall conduct an analysis of the costs and benefits to issuers described in section 701(b) of the requirements to use XBRL for financial statements and other periodic reporting required to be filed with the Commission under the securities laws. Such analysis shall include an assessment of—

(1) how such costs and benefits may differ from the costs and benefits identified by the Commission in the order relating to interactive data to improve financial reporting (dated January 30, 2009; 74 Fed. Reg. 6776) because of the size of such issuers;

(2) the effects on efficiency, competition, capital formation, and financing and on analyst coverage of such issuers (including any such effects resulting from use of XBRL by investors);

(3) the costs to such issuers of—

(A) submitting data to the Commission in XBRL;

(B) posting data on the website of the issuer in XBRL;

(C) software necessary to prepare, submit, or post data in XBRL; and

(D) any additional consulting services or filing agent services;

(4) the benefits to the Commission in terms of improved ability to monitor securities markets, assess the potential outcomes of regulatory alternatives, and enhance investor participation in corporate governance and promote capital formation; and

(5) the effectiveness of standards in the United States for interactive filing data relative to the standards of international counterparts.

SEC. 703. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall provide the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report regarding—

(1) the progress in implementing XBRL reporting within the Commission;

(2) the use of XBRL data by Commission officials;

(3) the use of XBRL data by investors;

(4) the results of the analysis required by section 702; and

(5) any additional information the Commission considers relevant for increasing transparency, decreasing costs, and increasing efficiency of regulatory filings with the Commission.

SEC. 704. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title, the terms “Commission”, “emerging growth company”, “issuer”, and “securities laws” have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

TITLE VIII—RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

SEC. 801. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(c)(2) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “A banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board” and inserting the following:

“(A) GENERAL CONFORMANCE PERIOD.—A banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CONFORMANCE PERIOD FOR CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board shall bring its activities related to or investments in a debt security of a collateralized loan obligation issued before January 31, 2014, into compliance with the requirements of subsection (a)(1)(B) and any applicable rules relating to subsection (a)(1)(B) not later than July 21, 2019.

“(ii) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘collateralized loan obligation’ means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.”

TITLE IX—SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT **SEC. 901. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.**

Section 203(l) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(l)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No investment adviser” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No investment adviser”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, a venture capital fund includes an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940).”

SEC. 902. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND PRIVATE FUNDS.

Section 203(m) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, the assets under management of a private fund that is an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940) shall be excluded from the limit set forth in paragraph (1).”

SEC. 903. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Section 203A(b)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) that is not registered under section 203 because that person is exempt from registration as provided in subsection (b)(7) of such section, or is a supervised person of such person.”

TITLE X—DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

SEC. 1001. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10-K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10-K to which such item relates.

SEC. 1002. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of

this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S-K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S-K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 1003 is necessary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S-K.

SEC. 1003. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S-K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S-K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S-K by the Commission under section 1002 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

TITLE XI—ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT

SEC. 1101. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COMPENSATORY BENEFIT PLANS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regula-

tions, so as to increase from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 the aggregate sales price or amount of securities sold during any consecutive 12-month period in excess of which the issuer is required under such section to deliver an additional disclosure to investors. The Commission shall index for inflation such aggregate sales price or amount every 5 years to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rounding to the nearest \$1,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 37, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the American people, for the sake of all of those who are underemployed, who are unemployed still today in this economy, let us hope that the third time is the charm.

The bill that is before us today, substantially authored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, was on the floor in a substantially identical version in the 113th Congress.

This bill, to ease the burdens on small businesses, on job creators to help foster capital creation, so that people can be put back to work, so that people can have good careers, so that people can pay their mortgages and pay their health care premiums, substantially in the same form passed in the last Congress 320-102; regrettably then, the United States Senate, under Democrat control, took up no portion of the bill.

It was last week that a slightly different version of the bill was brought to this House floor under what we know as our suspension calendar, which is reserved for bills that typically enjoy broad bipartisan support; regrettably, it proved to be about a dozen votes short because a number of my friends from the other side of the aisle apparently decided that they were for the bill before they were against the bill. They changed their minds in approximately 7 days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. There were 11 different modest provisions, all of which enjoyed broad

bipartisan support, again which were modest, modest attempts to ensure that small businesses could still survive in an otherwise onerous Washington regulatory climate.

Mr. Speaker, we had a bill that, even combined—and it is quite common for us to roll up bills for the sake of efficiency, bills that are quite similar in nature—was 30 pages long. Not 300, not 3,000—it wasn't the 2,000 pages of ObamaCare, not the 2,000 pages of Dodd-Frank—it was merely 30 pages.

Now, what is included in this bill? Well, included in this bill is H.R. 634, which passed this body 411-12. It includes H.R. 5471, which passed the House by voice vote, not a dissenting vote that I recall. It includes H.R. 801 that passed the House 417-4. It includes H.R. 2274, the bill that passed the House 422-0.

I could go on and on, but of the bills that are rolled up to ensure greater capital formation and regulatory relief for our smaller business enterprises, all of these passed either the committee or the House with overwhelming bipartisan support, and now—now—the minority is coming to this floor and somehow crying foul. Again, many were for it before they were against it.

I don't know how we can look our constituents in the eyes and know that, even today, they continue to suffer in this economy and not do something to help them.

What this is really all about, Mr. Speaker, is there is a division. There is a division within the Democrat Party. According to press reports, some Democrats have reportedly told their fellow Democrats that if they dare to vote for a bill that makes a clarification or modification to Dodd-Frank, they aren't real Democrats.

It is interesting that yesterday, President Obama signed into law a modification of Dodd-Frank. I know the President is not a Republican, but according to some Democrats, apparently by signing a modification to Dodd-Frank, he is not apparently a Democrat, either, so I am not really sure what he is.

It is fascinating that a former chairman, Barney Frank, of the House Financial Services Committee, one of my predecessors, in previous testimony before our committee, indicated a number of changes to Dodd-Frank that he thought would be proper, so according to some Democrats, apparently Barney Frank is no longer a Democrat, either.

What this is really getting at, Mr. Speaker, is of the 11 bills that are rolled up into this 30-page document, some of them either clarify or modify provisions of Dodd-Frank, and for some Members of the Democratic Party, apparently, Dodd-Frank has now been elevated beyond ideology to religion, and there can be no changes in a 2,000-page bill that we know is fraught with unintended consequences.

Yet there are some on the other side of the aisle that say, "no changes, no changes," yet President Obama signed a change into law. Former Chairman Frank has indicated a number of changes he would consider.

It is time to get beyond the religion. It is time to get beyond the ideology. It is time to get America back to work. It is time to start growing this economy from Main Street up, not Washington down, because that is not working, Mr. Speaker.

It is time to do what everybody claims they want to do, and that is work on a bipartisan basis. All of these bills passed with overwhelming bipartisan majorities, and now, because of this almost religious zeal for the Dodd-Frank brand, again, some of my Democratic colleagues have decided that they were for it before they were against it.

It is time to put America back to work. It is time to enact H.R. 37, Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. Let's make sure the third time is the charm.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try, try again. Usually, we tell that saying to children to encourage them to achieve greater things, but it seems that when it comes to Congress, it is what Wall Street keeps telling House Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans thought they could sneak this bill by last week through a fast-track process on the House floor, a process with limited debate and no opportunity for amendments. They thought they could ram through this gift to a handful of the biggest Wall Street banks on just the 2nd day of this new Congress right after we had reconvened.

Well, the American people were watching, and the Democrats here in the House told them "no." The Republican bill failed. Now, here they are; they are at it again. Now, H.R. 37 is back on the floor again, without the opportunity to amend it and with limited debate.

□ 2015

The only difference is that Republicans have reduced how many votes are needed to guarantee passage. That's right. Rather than fix the bill to win broad support, Republicans just changed the rule to make sure the tainted bill passes.

And what does this bill do? Well, for one, it takes a part of Wall Street reform's Volcker rule and delays it for yet another 2 years. Remember that the Volcker rule is the part of Dodd-Frank that stops government-supported banks from gambling with bank depositors' money. And this extra 2-year delay comes on top of a 3-year delay that our regulators carefully

crafted to ease the megabanks' transition.

This particular part of the law that Republicans want to see delayed applies to what are known as collateralized loan obligations, or CLOs. CLOs are bundles of leveraged loans, loans often issued by private equity firms to facilitate corporate buyouts that can harm American jobs. The loans are sliced and diced into packages and sold off to investors, including banks that hold customers' deposits. The packages often also contain credit default swaps or other derivatives that can make the position even riskier.

Somehow, Wall Street bankers—the supposedly smartest people in the room—can't seem to comply with a law passed in 2010 by—that's right—2017. Seven long years isn't enough. The Republicans and the banks want nearly a decade.

In addition to that, the Republican bill wouldn't just let the banks hold on to these CLOs. The bill would let the banks accumulate new CLOs also. That's right. The banks could actively trade in and out of these investments, unlike the rules carefully crafted by the Federal Reserve.

We saw the Republican playbook at the end of last year with the so-called swaps push-out rule. They hope they can jam these bills through Congress by attaching them to must-pass legislation. And most of all, they hope these issues are way too complicated or too technical for the American people to understand or care about. But the American people really do understand. They remember how our economy was nearly brought to its knees in 2008, and they recognize that we can't let Wall Street slowly chip away at reforms designed to prevent that kind of large-scale financial crisis from happening again.

And President Obama gets it, too. That is why the White House said he would veto this legislation if it got to his desk. And so one cannot help but wonder why are we here on the floor after 8 o'clock in the evening with an attempt to push through something that was jammed into a package of bills? Many of those bills had been heard either in committee or on the floor, but one portion of this bill had not. And so is this simply an attempt to ram down one segment that they fear real debate on, ram it down the throats of the Members of this Legislature and the citizens of this country, hiding it in this package, hoping that we won't get it?

What is worse is that this legislation has been brought to the floor without regard for any regular order. The nine new members on the Financial Services Committee will not get a chance to hear testimony on it at all. And in just the 2nd week of their term, 52 new Members of the House are expected to

vote on it, having complicated deregulation shoved down their throats. Democrats offered 13 amendments, one of them bipartisan, but none of these amendments will be considered or debated. Why? Because my colleagues on the other side are not interested in legislation but, rather, in political theater.

We cannot let this casual disregard for the legislative process stand. We want to see reforms sensibly implemented. We want to work with regulators to get the rules right, and we want our largest banks to stop gambling and go back to facilitating growth in the real economy. But that is difficult to do when my Republican counterparts continue pushing legislation that masquerades as technical fixes but really makes substantive changes to the Dodd-Frank reform law. And then they package completely reckless legislation with other provisions that are either necessary or sensible.

Democrats know better, President Obama knows better, and the American people know better. So I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to say that this highly controversial bill that the ranking member alludes to passed on the House floor by voice vote, and this particular financing helps companies like Dunkin’ Donuts, American Airlines, Burger King, and Goodyear Tire put people to work in America—hardly Wall Street. The head of the Independent Community Bankers has said it is necessary to protect community banks, and that is why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am now happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) on behalf of the Agriculture Committee, which shares jurisdiction on this bill.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy and Credit, I specifically want to highlight and voice my support for the past work of the Agriculture Committee on the three titles of this bill that we worked on.

First of all, title I of this bill, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act, will provide much-needed relief to American farmers, businesses, and job creators who rely on derivatives to manage the risk inherent in the daily operation of their farms and businesses. It will do so by reinforcing congressional intent that those market participants who have been exempted from clearing their trades are also exempted from corresponding margin requirements.

These exemptions make sure that end users do not have to divert working capital to margin requirements, thus keeping those dollars at work in the economy. I am pleased that this provision was included in this package, as well as in the TRIA authorization that was recently approved by both the House and the Senate.

Also under the Ag Committee’s jurisdiction is title II of H.R. 37, pertaining to the treatment of interaffiliate transactions. This well-reasoned provision was passed by the Congress multiple times in the 113th Congress and also will prevent the tie-up of working capital. It will do so by ensuring that transactions between affiliates within a single corporate group are not regulated as swaps.

If such transactions are subject to the same regulations as swaps, companies could be subject to double margin requirements. Since interaffiliate swaps pose no systemic risk to the economy or the marketplace, such redundant regulation would provide no additional risk reduction while substantially raising costs that would ultimately be passed on to the consumers. Title II of H.R. 37 will prevent that misguided regulatory scheme and allow American businesses to continue utilizing their established and efficient centralized trading models.

Finally, the corrections made by title V of H.R. 37 will ensure that regulators and market participants have access to a global set of swap market data.

Dodd-Frank currently requires indemnification agreements from foreign regulators requesting information from U.S. swap data repositories or derivatives clearing organizations. These agreements state that the foreign regulator will abide by certain confidentiality requirements and indemnify the U.S. Commission for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for information.

Unfortunately, the concept of indemnification does not exist in many foreign jurisdictions. As such, some foreign regulators cannot agree to these indemnification requirements. This may hinder our ability to make a workable data-sharing arrangement with those regulators and ultimately fragment the marketplace by encouraging them to establish their own data repositories. H.R. 37 narrowly addresses this potential data-sharing problem by simply removing the indemnification requirements from current law. Existing provisions requiring certain confidentiality obligations will remain in place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. FITZPATRICK for working to include these provisions in today’s bill. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this legislative package aimed at reducing regulatory burdens and promoting economic growth.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her great work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 37, the so-called Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act.

I served on the Financial Services Committee during the 2008 financial crisis, and I had an opportunity to witness the harmful impact that lack of regulation had on hardworking families around our Nation at a total cost of more than \$22 trillion, according to the Government Accountability Office. My constituents—and many of yours—lost their homes, their jobs, and their retirement savings during that period. Many pension funds today continue to suffer and are on the brink of collapse because of the reckless policies that were observed during that time by many of our major banks.

While I voted against the bailout of the Wall Street banks who were rewarded with bonuses as a result of the bailout, I did have the honor of helping to assist in reforming our financial system through the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. I regret the bill under consideration today rolls back many of those reforms that my colleagues and I fought so hard to adopt.

I would note that after being defeated last week under a suspension process that offered no opportunity for amendments, this bill now has inexplicably been brought to the House floor under a closed rule that again does not include any of the 14 amendments that were filed with the Rules Committee. At a minimum, a bill that does so much harm to our financial system necessitates the normal committee process and additional time for debate.

H.R. 37 contains 11 separate bills, a few of them which I support, others I strongly oppose. Portions of H.R. 37 have entirely new provisions that the members of the committee and of this Congress have not had the opportunity to thoroughly analyze.

By the way, if you desire a good review of this legislation, in this past Sunday’s New York Times there is an article written by Gretchen Morgenson that I think is extremely well-written and goes into great detail beyond the time that I am allocated here tonight.

Title II of this bill would allow banks with commercial business to trade derivatives privately rather than on clearinghouses. This would increase risk and reduce transparency for these transactions. My amendment, which was not accepted, would have improved

the provisions by prohibiting systematically important financial institutions, whose collapse would pose a serious risk to our financial system, from claiming the exemption under this title.

Title VIII of this bill includes new language that has not been considered by the Financial Services Committee under regular order. If passed, title VIII would give banks an additional 2 years to comply with the provisions of the Volcker rule that mandates that banks divest collateralized loan obligations—packages of risky debt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentlewoman.

This 2-year extension is in addition to the extension we already provided by the regulation last year. That further delay adds unnecessary risk to our financial system. And that is why I sponsored another amendment to remove this additional 2-year delay, so banks will be required to comply with this provision of the Volcker rule no later than July 21, 2017.

Again, title XI of this bill modifies the SEC rule 701 by allowing private companies to compensate their employees up to \$10 million in company securities without having to provide those employees with certain basic financial disclosures about the company stock.

I strongly support employees receiving equity benefits from their firms in which they work, but those benefits should be tangible and real. We all remember Enron and WorldCom where employees were pressured to buy stock as part of their compensation, and at the end of the day, that stock was completely worthless.

Why can't we enable employees to receive some equity in the company in which they work and ensure that those workers get accurate financial disclosure as part of that deal? This is why I offered three amendments to reform title XI in order to make certain workers get accurate information about the equities shares that they are receiving from the companies they work for. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee chose to deny all the amendments to this bill.

In closing, this harmful bill uses the veneer of job creation to provide special treatment for well-connected corporations and financial institutions while doing very little for the workers that it professes to help.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and, again, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

[From NYTimes.com, Jan. 10, 2015]

KICKING DODD-FRANK IN THE TEETH

(By Gretchen Morgenson)

The 114th Congress has been at work for less than a week, but a goal for many of its

members is already evident: a further rollback of regulations put in place to keep markets and Main Street safe from reckless Wall Street practices.

The attack began with a bill that narrowly failed in a fast-track vote on Wednesday in the House of Representatives. It is scheduled to come up again in the House this week.

The bill, introduced by Representative Michael Fitzpatrick, a Pennsylvania Republican who is a member of the House Financial Services Committee, has three troublesome elements. First, it would let large banks hold on to certain risky securities until 2019, two years longer than currently allowed. It would also prevent the Securities and Exchange Commission from regulating private equity firms that conduct some securities transactions. And, finally, the bill would make derivatives trading less transparent, allowing unseen risks to build up in the system.

Of course, you wouldn't know any of this from the name of the bill: the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. Or from the mild claim that the bill was intended only "to make technical corrections" to the Dodd-Frank legislation of 2010.

Here's the game plan for lawmakers eager to relax the nation's already accommodating financial regulations: First, seize on complex and esoteric financial activities that few understand. Then, make supposedly minor tweaks to their governing regulations that actually wind up gutting them.

"We're going to see repeated attempts to go in with seemingly technical changes that intimidate regulators and keep them from putting teeth in regulations," predicted Marcus Stanley, policy director at Americans for Financial Reform, a nonpartisan, nonprofit coalition of more than 200 consumer and civic groups across the country. "If we return to the precrisis business as usual, where it's routine for people to accommodate Wall Street on these technical changes, they're just going to unravel the postcrisis regulation piece by piece. Then, we'll be right back where we started."

The bill was put forward on the second day of the new Congress, in an expedited process, which didn't allow for debate among members. This process is supposed to be reserved for noncontroversial bills and requires support from a two-thirds majority to prevail. It fell just short of achieving that level, with a vote of 276 to 146, overwhelmingly backed by Republicans and opposed by most Democrats.

A central element of the bill chipped away at part of the Volcker Rule, the regulation intended to reduce speculative trading activities among federally insured banks. The bill would give the institutions holding collateralized loan obligations—bundles of debt—two additional years to sell those stakes.

The sales were required under the Volcker Rule, which bars banks from ownership in or relationships with hedge funds or private equity firms, many of which issue and oversee these instruments. Like the mortgage pools that wreaked such havoc with United States banks in the most recent crisis, C.L.O.s can pose high risks for banks.

The creation of such securities has been torrid recently: \$124.1 billion was issued last year, compared with \$82.61 billion in 2013, according to S&P Capital IQ. Among the banks with the largest C.L.O. exposures are JPMorgan Chase and Wells Fargo; according to SNL Financial, a research firm, JPMorgan Chase held \$30 billion and Wells

Fargo \$22.5 billion in the third quarter of 2014, the most recent figures available. The next-largest stake—\$4.7 billion—was held by the State Street Corporation.

Given the size of these positions, it's not surprising the institutions want more time to jettison them. But the new legislation represents Wall Street's second reprieve on these instruments. After banks objected to the sale of their holdings last spring, the Federal Reserve gave them two years beyond the initial 2015 deadline to get rid of them.

Now they want another two years.

Although the top three banks had unrealized gains in their C.L.O. holdings in the third quarter, SNL said some banks were facing losses. And that was before the collapse in the price of oil, which has undoubtedly pummeled some of these securities.

A second deregulatory aspect in the Fitzpatrick bill relates to the lucrative private equity industry, which remains loosely regulated. The bill would exempt some private equity firms from registering as brokerage firms with the S.E.C. Under securities law, such registration is required of firms that receive fees for investment banking activities, like providing merger advice or selling debt securities.

Private equity firms are typically registered only as investment advisers, so submitting to broker-dealer regulation would result in more frequent examinations and more rules.

These firms don't like that. But their investors could benefit from closer regulatory scrutiny of costly conflicts of interest in these operations. For example, a private equity firm providing merger advice to a company its investors own in a fund portfolio—not an arm's-length transaction—could easily charge more for those services than an unaffiliated firm would.

Finally, the bill's changes in derivatives would reduce transparency and increase risks in this arena by allowing Wall Street firms with commercial businesses like oil and gas or other commodities operations—to trade derivatives privately and not on clearinghouses.

Trading on clearinghouses generates accurate price data that help both banks and regulators value these instruments. Because these clearinghouses perform risk management, problematic positions are easier to spot.

If this change goes through, it will be the second recent victory on derivatives for big banks. Last month, Congress reversed a part of the Dodd-Frank law barring derivatives from being traded in federally insured units of banks. Taxpayers may be on the hook for bailouts, therefore, if losses occur in the banks' derivatives books.

The Dodd-Frank law, as written back in 2010, was by no means a comprehensive fix for a risky banking system. And it is more vulnerable to attack, in part, because of its complexity and design. Dodd-Frank delegated so much rule-making to regulators that it essentially invited the institutions they oversee to fight them every inch of the way.

And when Congress backs the industry in these battles, it's no contest.

Still, it is remarkable to watch the same financial institutions that almost wrecked our nation's economy work to heighten risks in the system.

"The truth about Dodd-Frank is it's pretty moderate and pretty compromised already," Mr. Stanley of Americans for Financial Reform said. "Any further compromise and it tends to collapse into nothingness."

Which is exactly what Wall Street seems to be hoping for.

□ 2030

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I continue to be fascinated by my Democratic colleagues whose rhetoric is against Wall Street, yet they vote in Dodd-Frank to codify a taxpayer bailout fund for Wall Street into that legislation. They designate firms too big to fail so their rhetoric is aimed at Wall Street but they hurt Main Street, who we are trying to help now.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is the author of the title that helps so many of our small businesses grow.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important package, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for his leadership, and I rise in strong support of his legislation, H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act.

Indeed, this bill is about jobs and it is about economic growth. And it is about jobs on Main Street. Make no mistake about it: essentially the same legislative package passed the House last fall by a bipartisan vote of 320-102. If I may, I want to talk a little bit about title VIII of this legislation, which passed the House last April by voice vote, and it contains language from a bill I introduced in the last Congress, H.R. 4167, the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act.

I worked closely with my colleague across the aisle, Congresswoman MALONEY of New York, to craft sound, commonsense, bipartisan language to clarify the Volcker rule while maintaining its original legislative intent regarding the treatment of collateralized loan obligations.

Now let's just talk a little bit about the Volcker rule and what it does. As currently structured, this rule will substantially disrupt the market for CLOs, a vital source of capital for mid-sized and emerging growth American companies that cannot cost-effectively access the corporate bond market. There are two negative impacts of this rule.

First of all, it will have a serious negative impact on banks, many small- and medium-sized community banks, and it is estimated that banks will have to divest or restructure up to \$70 billion of CLO notes under this rule if unchanged.

Second, it will compromise credit availability for American companies that are beneficiaries of this innovative source of credit.

Today, CLOs hold approximately \$350 billion of senior secured commercial and industrial loans to some of the most dynamic, job-producing companies in America. One of these companies, Tempur Sealy International, the

world's largest manufacturer of mattresses, foundations, pillows, and other bedding products, is headquartered in my district.

So it seems to me that the medicine being prescribed by the Volcker rule, forcing banks to sell billions of dollars of CLO paper in a fire-sale scenario, and the loss of credit availability for a wide range of Main Street businesses, growing companies, job-producing employers would be a far more damaging result to jobs and the economy than the perceived disease, banks ever suffering losses from holding AAA CLO paper, which is fundamentally different and distinguishable from the mortgage-backed securities that led to the run-up to the financial crisis.

It is important to note what this bill does and what this title does, and what it does not do. It doesn't do away with the Volcker rule. If you listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you would think that we are totally doing away with the Volcker rule. That is not what this does. What it does is it grandfathers legacy CLOs and prevents a fire sale of these CLOs.

So without the adoption of this grandfather provision, the Volcker rule would effectively operate to make illegal certain investments that were perfectly legal and safe when they were made. In other words, the Volcker rule as currently written applies retroactively to CLOs, attaching legal consequences to investment decisions made by private parties who did not anticipate these consequences at the time the decision was made. Such retroactivity will profoundly and negatively disrupt the plans and settled expectations of CLO investors, and this will create turmoil in the commercial credit market and force banks to sell billions of existing CLO debt. As a result, the cost of financing will increase and access to credit will dry up, and this will reduce liquidity in America's capital markets.

Let me make a point here. Much has been said about Wall Street versus Main Street. This is about Main Street jobs. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Independent Community Bankers Association, and the American Bankers Association all talk about how this will help. Our bill, our fix, will help community banks grow capital and support local economic development and job creation on Main Street.

The Bipartisan Policy Center says that forcing a select group of banks to sell these assets over a short time is not the optimal solution. Such an action would create an environment of institutions forced to sell, and buyers who can purchase CLOs at extraordinarily cheap prices, and this would create unnecessary losses at banks and produce windfall profits for those who can demand to buy them at below market rates.

The CLO provision represents a small and commonsense solution, not a roll-

back of Dodd-Frank by any means. It keeps the Volcker rule completely intact and simply provides phased-in compliance to banks of all sizes that made sound investment decisions, allowing for a finite universe of well-performing legacy CLOs to be sold or paid off.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

It will keep the Volcker rule completely intact, and simply provide phased-in compliance to banks of all sizes that made sound investment decisions, allowing the finite universe of well-performing legacy CLOs to be sold or paid off over an added 2 years rather than forcing these legacy CLOs into a fire sale.

The proprietary trading ban is retained entirely for all new CLO issuances.

So in conclusion, there has been a lot of talk about deregulation. As for the canard that deregulation was to blame for the financial crisis, that story line has been thoroughly debunked. The crisis was caused by the government's own housing policies, which fostered the creation of 25 million subprime and other low-quality mortgages, almost 50 percent of all the mortgages in the United States that defaulted at unprecedented rates.

In contrast, CLOs were not the root cause of the crisis. CLOs performed very well during the crisis. Regulators have many tools to ensure bank CLOs do not pose financial risks. CLO AAA or AA notes, in fact, have never defaulted. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense Main Street jobs bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are so many inaccuracies in some of the testimony that I am hearing from the opposite side of the aisle that I don't know where to start to try to clear up some of the points that they are attempting to make.

First of all, let me start with this business about how community banks are going to be hurt. This is simply an attempt to hide behind community banks and scare the Members of this body into believing that if they don't support this bill, that somehow their community banks are going to suffer.

The FDIC said that 95 percent of CLOs owned by banks are owned by those with more than \$50 billion in assets, with the preponderance owned by Citi, JPMorgan Chase, and Wells Fargo.

Specifically, JPMorgan Chase has \$33.5 billion worth of CLOs; Wells Fargo has \$24.1 billion worth of CLOs; and Citi has \$4.7 billion worth of CLOs.

So what are we talking about when we use this kind of messaging to claim

that somehow we are going to hurt these small banks? That is absolutely not true. And I want to tell you, the community banks have not been in the background putting out tremendous sums of money on this lobbying effort. According to *The New York Times*:

The current efforts to undermine Dodd-Frank have been textbook lobbying. In the first three quarters of last year, the securities and investment industry spent nearly \$74 million on lobbying on 704 registered lobbyists.

So get this picture. We keep seeing attempts by any means necessary from the opposite side of the aisle to push controversial legislation into packaged bills, some of those bills having been supported either in committee or on the floor. It is not enough that they lost when they put this on the suspension calendar. They have come back with a rule that does not allow for any debate, and they are determined to win this by majority vote, even in the face of a veto. Who are they trying to protect?

If it is true that 95 percent of the CLOs owned by banks are owned by those with more than \$50 billion in assets, and I told you who has a preponderance, then that is who is being protected. It is the biggest banks in America—Citi, JPMorgan Chase, and Wells Fargo. That is who is being protected. This money I am talking about, \$74 million on lobbying 704 lobbyists, these are the big banks spending the money lobbying on this legislation.

And so this business about protecting Main Street, about protecting the small businesses, simply attempts to misguide and mislead, knowing that most folks really don't understand the CLO market, that this legislation, along with many other pieces of legislation, are complicated. Dodd-Frank is an attempt to reform what had gone terribly wrong in this country. We have seen attempt after attempt, probably more than 100 attempts in the Financial Services Committee, to try and undermine Dodd-Frank, to get rid of Dodd-Frank, to break it up piece by piece, and again by any means necessary.

And so if you can answer why all these attempts, why all of this money is being spent, why we're protecting just these three big banks in America, then you can see that this is not about Main Street, this is not about small businesses. This is now about relationships between too many Members of this House and of this Congress with the biggest banks in America, who are determined to destroy Dodd-Frank. And they have tried all of these tactics and they have tried somehow to make people believe that we don't care about this fire sale that we are going to cause the big banks.

Well, let me just say this. No, I don't worry about causing a fire sale of the big banks. I am not here to protect the big banks. I am truly here to protect

Main Street and small business entrepreneurs and business people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk further about title VIII and how it does not benefit small businesses. CLOs comprised only of actual loans are exempt from the Volcker rule entirely. We are only talking about CLOs that contain other instruments like credit default swaps, interest rate swaps, commercial paper-backed securities, et cetera.

The Volcker rule will have a minimum impact on the CLO market. Nothing in the rule says that other buyers of CLOs need to stop their purchases. Nonbanks like hedge funds or insurance companies can continue to purchase or trade CLOs. The restriction only affects banks, big banks, which have tremendous access to taxpayer subsidies through the FDIC and the Federal Reserve borrowing window.

Various Wall Street research analysts have said that the market "shrugged off" the Volcker rule and that the industry can do just fine moving forward. In fact, 2014 saw record issuances for new, Volcker-compliant CLOs.

Banks will have 5 years, including 3 years worth of extensions, to comply with this provision. The Republicans now want to give them 7 years. Our position is this: enough is enough. Eventually the Volcker rule has to become operational or else Dodd-Frank becomes meaningless.

□ 2045

These CLOs are typically leverage loans. It should buy private equity firms to facilitate corporate buyouts of large companies. This is more about facilitating private equity than helping Main Street businesses.

For example, leverage buyouts are when a private equity firm pays for a controlling interest in a company by taking out a loan against that company, saddling the company with debt. The aim is to reduce costs, often by firing workers and slashing employee pay and benefits in order to quickly resell the leaner company for a profit. So this isn't about job creation; this is about job destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who is the sponsor of this job-creating legislation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

It is really hard to believe that a package of bills that comes to the floor which individually passed the House 422-0, another bill passes by voice vote, another bill passes 414-3, have become so controversial—become so controversial why? Because they are about to become law and they should become law. These are smart, technical reforms to

an overly burdensome law, Dodd-Frank, that are bipartisan.

All of these bills have Democrat and Republican cosponsors, all of them have gained Democrat and Republican support in the committee and on the floor of the House, and these bills should pass.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his longstanding leadership in reining in out-of-control Washington regulators that are hurting small business and Main Street lenders.

Mr. Speaker, smart regulations allow the private sector to innovate and create jobs while protecting taxpayers and consumers; however, one-size-fits-all regulations hurt the economy by treating small- and medium-sized companies as if they are large multinational corporations.

No Main Street small business, manufacturer, farmer, or rancher caused the financial crisis; yet they are subject to thousands of new pages of regulations that were supposedly designed for big Wall Street firms. Mr. Speaker, that is not fair.

That is why I have introduced this bill. It is a bipartisan package of commonsense jobs bills that provides regulatory relief to help grow the economy from Main Street up, not from Washington down.

This bill is made up of individual measures that previously passed either the House or the Financial Services Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support during the 113th Congress. It is a recognition of the fact that regulations, no matter how well-intentioned, can be made more targeted and can be made more effective.

More than 400 new regulations imposed on our Nation's small- and medium-sized companies impedes their ability to access the capital needed to grow, innovate, and create jobs. These regulations may have been targeting Wall Street, but their burden falls heavily on Main Street.

That is what this bill seeks to fix. These legislative prescriptions represent serious bipartisan commitments to make our regulatory system more responsive to the needs of the workers and the local businesses that we all represent.

The American people want Republicans and Democrats to work together to strengthen our economy and help the private sector create jobs like only it can. Good-paying jobs and greater opportunities are the foundations of real economic growth, growth that is strong and growth that is sustainable, growth that lifts people up from poverty.

That kind of growth can't come from Washington, and it won't happen unless small business owners, entrepreneurs, and workers have the freedom and the opportunity to use their God-given talents and creativity to earn their success.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk in this town about bipartisanship and finding middle ground here in our Nation's Capitol; yet, at this very moment, groups on both the far left and the far right stand in the way of even incremental progress by pulling Members of both parties to the extremes.

I know that if things are going to get done in this body, it will be from strong bipartisan support from principled, yet pragmatic, lawmakers willing to put politics to the side and work together for the common good. As someone who seeks out that course, I would like to recognize those Members willing to look past the demagoguery and misinformation in order to support this bill.

I have high hopes that this Congress can restore the faith of our constituents in the legislative process and the role of Congress in strengthening our Main Street economy, and we can start with this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the bill and, in doing so, putting aside bill posturing in favor of bipartisan reforms to get people back to work.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Despite what my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle have said, this package of bills does not simply constitute a technical set of changes to Dodd-Frank or to our securities laws. In fact, these changes are substantive and the package is widely opposed.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle keep talking about they are protecting Main Street, but let me recite for you what Main Street is saying about this bill. Let me read for you some highlights of the opposition letters we have received in addition to opposition from President Obama, Secretary Lew, and former Federal Reserve Chair Paul Volcker himself.

Main Street is represented by, number one, Americans for Financial Reform. Americans for Financial Reform says that H.R. 37 "includes numerous changes that could have significant negative impacts on regulators' ability to police the financial markets, so that they function safely and transparently."

They go on to oppose title VII of this bill, citing a Wall Street Journal article outlining how regulators are increasingly warning banks about the looser underwriting standard for leveraged loans.

Further, representing Main Street, the AFL-CIO says of H.R. 37, that they oppose the bill because it "would loosen key Dodd-Frank protections wisely put in place after the 2008 financial collapse."

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights notes about H.R. 37: "One lesson of the financial crisis is that deregulation in areas that appear

technical and arcane can have significant impacts on the financial system and, thus, on the well-being of ordinary families, particularly in the communities we represent."

Finally, Public Citizen noted about H.R. 37 that we should not provide more CLO relief because "the largest banks dominate ownership," as I demonstrated a moment ago, "of CLOs."

Mr. Speaker, I think we should heed the warning of Main Street, the warning of these groups who truly represent Main Street.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy now to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a member of the committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. We are here, once again, debating simple measures aimed at growing the economy and relieving some of the unnecessary burdens imposed by the Dodd-Frank legislation.

Even Tim Geithner, the former Secretary of the Treasury, stated that the Volcker rule and implications of it being regulated were not material in the demise and harm due to major institutions, rather as a result of extended credit.

This legislation included in this bill is bipartisan, which is why so many of my colleagues already voted in support of it in the 113th Congress and again last week.

This is a jobs bill. The relief we can give to small business today directly impacts their ability to create jobs. For instance, although small companies are at the forefront of technological innovation and job creation, they often face significant obstacles in obtaining capital in the financial markets.

These obstacles are often due to the largest burden that securities regulations, which are typically written for large public companies, place on small companies when they seek to go public.

We need competitive markets that encourage innovation, and we need to develop a regulatory environment that acknowledges the differences between small, private, and start-up companies and well-established public companies.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There has been a lot of talk about bipartisan support or lack of. There have been a lot of talks about how the Republicans have been able to get Democratic votes and that, somehow, we should be happy, we should be satisfied, and that they really don't understand why it is that we are opposing not only

the bill, but the tactics that have been used in several attempts to pass legislation with controversial bills tucked into the big package.

Let me give you a summary of amendments that Republicans refuse to consider as we have attempted to work with them.

Mr. ELLISON and Mr. ISSA offered a bipartisan amendment to strike title VII of the bill, so that all public companies will have to report their financial statements in a computer-readable format. Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. KUSTER both offered amendments striking the CLO title.

In a similar vein, because Republicans refuse to hold debate on the CLO title, Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CAPUANO offered an amendment to require the regulators to first determine that such a delay was, indeed, in the public interest.

Mr. LYNCH also proposed to revise the delay from 2019 to a date we previously considered and approved in the House, 2017. This revised date is one that we had thoroughly considered in the House. We never considered in the House an extension for 2 more years to 2019.

In an effort to prevent the spread of systemic threats, Mr. LYNCH proposed that an affiliate of a financial institution, whose failure could pose a systemic risk to our economy, should be required to clear its derivatives.

Mr. LYNCH raised a concern that companies, like GE Capital, might be able to take large bets in one part of their company, but receive relief from rules intended to mitigate those risks in another. Mr. LYNCH also offered three amendments on title XI, all intended to ensure that employees understand their compensation.

Elsewhere in the bill, Mr. CAPUANO offered an amendment to title X, requiring companies to disclose political campaign contributions. In the same title, Mr. ELLISON required the SEC to finalize its Dodd-Frank rules related to executive compensation data within 60 days.

Mr. GRIJALVA proposed an amendment to restore the swaps push-out provision that Republicans eliminated by attaching it to the CR/Omnibus last month. Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GRIJALVA also proposed a substitute amendment to focus this Congress on something that would help our economy, ending budget sequestration.

Finally, I propose that we find a way to pay for part of the budget of the cash-strapped SEC by imposing a user fee on investment advisers. This is a commonsense proposal that has been supported by investment advisers, investment advocates, former Republican Chairman Spencer Bachus, SEC Chair White, and the State securities regulators.

Despite the fact that the SEC can only examine an adviser on average

once a decade, our committee didn't even consider this issue last Congress.

That is an effort, Mr. Speaker and Members, to show that we have attempted to work with the opposite side of the aisle. We have attempted to offer commonsense amendments that have been absolutely rejected without any consideration being given to them.

We find ourselves here on the floor at 9 this evening, attempting to debate a bill that is going nowhere, that has been issued by the President, a veto message. We are here debating again about whether or not we are putting our taxpayers and Main Street and our small businesses at risk, going back to some of the same tactics, some of the same ways that were used by the banks that brought us to the point of a recession, almost a depression.

Somehow in this short period of time, we have forgotten what happened in 2008, we have forgotten about how many businesses were destroyed, small businesses were destroyed, we have forgotten how many elderly folks lost money in their 401(k)'s, we have forgotten how many homes were foreclosed on, we have forgotten about how we brought this country to the brink of a disaster.

□ 2100

And so let me just say that Dodd-Frank is an attempt for reform. And it is not even a tough reform. As a matter of fact, many of us consider it rather mild. But we have on this side of the aisle been fighting day in and day out in our committee to try and just see the implementation of Dodd-Frank rather than the destruction of an attempt to reform an industry that caused great harm to this society.

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the chairman of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the ranking member talk about this bill tonight and you would think the sky is falling if this CLO portion of our package is passed. The problem with that argument is that 53 of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee, with Republicans, voted to pass this package last year. Only three Democrats dissented—only three. Then it passed this House floor by a voice vote.

If this bill was so disastrous for the American economy, I would ask my good friend across the aisle: At 9 o'clock on a Tuesday night where Members of Congress have nothing going on, where are the Democrats? Where is the outrage with this package?

There is only one. There is only one, because many Democrats in the last Congress voted for this bill because they agreed with it. It didn't get any-

where because it fell into HARRY REID's trash bin.

The Volcker rule directed under Dodd-Frank was supposed to stop big banks from using insured customer funds to engage in risky investments. CLOs had a default rate of less than one-half of 1 percent. These are safe. This wasn't the cause of the financial crisis. The cause was Fannie and Freddie securitizing loans that had no documentation, no verification of income, and subprime mortgages. In Dodd-Frank, the root cause of the financial crisis wasn't addressed because Fannie and Freddie weren't even brought up.

When we talk about Dodd-Frank, the ranking member is so concerned about Dodd-Frank being chipped away, but the CLO issue wasn't even in Dodd-Frank. Section 619 of Dodd-Frank states:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict the ability of a banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Federal Reserve Board to sell or securitize loans in a manner otherwise permitted by law.

CLOs were excluded in Dodd-Frank, which the ranking member voted for. But not only that, in the first proposal of the Volcker rule, CLOs weren't even included.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. DUFFY. They were not included. It was only in the final rule that we realized that CLOs were so dangerous.

This is a political ploy. Join the American people, join common sense, and join some of your fellow Democrats. Let's support this reform package.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), chairman of the Monetary Policy Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I, too, share my friend from Wisconsin's frustration at this. This is sort of like saying we are going to have a cookie that is getting baked here on the House floor and our friends across the aisle approve of the eggs, they approve of the butter, they approve of the sugar, and they approve of the chocolate chips, but they don't want the final product. I am confused as to why we cannot put all these ingredients together and get this done finally. The American people are begging us to get this work done. That is why I rise today, Mr. Speaker: to support H.R. 37.

Part of that bill has my bill from the last Congress, H.R. 2274. Excessive and unnecessary regulations have been hurting our economy, increasing costs to consumers and investors, reducing wage growth, and restricting access to private sector capital that our Nation's job creators need in order to grow the economy and create jobs.

This unanimously passed bipartisan legislation is a compilation of commonsense regulatory relief bills that have been carefully crafted to help grow the economy for Main Street and not from Washington, D.C. My bill actually is part of that.

Eleven of these bills have previously been passed by this very body or at the Financial Services Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support. In fact, my bill idea came not from anybody on Wall Street, not from anybody in Washington, D.C., but from a mergers and acquisitions lawyer back in my district in Grand Rapids, Michigan, who said: We've been struggling with this problem and we need some help because we cannot get the SEC to move on this.

So that is why I put together the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act, and this has been kindly rolled into this larger package.

It has been estimated that approximately \$10 trillion of privately owned, small family-owned-type businesses will be sold or, worse yet, closed in the coming years as baby boomers retire. I don't think any of us would think that that is a good thing. Mergers and acquisitions brokers play a critical role in facilitating the transfer of these smaller privately held companies. Who benefits? Small communities and the workers that they employ and that live in those areas. This bipartisan provision would create a simplified system for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of these smaller privately held companies.

In today's highly charged political environment, however, it is hard because it would be nice to show the American people that we have positive, effective initiatives that should be passed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now very happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the "Live Free or Die" State of New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA), a member of the committee.

Mr. GUINTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today in support of, and as a cosponsor of, H.R. 37.

Mr. Speaker, back in April 2012, President Obama signed into law the JOBS Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation which makes it easier for small companies, small businesses, to access capital markets by easing the burden of certain securities regulations.

Despite its sweeping scope, the Dodd-Frank Act does little to spur the type of capital formation that is essential for any real and lasting economic recovery to take hold in our Nation. Without access to capital, business slows, and without regulatory certainty, capital disappears.

A small company should not be subject to the same regulatory demands and requirements that a Fortune 500 company is required to meet. That is why H.R. 37 follows on the success of the bipartisan JOBS Act and continues the Financial Services Committee's extensive examination of finding bipartisan solutions.

This package includes 10 pieces of legislation that my friend from California, the ranking member, supported and endorsed and voted for in the past. We need to make it easier for small companies to access public and private markets so that they can grow, hire, and provide greater economic opportunities for our citizens.

Contrary to this rhetoric we hear this evening, H.R. 37 is not a massive repeal of Dodd-Frank. It is a bill that recognizes Dodd-Frank is not perfect. It is a bill that recognizes market disruptions are not a smart result.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I will try to speak fast. I have missed all of you in my couple years' absence.

Have you ever had a moment where you are heading towards the microphone and you are starting to wonder if some of the debate you have been just listening to is a little bit tongue-in-cheek?

Can we do a quick explanation of CLOs, these collateralized loans? It is commercial paper. That is what the vast majority of it is. It has been around for a very long time.

Now, here is the absurdity that is coming in. If I have commercial paper that is made up of marginal loans, 2 years from now the bank continues to get to own that. But if that paper, that collateralized managed debt actually has a covenant in it that, if something goes wrong, I get to reach in and grab some of the equity of the company, all of a sudden they can't hold that. So the more secure CLOs you don't get to own in 2 years; the more marginal you do get to keep on the banks' books.

This is, first, absurd. But it is perfectly rational to say: Look, why don't we take this part that expires in 2 years and push it out 2 more years so there can be an orderly unwinding of a fairly absurd rule? But the rule is the rule.

So a lot of this debate around the CLOs, I am sorry, it is great hyperbole, but it has almost nothing to do with what the actual product does. And understand, over the last 20 years, CLOs that were AA or higher, not a single instrument went bad.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have really witnessed here is a debate between the left and the far left, and the far left doesn't want the left to work on a bipartisan basis. That is sad. I think that is what the American people want us to do. The American people, by and large, don't want to occupy Wall Street. They just want to quit bailing it out, and bailing it out is exactly what the Dodd-Frank Act does. It is time to grow this economy from Main Street up, not Washington down, and that is what the big debate is.

Almost every bill here, Mr. Speaker, is a modest bill to help small businesses, to help capital formation to put America back to work. They passed on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis.

Let's show the American people that we can do it. Don't let the far left torpedo America's hopes and dreams. I encourage all the House Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today in support of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. I am especially proud of, and would like to highlight, the work of the Agriculture Committee on the titles of this bill under its jurisdiction—the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act, a provision on the Treatment of Affiliate Transactions, and a provision regarding Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Corrections.

MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

I am pleased that the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act was included as Title I of this bill, and even more so, that this provision was already approved by both chambers as a part of TRIA reauthorization. This Title puts in statute important protections for American businesses. To grow our economy, businesses should use their scarce capital to buy new equipment, hire more workers, build new facilities, and invest in the future. They cannot do that if they are required to hold money in margin accounts to fulfill a misguided regulation.

INTER-AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS

Title II of H.R. 37, regarding the Treatment of Inter-Affiliate Transactions, was passed by the House multiple times in the 113th Congress and will also provide additional certainty to American business. It will do so by preventing the redundant regulation of harmless inter-affiliate transactions that would unnecessarily tie up the working capital of companies with no added protections for the market, or benefits to consumers.

Today, businesses across the nation rely on the ability to centralize their hedging activities. This consolidation of a hedging portfolio across a corporate group allows businesses to reduce costs, simplify their financial dealings, and to reduce their counterparty credit risk.

Title II of H.R. 37 will allow American businesses to continue utilizing this efficient, time-tested business model.

INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Finally, Title V of H.R. 37 makes much needed corrections to the swap data repository

and clearinghouse indemnification requirements in Dodd-Frank.

Currently, Dodd-Frank requires a foreign regulator requesting information from a U.S. swap data repository or derivatives clearing organization to provide a written agreement stating that it will abide by certain confidentiality requirements, and will indemnify the U.S. Commissions for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for information.

However, while the concept of indemnification is well-established within U.S. tort law, it does not exist in many foreign jurisdictions, making it impossible for some foreign regulators to agree to these indemnification requirements. This threatens to make data sharing arrangements with foreign regulators unworkable.

H.R. 37 mitigates the problem by simply removing the indemnification provisions in Dodd-Frank. However, the required written agreement mandating certain confidentiality obligations is left in place. So rather than stripping down Dodd-Frank, as we are so often accused, this change will actually serve to enhance market transparency and risk mitigation, by ensuring that that regulators and market participants have access to a global set of swap market data.

As Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and as a cosponsor of each of these bills in the 113th Congress, I appreciate Mr. FITZPATRICK's work to bring these provisions together in a package that reduces regulatory burdens and promotes economic growth. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 13, 2014.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am pleased to see three bills that the House Committee on Agriculture passed in the 113th Congress included as Titles I, II, and V of H.R. 37, "Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act."

H.R. 634, H.R. 5471, and H.R. 742, which were also included as Subtitles A, B, and C of Title III of H.R. 4413, "Customer Protection and End-User Relief Act," from the 113th Congress provide an important protections to end-users from costly margining requirements and needless regulatory burdens; as well as correct an unworkable provision in Dodd-Frank which required foreign regulators to break their local laws in order to access the market data they needed to enforce their laws.

In support of these titles, I would like to request that the pertinent portions of the Committee on Agriculture report to accompany H.R. 4413 in the 113th Congress be included in the appropriate place in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

TITLE 3—END-USER RELIEF SUBTITLE A—END-USER EXEMPTION FROM MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

Section 311—End-user margin requirements

Section 311 amends Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) as added by Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for swap transactions involving end-users that qualify for the clearing exception under 2(h)(7)(A).

“End-users” are thousands of companies across the United States who utilize derivatives to hedge risks associated with their day-to-day operations, such as fluctuations in the prices of raw materials. Because these businesses do not pose systemic risk, Congress intended that the Dodd-Frank Act provide certain exemptions for end-users to ensure they were not unduly burdened by new margin and capital requirements associated with their derivatives trades that would hamper their ability to expand and create jobs.

Indeed, Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act includes an exemption for non-financial end-users from centrally clearing their derivatives trades. This exemption permits end-users to continue trading directly with a counterparty, (also known as trading “bilaterally,” or over-the-counter (OTC)) which means their swaps are negotiated privately between two parties and they are not executed and cleared using an exchange or clearinghouse. Generally, it is common for non-financial end-users, such as manufacturers, to avoid posting cash margin for their OTC derivative trades. End-users generally will not post margin because they are able to negotiate such terms with their counterparties due to the strength of their own balance sheet or by posting non-cash collateral, such as physical property. End-users typically seek to preserve their cash and liquid assets for reinvestment in their businesses. In recognition of this common practice, the Dodd-Frank Act included an exemption from margin requirements for end-users for OTC trades.

Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act (and Section 764 with respect to security-based swaps) requires margin requirements be applied to swap dealers and major swap participants for swaps that are not centrally cleared. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are banks, the prudential banking regulators (such as the Federal Reserve or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) are required to set the margin requirements. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are not banks, the CFTC is required to set the margin requirements. Both the CFTC and the banking regulators have issued their own rule proposals establishing margin requirements pursuant to Section 731.

Following the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act in July of 2010, uncertainty arose regarding whether this provision permitted the regulators to impose margin requirements on swap dealers when they trade with end-users, which could then result in either a direct or indirect margin requirement on end-users. Subsequently, Senators Blanche Lincoln and Chris Dodd sent a letter to then-Chairmen Barney Frank and Collin Peterson on June 30, 2010, to set forth and clarify congressional intent, stating:

The legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margin on end-users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. If regulators raise the costs of end-user transactions, they may create more risk. It is imperative that the regulators do not unnecessarily divert working capital from our economy into margin accounts, in a way that would discourage hedging by end-users or impair economic growth.

In addition, statements in the legislative history of section 731 (and Section 764) suggests that Congress did not intend, in enacting this section, to impose margin requirements on nonfinancial end-users engaged in hedging activities, even in cases where they entered into swaps with swap entities.

In the CFTC’s proposed rule on margin, it does not require margin for un-cleared swaps when non-bank swap dealers transact with non-financial end-users. However, the prudential banking regulators proposed rules would require margin be posted by non-financial end-users above certain established thresholds when they trade with swap dealers that are banks. Many of end-users’ transactions occur with swap dealers that are banks, so the banking regulators’ proposed rule is most relevant, and therefore of most concern, to end-users.

By the prudential banking regulators’ own terms, their proposal to require margin stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. The plain language of section 731 provides that the Agencies adopt rules for covered swap entities imposing margin requirements on all non-cleared swaps. Despite clear congressional intent, those sections do not, by their terms, exclude a swap with a counterparty that is a commercial end-user. By providing an explicit exemption under Title VII through enactment of this provision, the prudential regulators will no longer have a perceived legal obligation, and the congressional intent they acknowledge in their proposed rule will be implemented.

The Committee notes that in September of 2013, the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and the Bank of International Settlements published their final recommendations for margin requirements for uncleared derivatives. Representatives from a number of U.S. regulators, including the CFTC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve participated in the development of those margin requirements, which are intended to set baseline international standards for margin requirements. It is the intent of the Committee that any margin requirements promulgated under the authority provided in Section 4s of the Commodity Exchange Act should be generally consistent with the international margin standards established by IOSCO.

On March 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act,” the following testimony was provided to the Committee with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

In approving the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress made clear that end-users were not to be subject to margin requirements. Nonetheless, regulations proposed by the Prudential Banking Regulators could require end-users to post margin. This stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. While the regulations proposed by the CFTC are preferable, they do not provide end-users with the certainty that legislation offers. According to a Coalition for Derivatives End-Users survey, a 3% initial margin requirement could reduce capital spending by as much as \$5.1 to \$6.7 billion among S&P 500 companies alone and cost 100,000 to 130,000 jobs. To shed some light on Honeywell’s potential exposure to margin requirements, we had approximately \$2 billion of hedging contracts outstanding at year-end that would be defined as a swap under Dodd-Frank. Applying 3% initial margin and 10% variation margin implies a potential margin requirement of \$260 million. Cash deposited in a margin account cannot be productively deployed in our businesses and therefore detracts from Honeywell’s financial performance and ability to promote economic growth and protect American jobs.—Mr. James E. Colby, Assistant Treasurer, Honeywell International Inc.

On May 21, 2013, at a hearing entitled “The Future of the CFTC: Market Perspectives,” Mr. Stephen O’Connor, Chairman, ISDA, provided the following testimony with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

Perhaps most importantly, we do not believe that initial margin will contribute to the shared goal of reducing systemic risk and increasing systemic resilience. When robust variation margin practices are employed, the additional step of imposing initial margin imposes an extremely high cost on both market participants and on systemic resilience with very little countervailing benefit. The Lehman and AIG situations highlight the importance of variation margin. AIG did not follow sound variation margin practices, which resulted in dangerous levels of credit risk building up, ultimately leading to its bailout. Lehman, on the other hand, posted daily variation margin, and while its failure caused shocks in many markets, the variation margin prevented outsized losses in the OTC derivatives markets. While industry and regulators agree on a robust variation margin regime including all appropriate products and counterparties, the further step of moving to mandatory IM [initial margin] does not stand up to any rigorous cost-benefit analysis.

Based on the extensive background that accompanies the statutory change provided explicitly in Section 311, the Committee intends that initial and variation margin requirements cannot be imposed on uncleared swaps entered into by cooperative entities if they similarly qualify for the CFTC’s cooperative exemption with respect to cleared swaps. Cooperative entities did not cause the financial crisis and should not be required to incur substantial new costs associated with posting initial and variation margin to counterparties. In the end, these costs will be borne by their members in the form of higher prices and more limited access to credit, especially in underserved markets, such as in rural America. Therefore, the Committee’s clear intent when drafting Section 311 was to prohibit the CFTC and prudential regulators, including the Farm Credit Administration, from imposing margin requirements on cooperative entities.

SUBTITLE B—INTER-AFFILIATE SWAPS Sec. 321—Treatment of affiliate transactions

“Inter-affiliate” swaps are contracts executed between entities under common corporate ownership. Section 321 would amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide an exemption for inter-affiliate swaps from the clearing and execution requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act so long as the swap transaction hedges or mitigates the commercial risk of an entity that is not a financial entity. The section also requires that an “appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism” be utilized between the entity seeking to hedge against commercial risk if it transacts with a swap dealer or major swap participant, but this credit support measure requirement is effective prospectively from the date H.R. 4413 is enacted into law.

Importantly, with respect to Section 321’s use of the phrase “credit support measure or other mechanism,” the Committee unequivocally does not intend for the CFTC to interpret this statutory language as a mandate to require initial or variation margin for swap transactions. The Committee intends for the CFTC to recognize that credit support measures and other mechanisms have been in use between counterparties and affiliates engaged in swap transactions for many years in different formats, and therefore, there is no need to engage in a rulemaking to define such broad terminology.

Section 321 originated from the need to provide relief for a parent company that has multiple affiliates within a single corporate group. Individually, these affiliates may seek to offset their business risks through swaps. However, rather than having each affiliate separately go to the market to engage in a swap with a dealer counterparty, many companies will employ a business model in which only a single or limited number of entities, such as a treasury hedging center, face swap dealers. These designated external facing entities will then allocate the transaction and its risk mitigating benefits to the affiliate seeking to mitigate its underlying risk.

Companies that use this business model argue that it reduces the overall credit risk a corporate group poses to the market because they can net their positions across affiliates, reducing the number of external facing transactions overall. In addition, it permits a company to enhance its efficiency by centralizing its risk management expertise in a single or limited number of affiliates.

Should these inter-affiliate transactions be treated as all other swaps, they could be subject to clearing, execution and margin requirements. Companies that use inter-affiliate swaps are concerned that this could substantially increase their costs, without any real reduction in risk in light of the fact that these swaps are purely for internal use. For example, these swaps could be “double-margined”—when the centralized entity faces an external swap dealer, and then again when the same transaction is allocated internally to the affiliate that sought to hedge the risk.

The uncertainty that exists regarding the treatment of inter-affiliate swaps spans multiple rulemakings that have been proposed or that will be proposed pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act. Section 321 provides certainty and clarity as to what inter-affiliate transactions are and how they are not to be regulated as swaps when the parties to the transaction are under common control.

On March, 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act,” the following testimony was provided with respect to efforts to address the problem with inter-affiliate swaps:

[I]nter-affiliate swaps provide important benefits to corporate groups by enabling centralized management of market, liquidity, capital and other risks inherent in their businesses and allowing these groups to realize hedging efficiencies. Since the swaps are between affiliates, rather than with external counterparties, they pose no systemic risk and therefore there are no significant gains to be achieved by requiring them to be cleared or subjecting them to margin posting requirements. In addition, these swaps are not market transactions and, as a result, requiring market participants to report them or trade them on an exchange or swap execution facility provides no transparency benefits to the market—if anything, it would introduce useless noise that would make Dodd-Frank’s transparency rules less helpful.—Hon. Kenneth E. Bentsen, Acting President and CEO, SIFMA

This legislation would ensure that inter-affiliate derivatives trades, which take place between affiliated entities within a corporate group, do not face the same demanding regulatory requirements as market-facing swaps. The legislation would also ensure that end-users are not penalized for using central hedging centers to manage their commercial risk. There are two serious prob-

lems facing end-users that need addressing. First, under the CFTC’s proposed inter-affiliate swap rule, financial end-users would have to clear purely internal trades between affiliates unless they posted variation margin between the affiliates or met specific requirements for an exception [i]f these end-users have to post variation margin, there is little point to exempting inter-affiliate trades from clearing requirements, as the costs could be similar. And let’s not forget the larger point—internal end-user trades do not create systemic risk and, hence, should not be regulated the same as those trades that do. Second, many end-users—approximately one-quarter of those we surveyed—execute swaps through an affiliate. This of course makes sense, as many companies find it more efficient to manage their risk centrally, to have one affiliate trading in the open market, instead of dozens or hundreds of affiliates making trades in an uncoordinated fashion. Using this type of hedging unit centralizes expertise, allows companies to reduce the number of trades with the street and improves pricing. These advantages led me to centralize the treasury function at Westinghouse while I was there. However, the regulators’ interpretation of the Dodd-Frank Act confronts nonfinancial end-users with a choice: either dismantle their central hedging centers and find a new way to manage risk, or clear all of their trades. Stated another way, this problem threatens to deny the end-user clearing exception to those end-users who have chosen to hedge their risk in an efficient, highly-effective and risk-reducing way. It is difficult to believe that this is the result Congress hoped to achieve.—Ms. Marie N. Hollein, C.T.P., President and CEO, Financial Executives International, on behalf of the Coalition for Derivatives End-Users.

SUBTITLE C—INDEMNIFICATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SWAP DATA REPOSITORIES

Section 331—Indemnification requirements

Section 331 strikes the indemnification requirements found in Sections 725 and 728 of the Dodd-Frank Act related to swap data gathered by swap data repositories (SDRs) and derivatives clearing organizations (DCOs). The section does maintain, however, that before an SDR, DCO, or the CFTC shares information with domestic or international regulators, they have to receive a written agreement stating that the regulator will abide by certain confidentiality agreements.

Swap data repositories serve as electronic warehouses for data and information regarding swap transactions. Historically, SDRs have regularly shared information with foreign regulators as a means to cooperate, exchange views and share information related to OTC derivatives CCPs and trade repositories. Prior to Dodd-Frank, international guidelines required regulators to maintain the confidentiality of information obtained from SDRs, which facilitated global information sharing that is critical to international regulators’ ability to monitor for systemic risk.

Under Sections 725 and 728 of the Dodd-Frank Act, when a foreign regulator requests information from a U.S. registered SDR or DCO, the SDR or DCO is required to receive a written agreement from the foreign regulator stating that it will abide by certain confidentiality requirements and will “indemnify” the Commissions for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for information. In short, the concept of “indemnification”—requiring a party to contractually agree to pay for another par-

ty’s possible litigation expenses—is only well established in U.S. tort law, and does not exist in practice or in legal concept in foreign jurisdictions.

These indemnification provisions—which were not included in the financial reform bill passed by the House of Representatives in December 2009—threaten to make data sharing arrangements with foreign regulators unworkable. Foreign regulators will most likely refuse to indemnify U.S. regulators for litigation expenses in exchange for access to data. As a result, foreign regulators may establish their own data repositories and clearing organizations to ensure they have access to data they need to perform their supervisory duties. This would lead to the creation of multiple databases, needlessly duplicative data collection efforts, and the possibility of inconsistent or incomplete data being collected and maintained across multiple jurisdictions.

In testimony before the House Committee on Financial Services in March of 2012, the then-Director of International Affairs for the SEC, Mr. Ethiopis Tafara endorsed a legislative solution to the problem, stating that:

The SEC recommends that Congress consider removing the indemnification requirement added by the Dodd-Frank Act . . . the indemnification requirement interferes with access to essential information, including information about the cross-border OTC derivatives markets. In removing the indemnification requirement, Congress would assist the SEC, as well as other U.S. regulators, in securing the access it needs to data held in global trade repositories. Removing the indemnification requirement would address a significant issue of contention with our foreign counterparts . . .

At the same hearing, the then-General Counsel for the CFTC, Mr. Dan Berkovitz, acknowledged that they too have received growing concerns from foreign regulators, but that they intend to issue interpretive guidance, stating that “access to swap data reported to a trade repository that is registered with the CFTC will not be subject to the indemnification provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act if such trade repository is regulated pursuant to foreign law and the applicable requested data is reported to the trade repository pursuant to foreign law.”

To provide clarity to the marketplace and remove any legal barriers to swap data being easily shared with various domestic and foreign regulatory agencies, this section would remove the indemnification requirements found in Sections 725 and 728 of the Dodd-Frank Act related to swap data gathered by SDRs and DCOs.

On March, 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act,” Mr. Larry Thompson, Managing Director and General Counsel, the Depository Trust and Clearing Corporation, provided the following testimony with respect to provisions of H.R. 742, which were included in Section 331:

The Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013 would make U.S. law consistent with existing international standards by removing the indemnification provisions from sections 728 and 763 of Dodd-Frank. DTCC strongly supports this legislation, which we believe represents the only viable solution to the unintended consequences of indemnification. H.R. 742 is necessary because the statutory language in Dodd-Frank leaves little room for regulators to act without U.S. Congressional intervention. This point was reinforced in the CFTC/SEC January 2012 Joint

Report on International Swap Regulation, which noted that the Commissions “are working to develop solutions that provide access to foreign regulators in a manner consistent with the DFA and to ensure access to foreign-based information.” It indicates legislation is needed, saying that “Congress may determine that a legislative amendment to the indemnification provision is appropriate.” H.R. 742 would send a clear message to the international community that the United States is strongly committed to global data sharing and determined to avoid fragmenting the current global data set for over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives. By amending and passing this legislation to ensure that technical corrections to indemnification are addressed, Congress will help create the proper environment for the development of a global trade repository system to support systemic risk management and oversight.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are being asked to vote on today is identical to legislation that failed on the suspension calendar last week—and so is now being brought back to the floor under a closed rule, without possibility of amendment. I opposed this bill on both policy and procedural grounds last week, and because nothing has fundamentally changed on either score, I will do so again today.

Mr. Speaker, this unwieldy legislation is comprised of eleven, mostly unrelated titles—a few of which I have supported in the past, some of which I probably could support on a freestanding basis in the future and several of which either need a lot more work or simply

should not be supported. In particular, as an advocate of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act, I think we should tread very carefully before modifying or weakening something as central to financial reform as the Volcker Rule, which Title VIII of this legislation would do with respect to collateralized debt obligations. Additionally, while I am strongly in favor of giving employees more ownership opportunities in the companies they work for, I also believe those employees deserve to know the value of the stock they are being offered, and that is something Title XI of this bill fails to do.

For these reasons, I urge a no vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 37 is postponed.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi:

Mr. WESTMORELAND, Georgia
Mr. JORDAN, Ohio
Mr. ROSKAM, Illinois
Mr. POMPEO, Kansas
Mrs. ROBY, Alabama
Mrs. BROOKS, Indiana

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 14, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and fourth quarters of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JAMES BRANDELL, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 5 AND OCT. 8, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
James Brandell	10/5	10/7	Belgium		871.29		1,644.70				2,515.99
	10/7	10/8	England		494.48		280.74				775.22
Committee total					1,365.77		1,925.44				3,291.21

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES BRANDELL, Dec. 11, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NETHERLANDS, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 21 AND NOV. 25, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael R. Turner	11/21	11/29	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,634.00				2,974.00
Hon. Lois Frankel	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		7,215.00				8,555.00
Hon. John Shimkus	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		8,625.00				9,965.00
Hon. Thomas Marino	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,634.00				2,974.00
Hon. Brett Guthrie	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,912.00				3,252.00
Hon. Gerald Connolly	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,634.00				2,974.00
Hon. James Sensenbrenner	11/21	11/24	Netherlands		1,005.00		11,312.00				12,317.00
Hon. Paul Cook	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		11,704.00				13,044.00
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	11/21	11/24	Netherlands		1,005.00		12,192.00				13,197.00
Jeff Dressler	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,634.00				2,974.00
Janice Robinson	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,634.00				2,974.00
Ed Rice	11/21	11/25	Netherlands		1,340.00		1,634.00				2,974.00
Committee total					15,410.00		62,764.00				78,174.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, Dec. 15, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, Jan. 7, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

36. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) [Docket No.: CFPB-2014-0008] (RIN: 3170-AA45) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

37. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Consumer Leasing (Regulation M) [Docket No.: R-1495] (RIN: 7100-ZA-09) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

38. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Test Procedures for Direct Heating Equipment and Pool Heaters [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0004] (RIN: 1904-AC94) received January 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

39. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Alternative Efficiency Determination Methods and Compliance for Commercial HVAC, Refrigeration, and Water Heating Equipment [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-TP-0024] (RIN:

1904-AC46) received January 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

40. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska: Nonattainment New Source Review [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0753; FRL-9921-40-Region-10] received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

41. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0163; FRL-9921-19-Region 7] received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

42. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone and 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0745; FRL-9921-29-Region 10] received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

43. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0696; FRL-9921-38-Region 9] received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

44. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, trans-

mitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Auxiliary Installations, Replacement Facilities, and Siting and Maintenance Regulations [Docket No.: RM12-11-002; Order No. 790-A] received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

45. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-13, Survey of New Foreign Direct Investment in the United States; Announcing OMB Approval of Information Collection [Docket No.: 111201710-4976-01] (RIN: 0691-AA82) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

46. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-565, "Legalization of Possession of Minimal Amounts of Marijuana for Personal Use Initiative of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

47. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-425, "Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Waiver Certification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

48. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-437, "Voter Registration Access and Modernization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

49. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-443, "Medical Marijuana Expansion Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

50. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-420, "Post-Arrest Process Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

51. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-451, "Rent Control Hardship Petition Limitation Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

52. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-442, "Extension of Time to Dispose of the Strand Theater Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

53. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-452, "Georgia Avenue Great Streets Neighborhood Retail Priority Area Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

54. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-441, "Business Improvement Districts Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

55. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-439, "Critical Infrastructure Freedom of Information Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

56. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-453, "Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

57. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-438, "Workers' Compensation Statute of Limitations Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

58. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-416, "Prohibition of the Harm of Police Animals Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

59. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-423, "Sustainable Solid Waste Management Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

60. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-426, "Wage Theft Prevention Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

61. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-424, "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KELLY

of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DENT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 287. A bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 288. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel for certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 289. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide the option to receive Medicare Summary Notices electronically, to increase the flexibility and transparency of contracts with medicare administrative contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 290. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 3-day prior hospitalization requirement for Medicare coverage of skilled nursing facility services in qualified skilled nursing facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 291. A bill to establish a WaterSense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of

New York, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 292. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 293. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to exempt from manufacturer transparency reporting certain transfers used for educational purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the transfer of veterans to non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr.

BUTTERFIELD, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 295. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 296. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 297. A bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 298. A bill to amend chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the sale of, and access to, "research use only" products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 299. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to authorize privately insured credit unions to become members of a Federal home loan bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 300. A bill to provide for operational control of the international border of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Rules, Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VELA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 301. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to the identification of high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 302. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress from receiving any automatic pay adjustments through the end of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or combat-related special compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 304. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation of income of controlled foreign corporations attributable to imported property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 306. A bill to require the Attorney General to issue rules pertaining to the collection and compilation of data on the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 307. A bill to establish a gun buyback grant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 308. A bill to prohibit gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona until the expiration of certain gaming compacts; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for repealing the gas tax and establishing a carbon tax on highway fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 310. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 311. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act with respect to adoption and other pregnancy options counseling; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 312. A bill to amend the Defense Base Act (42 U.S.C. 1651 et seq.) to require death benefits to be paid to a deceased employee's designated beneficiary or next of kin in the case of death resulting from a war-risk hazard or act of terrorism occurring on or after September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 313. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 per-

cent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 314. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow workers who attain age 65 after 1981 and before 1992 to choose either lump sum payments over four years totaling \$5,000 or an improved benefit computation formula under a new 10-year rule governing the transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 315. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process to determine whether individuals claiming certain service in the Philippines during World War II are eligible for certain benefits despite not being on the Missouri List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 316. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr.

SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 317. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 318. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the post-employment restrictions on lobbying by Members of Congress and officers and employees of the legislative branch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 319. A bill to provide that a former Member of Congress or former Congressional employee who receives compensation as a lobbyist shall not be eligible for retirement benefits or certain other Federal benefits; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. SWALLOW of California):

H.R. 320. A bill to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 321. A bill to allow for a contract for operation of Melville Hall at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, after receipt of a gift from the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc., for renovation of such hall and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 322. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 323. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 324. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 325. A bill to amend the Pribilof Islands Transition Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide notice of certification that no further corrective action is required at sites and operable units covered by the Pribilof Islands Environmental Restoration agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 327. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 328. A bill to empower federally recognized Indian tribes to accept restricted fee tribal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 329. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 330. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 331. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce from authorizing commercial finfish aquaculture operations in the Exclusive Economic Zone except in accordance with a law authorizing such action; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 332. A bill to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act to prescribe an additional requirement for the designation of marine sanctuaries off the coast of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated less than 50 percent to receive concurrent payment of both retired pay and veterans' disability compensation, to extend eligibility for concurrent receipt to chapter 61 disability retirees with less than 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 334. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to require the Bureau of Land Management to provide a claimant of a small miner waiver from claim maintenance fees with a period of 60 days after written receipt of 1 or more defects is provided to the claimant by registered mail to cure the 1 or more defects or pay the claim maintenance fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 335. A bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act, the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997, the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000, and the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 336. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Architect of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 337. A bill to provide limitations on maritime liens on fishing permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage charitable contributions of real property for conservation purposes by Native Corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 339. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER:

H. Res. 29. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 30. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 288.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 1, Article 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 289.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 290.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress created a health care program called Medicare that is operated by the federal government. This bill would improve the efficiency and fairness of that program, especially access to care, while affecting interstate commerce, which Congress has the power to regulate under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 291.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 1 and clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 292.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 293.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. Per the Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress shall have the power regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 294.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 295.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 296.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 297.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 298.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section VIII. "The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States."

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 299.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 300.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 301.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 302.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 6 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 304.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 305.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 306.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 307.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 308.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 309.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 310.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 9—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 311.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 312.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 313.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 314.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 315.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 316.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 317.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 318.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 319.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

Article I, Section 6, Clause 1

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 320.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 321.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3,

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 322.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8,

Clause 7: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads"

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads"

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads"

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. COOK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LONG, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 27: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 29: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 36: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HILL, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 93: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 105: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 122: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 123: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 125: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 131: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 132: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 140: Mr. OLSON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 143: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 154: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. DOGETT.

H.R. 159: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 160: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 161: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 167: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 169: Mr. HARPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 174: Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 183: Mr. OLSON and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 184: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 185: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 187: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 191: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 204: Mr. OLSON and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 210: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 223: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 230: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 237: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 242: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 246: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 284: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 285: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. ROYCE.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Res. 11: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. ROUZER.

H. Res. 17: Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 28: Mr. ISRAEL.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. RIBBLE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE 2014 CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG/BUNDES RAT EXCHANGE

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, the U.S. Congress and the German Bundestag and Bundesrat have conducted an annual exchange program for staff members from both countries. The program gives professional staff the opportunity to observe and learn about each other's political institutions and interact on issues of mutual interest.

A staff delegation from the U.S. Congress will be selected to visit Germany for ten days from Friday, June 26–Sunday, July 5, 2015. During this ten day exchange, the delegation will attend meetings with Bundestag/Bundesrat Members, Bundestag and Bundesrat party staff members, and representatives of numerous political, business, academic, and media agencies.

A comparable delegation of German staff members will visit the United States for ten days Saturday, May 9–Sunday, May 17, 2015. They will attend similar meetings here in Washington. The U.S. delegation is expected to organize and facilitate these meetings.

The Congress-Bundestag/Bundesrat Exchange is highly regarded in Germany and the United States, and is one of several exchange programs sponsored by public and private institutions in the United States and Germany to foster better understanding of the politics and policies of both countries. This exchange is funded by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The U.S. delegation should consist of experienced and accomplished Hill staff who can contribute to the success of the exchange on both sides of the Atlantic. The Bundestag reciprocates by sending senior staff professionals to the United States.

Applicants should have a demonstrable interest in events in Europe. Applicants need not be working in the field of foreign affairs, although such a background can be helpful. The composite U.S. delegation should exhibit a range of expertise in issues of mutual concern to the United States and Germany such as, but not limited to, trade, security, the environment, economic development, health care, and other social policy issues. This year's delegation should be familiar with transatlantic relations within the context of recent world events.

In addition, U.S. participants are expected to plan and implement the program for the Bundestag/Bundesrat staff members when they visit the United States.

Participants are selected by a committee composed of personnel from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Depart-

ment of State and past participants of the exchange.

Members of the House and Senate who would like a member of their staff to apply for participation in this year's program should direct them to submit a resume and cover letter in which they state their qualifications, the contributions they can make to a successful program and some assurances of their ability to participate during the time stated.

Applications should be sent to the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, HC-4, the Capitol, by 5 p.m. on Friday, February 27, 2015.

TRIBUTE TO RAY MONCRIEF

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the most astute business leaders and job creators in southern and eastern Kentucky, Ray Moncrief, upon his retirement from the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation.

For generations, southern and eastern Kentucky has relied upon the coal mining industry for good paying jobs; however, primarily in the last decade, we have witnessed a debilitating decline in our Appalachian coalfields. To help diversify our business portfolio, I have long relied upon the expertise of my dear friend Ray Moncrief. In fact, he helped form the cornerstones of one of the region's largest job creating organizations, the Southeast Kentucky Economic Development Corporation (SKED).

Knowing the challenges of entrepreneurship in his own startup companies, Ray has dedicated countless hours to small business owners and local developers, providing technical and managerial training, guiding them through loan opportunities, development costs and contracts, and advocating for community partnerships and investments. He has taught numerous innovative individuals how to start, operate and expand successful companies and organizations in our region and across the country.

Ray's finite business sense has been sought out by countless businesses and non-profit organizations. His resume includes Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Mountain Ventures, Inc., and Fund Manager for both the Southern Appalachian Fund and Meritus Venture. He was previously a member of the NASBIC Board of Governors, and is currently a member of the Boards of Directors of the Community Development Financial Institution Coalition, the New Markets Tax Credit Coalition, the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, and NCB Capital Impact. He is also a founding director and

the founding Chairman of Appalachian Community Capital, Inc. Topping off his long list of credibility, Ray is also a founding member of the Community Development Venture Capital Alliance (CDVCA) and is credited for designing the community development venture capital.

As noted in his biography, Ray is a nationally and internationally recognized speaker and writer on the use of equity as an economic development strategy, and has provided testimony to the U.S. Congress on various economic topics. President George W. Bush appointed Ray to the Community Development Advisory Fund in 2008. He has also received Lifetime Achievement Awards from CDVCA and the National Association of Seed and Venture Funds.

I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Ray Moncrief for manifesting the spirit of entrepreneurship that helps run America. His investment into the practices of small business owners across southern and eastern Kentucky will undoubtedly continue to create jobs for generations to follow. I wish Ray the very best in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, because of flight cancellations due to inclement weather, I was unable to vote on Roll Call 2, Election of the Speaker. Had I been present, I would have voted for Representative NANCY PELOSI for Speaker of the House of Representatives.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 113TH ANNIVERSARY OF KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join the nation in celebrating the 113th Anniversary of Korean American Day this January 13, 2015. The Korean American community has been an integral part of our American fabric, and I am honored to recognize their vital role in shaping communities throughout our great Nation.

Since the first Koreans arrived on the shores of Honolulu, Hawaii, on this date in 1903, they have excelled and shown that the American Dream is alive. Whether in military, education, science, business, sports or the arts, Korean Americans proved that with hard work, dedication and zeal for education, they

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

can thrive and help make America even greater.

My time fighting in the Korean War gave me an enduring personal connection to Korea and its people. Since returning home from my service over six decades ago, I have witnessed South Korea's rise from a war-torn nation to becoming the world's 13th-largest economy, a transformation which has been largely driven by the resilience and industriousness of the Korean people. Here in America, Koreans have inspired us with the same entrepreneurialism and perseverance toward building success and wealth for their communities.

As a native and longtime Congressman of New York City, I am proud of its Korean American community and the greatness they contribute to our City and State. I applaud the services provided by many Korean American organizations to the Greater New York region, including free legal and medical help, immigration workshops, scholarship opportunities, and various cultural events. Koreans raise strong families and build successful businesses, active civic associations, churches, and charities that enhance our local economy and culture.

I am proud to serve as Honorary Chairman of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, and join my Colleagues and Korean American friends in celebrating their many milestones and triumphs. The Korean people will always have a very special place in my heart. I look forward to the continued friendship I cherish so much.

COMMEMORATING MARIO CUOMO

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the text of an op-ed in The Journal News I wrote commemorating former New York Governor Mario Cuomo.

[From The Journal News, Jan. 2, 2015]

REP. LOWEY: MARIO CUOMO WAS MY MENTOR AND INSPIRATION

(By Nita Lowey)

Mario and Matilda Cuomo and their five children were our neighbors in Holliswood, Queens. Mario's parents, Andrea and Immaculata, lived around the corner.

When Mario, an attorney and law professor who gained prominence by successfully mediating thorny housing disputes in Corona and Forest Hills, first ran for Lieutenant Governor of New York in 1974, Steve and I promptly jumped into his campaign. He lost. But Gov. Hugh Carey, recognizing Mario's extraordinary talents, appointed him as Secretary of State. (His parents famously asked: "Mario—you're a lawyer and a teacher. How come you took a job as a secretary?")

My first job in public service was in 1975 as an assistant to Mario Cuomo, working as a community relations officer in the New York metropolitan region. I worked closely with Mario, as he took charge of New York's anti-poverty programs following their devolution by the federal government through block grants to the states. He pursued housing, education, health, community development, and senior citizen initiatives, among others.

He was indefatigable and inspirational. A profound thinker and eloquent speaker, no wonder that he was elected lieutenant governor in 1978 and then governor three times.

Nobody articulated the ideals and values of public service better than Mario Cuomo. He aptly captured the essence of his brilliant career: "You campaign in poetry, but govern in prose."

During an event in 1984, when I was a New York state assistant secretary of state and Mario Cuomo was governor, Mario told me, "Now listen to me and you'll be OK." I listened, I learned, and I am doing OK.

I was honored when Gov. Cuomo spoke on my behalf at a ceremony celebrating my election to Congress in 1988. As we mourn his loss, I am confident that Mario Cuomo's legacy will continue and endure with the re-election of Gov. Andrew Cuomo.

TRIBUTE TO A.L. SINCLAIR

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a long-time friend and leader in southern and eastern Kentucky, Mr. A.L. Sinclair, upon his retirement from the Eastern Kentucky PRIDE Board of Directors.

In 1997, A.L. participated in a historic meeting at the Hazard Community and Technical College during which southern and eastern Kentucky's local elected officials joined forces to combat our region's troubles with pollution and illegal dumps. The late General James Bickford, former Secretary of the Kentucky Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet, and I presented a battle plan to the group, declaring "war against pollution" in our beautiful region. Together, we launched the Eastern Kentucky PRIDE organization to promote "Personal Responsibility In a Desirable Environment" and A.L. immediately became a general in the war.

Since then, A.L. has volunteered as his hometown, Adair County's PRIDE Coordinator and a member of the regional PRIDE Board of Directors that now serves 42 counties.

A.L.'s passion for cleaning up our Appalachian hillsides and streams was truly driven by his many years of dedicated work with the U.S. Forest Service, and his tireless efforts as Adair County's Solid Waste Coordinator. He went above and beyond the call of duty, spearheading a variety of cleanup activities, including roadside dump cleanups, tire amnesty programs, white-goods buy-back opportunities and free tipping at the transfer station. Almost daily, he foraged the hillsides for illegal dumpsites and acted quickly to get them cleaned up and pushed for accountability and justice for those who marred our cherished land.

Due to A.L.'s deep pride in our region and courageous efforts to educate students, community leaders and families in southern and eastern Kentucky, he has been recognized with several prestigious awards, including the Kentucky Environmental Quality Commission's Earth Day Award and PRIDE's Rogers-Bickford Environmental Leadership Award.

A.L. has inspired an entire generation to take pride in our region by keeping our hill-

sides and waterways clean, by creating innovative energy-saving projects in our schools, and bringing access to clean water and sanitary sewer to thousands of families over the last two decades.

"Great achievement is usually born of great sacrifice, and is never the result of selfishness." Those words, written by Napoleon Hill, a motivational American author, define A.L.'s heart of service and commitment to work for a better future in our region.

I ask my colleagues to join me applauding the diligent work this great advocate for a cleaner, more beautiful place in America. We deeply appreciate A.L. Sinclair and he will be greatly missed, but his torch will be carried forward by the thousands of PRIDE volunteers who have joined the mission across southern and eastern Kentucky.

GARY FRONTIERS SERVICE CLUB DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. MEMORIAL BREAKFAST

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the birth of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and reflect on his life and work, we are reminded of the challenges that democracy poses to us and the delicate nature of liberty. Dr. King's life, and, unfortunately, his untimely death, reminds us that we must continually work to secure and protect our freedoms. In his courage to act, his willingness to meet challenges, and his ability to achieve, Dr. King embodied all that is good and true in the battle for liberty.

The spirit of Dr. King lives on in the citizens of communities throughout our nation. It lives on in the people whose actions reflect the spirit of resolve and achievement that will help move our country into the future. I am honored to rise today to recognize several individuals from Indiana's First Congressional District who will be recognized during the 36th Annual Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Breakfast on Saturday, January 17, 2015, at the Genesis Convention Center in Gary, Indiana. The Gary Frontiers Service Club, which was founded in 1952, sponsors this annual breakfast.

The Gary Frontiers Service Club will pay tribute to local individuals who have for decades selflessly contributed to improving the quality of life for the people of Gary. This year, Reverend Dwight Gardner and Deborah McCullough, M.D., will be honored with the prestigious Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Drum Major Award for 2015. Additionally, several individuals will be recognized as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Marchers at this year's breakfast, including Judy Ball, Ph.D., James Henley III, Eugene Johnson, and Reverend Mary Watkins. Finally, Sam Frazier was selected as the 2014 Yokefellow of the Year.

Though very different in nature, the achievements of each of these individuals reflect many of the same attributes that Dr. King possessed, as well as the values he advocated. Like Dr. King, these individuals saw challenges and faced them with unwavering

strength and determination. Each one of the honored guests' greatness has been found in their willingness to serve with "a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love." They set goals and work selflessly to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these honorees, as well as the Gary Frontiers Service Club officers, President Oliver J. Gilliam, Vice President James Piggee, Recording Secretary Linnal Ford, Financial Secretary Sam Frazier, and Treasurer/Seventh District Director Floyd Donaldson, along with Clorius L. Lay, who has served as Breakfast Chairman for fifteen years, and all other members of the service club for their initiative, determination, and dedication to serving the people of Northwest Indiana.

RECOGNIZING CAROLYN CRNICH
ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Carolyn Crnich, longtime recorder and registrar of voters for Humboldt County, on her retirement.

Carolyn's service to Humboldt County and the regional community has been exemplary. A fifth generation Humboldt County native, she began her work with the county in 1976 as a drafting supervisor in the Humboldt County Auditor's Office. Carolyn served as county recorder beginning in 1990. Carolyn was re-elected and served unopposed in 1994, 1998, 2002, 2006 and 2010, as the recorder, county clerk and registrar of voters offices were merged.

Carolyn was certified as a California Registered Elections Official by The Election Center in Houston, Texas, and by the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials. Her work was also recognized by the American Association of University Women, which named her Women's History Month honoree in 2009. Carolyn was a key founding member of the Humboldt Election Transparency Project, which has been recognized by the National Association of Secretaries of State, the Lori Grace Foundation for Election Integrity, the Election Verification Network, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Speaker, Carolyn Crnich's commitment to county government and the vital role of elections in the community is commendable and worthy of recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to her.

IN HONOR OF LOU CALCAGNO

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the House to the remarkable

public service career of Lou Calcagno. I have had the distinct honor and pleasure of working with Lou for nearly 40 years in many capacities ranging from local land use questions to federal farm policy. Today is his last meeting as a Monterey County Supervisor and I wanted to take a moment to recognize his record and example.

Lou was born in 1937 on his family's ranch in Moss Landing, California, the youngest son of Italian immigrant parents Pietro and Clara Calcagno. He grew up in his family's dairy operation and attended Monterey County schools. Hoping to take the family business to the next level, Lou left home to study dairy husbandry and manufacturing at Cal-Poly, San Luis Obispo. He then returned to put his expertise to use and built a career as a highly successful dairyman, which included service as: Chairman of the California Milk Advisory Board, Chairman of the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board and Chairman of the California Co-Operative Creamery, and co-founder of the California Milk Advisory Board.

As Lou was building his successful dairy career, he married Carol Lanini. Together, Carol and Lou raised two children: Louis Franklyn (Carolyn) Calcagno and Debbie Calcagno Soares; and, they have three grandchildren: Adam (Colleen) Soares, Lauren Soares, and Jennifer Calcagno and one great-grandson, Bradley Franklyn Soares.

Lou's work in the dairy industry and agriculture more broadly pulled him into the world of public policy. Lou quickly became involved in local and state government and many other public service efforts, including leadership positions with the Monterey County Planning Commission, the Ag Land Trust, the Monterey County Fair, the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority, the Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority, the North County Water Issues Advisory Committee, LAFCO, the Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority, the Monterey Regional Waste Management District, TAMC, and is the only Republican to chair the California Coastal Commission, just to name a few.

The culmination of Lou's public service was the 16 years he spent as a member of the Monterey County Board of Supervisors. As one of his predecessors on that board myself, I know first-hand how much difference you can make in the lives of the people of your community. Lou's service was definitive proof of that truth. He amassed a dynamic record of pragmatic leadership and problem solving that including turning around the finances of Monterey County's public hospital, prioritizing the preservation of prime ag land in local land use planning, and many more accomplishments than I have time to list now. Lou's retirement will diminish a voice leadership that Monterey County has known and relied on for half a century.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to extend the gratitude of the House to Lou and his family for his leadership and vision and for the countless hours devoted to the minutia of local democracy and governance. It is the service of people like Lou Calcagno that make America the world's greatest democracy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 2015 I missed recorded votes #17-19. I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were present.

On Roll Call #17, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 203).

On Roll Call #18, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 33).

On Roll Call #19, I would have voted YEA (Approval of the Journal).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, during the week of January 6, 2015 I missed recorded votes #1-#16. I was unavoidably detained due to the death of my brother in California.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for JOHN BOEHNER for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted yes (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted yes (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted no (Motion to Recommit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted yes (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 22, the Hire More Heroes Act of 2015).

On Roll Call #8 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 26, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act).

On Roll Call #9 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act).

On Roll Call #10 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 23, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization).

On Roll Call #11 I would have voted yes (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #12 I would have voted yes (Rule for H.R. 3 and H.R. 30).

On Roll Call #13 I would have voted no (Motion to Recommit).

On Roll Call #14 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act).

On Roll Call #15 I would have voted no (Motion to Recommit).

On Roll Call #16 I would have voted yes (Passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act).

HONORING LARRY BLAKENEY FOR
HIS EXCEPTIONAL CONTRIBUTION
TO ALABAMA ATHLETICS

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Larry Blakeney, an exceptional Alabamian who has made an enormous contribution to athletics and the development of young people in my state.

Coach Blakeney is best known as the head coach of the Troy University Trojan football team, a position he held for 24 years, retiring this past December. During that time, Coach Blakeney built a little-known Southeast Alabama team into a conference powerhouse and a nationally-competitive program. His remarkable career at Troy has included six 10-win seasons, five Sunbelt Conference championships, and 178 wins—a total that places him among the top three Alabama college coaches, behind the legendary Paul “Bear” Bryant and just ahead of his mentor and winningest Auburn coach Ralph “Shug” Jordan.

Among the defining characteristics of Larry Blakeney-coached teams was the fearless attitude they took into competition. “Any team, anytime, anywhere” was Troy’s motto, never phased or intimidated by traditional college football powers. And the Trojans would not just compete against the best, they would win. Simply put, Larry Blakeney has personified Troy Football, so much so that the field on which the Trojans play bears his name.

Larry Blakeney’s impact on the game of football in Alabama started as a player in high school, when he led the Gordo Green Wave to a record of 24–2–2 and three-straight Warrior Conference championships. He enrolled at Auburn University, where he became the first sophomore to start at quarterback under Coach Ralph “Shug” Jordan, a distinction that shows the extraordinary trust the legendary coach placed in him.

Blakeney began his coaching career in the high school ranks, first at Southern Academy, then Walker High School and Vestavia Hills High School. He was then hired at his beloved alma mater, Auburn, where he served as an assistant coach for 14 seasons. Auburn would experience one of its most successful runs ever with Coach Blakeney calling plays, including three-straight SEC championships in 1987, 1988 and 1989. Coach Blakeney’s success and championship drive made him the perfect choice to lead Troy’s burgeoning football program beginning in 1991.

His success on the gridiron has led to many accolades, including multiple “Coach of the Year” honors and placement in the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame. However, Coach Blakeney’s impact goes far beyond the playing field.

From Gordo to Auburn to Troy, he has maintained close, warm relationships with his teammates, fellow coaches, and players. The Auburn Creed, which outlines how Auburn men and women are supposed to live, emphasizes “the human touch,” which cultivates love, understanding and sympathy with your fellow man. Larry Blakeney personifies and

embodies that “human touch” to a great and rare degree.

Hundreds and perhaps thousands of once-young men are, today, better husbands, fathers, and citizens because of the positive influence of Coach Blakeney; a good man who used the game of football to teach integrity, character, and perseverance throughout his entire career.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to acknowledge Coach Blakeney’s positive impact on young people in Alabama, to celebrate his remarkable career, and to honor his place among the greatest college football coaches to walk the sidelines in my state.

IN RECOGNITION OF JIMMY CATES

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jimmy Cates who is retiring as Public Works Manager of the City of North Richland Hills after a 30-year career with the City’s Public Works Department. As Manager of Public Works, Mr. Cates was responsible for the operations of the city’s streets, transportation, water distribution, and wastewater systems. These responsibilities include the duties assigned to the Divisions of Streets and Drainage, Transportation and Water/Sewer Maintenance and Repair. Ultimately, Mr. Cates ensured that the citizens of North Richland Hills had an efficient, effective and safe transportation system, water supply, sewer and stormwater system which would meet the needs of current and future residents.

A graduate of Indiana University, he is a member of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), American Public Works Association (APWA), International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA), Texas Water Utilities Association, and the American Water Works Association (AWWA).

I am honored to represent Mr. Cates and the City of North Richland Hills in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I gladly join the City and the appreciative citizens of the 26th Congressional District, whom he has dutifully served throughout his career.

RECOGNIZE THE SERVICE OF KUO-YU HANS CHIAO

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the service of Kuo-yu Hans Chiao. Mr. Chiao is the outgoing Senior Officer in the Congressional Liaison Division of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office, TECRO. Mr. Chiao is returning to Taiwan for his next assignment in the Department of North American Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China (Taiwan). During his service as the TECRO contact for my office, as well as the Senate Committee on Foreign Rela-

tions, Senate Committee on Finance, and House Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Chiao has served as an invaluable resource for my staff and me.

In 2009, Mr. Chiao was hand-picked to serve as a congressional liaison for TECRO. During his 6 year tenure in this position, Mr. Chiao developed a strategy that pro-actively expanded partnerships with key U.S. congressional offices to enhance Taiwan’s impact and credibility in Washington. Mr. Chiao worked tirelessly to garner support for S. 1683 that would allow the transfer of naval vessels to Taiwan. This legislation passed the Senate and the House, and was signed into law in December 2014. Mr. Chiao was also part of the TECRO team that worked toward the passage of H.R. 1151, which directs the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly (ICAO). This became public law in July 2013. Additionally, Mr. Chiao organized and oversaw many Congressional Member and Staff Delegation visits to Taiwan, forging solid ties between our two countries.

Mr. Chiao has served in Taiwan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 2005. Early in his diplomatic career, he served in Department of North American Affairs. Mr. Chiao received a Bachelor of Arts degree from National Taiwan University, majored in Foreign Languages and Literatures and minored in Political Science.

Though Mr. Chiao secured many legislative victories for Taiwan while he served in Washington, D.C., he made even more long-lasting relationships. My colleagues and our staff are proud to call him a friend, and we hope to see him back in Washington, D.C. one day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for three roll call votes on Monday, January 12, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner:

Roll Call Vote #17—Clay Hunt SAV Act—YES.

Roll Call Vote #18—Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act—YES.

Roll Call Vote #19—Journal Vote—YES.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,085,826,074,241.57. We’ve added \$7,458,949,025,328.49 to our debt in 5

years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARTIN LUTHER KING OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Martin Luther King Observance Committee, located in Morristown, New Jersey as it celebrates its 45th Anniversary.

Since 1970, the Committee, under the leadership of Dr. Felicia B. Jamison, has engaged the involvement of the whole Morris County community in programs and services that commemorate the extraordinary life and accomplishments of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Each year, the Committee encourages the community to join together in celebrating the birth of Dr. King by promoting and preserving his legacy.

January 19, 2015 marks the 30th year that Dr. King's birthday will be commemorated as a National Holiday. Dr. King would have turned 86 this year, calling all Americans to remember his incredible life, and the impact his legacy has had on the course of American history. Fifty-two years ago, Dr. King stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, here in our nation's capital, to deliver his famous "I Have a Dream" speech to those participating in the March on Washington. In his speech, which proved to be a defining moment in the Civil Rights Movement, Dr. King charged Americans, "As we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead." In celebrating the life of Dr. King as a holiday each year, we renew our pledge to continue in his legacy and promote the complete equality of all people in this nation.

Though it has only been a National Holiday for 30 years, the Martin Luther King Observance Committee has celebrated the birth of Dr. King for 45 years under the direction of Dr. Felicia B. Jamison. This year, to celebrate their anniversary in conjunction with Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, the Committee will hold two events on January 19th. First, their 30th Annual Interfaith Breakfast will begin the day by gathering all members of the community in celebration, as well as reflection on the legacy left by Dr. King. Following the breakfast, the committee will hold their 45th Annual Service of Celebration, properly honoring the life accomplishments of Dr. King and his influence in the Civil Rights Movement.

The Morris County community of all ages or economic status, of all religious persuasions, and of all political affiliations have recognized and acknowledged the invaluable contributions Dr. King has made to each and every American. That is why the theme of the Committee's celebration this year is appropriately titled "The Dream is Freedom; The Outcome is A Community of Persons." Regardless of the various differences that define us, all Americans can recognize and celebrate the influen-

tial legacy of a great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Just last year, we celebrated the 50th Anniversary of the Civil Rights Act, which you, Mr. Speaker, called possibly "the most consequential piece of legislation" in history. At the ceremony, Dr. King and Mrs. Coretta Scott King posthumously received a Congressional Gold Medal for their accomplishments. The Martin Luther King Observance Committee has expressed renewed encouragement in celebrating their 45th Anniversary, due to these awards recently presented to the Kings.

I commend the members of the Martin Luther King Observance Committee, especially committee chair Dr. Felicia B. Jamison, for their dedication to promoting the rich legacy of the life and works of Dr. King. Through the annual celebration of Dr. King's birth, the Committee has consistently demonstrated a dedication and commitment to advancing his philosophy and teachings.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Martin Luther King Observance Committee as it celebrates its 45th Anniversary.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW COLUMBIA ADMISSION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the New Columbia Admission Act with 93 original cosponsors, a record number. I am introducing the District of Columbia statehood bill as my first bill for the 114th Congress, an indication of its importance to the residents of the District of Columbia. This bill got its first-ever Senate hearing last Congress, ensuring that statehood is on the congressional agenda. Residents were so encouraged by the prospect of the first Senate hearing on our bill that more DC residents attended than had come to any DC hearing in memory. Their enthusiasm reflects that residents of our nation's capital have always been citizens of the United States but remain the only taxpaying Americans who do not have full and equal citizenship rights. The denial of local control of local matters and of equal representation in the Congress of the United States can be remedied only by statehood.

Therefore, I am introducing the New Columbia Admission Act to create a state from essentially the eight home-town wards of the District of Columbia. This 51st state, of course, would have no jurisdiction over the federal territory or enclave that now consists of the Washington that Members of Congress and visitors associate with the capital of our country. The U.S. Capitol premises, the principal federal monuments, federal buildings and grounds, the National Mall, and other federal property here would remain under federal jurisdiction. Our bill provides that the State of New Columbia would be equal to the other fifty states in all respects, as is always required, and the residents of New Columbia would have all the rights of citizenship as taxpaying American citizens, including two sen-

ators and, initially, one House member. The District of Columbia recognizes that it can enter the Union only on an equal basis and is prepared to do so.

The New Columbia Admission Act was the first bill I introduced after I was first sworn in as a Member of Congress in the 102nd Congress in 1991. Our first try for statehood received significant support in the House. In 1993, we got the first and only vote on statehood for the District, with nearly 60% of Democrats and one Republican voting for the New Columbia Admission Act. The Senate held a hearing on various approaches to representation, but the committee of jurisdiction did not proceed further. In the 113th Congress, our statehood bill got unprecedented momentum with the Senate's first-ever hearing on statehood, which was the first congressional hearing held on statehood in more than 20 years, since the House held its hearing on statehood in 1993, and obtained a record number of cosponsors in the House and Senate, including Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, as well as the other top three Democratic leaders in the Senate. In addition, President Obama endorsed DC statehood in a public forum before the statehood hearing was held.

Statehood is the only alternative for the citizens of the District of Columbia. To be content with less than statehood is to concede the equality of citizenship that is the birthright of our residents as citizens of the United States. That is a concession no American citizen has ever made, and one DC residents will not make as they approach the 214th year in their fight for equal treatment in their country. This bill reaffirms our determination to obtain each and every right enjoyed by citizens of the United States, by becoming the 51st State in the Union.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT WILLIAM J. ROSSMAN JR.

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this statement to honor the extraordinary life of a proud Wisconsinite, an American hero, and a friend: Sergeant William J. Rossman Jr. Sergeant Rossman recently passed away at the age of 91. He was a husband and father, a decorated military veteran, and an outstanding member of his community. And despite his storied military career and numerous accolades, those who were fortunate enough to meet Sergeant Rossman know he preferred to go by the much more modest title of "Bill."

Bill was your typical World War II Veteran. He was proud of his service, but never one to boast or brag of his accomplishments. He understood the true meaning of service: that you put others ahead of yourself. And he practiced this throughout his entire life, whether it was with his family, his work, or his community. But it was nearly 71 years ago, during his time fighting in the war, that Bill performed an act of service that still leaves me in awe to this day.

On February 14, 1944, after bombing the marshalling yards at Verona, Italy, Bill's B-24 Liberator was hit by a fierce concentration of flak that knocked out two of its engines. Unable to keep up with the bomber formation, six Messerschmitt ME-109s attacked the bomber, knocking out a third engine and starting a fire. The pilot, Lt. Robert Gernand, rang the alarm bell and ordered the crew to bail out of the aircraft. The bomber was in flames and falling in a tight spiral, quickly losing altitude. Under these dire circumstances, it would have made sense for Bill to follow the orders of Lt. Gernand and immediately do what was necessary to protect his own life. But that's not what happened. Bill noticed that his crew member Sgt. Louis Vasquez, the aircraft's radioman, was wounded and immobile. With complete disregard for his own life, Bill attended to Vasquez, removing his helmet and flak suit and securing his parachute before finally pushing him out of the camera hatch. Finally, Bill, who was also severely wounded, secured his own parachute and exited the aircraft.

Bill's story does not end there. After touching down, he was discovered by Italian resistance fighters who gave him medical care and transferred him to a monastery, where he posed as a wounded French civilian and remained silent to avoid being discovered by the Germans. But after ten days, Bill was identified as an American and taken away by German forces. He spent the next 15 months in various POW camps in different countries. Throughout his imprisonment, he was starved, his life was threatened, and received no medical attention for his wounds. He was marched from camp to camp, and faced numerous near-death experiences. Finally, in April 1945, Bill and his fellow prisoners in Bavaria were liberated by the Thirteenth Armored Division, led by a name familiar to all Americans: General George Patton.

Amazingly, Bill continued his career in the military after returning home to America. He remained in the Air Force and married his wife, Alice, in 1947 while attending Officer Candidate School. In 1949, he was discharged from the service after six years with the Army Air Corps and the U.S. Air Force. He returned to Racine, Wisconsin, where he and Alice raised their daughter, Pamela, and Bill worked in the private sector for 36 years until his retirement in 1986. In 2002, I had the privilege of presenting Bill with the Distinguished Flying Cross, America's oldest military aviation award. In addition to this and many other honors, Bill was also a recipient of a POW medal and the Purple Heart.

Bill was a true American patriot. I am submitting this statement for the record to honor his incredible life and help ensure that his story is remembered for years to come. His legacy sets a standard of what it truly means to serve. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Alice, his daughter Pamela, and his son-in-law Michael. He will be greatly missed by his friends, his family, the state of Wisconsin, and the United States of America.

HONORING REV. JOHN WOOD

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, Rev. John Wood was honored for his 25 years as Pastor of the Cedar Springs Presbyterian Church in Knoxville.

Almost everyone who has heard John Wood speak believes he is one of the greatest preachers this Nation has ever produced.

He is not loud or flashy or flamboyant, but he preaches the Gospel in a sincere, intelligent, humble way that relates well to all types of people.

I think he is one of the most brilliant men I have ever known, and I have felt that way since I first met him in one of his early days in Knoxville.

Under his leadership, Cedar Springs has become one of the largest Presbyterian churches in the Nation. His sermons are both enjoyable and thought-provoking, and, most importantly, Biblically-based.

He somehow has the ability to teach the Bible in a way that is helpful to Biblical scholars as well as to beginning Christians. He preaches in a kind, down-to-earth manner that gives his listeners the feeling he is preaching to himself as well as to everyone who is listening.

John has been a true friend and an inspiration to me and my family. He has been with us through good times and bad, and I am very fortunate to have known him and have him as a part of my life for these last 25 years.

Much more important than the help he has been to me, however, is the fact that he has touched thousands of lives in a good and positive way.

He has brought the Christian message to churches and meetings through the U.S. and to many countries around the world.

I want to congratulate John Wood on his 25 years at Cedar Springs and encourage all my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to listen to one of his sermons on the internet or hopefully someday in person.

I would also like to call attention to the article that appeared in the Knoxville News Sentinel on January 13, 2013, entitled "Pastor John Wood: Best leaders are servants."

PASTOR JOHN WOOD: BEST LEADERS ARE SERVANTS

(By Josh Flory)

Legendary University of Tennessee football coach Robert Neyland was famous for his seven maxims of winning football. In that spirit, the News Sentinel offers a series that highlights maxims for the 21st century—not about football, but about effective leadership.

On one Sunday every month, the Business section will highlight an East Tennessean from spheres including athletics, the arts, religion or the public sector, speaking about their "leadership maxims" for the 21st century.

John Wood, senior pastor, Cedar Springs Presbyterian Church: "The best leaders are those who help people accomplish good things, not by ruling over them, but by serving alongside them."

Q: Tell me about your philosophy of leadership as a pastor and a minister.

A: I think "leader"—just at its rawest, most basic definition—a leader is someone who gets other people to follow them and to get something done.

But a good leader is someone who encourages and motivates people to get something good or something necessary done. A great leader, the best leaders, are those who accomplish that—who encourage, who motivate, who really get people excited about being a part of something that they're doing—not by ruling but rather, as Jesus said, by serving.

It's servant leadership. And it's not just Jesus' word, it's really the whole picture of leadership, positive picture of leadership in the Bible. And (it) often contrasts between the very good leaders and very bad leaders, those who ruled and those who served. . . .

To me, the ultimate example of servant leadership, integrity in the Bible is John 13, where just the night before he was crucified, Jesus, having loved his disciples, loved them to the end and took off his robes, put a towel around his waist and did the one thing that no Jewish family could force another Jew who served them to do, and that was wash feet. . . .

And so Jesus lays aside His robes, puts a towel around His waist and crawls from one set of dirty feet to the next, washes feet, and then when He resumes his place He says: "Do you understand what I've told you? You call me Lord and master, I am. I'm your master, I'm your teacher. And if I, your master and teacher, have washed your feet, how much more ought you?" This is servant leadership. This is what it looks like."

Q: You mentioned the service aspect of leadership. At the same time . . . you mentioned this issue of mastery and being a master. In some sense your role involves challenging and confronting people at certain times, I would imagine. How do you balance those competing demands of confronting at times but also serving and being humble?

A: When Jack Kennedy was inaugurated as president, he asked Robert Frost to write a poem and read a poem for him, which Frost agreed to do. When Frost's friends heard that he had agreed to participate in Jack Kennedy's inauguration, they said how could you do this, you've always hated liberals?

And he said, Kennedy's no liberal. And they said, what do you mean, what's your definition of a liberal? And he said, a liberal is a man who cannot even pick his own side in an argument.

Now I always tell our people, Christ was never, in calling us to be humble, telling us that we can't have principled views—hopefully biblically formed and shaped—for which we are willing to stand and passionately take a position and debate it, but debate it charitably without demonizing people who hold a different view.

Being a leader means that you're going to have to go to people, often if you see them working what you think is outside of their own gifting, and say: "Look, you know, you have so many really wonderful gifts, and I want to help you use those gifts. We need for you to be using your gifts. We've got you in the wrong place. This is our fault. We asked you to do something that is outside of your gifting."

Or it's something that you clearly have no interest in. I think you could do it, but you've got no interest. Now let's help you get in a place where you can really be fulfilled and be, in our context, serving Christ and serving others by using your gifts. And let's deploy you rightly. . . . " But also as a pastor, and a pastor who believes that the

Bible is God's word written, there's often the responsibility of confronting—hopefully gently, lovingly but firmly—someone who's simply wanting to go along and be part of the family of Christ and yet wanting to live way outside clear teaching of God's word. And that doesn't mean on secondary and tertiary issues, but on things where the Bible is clear, where Christians have always everywhere believed these things.

You have to be able to go in love and say: "Look, I love you too much to watch you on a destructive course. And this isn't an option for you. How can I help you get out of this thing? And I'm willing to walk with you or we'll find somebody who will walk with you."

And again, I think too often as pastors we want so much for everybody to like us and for the numbers to keep increasing and for the money to keep coming in, and so we don't want to say the hard things. We say hard things that we know everybody agrees with. . . . We preach to the choir and they (say) "Oh yeah, go get 'em." And I don't want to preach to the people that are out there; I want to preach to the people that are here by preaching first to my own heart, confronting my own idols, my own demons, my own brokenness."

WE MUST FIGHT THE PRESIDENT'S UNILATERAL AMNESTY

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, we must fight to defund and reverse the president's unilateral amnesty.

Last summer, our nation experienced the consequences of the president's refusal to enforce the law. His unilateral actions enticed tens of thousands to unlawfully enter the country. According to the statistics, a vast majority of them remain in the U.S. today.

The president is now going around the legislative process again to grant amnesty to millions more. He wants hard-working American taxpayers to fund this disastrous plan. My constituents will not stand for it.

The president's unilateral amnesty must be completely defunded. Americans' tax dollars should be used to secure the border and keep this nation safe—not to reward those who have broken the law.

IN HONOR OF THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF VOICES FOR CHILDREN

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Voices for Children for their outstanding commitment and dedication to foster youth in San Diego.

This year, Voices for Children will celebrate its 35th year of operation since its founding in San Diego County. There are 5,100 children and youth living in the San Diego County foster care system. Voices for Children is fighting

to ensure those children are placed in a safe and permanent home. Voices for Children recruits, trains, and supervises 1,400 Court Appointed Special Advocate volunteers (CASAs) each year. CASAs are exemplary role models and volunteer mentors for the abused, neglected, and abandoned children and youth in San Diego's foster care system. These volunteers advocate for the best interests of foster children, provide vital information to judges in Juvenile Court and speak up for San Diego's foster youth in courts, schools, and the community.

I commend Voices for Children for their contributions and ongoing dedication to providing safe and permanent homes for every child in foster care, as well as their commitment to changing the lives of thousands of abused, neglected, or abandoned children in foster care.

SAYING GOOD-BYE TO AMBASSADOR ABDALLAH BAALI OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I say good-bye to a distinguished member of the Washington diplomatic corps—His Excellency Abdallah Baali of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. During his six years in Washington, Ambassador Baali has made a tremendous effort to engage with Congress and strengthen the U.S.-Algeria bilateral relationship. A man of calm demeanor and wise insights, the ambassador not only represented his government with honor and great ability, he worked hard to educate and inform Congress about Algeria's important role in the Maghreb-Sahel region, as well as the economic, human rights, and democratic progress being made by his country.

During the 113th Congress it was my honor to serve as the Democratic co-chair of the Congressional Algeria Caucus, along with my Wisconsin colleague Representative SEAN DUFFY. The work of Ambassador Baali and his staff was critical to re-establishing the caucus and I am deeply grateful for all of his efforts.

During his visits to my office I listened to Ambassador Baali's words closely as we discussed the relationship between our two nations and the need for a partnership in the Maghreb-Sahel region to combat extremism, promote security, and guarantee self-determination and freedom for the people of the Western Sahara. Algeria's role in regional security is critical and I greatly appreciated Ambassador Baali's wise counsel and valuable insights.

I wish to thank President Bouteflika and the people of Algeria for sending my nation such a capable, professional, and trusted diplomat. Ambassador Baali shall always be welcome in my office and I wish him much success and happiness as he returns home to Algeria.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. LEE ROY "TEX" KEITH

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to posthumously honor Mr. Lee Roy "Tex" Keith, who passed away December 23, 2014 at the age of 96, leaving behind a proud legacy.

In 2010, it was my privilege to present the 26th District of Texas Congressional Veteran Commendation to Lee Roy Keith. He honorably served our nation as a Marine aviator in World War II and the Korean War. Keith began pilot training in January 1943 and was commissioned as a captain serving at El Toro, CA where he flew military combat supplies to the Pacific. His Okinawan deployment involved evacuation of casualties from Japanese beaches and reconnaissance missions following the two atomic bombings. After assignment in Hawaii, he returned stateside and was released from active duty on October 30, 1946.

Keith earned a Bachelor of Science degree, established a ranching business and joined the USMC Reserves, achieving the rank of Major. On October 22, 1951, Keith was summoned again to active duty service to our nation in the Korean conflict. Following his distinguished military career, Major Keith served as an FAA Flight Inspector from 1960 to 1975. As a token of the esteem with which he was held by his peers, he was given the distinct honor of piloting the first official commercial aircraft landing at the new Dallas-Fort Worth Airport. Upon retiring from a post-military career with the FAA, Mr. Keith served as the Veterans Service Officer for Denton County and was elected to successive terms as President of the State VSO Association. He continued to support his fellow veterans by serving in multiple American Legion Commander positions, and as the Post 71 Boys State Chairman for 35 years.

With his impressive service record and unquestionable dedication to our country, it was an honor to represent Major Lee Roy "Tex" Keith in the U.S. House of Representatives and I extend my condolences to his family and friends.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 12th, 2015, I was unable to cast my votes on the House Floor due to repeated flight delays. Had I been able to avoid these travel complications, I would have voted as follows:

YES on H.R. 203 the Clay Hunt SAV Act Suspension Bill;

YES on H.R. 33 the Protecting Firefighters Emergency Responders Act Suspension Bill; and

YES on the Journal Vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 19, approval of the Journal, I was inadvertently absent. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

MEDAL OF HONOR BOWL

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the citizens of historic Charleston, South Carolina, hosted the second annual Medal of Honor Bowl to further underscore America's deep appreciation of Medal of Honor recipients who have made our freedoms possible.

Under the visionary leadership of Chairman Tommy McQueeney and tireless efforts of 57 volunteers, the weekend began with a tribute gala on Friday night as a prelude to the bowl game on Saturday afternoon at The Citadel's Johnson Hagood Stadium. This celebration of our nation's heroes served to raise awareness of the sacrifices made by our military and their families. Proceeds from the events are to support the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation and other charities to help disabled veterans and wounded warriors.

The National Medal of Honor Museum is located on board the USS *Yorktown* aircraft carrier, permanently docked at the Patriots Point Naval and Maritime Museum in Mt. Pleasant. This museum is home to the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, whose members have earned our nation's highest award for military valor, and this weekend's bowl game served as a tribute to them.

TOP TEN MISREPORTED STORIES
OF 2014**HON. LAMAR SMITH**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the media watchdog organization Accuracy in Media recently recounted the "Top ten misreported and underreported stories of 2014."

At the top of their list was the media's failure to adequately report on the Benghazi scandal. Very few in the media expressed any interest in covering the attack on our embassy that led to the death of four Americans including a U.S. ambassador.

Other biased stories on the list include the media downplaying the rise of the Islamic State, portraying Israel as the aggressor in its dealings with Palestine, and the holdings by federal judges against President Obama's actions on immigration and Obamacare.

In December, a federal judge in Pennsylvania ruled that President Obama's executive actions on immigration are unconstitutional. This was block-buster news but most Americans never heard or read about it.

The media should give the American people the facts, not cover them up.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH B. HAUCK

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people in New York's 9th District to express our sincere appreciation for the dedication and sacrifices of Kenneth B. Hauck.

Kenneth B. Hauck selflessly and courageously served in the United States Army between October 1942 and May 1946. During his period of service Kenneth B. Hauck participated in World War II, where he fought in the Battle of the Bulge with Company B, 112th Infantry Regiment and was a Prisoner of War. His personal sacrifice and steadfast loyalty during this time go unparalleled. For his service he was awarded the American Campaign Medal, EAME campaign medal, World War II Victory Medal, and the Good Conduct Medal.

It is an honor to know that such impressive and dedicated men and women like Kenneth B. Hauck are willing to sacrifice so much in the name of freedom. It is my honor to recognize and thank Kenneth B. Hauck for his exemplary service to our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JODY B. HICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call votes numbers 17, 18, and 19.

Had I been present, I would have voted aye on Roll Call number 17 to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act.

I would have voted aye on Roll Call number 18 to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 33, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

I would have voted no on Roll Call number 19 to agree to the Speaker's Approval of the Journal.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 18, H.R. 33, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act, I was inadvertently absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR MARIO
CUOMO**HON. STEVE ISRAEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a true New York legend, Mario Matthew Cuomo, and to thank him for his service to the people of New York and this country. Mario Cuomo was not only one of the greatest governors in the history of New York and an orator whose skill rivals legends throughout history; he was a man of great principal and humility. At a time when New York needed a bold leader, Mario Cuomo stepped up and led the state in a truly unique and inspiring fashion.

Something that was so telling is when I visited the Cuomo family during Mario's wake. For our current Governor Andrew Cuomo and his sisters and brother, the day was about beginning the process of saying goodbye to their father. But for the long lines of people waiting outside to pay their respects, Mario Cuomo was a man who understood their struggles and worked every single day to make their lives better.

Governor Cuomo was a man of deeply held convictions, who used his time in office to make a difference in peoples' lives. He constantly strived to make progress in economic, environmental, and social justice, putting a face to what true progressivism looks like in the modern era. Even when his choices were not popular in the short term, Governor Cuomo had the foresight to understand that history would marvel at his wisdom for decades to come.

The list of accomplishments to Governor Cuomo's name is extensive and will serve as a high bar to future governors across our great country. A deeply caring family man, Governor Cuomo worked to better the life of children by implementing health care and education programs. A student of history, the Governor knew that we needed to increase our investment in infrastructure to rebuild roads and bridges across the state to boost our economy and put people to work. And the Governor was decades ahead of his time in aggressively advocating for environmental protection, understanding that leaving a more beautiful and healthy New York for the next generation was of the utmost importance.

The passing of Governor Cuomo reminds us all that we should be doing our best every single day to advocate for our constituents and give a voice to the voiceless. We need to be both practical and bold in our thinking, something the Governor mastered. Living up to the example left by Governor Cuomo is an enormous challenge, but one that will leave this country in a much better place.

May Governor Cuomo rest in peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 2015, on Roll Call #8 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 26—Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 7, 2015, on Roll Call #9 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 37—Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 7, 2015, on Roll Call #10 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 23—National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 8, 2015, on Roll Call #11 on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 8, 2015, on Roll Call #12 on H. Res. 19—Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 30) the Save American Workers Act of 2015, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 8, 2015, on Roll Call #13 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 30, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 8, 2015, on Roll Call #14 on Passage of H.R. 30—Save American Workers Act of 2015, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 9, 2015, on Roll Call #15 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 9, 2015, on Roll Call #16 on Passage of H.R. 3—Keystone XL Pipeline Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 14, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We pray that Your spirit will be upon the Members of this people's House, giving them the richness of Your wisdom.

Bless the Members of the majority party as they gather these next days. May they, with those who accompany them, travel safely and meet in peace.

Bless also the minority party as they prepare for their own gathering. May these days be filled with hopeful anticipation.

May the power of Your truth and our faith in Your providence give them all the confidence they must have to do the good work required for service to our Nation. Give all Members the strength of purpose and clarity of mind to do those things that bring justice and mercy to people and maintain freedom and liberty for our land.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ELLISON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AMERICANS BENEFIT FROM LOWER ENERGY PRICES

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, compared to last summer, hardworking Maine families are saving \$20 with every fill-up of their vehicles. The \$1,000 annual savings is buying almost 2 months of groceries for a family of four.

This winter, many of our families are saving an additional \$1,000 because the cost of heating oil has plummeted. That is another 2 months of groceries.

Last week, I was proud to join House Republicans and Democrats to finally approve the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. Our families will have more money, have more jobs, and enjoy more freedom when America increases the production and transportation of all forms of domestic energy and do it in an environmentally sensitive way.

Increase production, and drive down price.

Now, the House has done its job to approve the Keystone pipeline. I respectfully ask the Senate to do the same; then together, we must ask the President to do his part.

It is the right thing to do for more jobs, fatter paychecks, and more security.

DON'T DEREGULATE WALL STREET AGAIN

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are about to cast votes on a bill that I believe will make Wall Street a little freer to make risky bets for a few more years: Where were we 6 years ago?

Well, let me just give you a blast from the past with some headlines. From The Wall Street Journal, on January 7, 2009, "ADP Reports 693,000 Private Sector Jobs Lost"; CNN, January 9, 2009, "Worst Year for Jobs Since '45"; Bloomberg, January 8, 2009, "December's Job Loss Was Bad. But How Bad?"; in The New York Times, February 14, 2009, "Job Losses Pose a Threat to Stability Worldwide."

President Obama hadn't been in office. This was other stuff, mistakes that had happened in the past connected to deregulation of Wall Street.

We were staring down the worst recession since the Great Depression. Today, we are about to embark back down that path to deregulate Wall Street again. Don't do it.

REMEMBERING ROBERT JORDAN

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to honor my friend, lifetime Fayetteville resident and entrepreneur, Robert Jordan, who passed away on December 16, 2014.

In 1952, Robert got his first job in retail at the age of 17 at the old Travis Hardware store in downtown Fayetteville. During his visits to various warehouses around town, Robert noticed items seemingly not for sale and placed off to the side. Eventually, he realized he could cheaply buy some of those discarded items, take them back to downtown Fayetteville, and sell them for a profit, while still offering his customers a good deal.

By the early 1970s, Robert was giving full-time attention to buying and selling salvage merchandise and became well-known for his wheeling and dealing. If you wanted to know anything about the community in Fayette County or if you wanted to win an election, you went to see Robert Jordan. Robert was the guy to go to.

Jordan Sales and Salvage became popular and profitable, and it is a fine example of what American entrepreneurship is all about. The way Robert ran his business and treated customers as his friends is a true statement of the compassion and faith involved in all the aspects of his daily life, especially the big love he had for his family.

Joan and I send our condolences and prayers to the Jordan family, especially his wife of 60 years, Nellie, during this difficult time, and I am thankful to have met Robert and to have visited his store from time to time, but I am especially lucky to call him my friend.

Robert, until we meet again, we miss you.

DON'T PLAY GAMES WITH HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand against the tactics used by the House Republicans for their partisan fights. I find it unconscionable that the House Republicans would threaten the funding of the Department of Homeland Security over the President's executive action on immigration.

We just saw what happened to our friends in France, and now, they are going to play games with our national security and threaten its funding. This executive action isn't an election strategy or a scheme to grow the Federal Government; it is a moral imperative.

The President acted because this House refused to even vote on the bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill. It was widely expected that a vote on that bill would have succeeded.

Our broken immigration system has forced millions to live their lives in fear. The President's action is the right thing to do, is the humane thing to do.

I oppose the defunding of this executive action, Mr. Speaker, and I oppose the threatening of the funding of the Department of Homeland Security and, by extension, our national security.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PENN STATE WORLD CAMPUS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penn State World Campus on being ranked number one in the Nation for the best online bachelor's programs in the country.

The recognition was given by the U.S. News & World Report's 2015 Best Online Programs and marks the highest ever ranking for the university; further, Penn State ranks in the top 10 for the best online graduate programs in business, engineering, education, and computer information technology.

The assessment criteria included student engagement, faculty credentials and training, peer reputation, student services, and technology.

Penn State World Campus, which provides high-quality online education to meet the needs of busy adults who want to advance their careers, currently has 10,805 students enrolled in 119 degree and certificate programs.

The third year that U.S. News & World Report has ranked online degree programs, almost 300 institutions that offer online bachelor degrees are included in the rankings.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my alma mater for this esteemed recognition, including the talented staff and the innovative educators at Penn State University.

DON'T PICK POLITICS OVER COUNTRY

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of our Nation's continued safety and national security. Recent world events vividly re-

mind us of the importance of supporting and maintaining a strong and robust homeland security policy.

Today, we are going to vote on H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and it provides for critical, important funding to the Department, including vital support for essential law enforcement activities and programs.

I had hoped that my Republican colleagues would bring this bill, a clean bill, to the floor; instead, we have more politics as usual. A bill that would actually be signed into law by the President is what this country needs; however, what we have is not that case today.

It is unfortunate and extremely upsetting that the Republicans are now threatening to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, endangering the security of our entire country and appeasing the most extreme anti-immigration reform fringes of their party.

This is simply politics over country and should not be a part of the debate surrounding our critically important appropriations bills for Homeland Security.

The five amendments that the Republicans plan to attach to the bipartisan Homeland Security bill represent some of the most extreme anti-immigration legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject these amendments, reject this partisan gamesmanship that threatens our national security, and call on the majority to vote on and pass the original version of H.R. 240.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND THE HOMELESS

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the wind chill in Buffalo, New York, was 20 below zero. Dead of hypothermia was Ronald Hunter. He was 21 and had untreated schizophrenia.

A third of the Nation's 750,000 homeless are so severely mentally ill that they cannot take care of themselves. They starve, they freeze, they live in their own squalor.

Had Ronald had some other brain disease like Alzheimer's, he might very well be alive today, but because he had a mental illness, the system refused to help.

Ronald's father told The Buffalo News:

"When he was living with us, I found him curled up in a ball in the corner of the bedroom," and I said, "What is wrong, baby?"

He replied to his dad, "I am hearing voices telling me to kill myself."

Ronald's parents called Crisis Services, but as his stepmom said, "Because

he was 18, it was up to him if he wanted help." In other words, we let him die with his rights on.

Don't you understand, America, that this is a brain disease; it is not a choice?

I will soon be reintroducing the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, and I invite all Members to join me in rebuilding our broken mental health system, so that we have treatment before there is tragedy.

AMERICA'S IMPROVING ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 2014, the American economy had the strongest job growth it has had since 1997. That is 18 years ago. We have had private sector jobs growth for 58 straight months. That is the longest stretch on record.

Our economy has once again become the envy of the world. Inflation is tame. Gas prices are low. The deficit is falling, and the stock market is up.

Consumer sentiment is now at its highest level since the early years of 2007. The economic outlook looks good, but it could and should be better. This success has been based on sound public policy.

If we stop the politicking and work together, we can make our growing economy work for all Americans.

□ 0915

IMMIGRATION

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the President's continued use of executive action to bypass Congress and the American people in order to move forward with his own agenda. In the Granite State, we believe deeply in the rule of law and separation of powers, and the President's abuse of executive authority runs counter to these principles.

The United States is a very generous country to those who come here seeking a better life for themselves and their family. Every year, countless seek solace on our shores in search of economic and political freedom.

Unfortunately, our laws have not kept up with our needs. Our current economic system is broken. Instead of encouraging legal immigration, streamlining the process, and reforming our visa system, the President has intentionally refused to enforce the laws already on the books. The President's DACA order has encouraged thousands of children to take a perilous journey, ripping them from their families and placing their well-being with those who seek to exploit them.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation cannot send a signal that we won't enforce our laws or hold those responsible for breaking them. Our immigration system can be better. Compassion for people and care to faithfully execute our laws are not mutually exclusive.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, including extraneous material, on further consideration of H.R. 240, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 27 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 240.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) kindly take the chair.

□ 0917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, January 13, 2015, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 240

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive man-

agement of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$132,573,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That all official costs associated with the use of government aircraft by Department of Homeland Security personnel to support official travel of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary shall be paid from amounts made available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary: *Provided further*, That not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a comprehensive plan for implementation of the biometric entry and exit data system required under section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), including the estimated costs for implementation.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), \$187,503,000, of which not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$4,493,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and \$6,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for the Human Resources Information Technology program: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary for Management shall include in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, which shall include the information required under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management" under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74), and shall submit quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), \$52,020,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Future Years Homeland Security Program, as authorized by section 874 of Public Law 107-296 (6 U.S.C. 454).

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, \$288,122,000; of which \$99,028,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$189,094,000,

to remain available until September 30, 2016, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security.

ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$255,804,000; of which not to exceed \$3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which \$102,479,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$118,617,000; of which not to exceed \$300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

TITLE II

SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 7,500 (6,500 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; \$8,459,657,000; of which \$3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which \$30,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, solely for the purpose of hiring, training, and equipping U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers at ports of entry; of which not to exceed \$34,425 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; and of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2015, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be \$35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to compensate any employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That the Border Patrol shall maintain an active duty presence of not less than 21,370 full-

time equivalent agents protecting the borders of the United States in the fiscal year.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for U.S. Customs and Border Protection for operation and improvement of automated systems, including salaries and expenses, \$808,169,000; of which \$446,075,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017; and of which not less than \$140,970,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment.

BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, \$382,466,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, the Air and Marine Operations Center, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including salaries and expenses, operational training, and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts; \$750,469,000; of which \$299,800,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$450,669,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been identified as excess to U.S. Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2015 without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall be available for customs expenses when necessary to maintain or to temporarily increase operations in Puerto Rico: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any changes to the 5-year strategic plan for the air and marine program required under the heading "Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, and Maintenance" in Public Law 112-74.

CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, and maintain buildings, facilities, and related infrastructure necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, \$288,821,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

U. S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations, including intellectual property rights and overseas vetted units operations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement

only) police-type vehicles; \$5,932,756,000; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed \$11,475 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than \$305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than \$5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); of which not to exceed \$40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, is for maintenance, construction, and leasehold improvements at owned and leased facilities; and of which not to exceed \$11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, not less than \$1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: *Provided further*, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2015: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, not less than \$3,431,444,000 is for detention, enforcement, and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for Custody Operations in the previous proviso, \$45,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided for the Visa Security Program and international investigations, \$43,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for investigation of intellectual property rights violations, including operation of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been materially violated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance

evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than "adequate" or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: *Provided further*, That nothing under this heading shall prevent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime: *Provided further*, That without regard to the limitation as to time and condition of section 503(d) of this Act, the Secretary may propose to reprogram and transfer funds within and into this appropriation necessary to ensure the detention of aliens prioritized for removal.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, \$26,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$5,639,095,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016; of which not to exceed \$7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: *Provided further*, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: *Provided further*, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2015 so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$3,574,095,000: *Provided further*, That the fees deposited under this heading in fiscal year 2013 and sequestered pursuant to section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), that are currently unavailable for obligation, are hereby permanently cancelled: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2015, any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a) of such title: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, mobile explosives detection equipment purchased and deployed using funds made available under this heading may be moved and redeployed to meet evolving passenger and baggage screening security priorities at airports: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 45,000 full-time equivalent screeners: *Provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the

date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security efforts and resources being devoted to develop more advanced integrated passenger screening technologies for the most effective security of passengers and baggage at the lowest possible operating and acquisition costs, including projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 years or until project completion, whichever is earlier;

(2) how the Transportation Security Administration is deploying its existing passenger and baggage screener workforce in the most cost effective manner; and

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities:

Provided further, That not later than April 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a semiannual report updating information on a strategy to increase the number of air passengers eligible for expedited screening, including:

(1) specific benchmarks and performance measures to increase participation in Pre-Check by air carriers, airports, and passengers;

(2) options to facilitate direct application for enrollment in Pre-Check through the Transportation Security Administration's Web site, airports, and other enrollment locations;

(3) use of third parties to pre-screen passengers for expedited screening;

(4) inclusion of populations already vetted by the Transportation Security Administration and other trusted populations as eligible for expedited screening;

(5) resource implications of expedited passenger screening resulting from the use of risk-based security methods; and

(6) the total number and percentage of passengers using Pre-Check lanes who:

(A) have enrolled in Pre-Check since Transportation Security Administration enrollment centers were established;

(B) enrolled using the Transportation Security Administration's Pre-Check application Web site;

(C) were enrolled as frequent flyers of a participating airline;

(D) utilized Pre-Check as a result of their enrollment in a Trusted Traveler program of U.S. Customs and Border Protection;

(E) were selectively identified to participate in expedited screening through the use of Managed Inclusion in fiscal year 2014; and

(F) are enrolled in all other Pre-Check categories:

Provided further, That Members of the United States House of Representatives and United States Senate, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the United States Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and the United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, \$123,749,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

INTELLIGENCE AND VETTING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of intelligence and vetting activities, \$219,166,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security support pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$917,226,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives—

(1) a report providing evidence demonstrating that behavioral indicators can be used to identify passengers who may pose a threat to aviation security and the plans that will be put into place to collect additional performance data; and

(2) a report addressing each of the recommendations outlined in the report entitled "TSA Needs Additional Information Before Procuring Next-Generation Systems", published by the Government Accountability Office on March 31, 2014, and describing the steps the Transportation Security Administration is taking to implement acquisition best practices, increase industry engagement, and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs:

Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$25,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Headquarters Administration until the submission of the reports required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of the preceding proviso.

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than \$700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of \$31,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding \$1,000,000 in total cost on any location; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; \$7,043,318,000, of which \$553,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities, of which \$213,000,000 is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress; of which \$24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed \$15,300 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Pro-*

vided, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent fees are insufficient to pay expenses of recreational vessel documentation under such section 12114, and there is a backlog of recreational vessel applications, then personnel performing non-recreational vessel documentation functions under subchapter II of chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, may perform documentation under section 12114: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$85,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until a future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2016 through 2020, as specified under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" of this Act, is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism may be allocated by program, project, and activity, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act: *Provided further*, That, without regard to the limitation as to time and condition of section 503(d) of this Act, after June 30, up to \$10,000,000 may be reprogrammed to or from Military Pay and Allowances in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 503.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, \$13,197,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; \$114,572,000.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$1,225,223,000; of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which the following amounts shall be available until September 30, 2019 (except as subsequently specified): \$6,000,000 for military family housing; \$824,347,000 to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; \$180,000,000 to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; \$59,300,000 for other acquisition programs; \$40,580,000 for shore facilities and aids to navigation, including facilities at Department of Defense installations used by the Coast Guard; and \$114,996,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: *Provided*, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for the production of the eighth National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for post-production costs:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs,

projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appropriations shall be identified and justified: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall not delay the submission of the capital investment plan referred to by the preceding provisos: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall have no more than a single period of 10 consecutive business days to review the capital investment plan prior to submission: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives one day after the capital investment plan is submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives when such review is completed: *Provided further*, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110-28 shall hereafter apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$17,892,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which \$500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): *Provided*, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts, and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, \$1,450,626,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the United States Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing,

lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards; travel of United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; \$1,615,860,000; of which not to exceed \$19,125 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; of which \$2,366,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; of which \$6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be for activities related to training in electronic crimes investigations and forensics: *Provided*, That \$18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That \$4,500,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided further*, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That the Director of the United States Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Secret Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate

and the House of Representatives, a report providing evidence that the United States Secret Service has sufficiently reviewed its professional standards of conduct; and has issued new guidance and procedures for the conduct of employees when engaged in overseas operations and protective missions, consistent with the critical missions of, and the unique position of public trust occupied by, the United States Secret Service: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Headquarters, Management and Administration until such report is submitted: *Provided further*, That for purposes of section 503(b) of this Act, \$15,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, may be transferred between Protection of Persons and Facilities and Domestic Field Operations.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of physical and technological infrastructure, \$49,935,000; of which \$5,380,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019, shall be for acquisition, construction, improvement, and maintenance of the James J. Rowley Training Center; and of which \$44,555,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for Information Integration and Technology Transformation program execution.

TITLE III PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, and information technology, \$61,651,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall be detailed by office, and by program, project, and activity level, for the National Protection and Programs Directorate.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$1,188,679,000, of which \$225,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That if, due to delays in contract actions, the National Protection and Programs Directorate will not fully obligate funds for Federal Network Security or for Network Security Deployment program, project, and activities as provided in the accompanying statement and section 548 of this Act, such funds may be applied to Next Generation Networks program, project, and activities, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of federally owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service: *Provided*, That the Director of the Federal Protective Service shall submit at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title

31, United States Code, a strategic human capital plan that aligns fee collections to personnel requirements based on a current threat assessment.

OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for the Office of Biometric Identity Management, as authorized by section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), \$252,056,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$122,150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, \$129,358,000; of which \$26,148,000 is for salaries and expenses and \$86,891,000 is for BioWatch operations: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$16,319,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for bio-surveillance, chemical defense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, \$934,396,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-295; 120 Stat. 1394), the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141, 126 Stat. 916), and the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-89): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$35,180,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which none is available for Federal Emergency Management Agency administrative costs: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$30,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for capital improvements and other expenses related to continuity of operations at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available, \$3,400,000 shall be for the Office of National Capital Region Coordination: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not less than \$4,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for expenses related to modernization of automated systems.

STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, \$1,500,000,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(1) \$467,000,000 shall be for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605), of which not less than \$55,000,000 shall be for Operation Stonegarden: *Provided*, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2015, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(2) \$600,000,000 shall be for the Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604), of which not less than \$13,000,000 shall be for organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(3) \$100,000,000 shall be for Public Transportation Security Assistance, Railroad Security Assistance, and Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under sections 1406, 1513, and 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53; 6 U.S.C. 1135, 1163, and 1182), of which not less than \$10,000,000 shall be for Amtrak security and \$3,000,000 shall be for Over-the-Road Bus Security: *Provided*, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(4) \$100,000,000 shall be for Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(5) \$233,000,000 shall be to sustain current operations for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which \$162,991,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers:

Provided, That for grants under paragraphs (1) through (4), applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 80 days after the grant announcement, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act within 65 days after the receipt of an application: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)) or any other provision of law, a grantee may not use more than 5 percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: *Provided further*, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communications towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: *Provided further*, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 509 of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may use the funds provided in paragraph (5) to acquire real property for the purpose of establishing or appropriately extending the security buffer zones around Federal Emergency Management Agency training facilities.

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants for programs authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), \$680,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which \$340,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and

\$340,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For emergency management performance grants, as authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$350,000,000.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2015, as authorized in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (42 U.S.C. 5196e), shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by the Department of Homeland Security necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year: *Provided*, That the methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees: *Provided further*, That fees received under this heading shall be deposited in this account as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2015, and remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the United States Fire Administration and for other purposes, as authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$44,000,000.

DISASTER RELIEF FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$7,033,464,494, to remain available until expended, of which \$24,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following reports, including a specific description of the methodology and the source data used in developing such reports:

(1) an estimate of the following amounts shall be submitted for the budget year at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code:

(A) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the prior fiscal year to the budget year;

(B) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the budget year to the budget year plus 1;

(C) the amount of obligations for non-catastrophic events for the budget year;

(D) the amount of obligations for the budget year for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State;

(E) the total amount that has been previously obligated or will be required for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State for all prior years, the current year, the budget year, the budget year plus 1, the budget year plus 2, and the budget year plus 3 and beyond;

(F) the amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered for the budget year;

(G) the amount that will be required for obligations for emergencies, as described in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), major disasters, as described in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), fire management assistance grants, as described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187), surge activities, and disaster readiness and support activities; and

(H) the amount required for activities not covered under section 251(b)(2)(D)(iii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)(iii); Public Law 99-177);

(2) an estimate or actual amounts, if available, of the following for the current fiscal year shall be submitted not later than the fifth day of each month, and shall be published by the Administrator on the Agency's Web site not later than the fifth day of each month:

(A) a summary of the amount of appropriations made available by source, the transfers executed, the previously allocated funds recovered, and the commitments, allocations, and obligations made;

(B) a table of disaster relief activity delineated by month, including—

(i) the beginning and ending balances;

(ii) the total obligations to include amounts obligated for fire assistance, emergencies, surge, and disaster support activities;

(iii) the obligations for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State; and

(iv) the amount of previously obligated funds that are recovered;

(C) a summary of allocations, obligations, and expenditures for catastrophic events delineated by event;

(D) in addition, for a disaster declaration related to Hurricane Sandy, the cost of the following categories of spending: public assistance, individual assistance, mitigation, administrative, operations, and any other relevant category (including emergency measures and disaster resources); and

(E) the date on which funds appropriated will be exhausted;

Provided further, That the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's Web site not later than 5 days after an award of a public assistance grant under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172) the specifics of the grant award: *Provided further*, That for any mission assignment or mission assignment task order to another Federal department or agency regarding a major disaster, not later than 5 days after the issuance of the mission assignment or task order, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the following: the name of the impacted State and the disaster declaration for such State, the assigned agency, the assistance requested, a description of the disaster, the total cost estimate, and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That not later than 10 days after the last day of each month until the mission assignment or task order is completed and closed out, the Administrator shall update any changes to the total cost estimate and the amount obligated: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$6,437,792,622 shall be for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief

and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the amount in the preceding proviso is designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING AND RISK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, including administrative costs, under section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), and under sections 100215, 100216, 100226, 100230, and 100246 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, (Public Law 112-141, 126 Stat. 916), \$100,000,000, and such additional sums as may be provided by State and local governments or other political subdivisions for cost-shared mapping activities under section 1360(f)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4101(f)(2)), to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (subtitle A of title II of division F of Public Law 112-141; 126 Stat. 916), and the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-89; 128 Stat. 1020), \$179,294,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2016, and shall be derived from offsetting amounts collected under section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)); which is available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; and floodplain management and additional amounts for flood mapping: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$23,759,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations and \$155,535,000 shall be available for floodplain management and flood mapping: *Provided further*, That any additional fees collected pursuant to section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)) shall be credited as an offsetting collection to this account, to be available for floodplain management and flood mapping: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2015, no funds shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund under section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017) in excess of:

(1) \$136,000,000 for operating expenses;

(2) \$1,139,000,000 for commissions and taxes of agents;

(3) such sums as are necessary for interest on Treasury borrowings; and

(4) \$150,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, for flood mitigation actions and for flood mitigation assistance under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c), notwithstanding sections 1366(e) and 1310(a)(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4104c(e), 4017):

Provided further, That the amounts collected under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) and section 1366(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 shall be deposited in the National Flood Insurance Fund to supplement other amounts specified as available for section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, notwithstanding section 102(f)(8), section 1366(e), and paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 1367(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(8), 4104c(e), 4104d(b)(1)-(3)): *Provided further*, That total administrative costs shall

not exceed 4 percent of the total appropriation: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 is available to carry out section 24 of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 4033).

NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND

For the predisaster mitigation grant program under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133), \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

To carry out the emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.), \$120,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3.5 percent of the total amount made available under this heading.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

For necessary expenses for citizenship and immigration services, \$124,435,000 for the E-Verify Program, as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), to assist United States employers with maintaining a legal workforce: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds otherwise made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may be used to acquire, operate, equip, and dispose of up to 5 vehicles, for replacement only, for areas where the Administrator of General Services does not provide vehicles for lease: *Provided further*, That the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may authorize employees who are assigned to those areas to use such vehicles to travel between the employees' residences and places of employment.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; the purchase of not to exceed 117 vehicles for police-type use and hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses for student athletic and related activities; the conduct of and participation in firearms matches and presentation of awards; public awareness and enhancement of community support of law enforcement training; room and board for student interns; a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal mobile phones for official duties; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; \$230,497,000; of which up to \$54,154,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; of which \$300,000 shall remain available until expended to be distributed to Federal law enforcement agencies for expenses incurred participating in training accreditation; and of which not to exceed \$7,180 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training sponsored by the Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That section

1202(a) of Public Law 107-206 (42 U.S.C. 3771 note), as amended under this heading in division F of Public Law 113-76, is further amended by striking "December 31, 2016" and inserting "December 31, 2017": *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall schedule basic or advanced law enforcement training, or both, at all four training facilities under the control of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure that such training facilities are operated at the highest capacity throughout the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation Board, including representatives from the Federal law enforcement community and non-Federal accreditation experts involved in law enforcement training, shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process to continue the implementation of measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, construction, and ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, \$27,841,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That the Center is authorized to accept reimbursement to this appropriation from government agencies requesting the construction of special use facilities.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and for management and administration of programs and activities, as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), \$129,993,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for science and technology research, including advanced research projects, development, test and evaluation, acquisition, and operations as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), and the purchase or lease of not to exceed 5 vehicles, \$973,915,000; of which \$538,926,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017; and of which \$434,989,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019, solely for operation and construction of laboratory facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds provided for the operation and construction of laboratory facilities under this heading, \$300,000,000 shall be for construction of the National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility.

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, as authorized by title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591 et seq.), for management and administration of programs and activities, \$37,339,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for radiological and nuclear research, development, testing, evaluation, and operations, \$197,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

For necessary expenses for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office acquisition and deployment of radiological detection systems in accordance with the global nuclear detection architecture, \$72,603,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act, may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts, and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2015, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

- (1) creates a new program, project, or activity;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, office, or activity;
- (3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;
- (4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a different purpose; or
- (5) contracts out any function or activity for which funding levels were requested for Federal full-time equivalents in the object classification tables contained in the fiscal year 2015 Budget Appendix for the Department of Homeland Security, as modified by the report accompanying this Act, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2015, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees or proceeds available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for programs, projects, or activities through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that:

- (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;
- (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity;
- (3) reduces by 10 percent the numbers of personnel approved by the Congress; or
- (4) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel that would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by the Congress, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are

notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Homeland Security by this Act or provided by previous appropriations Acts may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer under this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under subsection (b) and shall not be available for obligation unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(d) Notwithstanding subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, no funds shall be reprogrammed within or transferred between appropriations based upon an initial notification provided after June 30, except in extraordinary circumstances that imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property.

(e) The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in this section shall apply to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided in previous Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 504. The Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund, established pursuant to section 403 of Public Law 103-356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note), shall continue operations as a permanent working capital fund for fiscal year 2015: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security may be used to make payments to the Working Capital Fund, except for the activities and amounts allowed in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget: *Provided further*, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be available for obligation until expended to carry out the purposes of the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That all departmental components shall be charged only for direct usage of each Working Capital Fund service: *Provided further*, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be used only for purposes consistent with the contributing component: *Provided further*, That the Working Capital Fund shall be paid in advance or reimbursed at rates which will return the full cost of each service: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be notified of any activity added to or removed from the fund: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit a quarterly execution report with activity level detail, not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2015, as recorded in the financial records at the time of a reprogramming request, but not later than June 30, 2016, from appropriations for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2015 in this Act shall remain available through September 30, 2016, in the account and for the purposes for which the appropriations were provided: *Provided*, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval in accordance with section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for

purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2015 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 507. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) make or award a grant allocation, grant, contract, other transaction agreement, or task or delivery order on a Department of Homeland Security multiple award contract, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of \$1,000,000;

(2) award a task or delivery order requiring an obligation of funds in an amount greater than \$10,000,000 from multi-year Department of Homeland Security funds;

(3) make a sole-source grant award; or

(4) announce publicly the intention to make or award items under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance of making an award or issuing a letter as described in that subsection.

(c) If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that compliance with this section would pose a substantial risk to human life, health, or safety, an award may be made without notification, and the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 5 full business days after such an award is made or letter issued.

(d) A notification under this section—

(1) may not involve funds that are not available for obligation; and

(2) shall include the amount of the award; the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated; the type of contract; and the account from which the funds are being drawn.

(e) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 full business days in advance of announcing publicly the intention of making an award under “State and Local Programs”.

SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training that cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 509. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for expenses for any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus otherwise required under chapter 33 of title 40, United States Code, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus.

SEC. 510. (a) Sections 520, 522, and 530 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008 (division E of Public Law 110-161; 121 Stat. 2073 and 2074) shall apply with respect to funds made available in this

Act in the same manner as such sections applied to funds made available in that Act.

(b) The third proviso of section 537 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006 (6 U.S.C. 114), shall not apply with respect to funds made available in this Act.

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term “Buy American Act” means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448).

SEC. 513. Not later than 30 days after the last day of each month, the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a monthly budget and staffing report for that month that includes total obligations of the Department for that month for the fiscal year at the appropriation and program, project, and activity levels, by the source year of the appropriation. Total obligations for staffing shall also be provided by subcategory of on-board and funded full-time equivalent staffing levels, respectively, and the report shall specify the number of, and total obligations for, contract employees for each office of the Department.

SEC. 514. Except as provided in section 44945 of title 49, United States Code, funds appropriated or transferred to Transportation Security Administration “Aviation Security”, “Administration”, and “Transportation Security Support” for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 that are recovered or deobligated shall be available only for the procurement or installation of explosives detection systems, air cargo, baggage, and checkpoint screening systems, subject to notification: *Provided*, That semiannual reports shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on any funds that are recovered or deobligated.

SEC. 515. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to process or approve a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 for services provided by employees (including employees serving on a temporary or term basis) of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services of the Department of Homeland Security who are known as Immigration Information Officers, Contact Representatives, Investigative Assistants, or Immigration Services Officers.

SEC. 516. Any funds appropriated to “Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements” for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 for the 110-123 foot patrol boat conversion that are recovered, collected, or otherwise received as the result of negotiation, mediation, or litigation, shall be available until expended for the Fast Response Cutter program.

SEC. 517. The functions of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center instructor staff shall be classified as inherently governmental for the purpose of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 501 note).

SEC. 518. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report not later than October 15, 2015, to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security listing all grants and contracts awarded by any means other than full and open competition during fiscal year 2015.

(b) The Inspector General shall review the report required by subsection (a) to assess Departmental compliance with applicable laws and regulations and report the results of that review to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 15, 2016.

SEC. 519. None of the funds provided by this or previous appropriations Acts shall be used to fund any position designated as a Principal Federal Official (or the successor thereto) for any Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) declared disasters or emergencies unless—

(1) the responsibilities of the Principal Federal Official do not include operational functions related to incident management, including coordination of operations, and are consistent with the requirements of section 509(c) and sections 503(c)(3) and 503(c)(4)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 319(c) and 313(c)(3) and 313(c)(4)(A)) and section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143);

(2) not later than 10 business days after the latter of the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security appoints the Principal Federal Official and the date on which the President issues a declaration under section 401 or section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191, respectively), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a notification of the appointment of the Principal Federal Official and a description of the responsibilities of such Official and how such responsibilities are consistent with paragraph (1) to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report specifying timeframes and milestones regarding the update of operations, planning and policy documents, and training and exercise protocols, to ensure consistency with paragraph (1) of this section.

SEC. 520. None of the funds provided or otherwise made available in this Act shall be available to carry out section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 452).

SEC. 521. Funds made available in this Act may be used to alter operations within the Civil Engineering Program of the Coast Guard nationwide, including civil engineering units, facilities design and construction centers, maintenance and logistics commands, and the Coast Guard Academy, except that none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to reduce operations within any Civil Engineering Unit unless specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to grant an immigration benefit unless the results of background checks required by law to be completed prior to the granting of the benefit have been received by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the results do not preclude the granting of the benefit.

SEC. 523. Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Until September 30, 2014,” and inserting “Until September 30, 2015,”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “September 30, 2014,” and inserting “September 30, 2015.”.

SEC. 524. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require that all contracts of the Department of Homeland Security that provide award fees link such fees to successful acquisition outcomes (which outcomes shall be specified in terms of cost, schedule, and performance).

SEC. 525. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be used to approve a waiver of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 501(b) for the transportation of crude oil distributed from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretaries of the Departments of Energy and Transportation and representatives from the United States flag maritime industry, takes adequate measures to ensure the use of United States flag vessels: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives within 2 business days of any request for waivers of navigation and vessel-inspection laws pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 501(b).

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act for U.S. Customs and Border Protection may be used to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescription drug (within the meaning of section 801(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) from importing a prescription drug from Canada that complies with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That this section shall apply only to individuals transporting on their person a personal-use quantity of the prescription drug, not to exceed a 90-day supply: *Provided further*, That the prescription drug may not be—

(1) a controlled substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802); or

(2) a biological product, as defined in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

SEC. 527. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to reduce the United States Coast Guard's Operations Systems Center mission or its government-employed or contract staff levels.

SEC. 528. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any proposed transfers of funds available under section 9703.1(g)(4)(B) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102-393) from the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund to any agency within the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That none of the funds identified for such a transfer may be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives approve the proposed transfers.

SEC. 529. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for planning, testing, piloting, or developing a national identification card.

SEC. 530. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to conduct, or to implement the results of, a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-

76 for activities performed with respect to the Coast Guard National Vessel Documentation Center.

SEC. 531. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), and 30 days after the date on which the President determines whether to declare a major disaster because of an event and any appeal is completed, the Administrator shall publish on the Web site of the Federal Emergency Management Agency a report regarding that decision that shall summarize damage assessment information used to determine whether to declare a major disaster.

(b) The Administrator may redact from a report under subsection (a) any data that the Administrator determines would compromise national security.

(c) In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

(2) the term “major disaster” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

SEC. 532. Any official that is required by this Act to report or to certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may not delegate such authority to perform that act unless specifically authorized herein.

SEC. 533. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 534. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 535. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

SEC. 536. (a) Any company that collects or retains personal information directly from any individual who participates in the Registered Traveler or successor program of the Transportation Security Administration shall hereafter safeguard and dispose of such information in accordance with the requirements in—

(1) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–30, entitled “Risk Management Guide for Information Technology Systems”; and

(2) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–53, Revision 3, entitled “Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations”; and

(3) any supplemental standards established by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”).

(b) The airport authority or air carrier operator that sponsors the company under the Registered Traveler program shall hereafter be known as the “Sponsoring Entity”.

(c) The Administrator shall hereafter require any company covered by subsection (a)

to provide, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Sponsoring Entity written certification that the procedures used by the company to safeguard and dispose of information are in compliance with the requirements under subsection (a). Such certification shall include a description of the procedures used by the company to comply with such requirements.

SEC. 537. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractor performance that has been judged to be below satisfactory performance or performance that does not meet the basic requirements of a contract.

SEC. 538. In developing any process to screen aviation passengers and crews for transportation or national security purposes, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all such processes take into consideration such passengers' and crews' privacy and civil liberties consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.

SEC. 539. (a) Notwithstanding section 1356(n) of title 8, United States Code, of the funds deposited into the Immigration Examinations Fee Account, \$10,000,000 may be allocated by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services in fiscal year 2015 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

(b) None of the funds made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for grants for immigrant integration may be used to provide services to aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

SEC. 540. For an additional amount for the "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", \$48,600,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses to plan, acquire, design, construct, renovate, remediate, equip, furnish, improve infrastructure, and occupy buildings and facilities for the department headquarters consolidation project and associated mission support consolidation: *Provided*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall receive an expenditure plan not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act detailing the allocation of these funds.

SEC. 541. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code, or chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless such contract is otherwise authorized by statute to be entered into without regard to the above referenced statutes.

SEC. 542. (a) For an additional amount for financial systems modernization, \$34,072,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016.

(b) Funds made available in subsection (a) for financial systems modernization may be transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security between appropriations for the same purpose, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

(c) No transfer described in subsection (b) shall occur until 15 days after the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified of such transfer.

SEC. 543. Notwithstanding the 10 percent limitation contained in section 503(c) of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer to the fund established by 8

U.S.C. 1101 note, up to \$20,000,000 from appropriations available to the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 days in advance of such transfer.

SEC. 544. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that specific U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities no longer meet the mission need, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of individual Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities by directing the Administrator of General Services to sell all real and related personal property which support Service Processing Centers or other U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities, subject to such terms and conditions as necessary to protect Government interests and meet program requirements: *Provided*, That the proceeds, net of the costs of sale incurred by the General Services Administration and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, shall be deposited as offsetting collections into a separate account that shall be available, subject to appropriation, until expended for other real property capital asset needs of existing U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement assets, excluding daily operations and maintenance costs, as the Secretary deems appropriate: *Provided further*, That any sale or collocation of federally owned detention facilities shall not result in the maintenance of fewer than 34,000 detention beds: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be notified 15 days prior to the announcement of any proposed sale or collocation.

SEC. 545. The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall, with respect to fiscal years 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the information required in the multi-year investment and management plans required, respectively, under the headings "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses" under title II of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74); "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology" under such title; and section 568 of such Act.

SEC. 546. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure enforcement of all immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

SEC. 547. (a) Of the amounts made available by this Act for "National Protection and Programs Directorate, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security", \$140,525,000 for the Federal Network Security program, project, and activity shall be used to deploy on Federal systems technology to improve the information security of agency information systems covered by section 3543(a) of title 44, United States Code: *Provided*, That funds made available under this section shall be used to assist and support Government-wide and agency-specific efforts

to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective cybersecurity to address escalating and rapidly evolving threats to information security, including the acquisition and operation of a continuous monitoring and diagnostics program, in collaboration with departments and agencies, that includes equipment, software, and Department of Homeland Security supplied services: *Provided further*, That continuous monitoring and diagnostics software procured by the funds made available by this section shall not transmit to the Department of Homeland Security any personally identifiable information or content of network communications of other agencies' users: *Provided further*, That such software shall be installed, maintained, and operated in accordance with all applicable privacy laws and agency-specific policies regarding network content.

(b) Funds made available under this section may not be used to supplant funds provided for any such system within an agency budget.

(c) Not later than July 1, 2015, the heads of all Federal agencies shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives expenditure plans for necessary cybersecurity improvements to address known vulnerabilities to information systems described in subsection (a).

(d) Not later than October 1, 2015, and semiannually thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a report on the execution of the expenditure plan for that agency required by subsection (c): *Provided*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall summarize such execution reports and annually submit such summaries to Congress in conjunction with the annual progress report on implementation of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347), as required by section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

(e) This section shall not apply to the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government and shall apply to all Federal agencies within the executive branch except for the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SEC. 548. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 549. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the individual is an agent of a drug cartel unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 550. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be obligated to implement the National Preparedness Grant Program or any other successor grant programs unless explicitly authorized by Congress.

SEC. 551. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funding for the position of Public Advocate, or a successor position, within U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 552. (a) Section 559 of division F of Public Law 113-76 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f)(2)(B) is amended by adding at the end: "Such transfer shall not be required for personal property, including furniture, fixtures, and equipment."; and

(2) Subsection (e)(3)(b) is amended by inserting after "payment of overtime" the following: "and the salaries, training and benefits of individuals employed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to support U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers in performing law enforcement functions at ports of entry, including primary and secondary processing of passengers".

(b) Section 560(g) of division D of Public Law 113-6 is amended by inserting after "payment of overtime" the following: "and the salaries, training and benefits of individuals employed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to support U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers in performing law enforcement functions at ports of entry, including primary and secondary processing of passengers".

(c) The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may modify a reimbursable fee agreement in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act to include costs specified in this section.

SEC. 553. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for the travel to or attendance of more than 50 employees of a single component of the Department of Homeland Security, who are stationed in the United States, at a single international conference unless the Secretary of Homeland Security, or a designee, determines that such attendance is in the national interest and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives within at least 10 days of that determination and the basis for that determination: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section the term "international conference" shall mean a conference occurring outside of the United States attended by representatives of the United States Government and of foreign governments, international organizations, or nongovernmental organizations.

SEC. 554. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to reimburse any Federal department or agency for its participation in a National Special Security Event.

SEC. 555. With the exception of countries with preclearance facilities in service prior to 2013, none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for new U.S. Customs and Border Protection air preclearance agreements entering into force after February 1, 2014, unless—

(1) the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, has certified to Congress that air preclearance operations at the airport provide a homeland or national security benefit to the United States;

(2) United States passenger air carriers are not precluded from operating at existing preclearance locations; and

(3) a United States passenger air carrier is operating at all airports contemplated for establishment of new air preclearance operations.

SEC. 556. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to implement, administer, or enforce, in abrogation of the responsibility described in section 44903(n)(1) of title 49, United States Code, any requirement that airport operators provide airport-financed staffing to monitor exit points from the sterile area of any airport at which the Transportation Security Administration provided such monitoring as of December 1, 2013.

SEC. 557. In making grants under the heading "Firefighter Assistance Grants", the Secretary may grant waivers from the requirements in subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(1)(E), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4) of section 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

SEC. 558. (a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall not—

(1) establish, collect, or otherwise impose any new border crossing fee on individuals crossing the Southern border or the Northern border at a land port of entry; or

(2) conduct any study relating to the imposition of a border crossing fee.

(b) BORDER CROSSING FEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "border crossing fee" means a fee that every pedestrian, cyclist, and driver and passenger of a private motor vehicle is required to pay for the privilege of crossing the Southern border or the Northern border at a land port of entry.

SEC. 559. The administrative law judge annuitants participating in the Senior Administrative Law Judge Program managed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 3323 of title 5, United States Code, shall be available on a temporary reemployment basis to conduct arbitrations of disputes arising from delivery of assistance under the Federal Emergency Management Agency Public Assistance Program.

SEC. 560. As authorized by section 601(b) of the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-42) fees collected from passengers arriving from Canada, Mexico, or an adjacent island pursuant to section 13031(a)(5) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(5)) shall be available until expended.

SEC. 561. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of Homeland Security that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the budget unless such budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2016 appropriations Act.

SEC. 562. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Congress, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, beginning at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2017 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report on the purchase and usage of weapons, subdivided by weapon type. The report shall include—

(1) the quantity of weapons in inventory at the end of the preceding calendar year, and the amount of weapons, subdivided by weapon type, included in the budget request for each relevant component or agency in the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) a description of how such quantity and purchase aligns to each component or agency's mission requirements for certification, qualification, training, and operations; and

(3) details on all contracting practices applied by the Department of Homeland Security,

including comparative details regarding other contracting options with respect to cost and availability.

(b) The reports required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in an appropriate format in order to ensure the safety of law enforcement personnel.

SEC. 563. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for the environmental remediation of the Coast Guard's LORAN support in Wildwood/Lower Township, New Jersey.

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available to the Department of Homeland Security by this or any other Act may be obligated for any structural pay reform that affects more than 100 full-time equivalent employee positions or costs more than \$5,000,000 in a single year before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to Congress a notification that includes—

(1) the number of full-time equivalent employee positions affected by such change;

(2) funding required for such change for the current year and through the Future Years Homeland Security Program;

(3) justification for such change; and

(4) an analysis of compensation alternatives to such change that were considered by the Department.

SEC. 565. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives in this Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises homeland or national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days except as otherwise specified in law.

SEC. 566. Section 605 of division E of Public Law 110-161 (6 U.S.C. 1404) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 567. The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may transfer up to \$95,000,000 in unobligated balances made available for the appropriations account for "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program" under section 2(a) of the Community Disaster Loan Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-88; 119 Stat. 2061) or under chapter 5 of title I of division B of the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law (110-329; 122 Stat. 3592) to the appropriations account for "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Relief Fund". Amounts transferred to such account under this section shall be available for any authorized purpose of such account.

SEC. 568. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Gerardo Ismael Hernandez, a Transportation Security Officer employed by the Transportation Security Administration who died as the direct result of an injury sustained in the line of duty on November 1, 2013, at the Los Angeles International Airport, shall be deemed to have been a public safety officer for the purposes of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.).

SEC. 569. The Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Homeland Security shall ensure the congressional budget

justifications accompanying the President's budget proposal for the Department of Homeland Security, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, include estimates of the number of unaccompanied alien children anticipated to be apprehended in the budget year and the number of agent or officer hours required to process, manage, and care for such children: *Provided*, That such materials shall also include estimates of all other associated costs for each relevant Departmental component, including but not limited to personnel; equipment; supplies; facilities; managerial, technical, and advisory services; medical treatment; and all costs associated with transporting such children from one Departmental component to another or from a Departmental component to another Federal agency.

SEC. 570. Notwithstanding section 404 or 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c and 5187), until September 30, 2015, the President may provide hazard mitigation assistance in accordance with such section 404 in any area in which assistance was provided under such section 420.

SEC. 571. That without regard to the limitation as to time and condition of section 503(d) of this Act, the Secretary may propose to reprogram within and transfer funds into "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses" and "U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Salaries and Expenses" as necessary to ensure the care and transportation of unaccompanied alien children.

SEC. 572. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, grants awarded to States along the Southwest Border of the United States under sections 2003 or 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604 and 605) using funds provided under the heading "Federal Emergency Management Agency, State and Local Programs" in division F of Public Law 113-76 or division D of Public Law 113-6 may be used by recipients or sub-recipients for costs, or reimbursement of costs, related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor where they are encountered after entering the United States, provided that such costs were incurred during the award period of performance.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 573. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177):

- (1) \$5,000,000 from unobligated prior year balances from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Border Security, Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology";
- (2) \$8,000,000 from Public Law 113-76 under the heading "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Air and Marine Operations" in division F of such Act;
- (3) \$10,000,000 from unobligated prior year balances from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Construction and Facilities Management";
- (4) \$15,300,000 from "Transportation Security Administration, Aviation Security" account 70x0550;

(5) \$187,000,000 from Public Law 113-76 under the heading "Transportation Security Administration, Aviation Security";

(6) \$2,550,000 from Public Law 112-10 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";

(7) \$12,095,000 from Public Law 112-74 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";

(8) \$16,349,000 from Public Law 113-6 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";

(9) \$30,643,000 from Public Law 113-76 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";

(10) \$24,000,000 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Predisaster Mitigation Fund" account 70x0716; and

(11) \$16,627,000 from "Science and Technology, Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations" account 70x0800.

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 574. From the unobligated balances made available in the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund established by section 9703 of title 31, United States Code, (added by section 638 of Public Law 102-393), \$175,000,000 shall be rescinded.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 575. Of the funds transferred to the Department of Homeland Security when it was created in 2003, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

- (1) \$1,317,018 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses";
- (2) \$57,998 from "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
- (3) \$17,597 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Office of Domestic Preparedness"; and
- (4) \$82,926 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Predisaster Mitigation Fund".

SEC. 576. The following unobligated balances made available to the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 505 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76) are rescinded:

- (1) \$463,404 from "Office of the Secretary and Executive Management";
- (2) \$47,023 from "Office of the Under Secretary for Management";
- (3) \$29,852 from "Office of the Chief Financial Officer";
- (4) \$16,346 from "Office of the Chief Information Officer";
- (5) \$816,384 from "Analysis and Operations";
- (6) \$158,931 from "Office of Inspector General";
- (7) \$635,153 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses";
- (8) \$65,195 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Automation Modernization";
- (9) \$96,177 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Air and Marine Operations";
- (10) \$2,368,902 from "U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Salaries and Expenses";
- (11) \$600,000 from "Transportation Security Administration, Federal Air Marshals";
- (12) \$3,096,521 from "Coast Guard, Operating Expenses";
- (13) \$208,654 from "Coast Guard, Reserve Training";
- (14) \$1,722,319 from "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
- (15) \$1,256,900 from "United States Secret Service, Salaries and Expenses";

(16) \$107,432 from "National Protection and Programs Directorate, Management and Administration";

(17) \$679,212 from "National Protection and Programs Directorate, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security";

(18) \$26,169 from "Office of Biometric Identity Management";

(19) \$37,201 from "Office of Health Affairs";

(20) \$818,184 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Salaries and Expenses";

(21) \$447,280 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, State and Local Programs";

(22) \$98,841 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, United States Fire Administration";

(23) \$448,073 from "United States Citizenship and Immigration Services";

(24) \$519,503 from "Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Salaries and Expenses";

(25) \$500,005 from "Science and Technology, Management and Administration"; and

(26) \$68,910 from "Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, Management and Administration".

(RESCISSION)

SEC. 577. Of the unobligated balances made available to "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Relief Fund", \$375,000,000 shall be rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from the amounts that were designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 578. The explanatory statement regarding this Act, printed in the House of Representatives section of the Congressional Record, on or about January 13, 2015, by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, shall have the same effect with respect to the allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015".

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114-2. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ADERHOLT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114-2.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) No funds, resources, or fees made available to the Secretary of Homeland Security, or to any other official of a Federal agency, by this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year, including any deposits into the "Immigration Examinations Fee Account" established under section 286(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(m)), may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or carry out (including through the issuance of any regulations) any of the policy changes set forth in the following memoranda (or any substantially similar policy changes issued or taken on or after January 9, 2015, whether set forth in memorandum, Executive order, regulation, directive, or by other action):

(1) The memorandum from the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled "Civil Immigration Enforcement: Priorities for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens" dated March 2, 2011.

(2) The memorandum from the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion Consistent with the Civil Immigration Enforcement Priorities of the Agency for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens" dated June 17, 2011.

(3) The memorandum from the Principal Legal Advisor of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled "Case-by-Case Review of Incoming and Certain Pending Cases" dated November 17, 2011.

(4) The memorandum from the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled "Civil Immigration Enforcement: Guidance on the Use of Detainers in the Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Criminal Justice Systems" dated December 21, 2012.

(5) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Southern Border and Approaches Campaign" dated November 20, 2014.

(6) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants" dated November 20, 2014.

(7) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Secure Communities" dated November 20, 2014.

(8) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents" dated November 20, 2014.

(9) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Expansion of the Provisional Waiver Program" dated November 20, 2014.

(10) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Policies Supporting U.S. High-Skilled Businesses and Workers" dated November 20, 2014.

(11) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Families of U.S. Armed Forces Members and Enlistees" dated November 20, 2014.

(12) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Directive to Provide Consistency Regarding Advance Parole" dated November 20, 2014.

(13) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled "Policies to Promote and Increase Access to U.S. Citizenship" dated November 20, 2014.

(14) The memorandum from the President entitled "Modernizing and Streamlining the U.S. Immigrant Visa System for the 21st Century" dated November 21, 2014.

(15) The memorandum from the President entitled "Creating Welcoming Communities and Fully Integrating Immigrants and Refugees" dated November 21, 2014.

(b) The memoranda referred to in subsection (a) (or any substantially similar policy changes issued or taken on or after January 9, 2015, whether set forth in memorandum, Executive order, regulation, directive, or by other action) have no statutory or constitutional basis and therefore have no legal effect.

(c) No funds or fees made available to the Secretary of Homeland Security, or to any other official of a Federal agency, by this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year, including any deposits into the "Immigration Examinations Fee Account" established under section 286(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(m)), may be used to grant any Federal benefit to any alien pursuant to any of the policy changes set forth in the memoranda referred to in subsection (a) (or any substantially similar policy changes issued or taken on or after January 9, 2015, whether set forth in memorandum, Executive order, regulation, directive, or by other action).

(d) The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(e) Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this section shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of the such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph 4(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. CARTER) for his leadership in putting a great bill and a comprehensive bill before us this morning that deals with protecting the homeland.

I am presenting today, along with my distinguished colleagues—in particular, from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), and also Mr. BARLETTA from Pennsylvania—an amendment that defunds the President's unconstitutional executive actions on illegal immigration.

As it has been noted here last night and this morning, back in December, the House voted to fund the Federal Government for this fiscal year, FY15, but we kept funding for the Department of Homeland Security on a continuing resolution. By doing so, we were making a promise to the American people. It was a promise that once we had a Republican Senate, we would work together as a Congress to ensure the President's unconstitutional and unilateral actions would not go un-

checked. Today, this promise has been kept with this amendment before us today.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The executive actions of November 20, 2014, and the Morton memos of 2011 and 2012 are in direct contravention of congressional intent and have no standing in current law and must be dismantled.

Apparently, the President learned nothing from the devastating results of his previous executive amnesty, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, which led to nearly 70,000 children arriving on our southern border last summer at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to the American taxpayer.

This amendment turns back the President's shortsighted executive overreach, and for that reason, I strongly support its passage.

Mr. Chairman, we will also consider four additional amendments today. All of them seek to correct many of the dangerous actions the President has taken on this issue and restore the rule of law. I plan to support all of these amendments and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may utilize.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this poison pill amendment, which is a laundry list of attacks on anything the executive branch has done to improve immigration and border security policy. It caters to every whim of the Republican Conference's most extreme elements. It would defund the Secretary's Southern Border and Approaches Campaign designed to unify border security efforts. It would defund policies to improve employment-based immigration, to bring highly skilled workers into our country. It would defund the policy to parole in place family members of citizens or lawful permanent residents who seek to enlist in the U.S. military, a policy supported by the Department of Defense. Incredibly, it would defund the Department's provision of temporary relief to individuals who were brought to this country illegally as children—those covered by the DREAM Act—and to the parents of U.S. citizens who meet certain criteria.

Of course, it would defund the Secretary's policy of setting immigration enforcement priorities. Every prosecutor in this country exercises some level of discretion to make the most of

limited resources. We want our police to pursue murderers over traffic violators. We also should want DHS to focus enforcement efforts on illegal immigrants who pose a threat to our communities.

Now, it would be preferable—as the President is the first to acknowledge—to pass comprehensive immigration reform to address our country's festering immigration challenges. But in the face of House Republicans' failure to act, the President has taken well-considered steps, each of them well-grounded in law and precedent. If the Republican majority wishes to change the law in some way to deny him such authority, they should introduce legislation to do so. But adoption of this amendment would sabotage the Homeland Security funding bill and undermine our Nation's security at a time of great danger.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader of the House of Representatives to speak, and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, when the President was asked about his deportation policy early in 2013, President Obama said:

I am the President of the United States of America. I am not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed.

Mr. Chairman, a few days earlier he said:

I am not a king. I am the head of the executive branch of government. I am required to follow the law.

Twenty-two times, Mr. Chairman, the President said he couldn't ignore immigration law and create new laws by himself. But now, Mr. Chairman, President Obama has done exactly what he said he could not do. What changed between then and now? Nothing. Our Constitution is exactly the same, and Congress still retains the sole power to legislate.

Mr. Chairman, Presidents do not have the right to rewrite any law in any instance. This fact is explicitly clear in regards to immigration. Actually, when it comes to immigration, the Supreme Court stated:

Over no conceivable subject is the legislative power of Congress more complete.

This is not a battle between Democrats and Republicans or a battle between pro-immigration and anti-immigration. It doesn't matter whether, Mr. Chairman, you like the results of what the President did or not. This is about resisting the assault on democratic government and protecting the constitutional separation of powers.

Let me be clear. This bill funds the entire Department of Homeland Security,

so that is not an issue here. So when we vote today, there is only one question to ask: Do we weaken our Constitution by allowing the Executive to legislate, or do we defend the most fundamental laws of our democracy? There is no middle ground.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our ranking member on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the 114th Congress started 1 week ago with Republican leadership saying they wanted to work together and govern maturely. Well, it only took a week for Republican leadership to fold to its rightwing. Instead of compromise, we see confrontation.

Make no mistakes. The amendments being debated this morning would stop the bill, would kill the bill, hurt those who were brought here as children and know no other country than the United States, prevent the Department of Homeland Security from prioritizing the deportation of national security threats and dangerous felons, and are little more than a collection of political sound bites.

If you don't agree with the President's enforcement actions, which are legal and similar to steps taken by several Republican Presidents, then let us have a serious debate about comprehensive immigration reform, then bring an immigration bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the President's executive actions will grow the economy by \$90 billion to \$210 billion over the next 10 years and raise average wages for U.S.-born workers by \$170 a year. The House Republican proposal would not only eradicate these gains, but harm numerous security initiatives. After the tragic events in Paris, it is appalling that some would jeopardize our national security by adding these irresponsible amendments.

Let's vote against these poison bills and move forward with a solid, bipartisan Homeland Security bill supported by Democrats, Republicans, the House, and the Senate.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Aderholt-Mulvaney-Barletta amendment. The amendment will completely defund President Obama's unconstitutional power grab granting deferred action status and work authorization to over 4 million unlawful aliens. This policy threatens the separation of powers between Congress and the executive branch and violates President Obama's obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

In addition to barring the use of appropriated funds to carry out this policy, the amendment will also bar President Obama from using immigration user fees to accomplish his executive fiat.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment also defunds the Obama administration's so-called prosecutorial discretion memos that have gutted immigration enforcement within the United States, and the amendment defunds the ability of illegal aliens to receive any Federal benefit based on these policies.

Finally, the amendment makes clear that the defunded programs have no statutory or constitutional basis and, therefore, have no legal effect.

I again urge my colleagues to support this very good amendment.

□ 0930

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), the chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Wow, time flies when you are playing politics with people's lives. Just a year ago, as the Republican majority was rushing off to their retreat, they had a very different story. Here it is:

House immigration reform, 2013. Goodlatte-Cantor working to give legal status to kids. House GOP leaders embrace immigration fix that includes status for undocumented. Republicans see the light on immigration reform.

And what are the headlines today? Behold the Republican immigration strategy: mass deportation.

One year ago—this is the difference in the headlines that your party's public policy on immigration has caused. But wait, let's see what you said in your principles:

It is time to provide an opportunity for legal residence and citizenship for those who were brought to this country as children through no fault of their own, those who knew no other place as home.

Citizenship, legal residence for the undocumented youth—that was your idea, one that we applauded and we accepted and we cheered on. And 1 year later, you want to take away from 600,000 DREAMers their right to live in this country and to live legally. You want to deport them all. What happened? What happened?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind the gentleman to direct remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Well, then let me say this. I just think if that is what happened in 1 year, what are you going to come up with next year? What is your game plan for next year if this is the kind of position you have taken from one year to the next?

But let me just say this. The action you take today I know you believe will

cause fear and confusion and consternation in the immigrant community throughout this Nation, thereby causing the failure of the President's executive order because no one will sign up.

But let me tell you something. The fruits of your action today will cause only anger and outrage and the mobilization of an immigrant community throughout this Nation that will be the death knell of the future of your party as a national institution. That is what you will reap today with this.

Tonight, I will be with Congressman CICILLINE, and I will be there standing with the Catholic Diocese, with evangelicals, with men of faith in Providence, Rhode Island, and people will come forward. Where will the Republican Party be? Simply telling them that we cannot do anything.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), the cosponsor of this amendment, who has been very helpful in crafting this amendment.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment which I coauthored with my colleagues. Its purpose is simple. We defund President Obama's unlawful executive amnesty program for illegal immigrants. As we know, the President announced it only 2 months ago. But we also know that is not when this executive amnesty truly began. It began in 2011 with the Morton memos. Those memos told officials not to pursue certain broad categories of illegal immigrants.

Our amendment defunds the enforcement of those memos, and that goes to the heart of the amnesty program. In short, these memos told immigration officers to view the law the way President Obama wished it had been written rather than how Congress actually wrote it. That is the crux of this.

In the United States, we still have a legislative branch of government. Our amendment defends it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak against H.R. 240, the venomous and dangerous Republican appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

This bill and its amendments pander to those in the Republican Party who are unhappy with President Obama's executive action on immigration. It is malicious and foolishly puts our country at risk. Republicans brought this legislation under the guise of defending the Constitution, but the President's actions are constitutional. The obstruction and political games that Republicans are playing are the true behaviors that need to be condemned.

Republicans aren't interested in offering solutions or working to tackle the most pressing issues facing our country. How do I know? Because instead of offering a long-term solution to fix our broken immigration system, Republicans have opted to hold hostage funding for one of the most critical agencies in our government. As they peddle their malice about immigrants to pander to their base, they put our national security at risk. We should be doing everything we can to provide our security agencies with the support and the resources they need to prevent attacks like the one that occurred in France last week. Instead, Republicans are willing to withhold funding our national security in order to send a message to the President.

And as if that weren't juvenile enough, this bill also attacks the most vulnerable in our society. Republican amendments seek to revictimize those who have suffered domestic violence, picking on one of the groups least able to defend themselves. When I was a kid, we just called that bullying.

Republicans are consciously targeting millions of families who work hard, who contribute to their communities and are just trying to give their children a chance at the American Dream. You know, that same dream that many of our parents and grandparents had when they came to this country.

Mr. Chairman, with this bill, Republicans are not just abandoning basic humanity, they are also turning their backs on the economic benefits that come with bringing these people out of the shadows.

We could grow our economy anywhere from \$90 billion to \$210 billion over the next 10 years if we allow workers a chance to participate in the formal economy.

This is a new Congress and a new opportunity to work together. As a country, we are better than this. Shame on you.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), who is not only a cosponsor of this amendment but who, again, was very instrumental in this amendment taking place.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to do something I don't ordinarily do on this floor, which is implore my colleagues across the aisle to please, please, please, support this amendment. Let's take away for at least one day the "R" or the "D" from behind the President's name. Let's take away the "R" or the "D" from behind our names and look at this for what it is: a President doing something he says he cannot do—make law—using the excuse that this body cannot act so that he can. That is not how the system works, and it is wrong.

I am here today to tell you that if in the future a Republican President does

the same thing, I will be the first to be here with you to stand against that, to fight back.

But today I implore you to please support the amendment even if you are voting against the bill in order to send the message that law is not made in the White House. Law is not made because Congress fails to act. Law is made in this room when we do act, and every single time any President violates that, he violates all of this institution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, our Nation's Constitution is clear. Congress holds the power of the purse. There are no exceptions. There is no asterisk, and there is no fine print. The Founders designed our government in order to prevent these exact circumstances—a President who ignores the law, refuses to work with Congress and intends to govern unilaterally.

Whatever your views on the President's plan, it is the responsibility of every Member of this House to support this amendment, to maintain our representative government, and to uphold the framework of our Republic.

Our immigration system isn't broken. It is just not being used.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is joining us from the Birmingham area and is a new Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, President Obama has created a constitutional crisis by taking action that in his own words "changes the law." That power is not vested in the President. It is vested in Congress, along with the power of the purse, as has been mentioned, to take action when the executive branch overreaches.

This isn't about immigration policy. It is about defending and upholding the Constitution. In that regard, this amendment defunds the President's actions, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, 8 days ago Members of this House said the following:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to

the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

This is a question of whether this House and its Members fulfill that oath. We have a choice here. We can either agree with what the President did or defend the Constitution. Vote “aye.”

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a new Member to this body.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, many of my constituents are much like me. We are ready for a government that works like the one that we studied in civics class, one with coequal branches of power.

Winston Churchill once stated that the price of greatness is responsibility. As members of the legislative branch, voting “yes” for this amendment is a responsible step in the right direction.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, again let me just say before the gentleman closes, the amendment here before us today prevents any funds appropriated, or user fees collected by any Federal agency, to be used to carry out the executive actions that were announced on November 20, 2014, which would grant deferred action to an estimated 4 million people in the country illegally and unlawfully.

Again, this goes back to a promise that was made by the Republican House of Representatives at the end of last year, and we addressed this issue saying that we would work on this issue, make a commitment to address this issue of the President's action when this bill came to the floor, and this is fulfilling that promise today.

Again, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0945

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to close by again thanking colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the good work done on the underlying bill, our bipartisan, bicameral negotiated agreement on Homeland Security.

It is really a shame that we are faced here today with an amendment that has the potential to wreck this good bill and to damage the Homeland Security Department so badly. Now, I don't say that lightly. I think Members know I don't interject terms like “poison pill” into debates lightly; but, believe me, that term applies to the amendment we are now considering.

This amendment caters to every whim of the most extreme elements of the Republican Conference. It doesn't just roll back the President's recent executive action—which, by the way, is thoroughly grounded in law and precedent. It goes beyond that. It rolls back in its entirety the progress that has been made over many years on prioritizing dangerous criminals for deportation and bringing common sense to our deportation policy.

In pursuing this political vendetta, Republicans are putting at risk a full-year funding bill, worked out months ago, for the Department of Homeland Security, and they are doing that at a time of heightened alert.

Mr. Chairman, this is an egregious abuse, probably the worst I have ever seen, of the appropriations process. More than that, it is a reprehensible, reckless tactic which will compromise—has already compromised—the full and effective functioning of our Homeland Security Department and puts the security of our country at risk.

This amendment richly deserves our rejection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Aderholt-Mulvaney-Barletta Amendment to H.R. 240, the Fiscal Year 2015 Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

I oppose the amendment because it is nothing more than the Republican majority's latest partisan attack on the President and another diversionary tactic to avoid addressing the challenge posed by the nation's broken immigration system.

The President will veto the underlying bill if the Aderholt Amendment is adopted so I urge my colleagues to defeat this irresponsible amendment which has the potential to put the security of our homeland at risk.

House Republicans are playing a dangerous game of Russian Roulette with the security of America's homeland by recklessly adding this “poison pill” to legislation needed to fund the agencies and programs charged with securing the border and protecting the homeland.

Mr. Chair, the Aderholt Amendment seeks to prohibit the executive branch from exempting or deferring from deportation any immigrants considered to be unlawfully present in the United States under U.S. immigration law, and to prohibit the administration from treating those immigrants as if they were lawfully present or had lawful immigration status.

The amendment bill seeks to make January 9, 2015 the effective date of these prohibitions—thereby retroactively blocking the executive actions taken by President Obama to address our broken immigration system by providing smarter enforcement at the border, prioritize deporting felons—not families—and allowing certain undocumented immigrants, including the parents of U.S. citizens and lawful residents, who pass a criminal background check and pay taxes to temporarily stay in the U.S. without fear of deportation.

Mr. Chair, let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, who is the nation's Chief Executive, “shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.”

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the Take Care Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., *Arizona v. United States*; *Bowsher v. Synar*; *Buckley v. Valeo*; *Printz v. United States*; *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has “prosecutorial discretion”—the power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), may develop discretionary policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Executive authority to take action is thus “fairly wide,” indeed the federal government's discretion is extremely “broad” as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written by Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal. (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in *Arizona v. United States*, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as “[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families” or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation's international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution,

or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy with respect to these and other realities.

Mr. Chair, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama has acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama has not done anything that is novel or unprecedented.

Here are a just a few examples of executive action taken by several presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

1. In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 "Mariel Cubans" were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

2. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

3. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

4. In 1992, President George H.W. Bush granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

5. In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

6. In 2010 the Obama administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Chair, because of the President's leadership and far-sighted executive action, 594,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas are eligible for deferred action.

If these immigrants are able to remain united with their families and receive a temporary work permit, it would lead to a \$338 million increase in tax revenues, over five years.

Mr. Chair, the President's laudable executive actions are a welcome development but not a substitute modernizing the nation's immigration laws. Only Congress can do that.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges. Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

And as shown by the success in the last Congress of H.R. 1417, the bipartisan "Border Security Results Act," which I helped to write and introduced along with the senior leaders of the House Homeland Security Committee, we can do this without putting the nation at risk or rejecting our national heritage as a welcoming and generous nation.

This legislation has been incorporated in H.R. 15, the bipartisan "Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act," legislation which reflects nearly all of the core principles announced professed last year by House Republicans.

As a nation of immigrants, the United States has set the example for the world as to what can be achieved when people of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and experiences come together.

It is now time to open the golden symbolized by Lady Liberty's lamp to the immigrant community of today so they can participate fully in the American Dream.

These loyal and law-abiding persons have been waiting patiently for far too long for their chance.

We can and should seize this historic opportunity to pass legislation to ensure that we have in place adequate systems and resources to secure our borders while at the same preserving America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world and to reap the hundreds of billions of dollars in economic productivity that will result from comprehensive immigration reform.

President Obama has acted boldly, responsibly, and compassionately in exercising his constitutional authority to enforce the immigration laws in an effective and humane manner.

If congressional Republicans, who refused to debate comprehensive immigration reform legislation for more than 500 days, disapprove of the lawful actions taken by the President, an alternative course of action is readily available to them: pass a bill and send it to the President for signature.

The President has shown responsible leadership. The next move is for congressional Republicans to stop playing Russian Roulette with the security of America's homeland and bring to the floor a clean Homeland Security spending bill that the President can sign into law.

I urge all Members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114-2.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) No funds, resources or fees made available to the Secretary of Homeland Security, or to any other official of a Federal agency, by this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year, including any deposits into the "Immigration Examinations Fee Account" established under section 286(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 USC

1356(m)), may be used to consider or adjudicate any new, renewal or previously denied application for any alien requesting consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals, as authorized by the Executive memorandum dated June 15, 2012, and effective on August 15, 2012 (or any substantially similar policy changes issued or taken on or after January 9, 2015, whether set forth in memorandum, Executive order, regulation, directive, or by other action).

(b) The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(c) Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this section shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of the such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph 4(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of my amendment to freeze the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which was unlawfully created by executive memo on June 15, 2012.

My amendment prohibits Federal funding, fees, or resources from being used to consider or adjudicate any new, renewal, or previously denied application for any alien requesting consideration for deferred action.

Article I, section 8, clause 4 states that the Congress shall have power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization"—Congress, not the Executive. President Obama has circumvented Congress and unilaterally rewritten immigration law from the Oval Office.

A Federal judge in Pennsylvania said President Obama's amnesty is unconstitutional and that, number one, "Inaction by Congress does not make unconstitutional executive action constitutional"; and, number two, "Executive action goes beyond prosecutorial discretion. It is legislation." That is the reason we bring the amendment.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I strongly support her amendment to H.R. 240, which prohibits Federal funding or resources from being used to adjudicate any new, renewal, or previously denied application for the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. It is that simple.

The President's DACA program, announced by the President and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012, violates the laws Congress has written and is a usurpation of the plenary authority over immigration law that article I, section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution confers upon the legislative branch.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the gentlewoman's amendment to defund DACA.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I am very disturbed by the nature of this Blackburn amendment because it would prevent the use of Federal funds or resources to consider or adjudicate any new, renewal, or any previously denied application for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, or any subsequently similar program. This amendment is similar to the same Blackburn bill that passed the House in August of 2014.

This amendment clearly terminates the DACA program, the DREAMers, ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues. The amendment prevents new persons from applying for DACA and explicitly prohibits further efforts to renew deferred action under this amendment.

Hundreds of thousands of young people who came forward, passed background checks, obtained DACA, and have since followed the law would be deportable at the end of their 2-year deferred action period. This is serious; it is dangerous.

The amendment is anti-immigrant and antifamily. This is a vote to deport DREAMers. These applicants who have applied have positive impacts on both job growth and economy.

The amendment would leave DACA applicants without work authorization and would expose many of them to deportation to a country that they don't even know. We should be passing legislation to keep DACA recipients in our country because they have a net impact on our communities.

The amendment is one more of the same anti-immigrant-type rhetoric that has dominated conservatives and is further evidence that the majority is not interested in fixing our broken immigration system, but is only interested in penalizing members of our community who seek to work, go to school, and remain with their family.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), who is one of our Members who had truly a significant career as a prosecutor before coming to this Chamber.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blackburn amendment today.

The amendment prevents funding from going towards the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, known as DACA. Make no mistake about it, this program has become a magnet for drawing children from Central America, further putting thousands of children's lives at risk as they embark on a very dangerous journey, which does not only include unsafe conditions, but they are also vulnerable to abuse along the way. This program must be shut down.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not telling the American people that Homeland Security is fully funded. As a matter of fact, it has funded more than \$1 billion than the President asked for and more than \$400 million from last year.

If Homeland Security gets shut down, it is because the President vetoes the budget because he cannot get his way on amnesty for illegal aliens.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman CONYERS.

I just want to go back one moment, so that we can be very clear about this because I think we need to understand the difference between the rhetoric of today and the rhetoric of 1 year ago.

This is 1 year ago:

One of the greatest founding principles of our country was that children would not be punished for the mistakes of their parents.

I didn't write this. No one on our side of the aisle wrote this. I wish I would have. I am sure we would have all been proud to have been coauthors or cosponsors of that statement.

What happened? What happened? What happened to that principle? You just gave it up, it doesn't mean anything to you anymore, you don't care about children, you think children should be held responsible for the actions of their parents? Because that is precisely what you are saying today, because 600,000 young people came forward and did exactly this.

Then, wait a minute, it gets better because you said—and we were so happy because we thought we were moving forward because we thought the Republican Party was finally turning a page. You said:

It is time to provide an opportunity for legal residence and citizenship for those who were brought to this country as children.

What happened? I want one of you to deny that this isn't one of the principles you took into your conference last year. It is what you took. What happened 1 year later?

Well, you know, here is what happened, I think. You guys always say the same thing: Oh, it is that KING from Iowa. He tricks us at the last second. He brings in one of these poi-

sonous things, and there is nothing we can do about it.

Well, what excuse do you have today, when you did it with all the premeditation and thoughtfulness and viciousness to bring this amendment forward with the support of your complete Conference? This is not a surprise. You thought this out.

Where are you going to move the country forward to?

Let me just tell you about one number—yeah, there are 600,000—it is 270, that is the electoral college. It is the number it takes to elect the President of the United States. You are out of reach there.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair would ask Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan's time has expired.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's talk about a couple of these things. The Democrats like to say, Madam Chairman, that this is radical.

Let me ask you a question, let me ask my colleagues a question: Is it radical to support the rule of law? Is it radical to fight for American workers who are going to lose their jobs to illegal aliens? Is it radical to prioritize legal immigrants that are coming to this country? Is it radical to try to protect children that are in this program via the Office of Refugee Resettlement?

Democrats are over there saying that Republicans are playing politics with national security. Let me ask you another question: Why were they saying nothing this summer when the southern border was being overrun with all sorts of trafficking—human trafficking, sex trafficking, weapons trafficking, drug trafficking?

Here are the facts. DACA became effective August 15, 2012. In fiscal year 2014, the Office of Refugee Resettlement released 53,518 unaccompanied children here in the U.S. It is a magnet.

Seventy-five percent of all Americans reject the Obama executive amnesty. Eighty percent of Americans don't want foreign workers taking jobs from Americans.

Those are the facts, Madam Chairman.

To my colleagues, that is why we are here. We have two choices. We are either a Nation of laws or we are lawless.

President Obama is turning every State into a border State, every town into a border town; and unfortunately, the lawless amnesty has taken Democrats from the party of "yes, we can" to acting like the party of "because we can."

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Blackburn Amendment to H.R. 240, the Fiscal Year 2015 Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

I oppose the amendment because it is nothing more than the Republican majority's latest partisan attack on the President and another diversionary tactic to avoid addressing the challenge posed by the nation's broken immigration system.

The President will veto the underlying bill if the Blackburn Amendment is adopted so I urge my colleagues to defeat this irresponsible amendment which has the potential to put the security of our homeland at risk.

The Blackburn Amendment would prohibit U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) from using federal funds to implement enforcement guidance governing the exercise of prosecutorial discretion to ensure that scarce resources are targeted toward aliens who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety and not wasted on Dream Act children who pose no threat to our nation.

I oppose the Blackburn Amendment because it is hypocritical, irresponsible, and mean-spirited.

It is hypocritical because supporters of the amendment regularly claim that their refusal to compromise on budget issues and their support for sequestration is motivated by their belief in the importance of setting spending priorities.

Yet, the Blackburn Amendment would deny ICE the ability to use its limited resources in the most efficient manner to achieve its highest priorities which are apprehend, detain, and remove aliens who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety.

The Blackburn Amendment is irresponsible because it seeks to prevent trained, experienced, and professional agents and prosecutors from exercising their discretion and acting on the basis of what everyone knows to be true: that there is a vast difference between a terrorist bent on harming America and DREAM Act kid studying hard in school so he or she can graduate and join the Armed Services and willingly risk his or her life to defend the country.

This inefficient use of resources wastes taxpayer dollars and does nothing to keep America safe.

Third, the Blackburn Amendment is mean-spirited because it would have ICE target its limited resources on innocent, law abiding, young people who were brought to this country as children and would have them deported to a foreign land even though America is the country they know as home and the only to which they have ever pledged allegiance.

As Member of Congress, I have traveled many times to Iraq and Afghanistan and always the highlight of my visit was meeting the young men and women who are willingly risking their lives to defend the country they love more than life.

Right now, at this very moment, there are thousands of soldiers fighting for us in Afghanistan and elsewhere who are not yet American citizens but who dream that one day they will become citizens of the nation they gladly risk their lives to defend.

The Blackburn Amendment, however, would have ICE agents and prosecutors pretend to see no difference between someone like these veterans who came to this country as an undocumented immigrant and an alien engaged in or suspected of espionage or terrorism.

The Blackburn Amendment wastes the money of hard-working taxpayers.

It does nothing to make America safer.

And, just as bad, it is inconsistent with American values of justice and fair play.

Madam Chair, as a nation of immigrants, the United States has set the example for the world as to what can be achieved when people of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and experiences come together.

It is now time to open the golden symbolized by Lady Liberty's lamp to the immigrant community of today so they can participate fully in the American Dream.

Instead of passing irresponsible measures like the Blackburn Amendment, we should instead seize this historic opportunity pass legislation to ensure that we have in place adequate systems and resources to secure our borders while at the same preserving America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the world and to reap the hundreds of billions of dollars in economic productivity that will result from the passage of comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

I urge all Members to join me in opposing the Blackburn Amendment.

□ 1000

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114-2.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment to the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) No funds or fees made available to the Secretary of Homeland Security by this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or carry out (including through the issuance of any regulations) any policy relating to the apprehension, detention, or removal of aliens that does not treat any alien convicted of any offense involving domestic violence, sexual abuse, child molestation, or child exploitation as within the categories of aliens subject to the Department of Homeland Security's highest civil immigration enforcement priorities.

(b) The budgetary effects of this section shall not be entered on either PAYGO score-

card maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(c) Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this section shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of the such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph 4(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 240, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and to offer this amendment alongside my colleague, Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

If we are going to fix a broken immigration law, the way to do it is to uphold the rule of law, not undermine it. President Obama has offered amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants. That not only undermines the rule of law, it threatens American jobs. It is dangerous and irresponsible.

I am proud to have worked alongside my colleagues, including Mr. ADERHOLT from Alabama, to get this bill to the floor today so that we can responsibly fund the Department of Homeland Security but also defund the President's unlawful executive amnesty.

Madam Chair, do you want a great example of why the President acting unilaterally to circumvent Congress is a bad idea? Well, this amendment that we offer today demonstrates that.

Right now, illegal immigrants convicted of child abuse, sexual offenders, and domestic abusers, are not a top priority for deportation in this country. This amendment simply makes them a priority for deportation. This is an example as to why the President circumventing Congress is not only a bad idea, but it undermines the law.

I ask my colleagues to not only support this very important amendment, but also to support the underlying bill that uses the power of the purse. It is Congress' responsibility to defund the unlawful, unconstitutional acts of this President and his executive amnesty.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is unnecessary and harmful. The memorandum issued by

the Department of Homeland Security already makes people convicted of these crimes ineligible for deferred action and already makes them top priorities for deportation.

So, at best, this amendment is duplicative, but it does something else. In the memorandum there is this proviso:

In evaluating whether the offense is a significant misdemeanor involving domestic violence, careful consideration should be given to whether the convicted alien was also the victim of domestic violence. If so, this should be a mitigating factor.

This amendment leaves that out. And so that is why so many supporters of services to domestic violence victims are opposing this amendment. That includes the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the law enforcement officers group. They all oppose this amendment because they say it will make victims of domestic violence less able to seek help, less willing to call the police, and more likely to remain victims of domestic violence.

Let me make it clear. People who are convicted of aggravated felonies, which includes child molestation, child pornography, rape, or any crime of violence, are a top priority for deportation. They are excluded from relief under what the President did, as are significant misdemeanors, which includes convictions of domestic violence.

So this is really much simpler than it looks. This is trying to correct a problem that does not exist, but also creates a problem for domestic violence victims in the solution to a non-problem.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in support of a clean Homeland Security Appropriations bill that has bipartisan support and oppose the Republican amendments.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of passage of a clean Homeland Security Appropriations bill that has bipartisan support and will ensure the security of the American people and in opposition to the Republican Amendments to this legislation, most notably the Aderholt and Blackburn Amendments.

The Aderholt Amendment would bar the use of any funds to expand the DACA program, which has helped thousands of young people in my district in North and East Houston and Harris County come out of the shadows and be able to go to college and get a job without fear of deportation, as well as the Administration's recently announced DAPA initiative, which would similarly help up to 5 million immigrants who are parents and spouses of U.S. Citizens, who will be required to get right with the law and pay back taxes before receiving relief.

The Blackburn Amendment would end the DACA program, deporting hundreds of thousands of DREAMer young people who were

brought to this country as children and know no other home.

These amendments serve as nothing more than poison pills that will ruin months of bipartisan work by the Appropriations Committee and endanger funding for the very agencies that protect our country from terrorists, drug cartels, and organized crime and harm millions of immigrants who simply want to get right with the law and a fair, transparent path to legalization and earned citizenship.

The whole world saw the horrific acts of terrorism in Paris and France last week which resulted in the deaths of 17 innocent people, including 3 police officers, by 4 suspects who are believed to have connections with al Qaeda.

In this time of heightened security concerns, the last thing this chamber should contemplate is another fabricated funding crisis.

The Obama Administration has already announced its support of the bill, as introduced, and will sign this must-pass legislation into law immediately.

I call on my colleagues to support the clean passage of the underlining legislation, oppose these cynical amendments, and to join me in calling for this Congress to take on comprehensive immigration reform and fix our broken immigration system once and for all.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the work he and Mrs. ROBY did on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Madam Chair, this amendment simply requires the Department of Homeland Security to treat any alien convicted of any offense involving domestic violence, sexual abuse, child molestation, or child abuse or exploitation as a top priority for immigration enforcement. Unfortunately, the current priorities created by the Obama administration on November 20, 2014, treat certain aliens convicted of domestic violence, convicted of sexual abuse, or convicted of exploitation as a secondary priority.

While aliens convicted of a "significant misdemeanor," such as domestic violence, sexual abuse, or exploitation, are deemed a secondary priority for removal, they can stay in the United States in contravention of duly enacted law if they simply show "factors" warranting release.

The amendment corrects these irresponsible policies of the Obama administration and ensures that criminal aliens convicted of domestic violence and sexual abuse are treated as top priorities for removal.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her exceptional leadership, as well as that of the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CONYERS, and the work of your staff to bring the facts to the fore on this subject.

I rise in opposition to all of these amendments for reasons I spelled out for half an hour last night. Not to go into them again, but I want to say how disconcerting this is after we have seen the President act with authority under the law and also according to precedent of every President, Democratic and Republican, since President Eisenhower. That is why it is very disturbing to see the Speaker of the House saying President Obama has submitted his legacy of lawlessness.

Legacy of lawlessness. Was President Reagan lawless? Was President George Herbert Walker Bush lawless? Was President George W. Bush lawless? I never heard him say that about any executive actions taken by them.

I rise in opposition to all of these amendments, specifically, to the DeSantis amendment. Opposition is contained in a letter from the National Catholic Conference of Bishops. On behalf of the bishops, they write to ask that we oppose immigration-related amendments in the bill.

Specifically to DeSantis, they say:

Representative DeSantis' immigration amendment would prevent the Department of Homeland Security from implementing its memoranda setting civil immigration enforcement priorities. While presented as a measure that helps domestic violence victims, we fear that it actually would discourage many such victims from reporting abuse. Immigrants face obstacles to reporting crimes that have been perpetrated against them. This amendment would perpetuate this problem.

So I urge our colleagues to vote "no" on all of the amendments, and I call to their attention to the letter from the bishops urging a "no" vote on the amendments, which I will submit for the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,
Washington, DC, January 13, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) Committee on Migration, I write to ask that you oppose immigration-related amendments to H.R. 240, the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act which are being offered by Representatives Aderholt, Blackburn, and DeSantis, respectively. I urge your opposition to these amendments, which attempt to defund and block implementation of the Administration's executive actions on immigration taken on November 20th to help keep immigrant families with U.S. Citizen and Legal Permanent Resident children together, as well as block continued implementation of the Administration's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) initiative.

Representative Aderholt's immigration amendment would bar the use of funds for nearly all of the Administration's November 20th Executive Actions on Immigration and

undermine numerous Department of Homeland Security (DHS) memos that outline deportation priorities and prosecutorial discretion. Representative Aderholt's amendment would place millions of hard-working immigrant families in peril and perpetuate situations of family separation. In addition, this amendment would upend existing DHS deportation and discretion priorities and force millions of undocumented people to return to living in the shadows to avoid new draconian deportation priorities. Representative Aderholt's amendment would cause immigrant families to suffer great harm and would frustrate the existing administration of immigration laws.

Representative Blackburn's immigration amendment would effectively repeal the Deferred Action Childhood Arrival (DACA) program by denying funds to new, previously denied, and renewal DACA applications. The amendment would therefore affect hundreds of thousands of hard-working ambitious immigrant children. As you know, DACA has benefited youth who have been able to work and pursue education, thus helping them to reach their potential and contribute to our nation. Forcing these children back into the shadows and exposing them to the threat of deportation would undermine their future contributions to our nation, and treat them as criminals in the only homeland they have ever known.

Representative DeSantis's immigration amendment would prevent DHS from implementing its memoranda setting civil immigration enforcement priorities. While presented as a measure that helps domestic violence victims, we fear that it actually would discourage many such victims from reporting abuse. Immigrants face obstacles to reporting crimes that have been perpetrated against them. This amendment would perpetuate this problem.

In our churches and in our parishes, we see firsthand the devastation of family separation and the family breakdown that results from such separation. For this reason, we strongly oppose these amendments and ask that you vote against them. Should any of them be agreed to, we would ask that you oppose the underlying bill. Instead, we urge you to pass just and humane immigration reform legislation that addresses all aspects of our broken immigration system. Such legislation is the best solution to our currently broken system. We welcome the opportunity to work with this Congress to fix our immigration system through comprehensive legislative means. We stand ready to work with the leaders of both parties to protect poor and vulnerable people, promote human life and dignity, and advance the common good.

Finally, we are deeply disappointed that the version of H.R. 240 being brought to the House floor excludes prolife language that the House has included in its draft Homeland Security appropriations bills in recent years. This provision simply maintains the long-standing ban on use of DHS funds for abortions, a necessary step because DHS funds are no longer covered by the abortion funding ban contained in the Commerce/Justice/Science appropriations bills. We strongly urge that this important provision be restored to the bill before it is taken up by the full House, or that an amendment restoring it be made in order on the House floor.

Thank you for your consideration of our requests.

Sincerely,

MOST REVEREND EUSEBIO ELIZONDO,
Auxiliary Bishop of Seattle,
Chairman, USCCB Committee on Migration.

Ms. PELOSI. Again, what is disturbing about this is that you may have a difference of opinion about immigration or this or that, but don't describe the President as lawless and to use the Constitution as the basis for this debate when, in fact, the courts have upheld the rights of our Presidents to take executive action in relationship to protecting immigrants in our country—every President, Democratic and Republican, from President Eisenhower to the present.

I urge a "no" vote on all of the amendments, particularly, in this case, the DeSantis amendment.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The President likes to say that he wants to focus all of our resources on the criminals, and yet, over the last 2 years, by DHS' own figures, this administration has released 66,000 individuals who have been criminally convicted in our country and who are illegally in our country. The number of crimes and the quality of crimes is stunning: some are homicides; some are rapes; some are drug trafficking.

I think you have seen a record developed over the last several years that has put the public safety at risk, so I am perplexed why someone would oppose this amendment. If somebody is convicted of molesting a child, maybe it doesn't qualify under the highest priority. The administration wants to dismiss it as a significant misdemeanor. Why would we have any tolerance for child molestation? If you are not in our country legally and you get convicted of an offense like that, you should be gone.

We shouldn't even be discussing this. And the fact of the matter is, as a prosecutor, you have to make some tough decisions. You may not be able to put a young child victim on the stand. You may have problems with evidence, and you may have to do a plea to a lesser charge because of the family's concerns and because of what that could do to a victim. That perpetrator is no less dangerous to our community and to our society.

So I think the people that are going to vote "no" on this are basically saying we don't want a zero-tolerance policy against child molesters and sexual offenders. I don't care what offense it is, if you touch a child, you are here illegally, you are gone.

I urge people to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

I will enter in the RECORD a letter from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women opposing the DeSantis-Roby amendment.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN,

January 12, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the Steering Committee of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence ("NTF"), comprised of national leadership organizations advocating on behalf of sexual and domestic violence victims and women's rights, we write in opposition to the Aderholt and DeSantis amendments to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. These amendments are overly broad, sweep large numbers of victims into their scope and ignore the best interests of victims and their children.

We recently celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA"), which has, since it was first enacted, included critical protections for immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence. The proposed amendments serve to undermine protections from removal for victims of domestic and sexual violence and undercut the spirit of VAWA.

We strongly urge you to vote NO on the following amendments:

DESANTIS AMENDMENT

What it does:

This amendment prevents ICE from implementing the new detention and deportation priorities set in the November 20, 2014 Executive Action memo regarding Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants by preventing its implementation.

This amendment disallows funding to support implementation, administration, enforcement, or carrying out of any policy that does not prioritize enforcement against those with domestic violence, and sexual abuse, and child abuse convictions. In particular, the November 20th guidance recognizes that immigrant victims of domestic violence may be convicted of violence themselves, and the amendment removes DHS discretion to consider the facts underlying the conviction.

How it affects victims of domestic and sexual violence:

Victims of domestic violence often do not seek help when they know that the consequences to the perpetrator (for example, a spouse or parent, or perhaps other family member) may result in the perpetrator's deportation. This often takes place due to their financial dependence, and even close relationship to the perpetrator. As a result, this amendment will discourage victims from seeking help, reducing reporting and prosecution of crimes, creating communities that are less safe and in which victims are more likely to endure abuse.

Immigrant victims are vulnerable to being arrested and prosecuted for domestic violence, even when they are not the primary perpetrator of violence in the relationship. This frequently happens due to language and cultural barriers. Often, victims are desperate to be released and reunited with their children upon arrest and/or during trial. These factors—combined with poor legal counsel, particularly about the immigration consequences of criminal pleas and convictions—have in the past and will likely continue to lead to deportation of wrongly accused victims who may have pled to or been unfairly convicted of domestic violence charges.

The vast majority of sexual abuse, child exploitation and domestic violence convictions already fall within the highest priorities for enforcement; this amendment removes DHS discretion to consider the needs of victims.

ADDERHOLT AMENDMENT

What it does:

Among other things, the amendment prevents the use of funds or fees for all of the November 20, 2014 Executive Action mandates by the president, including the renewal and continuation of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program for young people who arrived in the United States as children, and hinders the ability to implement the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) program, which provides protection for parents of U.S. citizen and Legal Permanent Resident children. These programs grant immigrants who are not priorities for removal some protection from removal.

The amendment also prevents the use of "funds or fees" to carry out prior DHS guidance, including ICE Director Morton's prosecutorial discretion memos (2011), USCIS referrals of Notices To Appear (2011), ICE response to Secure Communities Task Force (Apr. 2012), detainees (Dec. 2012), and adjustment of status under visa waiver program (Nov. 2013).

The amendment prohibits any "substantially similar" policy changes to these memos in the future.

The amendment also prohibits the use of funds or fees to "grant any Federal benefit" to any noncitizen pursuant to any of the policy changes in these memos.

The amendment reinstates the Secure Communities Program.

Impact on victims of domestic and sexual violence:

This amendment increases the vulnerability to abuse for immigrants by increasing: (1) fear of deportation and (2) financial dependence on abusers.

Eliminates DHS prosecutorial discretion to consider the needs of victims of domestic and sexual violence, including the trauma they have experienced, in prioritizing enforcement activities.

Increases victims fear of deportation as a consequence of reporting crimes committed against them as a result of local law enforcement entanglement with ICE in implementing the Secure Communities Program. As a result, many violent crimes will go unreported.

We strongly urge members to prioritize the needs of immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence, and reject these amendments. These recommendations are endorsed by the Immigration subcommittee and the steering committee of the National Taskforce to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, including The Asian Institute on Gender Based Violence, ASISTA Immigration Assistance, Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities, Futures Without Violence, National Immigrant Justice Center, the National Network to End Domestic Violence, and the Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

If you have any questions, please contact us for further information through Grace Huang, Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence or Andrea Carcamo, Casa de Esperanza.

Ms. EDWARDS. As the founder and former executive director of the National Network to End Domestic Violence, I join the network of every State domestic violence coalition and the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women in opposing this amendment.

The issue really is very simple. Often—too often—in cases of domestic

violence, law enforcement show up at a home, they can't figure out what happened, both parties are arrested, and down the line both plead to misdemeanor domestic violence offenses. This happens all the time all around the country. For the victim, it may be because she just wants to get it out of the way to get back to her children or she has been threatened with further violence by her abuser or with her immigration status held over her head.

Whatever the reason, it turns out that in too many of these circumstances, no one—not law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, or even her attorney, if she is fortunate to have one—tells her that by pleading to the misdemeanor, her immigration status is threatened and she faces deportation.

So this is not about fault. It just means that we still have a lot of work to do when it comes to domestic violence. It is why we reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act in the last Congress.

Here is the harm. This amendment would prevent immigration authorities from looking beneath the surface in circumstances only of domestic violence offenses to make absolutely certain that we are not victimizing the victim twice by subjecting her to deportation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous amendment that could result in additional violence and undoing what successive Congresses and Presidents, Republicans and Democrats, have done for 20 years—afford fairness and protection for vulnerable immigrant women who are victims of domestic violence.

And so let's get the facts straight. This is not about shielding perpetrators. It is about protecting victims. Our immigration authorities deserve to take a second look when it comes to domestic violence, and I urge my colleagues to do no harm and vote "no" on the DeSantis-Roby amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1015

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114-2.

Mr. SALMON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), many individuals and businesses are required to purchase health insurance coverage for themselves and their employees;

(2) individuals who were unlawfully present in the United States who have been granted deferred action under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program undertaken by the Executive Branch and who then receive work authorization are exempt from these requirements;

(3) many United States employers hiring United States citizens or individuals legally present in the United States are required to either offer those persons affordable health insurance or pay a penalty of approximately \$3,000 per employee per year; and

(4) an employer does not have to provide insurance, or in many instances pay a penalty, if they hire individuals who were not lawfully present but who have been granted deferred action under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program and work authorization.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) this disparate treatment has the unacceptable effect of discouraging the hiring of United States citizens and those in a lawful immigration status in the United States; and

(2) the Executive Branch should refrain from pursuing policies, such as granting deferred action under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program and work authorization to unlawfully present individuals, that disadvantage the hiring of United States citizens and those in a lawful immigration status in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the co-author of this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you for yielding. Thank you to the chairman, and to my colleague from Arizona, Congressman SALMON, for your work on this legislation and this amendment.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Salmon-Thompson amendment.

President Obama's recent expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, protects a large number of unlawfully present aliens from deportation.

In addition to constitutional concerns and national security implications, Madam Chair, the action poses a range of unintended consequences.

Case in point: the President's policy creates an incentive to hire illegal immigrants over lawfully present workers. Illegal aliens who are granted deferred action are exempt from being counted under the 2010 health care

law's employer mandate, which requires employers with 50 or more employees to offer health insurance or pay a penalty.

Essentially, the President has created a situation where employers face a penalty for hiring Americans over illegal aliens.

Madam Chairman, the President's current deferred action expansion promotes the hiring of individuals who have broken the law over the men and women who have come through legal channels, worked hard, and played by the rules.

Congressman SALMON and I are proud to offer this commonsense amendment. The amendment merely states that it is the sense of Congress that this administration should not pursue any actions that put the interests of illegal immigrants before U.S. workers.

I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on the Salmon-Thompson amendment.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, the barbaric killing in Paris last week of 17 innocent human beings, including two police officers, is a stark reminder of the high price we sometimes pay to exercise our freedoms, including our freedom of speech.

Here in this House, we exercise that freedom every day on this floor, but that freedom comes with a responsibility. We are all entitled to our own opinions, and we can express them here, but we are not entitled to our own set of facts.

This sense of Congress fails in that responsibility. First, it misappropriates the facts, but worse, it misrepresents the facts.

The Affordable Care Act prohibits the precise activity and conduct by employers that this sense of Congress says it is trying to prohibit. In fact, the Affordable Care Act has explicit language, and I will, for the RECORD, submit 29 U.S. Code, section 218(c), protections for employees, which specifically prohibits an employer from discriminating against an American citizen who works for that employer for the purposes of hiring someone who doesn't have a right to work and, therefore, will not get insurance.

So the worst part of this sense of Congress is that it tries to mislead the American people to think something is going on that isn't. And if it is going on then, in the time that the gentleman has to push his amendment, I would urge him to name a name of an employer who is doing this to an American citizen who should be allowed to work.

29 U.S. CODE § 218C—PROTECTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES

(a) Prohibition

No employer shall discharge or in any manner discriminate against any employee with respect to his or her compensation, terms, conditions, or other privileges of employment because the employee (or an individual acting at the request of the employee) has—

(1) received a credit under section 36B of title 26 or a subsidy under section 18071 of title 42;

(2) provided, caused to be provided, or is about to provide or cause to be provided to the employer, the Federal Government, or the attorney general of a State information relating to any violation of, or any act or omission the employee reasonably believes to be a violation of, any provision of this title (or an amendment made by this title);

(3) testified or is about to testify in a proceeding concerning such violation;

(4) assisted or participated, or is about to assist or participate, in such a proceeding; or

(5) objected to, or refused to participate in, any activity, policy, practice, or assigned task that the employee (or other such person) reasonably believed to be in violation of any provision of this title (or amendment), or any order, rule, regulation, standard, or ban under this title (or amendment).

(b) Complaint procedure

(1) In general

An employee who believes that he or she has been discharged or otherwise discriminated against by any employer in violation of this section may seek relief in accordance with the procedures, notifications, burdens of proof, remedies, and statutes of limitation set forth in section 2087(b) of title 15.

(2) No limitation on rights

Nothing in this section shall be deemed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any employee under any Federal or State law or under any collective bargaining agreement. The rights and remedies in this section may not be waived by any agreement, policy, form, or condition of employment.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SALMON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment by Representatives SALMON and THOMPSON.

The amendment expresses the sense of Congress that U.S. workers should not be harmed by President Obama's unilateral executive action programs. These programs absurdly give American employers a financial incentive to hire unlawful aliens over American citizens and legal immigrants.

The fact is, in many cases, a business now has a \$3,000 incentive to hire an unlawful immigrant who benefited from the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. This is because, under ObamaCare, many businesses face a \$3,000 per employee penalty if they do not provide health insurance to their workers.

However, unlawful immigrants granted DACA relief and, most likely, those benefiting from President Obama's new deferred action program are not eligible for ObamaCare. Thus, in many cases, employers will not have to pay

this penalty if they hire deferred action recipients rather than legal workers.

It is simply indefensible public policy for the Obama administration to give unlawful aliens a leg up over legal workers. Yet, that is the result of the President's unilateral actions. I urge my colleagues to support this good amendment.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who is on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chair, I just want to report to the other side that you are already on retreat. As a party, you have retreated from our solemn oaths, camouflaged by pious, empty, pyrrhic acclamations of patriotism and liberty.

These are not stick people you are talking about. These are real people. They are not despots. They are not moneychangers. They are not felons. They are human equals to you and me.

You have a bumper sticker mentality without the bumper.

For years and years, all we heard is "read the bill." Well, we have read the bill and, in fact, I helped write the ACA. I am proud of that.

There is nothing in the ACA or the President's executive order that treats people who have temporary status under DACA differently than U.S. citizens for the purposes of triggering the employer mandate.

The whole purpose of this amendment is to play into fears that, by allowing immigrants to come out of the shadows and work legally and pay taxes, you are undermining American workers. That is a lie. Admit it.

Nothing in this ACA incentivizes employers to hire undocumented immigrants over American citizens. In fact, just the opposite, as you heard the speaker before me. Specifically, it prohibits employers from firing a citizen employee because they receive a premium tax credit. Read the bill.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are simply trying to obscure what the President did here with this executive order: provide responsible solutions to prevent families from being torn apart even further.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment—and have a nice retreat.

Mr. SALMON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, they say sunlight is the best disinfectant. We are trying to shed a little sunlight on some of the problems with the President's unconstitutional and illegal executive order of last year.

I am incredulous that the leader of the opposition has now encouraged the Members of the opposition to vote, en bloc, against all these commonsense amendments defending the American worker, protecting the American worker, cracking down on the molesters and

sex offenders, and making sure that they don't have a haven here in America, and making sure that those who want legal immigration are the first and foremost that we consider in this process, and that those who cheated the system have to get behind those folks that are doing it legally before their paperwork can be processed.

It is incredulous that the other side would oppose such commonsense measures that I believe most of America is crying for. People are hurting out there. Maybe they haven't gotten the memo, but I think most of us have.

The other thing that is incredulous is that when you hear a lot of squealing, you know when you have hit a raw nerve; you know there is some truth to what is being spoken.

This amendment is simply a sense of Congress that we don't give a \$3,000 benefit to those who have cheated the system, that we don't give a \$3,000 advantage to them over hardworking, tax-paying American citizens who have been out of work for quite some time.

As we know, President Obama recently issued a series of memos that would essentially grant legal status to millions of people residing illegally within the borders of the United States. Unfortunately, this is not the first time that such action has been taken by this administration, and history has a habit of repeating itself.

Under Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, up to 1.7 million individuals were granted legal status and were allowed to cut in line, being given preferential treatment over those who respected our laws and waited patiently for their immigration cases to be processed.

Furthermore, while these individuals who were given legal status under DACA were initially required to purchase health insurance under ObamaCare, they were later exempted from that requirement. With this exemption, those given legal status under DACA are not required to purchase insurance.

We just don't want that to happen again, and I would urge the other side to stand up for the American worker. That is why we are here.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from improper references to the President.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), vice chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Chair, I think my Republican colleagues take the American people for fools.

Madam Chair, I lost too many constituents and friends on 9/11. I lost people who I loved on 9/11. And in the years since then, New York City has been the focus of attempted terror plots too numerous to name.

Homeland Security funding is something that I take very seriously because it is so much a part of a New Yorker's life. And frankly, I would expect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take it as seriously as well.

But this is not a serious effort by any stretch of the imagination. You know what's good for our national security?

Bringing people out of the shadows so that we know who is in our country, focusing our limited enforcement resources on true threats to our country and not holding up needed funding for security and law enforcement programs to make a political point.

It is a political point they are trying to make. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle genuinely think our immigration system should deport parents instead of true criminals, if you want to destroy all our economic gains and throw a sucker punch to our economy by deporting 11 million people, then you know what? Bring a bill up on the floor, and let's have a real debate on all those issues.

Don't walk in here and tell me and the American people that this garbage belongs in the Homeland Security funding bill. Don't tell the American people that. They are not suckers and they are not fools. They know what you are doing.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I asked if the proponents would name the name of an American who has been discriminated against, the name of an employer who has discriminated against an American worker. They gave none. This is all anecdotal. These are all stories. They don't have anything to do with the fact that we need to pass the Homeland Security bill because we are jeopardizing the funding for our security.

Are people tone-deaf to what happened in Paris that they would do these types of amendments at a time when we need to support our men and women who protect us through Homeland Security?

This is wrong, and that is why we oppose this senseless sense of Congress amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SALMON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114-2.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. It is the sense of the Congress that the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) should—

(1) stop putting the interests of aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States ahead of the interests of aliens who are following proper immigration laws and procedures by adjudicating petitions and applications for immigration benefits submitted by aliens unlawfully present in the United States. When USCIS adjudicators and resources are used to adjudicate petitions and applications for aliens who are unlawfully present, the time it takes to process petitions and applications submitted by other aliens is significantly increased and a backlog is created. In addition, it is unfair to use the fees paid by other aliens to cover the costs of adjudicating petitions and applications for aliens unlawfully present in the United States; and

(2) use the funds available under existing law to improve services and increase the efficiency of the immigration benefits application process for aliens abroad or who are lawfully present in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 27, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, there are currently 4.4 million people ready to enter this country through legal channels. Many of them have been waiting for years. They have saved their money. They have filled out all of the proper forms. They have paid their fees.

This amendment is about doing right by them and their families. It is about making sure the men and women who play by the rules receive the fair treatment that they were promised.

Congress must send a clear message to the administration and the American people that we are committed to fixing what is broken about our immigration system but not at the expense of law-abiding immigrants.

In recent weeks, I have worked with The Heritage Foundation to identify seven failing programs at the USCIS that are in most need of improvement. One of the most egregious examples is of the \$792 million that the USCIS spent between 2008 and 2012 to create an online system for applicants to file forms and pay fees. After \$700 million spent and 4 years of time, only two forms out of 100 and one out of 73 different fees can be processed online.

The administration's repeated inability to build a Web site that works—well-documented as it is by now—is compounded by its eagerness to bypass the Constitution and break the law.

Had the President wished to show real leadership on immigration reform, he could have used his executive authority to promote greater efficiency and cost-saving measures within the system. Had he done so, I suspect there would have been overwhelming support in this Congress, but, regrettably, that is not the course he chose, and it is why this Congress must act.

We have a responsibility to American taxpayers and to millions of immigrants to establish spending priorities at the USCIS, and eliminating wasteful spending in the immigration system is an important component of our responsibility and is a first great step in achieving comprehensive reform. Ensuring that the fees paid by lawful applicants are not used to fast-track those who break the law strikes at the heart of our oath of office.

During my time in Congress, the 18th District of Illinois has welcomed more than 2,600 new citizens, many of whom have faced a long road to get here, but there are still thousands more who are waiting. It is not because their paperwork isn't in order, not because they have something in their records, and not because of anything other than there being a broken system.

Take Charles from Peoria. He has been trying to get his fiancée to join him here in the United States since January of 2012. For more than 2 years, Charles has waited. He has struggled with the financial support requirements. He has been unable to travel to see her. He had his application postponed time and time again. Why? Because Charles is a quadriplegic on disability.

Take Danny from Jacksonville, Illinois. He works two shifts at a meatpacking facility. He applied and paid for his green card on October 4 of 2013. His green card was mailed to the wrong address, even though it was properly done on his paperwork, and it was in order.

Danny lost his job because he couldn't show his green card to his employer. After many months of lost wages, the USCIS admitted to my office and to Danny that they screwed up and made a mistake. Now, more than a year later, Danny finally received his green card, and he went back to work, but not before our broken system cost him a year's worth of wages.

Madam Chair, these stories could be repeated hundreds of times in my congressional office alone—tens of thousands of times across this body in Republican and Democrat districts alike. The system is failing our constituents, their families, and their loved ones. It is failing businesses in our districts. It is failing daycare facilities and major manufacturers.

Yes, Mr. President, the system is broken, but the way to fix a broken system is not to overload the system by fast-tracking 5 million more people.

Madam Chair, it is as if these hardworking taxpayers—these hardworking people—are sitting at a toll booth.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. SCHOCK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, this amendment is premised on a mistake in the understanding of how USCIS actually works. Here is a fact that some people may not know: the USCIS is funded not by the taxpayers, it is funded by the fees of the applicants.

The amendment seems to assume that, if you are out of status, somehow, somebody else is paying for you—the taxpayers or some other applicant. That is not the case. Each applicant pays enough money to cover the cost of processing his own fee, and it does not delay others.

What this amendment would do would not just deal with DACA applicants; it would impact people whom I don't think we want to delay in terms of the processing of their petitions. For example, people who are victims of torture can come to the United States and make a case—a plea—for political asylum. They file petitions to do that. This amendment would say that their petitions can't be heard.

There are people who are victims of domestic violence. We created a visa category that allows domestic violence victims to petition so that they can be free to leave their abusers. Those petitions could not be heard in a timely manner.

Victims of sex trafficking are eligible for a T visa. That is something we created in law. According to this amendment, people who apply—sex trafficking victims—would not be eligible to have their petitions processed in a timely manner.

Here is something else: most of the petitions that are adjudicated are family-based. If you have your American citizen daughter marry somebody from another country, she can petition so that her husband can become a legal resident of the United States. If that husband is out of status, that petition would not be petitioned.

I don't think we want to do what this amendment suggests we should do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chair, I am in opposition to this amendment and to others who play politics with the security and safety of America.

Madam Chair, this bill plays politics with the security and safety of America while holding up vital investments that will create jobs.

The House GOP refused to take action on immigration reform last year, and now they're trying to make up for that mistake by attaching poison pill amendments to the bill that funds homeland security.

They accuse the President of being lawless, but they know the real problem is their own failure to offer constructive solutions to fix our immigration system.

We should be debating comprehensive immigration reform, not hosting a politically motivated charade that will harm our ability to deter, detect, and defend from a terrorist attack.

This could not be more poorly timed.

Last week our strong ally, France, was attacked and terrorized. People died.

I am deeply concerned about the impact this delayed funding may have on my own congressional district.

New York City continues to remain a high risk area and the City relies on the federal funds it receives to protect critical infrastructure, sustain anti-terrorism programs, and enhance emergency preparedness and response.

These not only protect our people but they put people to work.

On behalf of New Yorkers I plead with my colleagues to stop holding hostage this critically important funding.

The inclusion of these dangerous amendments poisons the bill and threatens our crucial homeland security needs and hurts our economy.

We must reject these amendments and pass a clean Homeland Security funding bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague and compatriot on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and the ranking member for his leadership.

Madam Chair, this is a full force assault on immigrants. It is an assault on the integrity of this Nation which was built upon the investment and the love of this country by immigrants from all over the world.

As I look to the landscape of what we now confront—2,000 dead in Nigeria by Boko Haram, little girls dressed with suicide bombs, and Homeland Security being held hostage by an assault on immigration—let me say to you that the Constitution has given the President the authority under the “take care” provision, so this assault of amendments that is trying to chip away at these executive actions is a false premise in order to attack the ideas and the values of this Nation.

In my own State, if the actions of the President's are in place, we will gain \$8.2 billion in gross domestic product and \$19.2 billion over 10 years, a decade. Do you think we need the underlying amendment or amendments? Pastors and religious leaders—the Episcopal bishops—have indicated that they support the executive actions. The Catholic bishops support the executive actions.

The Aderholt amendment wants to attack those young DREAMers who want to invest and young soldiers. The Blackburn amendment wants to take away, if you will, the childhood arrivals.

Mr. DESANTIS wants to misrepresent to victims of human trafficking and domestic violence. Mr. SALMON, in his amendment, wants to suggest that workers are being hired over American workers; then Mr. SCHOCK wants to ignore the investment of this particular language into this Nation.

Let me end by saying this is an attack on immigrants. Let's oppose all of these.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I believe I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to close. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of our full committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair and members of the committee, I oppose the Schock amendment for many of the numerous reasons that have already been stated by our colleagues, but I want to make sure that we are all perfectly clear on what is occurring on the House floor today.

The majority is, unfortunately, playing politics with the lives, safety, and security of the American people. The ideologues are holding funding hostage for the Homeland Security Department here today. That is not right. They would rather deport DREAMers—the kids and their parents—rather than fund the Department of Homeland Security.

In the wake of the recent Paris tragedy, we need to remain vigilant with smart enforcement policies that protect Americans. The Department of Homeland Security plays a central role in our fight against terror, and we must fully fund the efforts as soon as possible. We should not be attaching poison pill amendments to this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to really join us and govern with a sense of far more responsibility.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding, and let me thank all of my colleagues who have worked to put this bill together.

Madam Chair, today, I rise—and the House rises—to support and defend our Constitution. We do not take this action lightly; but, simply, there is no alternative. This is not a dispute between the parties or even between the branches of our government.

This executive overreach is an affront to the rule of law and to the Constitution itself. I appreciate all of the efforts of those working to fix our broken immigration system, especially since I am one of them.

What we are dealing with is a President who has ignored the people, who has ignored the Constitution, and even his own past statements. In fact, on at least 22 occasions, he said he did not have the authority to do what he has done.

Before he became President, on March 31, 2008, the President said: "I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we're facing right now have to do with the President trying to . . . not go through Congress at all, and that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President."

On May 19, 2008, the President said, "I believe in the Constitution, and I will obey the Constitution of the United States."

After he was President, on May 5, 2010, the President said, "Anybody who tells you . . . that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works."

□ 1045

On July 1, 2010, the President said: "There are those . . . who have argued passionately that we should . . . at least ignore the laws on the books . . . I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair."

On October 14, 2010, the President said: "I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can't simply ignore laws that are out there."

On October 25, 2010, the President said: "I am President. I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. . . . I can't just make the laws up by myself."

On March 28, 2011, the President said: "America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law."

On April 20, 2011, the President said: "I can't solve this problem by myself. . . . I can't do it by myself."

On April 29, 2011, the President said: "Some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how democracy works."

On May 10, 2011, the President said: "They wish I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how a democracy works."

On July 25, 2011, the President said: "The idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. . . . But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written."

On September 28, 2011, the President said: "We live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it."

On September 20, 2012, the President said: "What I've always said is, as the head of the executive branch, there's a limit to what I can do."

On October 16, 2012, the President said: "We're . . . a nation of laws. . . . And I've done everything that I can on my own."

On January 30, 2013, the President said: "I'm not a king. I am the head of the executive branch of government. I'm required to follow the law."

On January 30, 2013, the President also said: "I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law."

On February 14, 2013, the President said: "The problem is that I'm the President of the United States. I'm not the emperor of the United States."

On July 16, 2013, the President said: "I think that it is very important for us to recognize that the way to solve this problem has to be legislative."

On September 17, 2013, the President said: "My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are passed. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law."

On November 25, 2013, the President said: "The easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. . . . That's not our tradition."

On March 6, 2014, the President said: "And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore . . . any of the other laws that are on the books."

And on August 6, 2014, the President said: "I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers."

To think that the President of the United States actually studied constitutional law is one thing. But he didn't just learn constitutional law, he taught it as well. But now his actions suggest that he has forgotten what these words even mean.

Enough is enough. By their votes last November, the people made clear that they wanted more accountability from this President; and by our votes here today, we will heed their will, and we will keep our oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. SCHOCK. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-2 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ADERHOLT of Alabama.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. SALMON of Arizona.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. SCHOCK of Illinois.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for an electronic vote on amendment No. 2, and will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the remaining amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ADERHOLT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 190, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

AYES—237

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (NY)
Allen	Bridenstine	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Babin	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Buck	Cramer
Barr	Bucshon	Crawford
Barton	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benishek	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Black	Chabot	DesJarlais
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Duffy
Blum	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Bost	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Cole	Emmer

Farenthold	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Fincher	Lance	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rooney (FL)
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Roskam
Fleming	Long	Ross
Flores	Loudermilk	Rothfus
Forbes	Love	Rouzer
Fortenberry	Lucas	Royce
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Russell
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Salmon
Garrett	Marchant	Sanford
Gibbs	Marino	Scalise
Gibson	Massie	Schock
Gohmert	McCarthy	Schweikert
Goodlatte	McCauley	Scott, Austin
Gosar	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Gowdy	McHenry	Sessions
Granger	McKinley	Shimkus
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Shuster
Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Simpson
Graves (MO)	McSally	Smith (MO)
Griffith	Meadows	Smith (NE)
Grothman	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Guinta	Messer	Smith (TX)
Guthrie	Mica	Stefanik
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Stewart
Hardy	Miller (MI)	Stivers
Harper	Moolenaar	Stutzman
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Mullin	Thornberry
Heck (NV)	Mulvaney	Tiberi
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Tipton
Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer	Trott
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Turner
Hill	Noem	Upton
Holding	Nugent	Wagner
Hudson	Nunes	Walberg
Huelskamp	Olson	Walden
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Walker
Hultgren	Palmer	Walorski
Hunter	Paulsen	Walters, Mimi
Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Perry
Hurt (VA)	Perry	Webster (TX)
Issa	Pittenger	Webster (FL)
Jenkins (KS)	Pitts	Wenstrup
Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)	Westerman
Johnson (OH)	Poliquin	Westmoreland
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Whitfield
Jolly	Posey	Williams
Jones	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Jordan	Ratcliffe	Wittman
Joyce	Reed	Womack
Katko	Reichert	Woodall
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Yoder
King (IA)	Ribble	Yoho
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)
Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	Young (IA)
Kline	Roby	Young (IN)
Knight	Roe (TN)	Zeldin
Labrador	Rogers (AL)	Zinke
LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	

NOES—190

Adams	Clyburn	Esty
Aguilar	Cohen	Farr
Ashford	Connolly	Fattah
Bass	Conyers	Foster
Beatty	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Becerra	Costa	Fudge
Bera	Courtney	Gabbard
Beyer	Crowley	Galleo
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Graham
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grayson
Bonamici	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Boyle (PA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Hahn
Bustos	Delaney	Hastings
Butterfield	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Capps	DeBene	Higgins
Capuano	Denham	Himes
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Hinojosa
Carney	Deutch	Honda
Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Cartwright	Dingell	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Israel
Castro (TX)	Dold	Jackson Lee
Chu (CA)	Doyle (PA)	Jeffries
Ciulline	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Ellmers	Kaptur
Clay	Engel	Keating
Cleaver	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)

Kennedy	Moulton	Schrader
Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Kilmer	Nadler	Scott, David
Kind	Napolitano	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kuster	Nolan	Sherman
Langevin	Norcross	Sinema
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Sires
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Slaughter
Lawrence	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
Lee	Payne	Speier
Levin	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Lewis	Perlmutter	Takai
Lieu (CA)	Peters	Takano
Lipinski	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Lowenthal	Pocan	Titus
Lowe	Polis	Tonko
Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Torres
(NM)	Quigley	Tsongas
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rangel	Valadao
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen
Lynch	Richmond	Vargas
Maloney,	Ros-Lehtinen	Veasey
Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Velázquez
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Walz
McCollum	Rush	Wasserman
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
McGovern	T.	Waters, Maxine
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson Coleman
Meeks	Sarbanes	Welch
Meng	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Duckworth	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	Nunnelee	Visclosky

□ 1115

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 209, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—218

Abraham	Bridenstine	Cook
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Cramer
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Crawford
Amash	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Babin	Buck	Culberson
Barletta	Bucshon	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Burgess	DeSantis
Barton	Byrne	DesJarlais
Benishek	Calvert	Duffy
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Emmer
Black	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Fincher
Blum	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Fleming
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Flores
Brat	Conaway	Forbes

Fortenberry	Lucas	Ross	Lieu (CA)	O'Rourke	Sinema	Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	Lipinski	Pallone	Sires	Davis, Rodney	Kind	Rice (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Rouzer	LoBiondo	Pascarell	Slaughter	DeFazio	King (IA)	Rigell
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Royce	Lofgren	Payne	Smith (NJ)	Delaney	King (NY)	Roby
Garrett	Marino	Russell	Lowenthal	Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Gibbs	Massie	Ryan (WI)	Lowe	Perlmutter	Speier	Dent	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)
Gohmert	McCarthy	Salmon	Lujan Grisham	Peters	Swalwell (CA)	DeSantis	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Goodlatte	McCaul	Sanford	(NM)	Peterson	Takai	DesJarlais	Knight	Rohrabacher
Gosar	McClintock	Scalise	Lujan, Ben Ray	Pingree	Takano	Diaz-Balart	Kuster	Rokita
Gowdy	McHenry	Schock	(NM)	Pocan	Thompson (CA)	Dold	Labrador	Rooney (FL)
Granger	McKinley	Schweikert	Lynch	Polis	Thompson (MS)	Duffy	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Scott, Austin	MacArthur	Price (NC)	Titus	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Roskam
Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Maloney,	Quigley	Tonko	Duncan (TN)	Lance	Ross
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Sessions	Carolyn	Rangel	Torres	Emmer	Langevin	Rothfus
Griffith	Messer	Shimkus	Maloney, Sean	Reichert	Upton	Esty	Latta	Rouzer
Grothman	Mica	Shuster	Matsui	Rice (NY)	Tsongas	Farenthold	Lipinski	Royce
Guinta	Miller (FL)	Simpson	McCollum	Richmond	Vela	Fincher	LoBiondo	Ruiz
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Smith (MO)	McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao	Fitzpatrick	Long	Ruppersberger
Harper	Mooleenaar	Smith (NE)	McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen	Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Russell
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)	McNerney	Ruiz	Vargas	Fleming	Ryan (WI)	Love
Hartzler	Mullin	Stefanik	McSally	Ruppersberger	Veasey	Flores	Lucas	Salmon
Hensarling	Mulvaney	Stewart	Meehan	Rush	Vela	Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Stivers	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez	Fortenberry	Lummis	Scalise
Hice (GA)	Neugebauer	Stutzman	Meng	T.	Visclosky	Foster	Lynch	Schock
Hill	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz	Fox	MacArthur	Schrader
Holding	Noem	Thornberry	Moulton	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Franks (AZ)	Maloney, Sean	Schweikert
Hudson	Nugent	Tiberi	Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Schultz	Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Huelskamp	Olson	Tipton	Nadler	Schiff	Waters, Maxine	Garrett	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Trott	Napolitano	Schrader	Watson Coleman	Gibbs	Massie	Sessions
Hultgren	Palmer	Turner	Neal	Scott (VA)	Welch	Gibson	McCarthy	Shimkus
Hunter	Paulsen	Wagner	Nolan	Serrano	Wilson (FL)	Gohmert	McCaul	Shuster
Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Walberg	Norcross	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth	Goodlatte	McClintock	Simpson
Hurt (VA)	Perry	Walden	Nunes	Sherman		Gosar	McHenry	Sinema
Issa	Pittenger	Walker				Gowdy	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Jenkins (KS)	Pitts	Walorski				Graham	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi	Duckworth	Loebbsack	Ryan (OH)	Granger	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (OH)	Poliquin	Weber (TX)	Garamendi	Nunnelee	Scott, David	Graves (GA)	McSally	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Webster (FL)				Graves (LA)	Meadows	Speier
Jolly	Posey	Wenstrup				Graves (MO)	Meehan	Stefanik
Jones	Price (GA)	Westerman				Griffith	Messer	Stewart
Jordan	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland				Grothman	Stivers	Stutzman
Joyce	Reed	Whitfield				Guinta	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Williams				Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
King (IA)	Ribble	Wilson (SC)				Hahn	Mooleenaar	Tiberi
Kline	Rice (SC)	Wittman				Hanna	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Knight	Rigell	Womack				Hardy	Mullin	Trott
Labrador	Roby	Woodall				Harper	Mulvaney	Turner
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Yoder				Harris	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Yoho				Hartzler	Neugebauer	Valadao
Lance	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)				Heck (NV)	Newhouse	Walberg
Latta	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)				Hensarling	Noem	Walden
Long	Rokita	Young (IN)				Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Walker
Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin				Hice (GA)	Nunes	Walorski
Love	Roskam	Zinke				Higgins	Olson	Walters, Mimi

NOES—209

Adams	Costello (PA)	Green, Gene
Aguilar	Courtney	Grijalva
Amodei	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Ashford	Cuellar	Hahn
Bass	Cummings	Hanna
Beatty	Curbelo (FL)	Hardy
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Bera	Davis, Danny	Heck (NV)
Beyer	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Higgins
Blumenauer	Delaney	Himes
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Boyle (PA)	DelBene	Honda
Brady (PA)	Denham	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Dent	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Israel
Bustos	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Jeffries
Capps	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	Dold	Kaptur
Carney	Doyle (PA)	Katko
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Keating
Cartwright	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Ellmers	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Engel	Kildee
Chu (CA)	Eshoo	Kilmer
Cicilline	Esty	Kind
Clark (MA)	Farr	King (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Fattah	Kinzinger (IL)
Clay	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
Clyburn	Fudge	Langevin
Coffman	Gabbard	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Gibson	Lawrence
Conyers	Graham	Lee
Cooper	Grayson	Levin
Costa	Green, Al	Lewis

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1124

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DE SANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 278, noes 149, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

AYES—278

Abraham	Bost	Chabot
Aderholt	Boustany	Chaffetz
Aguilar	Brady (TX)	Cicilline
Allen	Brat	Clawson (FL)
Amash	Bridenstine	Coffman
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Cohen
Ashford	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Babin	Brownley (CA)	Collins (GA)
Barietta	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barr	Buck	Comstock
Barton	Buschon	Conaway
Benishke	Burgess	Connolly
Bera	Bustos	Cook
Bilirakis	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Cramer
Bishop (UT)	Carney	Crawford
Black	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Carter (TX)	Cuellar
Blum	Cartwright	Culberson

Adams	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Doyle (PA)
Beatty	Clay	Edwards
Becerra	Cleaver	Ellison
Beyer	Clyburn	Ellmers
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Engel
Blumenauer	Cooper	Eshoo
Bonamici	Costa	Farr
Boyle (PA)	Courtney	Fattah
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Fudge
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Capps	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Capuano	DeGette	Grayson
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Green, Al
Carson (IN)	DelBene	Green, Gene
Castor (FL)	DeSaulnier	Grijalva
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Gutiérrez
Chu (CA)	Dingell	Hastings

NOES—149

Heck (WA) McCollum
Hinojosa McDermott
Honda McGovern
Hoyer McNerney
Huffman Meeks
Israel Meng
Jackson Lee Moore
Jeffries Moulton
Johnson (GA) Nadler
Johnson, E. B. Napolitano
Kaptur Neal
Keating Nolan
Kelly (IL) Norcross
Kennedy O'Rourke
Kildee Pallone
Kilmer Pascarell
Larsen (WA) Payne
Larson (CT) Pelosi
Lawrence Pingree
Lee Pocan
Levin Price (NC)
Lewis Quigley
Lieu (CA) Rangel
Lofgren Rice (NY)
Lowenthal Richmond
Lowe Roybal-Allard
Lujan Grisham Rush
(NM) Sanchez, Linda
Lujan, Ben Ray T.
(NM) Sanchez, Loretta
Maloney, Sarbanes
Carolyn Schakowsky
Matsui Schiff

NOT VOTING—6

Duckworth Loeb sack
Garamendi Murphy (FL) Nunnelee
Ryan (OH)

□ 1128

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 31, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 171, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

AYES—253

Abraham Blackburn
Aderholt Blum
Allen Bost
Amash Boustany
Amodei Brady (TX)
Ashford Brat
Babin Bridenstine
Barletta Brooks (AL)
Barr Brooks (IN)
Barton Buchanan
Benishek Buck
Bera Bucshon
Billirakis Burgess
Bishop (MI) Crawford
Bishop (UT) Byrne
Black Calvert

Scott (VA) Culberson
Scott, David Curbelo (FL)
Serrano Davis, Rodney
Sewell (AL) DeFazio
Sherman Denham
Sires Dent
Slaughter DeSantis
Smith (WA) DesJarlais
Swalwell (CA) Diaz-Balart
Takai Latta
Takano Lipinski
Thompson (CA) Duncan (TN)
Thompson (MS) Emmer
Titus Farenthold
Tonko Fincher
Torres Fitzpatrick
Tsongas Fleischmann
Van Hollen Fleming
Vargas Flores
Veasey Forbes
Quigley Fortenberry
Rangel Vela
Rice (NY) Velázquez
Richmond Visclosky
Roybal-Allard Walz
Rush Wasserman
Sanchez, Linda Schultz
T. Waters, Maxine
Sanchez, Loretta Watson Coleman
Sarbanes Welch
Schakowsky Wilson (FL)
Schiff Yarmuth

Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)

NOES—171

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold

Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—9

Cole Loeb sack
Duckworth Nunnelee
Garamendi Payne Rogers (AL)
Ryan (OH)
Smith (MO)

□ 1133

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 32 I was unable to get to the well before the 2 minute vote closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 32 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 167, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

AYES—260

Abraham Barton
Aderholt Benishek
Allen Bera
Amodei Bilirakis
Ashford Bishop (MI)
Babin Bishop (UT)
Barletta Black
Barr Blackburn

Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding

NOES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield

Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Morrison
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin

Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel

Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Duckworth
Garamendi

Loebsack
Nunnelee

Rush
Ryan (OH)

□ 1138

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 27, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ISRAEL. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Israel moves to recommit the bill H.R. 240 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike the dollar amount and insert "\$129,573,000".

Page 37, line 20, strike the dollar amount and insert "\$1,503,000,000".

Page 37, line 22, strike the dollar amount and insert "\$468,500,000".

Page 38, line 8, strike the dollar amount and insert "\$601,500,000".

Strike all after section 578, before the short title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, last week terrorists struck France, reminding us every day that we must be vigilant and every day we must be prepared. Madam Speaker, I represent Long Island, New York. Hundreds of my constituents were killed on 9/11. Almost every day, another recovery worker from Ground Zero is losing his or her life all these years later.

On that day, on 9/11, those of us who were in this body, as the sun set over Washington, we took to the steps. We held hands and we sang "God Bless America." We committed ourselves to working together to strengthen our homeland security, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Members of Congress whose constituents expect us to keep them safe—whose constituents expect us to put aside whatever disagreements we have on whatever other issues there may be and at least agree on their fundamental right to be safe. That is the expectation.

And now, Madam Speaker, we have a bill that should not be controversial, that should fund our homeland security, but it has been turned into a divisive political strategy on immigration.

□ 1145

Madam Speaker, let's face it. This bill is not about homeland security; this bill is about Republican political security. It is an injustice to those who suffered on 9/11 and still remember that.

Members are entitled to whatever view they may have on the President's executive order. They are entitled to

whatever view they may have on immigration. They are entitled to votes on those issues.

But to force those views on a bill that funds grants to first responders, that helps those first responders hire additional personnel and purchase protective equipment, that assists our State and local governments in preventing and responding to terrorist attacks and other disasters, that secures essential cyber networks, that simply puts ugly politics ahead of the safety of the American people.

This bill goes too far. For the first time in history, they are holding our security hostage to the politics of immigration.

My motion gives every Member here a fundamental choice. It allows you to pursue whatever agenda you may have on immigration without undermining our homeland security. It would ensure passage of a clean Homeland Security bill, with an additional \$3 million for fusion centers.

Madam Speaker, this is The 9/11 Commission Report, the report that every Member of Congress said that we would heed and pay attention to, that we would not allow politics to be injected into. This report calls for fusion centers, which are located in every State, to gather, receive, analyze, and share threat information among Federal, State, and tribal law enforcement and other public safety partners.

Unity of effort and information sharing, this report says, is a key necessity in protecting our homeland; and our fusion center networks are critical in our response to that recommendation.

This motion to recommit makes a further investment in these fusion centers, so that we don't have a repeat of what happened in France a week ago.

This is the choice, Madam Speaker. It is clear, and it is stark. You can vote "yes" on this motion to recommit and strengthen fusion centers, or you can vote "no" and have weakened them. How will you explain your vote "no" if a disaster occurs?

You can vote "yes" and stand for full and immediate funding of DHS without Washington politics, or you can vote "no" and tell your constituents that being against immigration is more important to you than being for their homeland security. How will you explain that "no" vote to them if disaster occurs again?

Republicans are saying that anti-immigration riders on this bill are part of a political compromise. Madam Speaker, we all understand compromise, we all support compromise, but homeland security is the last thing in this body that should be subject to a political compromise—not after the attacks on France, not after 9/11 when we pledged to keep the American people safe, not after we stood on the steps of this building committing ourselves to bipartisan cooperation and to do the right thing for our homeland security.

Do the right thing, my colleagues, and vote for this motion to recommit and take the politics, the ugly politics, out of keeping the American people safe.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, may I remind my colleague from New York that we put \$300 million in those fusion centers in the bill.

At this time, because this is clearly primarily about the amendments that are on this bill, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Speaker, I thank his honor.

President Obama announced one of the largest extraconstitutional power grabs ever by a Chief Executive. He declared unilaterally that almost 5 million undocumented aliens will receive deferred action under some newfangled definition of "prosecutorial discretion," Madam Speaker.

Not only that, not only escaping consequences, he has decided to bestow benefits such as work authorization and immigration benefits—this, Madam Speaker, despite the fact that the very same President over 20 different times said he lacked the power to do what he just did, and he repeatedly said he is not a king.

Now, Madam Speaker, his position may have changed after the election, I hasten to add, but the Constitution has not. That document is clear, time-tested, and true, and it says that this body passes laws, and it is the responsibility of the Chief Executive, Madam Speaker, to make sure that those laws are faithfully enforced.

If this President's unilateral extraconstitutional acts are not stopped, Madam Speaker, future Presidents will no doubt expand that power of the executive branch and threaten the constitutional equilibrium.

But, Madam Speaker, this is not a fight between Republicans and Democrats; it is not even a fight over immigration reform. This is a fight over whether this branch of government will ever find the courage to stand up for itself.

The same document, the same document that this and all Presidents swear to defend, gives this body certain tools, tools like the power of the purse. It is about damn time we used that tool.

I would ask you to oppose this motion to recommit and support the underlying bill.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from the Judiciary Committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 244, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—184

Adams	Gabbard	Neal
Aguilar	Gallego	Nolan
Ashford	Graham	Norcross
Bass	Grayson	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Al	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Bera	Grijalva	Payne
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peters
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kaptur	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Chu (CA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciциlline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cleaver	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lawrence	Sherman
Cooper	Lee	Sinema
Costa	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Speier
Cummings	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Takai
Davis, Danny	Lowe	Takano
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeLauro	(NM)	Tonko
DelBene	Lynch	Torres
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Tsongas
Deutch	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	McCollum	Vela
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Walz
Eshoo	Meeks	Wasserman
Esty	Meng	Schultz
Farr	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NAYS—244

Abraham	Babin	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Allen	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amash	Barton	Black
Amodei	Benishkek	Blackburn

Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin

Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Duckworth
Garamendi

Loebsack
Nunnelee

Ryan (OH)

□ 1157

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie

Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—191

Adams
Agullar
Amash
Bass
Beatty

Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer

Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)

Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone

Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Duckworth
Garamendi

Loebsack
McDermott

Nunnelee
Ryan (OH)

□ 1204

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 37) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOULTON. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moulton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 37 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, before line 1, insert the following: **SEC. 3. BAD ACTOR DISQUALIFICATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—A person may not make use of the regulatory exemptions under this Act if such person—

(1) has been convicted of providing assistance, either directly or indirectly, to a terrorist organization or a state sponsor of terrorism;

(2) has been made subject to any judicial or administrative decree or order arising out of a governmental action that determined that the person provided assistance, either directly or indirectly, to a terrorist organization or a state sponsor of terrorism; or

(3) is affiliated with another person who has been convicted of providing assistance described under paragraph (1) or who has been the subject of a decree or order described under paragraph (2).

(b) REGULATORY EXEMPTIONS UNDER THIS ACT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “regulatory exemptions under this Act” means the following:

(1) The exemptions provided under section 4(s)(e)(4) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 15F(e)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by title I.

(2) The exceptions for affiliates provided under section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by title II.

(3) The registration threshold for savings and loan holding companies provided under section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the exemption from filing for savings and loan holding companies provided for under section 15(d) of such Act, as added by title III.

(4) The registration exemption for mergers and acquisition brokers provided under section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as added by title IV.

(5) The exemption from XBRL requirements provided under title VII.

(6) The conformance period for certain collateralized loan obligations provided under section 13(c)(2)(B) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as added by title VIII.

(7) The increase in the dollar amount from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 under section 230.701(e) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, required by title XI.

Page 30, line 2, insert after the period the following:

In issuing such rule, the Commission shall not eliminate any requirement to disclose—

(1) a conviction, including a conviction of providing assistance, either directly or indirectly, to terrorist organizations or state sponsors of terrorism; or

(2) a judicial or administrative decree or order arising out of a governmental action, including a decree or order that determined

that the person provided assistance, either directly or indirectly, to terrorist organizations or state sponsors of terrorism.

Mr. HENSARLING (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

From Paris to Boston, New York to London, we have seen in recent weeks and years that the threat of terrorism in our world remains constant. All Americans must remain vigilant, and this Congress must do everything in its power to prevent another terrorist attack.

History shows that leveraging America's economic strength is one of our Nation's best tools to combat the scourge of terrorism. We have forced rogue regimes like Iran to the negotiating table with strong economic sanctions. We have punished bad actors in Russia and North Korea by cutting off their access to global financial markets. And we ought to ensure that no one convicted of aiding and abetting terrorists, or state sponsors of terror, can take advantage of our financial system.

That is what my amendment does. It simply makes clear that no one who has been convicted of providing assistance, either directly or indirectly, to a terrorist organization or a state sponsor of terrorism can make use of the exemptions in the underlying bill.

The bill before us today is complex. It is a complex piece of legislation that includes measures that previously passed this House with large bipartisan support as well as other more controversial provisions.

The American people did not send us to Congress to find areas where we disagree. Our constituents sent us to Congress to get things done for all Americans. We could have moved forward today with a legislative package that includes commonsense reforms that protect consumers and create the conditions for economic growth. Reasonable people may disagree on the merits of this bill, but we should all be able to agree that those who support terrorists and state sponsors of terrorism should never use our financial system to their benefit. My amendment prevents this from happening.

I urge a “yes” vote on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the motion to recommit. I suppose I have some good news for the gentleman who offered it, and that is there are numerous bad actor provisions already within our Federal securities law. So, with the possible exception of the unconstitutional power grab of our President in granting amnesty and possibly allowing new bad actors to enter our country, I think that the motion to recommit is probably largely irrelevant.

Let's get down to the substance of the matter, and that is, Madam Speaker, here is an idea that is worthy of the American people. That idea is: Why don't we work on a bipartisan basis to promote job creation and reduce small business burdens?

That is exactly what H.R. 37 does. We all know it is a rollup of 11 simple, modest bills, all of which have passed this body with huge, huge bipartisan support. H.R. 634 passed 411–12; H.R. 5471 passed by voice vote; H.R. 801 passed 417–4; H.R. 2274, 422–0, Madam Speaker.

So this passed in the last Congress. Unfortunately, Senator REID didn't take it up. Maybe one of the reasons that his party lost the last election is because of the obstruction that the former Senate majority leader imposed on the American people.

Last week, it came within a dozen votes of passing. It would have passed, Madam Speaker, but so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle apparently were for it before they were against it, and they changed their vote. So why the change of heart? Madam Speaker, there was a change of heart because the left hand doesn't know what the far left hand is doing.

Three of these bills represent very modest clarifications or modifications of the 2,000-page Dodd-Frank Act. And to the ultraleft, the ultraliberal friends, Dodd-Frank is no longer policy. It is no longer philosophy. It is an article of religious faith. It is sacred text. It was chiseled in stone. It came down from Mount Sinai.

Meanwhile, the community banks and the Main Street businesses that are trying to put America back to work are suffering under the sheer weight, load, volume, complexity, and cost of the regulatory burden that has been imposed by our friends on the left.

The left aims their rhetoric at Wall Street, but they vote against Main Street. The hardworking American families and those who want to work become collateral damage. Main Street doesn't want to occupy Wall Street; they just want to quit bailing it out. And that is what we need to do, Madam Speaker.

So it is time to get America back to work. It is time to work on a bipartisan basis. It is time to grow this

economy from Main Street up, not Washington down. Reject the MTR. Vote in favor of promoting job creation and reducing small business burdens.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Republican majority did not allow a single amendment on this bill that benefits powerful financial interests. Members obviously have concerns about elements of this bill—146 members opposed this identical bill last week. A previous version of this bill also earned more than 100 no votes last Congress. The 52 new members who began service last week were not able to offer an amendment either.

These eleven bills make complex legal changes to our financial markets but no member of this Congress was afforded the opportunity to make a change. I offered three different amendments. All were rejected.

My first amendment had the support of Chairman ISSA and Representative POLIS. If we had more time, Ranking Member CUMMINGS would have added his name. This amendment strikes Section 7. Section 7 moves us backwards in efforts to increase transparency in our financial markets.

Section 7 would exempt more than 70 percent of public companies from complying with the eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) requirement. This exemption would completely undermine progress already made by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Going back to the 19th century approach, requiring investors, academics, regulators and the public to read reams of filing papers is definitely not what we should be doing. Instead, we should provide the data in structured data sets available for bulk downloads for comparison and analysis by investors, academics, the regulators and the public.

The SEC has made incredible progress in catching up with more than two dozen other nations that collect information this way. It has also made it easier for firms. A recent study by XBRL.US found that the average cost of submission was only \$10,000. In fact, seventy percent of firms in the study reported a cost of less than \$10,000.

The costs to individual firms is offset by the benefits those firms will receive because investors have easier access to data to make investment decisions. Society will also benefit by having financial data more readily available.

My second amendment required the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize its CEO pay ratio rule within 60 days of the bill's enactment. CEO pay rose an average of 4% last year. The average CEO earns more than 330 times his or her average employee.

My third amendment highlights what we really need to do to create jobs—end the mindless sequestration cuts which prevent us from making needed investments in infrastructure, housing, basic research, etc. It also strikes the language that further delays the transition to a safer financial system.

It is wrong that bills that help Wall Street and multi-national corporations get fast-tracked while bills that help working families have been slow-walked for years.

(From XBRL.US)

CONSEQUENCES OF XBRL EXEMPTION IN H.R. 37—MINIMAL SAVINGS, REDUCED TRANSPARENCY AND ACCESS TO CAPITAL FOR SMALL COMPANIES

NEW YORK, NY—The goal of Title VII in H.R. 37 is to reduce the burden on small public companies by delaying the XBRL (eXtensible Business Reporting Language) formatting requirement for companies with revenue under \$250 million for a minimum of three years. The XBRL exemption in the bill will not reduce the burden on small companies.

The savings from an XBRL exemption is only \$10,000 per year for most small companies. A December 2014 study conducted by XBRL US found that the average annual cost of XBRL filing for companies defined as "small companies" per the U.S. Securities and Exchange (SEC) definition is \$10,406; and 70% pay \$10,000 or less. These figures demonstrate that the annual cost of XBRL creation is low relative to the benefits that XBRL formatting can provide. Financial data in XBRL format is significantly more functional and timely, and therefore less costly for investors and analysts, than traditional HTML data, which must be rekeyed and vetted before use.

The study was based on aggregating annual costs for 1,299 companies, working with 14 separate service providers, geographically dispersed around the country. The dataset captures 32% of all companies with the small company designation.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 242, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

AYES—183

Adams	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	Cartwright	DeFazio
Ashford	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeLaney
Beatty	Chu (CA)	DeLauro
Becerra	Ciulline	DeBene
Bera	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Dingell
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doggett
Bonamici	Clyburn	Doyle (PA)
Boyle (PA)	Cohen	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Connolly	Ellison
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Eshoo
Bustos	Costa	Esty
Butterfield	Courtney	Farr
Capps	Crowley	Fattah
Capuano	Cuellar	Foster
Cárdenas	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Carney	Davis (CA)	Fudge

Gabbard	Lowey	Rush
Gallego	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Graham	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Grayson	Lynch	Sarbanes
Green, Al	Maloney, Carolyn	Schakowsky
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Grijalva	Matsui	Schrader
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Hahn	McDermott	Scott, David
Hastings	McGovern	Serrano
Heck (WA)	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Higgins	Meeks	Sherman
Himes	Meng	Sinema
Hinojosa	Moore	Sires
Honda	Moulton	Slaughter
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Israel	Nadler	Speier
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Jeffries	Neal	Takai
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Takano
Johnson, E. B.	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Jones	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Pallone	Titus
Keating	Pascarell	Tonko
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Torres
Kennedy	Pelosi	Tsongas
Kildee	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Kilmer	Peters	Vargas
Kirkpatrick	Pingree	Veasey
Kuster	Pocan	Vela
Langevin	Polis	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Walz
Lawrence	Rangel	Wasserman Schultz
Lee	Rice (NY)	Waters, Maxine
Levin	Richmond	Watson Coleman
Lewis	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Lieu (CA)	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
Lofgren		
Lowenthal		

NOES—242

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Aderholt	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Allen	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Babin	Ellmers	Jolly
Barletta	Emmer	Jordan
Barr	Farenthold	Joyce
Barton	Fincher	Katko
Benishek	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Bishop (MI)	Fleming	King (NY)
Black	Flores	Kinzing (IL)
Blackburn	Forbes	Kline
Blum	Fortenberry	Knight
Bost	Fox	Labrador
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Brat	Garrett	Lance
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Latta
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Long
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Buck	Gosar	Love
Bucshon	Gowdy	Lucas
Burgess	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Byrne	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Calvert	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Marino
Chabot	Grothman	Massie
Chaffetz	Guinta	McCarthy
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	McCaul
Coffman	Hanna	McClintock
Cole	Hardy	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Harper	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Harris	McMorris
Comstock	Hartzler	Rodgers
Conaway	Heck (NV)	McSally
Cook	Hensarling	Meadows
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Cramer	Hice (GA)	Messer
Crawford	Hill	Mica
Crenshaw	Holding	Miller (FL)
Culberson	Hudson	Miller (MI)
Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp	Moolenaar
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Mooney (WV)
Denham	Hultgren	Mullin
Dent	Hunter	Mulvaney
DeSantis	Hurd (TX)	Murphy (PA)
DesJarlais	Hurt (VA)	Neugebauer

Newhouse	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi	Graves (LA)	Massie	Royce	McCollum	Price (NC)	Takano
Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton	Graves (MO)	McCarthy	Ruiz	McDermott	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Nugent	Roskam	Trott	Griffith	McCaul	Russell	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Nunes	Ross	Turner	Grothman	McClintock	Ryan (WI)	McNerney	Richmond	Titus
Olson	Rothfus	Upton	Guinta	McHenry	Salmon	Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Palazzo	Rouzer	Valadao	Guthrie	McKinley	Sanford	Meng	Ruppersberger	Torres
Palmer	Royce	Wagner	Hanna	McMorris	Scalise	Moore	Rush	Tsongas
Paulsen	Russell	Walberg	Hardy	Rodgers	Schock	Moulton	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Walden	Harper	McSally	Schrader	Nadler	T.	Vargas
Perry	Salmon	Walker	Harris	Meadows	Schweikert	Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Pittenger	Sanford	Walorski	Hartzler	Meehan	Scott, Austin	Neal	Sarbanes	Vela
Pitts	Scalise	Walters, Mimi	Heck (NV)	Messer	Scott, David	Nolan	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Poe (TX)	Schock	Weber (TX)	Hensarling	Mica	Sensenbrenner	Norcross	Schiff	Visclosky
Poliquin	Schweikert	Webster (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Sessions	O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Walz
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup	Hice (GA)	Miller (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Pallone	Serrano	Wasserman
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Westerman	Higgins	Moolenaar	Shimkus	Pascarell	Sherman	Schultz
Price (GA)	Sessions	Westmoreland	Hill	Mooney (WV)	Shuster	Payne	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Ratcliffe	Shimkus	Whitfield	Himes	Mullin	Simpson	Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Reed	Shuster	Williams	Holding	Mulvaney	Sinema	Perlmutter	Speier	Welch
Reichert	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	Hudson	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Wittman	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)	Pocan	Takai	Yarmuth
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Womack	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)			
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall	Hultgren	Newhouse	Smith (TX)			
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Hunter	Noem	Stefanik			
Roby	Stefanik	Yoho	Hurd (TX)	Nugent	Stewart			
Roe (TN)	Stewart	Young (AK)	Hurt (VA)	Nunes	Stivers			
Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Young (IA)	Issa	Olson	Stutzman			
Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Young (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)			
Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)	Zeldin	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer	Thornberry			
Rokita	Thornberry	Zinke	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Tiberi			
			Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tipton			
			Jolly	Perry	Trott			
			Jordan	Peters	Turner			
			Joyce	Pittenger	Upton			
			Katko	Pitts	Valadao			
			Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	Wagner			
			Kilmer	Poliquin	Walberg			
			Kind	Polis	Walden			
			King (IA)	Pompeo	Walker			
			King (NY)	Posey	Walorski			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Price (GA)	Walters, Mimi			
			Kline	Quigley	Weber (TX)			
			Knight	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)			
			Labrador	Reed	Wenstrup			
			LaMalfa	Reichert	Westerman			
			Lamborn	Renacci	Westmoreland			
			Lance	Ribble	Whitfield			
			Larsen (WA)	Rice (SC)	Williams			
			Latta	Rigell	Wilson (SC)			
			Lipinski	Roby	Wittman			
			LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Womack			
			Long	Rogers (AL)	Woodall			
			Loudermilk	Rogers (KY)	Yoder			
			Love	Rohrabacher	Yoho			
			Lucas	Rokita	Young (AK)			
			Luetkemeyer	Rooney (FL)	Young (IA)			
			Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IN)			
			MacArthur	Roskam	Zeldin			
			Maloney, Sean	Ross	Zinke			
			Marchant	Rothfus				
			Marino	Rouzer				

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop (UT)	Huffman	Peterson
Duckworth	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	Nunnelee	

□ 1220

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 271, noes 154, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—271

Abraham	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Bustos	Dold
Amash	Byrne	Duffy
Amodei	Calvert	Duncan (SC)
Ashford	Carney	Duncan (TN)
Babin	Carter (GA)	Ellmers
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Barr	Chabot	Farenthold
Barton	Chaffetz	Fincher
Benishiek	Clawson (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Bera	Coffman	Fleischmann
Beyer	Cole	Fleming
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bishop (GA)	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Foster
Black	Connolly	Fox
Blackburn	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Blum	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Bost	Cramer	Garrett
Boustany	Crawford	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Gibson
Brat	Cuellar	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Gowdy
Brownley (CA)	Denham	Graham
Buchanan	Dent	Granger
Buck	DeSantis	Graves (GA)

NOES—154

Adams	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Aguiar	Davis, Danny	Israel
Bass	DeFazio	Jackson Lee
Beatty	DeGette	Jeffries
Becerra	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	DeBene	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Jones
Boyle (PA)	Deutch	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Keating
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Butterfield	Doyle (PA)	Kennedy
Capps	Edwards	Kildee
Capuano	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Engel	Kuster
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Langevin
Cartwright	Esty	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Farr	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Lee
Chu (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Cicilline	Fudge	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Gabbard	Lieu (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Gallo	Lofgren
Clay	Grayson	Lowenthal
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lowe
Clayburn	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Cohen	Grijalva	(NM)
Conyers	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Cooper	Hahn	(NM)
Costa	Hastings	Lynch
Courtney	Heck (WA)	Maloney
Crowley	Hinojosa	Carolyn
Cummings	Honda	Matsui

NOT VOTING—8

Curbelo (FL)	Huffman	Peterson
Duckworth	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	Nunnelee	

□ 1226

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 37, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. MILLS, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Michael P. Mills, United States District Court, Northern District of Mississippi:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI,
Oxford, MS, January 13, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 7, 2015, you designated me to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect Alan Nunnelee of the First District of the State of Mississippi under House Resolution 20, One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

Under such designation, I have the honor to report that on January 12, 2015 at Tupelo, Mississippi, I administered the oath of office to Mr. Nunnelee. Mr. Nunnelee took the oath prescribed by 5 U.S.C. 3331. I have sent two copies of the oath, signed by Mr. Nunnelee, to the Clerk of the House.

With kindest personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL P. MILLS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE), the whole number of the House is now 434.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF, THE HONORABLE LOUIE GOHMERT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Connie Hair, Chief of Staff, the Honorable LOUIE GOHMERT, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a grand jury subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, for testimony and documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

CONNIE HAIR,
Chief of Staff for the Hon. Louie Gohmert.

□ 1230

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2015 TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2015

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Friday, January 16, 2015, and, further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, last year, I promised my constituents that, in the new year, we would bring the fight on illegal immigration and act to restore the separation of powers that was upended by President Obama's lawless overreach, and I meant it. That is why I proudly voted for the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act and the attached amendments.

This bill is simple. It fully funds—yes, it fully funds—the DHS while ensuring that no dollars are made available for the President's executive amnesty.

I am especially pleased that this measure contained key provisions of my bill, the Immigration Compliance Enforcement Act, which will defund

the Obama administration's "public advocate" to lobby on behalf of illegal immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, we still have three co-equal branches of government, and when the President oversteps his bounds, we are compelled to respond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

TRADE

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon regarding Fast Track authorization.

There are many reasons to oppose Fast Track, but the first and foremost is that Fast Track is an abdication of Congress' fundamental responsibilities.

The Constitution authorizes the Congress, not the executive branch, to regulate commerce between nations. This deal was negotiated by the administration, in secret, without the proper input or oversight from the Congress. The grapevine tells us—because they are not talking to us directly—that it will do nothing to address currency manipulation, the mother of all trade barriers.

Just one consequence is an \$8,000 cost advantage to a Japanese vehicle sold in the United States, which is then used to subsidize parts, advertising, or to undercut the cost of a vehicle in the marketplace. In fact, Toyota made more in profits last year from currency manipulation than Ford made last year in its entire worldwide operations.

What I know about the domestic auto industry is that they can outcompete any of their competitors in the world, but they cannot outcompete the Bank of Japan or the Japanese Government.

Those who care about the constitutional responsibilities of Congress should oppose Fast Track.

FULLY FUND HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep disappointment in the votes that were just taken by the House.

We should be fully funding Homeland Security in this country. In light of what went on in Paris, in light of September 11, in light of the fact that there are terrorist cells, we need the Department of Homeland Security to be fully funded.

If there are differences of opinion with the President on the immigration bill, then that should be fought in an immigration bill, but we shouldn't mix apples with oranges.

My mother used to say, "You shouldn't cut off your nose to spite your face." That is exactly what this House did just before: we cut off our nose to spite our face.

To prove a point of dissatisfaction with the President, we cut funds for Homeland Security. That is an irresponsible act, and I really wish it would be reversed. We need to fully fund Homeland Security. The fight on immigration is the fight on immigration. Let's not mix apples with oranges, to quote another metaphor.

I am terribly disappointed, and I say to my colleagues that the Department of Homeland Security needs to be fully funded. We should be adding funds to keep our people safe, not pulling them away.

COMMITTED TO FIGHTING THE WAR ON TERROR

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I started out this week to remind Americans of the difficult times in which we live. Sadly, today, rather than passing a clean Homeland Security Appropriations bill upon which Americans are depending to secure this land, we had a political fight.

I want to remind those around the world that America still stands strong and committed to fighting the war on terror. In joining with our friends in Africa against the horrific actions of Boko Haram and the suicide bombings that they are forcing 10-year-old children to do, we stand with our friends in Europe and around the world.

Most of all, what we must do is find a way to steer the young lives that are being captured by the Internet and online brutality away from these kinds of dastardly acts.

I think it is important that we find a way to educate the young boys and girls in Nigeria and in countries around the world and to be able to say to them that there is a greater and better life of opportunity and humanity.

I am committed, as we move in this legislative process, to focus on removing the dastardly acts of these terrorists and on saving our boys and girls.

COSPONSORING LEGISLATION—CHANGES IN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will only take a few minutes and then yield the bulk of the time to Mr. CLYBURN.

I rise about a particular situation that has happened to me and, I am

sure, has happened to other Members that you might not be aware of. Other Members can sign you on to a piece of legislation without your consent, and that happened to me just this week.

Representative DIANE BLACK signed me on to H.R. 217, which is a particularly strong anti-choice bill and a bill that I would never support. Now, it was an honest mistake.

My name is ADAM SMITH. Regrettably, there is an ADRIAN SMITH, who serves—well, not “regrettably.” ADRIAN is a very nice man, but he is someone who has a name very close to mine, “ADRIAN SMITH.” She thought it was ADRIAN SMITH she was signing on to the bill. She signed me on to the bill instead, and that creates two problems and two things that I would urge this body to change.

First of all, nobody should be able to sign you on to a bill without your signature. Now, I know we do that, and that speeds up the process, but it creates a situation where anyone can put you on any bill. In this case, I was put on a bill that is polar opposite to my personal beliefs and my 18-year record in Congress.

The second thing that is really problematic about this is you would assume—well, okay—there is a simple fix: just take it off. To her credit, as soon as she noticed the mistake, Congresswoman BLACK did just that—she had my name removed as a cosponsor—but that is not what happens.

On the bill that is out there with the original cosponsors, my name does not simply disappear. A line is drawn through it, and it is said next to it “withdrawn” as if, at some point, I did cosponsor the bill and then changed my mind.

I don’t know how we change this rule, but when this happens—when it is clear that someone signs you on to a bill you had no intention of being on—your name should be removed. Period. End of story. It was never really there in the first place.

Now, as a part of my permanent record, there is my name as having been on a bill—to all appearances as my own choice—that, in a million years, I never would have cosponsored.

I rise to make that point clear to my constituents, first of all. I never signed on to it, and I never had any intention. Second of all, as I will do in a letter that I will send to the Speaker and to the minority leader, I would urge us to at least change that second policy.

Once it is clear that you never intended to sign on to a bill, your name should simply be removed. It should not be there with a line through it as if you did intend to sign on to the bill at one time. I think this is potentially damaging to a lot of Members.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ONE RIVER, ONE BOAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. SMITH, for allowing me to share this time with him.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the tradition of the First Amendment—a law deeply ingrained in the core of American values—I would like to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the poem “One River, One Boat.”

This poem was written by South Carolina’s poet laureate, Marjory Wentworth, in anticipation of reading it at today’s gubernatorial inauguration. It illustrates the history of my home State and ponders a look at the path the State seems to be embarking upon going forward.

Ms. Wentworth has recited a poem at the last three gubernatorial inaugurations, but she will not be reciting a poem at today’s. She was told that her participation would make the program too lengthy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have attended several inaugurations of South Carolina’s Governors. Some were shorter than others. None were allotted a specific amount of time. South Carolinians are proud of their poet laureates, but all have not always agreed with the import of their writings. I believe it is wrong to not include this prolific, artistic expression in this year’s ceremony.

Recently, individuals across the globe are living in fear of censorship when free speech and expression should be a fundamental right. We have even seen cowardly individuals use their own beliefs to badger, batter, and even murder those whose views and expressions they have found discomforting.

We have seen many instances of arbitrary actions against the powerless by the powerful when words and actions threaten their comfort levels. Such actions should not be.

I applaud Ms. Wentworth for her touching words, and I am reading her poem today in hopes that the people of South Carolina, across the country, and peoples around the world are as touched by her words as I have been.

ONE RIVER, ONE BOAT

(By Marjory Wentworth, poet laureate of South Carolina)

Because our history is a knot we try to unravel, while others try to tighten it, we tire easily and fray the cords that bind us.

The cord is a slow moving river, spiraling across the land in a succession of S’s, splintering near the sea.

Picture us all, crowded onto a boat at the last bend in the river: watch children stepping off the school bus, parents late for work, grandparents

fishing for favorite memories, teachers tapping their desks with red pens, firemen suiting up to save us, nurses making rounds, baristas grinding coffee beans, dockworkers unloading apartment size containers of computers and toys from factories across the sea.

Every morning a different veteran stands at the base of the bridge holding a cardboard sign with misspelled words and an empty cup.

In fields at daybreak, rows of migrant farm workers standing on ladders, break open

iced peach blossoms; their breath rising and resting above the frozen fields like clouds.

A jonboat drifts down the river.

Inside, a small boy lies on his back; hand laced behind his head, he watches stars fade from the sky and dreams.

Consider the prophet John, calling us from the edge of the wilderness to name the harm that has been done, to make it plain, and enter the river and rise.

It is not about asking for forgiveness. It is not about bowing our heads in shame; because it all begins and ends here: while workers unearth trenches

at Gadsden’s Wharf, where 100,000 Africans were imprisoned within brick walls awaiting auction, death, or worse.

Where the dead were thrown into the water, and the river clogged with corpses has kept centuries of silence.

It is time to gather at the water’s edge, and toss wreaths into this watery grave.

And it is time to praise the judge who cleared George Stinney’s name, seventy years after the fact, we honor him; we pray.

Here, where the Confederate flag still flies beside the Statehouse, haunted by our past, conflicted about the future; at the heart of it, we are at war with ourselves huddled together on this boat handed down to us—stuck at the last bend of a wide river splintering near the sea.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RADICAL ISLAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting short week. And with all the drills in the world going on, it is important that we deal with our Department of Homeland Security. And I am proud the House has taken quick action to pass such a budget and passed it handily.

Homeland Security needs to be funded, and the President needs to sign the bill. We have finished that today and are sending it to the Senate. Hopefully they will work quickly and deal with this issue because, as people in America know, we have crises all around us.

We have threats to our security all around us that require immediate attention.

The world is watching as we play golf while they come together, millions at a time, to stand against radical Islam and Islamic terrorism.

So it has been interesting to see the White House as the only significant international capital where the ultimate leader of the country cannot bring himself and, therefore, his spokespeople cannot bring themselves, to say the words “radical Islamic terrorism,” because that is what we are talking about.

And for an administration to diminish the seriousness of radical Islamic terrorists wanting to destroy Western civilization is worse than having our leadership's head in the sand, or wherever their head is. It is important to wake up and recognize what the world has recognized, what our Muslim friends have recognized—that radical Islam is a threat to our very existence and way of life.

The Weekly Standard has an article, January 13, by Daniel Halper, which says: “The White House won’t be calling jihadists adherents to ‘radical Islam.’ At least, that’s the reasonable takeaway from this extraordinary exchange the White House press secretary had today with a reporter.”

And I will jump down to a statement by President Obama’s chief spokesperson:

Mr. Earnest: I think the reason is twofold. One is I certainly wouldn’t want to be in a position where I’m repeating the justification that they have cited that I think is completely illegitimate, right? That they have invoked Islam to try to justify their attacks.

And the reporter said:

But to call it radical Islam you feel would be playing into their hands.

Mr. Earnest: Well, I think what I’m trying to do is I’m trying to describe to you what happened and what they did. These are individuals who are terrorists. And what they did was they tried to invoke their own distorted deviant view of Islam to try to justify them.

And I want to stop there. The President’s mouthpiece says that he is not going to call it “radical Islam” or “Islamic terrorism” because that is a deviant view. Well, if you look at the definition of “deviant,” that is what deviates from what most people do or say or think.

So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the deviant thought process is not what the reporters had and not what the major countries in the world have and not what our Muslim leader friends in the world have. It is what this White House has. Theirs is the deviation from what is truth, because the truth is—as much as this President doesn’t want to say it, and he doesn’t allow his spokespeople to say it, I will say it, Mr. Speaker: this is radical Islamic terrorism, and it is a threat to Western civilization.

And the more our leaders refuse to recognize it for what it is, the worse it gets because the radical Islamic terrorists realize they are winning. And the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the OIC, composed of the Islamic states in the world, all 57—I know it gets confusing to some in this country’s leadership whether we have 57 States and they have 50 or they have 57 and we have 50. But they have 57 because they include one that is not actually a state. But they are the ones that started the campaign after 9/11 of calling anyone who expresses concern about radical Islamic terrorism “Islamophobes.”

I fear God. I don’t fear any man. I am not a phobe of anything. But it is time to recognize truth, and that is that radical Islamic terrorists want to destroy our life and kill us. It is very simple.

And what is remarkable—and I think it is very important that both Democrats and Republicans have the opportunity to travel around and speak to world leaders in their own countries because when you are there in their country talking to them, as some of us on both sides of the aisle have done in those Middle Eastern countries, led by moderate Muslims who don’t believe they need to have an explosive jihad, they recognize that the terrorism that is a threat to them, as moderate Muslims, and the terrorism that is a threat to us and Western civilization, is radical Islam. They recognize that it is a religion.

And they recognize that when people in the name of Allah and Islam take territory and claim they are their own caliphate, their own government, then you had better understand who they are and what they are. And in this case, the Islamic State has enough strength and enough power to be taken seriously so that they are totally defeated and wiped off the map, whether it is in Syria, northern Iraq, wherever they find themselves, because they are at war with us.

And I mentioned it before, Mr. Speaker, but as we have had this administration do a cleansing—not necessarily a book-burning but a burning, in essence, of parts of the training books that talk about radical Islam, that tried to educate our FBI, our State Department, our intelligence communities, all of our government workers on what radical Islam is, what it believes, the intelligence officer said: We have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemy. And that has never been more apparent than it has been this week, with the radical Islamic jihad terrorist attack in Paris and in Nigeria.

Even though there weren’t reporters killed in Nigeria, those lives were every bit as much precious—around 2,000 lives. Somehow, much of the mainstream media had trouble report-

ing that. They were concentrating on the horrors of the journalists killed in Paris, and rightfully so. But they should not be neglecting the horrors for those villagers, so many of them Christian, who have been killed because they did not believe in radical Islam.

And one of the reasons, I would submit, that we should have had a President there in Paris—and I know it would have been difficult for this President, but he should have been there locked arm-in-arm with Prime Minister Netanyahu. Words keep leaking out about things that are said, about strained relations that this administration has with the Netanyahu administration. There is a leader whose eyes are clear and his vision is clear, and he can see exactly who is at war against him, who is helping him and the nation of Israel and who is not helping him and the nation of Israel.

And as we know from history, anytime a nation’s enemies see that nation’s strongest ally pulling away, it is provocative. And the more the United States distances itself from Israel, from those who recognize that radical Islamic terrorism is a threat to Western civilization, then the more radical Islamists win.

□ 1300

I really, honest to goodness, didn’t think we would be 6 years in to President Obama’s administration with him still not willing to acknowledge that radical Islam is a threat, is at war with us.

It is a religion. This administration may not like it, but it is a religion. It is a radical form of Islam. I hope one day that our top leaders in this country will have the courage of President al-Sisi in Egypt and that will reflect, as General al-Sisi has, the will of the people of their country.

If the story is properly written about Egypt—and one day it will be. It won’t be by people at The New York Times. It will be by people who are not trying to twist and turn and create history the way they want it. It will be by historians that are really looking at what has happened.

They will see that in the last 6 years that, besides Israel, the country that has been most fearless—and by “country,” I mean the people of the country—most fearless in standing up for freedom and against radical Islamic terrorism, unfortunately, has not been the United States because of our leadership. It has been the nation of Egypt.

Certainly, Israel has stood strong and fearless. Their nation has been under attack nonstop. God bless them and protect them. Egypt was not under attack other than by the radical form of Islam, the religion of radical Islam, and this administration helped oust one of this country’s allies.

Like him or not, there were plenty of agreements signed by this country

with President Mubarak, and this administration disregarded them. That is a problem for other countries and other leaders who want to sign agreements with this administration, but they don't know that our country can be trusted anymore.

As people see the decline of respect for America around the world, they should understand that it is being credited to the lack of reliability of the United States to keep its word, to support its friends, not to turn its back on its friends. This Nation's leaders have begun repeatedly appearing more helpful to our enemies than to our own friends. They don't know who to trust.

I mentioned to Secretary Kerry that I have talked to people in the Middle East, Muslim leaders, who say: We talk among ourselves, we are all worried we may be the next ally to be thrown under the bus.

He wanted to know who said that. Well, obviously, I couldn't tell him because he would throw them under the bus.

For many of us that have traveled around the Middle East and talked to leaders in the Middle East, we understand what they feel. Maybe they are not able to be as open and candid with this administration for fear of it turning on them the way it does anybody within the administration here in America or outside the administration.

God help the whistleblowers. If you want to stand up for truth, justice, and the American way in this administration and point out massive problems that could subject our country to attacks, to terrorism, God help you because this administration is coming after you. They will use the Justice Department, they will use the EPA, they will use the IRS.

This administration has been weaponized to go after anybody that dares to stand up, especially within the administration. People that want to stand up and tell the truth, they are attacked, they are threatened with prosecution.

If someone like General Petraeus, who has defended the administration—but this administration knows that General Petraeus has information that would virtually destroy any credibility that the administration might still have nationally and internationally—so what else would this administration do but leave over his head, for over a year-and-a-half, the threat: We are going to prosecute you, so you better keep your mouth shut.

They actually know just the threat of prosecution helps diminish potential credibility. So if you wonder why General Petraeus has not come out in the last year and a half and said, "No, those weren't our talking points, somebody that created them needs to be prosecuted, it was a fraud on the American people," he is not going to say that.

He has got this administration hanging a prosecution over his head. What do you expect? I doubt he will ever be able to say it without worrying about something over his shoulder coming after him.

Here he is. He has been defensive of the administration. He has been a good soldier. He has said what they wanted him to say. He hasn't told all he could say, and they are going to make sure he doesn't—or if he does, he pays a heavy criminal price. That is where we are now in America.

It may have been the kind of administration Richard Nixon dreamed of, but he knew he could never get there. He couldn't weaponize the IRS. He apparently dreamed of it. This administration has done it.

For the President, for his spokespeople not to be able to call the terrorism a result of radical Islamic terrorism, it weakens our country, it emboldens our enemies, and as we have seen, you may take out Osama bin Laden, but when you withdraw our troops prematurely before Iraq soldiers are ready to stand on their own and you have blinded ourselves of the ability to recognize that any believers like Khamenei or Ahmadinejad, the former President of Iran, if you have blinded yourself of the ability to learn and educate our administration on what they believe, then you are going to fall prey to everything they decide to do toward you and about you because you don't understand where they are coming from.

I repeatedly reflect on that scene in the movie "Patton," and although he didn't know Rommel was not there with his tank division, he yells out in the movie after his tanks have defeated Rommel's: Rommel, you magnificent fatherless—I am paraphrasing—fatherless man, I read your book.

If you read and learn and educate yourself about your enemies, you have got a better chance of defeating them, but this administration continues to make it more and more difficult to understand who our enemies are. All of this backing up and crawling, well, you know, this isn't all Islam.

Of course, it is not all Islam. That is how I can go to Afghanistan and hug dear Muslim friends, we have the same enemies—and a big old bear of a man who led the Northern Alliance to defeat the Taliban by February of 2002 in the initial defeat is now the Vice President, and thank God he is.

Some of us that just met with the new leadership recently—and I have known General Dostum for a while and met with my good friend the Honorable Massoud.

President Ghani basically has gathered around him people a bit like what Lincoln did. He took people who opposed him, ran against him, but because he clearly cares deeply about Afghanistan, he gathered around him a

team of rivals, and the good thing is, unlike the current administration here, he is not afraid of having people with opposing viewpoints around him.

He is just like Lincoln. Lincoln had rivals all around him, and he listened to their input. He got their opinions, and it helped him make better decisions. This administration here needs to do what President Ghani in Afghanistan is trying to do, and it is not easy because our U.S. administration here has been reaching out for the Taliban.

Initially, the Taliban are defeated, and then this administration comes in—and I know the prior administration started the massive occupation of Afghanistan with tens of thousands of troops.

This President comes in, and in his campaign, he said that was the real war. Well, yeah, but once you defeat your enemy in that part of the world, you don't help yourself by becoming an occupier—you add over 100,000 troops to the country that is so thrilled that you relieved them of radical Islamic leadership, then you become an enemy because, now, you are an occupier. We didn't do ourselves any favors.

There are people, unlike the Iraqis who threw down weapons and ran, turned them over to the Islamic State, in Afghanistan, the Northern Alliance was willing to fight the Taliban initially, and they are still willing to fight.

In fact, before President Ghani was elected—that was so much uncertainty: Is President Karzai going to try to have another term, even though it is against the constitution? Are they in for a civil war?

There was a great deal of trepidation on the part of the Northern Alliance that fought against the Taliban on our behalf with less than 500 American special ops and intelligence people embedded.

They knew we withdrew, and the Taliban were able to take over the national government. Then they were in for a war, and one of them told me: Look, since you have taken back the weapons, you don't support us anymore, and you are doing everything you can to help the Taliban—that is this administration—we realize the odds are that we will lose our lives, but we are not going down without a fight.

Well, fortunately, they have got a team of rivals leading the country. Prayers are with them. They are moderate Muslims that I trust, and they want the best for Afghanistan.

According to the military leaders I have talked to repeatedly in Afghanistan and others, the country of Pakistan has been the biggest supplier and supporter of the Taliban. The Taliban didn't do themselves any favors when they just, in such evil fashion, attacked a school and killed 140 or so precious people, including children.

There are many more in Pakistan that are saying: You know what, it is

time to stop supporting the Taliban, it is time to worry about Pakistan.

Some have even started saying it is time to quit persecuting the Baloch people.

□ 1315

The arbitrary lines that were drawn many decades ago put probably the bulk of the Baloch people in southern Pakistan where most of their minerals are. It put the Baloch people within the arbitrary lines drawn for a country called Iran. In fact, the Baloch area actually is where the Straits of Hormuz are. It is where much of the oil and gas is.

I have grown to admire and love many of the Baloch people. I wouldn't mind seeing them having an independent Balochistan. I wouldn't mind seeing an independent Kurdistan in northern Iraq, because unlike what is portrayed in much of the mainstream media, the Kurds never threw down their weapons and ran away or turned them over to the Islamic State. They are people we can trust.

Mr. Speaker, a solution to our problem there would be to announce that we are going to provide weapons directly to the Kurds. We don't have to go through Baghdad, because Baghdad doesn't want them to have the equipment they need. They are afraid of them. Let them have the equipment they need to defeat the Islamic State. Yes, I know, that would not make Turkey happy, but Turkey has said: Not only are we not fighting the Islamic State—even though we have pledged in our NATO alliance that we will help fight any enemy of our fellow NATO signatories—we are not going to help, and we are not going to let you use any of the NATO bases or U.S. bases here in Turkey. You are on your own.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if Turkey is not going to fight them and they are a threat to all Western civilization, then we are just going to have to supply the Kurds and let them take them out.

It has been an honor to be over there numerous times and spend time there even when the State Department said it was too dangerous to go. DANA ROHR-ABACHER and I went and spent 3 days when the State Department was telling us it was too dangerous to be there. But I knew that there was no way their leaders were going to let anything happen to us. And they didn't. They were trustworthy.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems this administration has is figuring out whom we can trust and whom we can't. I know that this administration continues to talk about these moderate, vetted Syrian Army soldiers that we can really help. Well, if they were there 3 or 4 years ago, most of them are ready to throw in with the Islamic State or with al Qaeda subsidiaries. In fact, they have done that very thing. They have fought together.

I don't know if "naivete" is the proper word, but when this administration started supplying their so-called free, vetted moderate Syrian Army personnel and the equipment, they kept ending up in the Islamic State's possession. They even suspended sending them more weapons and equipment for a while, but then some months later they picked it back up. I don't know why, what made them feel they were more believable than they were before, but amazingly, they started sending it, and it started ending up in Islamic State hands.

It is heartbreaking to be, as a few of us have, in northern Iraq in the Kurdistan area with real, patriotic Kurds who love their people and who have fought not just for themselves, but they have fought for other groups, Shi'a and Sunni, without throwing down their weapons. They have fought and died. But to look in their eyes and see the hurt as they say: Couldn't you give us some Humvees, some up-armored vehicles? Because we are fighting against the Islamic State, and they are using American Humvees. They are using American armored personnel carriers. They are using American tanks. We don't have anything that can penetrate your American tanks or your personnel carriers. Those are invulnerable almost completely to IEDs because you up-armored them and gave them to the Syrian Army that gave them to ISIS, or you gave them to the Iraqi soldiers that left them for ISIS.

The commander who had lost soldiers said: You don't know what it is like to see a big, armored vehicle that is going to be used for a suicide bombing coming at your soldiers who have weapons that can't possibly penetrate those vehicles. And they are shooting. They are doing everything they can to try to stop them, but because they are the best America has in the way of fighting vehicles, we can't stop them, and we know my guys are going to get blown up as this American vehicle gets close, and it has been set up to be a suicide bomb.

Mr. Speaker, since this administration has not been effective in fighting IS for so long, for too long they looked at them as the junior varsity, the JVs, shouldn't we at least help those who are fighting to help us, along with themselves, by giving them vehicles that could match up against the vehicles we provided to the Islamic State? It seems like the least we can do. It really does.

This administration was going to be the most transparent in history. There is a story out this week from PJ Media. Josh Earnest doesn't think President Obama is upset about missing the solidarity gathering of world leaders. The world leaders see that our way of life is at risk, and our leadership doesn't see it. He thinks if we give a good enough speech, we coddle, we offer to buy of-

fices in Qatar, or we release more of their murderers, that surely they will recognize how truly wonderful, kind, and generous we are and they will stop their evil ways of killing innocent people. It is not going to happen.

I have Christian friends that say: Yes, but as Christians, we are supposed to turn the other cheek. That is as individuals. Individual Christians should live out the beatitudes as Christ gave them. But the government has a different role. If you do evil, you should be afraid because the government, within the bounds of Christianity—Romans 13:4—is supposed to punish the evil, eliminate the evils, and protect your people. I don't try to convert anybody using my position in government, but for those who misunderstand Christian teaching, you need to read Romans 13.

We have an Attorney General still holding on, Holder the Holdover. He said he is concerned about the so-called lone wolf attacks in the United States—one of the things, Mr. Speaker, I don't think, again, that this administration understands. They talk about these lone wolf attacks, and yet when you get down to the bottom of it, you find out, gee, they had talked to al-Awlaki, the man born in the United States so he gets an American birth certificate, an American passport, and American citizenship because his parents came over and had him while they were here, so he is an American citizen. He is radicalizing people.

These weren't lone wolves. They got information, they got advice, and they got radicalization from somebody else. It is tough to find anybody self-radicalized because apparently there are plenty of imams in this country that are not the general rank-and-file imams. They are imams that are ready to radicalize those—and twist and convert into evil—that would kill innocent children, women, and men.

Mr. Speaker, we need to recognize the threat that is upon us, and you can't do that when an administration will not even call the evil for what it is. I know indications are, gee, the economy is getting so much better. We still have over 90 million people that are not counted as unemployed because they just finally gave up looking for a job. To me, that is unemployed. But we don't count them in our statistics. And this staggering story came out today, written by Wyton Hall:

In a stunning Tuesday report, Gallup CEO and Chairman Jim Clifton revealed that "for the first time in 35 years, American business deaths now outnumber business births."

I can't help but think that has something to do with the massive overregulation by this administration continuing to set records in the number of regulations it sets. How in the world can businesses keep up with over 70,000 new pages of regulations year after year? They did it again in 2014, over

70,000 pages of new regulations, and they are expected to follow them and manage to keep a business. You don't have to look very far to find CEO after CEO or a person that started a business, no matter how massive, who said: In looking at all the regulations now, it is a good thing I started my business when I did, because if I were trying to start it now, I never could. I couldn't overcome all of the massive government overregulation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see ObamaCare continuing to fail and continuing to provide less care for more money. But not to worry. A lot of your good health care dollars are going to fund navigators who will never put a Band-Aid on anybody or never even blow on a cut to make it feel better. No. They will never even pat somebody on the back. They are bureaucrats. They are not in the health care business, nor are the thousands and thousands and thousands of new IRS agents who are not looking out for your health. They will probably give you ulcers. But they are part of the health care dollars now.

So people keep asking me: LOUIE, I don't understand. My deductible is higher. I am paying more money than ever. I am getting less care. I am getting turned down for things. I don't get to choose my doctor. I sure don't have the insurance policy I wanted. I don't understand.

I have to explain: Well, that is because you are paying for a lot of government workers that don't really help in anybody's health problems at all. They create health problems, more likely.

With all of this as a background, all of the failures of the Federal Government, the Federal Government, in fact, is intruding in people's private lives. As they access email and gather phone logs of every call to and from American individuals, we were assured that would not happen when the PATRIOT Act was extended. I was not here when it was passed. We were told it was only if you were a foreign terrorist, a known foreign terrorist, or you had ties to foreign terrorists would you be even eligible to have your phone logs gathered, emails checked. "Only" we were told. Well, that turned out not to be true. That was just an outright lie. It is time to stop the government intrusion into people's private lives unless the government has a warrant.

As a judge, I had no problem signing a warrant if there was probable cause spelled out in the affidavit. There were times I would turn away law officers and say: You have plenty of speculation there that sounds good, but you don't have facts that get you to probable cause.

That should be in there, under the Constitution, before the government can start invading your privacy.

Then when the House and Senate were controlled by the Democrats,

President Obama is in the Oval Office, they passed a bill creating this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that apparently is out there thinking they need to be able to monitor everybody's debit and credit card records so that they can see if anybody is being taken advantage of.

□ 1330

Well, how about following the Constitution and not getting anybody's bank records or credit card or debit card records unless you have probable cause or unless the person gives permission.

I am hoping that is going to be a bill that we pass because I have talked to enough Republicans and know how we feel, and there are Democrats who feel the same way. Of course, they are the ones that created this monster, but that needs to be reined in. And now with that as a backdrop, we have the story: "Obama backs government-run Internet."

And I know there was somebody who wrote into the Longview paper that they want net neutrality. They love the idea of the government playing more of a role in the Internet. Well guess what? When the government takes control of the Internet in the name of neutrality, it will probably not be neutral, according to most Americans' opinions.

So I hope Americans are not fooled. I hope Americans don't buy into this because when the United States Government takes control of the Internet, then we are going to start having the same problems they have in China, in Russia, and other parts of the world where their government does control their Internet, and they control your freedom to search for what you want or to say what you want.

I know of numerous occasions where people said they were in China typing, and they mention anything about the government, even if it is not terrible what they said about the government, they start typing again, and they have lost their Internet connection. They have learned not to say anything about the government, let it go, and they keep their Internet connection better.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to also touch on this because we passed the funding for the Department of Homeland Security. I hope the President doesn't veto the bill. I hope the Senate will pass what we passed. There are some things in there I would have liked to have been different, but I read the bill totally. There are some parts that aren't great, and there are some parts that are great. I am very proud—my friend JOHN CARTER has some great language in there. I know he has worked very hard on language that is very good.

As I was reading the bill this weekend, I said, that was JOHN CARTER's specific language from an earlier bill.

Overall, it was a good bill. The amendments helped it. I voted for the bill. And now hopefully the Senate will do the right thing and pass it, and we will send it to the President and we will fund the Department of Homeland Security without all of the amnesties he has unconstitutionally created.

But if the President wants another way of doing things, I haven't heard anyone else suggest this, but I brought it up with some friends this morning. Perhaps we go ahead, if he doesn't think that he likes that and we are not able to override a veto, maybe it is time to start setting goals for the administration, and when they don't meet them, we just take that money from them and block grant it out to State and local law enforcement.

There are some jail cells open. We don't have to provide the hundreds of millions of dollars to hold people being detained. The local law enforcement is tired of holding people on behalf of the Federal Government and not being reimbursed. Let them do the job they are supposed to do of enforcing the law.

I know the Arizona case said, the Supreme Court said Arizona could not be enforcing immigration law, that was a Federal job, but we certainly have the authority to say, you know what? Let's block grant that money out and let State and local government do that, enforce our laws for us. I think we will get a whole lot better job done. So that may be something else to consider. If the President is not going to sign a bill that funds homeland security, maybe we need to fund it, and if they can't meet their goals, block grant it out to local authorities.

In the time I have left, I wanted to touch on a significant article by Patrick Poole of PJ Media, because, as he says, it is a look back on this year's parade of failure, and expect more in 2015.

His article is titled, "The National Security 'Not Top 10' of 2014." So my paraphrase is the top 10 failures in national security by this administration.

Number one: befriending "moderate al Qaeda" in Syria. Patrick Poole said:

"There are some ideas so at war with reason and reality they can only exist in the fetid Potomac fever swamps of D.C. think tank and foreign policy community. Such was the case in January when three of the best and brightest from those ranks published an article in Foreign Affairs (the same publication that in 2007 brought us the 'moderate Muslim Brotherhood') contending that the U.S. needed to befriend the Syrian jihadist group Ahrar al-Sham as some kind of counter to more extreme jihadist groups, like ISIS and Jabhat al-Nusra. The precedent they cited was the U.S. failure to designate the Taliban after 9/11.

Mind you, at the time they wrote this, one of Ahrar al-Sham's top leaders was a lieutenant for al Qaeda head

Ayman al-Zawahiri, who openly declared himself a member of al Qaeda. After most of their leadership was wiped out in a bombing in September, they have gravitated closer to the jihadist groups they were supposed to counter and their positions have been bombed by the U.S., much to the consternation of other vetted moderate rebel groups. So ridiculous was their proposition that the original subtitle of their article, 'An al Qaeda Affiliate Worth Befriending,' was changed online to 'An al Qaeda-Linked Group Worth Befriending' in hopes of minimizing the absurdity of their case."

But this administration bought into it.

And I understand there may be a Republican Senator or two that buys into it. It doesn't make it any less preposterous.

Number two of the top 10 national security failures:

Obama administration deploys three hashtag divisions in response to Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Some folks may remember that the response of this administration to help the Ukrainian people that I hold so dear, having lived with them for a summer back as a college student, the response of this administration was to launch a Twitter war that Russia wasn't terribly concerned about.

The number three failure of national security was Obama calling ISIS the "JV team."

I am sure Americans remember, and Patrick Poole discusses it, but to call the Islamic state a JV team betrayed his failure to get his security briefings as he should have to really understand what is happening in the world, because I don't believe for a minute, having talked to different intelligence people, I don't believe for a minute that our intelligence people did not know how dangerous the Islamic state was.

The number four failure of national security was the State Department official denying that Boko Haram targeted Christians.

Having been over there and having hugged and wept with those parents of daughters who were kidnapped and terrorized and made sex slaves, unlike the State Department official who says it wasn't about them being Christians—if you go hug them and weep with them and talk to them and their pastors, as I have, you find out it was precisely because they were Christians. Please, somebody in this administration, wake up. Radical Islam is at war with the United States and any Western civilization, and specifically with Christians.

When I asked these mothers whose daughters are still held kidnapped, probably sold into sex slavery by now—and this administration has not done enough because they don't see it as a war against Christianity—I asked, just to be sure, I said: Did they attack—

Boko Haram, these radical Islamist terrorists—did they attack your daughter's school because they were girls, because they don't believe girls should be educated?

They said: Oh, no, they don't believe girls should be educated, but they attacked it because it is a Christian school.

That is precisely why they attacked it.

Number five: Homeland Security adviser's pro-caliphate tweet used by ISIS recruiters. I had been warning about this pro-caliphate Homeland Security top adviser in Janet Napolitano's regime in Homeland Security, a guy that has spoken, was a listed speaker to pay tribute to the Ayatollah Khamenei as a man of vision of the 20th century, who blasted the prosecution of the Holy Land Foundation, the largest terrorist support prosecution in American history, and he defended the convicted defendants, and he tweets out. Finally, it was enough to show the administration what most of us who had eyes and ears understood. He tweeted out, after ISIS killed more innocent people, that the caliphate was inevitable so just, you know, get ready. And then ISIS used that to help recruit.

Number six failure of 2014 of national security in this administration: Obama and the State Department give shout-outs to Islamic cleric who okayed the fatwa authorizing the killing of Americans in Iraq. And Patrick Poole lays out exactly what it involved. Not once but twice, as I understand it, he gave a shout-out to this Islamic cleric who authorized the killing of Americans in Iraq.

Number seven: Obama administration gives heavy weapons to "vetted moderate" Syrian rebel groups; they promptly turn up in hands of ISIS and al Qaeda.

Number eight: The White House defends the Muslim Brotherhood's "commitment to nonviolence." And that is what some of the moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said, different countries saying, Why are you helping the Muslim Brotherhood? Do you not understand they are at war with you?

Number nine: The Obama administration defends U.S. Islamic groups branded as terrorist groups by the UAE.

The UAE is run by moderate Muslims. Perhaps this administration could learn something by listening to them and who they recognize to be terrorist groups.

And number 10: Having banned discussions of ideology driving Islamic terrorism, the Pentagon says it can't understand the ideology of ISIS.

Well, duh. It is no wonder they can't understand it when you are not allowed to be educated about what these people believe. But there are people around this town that have been banned from

teaching about radical Islam who perhaps should be unbanned.

In conclusion, I just want to reference the vote this week for Speaker. The vote is behind us. It is done. The Speaker was reelected. But one of the big concerns I had has not gone away, and it still needs to be addressed.

Those 4 years that Democrats controlled the House and the Senate, they set a record for the most bills brought to the floor where no amendments by anybody were allowed. They wouldn't let us participate in the legislative process. And we railed against that. We said, You put us in the majority, we won't do that. And it breaks my heart that under the current Speaker, a new record broke NANCY PELOSI's record of more bills brought to the floor with no amendments allowed, a closed rule. That has got to change.

Some have said our effort had no chance. If all those who said they would have voted with us but it had no chance had voted with us, then it would have been overwhelming.

□ 1345

One of the Speaker's supporters came up to me yesterday on the floor and handed me this and said, "This is from an old novel." I think it is called "The Lion's Den." He said, "This applies to you," and I appreciate it more than he would know.

The quote is this:

No matter how the espousal of a lost cause might hurt his prestige in the House, Zimmer had never hesitated to identify himself with it if it seemed to him to be right. He knew only two ways; the right one and the wrong, and if he sometimes made a mistake, it was never one of honor: he voted as he believed he should, and although sometimes his voice was raised alone on one side of a question, it was never stilled.

There were 24 such people that spoke this week, and I hope they will be honored and not belittled.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. MILLER, Florida
Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. KING, New York
Mr. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
Mr. WESTMORELAND, Georgia
Mr. ROONEY, Florida
Mr. HECK, Nevada
Mr. POMPEO, Kansas
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
Mr. TURNER, Ohio
Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio
Mr. STEWART, Utah

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 16, 2015, at 4 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

62. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of mobilizations of select Reserve units from October 2013 through September 2014, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: R-1411] (RIN: 7100-AD70) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

64. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-125, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the texts of Protocol to Convention No. 29: Protocol to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, and Recommendation No. 203: Recommendation on Supplementary Measures for the Effective Suppression of Forced Labor, adopted by the International Labour Conference in Geneva; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

67. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Framework Adjustment 3 [Docket No.: 140221166-4963-02] (RIN: 0648-BE01) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

68. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights state advisory committees, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

69. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations: Anchorage Grounds, Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0841] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

70. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Reduced

Visibility, Sector St. Petersburg Captain of the Port Zone, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

71. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Caregivers Program (RIN: 2900-AN94) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 340. A bill to provide for a limitation on the number of civilian employees at the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require States to recognize the military experience of veterans when issuing licenses and credentials to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 342. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges, without time-period limitation, to members of the Armed Forces who are involuntarily separated with a service-connected disability and also to extend such privileges to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a charitable deduction for the service of volunteer firefighters and emergency medical and rescue personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. ESTY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BASS, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 344. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 345. A bill to make persons who conspire to commit, commit, or benefit from an

act of human trafficking ineligible for admission to the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. VISLOSKY):

H.R. 346. A bill to improve the financial literacy of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 347. A bill to amend the Credit Repair Organizations Act to exempt certain consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 348. A bill to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 349. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to create an electronic database of research and information on the causes of, and corrective actions being taken with regard to, algal blooms in the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and other surface fresh waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COOK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. BASS, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. REED, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DENT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESTY, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs.

TORRES, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KATKO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MENG, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 350. A bill to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 351. A bill to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 352. A bill to rescind funds made available to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency if the Administrator fails to meet certain deadlines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 353. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include licensed hearing aid specialists as eligible for appointment in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 354. A bill to impose a civil penalty against a railroad carrier when a shift change of train employees causes a blockage of vehicular traffic at a grade crossing; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 355. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility with respect to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 356. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop and publish an action plan for improving the vocational rehabilitation services and assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 357. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 358. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemora-

tion of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 359. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 360. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 361. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 362. A bill to reduce the deficit by imposing a minimum effective tax rate for high-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COSTA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 363. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 364. A bill to prohibit assistance to the Palestinian Authority until it withdraws its request to join the International Criminal Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 365. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a notice and comment rulemaking before implementing certain policies relating to obstruction evaluation aeronautical studies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 366. A bill to reauthorize the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011, to provide assistance to small businesses owned by veterans, to improve enforcement of employment and re-employment rights of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 367. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the Federal Election Commission to establish and operate a website through which members of the public may view the contents of certain political advertisements, to require the sponsors of such advertisements to furnish the contents of the advertisements to the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 368. A bill to provide for greater safety in the use of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 369. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program to reimburse States and political subdivisions of States for expenses related to the presence of aliens having no lawful immigration status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 370. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, House Administration, Appropriations, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 371. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to permit insurers to offer catastrophic coverage plans to anyone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 372. A bill to authorize funds to prevent housing discrimination through the use of nationwide testing, to increase funds for the Fair Housing Initiatives Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr.

ZINKE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. HARDY);

H.R. 373. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 374. A bill to establish an Early Learning Challenge Fund to support States in building and strengthening systems of high-quality early learning and development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 375. A bill to establish a competitive grant program assisting the development of innovative early learning curricula for low-income children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 376. A bill to prohibit the sale, offering for sale, manufacture for sale, distribution in commerce, or import into the United States of certain firearm receiver castings or blanks, assault weapon parts kits, and machinegun parts kits and to prohibit the marketing or advertising of such castings or blanks and kits on any medium of electronic communications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 377. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require homemade firearms to have serial numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 378. A bill to prohibit the purchase, ownership, or possession of enhanced body armor by civilians, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 379. A bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DOGETT):

H.R. 380. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the inclusion of Social Security account numbers on Medicare cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CUM-

MINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 381. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and revive the separation between commercial banking and the securities business, in the manner provided in the Banking Act of 1933, the so-called "Glass-Steagall Act", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 382. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8585 Criterion Drive in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "Chaplain (Capt.) Dale Goetz Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 383. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Green Climate Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 384. A bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require annual reports to Congress on, and the maintenance of databases on, awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 385. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 386. A bill to provide student loan forgiveness for American Indian educators teaching in local educational agencies with a high percentage of American Indian students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 387. A bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 388. A bill to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose increased rates of tax with respect to taxpayers with more than \$1,000,000 taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 390. A bill to allow railroad employees to remain on duty as necessary to clear a blockage of vehicular traffic at grade crossings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 391. A bill to establish a grant program to preserve the legacy and ideals of Muhammad Ali and promote global respect, understanding, and communication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 392. A bill to resolve title issues involving real property and equipment acquired using funds provided under the Alaska Kiln Drying Grant Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 393. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling of genetically engineered fish; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 394. A bill to prevent the escapement of genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 395. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service by providing 2-fiscal-year budget authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 31. A resolution condemning the terrorist attacks in Paris, offering condolences to the families of the victims, expressing solidarity with the people of France, and reaffirming fundamental freedom of expression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BERA, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 32. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, as an entity of the United States Postal Service, should issue a commemorative stamp in honor of the holiday of Diwali; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H. Res. 33. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp honoring the life of Maya Angelou; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 34. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to provide members of the public with Internet access to certain Congressional Research Service publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LATTI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. REED, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 35. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 36. A resolution honoring the 22 years of mentoring, guidance, and educational assistance provided by the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project and recognizing its positive impact on the lives of at-risk boys and men of color; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 396. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 397. A bill for the relief of Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

OR

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes."

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof," and Article III, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13

The Congress shall have Power to provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which provides Congress the power to make "all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying out the constitutional powers vested in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution allows Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 is the necessary and proper clause, allowing Congress to enact all laws necessary and proper for executing any of their enumerated powers.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the US Constitution

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives,

shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but Congress may at any time make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Place of choosing Senators.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Power to tax and pay debts—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;"

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution;

This bill also makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following.

The Constitutional authority to enact this legislation can be found in:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 1)

Commerce Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

Constitutional analysis is a rigorous discipline which goes far beyond the text of the Constitution, and requires knowledge of case law, history, and the tools of constitutional interpretation. While the scope of Congress' powers is an appropriate matter for House debate, the listing of specific textual authorities for routine Congressional legislation about which there is no legitimate constitutional concern is a diminishment of the majesty of our Founding Fathers' vision for our national legislature.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power * * * To establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of US Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section XIII.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization". The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), "that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government." And, as the Court found in *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting *Boutilier v. INS*, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), "[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress' 'plenary

power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.'"

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.J. Res. 21.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V:

"The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this, Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 27: Mr. BRAT and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 36: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. KLINE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 109: Mr. OLSON, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 114: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 132: Mr. COLE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 140: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 160: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 167: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 173: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 188: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 191: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 192: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 197: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 204: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 206: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 217: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 221: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 235: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 246: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 265: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 270: Mr. OLSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 280: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 281: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 291: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 295: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 301: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 303: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 317: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BABIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HILL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. BRAT.

H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HILL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. TROTT.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. BRAT.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 12: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Res. 24: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. OLSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. DENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 113TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the 2d Session, 113th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

December 13, 2014:

H.J. Res. 131. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

December 16, 2014:

H.J. Res. 105. A joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez.

H.R. 43. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 78. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

H.R. 83. An Act making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

H.R. 451. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office".

H.R. 1391. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 1707. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2112. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the "National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 2203. An Act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

H.R. 2223. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the "Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building".

H.R. 2366. An Act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

H.R. 2678. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

H.R. 3085. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois,

as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3375. An Act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

H.R. 3534. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the "Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3687. An Act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 3957. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4443. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4812. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4919. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4924. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 4939. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2561 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the "Neil Havens Post Office".

H.R. 5030. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

H.R. 5106. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo,

California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building".

H.R. 5108. An Act to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5681. An Act to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

December 18, 2014:

H.R. 669. An Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 1067. An Act to make revisions in title 36, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements.

H.R. 1204. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1206. An Act to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1281. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

H.R. 1378. An Act to designate the United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center" and to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Court-house".

H.R. 1447. An Act to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2591. An Act to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

H.R. 2640. An Act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2719. An Act to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2952. An Act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department of Homeland Security and develop a comprehensive workforce strategy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3027. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 Miller Valley Road in Prescott, Arizona, as the "Barry M. Goldwater Post Office".

H.R. 3044. An Act to approve the transfer of Yellow Creek Port properties in Iuka, Mississippi.

H.R. 3096. An Act to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

H.R. 3329. An Act to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3374. An Act to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3468. An Act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend insurance coverage to amounts held in a member account on behalf of another person, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3572. An Act to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units.

H.R. 4007. An Act to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

H.R. 4193. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4199. An Act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Waco, Texas, as the “Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center”.

H.R. 4276. An Act to extend and modify a pilot program on assisted living services for veterans with traumatic brain injury.

H.R. 4416. An Act to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 161 Live Oak Street in Miami, Arizona, as the “Staff Sergeant Manuel V. Mendoza Post Office Building”.

H.R. 4651. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 West Baker Road in Baytown, Texas, as the “Specialist Keith Erin Grace, Jr. Memorial Post Office”.

H.R. 4771. An Act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids.

H.R. 4926. An Act to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the “James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway”.

H.R. 5050. An Act to repeal the Act of May 31, 1918, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5057. An Act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5069. An Act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5185. An Act to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009.

H.R. 5331. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 73839 Gorgonio Drive in Twentynine Palms, California, as the “Colonel M.J. ‘Mac’ Dube, USMC Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5562. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, as the “Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building”.

H.R. 5687. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach,

California, as the “Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office”.

H.R. 5705. An Act to modify certain provisions relating to the Propane Education and Research Council.

H.R. 5739. An Act to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5816. An Act to extend the authorization for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

H.R. 5859. An Act to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes.

December 19, 2014:

H.R. 1068. An Act to enact title 54, United States Code, “National Park Service and Related Programs”, as positive law.

H.R. 2754. An Act to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2901. An Act to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3608. An Act to amend the Act of October 19, 1973, concerning taxable income to members of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

H.R. 3979. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4030. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the “Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building”.

H.R. 4681. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5462. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers.

H.R. 5771. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the 2d Session, 113th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

December 16, 2014:

S. 229. An Act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs

located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the “Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center”.

S. 1434. An Act to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the “Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic”.

S. 2040. An Act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

S. 2917. An Act to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

S. 2921. An Act to designate the Community Based Outpatient Clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the “Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic”.

December 18, 2014:

S. 1000. An Act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes.

S. 1353. An Act to provide for an ongoing, voluntary public-private partnership to improve cybersecurity, and to strengthen cybersecurity research and development, workforce development and education, and public awareness and preparedness, and for other purposes.

S. 1474. An Act to amend the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to repeal a special rule for the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 1683. An Act to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients, and for other purposes.

S. 1691. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents.

S. 2142. An Act to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

S. 2270. An Act to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 2338. An Act to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, and for other purposes.

S. 2444. An Act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

S. 2519. An Act to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity.

S. 2521. An Act to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security.

S. 2651. An Act to repeal certain mandates of the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General.

S. 2759. An Act to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport.

S. 3008. An Act to extend temporarily the extended period of protection for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes.

December 19, 2014:

S. 2673. An Act to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BOYERTOWN MUSEUM OF
HISTORIC VEHICLES

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Boyertown Museum of Historic Vehicles as it celebrates 50 years of educating countless visitors about the important role Berks County and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania played in the development of America's automobile industry.

Before Detroit became the automobile capital of the world, Berks County was at the forefront of America's transportation revolution. Horse-drawn carriages yielded to electric and gasoline-powered vehicles test driven on the steep slopes and hairpin curves leading to the summit of Mt. Penn in Reading and other roads in the region.

Thanks to the outstanding dedication and hard work of its staff and volunteers, as well as the generosity of its members and supporters, the Museum chronicles the groundbreaking contributions of automobile manufacturing pioneers such as Charles Duryea, who along with his brother, Frank, is credited with designing and producing the country's first hill-climbing, gasoline-powered vehicle and the first commercially-produced automobile in 1900.

Founded by Paul R. Hafer and his wife, Ermine, in 1965, the Museum is home to fascinating exhibits and dozens of automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles that were manufactured in Pennsylvania. The community will help the Museum kick off a year-long celebration of the 50th anniversary on Saturday, January 17th during a Golden Gala.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Boyertown Museum of Historic Vehicles as it celebrates this memorable milestone and continues telling the uniquely American story of how hard work, ingenuity and craftsmanship helped Berks County and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania revolutionize how all of us travel.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE
OF CONSTANCE KEND EISENSTAT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman and cherished constituent, Constance Eisenstat, who died on December 23, 2014, at the age of 83. Born in New York City to Lee and Cecile (Meyer) Kend, Connie spent the first

half of her life as a New Yorker, and then as a Californian in the Bay Area.

Connie made the world better with all she did and was. A unique, tasteful, funny, smart, intuitive, wise and fully decent woman, she consistently made herself available to help those who needed her, whether it was wardrobe guidance, new shopping opportunities, or exclusives on upcoming sales! Her notable travel and fine dining tips, favorite recipes, reviews of movies, art, and theatre were offered free of charge, and everyone trusted Connie's judgment and good taste. But most importantly, Connie was truly at her best when coaching others through their illnesses, their difficult personal times or their life's challenges. Connie was a courageous woman. She inspired others through her inner strength, fighting off her own illnesses countless times, yet never allowing them to get her down.

Inspired by a program established at Sloan Kettering Hospital in New York, Connie and a friend launched the Patient to Patient Program at Stanford Hospital. They and their group of carefully trained volunteers paid visits to patients who had undergone breast cancer surgeries. Introducing themselves as breast cancer survivors, they offered information and support services to hospital patients with gentleness and sensitivity. When the Community Breast Health Project (CBHP) was created in 1993, Connie once again offered her services to help launch this valued community non-profit organization. For many years she served as a committed volunteer and fundraiser, and together with a group of like-minded individuals, she sustained and strengthened this premier community organization (now Bay Area Cancer Connections) that supports people touched by breast and ovarian cancer with comprehensive, personalized services in an atmosphere of warmth and compassion.

Connie was a devoted wife, mother, grand mom, friend, and community leader. Her loyalty, style, energy, creativity, humor, determination and bravery are all hallmarks of who she was and made her unforgettable. She was an entrepreneur before the word was popularized . . . the owner of a tennis shop, Connie's Racquet, and a food business, Ultomato. She also brought her enduring sense of beauty to the Cantor Arts Center at Stanford University as a member of the Board.

Connie leaves her beloved husband of 55 years, Albert (Pepsi), her children Melissa (Jonathan) and Michael (Susanne) and her beloved four grandsons, Mitch, Johnny, Ben and Tommy. Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring and celebrating the life of Connie Eisenstat. In the words of Vincent Van Gogh: "Close friends are truly life's treasures. Sometimes they know us better than we know ourselves."

With gentle honesty, they are there to guide and support us, to share our laughter and our tears.

Their presence reminds us that we are never really alone".

This beloved and unique woman strengthened her family, her friends, her community and her country. May our tribute to her be a source of pride and comfort to the entire Eisenstat family.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND
RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM L.
BERG

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and retirement of William L. Berg. Mr. Berg, a lifelong resident of Wisconsin, is retiring from his position as president and CEO of Dairyland Power Cooperative. During his career, Mr. Berg oversaw a series of major transitions in the electric utility industry. He handled these transitions with confidence, leaving Dairyland better for his service. Mr. Berg's tenure at Dairyland was the longest of any CEO of a generation and transmission cooperative in the United States.

Mr. Berg graduated from the University of Wisconsin-Madison with a Bachelor's and Master's Degrees in Electrical Engineering in 1971 and 1972, respectively. From 1972 to 1974, Mr. Berg was employed by the Wisconsin Electric Power Company as an engineer. Bill was hired by Dairyland in 1974, and assumed the duties of president and chief executive officer in 1990, just as the electric restructuring movement began. His leadership helped to guide Dairyland through the rapid changes associated with this period of restructuring and deregulation.

Mr. Berg spent his career championing the values underpinning the cooperative business model. He believed that the strength of a cooperative comes from its members. His primary concern was always the interests of the cooperative's members, and by remaining focused on their fundamental importance, he was able to achieve great success as the leader of the cooperative.

Mr. Berg is a registered Professional Engineer in the State of Wisconsin and a member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers. He spends his time serving on a variety of boards and committees, including the Board of Advisors of Viterbo University and its Executive Committee. He also serves on the Rail Energy Transportation Advisory Committee of the Surface Transportation Board of the U.S. Department of Transportation and is a member of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's Environmental Task Force. Mr. Berg is a past-president and current board member of the National Renewables Cooperative Organization. He is also a past-president

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of the National G&T Managers' Association and has served on the Board of Directors of the Electric Power Research Institute.

Bill and his wife, Cindi, live in La Crosse where they plan to remain active in their church and in other community activities after Bill's retirement. Together they have two children, Michael and Sarah, as well as five grandchildren. Bill and Cindi are keen travelers, enjoying hiking experiences across the continents. I wish Bill and Cindi all the best in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 17–19.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes on #17, yes on #18, no on #19.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN PITSTICK

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Pitstick who is retiring as the Director of Planning and Development from the City of North Richland Hills.

As Director, Mr. Pitstick was responsible for all of the city's development activities, including planning and zoning as well as direction of building inspections. These responsibilities for comprehensive planning, strategic development and redevelopment included revitalization of Boulevard 26, expansion of Loop 820, future commuter rail station planning and gas well regulations.

Under his leadership, the City of North Richland Hills was presented with the "Certificate of Achievement for Planning Excellence" by the Texas Chapter of the American Planning Association. The annual award recognizes "a commitment to professional planning by City Administration, Elected and Appointed Officials and exemplary professional standards demonstrated by the Planning Staff."

Mr. Pitstick is a graduate of the University of Texas at Arlington with a Bachelor's Degree in Communications and a Master's in Urban Affairs. With a career spanning over 30 years of service, his retirement from North Richland Hills was preceded by his service in key positions with the cities of Hurst, Wylie, Arlington, Lancaster and Irving.

I am honored to represent Mr. Pitstick and the City of North Richland Hills in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I gladly join the City and the appreciative citizens of the 26th Congressional District and across North Texas whom he has dutifully served throughout his career.

RECOGNIZING MR. BILL MISCHKE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Bill Mischke, a dedicated Scouter, mentor to countless youth and one of my first merit badge counselors. As the director for Camp Ockanickon, Bill ensured each Boy Scout troop had a fulfilling experience at the camp fires, the mess hall was well stocked and each counselor was prepared for the rigors the summer would bring. Additionally, he oversaw the implementation of the GE Betz Science Center, the first such center in the United States which provides an opportunity for scouts to earn STEM based merit badges. After a successful career with the Bucks County Council, Bill has moved on to spend more time with his family but has continued to impact the lives of our future leaders as the Director of Program Experience with the DelMarVa Council. I want to congratulate him on a successful life committed to the tenants of the Scout Oath and Law and wish him happiness in all his future endeavors. I yield back.

HONORING PETRA C. KAATZ

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Petra C. Kaatz, the National President of the Jewish War Veterans Department of Florida Ladies Auxiliary. Her diligence on behalf of our men and women in uniform is a testament to her dedication to our country, and she rightfully deserves our recognition and admiration.

Petra Kaatz started a long and fulfilling career as a member of the Long Island Civil Air Patrol, where she became a flight nurse and ran a stewardess training program for female cadets. At the age of 22, she became the head nurse of a medical surgical unit and later served as PTA President at United Cerebral Palsy of Queens and Children's Rehabilitation Center. She became President of the Queens Hospital Center Community Advisory Board and served as a representative for the United Nations Year of the Disabled. She also established and ran a Cub Scout pack for disabled children at the Henry Viscardi School in Albertson, New York and was editor of the PTA newsletter.

Petra joined the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America Ladies Auxiliary in 1994 and has been an active member ever since. Before becoming National President of the JWVA, she served as Queens County President, Department of New York President, and the chairman of various auxiliary, county, and department JWVA committees. She is a member of the Advisory Board of the national JWVA and life-member of the Ladies Auxiliary.

Representing a district home to veterans of every major conflict since World War II, I know

very well the sacrifices that our military families have made for our country. Petra Kaatz's commitment to honor our military and their families should serve as an inspiration for us all, and I have no doubt she will continue to inspire South Floridians to live by her example.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 24, on agreeing to amendment number two to H.R. 185 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

PASTOR DAN Q. CARR

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor Pastor Dan Q. Carr of South Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District, on the occasion of the pastor's 30th anniversary of ministry at Faith Baptist Church of Gulfport.

Born in 1962, Pastor Carr found himself called to preach at a young age. He surrendered to that call on January 17, 1985, and became pastor of Faith Baptist Church on that same day. On Sunday, January 18, 2015, his flock of family and friends will join together to honor Pastor Carr's 30 years of faithful stewardship.

On that fateful day in 1985, Faith Baptist Church began with nine dedicated members and since has grown to a congregation of over one thousand.

That type of growth, along with a steadfast pastor like Dan Carr, has allowed Faith Baptist Church to become a community leader of faith ministry and outreach. In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in 2005, Faith Baptist opened its doors as a relief station where thousands of Gulf Coast survivors found comfort, hope, and needed supplies in those troubled and uncertain times.

Pastor Carr is married to his lovely wife Mickey, and together they share nine children and eleven grandchildren. Mississippi, Gulfport, and the Fourth Congressional District are blessed by the continued ministry of Pastor Dan Carr.

I congratulate Pastor Dan Carr on his 30th anniversary and wish the Faith Baptist Church family continued growth and success in ministry for many more years to come.

TRIBUTE TO MR. DAN FAGER

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Dan Fager on his retirement with thirty-five years of service with Chevron Corporation.

Dan was born and raised in Topeka, Kansas, and he graduated from Topeka West High School in 1970. After high school he attended the University of Kansas for two years. He then transferred to Michigan State University and graduated in 1974 with a degree in Criminal Justice. Dan was a police officer in Baltimore, Maryland for one year before heading back to the University of Kansas Law School, where he obtained a Juris Doctor degree in 1977. Dan lived in Denver right after law school where he worked as a law clerk for the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Dan Fager began his career with Chevron in September of 1980 as a Land Representative in the Denver office. In 1985, he became District Supervisor for Land. Dan then moved to Washington, DC as the Upstream Representative in 1988 on a "temporary" assignment. That temporary assignment soon morphed into his permanent placement.

Fager quickly became a highly respected and effective lobbyist in Washington, DC establishing Chevron as a go-to company on Capitol Hill. His word was his bond and his fact-based approach and commitment to integrity made him indispensable to Chevron and the people in Washington with whom he worked.

His accomplishments are numerous, including the Unocal acquisition for Chevron, first preserving Chevron's right to operate in Burma and then later helping to lift the sanctions that allowed the U.S. to normalize the commercial relationship. He also played a key role ensuring that U.S. tax policy encouraged U.S. investment in oil and gas.

As the head of Chevron's federal affairs team, Dan managed a staff of four. While his tendency to play the "devil's advocate" could sometimes frustrate the team, they agree that his challenges helped them sharpen their lobbying skills.

Anyone who knows Dan will describe him as a true gentleman with a bi-partisan spirit. He is well respected for both his knowledge on issues and his calm and kind demeanor. He is a consummate professional, with a warm sense of humor and strong work ethic. I am proud to call him a personal friend.

I congratulate Dan on his retirement and thank him for his diligent service to the energy industry. I wish him all the best that retirement has to offer.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took of-

fice, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is 18,086,946,763,085.79. We've added \$7,460,069,714,172.71 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING ALITHER MAE STEPHENS

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alither Mae Stephens of Copperas Cove, Texas as she celebrates her 100th birthday on January 15, 2015. Even with a century of living behind her, she remains a vibrant part of her growing central Texas community.

Born in Cassatt, South Carolina, Alither kept her southern heritage alive when she moved to Copperas Cove. Devoted to family, Alither and her beloved Edward had one daughter, eight grandchildren, and numerous great-grandchildren. She knows the keys to a long life are eating healthy, staying positive, and remaining active. Alither continues to cook for herself and church, bowling, and civic duties help fill her days.

In her century of living, Alither witnessed her nation's brave soldiers defend freedom on foreign shores, watched a humble midwesterner take mankind's first steps on another world, and marveled at technological advances beyond any of her dreams. She listened to the soaring words of a southern minister as he worked to bring equality to all Americans and she saw people of all races, creeds, and backgrounds join together to make our nation a beacon of hope and freedom. Alither saw how America has been defined by extraordinary men and women who fought for a country brave enough to confront its past imperfections and hopeful enough to embrace a better tomorrow.

The City of Copperas Cove, Texas proclaimed January 15, 2015 as Alither Mae Stephens Day, a fitting tribute to an amazing lady who has lived a long life, blessing all she has come into contact with along the way. I join her family and friends in celebrating Alither as we wish her the happiest of birthdays and nothing but health and prosperity in the years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 19 on Monday, January 12th, 2015, my son underwent emergency surgery for appendicitis. For that reason, I was unable to travel to Washington, DC, in time for floor votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. LORI A. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT OF THE LACKAWANNA COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Lori A. Williams, who will be honored as the 137th President of the Lackawanna County Medical Society during its Annual Presidential Reception on Saturday, January 24. Dr. Williams has brought her training and education to the task of providing and improving health care in Eynon, Lackawanna County, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Williams is an alumnus of the University of Scranton and Hahneman Medical School. She completed her internship and residency at MacDill AFB in Biloxi, Mississippi. Dr. Williams is board certified in internal medicine. She served three years as a staff internist at MacDill AFB in Tampa, Florida. After serving as a major in the Air Force, Dr. Williams returned home to northeast Pennsylvania.

Upon returning to Eynon, Dr. Williams set up a private practice where she has been a driving force in the Lackawanna medical community. Throughout her career, Dr. Williams has provided exceptional medical care and served as a leader in her field. An outspoken advocate for fellow physicians, she has served on the House of Delegates of the Pennsylvania Medical Society. Dr. Williams has also served as the Society's chief spokesperson on patient rights and quality of care issues.

It is a great honor to recognize Dr. Lori Williams for her work in the medical field. I am grateful for her leadership and advocacy in the Lackawanna medical community. May she continue to achieve excellence in providing care to the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE CITIZENS' STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS AN ENTITY OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, SHOULD ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN HONOR OF THE HOLIDAY OF DIWALI

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the House Resolution Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, as an entity of the United States Postal Service, should issue a commemorative stamp in honor of the holiday of Diwali. I am proud to be joined in this effort by my colleagues Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD, Congressman MIKE HONDA, Congresswoman GRACE MENG, and Congressman AMI BERA.

The five-day "festival of lights," Diwali celebrates the triumph of good over evil, light over dark, and knowledge over ignorance. This festive and important Indian holiday is celebrated by billions across the globe. Despite the significance of this holiday to many Americans, the United States Postal Service has not yet recognized Diwali with a commemorative stamp, as it has with other major religious and cultural holidays such as Christmas, Kwanzaa, Hanukkah, and Eid.

As one of the world's oldest religious holidays, Diwali has survived political, economic and social changes throughout history, while always carrying the universal symbolism of the victory of light, goodness, knowledge and truth. It is long overdue that we honor this significant holiday with a postage stamp of its own.

HONORING CHIEF RICHARD
MELTON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Napa Police Department (NPD) Chief Richard Melton upon his retirement. Capping off a long and impressive career in law enforcement, Chief Melton devoted the last ten years to serving and protecting our community as Chief of Police.

Before coming to Napa, Chief Melton was the Chief of Police for both Farmington and Los Alamos, New Mexico Police Departments. Upon assuming the position of Chief of Police in Napa in 2004, Chief Melton immediately began improving the NPD's relationship with the community as well as both the level of professionalism and education within the NPD.

Chief Melton made it a priority for the NPD to forge a better working relationship with members of the homeless population in our community. As a result, the number of calls involving homeless persons decreased by 50 percent and the number of homeless persons arrested dropped by 50 percent. Chief Melton also worked to improve the NPD's interactions with those in our community who suffer from mental health issues by bringing a part-time Napa County Mental Health Worker to the NPD. As Chief, Richard Melton recognized the importance of compassion, efficiency and professionalism when working with all members of our community.

Chief Melton made significant progress in raising the level of education within the NPD. He always encouraged and supported his employees to take advantage of training and educational opportunities. He also raised the level of formal education for employees at the supervisory and managerial levels. Chief Melton made a concerted effort to increase the level of professionalism within the NPD during his tenure, while still remaining approachable and receptive to his employees.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Melton's career is nothing short of impressive. On behalf of a grateful community, I wish him a most enjoyable retirement.

IN HONOR OF TASSOS
EFSTRATIADES, ESQ.

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tassos Efstratiades, Esq. of Cherry Hill, New Jersey for his achievements, contributions, and service to the people of New Jersey and its Hellenic community.

Born in Athens, Greece, Mr. Efstratiades' life has been an inspiration to the citizens of South Jersey. After coming to the United States, he graduated from Villanova University with a law degree and a Master's degree in International Relations. Over his more than three decades practicing law, Mr. Efstratiades has published numerous law articles and now serves as the co-chair of the Philadelphia Bar Association's Banking Committee.

Mr. Efstratiades also served the people of New Jersey in a number of civic posts. He was a close advisor to Governor James Florio, served as a board member of the New Jersey Economic Development Authority, and as chairman of the Governor's Commission on International Trade among several other positions. Currently, he is serving as a member of the New Jersey Health Care Administration Board.

Mr. Efstratiades is a pillar of New Jersey's Hellenic community. He was one of the founders of the Greek American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, and served not only as the first chairman of its board, but later as its president as well. He was instrumental in the creation of the Hellenic Federation of New Jersey and, after being elected its first president, he worked tirelessly to promote the interests of the Greek Orthodox Church and the Hellenic community in New Jersey. In recognition of his efforts, Mr. Efstratiades was made an Archon of the Ecumenical Patriarchate by His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I.

Mr. Speaker, Tassos Efstratiades, Esq. is a great man who exemplifies the American spirit. I join the Hellenic Federation and all of New Jersey in honoring the achievements of this exceptional man.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 17 on Monday, January 12th, 2015, my son underwent emergency surgery for appendicitis. For that reason, I was unable to travel to Washington, DC, in time for floor votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

TRIBUTE TO FIRE CHIEF MATT
SHOBERT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose commitment and contributions to the City of Murrieta, California are exceptional. Murrieta has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Murrieta Fire Chief, Matt Shobert, is one of these individuals. On Tuesday, January 20, 2015, Matt Shobert will be honored for his devoted and valiant service to the people of Murrieta.

Matt began his firefighting career in Tucson, Arizona, actively working his way to leading the fire department in Sedona, Arizona. He then brought his talent and leadership to the Hemet Fire Department, in which he served as Fire Chief for three years. Matt was then appointed as Murrieta's Fire Chief in March of 2011 in which he enthusiastically served the community for nearly four years.

Chief Shobert holds a Master Degree in Organizational Management, a Bachelor's Degree in Business Management and an Associate's Degree in Fire Science. In addition, Matt also graduated from the National Fire Academy's Executive Fire Officers' Program, has been accredited three times as a Chief Fire Officer Designee by the Center for Public Safety Excellence and has also been awarded membership into the Institution of Fire Engineers.

Chief Matt Shobert is retiring after incurring a devastating injury while doing what he enjoyed most, keeping the people of Murrieta safe. Throughout his tenure, Fire Chief Matt Shobert continued the distinguished history of the Murrieta Fire Department, working daily to improve the partnership held with the community and by enhancing the strong sense of camaraderie amongst the firefighters in his department.

Fire Chief Matt Shobert has been an excellent public servant who has consistently provided for the safety and well-being of the community of Murrieta. His legacy will serve as a shining example and constant reminder of what it means to be a public servant and I am proud to call Matt a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many are grateful for his service and salute him in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 2015 I missed recorded votes #17-19 due to travel delays.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were present for these votes.

On Roll Call #17, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 203).

On Roll Call #18, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 33).

On Roll Call #19, I would have voted YEA (Approval of the Journal).

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
LAREDO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a momentous occasion: the 100th anniversary of the Laredo Chamber of Commerce. For one century, this organization has been an instrumental and encouraging part of our community that wishes to see our city continue to grow and move forward.

The Laredo Chamber of Commerce was founded in April of 1915 in Laredo, Texas. It is the largest and oldest business organization in Laredo, representing over 650 members from numerous industries, including financial institutions, retailers, and service providers. It is a voluntary, not-for-profit association that inspires development in business and tourism, and is a voice for the local business community. The Chamber is also a member of other associations such as the American Chamber of Commerce, the Texas Association of Mexican American Chambers of Commerce, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It is in the Laredo Chamber of Commerce's mission statement that it is their duty to be proactive in order to further the success of the Laredo area while also strengthening the advancement of development in areas such as infrastructure and resources. In addition, the Chamber provides various workshops for community members, such as seminars, trainings, and informative customer service sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the Laredo Chamber of Commerce for their hard work and endless effort in improving our community these past 100 years. I thank you for this time.

HONORING DEBORAH MAYER

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the Committee on Ethics, and along with my colleague, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, the Ranking Member, I rise today to congratulate our departing Director of Investigations, Deborah Mayer, on her new position as staff director for the Senate Ethics Committee, and to thank her for her service to the House. Her new position continues a career dedicated to public service, which includes not only her work for the House, but also her prior work as a prosecutor with the Justice Department, and her 16-years of service in the JAG Corps of the United States Navy and Naval Reserves. Her dedication to public service, as well as her keen

legal mind, will serve the Senate well, as they have served this body for the last several years. Their gain is our loss, and we thank her deeply for her service to this House.

HONORING DEBORAH MAYER

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank Deborah Mayer for her service to the Committee on Ethics as its Director of Investigations. Since 2011, Ms. Mayer has lent her experience as a skilled lawyer and manager to the Committee's important work of enforcing the House ethics rules. She managed a team of attorneys and investigators that successfully handled a busy docket of investigations.

During that time, she provided wise counsel to the Committee Members, guiding us through complicated issues and difficult choices. She instilled in her team a strong sense of the value of public service and a dedication to finding the truth, with fairness and impartiality. Deb's entire career has been dedicated to public service—as a paramedic, in uniform, and as an attorney.

Although she is leaving the House, she will continue her impressive record of public service as staff director for the Senate Ethics Committee. As she begins her new role, we pause to note that we will miss her leadership and her talents, but we know she will remain our friend. Congratulations, Deb, and good luck.

SHARON MENDOZA DOUGHTY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Sharon Mendoza Doughty, who passed away on November 19, 2014 following a long battle with cancer. A pioneering rancher, conservationist, teacher, winemaker and a natural leader, Ms. Doughty was a positive force within the local community.

Sharon Doughty grew up on her parents' historic B Ranch on the Point Reyes Peninsula. After the passing of her second husband, Bill Bianchini Jr., in the early 1980s, she took over the daily operations of their 800-acre dairy. Transitioning from a career as an accountant and teacher, Sharon Doughty became a full-time rancher with the help of her close family and friends.

Through her comprehensive knowledge of the dairy trade, Ms. Doughty became a natural leader within the North Bay dairy community and leaves behind a long legacy of positive impacts. The depth of her commitment to Marin County agriculture united fellow ranchers and helped to propel their products into national markets. A dedicated advocate for the preservation of local agricultural lands, Ms. Doughty served two terms as the president of

the Marin Agricultural Land Trust and one term as a member of the California Coastal Commission. She selflessly devoted her time and expertise to the Marconi Conference Center in Marshall and 4-H. Among her many honors, in 2007, Ms. Doughty was named the "Woman of the Year" for California's 6th Assembly District for her exceptional community leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Sharon Doughty's life teaches us that one woman can make a substantial difference. Her efforts will not soon be forgotten as much of her legacy lives on all around us in Marin County and beyond. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband Steve; daughters Kathleen von Raesfeld and Karen Taylor; brothers Joseph Mendoza Jr. and James Mendoza; grandchildren Audrey and Nina von Raesfeld, Camilla, William Joseph, and Eva Taylor; and nephew Will Clark.

STOPPING OBAMA'S AMNESTY

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, America is a nation of immigrants. Since the earliest days of our nation, countless generations have come from around the world to build a better life here for themselves, their children and their families.

But we are also a nation built on the rule of law, and those who enter our country illegally disregard those laws.

Illegal immigration is an injustice to every single person who followed the proper procedure when they came to the United States, and in an age of international terrorism and global pandemics, it presents a serious national security risk.

What we don't need right now is amnesty. Instead, we need strict border security and the proper enforcement of the laws we already have on the books.

Unfortunately, our president does not feel the same way.

Upon discovering he could not get support from Congress, he decided to circumvent the legislative branch through executive action and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants.

He disregarded both the will of the American people and the separation of powers that our founding fathers laid out for our government.

By ignoring the core parts of our democracy, President Obama has shamefully overstepped his Constitutional authority.

A nation is nothing without total control over the sovereignty of its borders, and this executive action has only made the situation worse by offering a powerful incentive for more people to enter illegally.

Make no mistake: I am and always will be 100 percent opposed to blanket amnesty for illegal immigrants.

In the last election, the American people sent a message and elected Republicans to a majority in both the House and Senate.

Congress is now in a much stronger position to prevent this amnesty from being put in place, and we are working hard for the people to stop it.

That is why I am proud to stand here today with my colleagues to put a halt to this outrageous example of executive overreach, and to tell this president that he is not above the law.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUEBLO GARDENS NEIGHBORHOOD DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BREAKFAST

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the Pueblo Gardens Neighborhood Association's Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Breakfast on the occasion of its 25th Anniversary this Saturday, January 17, 2015.

This breakfast tradition was established in Tucson in 1990 by community activists John McNair and Edwina Gomez along with others to honor the great civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. They are working to keep his dream of fair and equitable treatment alive by fundraising for at-risk neighborhood youth to help them achieve their own dreams. In turn, youth are asked to perform community service projects that benefit the city of Tucson. In 1997, long-time community activist, James E. Christopher became Chairman of the program. As Chairman for the past eighteen years, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Breakfast has increased in attendance from thirteen people in its first breakfast to an average of one hundred and seventy-five in current years.

Pueblo Gardens' Martin Luther King, Jr. Breakfast has the distinguished honor of being the sole neighborhood in Tucson to attract city, county, state, and federal dignitaries, along with radio, television and newspaper coverage for an event of its kind.

Dr. King's dream has started to come to light with the election of an African-American president, Latina woman sworn into the Supreme Court, the acknowledgement of gay members in the military, and so forth. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Breakfast funding has enabled many youth to graduate from high school and continue on to receive post-secondary education certificates and degrees. Many of these youth have become part of the Tucson workforce and are valuable assets to the community.

Finally, I must acknowledge the cast of dedicated volunteer board members who work diligently to fundraise and continue the breakfast tradition while working through the Pueblo Garden Neighborhood Association, a designated 501(c)(3) organization.

Congratulations and best wishes to the Pueblo Gardens Neighborhood Association in Tucson as we join them to celebrate on January 17, 2015, for its 25th Anniversary of their Martin Luther King, Jr. Breakfast. I thank the Pueblo Gardens MLK Breakfast Committee for their steadfast determination to keep Dr. King's dream alive while helping youth achieve their goals.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACHIEVEMENT OF MAJOR WILLIAM BRURING

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the career of Major William E. Bruring. Major Bruring began his career with the Civil Air Patrol as a high school student in December of 1941. He joined the organization right after the Pearl Harbor attacks, when his mentor, Roy E. Kumm, began Civil Air Patrol organizational meetings in the 32nd Red Arrow Wisconsin U.S. Army Division. Major Bruring was just 18 years old when he joined.

In Wisconsin, the Civil Air Patrol served many purposes. They towed aerial targets for student pilots, performed pre-flight training and handled other home front duties, such as war drives, collecting supplies and assembling medical kits to be deployed overseas to American troops in need of relief. Major Bruring also served as a paratrooper in the Army during World War II, volunteering for service when he graduated high school in 1943, and served in the Navy during the Korean War. When he returned home, he continued to serve in the Civil Air Patrol, and continues to serve in the organization today. Every Memorial Day, Major Bruring helps to coordinate ceremonies honoring America's veterans.

On December 10th, 2014, Major Bruring was honored with the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest distinction awarded to civilians in the United States, for his dedication and service in the Civilian Air Patrol during World War II. He is but one example of the brave men and women of Wisconsin who serve their country.

It is with great pleasure that I extend these words of congratulations, as well as words of sincere appreciation, for all that Major Bruring has done for western and central Wisconsin. His service, both as a civilian in the Civil Air Patrol and as a soldier in World War II and Korea, are worthy of the highest praise, and he is certainly deserving of the Congressional Gold Medal. I wish him the best of luck in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY HO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. Anthony Chung-Yi Ho. Mr. Ho has served with distinction as Deputy Director of the Congressional Liaison Division of the Taiwan Economic and Cultural Representative Office. His leadership and expertise have been invaluable in working with me and my staff and many other congressional offices on Capitol Hill. I want to congratulate him for moving back to his home country of Taiwan, and thank him for his many years of service.

Mr. Ho has worked closely with my staff for many years on many matters related to U.S.-

Taiwan relations. Thanks in large part to his efforts, my staff and I have engaged many times on matters important to Taiwanese-American interests and our shared values of democracy, freedom and human rights.

In addition, over the years the State of Idaho has maintained a fruitful relationship with the Taiwan Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Under Mr. Ho's guidance, our office has cultivated a valuable relationship with the Taiwan Foreign Ministry, which has benefited both Idaho and Taiwan greatly.

Taiwan is one of Idaho's top trading partners, and many sectors of the Idaho economy benefit from the strong ties between the U.S. and Taiwan. Mr. Ho has fully dedicated himself to strengthening this relationship, and my constituents and I are very grateful for his efforts in this regard.

I commend Anthony Ho for his dedication to the enduring friendship and respect between the U.S. and Taiwan. It has been an honor and a pleasure to work with him, and we will greatly miss him when he leaves Washington, D.C. I join many of my colleagues and their staffs in recognizing the devotion of Mr. Anthony Chung-Yi Ho and for his exceptional service and immense contributions to strengthening relations between Taiwan and the United States.

HONORING TONY PADILLA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tony Padilla, a community icon, loving father and proud New Mexican.

Tony was a lifelong resident of Los Padillas, a community he cherished in the South Valley of Bernalillo County. Tony never forgot his roots; he lived them every day of his life. He had a fiery passion, deep conviction and heartfelt desire to improve the lives of his friends and neighbors.

Many vividly recall his many years at the Bernalillo County Fire Commission where he could be found marking the scene of a fire and training young firefighters on necessary skills they would need on the job. He always had a presence in the community; whether it was helping families grieve the tragic loss of a loved one, supporting the Rio Grande High School baseball team and Los Padillas Community Center, or standing up for his fellow South Valley residents.

A piece of Tony will live on forever in all of us; that characteristic "Hey neighbor" from across the yard followed by a vibrant smile, those routine visits to the Post Office for a brisk and engaging conversation, the fun and laughter at the church Fiesta, the insightful life lessons and the endless love he had for everyone he met.

Tony demonstrates the impact that one individual can have on an entire community and serves as an inspiration for future generations of New Mexicans. His warmth, dedication and selflessness were felt by all. My thoughts and prayers are with family, friends and everyone

who experienced Tony's generosity and compassion. May the memory of Tony live on in our hearts.

29TH ANNIVERSARY OF REV. DR.
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. HOLIDAY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this year, the nation observes for the 29th time the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday.

Each year this day is set aside for Americans to celebrate the life and legacy of a man who brought hope and healing to America.

The Martin Luther King Holiday reminds us that nothing is impossible when we are guided by the better angels of our nature.

Dr. King's inspiring words filled a great void in our nation, and answered our collective longing to become a country that truly lived by its noblest principles.

Yet, Dr. King knew that it was not enough just to talk the talk; he had to walk the walk for his words to be credible.

And so we commemorate on this holiday the man of action, who put his life on the line for freedom and justice every day.

We honor the courage of a man who endured harassment, threats and beatings, and even bombings.

We commemorate the man who went to jail 29 times to achieve freedom for others, and who knew he would pay the ultimate price for his leadership, but kept on marching and protesting and organizing anyway.

Dr. King once said that we all have to decide whether we "will walk in the light of creative altruism or the darkness of destructive selfishness.

"Life's most persistent and nagging question," he said, is "what are you doing for others?"

And when Dr. King talked about the end of his mortal life in one of his last sermons, on February 4, 1968 in the pulpit of Ebenezer Baptist Church, even then he lifted up the value of service as the hallmark of a full life:

I'd like somebody to mention on that day Martin Luther King, Jr. tried to give his life serving others, he said. I want you to say on that day, that I did try in my life . . . to love and serve humanity.

We should also remember that the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was, above all, a person who was always willing to speak truth to power. There is perhaps no better example of Dr. King's moral integrity and consistency than his criticism of the Vietnam War being waged by the Johnson Administration, an administration that was otherwise a friend and champion of civil and human rights.

Martin Luther King, Jr. was born in Atlanta, Georgia on January 15, 1929.

Martin's youth was spent in our country's Deep South, then run by Jim Crow and the Klu Klux Klan.

For young African-Americans, it was an environment even more dangerous than the one they face today.

A young Martin managed to find a dream, one that he pieced together from his readings—in the Bible, and literature, and just about any other book he could get his hands on.

And not only did those books help him educate himself, but they also allowed him to work through the destructive and traumatic experiences of blatant discrimination, and the discriminatory abuse inflicted on himself, his family, and his people.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. that we celebrate today could have turned out to be just another African-American who would have had to learn to be happy with what he had, and what he was allowed.

But he learned to use his imagination and his dreams to see right through those "White Only" signs—to see the reality that all men, and women, regardless of their place of origin, their gender, or their creed, are created equal.

Through his studies, Dr. King learned that training his mind and broadening his intellect effectively shielded him from the demoralizing effects of segregation and discrimination.

Dr. King was a dreamer. His dreams were a tool through which he was able to lift his mind beyond the reality of his segregated society, and into a realm where it was possible that white and black, red and brown, and all others live and work alongside each other and prosper.

But the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was not an idle daydreamer. He shared his visions through speeches that motivated others to join the nonviolent effort to lift themselves from poverty and isolation and create a new America where equal justice and institutions were facts of life.

In the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are Created Equal."

At that time and for centuries to come, African-Americans were historically, culturally, and legally excluded from inclusion in that declaration.

Dr. King's "I Have a Dream" Speech, delivered 51 years ago, on August 28, 1963, was a clarion call to each citizen of this great nation that we still hear today.

His request was simply and eloquently conveyed—he asked America to allow of its citizens to live out the words written in its Declaration of Independence and to have a place in this nation's Bill of Rights.

The 1960s were a time of great crisis and conflict. The dreams of the people of this country were filled with troubling images that arose like lava from the nightmares of violence and the crises they had to face, both domestically and internationally.

It was the decade of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Vietnam War, and the assassinations of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Malcolm X, Presidential Candidate Robert Kennedy, and the man we honor here today.

Dr. Martin Luther King's dream helped us turn the corner on civil rights.

It started with a peaceful march for suffrage that started in Selma, Alabama on March 7, 1965—a march that ended with violence at the hands of law enforcement officers as the marchers crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

But the dream did not die there.

Dr. King led the Montgomery Bus Boycott, begun with Rosa Parks, that lasted for 381 days, and ended when the United States Supreme Court ruled that it was unconstitutional to discriminate on account of race in the field of interstate public transportation.

Dr. King used nonviolent tactics to protest against Jim Crow laws in the South and he organized and led demonstrations for desegregation, labor and voting rights.

When the life of Dr. Martin Luther King was stolen from us, he was still a very young man, only 39 years old.

People remember that Dr. King died in Memphis, but few remember why he was there.

On that fateful day in 1968 Dr. King came to Memphis to support a strike by the city's sanitation workers.

The sanitation workers there had recently formed a chapter of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees to demand better wages and working conditions.

But the city refused to recognize their union, and when the 1,300 employees walked off their jobs the police broke up the rally with mace and police batons.

It was then that union leaders invited Dr. King to Memphis.

Despite the danger he might face entering such a volatile situation, it was an invitation he could not refuse.

Not because he longed for danger, but because the labor movement was intertwined with the civil rights movement for which he had given up so many years of his life.

The death of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., will never overshadow his life.

That is his legacy as a dreamer and a man of action.

It is a legacy of hope, tempered with peace. It is a legacy not quite yet fulfilled.

I hope that Dr. King's vision of equality under the law is never lost to us, who in the present, toil in times of unevenness in our equality.

For without that vision—without that dream—we can never continue to improve on the human condition.

For those who have already forgotten, or whose vision is already clouded with the fog of complacency, I would like to recite the immortal words of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former shareholders will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but for the content of their character.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with words of interposition and nullification—one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough place will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

Dr. King's dream did not stop at racial equality; his ultimate dream was one of human equality and dignity.

Dr. King believed that freedom and justice was the birthright of every individual in America.

It is for us, the living, to continue that fight today and forever, following in the great spirit that inspired the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HONORING KYLE EAN LONG

HON. MARK DESAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Kyle Ean Long, who was born in Sacramento on June 14, 1987, and died on January 10, 2015, at the very young age of 27. Kyle, the son of James and Tina Long, was born and raised in Sacramento, attended local public schools, and was a graduate of California State University, Sacramento.

I have known Kyle for three years, beginning when he came to work in my California Capitol office in January of 2012 as an intern. Kyle swiftly became known as "Sunshine" for his positive attitude and infectious happiness. Kyle then worked for Assembly member Tony Mendoza. After his work in the Assembly, Kyle worked for me as a Legislative Aide for two years as an integral team member, a role that he thrived in.

Kyle was dependable and resourceful team member. As a college student, Kyle worked diligently towards a career in public policy. While attending college at Sacramento State University, Kyle honed his extraordinary people skills at Chicory Coffee in Sacramento, and became a familiar face to those working in the State Legislature. Kyle was a master of working with people of all backgrounds and of bringing people together.

Kyle's passion for public policy and his enthusiasm for bringing people together made him a highly effective Legislative Aide. During his tenure in the State Legislature, Kyle successfully steered bills through the legislative process that helped to provide counseling services for rape victims, to keep pesticides out of California schools, to provide school supplies for homeless children, and to close loopholes to keep drunk drivers off of the roads.

In addition to being a valued colleague, Kyle was an important member of the State Senate family, a beloved friend, and an integral member of the community. Kyle made sure to have dinner with his grandmother every Tuesday, was always there to support his friends, and was looked up to by his two siblings and many cousins.

Kyle was a committed public servant who considered his public policy work a privilege

and took on his responsibilities with a strong sense of duty. He was a dependable, resourceful team player who was a beloved colleague with a bright future ahead of him. Kyle's tragic loss is inexplicable, and I send my deepest condolences to his family, friends, and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life of Kyle Long. The world is a brighter and better place because of him.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on January 13, 2015. Had I been present I would have voted "No" on Roll Call 20, "No" on Roll Call 21, and, "Yes" on Roll Call 22, "No" on Roll Call 23, "Yes" on Roll Call 24, "Yes" on Roll Call 25, "Yes" on Roll Call 26, "Yes" on Roll Call 27, and "No" on Roll Call 28.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent on January 6th, as I was attending the funeral of former New York Governor Mario Cuomo. Had I been present I would have voted in the following manner:

Roll Call #1 Present.

Roll Call #2 For Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

Roll Call #3 No on Tabling the Motion to Refer.

Roll Call #4 No on Ordering the Previous Question.

Roll Call #5 Yes on the Motion to Commit with Instructions.

Roll Call #6 No on Adopting Rules for the 114th Congress.

Roll Call #7 Yes on H.R. 22, the Hire More Heroes Act of 2015.

DOLLY MAE NAVE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dolly Nave, who passed away on December 23, 2014, at her home in San Rafael, California. As a dedicated community organizer and leader, Ms. Nave helped to transform recreational facilities in the City of San Rafael for the benefit of countless Marin County residents.

In the 1980s, on behalf of Ms. Nave's eight children and the children in the local community, Ms. Nave rallied the support of local con-

tractors and volunteers to donate the equipment, labor, and funding necessary to breathe new life into public schools and city-owned recreation fields and facilities. Ms. Nave continued to improve recreational facilities throughout her life, and founded the Marin Bocce Federation in Albert Park, San Rafael.

Ms. Nave was a skillful community leader who processed the necessary organizational skills to always put the pieces in place and get the job done. She was the project manager for the construction of Marin Community Fields in Larkspur and was in the forefront of numerous projects at San Rafael High, initiating the successful "Save Night Football" campaign. A volunteer at Albert Park for 35 years, she became known as the "Angel of Albert Park" because she was one of its foremost advocates. In 1993, she was a founding board member and construction chair of the Marin Bocce Federation in Albert Park. The six bocce courts are now used by more than 1,000 players a week.

Ms. Nave's work did not go unnoticed, and her longstanding commitment to the others was recognized by numerous awards including San Rafael Citizen of the Year, the Marv Lechner Award from San Rafael High, and Woman of the Year for California's Third Senate District in 1991. She was also one of the first women to be inducted into the Marin Athletic Foundation High School Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, Dolly Nave's selfless efforts have benefited countless residents of San Rafael and Marin County. Her legacy will not soon be forgotten as her accomplishments can be seen all around the City of San Rafael. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband, Rich; three sons, Richard Jr., Paul and Tom; and three daughters, Sheri, Kathy and Patti; as well as her forty-two grandchildren and great grandchildren.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 18 on Monday, January 12th, 2015, my son underwent emergency surgery for appendicitis. For that reason, I was unable to travel to Washington, DC, in time for floor votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 15, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 20

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by

the committee during the 114th Congress.

SR-253

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, January 16, 2015

The House met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MESSER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 16, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LUKE MESSER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Thomas Petri, Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty ever-living God, in whose hand lies every human heart and the rights of all peoples, graciously receive the prayers we pour out to You for our country, that, through the wisdom of its leaders and the integrity of its citizens, harmony and justice may be assured and lasting prosperity come with peace.

Look with favor, we pray, on this House, and, in Your mercy, we beg You to grant that its Members may be Your instruments for us and for the whole world, that the flourishing of peoples, the establishment of peace, and the freedom of religion may, through Your gift, be made secure.

Mercifully pour out upon these men and women, O God, the spirit of Your wisdom, that they may decide everything for the well-being and peace of all, and may they never turn aside from Your will.

We ask this through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Illinois
Mr. HIMES, Connecticut
Ms. SEWELL, Alabama
Mr. CARSON, Indiana
Ms. SPEIER, California
Mr. QUIGLEY, Illinois
Mr. SWALWELL, California
Mr. MURPHY, Florida

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, January 20, 2015, for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 20, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

72. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training FY 2014 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f) and (g); Public Law 87-256, section 112(f) and (g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

73. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuban Assets Control Regulations received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. A letter from the Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's interim final rule — Federal Awarding Agency Regulatory Implementation of Office of Management and Budget's Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards received January 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

75. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the An-

nual Operating Plan for Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2015, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1552(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

76. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, Oregon Inlet, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0987] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

77. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Safety/Security Zone Regulations; 2014 Tampa Bay; Captain of the Port St. Petersburg Zone, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0040] (RIN:1625-AA87) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

78. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule with request for comments — Elimination of the Air Traffic Control Tower Operator Certificate for Controllers Who Hold a Federal Aviation Administration Credential With a Tower Rating [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1000; Amdt. No. 65-56] (RIN: 2120-AK40) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. ELLMERS (for herself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 398. A bill to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCAUL (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 399. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

H.R. 400. A bill to require the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit reports on definitions of placement and recruitment fees for purposes of enabling compliance with the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 401. A bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 402. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. BASS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 403. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 404. A bill to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 37. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the recent terrorist attacks in Paris that resulted in the deaths of seventeen innocent persons and offering condolences to those personally affected by this cowardly act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. "To provide for the common defense," to

raise and support Armies," "to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 132: Mr. BRAT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. STEWART, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 140: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 158: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 169: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 181: Ms. BASS, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 223: Mr. DUFFY and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 224: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 225: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 228: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 300: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 304: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 344: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 351: Mr. McCAUL and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 354: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 390: Mr. EMMER and Mr. DUFFY.

H. Res. 11: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H. Res. 31: Mr. DUFFY.

SENATE—Friday, January 16, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, giver of good gifts, thank You for another day to serve You. Focus the attention of our Senators on Your will and enable them to discover what best pleases You. Help them to debate without quarrelling and to disagree without being disagreeable. Inspire them to become disciplined followers of Your purposes ever eager to obey Your commands. Guide, strengthen, and bless them until they reflect Your image of purity, honesty, humility, generosity, and love.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 33

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate is continuing to consider S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL are here this morning to manage debate, and there are several amendments pending. We will begin voting on those—and any amendments in the queue—around 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday afternoon.

I encourage all Senators who have not already done so to talk to the bill managers about scheduling a time to come down and offer their amendments.

It has taken a while to get going on this bill, and the last thing we need at this point is for Members who have been saying they want to have amendments to be reluctant to offer them.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are looking forward to welcoming President Obama to the Capitol on Tuesday. The State of the Union is a unique opportunity, not just for the President but for our entire country. If he lays out an agenda that corresponds to the message the voters delivered in November, it could signal a truly productive moment for our country.

In November the American people told us they are tired of Washington's dysfunction. They told us they are tired of Washington's prioritizing the concerns of powerful special interests over their own. They called for a Congress that functions again, and that is just what we have been working toward. They called for Congress to focus on jobs and reform, and that is what we have been doing.

They also called for President Obama to cooperate with Congress to enact a different and better reform agenda for the middle class. On that front, we have some distance to cover, but Tuesday can be a new day. This can be the moment the President pivots to a positive posture. This can be a day he promotes realistic reforms that focus on economic growth instead of spending more money than we have. We are eager for him to do so.

There is much we can accomplish for the American people if the President is willing to work with us. We will be looking for signs of that in the speech he delivers Tuesday night.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Markey/Baldwin amendment No. 13 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL Pipeline into the United States is used to reduce United States dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Portman/Shahen amendment No. 3 (to amendment No. 2), to promote energy efficiency.

Cantwell (for Franken) amendment No. 17 (to amendment No. 2), to require the use of iron, steel, and manufactured goods produced in the United States in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to an amendment offered by Senator McCain pertaining to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, popularly referred to as the Jones Act.

I will, of course, start by saying that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator McCain, has a distinguished record of support for our men and women in the military and cares deeply about our national security, but on this amendment I respectfully disagree with our chairman.

I wish to take a few minutes this morning to remind my colleagues why the Jones Act is an essential component of our national security policy and shipbuilding is a foundational component of American manufacturing.

The Jones Act requires that our maritime vessels engaged in shipping goods between U.S. ports must meet three requirements: They must be built in the United States, at least 75-percent owned by U.S. citizens, and operated by U.S. citizens. The Jones Act helps to shore up our national security by providing reliable sealift in times of war. It ensures our ongoing viability as an ocean power by protecting American shipbuilders. As a result, the Jones Act

provides solid, well-paying jobs for nearly half a million Americans from Virginia to Hawaii.

In short, the Jones Act promotes national security and American job creation. Therefore, I am unclear why some of my colleagues are opposed to this commonsense law. I don't say this simply as a Member from an island State where we depend on the reliability offered by American shippers for fresh food, energy, and other everyday goods, but I say this as a Senator who cares deeply about supporting our strong and growing middle class and creating American jobs.

First, shipbuilding is a major job-creating industry. According to the Maritime Administration, there were 107,000 people directly employed by roughly 300 shipyards across 26 States in 2013. Additionally, shipyards indirectly employed nearly 400,000 people across the country. This amendment would specifically knock out the Jones Act provision that requires that U.S.-flagged ships be built in the United States, jeopardizing good-paying, middle-class jobs. To me, that is reason enough to oppose this amendment.

Secondly, this is not the time to create the instability this amendment would directly cause. After struggling through tough times, America's shipbuilding industry is coming back. Both this Congress and the administration have long stressed the need for creating and keeping manufacturing jobs here at home in the United States. According to the Navy League, there are 15 tanker ships being built here in the United States right now and slated to join our U.S. flag fleet. These ships don't create quick-turnaround jobs but hundreds of thousands of well-paying, long-term manufacturing jobs. If these ships are not built here in U.S. shipyards by U.S. workers, where will they be built? Where will these jobs go? China? Other Asian countries? Europe? The shipbuilding industry in our country is rebounding.

Repealing the Jones Act is a step in the wrong direction. Instead of dismantling a policy that supports American jobs, Congress should be focused on doing more to promote and grow American jobs and American manufacturing.

Repealing the Jones Act's requirement to build ships here in the United States will unquestionably cost U.S. jobs and weaken our position as a manufacturing leader. Those are two strikes against the amendment.

The third and final strike is the fact that the amendment would undermine our national homeland security. The Jones Act's requirements—along with American shipbuilding and the maritime industries they underpin—provide American-built ships and crews for use by the Department of Defense in times of need. It is easy to see why the Navy and Coast Guard strongly oppose repeal of the Jones Act and all of its components.

The Defense Department has concluded:

We believe that the ability of the nation to build and maintain a U.S. flag fleet is in the national interest, and we also believe it is in the interest of the DOD for U.S. shipbuilders to maintain a construction capability for commercial vessels.

Therefore, there are three strikes against this amendment.

If adopted, the amendment would dismantle the Jones Act, costing American jobs, hurting American manufacturing, and undermining our national security. I ask my colleagues to stand with me—and I certainly ask the chair of the Armed Services Committee to change his mind on this amendment—and nearly half a million middle-class Americans and vote against this amendment if it is brought up for a vote.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I know my colleagues are coming to the floor to talk about various amendments. It is likely that on Tuesday we will start voting on at least the pending amendments we have discussed so far. I come to the floor today to talk about the proposal by TransCanada Corporation and about the fact that, obviously, there are some here who want to give an expedited approval to that and usurp the President, who needs to review this project in detail to make sure we understand the interests of various people, property owners, and people affected by the pipeline.

One particular issue in this debate is why Congress should be hurrying to give a special interest permitting go-ahead while the President still has issues to address and as do the local communities. I know many of my colleagues are going to come to the floor to talk about those special interest concerns, as well as the issues of energy efficiency, property rights, climate change, and a whole host of priorities. But I am here today to talk about an issue I think is particularly important, which is the fact that tar sands has a loophole and doesn't pay into the oilspill liability trust fund.

Both of my colleagues, Senator MARKEY and Senator WYDEN, are going to be putting forward amendments to close this loophole. As a country we have made sure the taxpayers aren't stuck with the tab of cleaning up oil spills. The principle behind that is to keep our waters safe and to keep our communities from paying the cost of this pollution. It means really to have

commonsense laws on the books providing that polluters pay for cleanup. So that is the principle that drives the oilspill liability trust fund. It is something we have had in place for a while.

Basically, what the oilspill liability trust fund means is simply that American taxpayers won't be left holding the bag for the responsibility of spills that happen. We currently in law have a loophole that means that companies that produce the tar sands don't have to pay into the trust fund. That is because they are considered as synthetic petroleum. So just by the definition, they basically have had a loophole. It is important to me, as the United States considers whether a pipeline should be built across our country that would include these tar sands, which is very thick and heavy material and it is often diluted with lighter oil so it can be easier to handle. But when the spills happen, and it spills in water as we saw with the Kalamazoo spill, it leaves a thicker oil behind that usually sinks to the bottom of the water. That makes it hugely expensive to clean up and really almost nearly impossible to clean up.

These concerns are driving us to make sure that as the United States and Canada continue to look at tar sands production, we are getting the technology in place to deal with this and to get the job done and to make sure that those who are liable for those kinds of spills are actually paying into a fund that would help clean up the mess.

That is why it is so important that the Senate take up action on one of these amendments, so that we will be paying into the oilspill liability trust fund for any pipeline that is carrying this crude material.

I want to go back to why this trust fund was created and why it was so important. The oilspill liability trust fund was created in 1986 as part of the Comprehensive Environmental Response and Liability Act. This bill was signed by President Reagan, but it took 4 more years and a major disaster before the country actually funded the oilspill liability trust fund, and that disaster was *Exxon Valdez*. My colleague from Alaska will be on the floor later today, and I am sure she could talk a lot about this issue as well. I had many conversations with the late Senator Ted Stevens about this issue, and there were various times when we increased payments into the oilspill liability trust fund. When one comes from the State of Washington and Pacific waters and when one comes from Alaska, how we clean up these oil spills is incredibly important to our economies.

What happened in 1989 is that an oil tanker hit a reef and ended up spilling 11 million gallons of crude oil. It didn't take long for those pristine waters of Prince William Sound in Alaska to be impacted. So the impacts of the *Exxon*

Valdez disaster were devastating not just to Prince William Sound but to the entire Pacific Northwest, and the total cost of that cleanup was \$2.5 billion.

Ten years ago, a Federal judge ordered Exxon to pay \$6.7 billion to thousands of Alaskans affected by that oil spill. Fishermen in the Northwest lost more than \$300 million as a result of that oil spill. At the time, the livelihood of individuals was impacted and, obviously, the wildlife was impacted. It killed sea otters, harbor seals, and approximately 250,000 birds. The images of all this wildlife are seared into our memories even 25 years after the spill.

When the gulf spill just recently happened, we revisited a lot of those issues because we wanted to make sure we were getting things right. It was very interesting to see the environmental effects years later and some of the things that still had not recuperated from the oil spill in Prince William Sound.

In 1990 Congress passed the Oil Spill Pollution Act, and it was signed into law by President Bush. It added sweeping improvements to the oil spill response and held parties responsible. It established the mechanism actually to invest in the oilspill liability trust fund. Specifically, the bill said: Let's have a per-barrel tax to raise the revenue for the fund. So today that is an 8 cents per-barrel tax on oil products.

As I mentioned, this was signed into law by President Bush, who specifically praised the funding of the oilspill liability trust fund. He said that "the prevention, response, liability, and compensation components fit together into a compatible and workable system that strengthens the protection of our environment."

The reason I am bringing that up is because if the oilspill liability trust fund was good enough for oil products promoted by a Republican President, then it ought to be good enough for us in Congress to add tar sands. That literally was just not thought of under the current definition because of the way the definition was written. Because it is a synthetic fuel, they have a loophole. It is a question whether we are going to close this loophole or whether we are going to let them pay zero into the trust fund.

The fund is used to pay for immediate cleanup costs and spills in navigable waters. This is a very important point. Some people would say: Well, aren't people just liable for their own mess, and why don't they just clean it up?

I can tell you that in trying to protect Puget Sound and trying to clean up the waters off the coast of Washington, you might think it would be easy to figure out where the oil came from. It is not. When you have a busy waterway like Puget Sound, and all of a sudden somebody sights an oil slick

or oil product in the water, they don't know how serious it is. It takes months and months, sometimes years, to figure out where the pollution came from.

Yes, in the case of *Exxon Valdez* we had a ship that hit a reef and caused a problem. But in many cases, sometimes you don't know where the spill is coming from. A lot of people will say: Well, it wasn't us. Or they start this process. An oil spill needs an immediate response, and that is why we established the oilspill liability trust fund—to have an immediate response so that we are not sitting around waiting for weeks and months to figure out who did the oil spill, and so somebody can start the process immediately and work with the Coast Guard to actually clean it up.

You would think this doesn't happen that frequently, but it happens a lot more frequently than people realize. That is why an immediate fund is important, and that is why everybody who is producing oil should pay into it. Yet there is a loophole in the law, so the per-barrel tax doesn't apply to tar sands.

In 2011 the IRS issued a ruling stating that the tar sands imported into the United States were not subject to the excise tax on petroleum. The ruling was actually based on a 1980 House Ways and Means Committee report that crude oil does not include tar sands. As I said earlier, it is considered synthetic. Therefore, according to the IRS, it is not subject to the tax.

We should simply clean this up and have those responsible for their mess also be responsible for paying in to clean it up. When the oilspill liability trust fund was established, it was intended to be a mechanism for all oil spills—not the definition of oil as a product.

Congress should fix this next week when we vote on this legislation and figure out exactly how to make sure the Commandant of the Coast Guard would have the tools to deal with this.

I, too, have concerns about the fact that we don't really have the tools yet to accurately clean up tar sands. When the Commandant of the Coast Guard was before a commerce hearing just a year ago—because I have a great deal of concern about the moving of this product on a variety of transportation means—I asked him about tar sands because the last thing we want to see is product out on our waterways. He said: Our technology is not as sophisticated when you have tar sands. They are heavier, they sink into the water, into the ocean bottom, so it is a challenge for us. Once it settles on the sea floor, our technology is lacking in that regard.

Basically, I am finding that some of the dirtiest oil out there does not pay into the oilspill trust fund, and we don't even have the mechanisms for cleaning up. Unfortunately, we learned

that lesson very hard in the 2010 Enbridge pipeline, which was owned by another Canadian company, along the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. It ruptured, and it spilled 1 million gallons of tar sands into the river.

This is a picture of that cleanup and the process, which was \$1.2 billion that was spent. So for those of you who don't know Kalamazoo, it was an incredible economic, environmental, and historic issue for the people of Michigan. The river was closed for business for 18 months after that spill. More than 35 miles of the river had to be off limits because it was difficult to clean up.

Today, 4 years later, they are still impacted. As I said, the cost was \$1.2 billion because they had to dredge the bottom of the river. So any oil spill of that magnitude is damaging. Yet, when we look at this issue, the fact that these tar sands were sinking to the bottom made that dredging even more serious.

It is the reason why we need to make sure these tar sands are taxed just as any other oil that is produced in the United States and pays into this trust fund. A Cornell University study found that "this spill affected the health of hundreds of residents, displaced residents, hurt businesses, and caused a loss of jobs" in Kalamazoo. This study is located online at: https://www.ilr.cornell.edu/sites/ilr.cornell.edu/files/GLI_Impact-of-Tar-Sands-Pipeline-Spills.pdf.

I think it is just the start of what the challenges will be for us when we allow this kind of tar sands development to move through the United States. Our spill responders are very skilled. First, they know we need to do everything we can to prevent spills, to begin with. They are developing technologies to respond to the case of an emergency. They are doing everything they can to use this trust fund.

So we need to make sure we are having those who are producing this product pay into the trust fund. We need to make sure we are closing this loophole. So my colleagues—as I said, Senator WYDEN and MARKEY—have been working on this issue for some time. Senator WYDEN, the ranking member on the Finance Committee, I know he feels very strongly they should be paying into the oil spill liability trust fund and paying their fair share of revenue. I know Senator MARKEY has worked on this issue in the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate.

So we need to make sure people understand that dredging is not good enough, that our country needs a plan, that we need not just to rush through this pipeline and basically to think that we have all of the technology, all of the methods, all of the appropriate emergency funds to clean this up. We need to make sure we are not sitting here arguing with a company—a Canadian company—that just wants us to

clean up the mess and leave the U.S. taxpayer paying the bill.

In fact, there was some debate in the Kalamazoo spill whether the Enbridge company had hit their liability cap and so the trust fund should pay for it, even though they never paid into the trust fund.

So are we going to let the American taxpayers clean up a Canadian oil mess at our expense—that we paid in—and everybody is affected by that? I think we should slow down this process and make sure we are getting things like the oil spill liability trust fund right and that we are getting this added to this legislation before it moves out of the Senate.

I know my colleagues will get a chance to look at this next week. As I said, we will probably start voting early next week on some of these amendments that are being offered. But I hope my colleagues will close these loopholes and make sure that the U.S. citizen and taxpayer is not left on the hook paying for oil spill responsibility that should be the responsibility of these individual companies. I know we are expecting some of our other colleagues to come to the floor shortly to speak on their amendments.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, when the new Congress opens there is a choice as to which issues we should start to work on. Would it be infrastructure jobs, clean energy jobs, a minimum-wage increase for all of America? No, no. That is not what the new majority decides to bring up. No. Instead, it is a Canadian oil export pipeline.

Next week I am going to offer an amendment that the Senate will consider to ask whether we will put Americans first or oil companies first, whether we will keep this oil and gasoline here for Americans or send it to foreign nations to help them instead.

If my amendment is defeated, it will make clear this is not an energy plan that is “all of the above,” it is oil above all.

My amendment says that if we build the Keystone Pipeline, we keep that oil here. We keep that gasoline here. We keep the diesel, the jet fuel, the heating oil. We keep it all here, because if we send it abroad, what are we doing? We are helping Canadian oil companies get a higher price for their oil. We are acting as the middlemen between dirty foreign oil and thirsty foreign markets.

Without my amendment, there is nothing in the bill or U.S. law that

would prevent this oil from being exported. Eighty percent of our refined fuel exports go out of the gulf coast, exactly where Keystone would end, and foreign crude oil—including crude oil from Canada—can be freely reexported.

We know what TransCanada’s plan is because I asked him at a congressional hearing—a senior TransCanada official—whether he would commit his company to keeping the oil and refined products from Keystone in the United States of America, and he said no.

Why do the oil companies want to export this Canadian tar sands oil? Because they can get a higher price and make more profit.

Tar sands crude in Canada trades for \$13 less than the U.S. crude benchmark. The international prices are \$3 higher than our prices.

If we do all of this, if we build this pipeline and then we send this oil to foreign countries, then we have turned Uncle Sam into “Uncle Sucker.” Because, make no mistake, without my amendment this bill will not do anything to help people at the pump. It will just serve to pump up the profits for oil companies.

We shouldn’t export in oil, even as we are forced to send young men and women to defend oil interests in the most dangerous parts of the world.

Let us have that debate. As we import—still—oil from the Middle East, coming into the United States on tankers, this proposal we are debating next week will actually export oil that is already in the United States. We still import millions of barrels of oil every single day.

What we hear from the Canadians, what we hear from the oil industry is that this is all about energy independence. Energy independence cannot, by definition, include the exportation of oil while the United States of America is still importing millions of barrels of oil per day. That is heading us away from, rather than toward, the goal of energy independence.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is at the heart of the issue of what it is that we must understand about this Keystone Pipeline debate. We want lower prices for consumers, lower prices at the gasoline pump, lower prices for home heating oil, lower prices for diesel, and lower prices all across America. It is akin to a tax break that is going into the pockets of every single American, giving them more spending money because they are paying much less for oil in all of its forms in the United States of America right now, and it is giving an incredible incentive for economic growth in America.

What makes America great? What makes America strong? What makes us strong is when we are strong at home. What makes us strong at home is our economy, because the stronger our economy, the stronger the United States is in projecting power across this planet.

That is why on this debate the exportation of oil is so central. It goes right to the heart of what we must be discussing and debating in our country. This is an incredible opportunity for our country.

Let’s take it to the next step. The next step includes what is the taxation on the Canadian oil. There is a loophole, believe it or not, in the American Tax Code that allows tar sands oil from Canada—such as that that would flow through the Keystone Pipeline—to not pay into the Federal trust fund to respond to oil spills in the United States—understand that?

Canadian oil, the dirtiest in the world, coming through the pipeline that the Canadians want to build through the United States, in the event of an oil spill, will not have paid into the oil spill liability fund for oil spill accidents in the United States.

I wrote to the Treasury Department in 2012 urging them to close this loophole through executive action, but their response indicated that they do not believe they have the authority to close this loophole on their own, and they need legislation to do so.

Yet there is nothing in this bill that would close this tax loophole for Keystone tar sands oil. Tar sands oil can be more difficult to clean up than regular crude but receives a “get out of Canada tax-free” card. That makes absolutely no sense. We are already importing more than 1.2 million barrels per day of tar sands oil into the United States. But oil companies don’t have to pay into our cleanup fund to import that dirty oil.

There are roughly 30 oil companies importing tar sands crude into the United States. If you are one of those 30 companies, you are getting a great deal. But if you are one of the hundreds of other oil companies out there that do pay into the oil spill trust fund, you should hate this loophole, and the American people should hate that loophole as well because the Canadians and their oil companies are not paying their fair share of the dues to be able to participate in our great American society. They want to build a pipeline like a straw right through the middle of the United States, send the dirtiest oil right down that straw, and if that straw breaks, if there is a spill, the Canadians have not contributed to the oil spill liability trust fund. Does that make any sense? Does that make any sense? Of course it doesn’t.

That is why this debate is so important. The Congressional Budget Office says this is going to cost the United States of America hundreds of millions of dollars because the Canadians escape their responsibility of paying for the accidents. That is why Senator WYDEN and I are working here to make sure we have an ability to close this loophole, and we are working with Senator CANTWELL, the ranking member on the committee. Along with Senator CANTWELL,

we are going to make sure we have this important debate on the Senate floor.

I know Senator CANTWELL was out here earlier today raising this issue, highlighting this issue, pointing out how unfair and unjust it is that the Canadians escape their responsibility to pay and that it is just another giveaway to the oil industry that ensures this is nothing more than a giveaway to those Canadian companies.

I say this on a day when it is being reported there are now 140,000 people in America employed in the solar industry—140,000. There is another 50,000 employed in the wind industry—nearly 200,000 people employed in industries that, for the most part, didn't really even exist in a meaningful way 7 years ago. That is how quickly our own domestic wind and solar industries have been developed—creating jobs here in the United States, creating growth here in the United States, creating opportunity here in the United States.

So this, colleagues, is really what we should be debating. But once again, when the Republicans are in control, we do not debate all of the above. We don't debate wind and solar and biomass and energy efficiency and oil and gas and nuclear. The Republicans always make it one subject, and that is oil above all, not all of the above.

So I am looking forward to this debate. It goes right to the heart of the security of our country, the economy of our country, and the environment of our country. This is the dirtiest oil in the world. This oil is going to contribute dangerously to the warming of the planet. Last year—2014—was the single warmest year ever recorded in the history of the planet—2014. You don't have to be Dick Tracy to figure out this is a problem that we are passing on to the next generations without the debate this issue must have if we are going to discharge our responsibilities to those next generations.

The Keystone Pipeline is the central opportunity we are going to have to raise this issue of global warming, of the national security of our country, of making our economy stronger, and of ensuring we discharge our responsibility to the next generation.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, climate change is one of the greatest challenges of this century. We have a profound choice before us. We can deny that our climate is warming, we can fall behind our economic competitors,

we can ignore the danger to our planet and to our security—that is one choice—or we can move forward with the diversified energy portfolio that includes clean energy, with an energy policy that makes sense, that creates jobs, that protects the environment, and that will keep our Nation strong.

There is a lot of work to be done. We can work together, we can find common ground, become energy independent, move us on a path to energy independence, grow our economy, and fight climate change. But instead, unfortunately, our focus today is on the Keystone XL Pipeline. The new majority has not chosen to start with energy policy as a whole or innovation or manufacturing policy or our response to climate change. Instead, we are debating on the floor of the Senate just one pipeline project, which primarily benefits another Nation.

There is really one basic question. Is the Keystone Pipeline in our Nation's interest—not Canada's interest or Wall Street's interest but our Nation's interest. I do not believe it is. I say this for two reasons. First, we are being asked to do something I believe is unprecedented—for Congress to step in and promote a bill for one private-sector energy project, to wave ahead a private pipeline for a private foreign company so that Canadian oil can be piped to Texas for export to other nations. Again, how does this serve our Nation?

We are told it is about jobs. Keystone will create jobs, and, of course, we are all for that. But how many jobs? About 3,900 temporary construction jobs. But how many permanent jobs—jobs that American families can count on for years to come? Maybe about 50. Yet with all the challenges we face, at home and abroad, this is the priority. This is priority No. 1 for the new Republican Congress. This is one choice. It is the wrong choice and the wrong priority.

This brings me to my second point. We are at a crossroads in our energy policy. We can still lead the world in clean energy production—wind, solar, advanced biofuels—to reduce global warming pollution, to become energy independent, and to create permanent American jobs. That is our future. That should be our priority.

New Mexicans are already seeing the impact of global warming. The Southwest is at the eye of the storm, with historic drought, with severe flooding when it does rain, and with more and more wildfires. I talk to farmers and ranchers in my State, and they are struggling. According to a study at Los Alamos National Laboratory, by 2050—not far away—we may not have any forests left in my State. It will be as if New Mexico were dragged 300 miles to the south. Our climate will resemble land that is now in the middle of the Chihuahuan Desert.

I am not a scientist; neither are my colleagues. But the experts at Los Ala-

mos National Laboratory and scientists all over the world are clear: If we do nothing, it will only get worse. We are already seeing the impact. Recently the Government Accountability Office issued a warning: Climate change will continue to increase costs to taxpayers for the Federal Flood and Crop Insurance Programs. FEMA is already \$24 billion in debt due to extreme weather events such as Hurricane Sandy and last year's floods in New Mexico. The cost of the Federal Crop Insurance Program has increased 68 percent just since 2007. If left unchecked, these costs will continue to skyrocket.

But this is more than numbers, disturbing as they are. This is the burden of climate change on farmers, ranchers, and our communities. The damage is real. The threat is here. But so are the solutions and the opportunities, and there are many opportunities. With the right priorities, we can encourage the production of clean energy. We can create a clean energy economy that leads the world. We can create the jobs of the future right here at home and revitalize rural America.

I have long said we need a “do it all and do it right” energy policy. That includes traditional energy sources. Oil and gas play an important role in my State. New Mexico is a leading producer of both oil and gas. We have strong, independent companies. They employ over 12,000 New Mexicans. They help pay for our schools and our other public services. They are an important part of the mix, and so are renewables such as wind and solar. The United States has incredible wind energy potential, enough to power the Nation 10 times over. New Mexico has some of the best wind resources in the Nation, enough to meet more than 73 times the State's current electricity needs. Wind power emits almost no carbon pollution. It uses virtually no water. It already saves folks in my State 470 million gallons of water a year. The U.S. solar industry employs more than 143,000 Americans—more than coal and natural gas combined. Solar jobs grew 10 times faster than the national average. The majority are in installation, sales, and distribution. Those are well-paying local jobs. Those are permanent jobs, and they won't be shipped overseas.

Now is the time to build on the momentum and invest in a clean energy economy. Now is the time to create energy at home and jobs at home. Now. Not later. And we need to do it before we lose too much of the market to our overseas competitors in Germany, China, and elsewhere. They can see the future too, and they are going after it.

A national renewable electricity standard would help us get there. The proposal I have introduced for many years would require utilities to generate 25 percent of electricity from renewable sources by 2025. New Mexico

and over half the States already have one. The States are moving in that direction. The Nation needs to move in that direction. We need a national standard. Experts have said a national standard could create 300,000 new jobs. I have pushed for this ever since I came to Congress. The House of Representatives has passed it. The Senate has passed a version of this three times. We have to get it right. We have to do this. Let's get it done.

America can lead the world in a clean energy economy. We have the technology, and we have the resources. We just need the commitment and the cooperation.

This is a new Congress. Let's find common ground where we can move forward. Just as we invested in the oil industry, we need to invest in wind, solar, and biofuels. We should support tax credits for renewables. We should encourage important cutting-edge energy research at great institutions such as Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories. What we don't need is Congress simply acting as a permitting agency for a Canadian pipeline.

I understand the frustration that this project has been pending for so long. I believe the President should make a decision now. The necessary studies have been done. The recent litigation is over. We have debated this project extensively in this Congress and in several elections. If the President decides to approve it without some strong conditions that mitigate its climate impact, I will be very disappointed. If the President rejects it, the supporters can raise this issue in the next election. But Congress should move on to real, pressing policy debates.

Let's get our heads out of the tar sands and work together for our economy, for our energy independence, and for our future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is good to be here on the Senate floor talking about where we are in the process to hopefully finally move toward approval of a permit to allow for construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

It has been interesting—the past couple speakers this morning have all mentioned that they don't understand why the first order of business in this new Congress should be this measure, that there are a lot of issues out there. And there certainly are. There will always be issues in the Senate. This is what we do. These are all weighty

issues. But I would remind my colleagues that one of the reasons we are moving early to the Keystone XL Pipeline legislation is because in many ways this is a bit of unfinished business.

It was just 6 weeks or so ago that we had this measure before us on the floor of the Senate. It was before this body for debate—a good debate—led by our former colleague from Louisiana who was absolutely passionate—absolutely passionate—in her defense of why this was timely, important, critical that this measure be approved. We had that debate, and unfortunately in the final vote we were shy one vote and so we did not see passage. It was a measure that was in front of us because it was timely and also because of the work this body had done to advance it. The energy committee had hearings, process, and we had a bill in front of us.

It is the first week of this session, and we have a lot of measures that we will be taking up that are extremely important, but they are perhaps not as primed, if you will, for action on the Senate floor because that legislation hasn't been drafted. The committees have not met to work through some of the legislation that will be before us.

So why not move to advance the Keystone XL Pipeline, a measure that will provide for good-paying jobs in this country; a measure that will work to enhance that relationship with our closest friend and ally to the north, Canada; a measure that will help us from an energy security perspective when we are able to displace oil coming in from places such as Venezuela with oil coming in from Canada. That is a relationship that this Senator would much rather enhance and further.

So for a host of different reasons we are on this measure in the second week of this new Congress. I am pleased we are at this place where when we reached unanimous consent earlier to proceed to consideration of amendments on this bipartisan bill. It has been interesting. As I have talked to not only colleagues but reporters out in the hallways—just people having conversations—and there was a fair amount of skepticism that if Republicans were to regain the majority, would we return the Senate to what we know as regular order, where there is a processing of amendments and a regular committee process, but that is what we are doing, folks. Those who are observing what is going on, beginning today, are seeing something that hasn't been seen around here in a number of years. It was unfortunate that we hadn't had that process, but it is never too late to do the right thing. It is never too late to get back to a deliberative process that allows for the open exchange and consideration of ideas on the floor.

When we talk about an open amendment process, clearly it is not just

open for amendments for those of us on this side of the aisle. It is an open amendment process for the full Senate so Members on both sides can offer their ideas and work to get votes on them. The majority leader has said several times that this process is going to be open, but it is not going to be open-ended. We are not going to be on this measure for a full year or even a full month, but we will be taking the time to do the deliberation that I think is important. I think you have already got some people saying: Oh, we are spending enough time on it. It is a mixed message with those saying it is not timely, we shouldn't be taking it up, and then others complaining that we have been on it now since last week. I think it is important for Members to know we are expecting to see amendments filed. We are expecting to see Members come to the floor to call up amendments. I would encourage Members not to wait until the last minute because to use the majority leader's words, this is not going to be open-ended. So let's get to our business and let's get it done.

We have three amendments that are currently pending before the body. Before I speak to each of those, I would like to very briefly address my support for the underlying bill from the perspective of Alaska and being one who is immersed in Alaska's energy process and politics.

I heard from more than a couple of folks back home who have seen the debate and discussion playing out, whether it is on C-SPAN or in the media, and I have been asked: We understand Keystone is in the national interest. We get that. But is it truly in Alaska's best interest? Folks back home are a little worried right now. We are seeing the price for oil sink to lows we have not seen in years, sitting around \$46 a barrel today. It has certainly had an impact on our State's budget—dramatically so. It is not just Alaska, I think we are seeing it in other oil-producing States. It is good news to have lower oil prices, but it is kind of a double-edged sword for some.

The questions that are being asked at home are legitimate, fair, and very important questions such as: OK. How does this fit in with the Alaska piece?

We certainly have large-scale infrastructure projects, particularly energy projects of a serious magnitude.

We have a world-class oilfield in Prudhoe Bay and the connector that the Trans-Alaska Pipeline provides from Prudhoe Bay down to tidewater in Valdez, an 800-mile silver ribbon that bisects our State, is truly a modern marvel. A State can have the resource, but if they don't have the infrastructure to move the resource it doesn't do them much good. It doesn't help their economy and it doesn't help fund education if they cannot move it to market.

As I mentioned, Alaskans are a little nervous right now. A New York Times article recently described what is happening in Alaska. The journalist described it as economic anxiety hanging over the State because of the drop in the price per barrel of oil. When a State relies on oil for about 90 percent of its revenues to fund its budget and the price drops dramatically, they notice it.

One way to deal with the variations and variables in price is to have sufficient production. Alaska is suffering from this economic anxiety because our oil production, which was over 2 million barrels a day, has dropped precipitously over the past couple decades. We are now talking about an oil pipeline that is less than half full. What does that mean to a State such as Alaska when the artery for the State's revenues is not pumping at an optimum level? We are in that place right now. As a State we are looking at what can we do to make a difference when it comes to production because there will be price variables. As long as OPEC is in play there will be price variables we are not able to affect as much as we would like.

We have the resource. We have an estimated 40 billion barrels of oil in our Federal areas, offshore in the Chukchi and Beaufort, on our coastal plain within the NPRA. We are not looking at a situation in Alaska where we are running out of oil or about to run out of oil. Our problem straight up is our limited ability to be able to access it. The holdback we get, the pushback we get from our own Federal Government, the policies that keep us from being able to access that resource has been our challenge.

Now back to the Keystone XL Pipeline. The Keystone Pipeline is not going to be carrying any Alaskan crude. Don't get a mixed message. We have a pipeline. We have already built it. It is waiting to be filled back up. The need isn't infrastructure in Alaska but permission—consent from the Federal Government to access our lands, access our waters to achieve that energy potential.

When I am talking to Alaskans about the imperative for Keystone and how it intersects with Alaska, there are a couple of messages. The first one is simple. There is plenty of demand within just the United States for all the oil Canada and Alaska can produce at the same time. The demand is there, even with the surge we have seen coming out of the Bakken and the amount of increased production we have seen domestically in this country. We are continuing to import that oil. Again, it is better for us to rely more on ourselves. The world view that supports the construction of Keystone XL is the same one that leads to new production in my State of Alaska; that is, the recognition that affordable energy is good.

This is my mantra. I keep advertising it. I have a bumper sticker that says "energy is good." Affordable energy is good. The understanding is that low prices result when world markets are well supplied along with the desire to achieve North American energy independence. This is something I feel very strongly about.

Approving the Keystone XL Pipeline is not going to eat into the markets for Alaska's oil. This is an important message for Alaskans to understand. In fact, it is going to help us preserve the markets we have because right now our North Slope crude is shipped predominantly to the west coast—makes sense, it is in closer proximity—where it is refined into gasoline and other petroleum products for use in the lower 48.

We take it down our 800-mile pipeline, put it to tidewater, and it is refined on the west coast. We enjoy the benefit of it here. But this ANS crude—Alaskan North Slope crude—as we call it, is now finding itself in competition from the shale plays out of the Bakken. So what we are seeing is, without a Keystone XL Pipeline oil, the oil that is being produced out of the Bakken is finding a home somewhere. It is not just sitting there. It is being moved.

Where is it being moved to? It is being moved to refineries that have capacity. It is going west. It is going west to those west coast refineries that are used to getting Alaska crude. Keep in mind that as it moves west, if we don't have the pipeline, how is it moving there? How are we moving it? We are moving it by rail, predominantly.

Again, we will have that discussion about the environmental impacts of rail or truck versus a pipeline and the safety and emissions issues. If you want a cleaner way to transport oil, it will be in a pipeline. If you want a safer way to transport oil, it will be in a pipeline. We have had this discussion in the past—and again, so Alaskans understand—and the Keystone XL Pipeline will benefit us in terms of being able to continue to send our crude to those west coast refineries.

We have heard—I believe repeatedly and incorrectly—that the Keystone XL Pipeline is a foreign project that is going to carry Canadian oil to the gulf coast. We know where the name Trans-Canada derives from. We know that much of the oil to be transported will be from Alberta, but I think it is important to acknowledge that we have about 100,000 barrels of Bakken crude that will come from North Dakota and Montana and down through the midcontinent. If we have the Keystone XL Pipeline constructed, it will avoid the west coast.

The last point I will make for the folks back home, for whom I work and who are following this issue, is that I really think the Keystone XL Pipeline is a test for us. It is a test of whether

we as a nation can still review, license, permit, and build a large-scale energy infrastructure project. We are looking at that in Alaska. We need to know that can continue to be done in this country, because if we cannot do it even here in the lower 48, where the costs are lower and there is an existing infrastructure that you tie into, which the Keystone XL will—you have the southern leg already completed—if we can't demonstrate that we can get beyond the process of permitting a leg of this pipeline over the Canadian border and into the United States, what confidence do we have that we are going to be able to do other big energy infrastructure projects? That worries me a great deal.

When people say that we are rushing this too quickly or that it is premature or that we need to let everything play out, I think we need to remind ourselves that 6 years is a pretty long time to play something out. Most companies don't have the wherewithal to wait something out over the course of 6 years because the cost of constructing this pipeline has not gone down during this intervening time period. If anything, the costs are going up. We know the costs are going up. We are working on the Keystone XL Pipeline right now, but it is just the first step of many I believe we need to take and to do in order to improve our energy policies.

I will be continuing my conversation with Members to explain how my State has an awful lot to offer our country—whether it is increasing the flow of oil in our Trans-Alaska Pipeline or getting production up so we are not half full and instead are full, so we can share that resource with people throughout the country. As we look to move our natural gas—our amazing quantities of natural gas—that massive infrastructure project is a way in which we can work to advance that resource.

Alaska has so much to offer the country, but we need to have the chance and the opportunity to do so. Our pipeline up north is already built. It was completed just after I got out of high school. In fact, I was privileged to have the opportunity to work up in Prudhoe Bay at that time and saw what actually happened out there in the oil fields. It has operated successfully, safely, and efficiently for decades. It has far surpassed what we believed we would be able to ship through that line, but it remains surrounded by billions and billions of untapped oil that can be brought to market, which would then bring in jobs, generate revenue, and keep prices as low as possible, and increase our security. We all want that.

This is a conversation that will continue until the conditions of Alaska's Statehood—those promises that were made to us back in 1959 when we became a State—are fulfilled and we are

allowed to produce our resources as a State.

So watching what is going on with Keystone is something that is of great interest to the folks back home. We will continue to watch it and hopefully be encouraged that we do the right thing from a jobs perspective, from a revenue perspective, from an economic perspective, and an energy-security perspective.

We have three amendments which are pending. I was privileged to be sitting in the Chair a little while ago when the junior Senator from Massachusetts spoke about his amendment. His amendment relates to exports from the Keystone XL Pipeline. My colleague from Massachusetts is not from a big oil-producing State, as I am.

I believe it is fair to say that his State cares a lot about the cost of energy. They have cold winters, infrastructure challenges, and other issues as it relates to energy, and I appreciate that. But it is important to understand what my colleague's amendment would do. It would specifically prohibit the export of oil that is brought into the United States through the Keystone XL Pipeline, as well as the export of the finished products made from that oil. It is not just the raw crude that is put into the line. It is what goes down to the refineries in the gulf coast and is then refined into products—whether it is diesel or some other product. It is saying that the export of that should be prohibited.

Basically, his amendment is a full-on, flat-out statement saying that you can't have any aspect of it—any drop of that—leave this country. It essentially says that all of this—every ounce of this new Canadian resource—will be brought into this United States and will stay here.

My colleague has raised the concern that the United States should not be that passthrough entity. He used the terminology that it is similar to a straw from Canada down to the gulf, and then it goes out the back end from there. The President, in a comment, used the term conveyor belt and that the United States should not be that conveyor belt. The argument is that we should not just be a passthrough where Americans get none of the benefits. Well, if we didn't get any of the benefits, I think we should be talking about that.

It is important to know this is not the first time we have had this discussion or this idea in front of us. Back in early 2012, it was part of an amendment that came before the floor. It was defeated 33 to 65. We had many of our Democratic colleagues join with all of the Republicans to reject a statutory ban on exports.

I am hopeful this amendment that has been offered and is pending will see the same fate and ultimately be defeated by at least the same margin. I

say that because I think it continues to be unnecessary, and I strongly believe it takes our export policies in the wrong direction.

This is not just LISA MURKOWSKI saying this takes us the wrong way. The Department of Energy has looked critically at the issue of the Keystone XL oil being exported and whether or not that makes sense. In their analysis—and they state it pretty succinctly—they say: Without a surplus of heavy oil in PADD 3—that is the gulf coast area—there would be no economic incentive to ship Canadian oil sands to Asia via Port Arthur, which is where it is coming out of.

The Department of Energy's conclusion—they had a pretty broad discussion about it. But their conclusion was then reinforced by the State Department in its final supplemental EIS for Keystone, which is a document that everybody should read—granted that it is 1,000 pages long, or thereabouts, but there is a summary that helps to condense so much of it. In the State Department's final EIS, they say that “such an option”—that being export—“such an option appears unlikely to be economically justified for any significant durable trade given transport costs and market conditions.” Think about that. I believe these conclusions make some pretty good sense here.

The purpose of the Keystone XL Pipeline is to bring Canadian and American oil—let's not forget the 100,000 barrels coming out of Montana and North Dakota—to the gulf coast. It does not make any sense to bring oil all the way—850 miles—to refineries that can refine it—remember, these refineries in the gulf coast are set up to deal with exactly this type of oil. So we have the line that brings it from the north to the south where you have refineries that are able to handle this. So tell me why it would make sense to just use this pipeline as a passthrough—as a conveyor belt or straw—and then ship it to refineries around the world that will add that transport cost to it. As the State Department EIS said, it would not be economically justified.

It is important to understand, again, what is going on down there in the refineries in gulf coast, and the State Department looked at that. What they found was that the traditional sources of heavy oil used on the gulf coast are declining. Why are they declining? What we traditionally see coming in as imports there—coming in from Venezuela and Mexico—has been drawn down or lessened, if you will, for a host of different reasons, but not the least of which is because we are producing more here in the lower 48 States in the Bakken.

We have talked a lot about the misalignment that is going on within our refineries and what is being produced and what we are capable of refining.

But again, what we are seeing in the gulf coast is an ability to take on more capacity for this heavy oil. The opportunity to refine the product that is coming out of Canada there in the gulf coast refineries is real. It is there.

Now, I think it is important to be honest here. I don't want to be written up in somebody's fact checker. Believe me, we looked at that. There are small amounts of oil from Keystone XL that could be reexported as a matter of economic efficiency, but that should not give anyone a reason to panic or get everybody all excited. It may come as a surprise to some, but the reexport of Canadian oil that is not commingled with the domestic crude is already completely legal. It is already a routine matter where the Commerce Department just routinely signs off on it. This is no big deal. There is no change in policy that is dramatic.

The Obama administration has already approved dozens of licenses to re-export crude oil all across the world.

I think it is important to recognize that this amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts would not just block the export of the crude, it would block the export of finished products. As he said, it would be everything. It would be the crude, and it would be everything that is then produced. Every bit we have he would have stay here. But blocking the export of finished products would be a reversal of existing law and current practices. And think about it—just from a practical perspective, how do we enforce this? How would we realistically enforce this measure of diesel that came from this refinery, from this pipeline here in the lower 48—that we can go ahead and export—and this is what we do. It is not any great state secret. We move our refined products, and we do so in a significant way to the benefit of our Nation. So how do we fence off everything that comes out of Keystone XL and say: The refined product from this particular pipeline can't move outside this country. It creates potential havoc, and maybe that is the point.

I think the Senate should recognize that this amendment is not going to improve this bill. I don't think it will change anybody's mind. I don't think it is going to bring new support. I think it is meant to kind of poison the well and perhaps ensure that this pipeline will never be built and that it can't operate.

I encourage my colleagues to look at a couple different documents. I mentioned the final supplemental environmental impact statement the State Department did. It is an important read for the critical analysis that went into it. I have cited those areas where they speak specifically to the impact of the export. There are others who have reviewed not only that but other documents, other outside facts.

I mentioned that President Obama had made reference to the conveyor

belt theory or tagging Keystone XL as being a conveyor belt for the oil. He made that statement when he was in Burma in November. His specific words were that it would provide "the ability of Canada to pump their oil, send it through our land, down to the Gulf, where it will be sold everywhere else."

So the fact checkers got on President Obama for that and did a pretty good analysis. I felt it was a pretty good analysis. They laid it out in clear English and ultimately decided that the President was going to be awarded three Pinocchios for that statement. For those who aren't familiar, if a person makes a significant factual error or obvious contradiction, they get three Pinocchios.

But it wasn't just the Washington Post and Glen Kessler who did this assessment. We also had another fact check come out of PolitiFact, and they also rated that statement mostly false on their Truth-O-Meter.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these fact checks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 20, 2014]
OBAMA'S CLAIM THAT KEYSTONE XL CRUDE WOULD GO 'EVERYWHERE ELSE' BUT THE UNITED STATES

(By Glenn Kessler)

"I won't hide my opinion about this, which is that one major determinant of whether we should approve a pipeline shipping Canadian oil to world markets, not to the United States, is does it contribute to the greenhouse gases that are causing climate change?"—President Obama, news conference at G20 summit, Brisbane, Australia, Nov. 16, 2014.

"Understand what this project is. It is providing the ability of Canada to pump their oil, send it through our land, down to the Gulf, where it will be sold everywhere else."—Obama, news conference, Rangoon, Burma, Nov. 14.

Twice during his recent overseas trip, President Obama asserted that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline was designed to take Canadian crude oil to the world markets. The implication of the president's words is that the United States would be simply a conveyor belt for the oil.

The pipeline would allow the Canadians "to pump their oil, send it through our land, down to the Gulf, where it will be sold everywhere else," the president said in Burma. The question he faced, he said in Australia, is whether "we should approve a pipeline shipping Canadian oil to world markets, not to the United States."

The White House did not provide an on-the-record comment.

Update: The Natural Resources Defense Council, in a response to this column, said we were relying on "outdated" information. It noted that in recent months there has been a jump in unrefined crude oil exports from the Gulf Coast, contradicting the conclusions of the State Department. "Data from the Gulf Coast today show that some of the tar sands from Keystone XL will be exported internationally before it sees a U.S. refinery," the NRDC said. "some" at the moment amounts to about 200,000 barrels a day;

for reference, a supertanker carries 2 million barrels. We did adjust some of the language concerning exports in response to the NRDC critique.

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

The president seriously overstates the percentage of Canadian crude that might be exported if the Keystone XL pipeline is built. He suggests all of it would be exported, without mentioning that it first would almost certainly stop on the Gulf Coast to be refined into products. On top of that, current trends suggest that about half of that refined product would be exported. That is not insubstantial, but it is certainly much smaller than 100 percent.

All of this is laid out in the extensive report issued by the State of Department earlier this year. The president might want to study it before he addresses the Keystone question again. In the meantime, he earns Three Pinocchios. We nearly made it Four Pinocchios, but it is correct that at least some of the product would be exported, based on current market conditions.

THREE PINOCCHIOS

Is this really the case?

THE FACTS

First of all, the president leaves out a very important step. The crude oil would travel to the Gulf Coast, where it would be refined into products such as motor gasoline and diesel fuel (known as a distillate fuel in the trade). As our colleague Steven Mufson reported more than two years ago, the refineries on the Gulf Coast are "eagerly waiting" for the Canadian crude, since there isn't enough oil in the area anymore to feed the refineries.

"The modernized Valero refinery [in Port Arthur, Tex.] can turn 310,000 barrels a day of some of the world's worst quality crude oil—such as the bitumen-laden mixture from Canadian oil sands—into gasoline and diesel fuel for cars and trucks," Mufson wrote. "Valero, the largest U.S. oil refining company, would be one of the biggest customers of oil from the Keystone XL pipeline, buying about 150,000 barrels a day."

Indeed, the State Department's final environmental impact statement on the Keystone XL project specifically disputed claims that the oil "would pass through the United States and be loaded onto vessels for ultimate sale in markets such as Asia," saying it was not economically justified. The State Department noted that the traditional sources of crude for the Gulf Coast, such as Mexico and Venezuela, are declining, and so refineries would have "significant incentive to obtain heavy crude from the oil sands."

So then the question turns on what happens to that oil after it leaves the refinery. Oil is a global commodity, of course, and where it travels often depends on market conditions. In Obama's telling, however, the refined Canadian oil goes "everywhere else" and "not to the United States."

But that's not right either, according to the State Department report. U.S. exports are not affected by various pipeline scenarios but instead by market conditions, such as "domestic demand versus domestic refining capacity, the cost of natural gas, and refining capacity abroad, including in foreign markets currently importing U.S. refined products such as Mexico, Brazil, Chile, and Europe," the report said. The demand for exports, in other words, is completely unrelated to building the Keystone XL pipeline.

For the sake of argument, let's look at the percentage of exports currently from the Gulf Coast area, using data for refining out-

put and product exports from the Energy Information Administration. Depending on how you crunch the numbers, the percentage of exports for finished products ranges between 35 percent and 50 percent. The State Department pegged the rate of exports at just over 50 percent, noting that "this increased volume of refined products is being exported by refiners as they respond to lower domestic gasoline demand and continued higher demand and prices in overseas markets."

In other words, at least half of the oil that is refined on the Gulf Coast stays in the United States. Market conditions could change, of course, but there is little basis to claim that virtually all of the product would be exported. (The Fact Checker has previously noted that, contrary to the claims of advocates of the project, Keystone XL is unlikely to have much impact on gasoline prices.)

Opponents of the Keystone project have seized on slides, such as the one below from one of Valero's presentations to investors, to suggest the plan ultimately is to export the production from Canadian oil sands.

But Bill Day, a spokesman for Valero, says "it's a mistake to interpret this to mean that Gulf Coast products would ONLY go to export markets." The slide is simply showing the flow of trade, from various refineries; diesel currently is more popular in Europe while gasoline is king in the United States, though demand for diesel is growing in both markets. Day noted that currently the vast majority of the company's products stay in the United States for domestic consumption.

[From PolitiFact, Nov. 20, 2014]

OBAMA SAYS KEYSTONE XL IS FOR EXPORTING OIL OUTSIDE THE U.S., EXPERTS DISAGREE

(By Lauren Carroll)

President Barack Obama and many other Democrats think there's little to be gained by building the Keystone XL pipeline.

On Nov. 18, Senate Democrats voted down a proposal to build the oil pipeline—which would stretch from Canada to Steele City, Neb., where it would connect with an existing pipeline that goes to Texas' coast. But the issue isn't going anywhere. When the new Republican-led Senate takes over in January, it will likely be at the top of their priorities list.

Obama and other Keystone critics have argued that the pipeline would have a negative environmental impact, while having little benefit for the United States. For example, constructing the pipeline would result in few permanent American jobs.

"Understand what this project is," Obama said at a Nov. 14 press conference in Burma. "It is providing the ability of Canada to pump their oil, send it through our land, down to the Gulf, where it will be sold everywhere else. That doesn't have an impact on U.S. gas prices."

Two days later, in Brisbane, Australia, Obama described Keystone XL as "a pipeline shipping Canadian oil to world markets, not to the United States."

Predicting the effect of the pipeline on gas prices is a little tricky. Experts tend to agree that it could impact gas prices, but the effect would be indirect and minimal. But in this fact check, we're going to focus on the export question—whether or not, as Obama said, Keystone XL's primary destination is beyond the United States.

We found that Obama's off the mark.

CRUDE OIL

In recent years, the United States has become a net-exporter of refined oil products,

like gasoline, jet fuel and asphalt (meaning it exports more products than it imports), according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. However, it is a net-importer of the crude oil it uses to make those products.

Keystone XL would transport crude oil from Canada's tar sands through the Midwestern United States down to the Gulf Coast, and there are refineries all along the proposed route.

America gets more crude oil from Canada than any other country. Nearly all of Canada's exports go to the United States, and this accounts for about a third of America's total crude oil imports. Much of its oil already makes it to the United States by rail and existing pipelines.

We asked several energy economics experts, and they believe that quite a bit—if not most—of the Keystone XL crude oil will be bought and used by American refineries.

"It's difficult to say with any certainty, but it is most likely that most would be refined in the U.S.," said Kenneth Medlock, an expert in energy economics at Rice University in Texas.

A recent State Department report argues that it would not be "economically justified" for Canada to primarily export its Keystone XL oil to countries other than the United States, when there are plenty of American refineries to consume it.

Some independent refineries—particularly those in the upper Midwest, but also in Texas—are in desperate need of crude oil, said Charles Ebinger, a senior fellow in energy security at the Brookings Institution. Currently, the refineries have to import crude from places like Venezuela and Mexico—though it would be cheaper and better for overall energy security to buy from a North American source, rather than pay high transport costs.

On Nov. 17, TransCanada told Reuters, it "makes no business sense for our customers to transport oil down to the U.S. Gulf Coast, pay to export it overseas but then pay to transport millions of barrels of higher-priced oil back to the U.S. refineries to create the products we rely on."

Ebinger added that many American refineries are geared to use heavy crude, which is what Keystone would transport from Canada's tar sands.

There would, though, likely be oil coming through the Keystone XL pipeline in excess of what the American refineries would be able to use, noted Eric Smith, an energy economist at Tulane University. This excess oil could go to other countries capable of refining it. Still, most Keystone oil would stay in North America.

REFINED PRODUCTS

Some Keystone XL critics have focused on the fact that American refineries could export some of the products they make with the Canadian crude oil, such as gasoline, diesel fuel or asphalt. They argue that because products made in the United States, using Keystone XL oil, will leave the country, the pipeline wouldn't improve domestic energy security or independence.

Anti-Keystone XL environmental group Tar Sands Action (part of the larger 350.org) said in a Keystone XL fact sheet, that American refineries will process the oil but, "much of the fuel refined from the pipeline's heavy crude oil will never reach U.S. drivers' tanks."

However, American oil refineries' product exports are "not sensitive" to the addition of a new pipeline, the State Department study says. Export trends are more dependent on

demand—both domestically and abroad—as well as the cost of natural gas and foreign refining capacity. American oil refineries are already increasing their exports, and that trend could continue independent of Keystone XL.

"Refined product export levels have already increased and some of the crude used is from foreign sources," the report says. "As this may already be occurring, it may continue with or without (Keystone XL)."

Further, the report says, "The economic viability of exports does increase the demand for crudes in the United States," but, "this demand does not depend on the proposed project."

Even if exports are increasing, the majority of oil products refined in the United States stay in the United States. For example, in 2013, Gulf Coast area refineries produced about 946,000 barrels of finished motor gasoline per day. They exported about one-third of that—323,000 barrels per day.

In January, Our friends at the Washington Post's Fact Checker looked at an ad by liberal PAC NextGen Climate that said, "(China is) counting on the U.S. to approve TransCanada's pipeline to ship oil through America's heartland and out to foreign countries like theirs." A spokesman for NextGen told Fact Checker that they were referring to refined product exports, rather than crude oil. Fact Checker gave the ad its lowest rating of Four Pinocchios.

Even if Keystone XL isn't built, experts said Canada will find other ways to transport their oil to the United States. Canada already sends crude from the oil sands into the United States by rail and other pipelines.

"I have no doubt that Canada will develop alternate means of monetizing its crude oil, whether that be via expanded rail shipments or by building pipelines to one or both of its coasts," Smith said.

The longer that politicians debate Keystone XL, the more time Canada has to figure out these alternate means.

"Keystone XL is rapidly becoming irrelevant," said Michelle Foss, energy economist at the University of Texas' Bureau of Economic Geology.

OUR RULING

Obama said, Keystone XL allows "Canada to pump their oil, send it through our land, down to the Gulf, where it will be sold everywhere else."

The general consensus among experts, as well as the State Department, is that American refineries would be the primary buyers of crude oil transported through the Keystone XL pipeline, by a vast margin. Some Keystone XL critics have a point that American refineries would likely export some of the products that they make with crude oil transported by the pipeline. The State Department says, however, that product exports are already increasing, and that trend would likely continue independent of a new pipeline. Additionally, American refineries tend to keep more products in the country than they export.

We rate Obama's claim Mostly False.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Again, I think it is important to have a full understanding of what we are talking about when we talk about the export of Keystone XL and the imperative that in order for something to work, as the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested that we are just going to have this passthrough, it has to make sense for those who are moving this product.

There has to be economic justification at the other end. And what makes sense is to move that product to the gulf coast, where our refineries have the capacity to handle that heavy crude, turn it into product there, and continue to create jobs within that region.

I am not going to support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, which I think is obvious from my statement, but I believe it is important to give some of the background. I would commend to colleagues some of these articles I have referenced.

There are two other amendments that are pending before us, and I will speak very quickly to the amendment that has been offered by the Senators from Ohio and New Hampshire. They have once again teamed up to offer this bipartisan amendment on energy efficiency. They have worked very closely on these issues over the years. We are to the point where we can't think about energy efficiency without thinking PORTMAN or SHAHEEN, so I commend my colleagues for their diligence. I have been happy to support them in their efforts, and I am happy, quite honestly, that we will have an opportunity to vote on an amendment that does relate to energy efficiency. It is not the full-on energy efficiency bill my colleagues introduced previously, but it is an amendment with text that is identical to the measure that came out of the House, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act. This is a bill that moved through the House 375 to 36 during the last Congress, toward the end. We tried to move it through in the Senate, and we came close to advancing it by unanimous consent, but there were still a few outstanding concerns we couldn't get around, so it is back before us once again. But really nothing has changed since then, and in my view this is a good reason why this proposal is really regarded as important and noncontroversial. It is cost-neutral. It contains four provisions, one of which is extremely time-sensitive.

Sometimes people don't want to get down into the weeds of certain aspects of what we are dealing with. The time-sensitive provision we are dealing with is these energy efficiency standards related to water heaters where we have a consent decree from back in 2010 that our water heater manufacturers have until April 16 of this year—so actually 3 months from today—to meet these revised minimum efficiency standards from DOE.

The problem we have is that DOE's standards effectively ban production of these grid-enabled water heaters that many of our rural co-ops use for electrical thermal storage or demand response programs. So instead of saving energy, these revised standards now threaten to actually work against these goals. So we have a bizarre, unintended consequence in this situation.

We have been working for a couple of years now to address this and to fix it, and now it is urgent. Now we have to deal with it because, again, we are at 3 short months. The manufacturers are worried about what the Congress is going to do. Is it going to be resolved? Should I be building any of these? Thanks to the cooperation of the Senators from Ohio and New Hampshire, we have an opportunity to have this measure in front of us once again.

There are three other provisions in this amendment that are equally non-controversial. They all relate to voluntary efficiency programs. One focuses on the efficiency of commercial office buildings. Another provides greater information about energy usage in those buildings. The third looks at energy-efficient government technology and practices.

This is one that I hope we will be able to advance without further delay. This is really a commonsense effort to fix a real problem for our rural co-ops.

More importantly, let's embrace energy efficiency around here. We are now involved in the discussion about increased production, which is very real. I started off my comments by talking about Alaska's desired contribution to the national energy economy, but I view energy from a three-legged stool perspective: We have increased production. We have all the technologies that are going to allow us to achieve our potential with our clean and renewable resources, which is hugely important, but we also have the efficiency and the conservation piece. We don't talk about that enough around here. We need to do more. Shaheen-Portman is one way to get us there, albeit in a very small way.

The last amendment we have pending is an amendment offered by my colleague from Minnesota on the other side of the aisle, who also serves on the energy committee. He has introduced an amendment that would require that all of the iron, the steel—that all the manufactured goods that are used to construct Keystone XL be produced right here in the United States.

I think all of us want to do all we can, certainly, to encourage more jobs and job creation here in this country and to put in place policies that would allow us to do so. I do appreciate that the Franken amendment inserts language in the amendment that allows—or I guess it avoids a conflict with our international trade agreements because we know that could have really threatened the bill. It would actually have given the President real reason to threaten to veto this bipartisan bill. But they have addressed that within the amendment. I also appreciate that the amendment allows the President to waive the requirements for American materials based on findings he makes. So that is language which is included in it.

But I have to tell my colleagues, we are sitting here at 2,310 days since the initial cross-border application was submitted for this project. I was reminded that when the initial application was first presented, the President was then Senator Obama. That much time has elapsed. So I see this language, and I think it is included in this amendment in good faith, but I just can't be convinced that the President would actually exercise this type of a waiver in a timely manner. He certainly hasn't demonstrated it at any point throughout this whole, long, drawn-out process we have been on with Keystone XL after 6 years.

So I am going to be opposing this amendment for the same reasons I opposed it when we had it in front of us in 2012. It was included as part of a broader amendment at that time, but it did fall on a pretty strong bipartisan basis.

These are important issues to be thinking about and considering, and I did take good time to review this. Again, I think all of us want to do more to encourage job production, job creation. I buy American and I buy local wherever and whenever I can. I strongly support the use of American materials in American projects, whether it is in my State or around the country. I know the Presiding Officer probably does as well, as does the Senator from Minnesota. But in considering whether we here in Congress should mandate specific materials for the Keystone XL Pipeline, I have come down on the side that we should not mandate that.

I think we need to look at several things. First off is the commitment that has been made to buy American without any sort of mandate, without any requirement coming out of Congress. Fully 75 percent of the pipe from this project is going to come from North America. That is the commitment that has been made, and I understand that more than half of that—about 332,000 tons—is going to come from Arkansas alone.

Again, this is a commitment that has been made to ensure that America does derive benefit, that we do see those—direct and indirect—induced jobs. When you make a commitment, you say that we will pledge a full 75 percent of the pipe for the project that is going to come from North America. I think that is important. It was important enough that TransCanada announced this 3 years ago. So this is not just something they have decided in order to help facilitate this—that we are going to say 75 percent. They made this commitment a while ago.

Here in Congress we passed the Buy American Act, and that act specifically is applied to projects that are Federally funded. But keep in mind here that when we are talking about Keystone XL, this is a private project. Keystone

XL gets no subsidies. It will receive no taxpayer dollars. It will be built to the government's specifications. We have seen that when you look to that final SEIS, where the additional mitigation measures are required once the permit is approved. It will be built to government specifications, but I don't think the government should decide what it is actually built with. We are going to define the parameters in terms of mitigation, but, again, this is a private project. This receives no Federal funds, and it would be somewhat precedent setting. So I asked the Congressional Research Service to see if they can identify for me any other projects where the Congress has sought to force or direct private parties or a private company to purchase domestic goods and materials—so all of the materials that go into it and not just the steel but everything else in there. They have been looking. They have some pretty sharp folks over there at CRS. So far, they have not been able to come up with an example in our laws. I am concerned about this, quite honestly. As much as I support "Buy American" and making sure that we receive the benefit of these jobs from creating these products, I am concerned about the Congress' setting a precedent here. I think it potentially puts us on a pretty slippery slope.

If we are going to set the precedent here for Keystone XL and say, well, you have to do it for pipelines, why wouldn't we do it for other energy sources? Is that going to be a requirement we are going to place on wind turbines?

I know some of my colleagues are in some States where they are manufacturing good made-in-America wind turbines. I am all for that, but is that a policy we are going to take on—where we are going to say, no, it is an important industry, it is an important sector, and so we are going to require that it all be made in America? If that is the case, why not on our vehicles? Why not everything?

I worry about that. I worry about the precedent. I worry about where we go beyond Keystone XL if that is the requirement. I think it is also important to listen to the industry's perspective on this position. The American Iron and Steel Institute have been a huge supporter of Keystone XL for years now. They have 19 different member companies, major producers such as U.S. Steel. They have 125 associate members.

On January 8—actually, right after we came into session—before this amendment was even filed, the American Iron and Steel Institute sent every one of us a Steelgram reiterating their support for Keystone XL, and their letter is pretty definite. They are not nuanced about it. They say:

It is essential that Congress act to ensure the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline without further delay.

I think we should listen to those words. Those words aren't coming from a TransCanada. They are not coming from an oil company. They are coming from associations and workers around the country who believe earnestly and honestly that construction of this pipeline will be good for this country and it will be good for these families. So let's listen to them. Let's agree that 2,310 days and counting is more than enough time to make a decision.

We saw the Nebraska Supreme Court come out with their determination that the decision that came out of Nebraska was not unconstitutional. So it clears away that excuse, if you will, or that reason to say we can't move forward.

There is really nothing holding up a decision at this point in time other than the President's unwillingness to move on this issue. I think if we want to move forward and provide good jobs—and we have had the debate about how many jobs are really created. Is it the 42,100 that the final SEIS states in terms of direct and indirect jobs?

If you want just to focus on the permanent jobs, that is definitely a much lower number—35 to 50 permanent jobs. But you know what. When you build something, there is the opportunity for good, honest work for well-paying jobs for welders, for truck drivers, for operators. People are looking for an opportunity such as this. They want to be part of building something. I can tell you that in Alaska, when we are debating how we are going to move our natural gas to market and how we are going to build this natural gas pipeline that will move this, nobody is saying that we can't build this because it is only going to provide temporary construction jobs. That is not what we are talking about. They know that there is benefit there. They are hoping they are going to be part of that benefit.

When we talk about where we are with some of these amendments coming forward, I think it is good to have this debate. I think it is good to have this discussion, whether it is talking about exports, because that is a legitimate part of the discussion, talking about requirements that may be placed on construction. But I think we have to remember we are not the zoning board here in the Senate or in the Congress. This bill doesn't have anything to do with siting. We are not determining the route. That is what the States do and rightly so. What this 2-page, 400-word bill does is approve the issuance of that permit to allow for construction, but we are not the ones determining that this is the way the line goes.

I would urge colleagues to look critically at the language and see exactly what it does. Understand that when we are talking about the benefits and burdens of a pipeline, it is true that pipelines are not 100 percent fail-safe. Not

much that we build is 100 percent fail-safe, but what we try to do at every turn and at every opportunity is to make it as close as possible. But when you look from a safety perspective, from an environmental perspective, the safest and most environmentally sound way to move this oil is in a pipeline. It is not putting it in rail to other parts of the country. It is not putting it on the roads as we are seeing. Those are the options right now. Whether people in this body or across the Chamber here object, Canada is accessing their resource. They are accessing their resource, and they will move their resource. Right now the way they are moving it is in a way, quite honestly, that adds to emissions, has greater potential for a spill and for an environmental incident. So I am looking at it from the perspective that Canada is going to move that. They have made that very clear.

In fact, there was an article just a couple of days now, in the Wall Street Journal—and it is talking about the impact of lower oil prices and the impact on what is happening in Canada as an oil producer. Are they slowing down their production in response to lower oil prices? Absolutely not. What we are seeing is almost—I don't want to describe it as a doubling down because that is an inaccurate phrase—but what we are seeing is continued effort within Canada to access their oil resources. Some of the statements that are made by some of the Canadian oil companies are really quite telling. They say that Canadian Natural is a company that will "ensure the oil sands will continue adding to the global oil glut for a long time to come, regardless of the price of crude." They go on to say: "It's not well understood just how robust the oil sands are. If you stopped expansion of the oil sands tomorrow, you would have no decline in the production base for decades . . . But few of the largest producers in Canada envision scaling back production at their oil sands operations."

So what we are seeing is there was big investment up front with the oil sands in Canada and accessing a resource that is plentiful, but if you are to believe some of the statements from these Canadian companies, they are going to continue to produce their resource, even in the face of what we are seeing—declining world oil prices.

If Canada is going to continue to produce, how is that product going to be moved? I would rather it be moved safely through a pipeline, with fewer emissions through a pipeline, and to a part of the country where we are set up to accommodate that resource in our refineries so that we can refine that product to our benefit.

To me, that makes sense. So we will have good and—excuse the pun—energetic debate about amendments in these coming days. I think you can see

from my comments we are going to have some amendments that I like and some that I am not supporting. But what I am looking forward to is the fact that we are at a point that we are describing as regular orders. We are going to be voting on amendments, perhaps quite a few, as we move toward the final passage of this bipartisan bill. I look forward to the exchange that we will have.

I thank you for your attention, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am very pleased to join my colleague this morning, the chairman of our energy committee. The Senator from Alaska is doing a fantastic job leading our energy committee. I so appreciate her leadership on the committee, her knowledge of energy. Her words this morning—very well spoken—I think really go to the heart of what we are trying to do with this legislation: not only pass important energy legislation for the country but have this open process, open dialogue, have a real energy debate, and not just a debate but give people the opportunity to vote.

Republican and Democrat alike, we are saying, come on down here, bring your amendments, and let's have a serious discussion about energy and about building the energy future of this country. Offer your amendments, make your case, and then let's vote. If you can get 60 people to support your amendment, if you can get 60 votes, that gets attached to the legislation. That is the way it is supposed to work around here.

So we are encouraging our colleagues to join with us and get the work done that the American people want done. So I thank our energy chairman for setting that in motion. That is the right way to do business. That is what we are elected to do. We are going to get something done for the American people, who sent us here for that very reason.

When you look at what is going on in energy today, you have to feel pretty good about it. If not, drive over to the gas station to fill your car. Gas prices at the pump are about a dollar lower than they were this time a year ago. If you equated that savings our consumers are receiving at the pump to a tax cut, it would be more than a \$100 billion tax cut for hard-working Americans. That is pretty exciting. That did not just happen. It certainly did not happen because OPEC or anyone else—Venezuela or Russia or anybody—decided they wanted to cut us a break, cut hard-working Americans, hard-working taxpayers, consumers, small businesses across this country a break. It happened because we are producing more energy in this country and we are working with our closest friend and

ally in the world—Canada—to produce more energy.

On a daily basis we consume about 18 million barrels of oil a day—oil and oil equivalents—and produce about 11 million of those barrels here domestically. We are up to about 3 million, so of the 7 million we import, about 3 million comes from Canada. So we are down to only importing about 4 million barrels a day from other sources. If we stay on this track, if we build the necessary energy infrastructure—such as the Keystone XL Pipeline—and we continue to build good business climates and get our companies to invest, to create jobs, and produce more energy, we can get to a point where we truly have North American energy security, meaning we produce more energy here at home and with Canada than we consume. Boy, then we will be in the driver's seat—not OPEC; America will be in the driver's seat. If we don't do it, if we block projects like we are debating right now, then we will put OPEC back in the driver's seat. So when they hear our President say he is going to continue to block this project, to veto this legislation if we are able to pass it with a strong bipartisan majority, that is music to OPEC's ears because that puts them right back in the saddle. That is what they want.

But we work for America. That is why we need to continue to move forward and build this exciting energy future for our country that we are building. It is energy. It is jobs. It is economic growth. This project will create hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue—State, local, and Federal revenue to help reduce the debt and deficit. That is a huge and important impact of the project. Of course it is about national security with energy security. So I want to emphasize that again because that is doing the work the American people sent us here to do.

For the opponents—there are a couple of things that I heard this morning and that I hear on an ongoing basis. One is that, oh, gee, we should be doing renewable energy instead of fossil fuels.

Why not do all of it? Why are they mutually exclusive? How does doing this project in any way prevent us from doing any renewable project we ought to do? Let's do those renewable projects.

In my home State we use steam from coal plants to produce biofuels, power biofuels plants. We use the wastewater from some of our communities in those biofuels plants. We have wind energy. We have geothermal, ethanol, biodiesel. We are now the second largest oil-producing State in the country. We produce 1.2 million barrels a day—second only to Texas.

They are not mutually exclusive. Let's do it all. How does holding up one enable us to do the other? It does not. So when I hear the argument that

“Well, we ought to do all of those other things,” good—let's do them. But doing this project helps us. It provides more energy. Heck, let's do the others too. So arguing that we should do renewables is not an argument against this project. Fine. Let's do it. Let's do them both.

The other argument that I heard this morning and that I hear, of course, a lot from the critics is the environmental argument. Again, I say look at the facts. Go back to the science. The report itself says “no significant environmental impact.” That is the report done by the Obama administration, the environmental impact statement that was designed to look specifically at the environmental impacts. That has been done over the course of 6 years; not one, not two, not three, but five reports—three draft reports, two final reports. The results are right in the report: The Keystone XL Pipeline will have no significant environmental impact.

In fact, we will have higher greenhouse emissions without the pipeline than we will with it because it would take 1,400 railcars a day to move all of that crude into our country, which is what will happen. If somehow the critics manage to block that, then it would go to China. We would have pipelines built to the west coast of Canada. The oil would go to China in tanker ships and be refined in refineries that have higher emissions. So however you slice it, without the pipeline, we would have higher greenhouse gas emissions.

But here is what I want to touch on for just a few minutes today. I will talk about it more next week. Canada is working aggressively to get investment in the oil sands to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions. Exxon has a major project up there. Shell has a major project up there. The Exxon project is the Kearl project. The Shell project is the Quest project. In both cases they are bringing down the greenhouse gas emissions of the oil sands by investing in new technologies in cogeneration, and in carbon capture and storage. Hundreds of millions—billions of dollars are being invested along with the Canadian Government in carbon reduction technologies. Not only does that reduce the carbon footprint of the oil sands, but think about it—as that technology is developed, what happens? It is adopted in other places. It is adopted here in this country. It might be adopted in China and other places around the world. So the advances they make in technology in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, in reducing the footprint of this oil production and finding better ways, more cost-effective, more efficient ways, more environmentally friendly ways to produce that energy, that technology then is adopted around the world.

In other words, they are finding solutions to some of the concerns that are

being raised on the environmental front by the very critics of this project. So instead of stopping that investment and that advancement, why don't we find ways to continue to develop that, which is not only a benefit in the oil sands in Alberta, but it is a benefit that we can utilize to produce energy in this country and other places around the world. That is true for oil. That is true for gas. That is true for all fossil fuel energy.

See, that is how America has always worked. We create that business climate. We encourage the investment. We get American ingenuity. We get American companies to use their entrepreneurial genius to make those investments to not only create good jobs but to produce more energy, giving us energy security, and deploy the very technologies that give us the better environmental stewardship that we want. But when we block these projects, when we prevent the investment, when we will not let them build the infrastructure, we bring all of that to a grinding stop. Why would we do that? It does not make sense.

There is not one penny of U.S. taxpayer money going into this \$8 billion project. It is private investment. Why would we not want the private investment that helps build the infrastructure and develop and deploy the technology that gives us better environmental stewardship? Isn't that what it is all about? Isn't that why our powerplants and our energy production in this country are light-years ahead of what they are doing in countries around the world, where in many cases they are still using third world-type energy approaches? Let's lead the way forward in technology. Let's empower that to happen.

Because I note that the time is wrapping up here, I will come back to the floor next week. But I am going to talk about the hundreds of millions that are being invested in the Kearl project—Exxon is doing that project—and also in the Quest project, and Shell is doing that project. They are working with the provincial government in Alberta to develop carbon capture and storage. That is something we talk all the time about wanting to do. Here we have private companies working to put hundreds of millions into developing that very technology.

Since 1990 the greenhouse gas emissions for the production of oil in the oil sands has come down 28 percent—been reduced almost by one-third. They are continuing to find ways to improve the environmental stewardship and reduce the greenhouse gas emissions. Isn't that what we want versus continuing, for example, to import oil from Venezuela that has as high or a higher footprint, and you do not have that kind of investment in new technologies, that kind of investment in better environmental stewardship.

So as we talk about this issue, let's talk about it in a way where we advance the ball and we do it the right way; where we get the energy, the jobs, the economic growth; where we build our relationship with Canada rather than saying: No, we are not going to work with you guys. At the same time, we will get better environmental stewardship. We can do it. Let's do it.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the critical need for cyber security legislation.

Computers control nearly everything we use in our daily lives. They control our cars, our phones, our water supply, our power grid, our financial services, our retail networks, our food production and in many respects our military capabilities.

Fortunately, our adversaries have not yet succeeded in inflicting major physical damage on our Nation's interdependent critical infrastructure.

That is not to say however they are not vulnerable to persistent threats in cyber space. Look no further than in the "2014 U.S. State of Cybercrime Survey." That is a study prepared by PricewaterhouseCoopers, the U.S. Secret Service, Carnegie Mellon University, and CSO magazine.

Of the more than 500 U.S. executives and security experts surveyed, 77 percent of businesses detected an attempted security breach in the previous 12 months, and 34 percent of these businesses said the number of security incidents detected increased over the previous year, with an average number of 135 incidents per organization.

The report makes many key observations, but let me emphasize a key finding that resonated with me. One thing is very clear: Most organizations' cyber security programs do not rival the persistence, tactical skills, and technological prowess of today's cyber adversaries.

Cyber thieves proved their determination just last week when Russian hackers amassed over 1 billion Internet user names and passwords, the largest known collection of Internet credentials.

In the years following the September 11, 2001, attacks, the U.S. Director of National Intelligence consistently ranked terrorism as our No. 1 threat, but that started to change a few years ago. In 2012 then-FBI Director Robert Mueller predicted that "in the not too

distant future, we anticipate that the cyber threat will pose the number one threat to our country."

He was right.

In 2013 and 2014 the intelligence community's Worldwide Threat Assessment lists cyber as the top threat to our Nation. Terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and unauthorized leaks of classified information remain grave threats to our country, but cyber is now our No. 1 threat.

Yet it is hard to believe no major cyber security legislation has been enacted since 2002, when Congress passed the Federal Information Security Management Act—or FISMA—and the Cybersecurity Research and Development Act. Of course, there have been provisions relevant to cyber security enacted in subsequent laws but nothing as significant or comprehensive as the laws passed 12 years ago.

As we begin a new Congress, let me articulate a few guiding principles that should be included in any cyber security legislation.

First, we must acknowledge the need for the government and the private sector to cooperate in order to fend off cyber attacks, but today businesses are reluctant to share critical information out of fear of legal repercussions. Congress must provide proper incentives, such as liability protection, to encourage the private sector to share cyber threat information with our government.

Next, any cyber security legislation must strike the right balance between protecting our Nation's computer infrastructure and protecting individual privacy rights.

Thus, information sharing between businesses and the government must be tailored to the recipient's actual security responsibilities. Moreover, any legislation should avoid overly broad language that could clash with privacy protections.

Furthermore, a voluntary, non-regulatory approach is most likely to yield consensus legislation. The role of DHS and other government agencies should be to provide advice and resources to improve our Nation's cyber security posture, not to pile on additional burdensome regulations.

Finally, and perhaps most important, we must build a strong cyber security workforce in the public and the private sectors. Enacting cyber security legislation will mean very little if there are no trained professionals prepared to tackle our Nation's cyber security challenges.

In order to build the enduring capabilities capable of protecting our cyber infrastructure, we must encourage young people to pursue high-tech careers and attract highly skilled workers from around the world.

Beyond the civilian realm, the cyber threats we face present critical new challenges to our national security. Ar-

guably, we have not yet faced a similarly novel catalyst for policy formulation and change since the development of our nuclear deterrence strategy more than 60 years ago.

As we face this new world of cyber threats, the fundamental question remains the same: What is the most efficient and effective means to defend our country, the United States, while remaining true to the Constitution at the same time. Answering that question should be the cornerstone of the President's cyber security strategy.

I was encouraged to hear the President say during his visit to the National Cybersecurity Communications Integration Center earlier this week that "cyber threats are an urgent and growing danger." I certainly share that assessment of the dire nature of this very real threat to our national security.

While I applaud the White House for its plans to host a conference on cyber security and consumer protection next month, the nature of the cyber security threat demands a comprehensive strategy to protect our Nation.

Much work remains to be done on this front, especially from the standpoint of the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security. The urgency of this task was amplified when the Congressional Research Service concluded just this month that "the overarching defense strategy for securing cyberspace is vague and evolving."

As we face these threats, we must act decisively to ensure that bureaucratic barriers do not hinder the development of an effective strategy to counter threats from cyber space. As it stands, there is not a single agency primarily responsible for cyber defense.

The Department of Homeland Security is charged with protecting civilian networks and working with the private sector. The FBI and Secret Service are responsible for investigating cyber crime, and the Department of Defense is responsible for defending its own systems and partnering to protect the defense industrial base.

Critically, the Defense Department is only tasked with supporting DHS when the cyber attack is directed at our homeland. Yet these differences of responsibility can operate as artificial barriers to the efficient and effective cyber defense system.

Indeed, the lack of a single organization with direct responsibility runs counter to the basic leadership principle of unity of command. It bears remembering that these boundaries only exist for our agencies, not the hackers which seek to exploit the limitless terrain of cyber space. In a world in which the lines between cyber crime and cyber warfare are increasingly blurred, we need to ensure that all of our defensive cyber capabilities are brought to bear against the wide variety of

threats facing our infrastructure, private and public, civilian and military.

Nevertheless, the need for a primary agency of responsibility does not necessarily mean the Department of Defense should be that agency, even despite its remarkable capabilities. Such a course would raise both legal and practical concerns.

Beginning with the legal issue, as the Supreme Court has stated, there is a "traditional and strong resistance of Americans to any military intrusion into civilian affairs."

The use of the military to enforce the law, with respect to domestic hackers or to virtually patrol on private networks is problematic because of the provisions of 18 U.S.C. section 1835.

In addition, the Defense Department's organization to defend against cyber attacks might not be the most efficient. Currently, U.S. Cyber Command, which is responsible for the training and equipping of our cyber warriors, is also entrusted with the Department's operational activities in cyber space. Such a construct makes sense. Yet unlike a unified combatant command, Cyber Command is a subunified command under U.S. Strategic Command. Though this configuration has been considered and agreed to by the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am still not convinced of its value. Therefore, I also hope the President addresses how our military forces can best be aligned to facilitate the most efficient and effective cyber defense possible.

But returning to the larger question, if concentrating our efforts entirely in the hands of the Defense Department is not advisable, what are we to do?

One possible solution has been presented by Richard Clarke, the noted former member of the National Security Council, in his book, "Cyber War."

To be clear, I am not endorsing Mr. Clarke's proposal. We surely do not need another government bureaucracy, but I do believe it is an important concept to be discussed during future debates on cyber security. Specifically, Mr. Clarke argues for a civilian cyber defense administration which would be responsible for protecting "the dot-gov domain and critical infrastructure during an attack." As well as assigning those Federal law enforcement agencies personnel responsible for cyber crime to this centralized cyber defense administration, it would only be logical to ask if such an agency could provide other cyber defense functions.

Accordingly, addressing proposals such as this as part of answering the question as to what is the most effective organization we can employ for cyber security should be a focal point of the President's address.

But we should not just place these questions at the President's door. The Senate itself must consider modifying the way it considers cyber security legislation and issues.

Currently, there are at least five separate Senate committees which are responsible for various aspects of cyber security. Therefore, we, too, have a unity-of-effort issue, and the Senate should consider means to concentrate this body's expertise on this critical matter.

In conclusion, there are a myriad of questions which our government must address before we are able to state we have the most effective, efficient, and constitutional cyber security defense possible.

I hope the President fully utilizes the opportunity presented to him in his State of the Union Address to answer these important questions—and if he doesn't, we have to. So we better solve these problems. I presume the President will speak intelligently on these issues and hopefully in a way that will unify the country, unify the Congress, and get us all working in the same way.

We can't afford to let this drag any longer. This is one of the most important sets of issues we have in our country. It may be one of the most important issues or sets of issues in the world at large.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 12 in Saudi Arabia a prominent human rights lawyer, Mr. Waleed Abu al-Khair, was handed a 5-year extension to his 10-year prison sentence. Mr. Abu al-Khair, who is the founder and director of the watchdog group Monitor of Human Rights in Saudi Arabia, was also fined, banned from travel outside the country for 15 years after his release, and his websites will be shut down. What were the crimes that brought about this sentence? He was charged with harming the kingdom's reputation and insulting judicial authority, among other violations related to his non-violent activism.

This case and others like it certainly have harmed the kingdom's reputation, and insulted its judicial system, but the fault is not Mr. Abu al-Khair's.

After years of defending human rights activists as a legal advocate in Saudi courts, he was called in front of a terrorism tribunal at the end of 2013 for a trial that from its earliest days was declared a farce by human rights organizations. This was not the first time Mr. Abu al-Khair was made a target of the justice system, having first faced trial in 2011 for signing a petition that called for government reform.

During the fifth hearing in front of the terrorism tribunal he was jailed mid-trial under the January 2014 anti-terrorism law, which covers verbal acts that harm the reputation of the state. Mr. Abu al-Khair was eventually sentenced to 10 years for his activism amid growing international condemnation of Saudi repression. His decision not to disavow his beliefs led to this week's further sentencing.

Unfortunately, Mr. Abu al-Khair's case is not unique. As more Saudis have begun to speak out against government repression, the monarchy has responded by escalating its crackdown on dissent, including by using the already dubious terrorism tribunal system to punish human rights defenders.

It is ironic that while Saudi officials condemned the brutal killings of journalists at Charlie Hebdo, and their Ambassador attended the rally in Paris, their Justice Ministry was preparing to carry out the first of 1,000 public lashings of Raif Badawi. Like the cartoonists, Mr. Badawi has been accused of insulting Islam, and like them and his former lawyer, Mr. Abu al-Khair, he was simply exercising his nonviolent right of freedom of expression. Needless to say, his persecution has drawn an international outcry, including by many of those who joined the Saudi government in denouncing the attacks in Paris.

The United States and Saudi Arabia have long been strategic allies, and we want that relationship to continue. But the fundamental right of free expression cannot be a casualty of convenience. The injustices I have described must be addressed. Not only do these actions violate the Saudi government's stated policy and its commitment as a member of the UN Human Rights Council to protect human rights, but they are a flawed strategy for discouraging dissent. Ominously, as we have seen in many countries, they may cause critics of the government to resort to violence to achieve their goals.

I urge the Saudi government to release Mr. Abu al-Khair and Mr. Badawi and dismiss the spurious charges against them. This kind of repression and barbarity have no place in the 21st century.

CORN ETHANOL MANDATE ELIMINATION ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to submit an amendment with my

colleagues, Senators TOOMEY and FLAKE to correct a major problem with the current Renewable Fuel Standard: the mandate for corn ethanol. We see two major problems with continuing to mandate the consumption of so much corn ethanol each year. The statute currently mandates more corn ethanol than can be used by the current vehicle fleet and gas stations. Roughly 40 percent of the U.S. corn crop is now used to produce ethanol, artificially pushing up food and feed prices while damaging the environment. This amendment offers a simple fix that addresses both problems: elimination of the corn ethanol mandate.

Also, the amendment leaves in place the requirement that oil companies purchase and use low-carbon advanced biofuels, including cellulosic ethanol and biodiesel. This allows the program to focus on the fuels that best address climate change and do not compete with the food supply.

Let me highlight a few of the unintended consequences of the corn ethanol mandate. The policy has led us to use roughly 40 percent of the U.S. corn crop not for food but for fuel, nearly twice the rate in 2006. Using more and more corn for ethanol—in drought years as well as years with bumper crops—places unnecessary pressure on the price of corn.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated in June 2014 that escalating the volume of corn ethanol as currently required by statute would raise the average price of corn about 6 percent by 2017. That would increase food expenditures by \$3.5 billion per year by 2017, the equivalent of about \$10 per person, which most directly affects families living on the margin.

Internationally, according to Tufts University researchers, the corn ethanol mandate has cost net corn importing countries \$11.6 billion in higher corn prices, with more than half that cost, \$6.6 billion, borne by developing countries. Higher corn prices also raise prices throughout the food supply chain by raising the cost of animal feed. For the turkey industry alone, the Renewable Fuel Standard raised feed expenses by \$1.9 billion in 2013, according to the President of the National Turkey Federation. For the restaurant industry, a recent Price-Waterhouse-Coopers study projects that the corn ethanol mandate would increase costs by up to \$3.2 billion a year. For the milk industry, the Western United Dairyman reported in 2013 that a combination of high feed costs and low milk prices put 105 dairies out of business in one year alone.

The corn ethanol mandate also has unintended environmental consequences. In 2013, an investigative report from the Associated Press found using government satellite data that 1.2 million acres of virgin land in Nebraska and the Dakotas alone were

converted to fields of corn and soybeans since 2006. Putting virgin land under cultivation has environmental consequences, including greater runoff, greater use of fertilizer, and less land available for conservation.

Another consequence of the corn ethanol mandate is that it places a regulatory requirement on oil refiners that cannot actually be satisfied—it requires more ethanol than the auto fleet and existing gas stations can accommodate, a concept called the blend wall. Under the RFS, oil refineries are required to blend 15 billion gallons of corn ethanol into the fuel supply in 2015. This far exceeds the roughly 13.5 billion gallons that our current infrastructure can accommodate. According to the Environmental Protection Agency's final 2013 rule, the "EPA does not currently foresee a scenario in which the market could consume enough ethanol to meet the volumes stated in the statute." The Congressional Budget Office confirmed this judgment in its June 2014 report, saying that the statutory goal of escalating corn ethanol volumes would be "very hard to meet in future years."

Chevron, which operates oil refineries in my home State, is also concerned that the statutory mandate requires too much ethanol. It is Chevron's judgment that "the required volume of renewable fuel exceeds the amount that can be safely blended into transportation fuels used by consumers." Facing this difficulty, the EPA has been unable to finalize the volume requirements for 2014 or 2015. This leaves the businesses seeking to develop advanced biofuel ventures without any certain prospects to guide their investments and undermines the primary purpose of the Renewable Fuel Standard.

The Corn Ethanol Mandate Elimination Act would address the blend wall directly, thereby allowing EPA to continue increasing volumes of low carbon advanced biofuel.

The corn industry, by contrast, does not depend on the RFS for its livelihood. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that refiners will continue to blend corn ethanol into the fuel supply in the absence of a mandate, because ethanol is the oil refiner's preferred octane booster and oxygenate.

Ultimately, I believe that this bill would better serve the advanced biofuel industry by removing the blend wall as an obstacle to the industry's expansion, and providing the regulatory certainty that they need to guide their investments. These advanced biofuels have none of the same problems as corn ethanol. They do not compete directly with food, and they reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50 percent compared to petroleum.

I am also fundamentally committed to the vitally important public health

and climate protections provided by the Clean Air Act. That is why I would like to make it crystal clear that this legislation is a narrow bill repealing the corn ethanol mandate. The bill's language explicitly clarifies that the legislation has no effect on the low-carbon advanced biofuel provisions in the Renewable Fuel Standard, and I would oppose any bill that would amend, revise or weaken the advanced biofuel provisions or other public health protections provided by the Clean Air Act.

The elimination of the corn ethanol mandate is a smart, simple reform with support from the prepared food industry, the dairy, beef, and poultry industries, the oil and gas industries, hunger relief organizations, and environmental groups.

The bill solves the problems of the Renewable Fuel Standard while maintaining the provisions that encourage the development, growth, and deployment of cellulosic ethanol, algae-based fuel, biodiesel, and other low-carbon advanced biofuels.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

JOHNSON CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this year marks the centennial year of the establishment of the Johnson City Chamber of Commerce.

Since its establishment on July 6, 1915, the chamber has served as the leading voice for local business and community development. The chamber has been instrumental in transforming Johnson City from a small rail-shipping town in the early 1900s to a distinguished medical community over the past several decades and continues to lead the way for new business, trade, and growth in upper East Tennessee.

As we see around the country, the Federal Government has been throwing a big, wet blanket of burdensome regulations on businesses and the economy, and chambers of commerce around the Nation have been leaders in advocating to get Washington out of the way and unleash our free enterprise system. The best thing we can do for job creation is to remove these regulations so businesses and entrepreneurs will be able to get our economy moving again.

We need to be working to help our job creators put people back to work, and we thank the Johnson City chamber for its work to help Tennessee businesses and employees, and for all it has done to help Johnson City succeed and continue to thrive.

With a new Republican majority, we will work with the chamber to advance our shared goals to jump-start our

economy and liberate our free market so businesses in Tennessee and around the Nation will have the freedom they need to get our economy going in the right direction.●

VERMONT ESSAY WINNERS

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, since 2010 I have sponsored a State of the Union essay contest for Vermont students. The contest, now in its fifth year, is an opportunity for Vermont students to articulate what issues they would prioritize if they were President of the United States. A panel of Vermont teachers reviewed all of the essays submitted and selected the top twenty. I am proud to say that more than 400 students wrote essays for this year's State of the Union contest.

I would like to congratulate each and every finalist, and to specifically acknowledge Leo Lehrer-Small as this year's winner of the contest. I would also like to recognize Ryan Taggard for placing second and Craig Pelsor and Hadley Menk for placing third. I ask to have printed in the RECORD the winning essays.

The essays follow.

LEO LEHRER-SMALL, MOUNT MANSFIELD UNION HIGH SCHOOL (WINNER)

As we enter the year of 2015, there is one issue in particular that our government, in conjunction with global policy makers, need to address with attention and urgency. This issue, quite simply, is the safety of our planet: global climate change is already affecting the environment through droughts, increasingly frequent heat waves, and rising sea levels. It is a scientific fact that climate change is man-made, even though some politicians still deny the part that humans play in the issue.

As the most powerful country in the world, the US must be a driving force in halting global climate change. The question is: how do we go about doing this? In order to fix our growing crisis, we must first understand the roots of the problem. Last year's report released by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change showed that the recent rise of temperature is due to an excess of greenhouse gases that humans have released into our atmosphere. And to quote the Environmental Protection Agency, "The largest source of greenhouse gas emissions from human activities in the United States is from burning fossil fuels for electricity, heat, and transportation." So it is clear; the root of our problem is our overuse of fossil fuels.

We must take drastic measures to reduce our fossil fuel consumption. Congress must make and pass bills that finance green energy projects. Government subsidies which are currently being given to the oil and gas industries should be given to the renewable energy industry. This boost would allow renewable and clean energy sources such as wind and solar to provide more of the nation's energy, and in return lower our usage of fossil fuels. The growth of clean energy usage in the US would not only play a role in climate change reversal, but also provide millions of safe jobs for American workers.

Furthermore, our government should heavily tax the large greenhouse gas producers; companies that burn cheap fossil fuels to

make massive amounts of money. These are the main contributors to climate change. These are the corporations that we must limit through a tax on carbon dioxide. Such a tax would not only discourage the burning of fossil fuels, but the money may also be invested in the redevelopment of clean energy.

And as one of the leaders in our global economy, the rest of the world will look to us to initiate the transition towards clean energy usage. We have the opportunity to globally legitimize renewable energy, which is a vital step towards ending climate change. The action that our country takes on this problem will be a model for the rest of the world, which makes it the most important issue that should be addressed by the United States. Not taking care of the planet is not taking care of the people.

RYAN TAGGARD, BRATTLEBORO UNION HIGH SCHOOL (SECOND PLACE)

The state of our country has seen marked improvement over the last year. Unemployment is at its lowest level since before the recession, the stock market is setting record highs, and a manufacturing sector that has added jobs for the first time in nearly two decades. But we're working to regain lost ground, while neglecting the importance of innovating, creating, and aspiring—the very aspects that once made our country great.

Throughout the 60's and 70's, America was the planet's premier superpower. Despite the threat of an aggressive U.S.S.R. looming on the horizon, campus unrest, the conflict in Vietnam, and the civil rights movement playing out in confrontations on the street, we found time to dream about tomorrow. The engine of this growth was the relentless advancement of science and technology. Our crown jewel, NASA, was among the most powerful agencies the world had ever seen, and promised us a future full of plenty. We didn't outsource jobs, because no other nation could do what America could. We spawned entire industries built around new inventions. And most importantly, we gained a technological edge, strengthening our military, infrastructure, and economy.

MRIs, GPS receivers, cochlear implants, Lasik surgery, catalytic converters, the first fuel cells, cordless tools, cell phones, and the microprocessors that enable our lives are all direct results of our first forays into the abyss of space. Due to our curiosity, hundreds of thousands of lives were saved. Patients who were born deaf were given the ability to hear. The blind could see. The environment was restored in numerous and invaluable ways, and communication became constant and universal. Curiosity enabled our nation to perform miracles.

Unfortunately for our nation, NASA was formed in the midst of a panic induced by the launch of the Soviet's Sputnik. Once the American government saw that the U.S.S.R. wasn't ready to go to the moon, they ceded their push to move forwards. Today NASA's spending represents 0.49% of our federal budget. This half a penny off the tax dollar pays for all of NASA's operations: the International Space Station, Hubble telescope, Curiosity rover, all the astronauts, and more. With only a slight increase in funding, we could go back to the moon, send men to Mars, and journey on to explore asteroids and alien worlds.

The incentives for raising NASA's budget are diverse, powerful, and irrespective of party. As well as providing an opportunity for our government to assume a leadership position, the economic stimulus that accompanies a revived space industry would create new jobs, the technologies developed would

improve our lives, and the cultural shift that occurred in the 60's and 70's would once again become the norm. Students would aspire to become scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and technologists. We as a nation would reclaim our former spot at the very forefront of innovation. And America would reap the benefits of an educated, industrial, and forward thinking workforce.

HADLEY MENK, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (THIRD PLACE)

The future of our great nation is being threatened at this very moment, and the foe may not be what you suspect. The current states of our agricultural practices are harming our country's future in catastrophic ways. Before a country can focus on issues like health care, gun control, abortion, or even the functioning of its own government, it must make sure the people's basic needs are met. And nothing is more basic or essential than food.

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that the world's population will reach 9 billion people within the next 40 years. To meet this need, global agricultural production must increase by 70%. Elected officials of the United States must take this seriously. Fortunately, agriculture is a subject in which Vermont is well versed. It is time for Vermont to lead the way in advocating for more efficient, effective, and sustainable agriculture. Investing in agriculture is one of the simplest but most effective ways for the United States to protect its future as a nation and as a world leader.

There are several interconnected issues currently facing our agriculture industry, the most important of which are affordability, water, and land management. Food prices tend to fluctuate depending on the price of oil, as petroleum products are widely used in almost all aspects of food production. From trucks and equipment to synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, petroleum plays too large a role in our food. Emphasis must be placed on finding more natural alternatives to petroleum. Water and land management are also major issues. As is evidenced by the crisis in California, more needs to be done in terms of finding ways to better conserve water for agriculture. According to the Index Mundi, in North America in 1961, the amount of arable land per person was 1.1 hectares. In 2009, that number had decreased to .61 per person, due to land misuse. Legislators on a local, state, and national level need to work with scientists to solve these potentially catastrophic problems.

Without agriculture, it is impossible for any country to survive. Widespread food shortages can cause not only starvation but also corruption in the government. Investing in food production benefits everyone, regardless of race, gender, socioeconomic status, or political party, and yet agriculture is not treated with as much attention as issues like gun control and immigration in the media.

In order to preserve the future of the United States, we as Vermonters must lead the way in urging legislators to endorse measures that will improve agricultural methods and help farmers be more sustainable. In a letter to George Washington dated August 14, 1787, Thomas Jefferson stated that "Agriculture . . . is our wisest pursuit, because it will in the end contribute most to real wealth, good morals and happiness."

CRAIG PELSOR, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (THIRD PLACE)

The United States of America is without a doubt in a better position now than it was ten years ago. The economy has rebounded

and the few lingering effects of the "Great Recession" are being mended. The national unemployment rate stands at 5.9% as of September, the lowest it's been since 2008. The United States is producing more oil, natural gas and energy from renewable resources than ever before, which seeks to further the eventual dream of an energy independent America. In addition, rates for violent and property crimes continue to decline and our national GDP continues to outpace every other nation's.

Even with the future seeming so bright, there remains still pressing issues to which we must give our full attention.

As the economy has recovered and grown, so has the gap between the rich and the poor, and even the rich and the super-rich. We hear of the wealthiest one percent's still growing fortunes while those in the 30th or 10th percentile are still waiting for the wealth to trickle down. That has not worked, and we must do something to stem the tide of this growing inequality. To do this we must raise the minimum wage until it is a livable wage in all fifty states, as well as reorganizing our tax structure so that those with the most wealth are contributing more than those without. There is also the issue of massive student loan debts which dampen the potential success of graduates. With the average student loan debt growing, there are a number of steps we could take to make paying for higher education less of a financial burden. Expand the federal student loan program to grant more money to those who need it, while at the same time ensuring public colleges and universities do not raise their tuitions. The system of federally subsidized universities used in Canada and some European nations could easily be adopted in the United States in order to keep the working costs of our colleges and universities at a level where they will not need to raise their tuition costs every year.

On a global front, there continues the troubles in the Middle East and abroad, for which America has a duty to respond with both humanitarian aid and military force to ensure a lasting peace in the region. The arming of so called "moderate" rebels in conflicts in Syria have proven of little aid to America or its interests as well as the weapons and intelligence we provide ending up in unintended hands. Also, the billions of dollars of military aid to countries such as Israel which has become a massively unnecessary expenditure. In light of this, America should adopt a renewed focus on bettering education opportunities and the general standards of living in the Middle East and avoid joining any new conflicts. The containment and destruction of ISIS should remain a top priority, although the commitment of ground troops to the area should be withheld unless the situation gets far worse.

A chasm of trust has grown between American citizens and those put in charge of their protection, law enforcement, due to a lack of transparency and discretion. To that end, the United States government must provide the states with incentive to equip local law enforcement with things such as body cameras instead of armored vehicles and assault rifles, as well as further training in dealing with the mentally ill and minorities where it is most needed. Until the people feel like police officers are being held accountable for their actions, we cannot expect to further improve the nation.

Another small change which may help stem the continuing rise in prescription drug abuse would be the outlawing of television, radio and internet advertising for all pre-

scription drugs. With this people will be less likely to believe that they need all of the drugs that they see on television and that they are all safe because they are being publicly advertised.

There is no one solution to all the nation's problems, but through many small steps and congressional efforts like the ones that I have mentioned can make the United States of America a much stronger and prosperous nation. •

RECOGNIZING S&W WHOLESALE FOODS

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, one of the most important advantages of small businesses is their unparalleled devotion to their customers and communities. Small business owners are the most qualified to truly recognize and meet the needs of their local regions. Having a local presence can make all the difference when it comes to building up a community, providing essential goods and services, as well as giving back to those starting new ventures. For my second Small Business of the Week, I am honored to recognize S & W Wholesale Foods for its success and commitment to serving southeast Louisiana and parts of the Mississippi Gulf Coast.

Family owned and operated, Frank Spalitta and Richard Willams opened S & W Wholesale Foods in 1978. Over the years, it has grown from a 5,000 square foot operation to two locations in Hammond, LA, and Baton Rouge, LA. While S & W Wholesale Foods is well-known for distributing fresh food products such as meats, seafood, and produce, it also stocks complementary supplies, including plasticware, chemical and cleaning supplies, and paper products to surrounding restaurants, bakeries, childcare centers, convenience stores, and other local businesses. When Frank retired in 2006, his son and daughter-in-law, Paul and Tiffany Spalitta, purchased the business in order to keep the family tradition alive.

S & W Wholesale Foods has made a commitment to provide the best available products to its customers, while also supporting an environment in which local restaurants and businesses work together to succeed. As a shareholder in one of the largest foodservice distribution cooperatives, Unipro Foodservice, S & W Wholesale Foods is able to supply high-quality products and services for its customers, which in turn supply Louisianians and residents of the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Even more inspiring is that S & W Wholesale Foods incorporates Louisiana brands, including New Orleans Roast and Zatarain's, to its larger product base. One of the more unique aspects of the company is the quarterly brochure that shares seasonal recipes and localized tips and ideas to help readers build up and maintain their own businesses.

S & W Wholesale Foods is a great example of how hard work and quality

products can lead to a successful small business. The company's motto truly sums up the undeniable foundation of its priorities, "Large Enough to Serve . . . Small Enough to Care." It is my honor to recognize this company that works so diligently to promote the businesses of the customers they serve. Once again, I congratulate S & W Wholesale Foods for being recognized as this week's "Small Business of the Week" and wish them all of the best in the future. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:38 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 37. An act to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes.

H.R. 185. An act to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents.

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 37. An act to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 185. An act to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an above-the-line deduction for child care expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 181. A bill to jump-start economic recovery through the formation and growth of new businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 182. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 183. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 184. A bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to require background checks before foster care placements are ordered in tribal court proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 185. A bill to create a limited population pathway for approval of certain antibacterial drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 186. A bill to improve transparency and efficiency with respect to audits and communications between taxpayers and the Inter-

nal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 187. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 188. A bill to ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL pipeline into the United States is used to reduce United States dependence on Middle Eastern oil; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 27. A resolution to authorize testimony and representation in United States of America v. Jeffrey A. Sterling; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 165

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 165, a bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 171

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 171, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel in connection with certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 13 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 17 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 19 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 25

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 25 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 27—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. JEFFREY A. STERLING

Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 27

Whereas, in the case of *United States of America v. Jeffrey A. Sterling*, Cr. No. 10-485, pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, testimony has been requested from Julie Katzman, a former employee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current or former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Julie Katzman is authorized to testify in the case of *United States of America v. Jeffrey A. Sterling*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Ms. Katzman in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 35. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 36. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 37. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 38. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 39. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 40. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 41. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 42. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 43. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 44. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 45. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 46. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 47. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 48. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 49. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 50. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 51. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 52. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr.

CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 53. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 54. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 55. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 56. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 35. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. —. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SCHOOL.—The term “school” means—

(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

(C) a school of the defense dependents’ education system under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a

review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities to support the initiation of the projects;

(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(4) develop and maintain a single online resource website with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

SA 36. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr.

FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ USE OF ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURES IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) private sector funding and expertise can help address the energy efficiency challenges facing the United States;

(2) the Federal Government spends more than \$6,000,000,000 annually in energy costs;

(3) reducing Federal energy costs can help save money, create jobs, and reduce waste;

(4) energy savings performance contracts and utility energy service contracts are tools for using private sector investment to upgrade Federal facilities without any up-front cost to the taxpayer;

(5) performance contracting is a way to retrofit Federal buildings using private sector investment in the absence of appropriated dollars; and

(6) retrofits that reduce energy use also improve infrastructure, protect national security, and cut facility operations and maintenance costs.

(b) ENERGY MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 543(f)(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8253(f)(4)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(2) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) MEASURES NOT IMPLEMENTED.—Each energy manager, as part of the certification system under paragraph (7) and using guidelines developed by the Secretary, shall provide an explanation regarding any life-cycle cost-effective measures described in subparagraph (A)(i) that have not been implemented.”.

(c) REPORTS.—Section 548(b) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8258(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) the status of the energy savings performance contracts and utility energy service contracts of each agency;

“(B) the investment value of the contracts;

“(C) the guaranteed energy savings for the previous year as compared to the actual energy savings for the previous year;

“(D) the plan for entering into the contracts in the coming year; and

“(E) information explaining why any previously submitted plans for the contracts were not implemented.”.

(d) DEFINITION OF ENERGY CONSERVATION MEASURES.—Section 551(4) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8259(4)) is amended by striking “or retrofit activities” and inserting “retrofit activities, or energy consuming devices and required support structures”.

(e) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.—Section 801(a)(2)(F) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)(F)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) limit the recognition of operation and maintenance savings associated with systems modernized or replaced with the implementation of energy conservation measures, water conservation measures, or any combination of energy conservation measures and water conservation measures.”.

(f) MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITY.—Section 801(a)(2) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a Federal agency may sell or transfer energy savings and apply the proceeds of the sale or transfer to fund a contract under this title.”.

(g) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—Section 802 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287a) is amended by striking “(and related operation and maintenance expenses)” and inserting “, including related operations and maintenance expenses”.

(h) DEFINITION OF ENERGY SAVINGS.—Section 804(2) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287c(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “federally owned building or buildings or other federally owned facilities” and inserting “Federal building (as defined in section 551)” each place it appears;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) the use, sale, or transfer of energy incentives, rebates, or credits (including renewable energy credits) from Federal, State, or local governments or utilities; and

“(F) any revenue generated from a reduction in energy or water use, more efficient waste recycling, or additional energy generated from more efficient equipment.”.

SA 37. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY OF LIMITATIONS ON EXPORTATION OF DOMESTIC CRUDE OIL TO FOREIGN CRUDE OIL IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES BY PIPELINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, crude oil imported into the United States by pipeline shall be subject to the limitations described in subsection (b) and the licensing requirements described in subsection (c) to the same extent and in the same manner as those limitations and requirements apply to crude oil produced in the United States.

(b) LIMITATIONS DESCRIBED.—The limitations described in this subsection are the limitations on the exportation of crude oil produced in the United States under section 103(b) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212(b)), section 28(u) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(u)), and section 28 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1354).

(c) LICENSING REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED.—The licensing requirements described in this subsection are the licensing requirements applicable to crude oil produced in the United States under the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.)

(as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

SA 38. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CLARIFICATION OF OIL SANDS AS CRUDE OIL FOR EXCISE TAX PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4612(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) CRUDE OIL.—The term ‘crude oil’ includes crude oil condensates, natural gasoline, bitumen, and bituminous mixtures.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 4612(a) of such Code is amended by striking “from a well located”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 39. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGIONAL HAZE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”) shall not reject or disapprove, in whole or in part, a State implementation plan addressing any regional haze regulation of the Environmental Protection Agency (including the regulations described in sections 51.308 and 51.309 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)), if—

(1) the State—

(A) has submitted to the Administrator a State implementation plan for regional haze that considers the factors identified in section 169A of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7491); and

(B) substantially applied the relevant laws (including regulations) in determining the final plan to be selected;

(2) the Administrator cannot demonstrate, using the best available science, that a Federal implementation plan action governing a specific emissions source or emissions unit, when compared to the State plan, will result in greater than a 1.0 deciview improvement from any new emissions control in any single class I area (as classified under section 162 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7472)), based on a 3-year average of the maximum 98th-percentile impact; or

(3) implementation of the Federal implementation plan, when compared to the State plan, will result in an economic cost to the State or to the private sector of greater than \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year or \$300,000,000 in the aggregate.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies to all State implementation plans described in subsection (a) submitted to the Administrator before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 40. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to ap-

prove the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ELIMINATION OF CORN ETHANOL MANDATE FOR RENEWABLE FUEL.

(a) REMOVAL OF TABLE.—Section 211(o)(2)(B)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking subclause (I).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 211(o)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by redesignating subclauses (II) through (IV) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively;

(B) in subclause (I) (as so redesignated), by striking “of the volume of renewable fuel required under subclause (I),”; and

(C) in subclauses (II) and (III) (as so redesignated), by striking “subclause (II)” each place it appears and inserting “subclause (I)”; and

(2) in clause (v), by striking “clause (i)(IV)” and inserting “clause (i)(III)”.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section affects the volumes of advanced biofuel, cellulosic biofuel, or biomass-based diesel that are required under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)).

SA 41. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STANDARDS FOR COAL REFUSE POWER PLANTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 19th-century mining operations left behind more than 2,000,000,000 tons of coal refuse on surface land in various coal mining regions of the United States;

(2) coal refuse piles—

(A) pose significant environmental risks;

(B) have contaminated more than 180,000 acres of land and streams; and

(C) are susceptible to fires that endanger public health and emit an estimated 9,000,000 tons of carbon dioxide each year, in addition to other uncontrolled pollutants;

(3) the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, and the Department of Environmental Protection of the State of Pennsylvania recognize the significant public health benefits of power plants that use coal refuse as fuel;

(4) since the inception of coal refuse power plants, the plants have removed 210,000,000 tons of coal refuse and restored 8,200 acres of contaminated land; and

(5) due to the unique nature of coal refuse and the power plants that use coal refuse as a fuel, those plants face distinct economic and technical obstacles to achieving compliance with regulatory standards established for traditional coal-fired power plants.

(b) DEFINITION OF COAL REFUSE.—In this section, the term “coal refuse” means any byproduct of coal mining, physical coal cleaning, or coal preparation operations that contains coal, matrix material, clay, and other organic and inorganic material.

(c) EMISSION LIMITATIONS FOR CERTAIN ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The general emission limitations established by the Environmental Protection Agency in the final rule entitled “Federal Implementation Plans: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone and Correction of SIP Approvals” (76 Fed. Reg. 48208 (August 8, 2011)) (or a successor regulation) shall not apply to an electric utility steam generating unit described in paragraph (3).

(2) HYDROGEN CHLORIDE AND SULFUR DIOXIDE.—The emission limitations for hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide contained in table 2 of subpart UUUUU of part 63 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), entitled “Emission Limits for Existing EGUs” shall not apply to an electric utility steam generating unit described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNITS.—An electric utility steam generating unit referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) is an electric utility steam generating unit that—

(A) is in operation as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) uses fluidized bed combustion technology to convert coal refuse into energy; and

(C) uses coal refuse as at least 50 percent of the annual fuel consumed, by weight, of the unit.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this section takes effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 42. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the possible impediments to transitioning the entire Federal fleet (as that term is defined in section 303(b)(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212(b)(3)) and vehicles of the United States Postal Service to vehicles fueled by natural gas.

(2) CRITERIA.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall specifically examine—

(A) the status of refueling infrastructure;

(B) the ability of private vendors to supply adequate numbers of natural gas vehicles, including the necessary accessories; and

(C) any new maintenance requirements, including technical training for employees of the Federal Government, that the transition would require.

(b) REPORT.—On completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

SA 43. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone

XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “North American Energy Infrastructure Act”.

SEC. 202. FINDING.

Congress finds that the United States should establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

SEC. 203. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (c) and section 207, no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment under this section.

(b) **CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a cross-border segment for which a request is received under this section, the relevant official identified under paragraph (2), in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment unless the relevant official finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment is not in the public interest of the United States.

(2) **RELEVANT OFFICIAL.**—The relevant official referred to in paragraph (1) is—

(A) the Secretary of State with respect to oil pipelines; and

(B) the Secretary of Energy with respect to electric transmission facilities.

(3) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.**—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing for the request under paragraph (1), that the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(A) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(B) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility.

(c) **EXCLUSIONS.**—This section shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico—

(1) if the cross-border segment is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) if a permit described in section 206 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued;

(3) if a certificate of crossing for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has previously been issued under this section; or

(4) if an application for a permit described in section 206 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which such application is denied; or

(B) July 1, 2016.

(d) **EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.**—

(1) **APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section or section 207 shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment is sought under this section.

(2) **ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.**—Nothing in this section or section 207 shall affect the authority of the President under section 103(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

SEC. 204. IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking, “For purposes of subsection (a) of this section” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subsection (a)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA AND MEXICO.**—In the case of an application for the importation or exportation of natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico, the Commission shall approve the application not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the application.”.

SEC. 205. TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

(a) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.**—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **STATE REGULATIONS.**—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking “insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission’s powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)”.

(2) **SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.**—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a-4(b)) is amended by striking “the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.”.

SEC. 206. NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.

No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order No. 12038, Executive Order No. 10485, or any other Executive

order shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any cross-border segment thereof.

SEC. 207. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.

No certificate of crossing under section 203, or permit described in section 206, shall be required for a modification to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility—

(1) that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico as of the date of enactment of the Act;

(2) for which a permit described in section 206 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(3) for which a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility has previously been issued under section 203.

SEC. 208. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Sections 203 through 207, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect on July 1, 2015.

(b) **RULEMAKING DEADLINES.**—Each relevant official described in section 203(b)(2) shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of section 203; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of section 203.

SEC. 209. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “cross-border segment” means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at the national boundary of the United States with either Canada or Mexico;

(2) the term “modification” includes a change in ownership, volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnection, or adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations);

(3) the term “natural gas” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a);

(4) the term “oil” means petroleum or a petroleum product;

(5) the terms “Electric Reliability Organization” and “regional entity” have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o); and

(6) the terms “Independent System Operator” and “Regional Transmission Organization” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

SA 44. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTION OF EXISTING GRAZING RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any rule or regulation of the Bureau of Land Management, within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, in areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management, any grazing of livestock that was established as of September 17, 1996, or the date that is 1 day before the designation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in accordance with Presidential Proclamation Number 6920 (whichever is earlier), and any grazing of livestock that has been established since that date, shall be allowed to continue subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary of the Interior considers to be necessary, on the condition that the Secretary shall allow the grazing levels to continue at current levels to the maximum extent practicable.

(b) PERMITS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior may issue new permits (or renew permits) for the grazing of livestock in the areas described in subsection (a).

SA 45. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PRIORITIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL REVENUES.

Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and all that follows through “All money received” in the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 35. DISPOSITION OF MONEY RECEIVED.

“(a) DISPOSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—All money received”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking “All moneys received” and inserting the following:

“(2) AMOUNTS TO MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—All money received”;

(B) in the third sentence, by striking “Payments to States” and inserting the following:

“(3) DEADLINES.—Payments to States”;

(C) in paragraph (2) (as designated by subparagraph (A)), by adding at the end the following:

“(B) PRIORITIZATION OF REVENUES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, after the date of enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, the Secretary or Congress increases a royalty rate under this Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act), of the amount described in clause (ii), there shall be deposited annually in a special account in the Treasury only such funds as are necessary to fulfill the staffing requirements of the agencies responsible for activities relating to—

“(I) coordinating or permitting Federal oil and gas leases;

“(II) permits to drill and applications for permits to drill (APDs); and

“(III) compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(ii) DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the amounts credited to miscellaneous receipts under paragraph (1), taking into account the increased royalty rate under this Act, as described in clause (i); and

“(II) the amounts credited to miscellaneous receipts under paragraph (1), as in effect on the day before the effective date of such an increased royalty rate.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting the clauses appropriately;

(B) by striking “(2) Of” and inserting the following:

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Of”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) PRIORITIZATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, after the date of enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, the Secretary or Congress increases a rental rate under this Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act), of the money deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (A)(ii), only such funds as are necessary from the amount described in clause (ii) shall be used to fulfill the staffing requirements of the agencies responsible for activities relating to—

“(I) coordinating or permitting Federal oil and gas leases;

“(II) permits to drill and applications for permits to drill (APDs); and

“(III) compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(ii) DESCRIPTION OF AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in clause (i) is an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the amounts deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (A)(ii), taking into account the increased rental rate under this Act, as described in clause (i); and

“(II) the amounts of the money deposited in the Fund under subparagraph (A)(ii), as in effect on the day before the effective date of such an increased rental rate.”.

SA 46. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION.

The Mineral Leasing Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 44 (30 U.S.C. 181 note) as section 45; and

(2) by inserting after section 43 (30 U.S.C. 226-3) the following:

“SEC. 44. STATE AUTHORITY FOR HYDRAULIC FRACTURING REGULATION.

“(a) DEFINITION OF HYDRAULIC FRACTURING.—In this section the term ‘hydraulic fracturing’ means the process by which fracturing fluids (or a fracturing fluid system) are pumped into an underground geologic formation at a calculated, predetermined rate and pressure to generate fractures or cracks in the target formation and, as a result, increase the permeability of the rock near the wellbore and improve production of natural gas or oil.

“(b) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not enforce any Federal regula-

tion, guidance, or permit requirement regarding hydraulic fracturing, or any component of hydraulic fracturing, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on or under any land in any State that has regulations, guidance, or permit requirements for hydraulic fracturing.

“(c) STATE AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall recognize and defer to State regulations, guidance, and permitting for all activities regarding hydraulic fracturing, or any component of hydraulic fracturing, relating to oil, gas, or geothermal production activities on Federal land regardless of whether the regulations, guidance, and permitting are duplicative, more or less restrictive, have different requirements, or do not meet Federal regulations, guidance, or permit requirements.”.

SA 47. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR PINYON-JUNIPER TREE REMOVAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a vegetation management project by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management or the Chief of the Forest Service involving removal or treatment of any Pinyon or Juniper tree for the purpose of conserving or restoring the habitat of the greater sage-grouse or mule deer shall be eligible to be a categorical exclusion (as defined in section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)) for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

SA 48. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DEFINITION OF UNDERGROUND INJECTION.

Section 1421(d)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) includes the underground injection of natural gas for purposes of storage.”.

SA 49. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE.

(a) MORATORIUM ON CLOSING OR CONSOLIDATING POSTAL FACILITIES.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service may not close or consolidate any processing and distribution center, processing and distribution facility, network distribution center, or other facility that is operated by the United States Postal Service, the primary function of which is to sort and process mail.

(b) MORATORIUM ON CHANGES TO SERVICE STANDARDS.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Postal Service shall apply the service standards for first-class mail and periodicals under part 121 of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, that were in effect on July 1, 2012.

SA 50. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CLARIFICATION OF TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL FOR EXCISE TAX PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4612(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) CRUDE OIL.—The term ‘crude oil’ includes—

“(A) crude oil condensates and natural gasoline, and

“(B) in the case of any calendar quarter beginning more than 60 days after the date on which the certification under subsection (g) is made, synthetic petroleum, any bitumen or bituminous mixture, any oil derived from a bitumen or bituminous mixture, and any oil derived from kerogen-bearing sources.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 4612(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of any calendar quarter beginning more than 60 days after the date on which the certification under subsection (g) is made, the preceding sentence shall be applied without regard to whether the crude oil is produced from a well.”.

(c) CERTIFICATION THAT MODIFICATION WILL NOT INCREASE PRICE OF GASOLINE.—Section 4612 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO DEFINITION OF CRUDE OIL.—The Secretary shall not make a certification under this subsection unless the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the provisions of subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(1) and the second sentence of subsection (a)(2) will not result in any increase in the retail price of gasoline in the United States.”.

SA 51. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—METAL THEFT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Metal Theft Prevention Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “critical infrastructure” has the meaning given the term in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e));

(2) the term “recycling agent” means any person engaged in the business of purchasing specified metal for reuse or recycling, without regard to whether that person is engaged in the business of recycling or otherwise processing the purchased specified metal for reuse; and

(3) the term “specified metal” means metal that—

(A)(i) is marked with the name, logo, or initials of a city, county, State, or Federal government entity, a railroad, an electric, gas, or water company, a telephone company, a cable company, a retail establishment, a beer supplier or distributor, or a public utility; or

(ii) has been altered for the purpose of removing, concealing, or obliterating a name, logo, or initials described in clause (i) through burning or cutting of wire sheathing or other means; or

(B) is part of—

(i) a street light pole or street light fixture;

(ii) a road or bridge guard rail;

(iii) a highway or street sign;

(iv) a water meter cover;

(v) a storm water grate;

(vi) unused or undamaged building construction or utility material;

(vii) a historical marker;

(viii) a grave marker or cemetery urn;

(ix) a utility access cover; or

(x) a container used to transport or store beer with a capacity of 5 gallons or more;

(C) is a wire or cable commonly used by communications and electrical utilities; or

(D) is copper, aluminum, and other metal (including any metal combined with other materials) that is valuable for recycling or reuse as raw metal, except for—

(i) aluminum cans; and

(ii) motor vehicles, the purchases of which are reported to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (established under section 30502 of title 49, United States Code).

SEC. 203. THEFT OF SPECIFIED METAL.

(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful to knowingly steal specified metal—

(1) being used in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; and

(2) the theft of which is from and harms critical infrastructure.

(b) PENALTY.—Any person who commits an offense described in subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 204. DOCUMENTATION OF OWNERSHIP OR AUTHORITY TO SELL.

(a) OFFENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase specified metal described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 202(3), unless—

(A) the seller, at the time of the transaction, provides documentation of ownership of, or other proof of the authority of the seller to sell, the specified metal; and

(B) there is a reasonable basis to believe that the documentation or other proof of authority provided under subparagraph (A) is valid.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a requirement on recycling agents to obtain documentation of ownership or proof of authority to sell specified metal before purchasing specified metal.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY OF RECYCLING AGENT.—A recycling agent is not required to indepen-

ently verify the validity of the documentation or other proof of authority described in paragraph (1).

(4) PURCHASE OF STOLEN METAL.—It shall be unlawful for a recycling agent to purchase any specified metal that the recycling agent—

(A) knows to be stolen; or

(B) should know or believe, based upon commercial experience and practice, to be stolen.

(b) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 for each violation.

SEC. 205. TRANSACTION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) RECORDING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent shall maintain a written or electronic record of each purchase of specified metal.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth recording requirements that are substantially similar to the requirements described in paragraph (3) for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) CONTENTS.—A record under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the name and address of the recycling agent; and

(B) for each purchase of specified metal—

(i) the date of the transaction;

(ii) a description of the specified metal purchased using widely used and accepted industry terminology;

(iii) the amount paid by the recycling agent;

(iv) the name and address of the person to which the payment was made;

(v) the name of the person delivering the specified metal to the recycling agent, including a distinctive number from a Federal or State government-issued photo identification card and a description of the type of the identification; and

(vi) the license plate number and State-of-issue, make, and model, if available, of the vehicle used to deliver the specified metal to the recycling agent.

(4) REPEAT SELLERS.—A recycling agent may comply with the requirements of this subsection with respect to a purchase of specified metal from a person from which the recycling agent has previously purchased specified metal by—

(A) reference to the existing record relating to the seller; and

(B) recording any information for the transaction that is different from the record relating to the previous purchase from that person.

(5) RECORD RETENTION PERIOD.—A recycling agent shall maintain any record required under this subsection for not less than 2 years after the date of the transaction to which the record relates.

(6) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Any information collected or retained under this section may be disclosed to any Federal, State, or local law enforcement authority or as otherwise directed by a court of law.

(b) PURCHASES IN EXCESS OF \$100.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a recycling agent may not pay cash for a single purchase of specified metal of more than \$100. For purposes of this paragraph, more than 1 purchase in any 48-hour period from the same seller shall be considered to be a single purchase.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a recycling agent that is subject to a State or local law that sets forth a maximum amount for cash payments for the purchase of specified metal.

(3) PAYMENT METHOD.—

(A) OCCASIONAL SELLERS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for any purchase of specified metal of more than \$100 a recycling agent shall make payment by check that—

- (i) is payable to the seller; and
- (ii) includes the name and address of the seller.

(B) ESTABLISHED COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS.—A recycling agent may make payments for a purchase of specified metal of more than \$100 from a governmental or commercial supplier of specified metal with which the recycling agent has an established commercial relationship by electronic funds transfer or other established commercial transaction payment method through a commercial bank if the recycling agent maintains a written record of the payment that identifies the seller, the amount paid, and the date of the purchase.

(C) CIVIL PENALTY.—A person who knowingly violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$5,000 for each violation, except that a person who commits a minor violation shall be subject to a penalty of not more than \$1,000.

SEC. 206. ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

The Attorney General may bring an enforcement action in an appropriate United States district court against any person that engages in conduct that violates this title.

SEC. 207. ENFORCEMENT BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An attorney general or equivalent regulator of a State may bring a civil action in the name of the State, as parens patriae on behalf of natural persons residing in the State, in any district court of the United States or other competent court having jurisdiction over the defendant, to secure monetary or equitable relief for a violation of this title.

(b) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which an action under subsection (a) is filed, the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State involved shall provide to the Attorney General—

- (1) written notice of the action; and
- (2) a copy of the complaint for the action.

(c) ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.—Upon receiving notice under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall have the right—

- (1) to intervene in the action;
- (2) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein;
- (3) to remove the action to an appropriate district court of the United States; and
- (4) to file petitions for appeal.

(d) PENDING FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS.—If a civil action has been instituted by the Attorney General for a violation of this title, no State may, during the pendency of the action instituted by the Attorney General, institute a civil action under this title against any defendant named in the complaint in the civil action for any violation alleged in the complaint.

(e) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing a civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this section regarding notification shall be construed to prevent the attorney general or equivalent regulator of the State from exercising any powers conferred under the laws of that State to—

- (1) conduct investigations;
- (2) administer oaths or affirmations; or
- (3) compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

SEC. 208. DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and policy statements applicable to a person convicted of a criminal violation of section 203 of this Act or any other Federal criminal law based on the theft of specified metal by such person.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Sentencing Commission shall—

- (1) ensure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements reflect the—

(A) serious nature of the theft of specified metal; and

(B) need for an effective deterrent and appropriate punishment to prevent such theft;

- (2) consider the extent to which the guidelines and policy statements appropriately account for—

(A) the potential and actual harm to the public from the offense, including any damage to critical infrastructure;

(B) the amount of loss, or the costs associated with replacement or repair, attributable to the offense;

(C) the level of sophistication and planning involved in the offense; and

(D) whether the offense was intended to or had the effect of creating a threat to public health or safety, injury to another person, or death;

(3) account for any additional aggravating or mitigating circumstances that may justify exceptions to the generally applicable sentencing ranges;

(4) assure reasonable consistency with other relevant directives and with other sentencing guidelines and policy statements; and

(5) assure that the sentencing guidelines and policy statements adequately meet the purposes of sentencing as set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 209. STATE AND LOCAL LAW NOT PRE-EMPTED.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to preempt any State or local law regulating the sale or purchase of specified metal, the reporting of such transactions, or any other aspect of the metal recycling industry.

SEC. 210. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 52. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ENERGY EFFICIENCY RETROFIT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICANT.—The term “applicant” means a nonprofit organization that applies for a grant under this section.

(2) ENERGY-EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “energy-efficiency improvement” means an installed

measure (including a product, equipment, system, service, or practice) that results in a reduction in use by a nonprofit organization for energy or fuel supplied from outside the nonprofit building.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “energy-efficiency improvement” includes an installed measure described in subparagraph (A) involving—

- (i) repairing, replacing, or installing—
- (I) a roof or lighting system, or component of a roof or lighting system;
- (II) a window;
- (III) a door, including a security door; or
- (IV) a heating, ventilation, or air conditioning system or component of the system (including insulation and wiring and plumbing improvements needed to serve a more efficient system);

(ii) a renewable energy generation or heating system, including a solar, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, or biomass (including wood pellet) system or component of the system; and

(iii) any other measure taken to modernize, renovate, or repair a nonprofit building to make the nonprofit building more energy efficient.

(3) NONPROFIT BUILDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “nonprofit building” means a building operated and owned by a nonprofit organization.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “nonprofit building” includes a building described in subparagraph (A) that is—

- (i) a hospital;
- (ii) a youth center;
- (iii) a school;
- (iv) a social-welfare program facility;
- (v) a faith-based organization; and
- (vi) any other nonresidential and non-commercial structure.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program to award grants for the purpose of retrofitting nonprofit buildings with energy-efficiency improvements.

(c) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants under the program established under subsection (b).

(2) APPLICATION.—The Secretary may award a grant under this section if an applicant submits to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe.

(3) CRITERIA FOR GRANT.—In determining whether to award a grant under this section, the Secretary shall apply performance-based criteria, which shall give priority to applications based on—

- (A) the energy savings achieved;
- (B) the cost-effectiveness of the energy-efficiency improvement;
- (C) an effective plan for evaluation, measurement, and verification of energy savings;
- (D) the financial need of the applicant; and
- (E) the percentage of the matching contribution by the applicant.

(4) LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL GRANT AMOUNT.—Each grant awarded under this section shall not exceed—

- (A) an amount equal to 50 percent of the energy-efficiency improvement; and
- (B) \$200,000.

(5) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant awarded under this section shall be subject to a minimum non-Federal cost-sharing requirement of 50 percent.

(B) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share may be provided in the form of in-kind contributions of materials or services.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, to remain available until expended.

(e) OFFSET.—Section 942(f) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16251(f)) is amended by striking “\$250,000,000” and inserting “\$200,000,000”.

SA 53. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology recommends that the United States develop a Governmentwide Federal energy policy and update the policy regularly with strategic Quadrennial Energy Reviews similar to the reviews conducted by the Department of Defense;

(2) as the lead agency in support of energy science and technology innovation, the Department of Energy has conducted a Quadrennial Technology Review of the energy technology policies and programs of the Department;

(3) the Quadrennial Technology Review of the Department of Energy serves as the basis for coordination with other agencies and on other programs for which the Department has a key role;

(4) a Quadrennial Energy Review would—
(A) establish integrated, Governmentwide national energy objectives in the context of economic, environmental, and security priorities;

(B) coordinate actions across Federal agencies;

(C) identify the resources needed for the invention, adoption, and diffusion of energy technologies; and

(D) provide a strong analytical base for Federal energy policy decisions;

(5) a Quadrennial Energy Review should be established taking into account estimated Federal budgetary resources;

(6) the development of an energy policy resulting from a Quadrennial Energy Review would—

(A) enhance the energy security of the United States;

(B) create jobs; and

(C) mitigate environmental harm; and

(7) while a Quadrennial Energy Review will be a product of the executive branch, the review will have substantial input from—

(A) Congress;

(B) the energy industry;

(C) academia;

(D) nongovernmental organizations; and

(E) the public.

(b) QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 801 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7321) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 801. QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy within the Executive Office of the President.

“(2) FEDERAL LABORATORY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘Federal Laboratory’ has the meaning given the term ‘laboratory’ in section 12(d) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)).

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘Federal Laboratory’ includes a federally funded research and development center sponsored by a Federal agency.

“(3) INTERAGENCY ENERGY COORDINATION COUNCIL.—The term ‘interagency energy coordination council’ means a council established under subsection (b)(1).

“(4) QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW.—The term ‘Quadrennial Energy Review’ means a comprehensive multiyear review, coordinated across Federal agencies, that—

“(A) focuses on energy programs and technologies;

“(B) establishes energy objectives across the Federal Government; and

“(C) covers each of the areas described in subsection (d)(2).

“(b) INTERAGENCY ENERGY COORDINATION COUNCIL.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, and every 4 years thereafter, the President shall establish an interagency energy coordination council to coordinate the Quadrennial Energy Review.

“(2) CO-CHAIRPERSONS.—The appropriate senior Federal Government official designated by the President and the Director shall be co-chairpersons of the interagency energy coordination council.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The interagency energy coordination council shall be comprised of representatives at level I or II of the Executive Schedule of—

“(A) the Department of Energy;

“(B) the Department of Commerce;

“(C) the Department of Defense;

“(D) the Department of State;

“(E) the Department of the Interior;

“(F) the Department of Agriculture;

“(G) the Department of the Treasury;

“(H) the Department of Transportation;

“(I) the Office of Management and Budget;

“(J) the National Science Foundation;

“(K) the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(L) such other Federal organizations, departments, and agencies that the President considers to be appropriate.

“(c) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—Each Quadrennial Energy Review shall be conducted to provide an integrated view of important national energy objectives and Federal energy policy, including the maximum practicable alignment of research programs, incentives, regulations, and partnerships.

“(d) SUBMISSION OF QUADRENNIAL ENERGY REVIEW TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 1, 2016, and every 4 years thereafter, the President shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the Quadrennial Energy Review.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—The report described in paragraph (1) should include, as appropriate—

“(A) an integrated view of short-, intermediate-, and long-term objectives for Federal energy policy in the context of economic, environmental, and security priorities;

“(B) anticipated Federal actions (including programmatic, regulatory, and fiscal actions) and resource requirements—

“(i) to achieve the objectives described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) to be coordinated across multiple agencies;

“(C) an analysis of the prospective roles of parties (including academia, industry, consumers, the public, and Federal agencies) in achieving the objectives described in subparagraph (A), including—

“(i) an analysis, by energy use sector, including—

“(I) commercial and residential buildings;

“(II) the industrial sector;

“(III) transportation; and

“(IV) electric power;

“(ii) requirements for invention, adoption, development, and diffusion of energy technologies that are mapped onto each of the energy use sectors; and

“(iii) other research that inform strategies to incentivize desired actions;

“(D) an assessment of policy options to increase domestic energy supplies and energy efficiency;

“(E) an evaluation of energy storage, transmission, and distribution requirements, including requirements for renewable energy;

“(F) an integrated plan for the involvement of the Federal Laboratories in energy programs;

“(G) portfolio assessments that describe the optimal deployment of resources, including prioritizing financial resources for energy programs;

“(H) a mapping of the linkages among basic research and applied programs, demonstration programs, and other innovation mechanisms across the Federal agencies;

“(I) an identification of, and projections for, demonstration projects, including timeframes, milestones, sources of funding, and management;

“(J) an identification of public and private funding needs for various energy technologies, systems, and infrastructure, including consideration of public-private partnerships, loans, and loan guarantees;

“(K) an assessment of global competitors and an identification of programs that can be enhanced with international cooperation;

“(L) an identification of policy gaps that need to be filled to accelerate the adoption and diffusion of energy technologies, including consideration of—

“(i) Federal tax policies; and

“(ii) the role of Federal agencies as early adopters and purchasers of new energy technologies;

“(M) a priority list for implementation of objectives and actions taking into account estimated Federal budgetary resources;

“(N) an analysis of—

“(i) points of maximum leverage for policy intervention to achieve outcomes; and

“(ii) areas of energy policy that can be most effective in meeting national goals for the energy sector; and

“(O) recommendations for executive branch organization changes to facilitate the development and implementation of Federal energy policies.

“(e) INTERIM REPORTS.—The President may prepare and publish interim reports as part of the Quadrennial Energy Review.

“(f) EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall provide the Quadrennial Energy Review with an Executive Secretariat who shall make available the necessary analytical, financial, and administrative support for the conduct of each Quadrennial Energy Review required under this section.

“(2) COOPERATION.—The heads of applicable Federal agencies shall cooperate with the

Secretary and provide such assistance, information, and resources as the Secretary may require to assist in carrying out this section."

(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section supersedes, modifies, amends, or repeals any provision of Federal law not expressly superseded, modified, amended, or repealed by this section.

SA 54. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ENSURING PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the credit allowed under section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is permanently extended for facilities described in subsection (d)(1) of such section.

SA 55. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY OF BY-PRODUCT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall complete and make publicly available on the Internet a study assessing the potential environmental impact of by-products generated from the refining of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in section (2)(a), including petroleum coke.

(b) **REPORT.**—On completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including a summary of best practices for the transportation, storage, and handling of petroleum coke.

SA 56. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON PROPOSED POWDER RIVER 3 LOW MILITARY OPERATIONS AREA.

The Secretary of the Air Force may not approve the proposed Powder River 3 Low

Military Operations Area (MOA), described in the final environmental impact statement for the Powder River Training Complex as "500 feet altitude above ground level (AGL) up to, but not including, 12,000 feet MSL" in the Powder River 3 section of the Powder River Training Complex.

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2014 fourth quarter Mass Mailing report is Monday, January 26, 2015. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records will be open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 27, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 27) to authorize testimony and representation in United States of America v. Jeffrey A. Sterling.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony in a criminal case under way in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. In this case, a former CIA officer has been charged with unlawfully disclosing classified information. In 2010, the Senate agreed to S. Res. 600, in the 111th Congress, which authorized the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to provide evidence in the investigation that preceded this indictment.

In addition to Senate Intelligence Committee staff, testimony as a fact witness has been requested from a former employee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The chairman and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee would like to cooperate with the request for testimony in this case.

Accordingly, this resolution would authorize the former Judiciary Committee employee to testify at trial with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 240

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Tuesday, January 20, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 20, 2015; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; I further ask that the Senate then proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning

business, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference lunches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Senators should anticipate votes on pending amendments to the bill starting shortly after lunch on Tuesday. Senators MURKOWSKI and CANTWELL are working with Members on both sides of the aisle to debate and offer amendments to the bill. Now that we have overcome the Democratic filibuster on the motion to proceed to this bill, Senators are free to come to offer their amendments.

The tree has not been filled and Chairman MURKOWSKI is managing an orderly process to alternate amendments between the two sides.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2015, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:33 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 20, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

JOHN E. MENDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2015, VICE SHARON Y. BOWEN, RESIGNED.

JOHN E. MENDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ADEWALE ADEYEMO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE MARISA LAGO.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BRIAN JAMES EGAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE LEGAL ADVISER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, VICE HAROLD HONGJU KOH, RESIGNED.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

MATTHEW T. MCGUIRE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE IAN HODDY SOLOMON, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, I attended the funeral of the former Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo, in New York City. Consequently I missed several votes in the House of Representatives.

I would like to submit how I intended to vote had I been present:

On Roll Call 1, the Quorum Call of the House, I would have voted PRESENT.

On Roll Call 2, the Election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I would have voted for Representative NANCY PELOSI of California.

On Roll Call 3, to Table the Motion to Refer H. Res. 5, Adopting rules for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, I would have voted NAY.

On Roll Call 4, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 5, I would have voted NAY.

On Roll Call 5, the Motion to Recommit H. Res. 5 with Instructions, I would have voted YEA.

On Roll Call 6, Agreeing to H. Res. 5, I would have voted NAY.

On Roll Call 7, the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 22, I would have voted YEA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain my vote on Wednesday, January 14, 2015 in opposition to H.R. 240, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015. Although I support many aspects of this legislation, I was unable to support the final bill due to a number of troubling amendments.

I am strongly in favor of funding the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), especially with the risk of terrorism we currently face as a nation. I applaud many sections of the DHS funding bill, including increased funding from FY 2014 for Customs & Border Patrol (CBP), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

However, there are a number of amendments added to this bill which run the risk of tearing families apart, and I could not support the final bill.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF LEMON HENRY MOSES, JR.

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lemon Henry Moses, Jr., a distinguished community leader in Maryland's Fifth District who passed away on December 10, 2014. He was 94 years old.

Lemon Moses made history as the first African-American to serve as Chairman of the Charles County Liquor Board. All of us who knew Lemon saw how deeply devoted he was to his family, his community, and his country. He gave so much of himself to all three, and he will be fondly remembered by the many whose lives he touched across Charles County and Maryland.

After growing up in Savannah, Georgia, Lemon moved to Pittsburgh in his youth and was a singer and tap dancer in a local Vaudeville troupe called the 'Kandy Kids,' where he befriended Gene Kelly before he became famous. Attending Howard University in Washington, DC, Lemon studied mechanical engineering, and when World War II broke out, he joined the U.S. Navy and served his country as a sailor in the Pacific Theater of Operations. When the war ended, he began a career with the U.S. Postal Service that lasted forty-four years, where he served in a number of leadership positions.

Lemon became involved in the Civil Rights Movement in 1947, when he worked to integrate his local school district while serving as president of a parent-teacher association. In the Postal Service, he held the role of Eastern Region Vice President for the Postal Service Supervisors and made equal rights a focus of his work there. President Lyndon Johnson later appointed Lemon as an Equal Employment Opportunity Specialist to handle discrimination complaints in Congress. In 1974, he moved to Waldorf, in Charles County, where he became very active in the County's chapter of the NAACP. In addition to a trailblazing service on the Charles County Liquor Board, Lemon also spent five years on the board of directors for what is now the University of Maryland Charles Regional Medical Center and was active in Chapter 3885 of the AARP.

Lemon was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He is survived by his wife of seventy-three years, Elaine Moses, as well as his daughter Yvonne Beatrice Buford and her husband Walter; and his son Mike Moses and his wife Delores. In addition to them, four grandchildren, and eight great-grandchildren, Lemon is survived by a community to which he had devoted so much of his time and energy both before and during his retirement. He was an active member of St. Peter's Catholic Church in Waldorf, where

family and friends bade farewell in a moving funeral mass on December 18, 2014.

I join in expressing my condolences to Elaine and to the entire Moses family, and I thank them for sharing Lemon with all of us for the many years in which he did so much good for the people and communities of Charles County and for our country. As I remarked at his funeral, Lemon Moses was no lemon—he was a peach, a pear, and an apple, and all of our lives were made sweeter because of his.

HONORING DENISE RUSHING

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Lake County Supervisor Denise Rushing for her eight years of dedicated service to the people of Lake County. Supervisor Rushing championed countless projects that will improve the long-term vitality of our county.

Supervisor Rushing served as the 3rd District Supervisor for Lake County for eight years, during which time she also served as the Chair of the Lake County Board of Supervisors. During her years of service, Supervisor Rushing was instrumental to implementing and finishing a number of projects that will help to protect and sustain our environment.

During her tenure Lake County installed solar power at county facilities, such as the jail and wastewater treatment plant. With Supervisor Rushing's guidance, the Board of Supervisors transformed the unsightly trailer park known as Clark's Island into an eco-park, made entirely of natural materials. In fact, Lake County made such tremendous advances in its use of solar power and green building practices that the county received two California Green Summit Environmental Leadership Awards.

Supervisor Rushing also championed the development of Mount Konocti County Park, the Middle Creek Restoration Project and the Konocti Regional Trails. Thanks to her fine work, residents of Lake County will be better able to enjoy the natural beauty and splendor that our county offers for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Supervisor Rushing for her invaluable service to Lake County. Her unyielding dedication to protecting and promoting environmental sustainability and renewable energy is greatly appreciated by the entire community and we wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRATULATING THE OHIO
STATE UNIVERSITY BUCKEYES

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate The Ohio State University Buckeyes, the undisputed 2015 NCAA Football National Champions. In the inaugural College Football Playoff National Championship Game on January 12, 2015, the Buckeyes, led by Coach Urban Meyer, beat the Oregon Ducks with a final score of 42–20.

In the state of Ohio, nothing is given. Everything is earned. This year's Buckeye football team worked hard the entire season in the face of adversity. After the pre-season loss of starting quarterback Braxton Miller, many critics predicted the season would be doomed. Following a 35–21 defeat in the second game of the season to the Virginia Tech Hokies, many questioned whether the Buckeyes could win the Big-10 Championship. When J.T. Barrett broke his ankle in the final regular season game against the University of Michigan, some wondered if the Buckeyes even deserved to be considered for the playoffs despite a 11–1 record.

This year's team defied all odds, silenced the critics, and finished the season as national champions. In their final 3 games of the season the Buckeyes, led by quarterback Cardale Jones, a constituent of my Congressional District, won the Big 10 Championship against the Wisconsin Badgers, defeated the Alabama Crimson Tide in the Sugar Bowl to advance to the National Championship Game, and capped off the tremendous season with a win over the Oregon Ducks.

As a proud alum of The Ohio State University, I commend these student athletes for their hard work and dedication both on and off the football field. O–H–I–O!

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY
OF DAVID L. LEVY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of David Lawrence Levy, a pioneering children's rights leader and advocate for joint parenting, who passed away last

month. A longtime resident of Hyattsville, MD, which is in the Fifth District, David had battled cancer for several years with tenacity, determination, and infectious optimism. Sadly, he lost that battle on December 11, 2014, when he passed away at the age of 78.

David co-founded the National Council for Children's Rights—now called the Children's Rights Council—in 1985 and served as its CEO until 2008 and President of its Board until 2009. During that time, he fought for policies at the local, state, and federal level that promoted shared parenting with joint custody of children after divorce and encouraged courts to place the needs and well-being of children first. The title of a book David edited in 1994 summed up well the mission of the organization he had built: "The Best Parent is Both Parents." He oversaw the creation of the Children's Rights Council's access and visitation centers—including its flagship center in Prince George's County—which provide neutral locations for separated parents to drop off and pick up their children and a place where supervised visitation can take place. In October 2009, David was named as one of the "25 Most Influential People in our Children's Lives" by Children's Health magazine, alongside Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, Melinda Gates, and Taylor Swift.

David was a native of New York and received his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Florida before settling in Hyattsville, which is in Prince George's County. Early in his career, he spent several years working as a copyright lawyer at the Library of Congress. David was also an accomplished author, having published several works ranging from fiction novels to articles in the Washington Post and other papers. He served as President of the Beth Torah Congregation in Hyattsville and later was an active member of Tifereth Israel Congregation in Washington, DC, where family, friends, and local community leaders gathered on December 14 to pay tribute to David at his funeral service.

David is survived by his wife Ellen, their daughter Diana and her husband Danny, his son Justin and his wife Ilana, and his granddaughter Corina. He also leaves behind many friends, neighbors, and extended family who will fondly remember David for his warmth, his sense of humor, and his enthusiasm for life. I join in offering my condolences to his family, in mourning this loss to our community and our country, and in celebrating his extraordinary life.

DOLLY MAE NAVE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 16, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dolly Nave, who passed away on December 23, 2014, at her home in San Rafael, California. As a dedicated community organizer and leader, Ms. Nave helped to transform recreational facilities in the City of San Rafael for the benefit of countless Marin County residents.

In the 1980s, on behalf of Ms. Nave's eight children and the children in the local community, Ms. Nave rallied the support of local contractors and volunteers to donate the equipment, labor, and funding necessary to breathe new life into public schools and city-owned recreation fields and facilities. Ms. Nave continued to improve recreational facilities throughout her life, and founded the Marin Bocce Federation in Albert Park, San Rafael.

Ms. Nave was a skillful community leader who possessed the necessary organizational skills to always put the pieces in place and get the job done. She was the project manager for the construction of Marin Community Fields in Larkspur and was in the forefront of numerous projects at San Rafael High, initiating the successful "Save Night Football" campaign. A volunteer at Albert Park for 35 years, she became known as the "Angel of Albert Park" because she was one of its foremost advocates. In 1993, she was a founding board member and construction chair of the Marin Bocce Federation in Albert Park. The six bocce courts are now used by more than 1,000 players a week.

Ms. Nave's work did not go unnoticed, and her longstanding commitment to others was recognized by numerous awards including San Rafael Citizen of the Year, the Marv Lechner Award from San Rafael High, and Woman of the Year for California's Third Senate District in 1991. She was also one of the first women to be inducted into the Marin Athletic Foundation High School Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, Dolly Nave's selfless efforts have benefited countless residents of San Rafael and Marin County. Her legacy will not soon be forgotten as her accomplishments can be seen all around the City of San Rafael. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband, Rich; three sons, Richard Jr., Paul and Tom; and three daughters, Sheri, Kathy and Patti; as well as her forty-two grandchildren and great grandchildren.

SENATE—Tuesday, January 20, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Your Name on all the Earth. Make this day an opportunity for our lawmakers to advance Your providential purposes. May they think Your thoughts, striving always to do Your will.

Lord, lead them together to find solutions to the problems that beset our Nation and world. Calm their fears and strengthen their faith, as You use them to accomplish Your will. Let Your peace guard their hearts.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate is continuing to consider S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL are here this morning to manage debate, and there are several amendments pending. We will begin voting on those and any other amendments in the queue shortly after lunch today.

Senators also should begin gathering in the Chamber at 8:20 this evening so that we can proceed as a body to the House for the State of the Union Address.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 240

Mr. MCCONNELL. I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

WORKING TOGETHER FOR POSITIVE CHANGE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, tonight we will welcome President Obama to the Capitol. We look forward to hearing what he has to say.

We are looking forward to Senator ERNST's address, as well. JONI ERNST understands the concerns of hard-working families in a way much of Washington has not. That is why the people of her State sent her here—to fight for them. She will explain the commitment of this new Congress to work for policies aimed at the good jobs and better wages Americans deserve.

Tonight is a big moment for the President—and for our country. The tone he strikes and the issues he highlights will tell us a lot about what to expect in his Presidency's final act. There is a lot riding on it, and we will be listening closely.

One option is the path he has been on for so many years. I sincerely hope he makes a different choice. The American people just spoke in clear terms about this direction. They called for a new one. We should work together to make Washington focus on their concerns.

Working with the new Congress for positive change—that is the second option for President Obama. It is the one struggling families and serious policymakers urge him to choose. The new Congress has already started to take up smart, bipartisan ideas focused on jobs and reform. But when we have asked the White House for constructive engagement, what we have seen, at least so far, has been pretty discouraging. We need to change this dynamic. We need to turn the page. The State of the Union offers that opportunity.

The American people aren't demanding talking point proposals designed to excite the base but not designed to pass. What they said they are hungry for is substance and accomplishment. They want Washington to get back to work and focus on a serious jobs and reform agenda. They said they are ready to see more constructive cooperation, especially on bipartisan jobs

initiatives—bipartisan jobs initiatives such as the Keystone infrastructure bill. Keystone has support in both parties. It is an important piece of infrastructure for our country. According to what the Obama administration's own State Department has said previously, constructing a pipeline would support literally thousands of jobs. It has already passed the House. We are currently working to pass it through the Senate. It will be on the President's desk before long. We see no reason for him to veto these jobs.

But whatever he decides, we are going to keep working for positive, middle-class jobs ideas here in Congress. As I have said before, we are not here to protect the President from a good idea. If the President is willing to work with us, there is much we can get accomplished for the American people.

We have already identified several areas of potential cooperation, such as tearing down trade barriers in places such as Europe and the Pacific, building jobs with comprehensive progrowth tax simplification, and working to prevent cyber attacks. On each of these issues, the President has previously sent some positive signals. Now we need some constructive engagement.

We will be looking for signs of that in the speech he delivers tonight.

What I hope is that he presents some positive, bipartisan ideas of his own that can pass the Congress Americans just voted for. Give us new ideas to prevent Iran from becoming a country with nuclear weapons or to confront the threats posed by terrorism or to remove regulations that hurt struggling coal families. Challenge us with truly serious, realistic reforms that focus on growth and raising middle-class incomes—reforms that don't just spend more money we don't have. And if the President is ready for a new beginning beyond canceled health plans and partisan executive overreach, work with us to pursue an achievement that history will actually remember. Reach across the aisle to allow us to save and strengthen Medicare. Cooperate with both parties to save Social Security. The President should tell America his plan for responsible reforms that aim to balance the budget and not just more tired tax hikes.

Achieving important reforms such as these would represent a win for hard-working families. It would deliver the kind of commonsense progress Americans deserve.

So we welcome the President tonight. We look to his address with interest. If the President is ready to play offense, then we urge him to join the

new Congress in playing offense on behalf of the American people.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

NEW IDEAS FOR AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, tonight President Obama will deliver his State of the Union Address to outline his plan to make life better for middle-income families and those struggling in our strengthening economy. I have heard from both sides—Democrats and Republicans—the lament that even though many hard-working families are doing their best and businesses are more profitable because our workers are more productive, a lot of families don't see it in their paychecks. They struggle from paycheck to paycheck to pay for the basics in life. So we have to ask ourselves: What will we do about this? Will we do anything?

I worry that the comments just made by the majority leader suggest that he is relying on faith alone—faith in our free market system; faith in the belief that if we have an expanding economy, which we do, and if we have profitability in corporations, which we do, that it will translate into a better standard of living for working families. Well, it may be an article of faith, but it is one that can be challenged because that is exactly what has been happening in America for years. The economy has been growing, and we have seen an increase in jobs for 58 straight months. At the same time, we have noted that working families across America don't see any change in their lives. They don't see any income change.

Then we look at the reality. The reality shows that the gap between the rich and poor in America just grows larger and larger. We can talk separately about the compensation for CEOs and corporations. It is reaching record levels—far beyond the excesses of previous moments in American economic history.

What we are finding is that people at the very top of the corporate ladder are taking out more money from the economy than the workers who are generating the profits they are gleaming. That is not right. The President is going to challenge us to get beyond faith in our free market system to good works by Congress. He is going to talk about specifics—ideas the average family can understand and appreciate, such as the earned income tax credit. Here is an effort to say if you are working, we will make sure that your tax burden gives you a break so that you have additional money for your family to pay for daycare for the kids, to make certain you can pay for the util-

ity bills and the basics of life. I have joined with SHERROD BROWN of Ohio. We want to try to make the earned income tax credit available to more and more working Americans so we can supplement their income as they struggle to get by paycheck to paycheck. That is one of the first ideas we can pursue.

The second initiative the President will address is college affordability. There are plenty of critics of the President's plan, but I think he has put his finger on reality. We can no longer be satisfied by saying it is the responsibility of our society to provide education from kindergarten through the grade 12. That doesn't reflect the reality of work today. In just a few years, more than a third of the jobs across America will require a college degree. What are we doing to prepare the workforce in America for 21st century requirements when it comes to education? Now, we know what is happening. More and more students are getting deeper and deeper in debt, and many are dropping out because of it. Those who finish and earn a diploma are saddled with a debt which changes their lives. President Obama has said: Let us start moving forward to make 2 years of community college a commitment in America for those students who are in need, No. 1, and No. 2, are willing to meet the standards. And the standards are graduation within 3 years.

I look at some of the comments made in criticism of this, and they overlook the second part of the President's proposal—that part which demands that those students perform in order to receive assistance from our government in paying for community college.

We have to look at a new model in America—in Arkansas, in Illinois, and across America—that is a K-14 model. That is reality. Certainly, we have to improve the K-12 performance. When two-thirds of community college students in many States, including my own, come to community colleges not performing at the 12th grade level, there is work to be done in the lower grades. But let's assume the obvious: If people want a good-paying job in the future, they need additional training. The affordable place to go is a community college, and we ought to make that a pathway that is affordable for every dedicated, hard-working student and their family.

That isn't all. The President also acknowledges and will acknowledge tonight the reality of the housing market. Since 2009, our housing market in America has been recovering from a recession. Home building has more than doubled, yielding a lot of jobs for construction workers. Home prices are going back up. Millions of families whose home value was less than what they owed on their mortgage are now turning the corner. But for many

Americans, buying a home is still out of reach. The President plans to reduce the FHA mortgage insurance premiums which is going to help responsible Americans afford a home.

We need faith in our free market but good works by Congress when it comes to these essentials. The President is also going to propose a Healthy Families Act. Here is something that gets to the reality of life for working Americans. It would provide for businesses with 15 or more employees up to 7 paid sick days each year. You might say to yourself: What is a business going to do with people taking 7 days off in sick leave?

What we found is if the employer will stand behind the employees when it comes to the basics such as sick leave, they will get more loyalty and more performance from those employees. That is a fair trade. It is one the President will propose this evening.

I would say to the majority leader and those who share his position, faith in the free market is a good thing but not enough. We need to step in and make sure we have faith in working families, faith in the belief that if they can improve their lot in life, if their struggle paycheck to paycheck is somehow lessened, we are all going to be better off for it. I support the President's message this evening and look forward to hearing it delivered.

CUBA

Mr. DURBIN. On a separate topic, late last night I returned from Havana, Cuba, with Senator PATRICK LEAHY, Senator STABENOW, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, and Congressman WELCH of Vermont. It was a whirlwind trip.

In a matter of 2 days we had a number of visits with a variety of different people in Havana. They included government officials. Bruno Rodriguez, who is the Foreign Minister of the Cuban Government; we had a lengthy meeting with him yesterday.

We had a meeting with about 10 different Ambassadors to Cuba from foreign countries. We met as well with a dozen reformers or dissidents, opponents of the current Castro regime in Cuba, and had individual meetings with ministries. This was a productive and important delegation trip, important because starting tomorrow we are going to have face-to-face negotiations in Havana between the United States and Cuba pursuant to President Obama's December 17 announcement. We are setting out to change the foreign policy of the United States as it regards Cuba. It is time for change.

For over 50 years we have been committed to a policy of exclusion, believing if we had embargoes and blockades we could force internal change in Cuba. The policy failed. The Castro brothers still reign, and life in Cuba is not what we want to see.

What the President has said is let's engage them at a different level, a constructive level where we try to find ways to open the Cuban economy and Cuban society. That, to me, is the best course. It isn't just a theory that is the best course, it has been proven.

When the Soviet Empire came to an end, what happened to the Warsaw Pact nations allied with the Soviet Union? They opened their doors to the West, they saw what they could anticipate to be part of their life in the future, and they made the conscious choice to move toward democracy, to move toward a free market economy. I think the same can happen in Cuba.

One young man came to speak to us. He had gotten in trouble because he challenged the Cuban Government. They put him back on a pig farm to work, but he was still determined to aspire to a better place in Cuba in the future. He said to us: What President Obama's announcement has done is to pull the blanket off the caged bird in Cuba. Those of us who live in Cuba are still in the cage of communism, but we can see out now about opportunities and a future. That, I believe, is part of what the President's new policy is all about.

When we were discussing our current blockade with Cuba with their leadership, we learned that powdered milk comes to Cuban citizens from New Zealand—halfway around the world—when there is an ample supply in the United States. What we are trying to do is to not only open the Cuban economy to powdered milk but to the power of ideas, the exchange of values, the belief that if the Cuban people see a better model for their future, they will gravitate toward that model.

This negotiation which opens this week is the beginning of this conversation. The President is moving in areas of trade and travel, as we hope he will do, to expand these opportunities, but we have to do our part in Congress. As contentious and spirited as the debate may be about changing our policy in Cuba, it wasn't that long ago that we stood on the floor of the Senate and considered establishing diplomatic relations with Vietnam. There were some with fresh memories of all we had lost, over 40,000 American lives in Vietnam, who said we shouldn't have a normal relationship with what is a repressive regime in a country we just concluded a war with. Others with cooler minds prevailed, and we established diplomatic relations and I think to the betterment of both nations.

Let us move forward, not forsaking our principles, not turning our back on our belief that the Cuban society should be more open, fair, and legitimized by the voters at the polls but believing we can work with this country as we have with others around the world, even when we disagree with their form of government and their

practices, to try to strive to reach that democratic ideal.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. The last point I would like to make relates to a motion that was made this morning by the majority leader. It was related to the appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. Why are we bringing up this appropriations bill at this moment? Because when we agreed last December to fund our government, the Republicans in the House insisted we carve out the Department of Homeland Security and not give it its regular budget, instead give it emergency spending, a continuing resolution.

This is not the way to run any department of government, certainly not the Department of Homeland Security. Why is it important to fund this department? One need only look to what has happened in the last few days in Paris to understand that the threat of terrorism to the world is still very real. One of our first lines of defense when it comes to terrorism is our Department of Homeland Security. There is no excuse for us to be dealing with this continuing resolution to fund this department. They should have the resources they need to keep America safe, but instead what has happened is this: The House of Representatives last week said they will only agree to fund this department properly if they can provide certain riders and changes in the law as part of it.

I would tell you that the change that has been proposed by the House of Representatives is unacceptable. The President has said he is going to veto it if it is sent to his desk, and I totally support his position.

Here is what they have come up with in the House of Representatives. If you are familiar with the DREAM Act, which I introduced in Congress 14 years ago, it says: If a young person is brought to the United States at an early age, parents making the decision to come to this country, and that young person grows up in the United States, finishes high school, no serious criminal problems, willing to go forward to higher education or to the military, we will give them a chance of becoming legal in America. That is the DREAM Act. It has been considered and passed on the floor of the Senate, considered and passed on the floor of the House but never in the same session, and so it is not the law of the land.

President Obama, a little over 2 years ago, came out with an Executive order program known as DACA. DACA said to these young people who would qualify under this law: If you will come forward and register with our government, if you will pay the filing fee, if you will allow us to do the background

check, we will allow you to stay, go to school, and work in America and not be deported. Six hundred thousand young people have come forward. We estimate there are some 2 million eligible, and 600,000 have come forward. Thirty thousand are from my State of Illinois. Who are these young people?

Let me introduce you to one of them, Oscar Vazquez. Oscar Vazquez grew up in Phoenix, AZ. His mother and father brought him to that city from Mexico, and he was undocumented. He attended Carl Hayden High School in Phoenix. He was a member of the Junior ROTC. His goal was to serve in the U.S. Army.

When he went to the recruiter to sign up, the recruiter said: I need your birth certificate.

Oscar said: Come on. We are fighting a war. Can't you look the other way and just let me join?

He said: No, young man. You don't have the proper documents. You can't enlist in the U.S. Army.

He was despondent because that was his goal. He went home and got engaged in another project which is the subject of a new movie called "Spare Parts," which George Lopez produced, directed, and starred in, which I saw last week. I will not give away the whole story, but I can tell you this: Oscar Vazquez and three other students at Carl Hayden High School entered into an underwater robotics competition. They competed with colleges such as MIT and they won. Their high school team won the underwater robotics competition.

The talented young man, Oscar, said: I am going to Arizona State University. Without any government assistance, he graduated with a degree in mechanical engineering. After he got his degree and a wife and a baby, he said: Now I have to get right with America. I have to resolve this issue of being undocumented.

That means Oscar decided to move back to Mexico. He was living in Mexico—the law required him to stay there for 10 years. That is how the law is written. He petitioned the United States for a chance to come back in. Eventually he was given a waiver. Oscar Vazquez came back, became a citizen of the United States of America, and the first thing he did was enlist in the U.S. Army. He went into combat in Afghanistan, and he came home after having served our Nation honorably and now is working for a major railroad in the State of Montana, with his wife and children.

That is the story of one DREAMer, one DREAMer who was given a chance and has made a difference in America. He not only served in our military, but he had a degree in mechanical engineering. He is going to be a job creator, a job builder himself.

So what do the House Republicans want to do to people such as Oscar Vazquez? Deport them. That is exactly

what they called for. They are dream killers. That isn't right. We ought to give Oscar, young men and women just like him a chance to succeed and a chance to make America better.

I have stood on this floor over 50 times with color photographs such as this one by my side and told the stories of DREAMers. This last weekend I was in Chicago and six of them came forward and told their stories. Each and every one of them had a compelling reason for us to defeat this mean-spirited amendment that came out of the House of Representatives.

The President will veto it if it gets to his desk, but I hope we will do better in the Senate. I hope there are enough Senators on both sides of the aisle, 60-plus, who will stand up for the DREAMers of America. This is a test. It is a test as to whether we believe in fairness and justice and the value that immigrants such as Oscar Vazquez bring to the future of America.

The House of Representatives just doesn't see it. They are blinded by their hatred for these immigrants, and they continue to pass these mean-spirited amendments. We can do better. We must do better as a nation. Let us stand up for the DREAMers, and let us all be dedicated to passing comprehensive immigration reform. Our immigration laws are broken. Our system is broken. It is time for us to accept our responsibility and repair it.

We passed a bill a year and a half ago on the floor of the Senate with 68 votes—14 Republicans—Republicans and Democrats voted for it and sent it over to the House of Representatives and it languished for a year and a half. They refused to even call it or consider it. Our immigration system is still broken. Withholding money from the Department of Homeland Security, threatening with these riders that are dream killers for so many young people in America, that is unacceptable.

I will stand on this floor as long as it takes to defend this DREAM Act and people such as Oscar Vazquez, who contribute to America and make it a better nation. I hope we will have bipartisan support for defeating the House of Representatives' riders that have been branded by the President as unacceptable and he will veto.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first

half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Missouri.

REMEMBERING PAT GRAY

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, people who work in politics sometimes suffer a bad image. People who run for office, obviously, sometimes suffer a bad image. But sometimes even worse is the image that what we call the political handlers have—those people who have made a career of professionally helping people get elected. They are seen as ruthless, as hired guns, as aggressive, even soulless, unprincipled. I am here to talk about one of those political operatives, but this political operative was special. This political operative was my friend. He was principled, he was brave, but most of all he was a patriot. Pat Gray passed away very recently and he will be missed.

Pat grew up in Oklahoma. After serving 4 years in the Navy, he moved to Kansas City where he took a job with the Kansas City Power and Light Company. He also became very active in the Jaycees. He found that work as part of the Jaycee organization was exhilarating. He had his first taste of working on campaigns to improve the community and he was hooked.

Very quickly he moved into advertising. That advertising job then morphed into working on political campaigns. Pat made his bones in 1982 as a political consultant when he took on the city incumbent county executive in Jackson County, MO. Jackson County is the county where the person who used to have this desk is from, Harry Truman. Jackson County is the county that contains Kansas City.

It was then and still is a place where Democrats do well. So for Pat Gray to take on a candidate to be a sitting incumbent county executive was quite brave because, as I am sure the Presiding Officer understands, politics is rough locally. When someone takes on a powerful person in the predominating party in a community, there is usually a price to pay, but Pat was not deterred. His candidate, Bill Waris, beat that sitting county executive, Dale Baumgardner, in 1982.

The following year Pat was hired in an important mayoral campaign where he was also successful, electing the Kansas City mayor. Pat was low key, but he was aggressive. Pat had little ego but lots of laser-like strategy. He was very easy going, but he was very hard on his opponents. As one Kansas Citian put it after Pat had passed away: Pat slid into second with his spikes in the air. So you either had to make a very good throw or get out of the way.

That was his style, very hands-on. He wanted to win badly. Pat was instrumental in electing the first woman as Jackson County executive, the first

woman as Jackson County prosecutor—my campaign for that office in 1992—and the first woman as mayor of Kansas City.

He helped to elect mayors, legislators, city council members, too many for me to name, too many campaigns, too many candidates. Nine out of ten times he was successful. He helped me throughout my career. I remember vividly in 1990, when I was running for the county legislature, his coming to my home in Coleman Highlands with a camera and shooting a commercial with me sitting on my living room couch, just the two of us. He became a trusted advisor and my dear friend until his death.

As I stand at the very desk Harry Truman used in the Senate, I stand here in part because of his help and his loyalty. I will be reaching for the phone to call Pat Gray countless times in the coming years. While he helped many candidates, including me, it was on community issues that his record was particularly impressive. The e-tax renewal in Kansas City, which many thought had no chance, Pat successfully steered; the renewal and invigoration of our sports complex in Kansas City, the home of the division champion Kansas City Royals and our Kansas City Chiefs. Pat Gray strategized a brilliant campaign to revitalize downtown Kansas City through the building of a major sports arena, which has now resulted in blocks and blocks of revitalization. In fact, real estate in Kansas City—residential real estate in downtown Kansas City—is now a hot ticket in large part because of Pat Gray; the very first area transportation tax, which gave a lifeline to thousands of Kansas Citians in the urban center, allowing them to find that way to get to work; a property tax for indigent care at Truman Medical Center.

Can you imagine anything that might be more difficult to pass? Asking people to pay more property taxes to help care for the poor who were turning up in the emergency room at our major local hospital, Pat Gray did that; additional tax moneys for both police and fire and an issue very near and dear to my heart. He helped me renew the community antidrug tax in Kansas City, which has been so instrumental in doing research and development on the antidrug strategies that work—not just more police, not just more prosecutors, not just more jail space but also prevention and treatment. Pat Gray was there helping me as we started one of the very first drug courts in the country in Kansas City, as a result of his help with the COMBAT tax initiative.

Pat adored his family. His wife Brenda always patient and smiling, he really adored Brenda. She climbed into the roller coaster with Pat Gray in the late 1970s. While she had to hold on hard during part of the ride, there was never

any question that they were a team and she was his rock.

His children, Christopher, Donna, and Lauren, he was their guiding light and they were his pride and joy. Pat loved this country. He loved his family. He loved his city. He loved his friends and he loved his work. But most of all, he loved this country.

Pat's biggest secret, as a sometimes rough-and-tumble political brawler: he was an idealist who was inspired every day by our grand and glorious democracy. He had deep respect for the system he worked within. He understood that in America a good idea is sometimes enough; a good idea helped along by a professional consultant who was a patriot.

We will miss you, Pat Gray. We will miss you, Pat Gray, the patriot.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning I rise in support of two amendments that will make it clear to the American people exactly what this bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline is all about and whom our Republican friends from across the aisle are trying to help.

The amendments offered by Senators MARKEY and FRANKEN would ensure that the pipeline benefits the American consumer and the American economy. Without them, the bill to authorize the pipeline will benefit narrow special interests, such as foreign oil companies, not hard-working Americans.

We have heard from several of my friends on the other side of the aisle, including the lead sponsor, that the Keystone bill is a jobs bill and an energy bill. That may be true, but without Senator MARKEY's amendment it is nothing but a Canadian energy bill, and without Senator FRANKEN's amendment it is a paltry jobs bill.

First, on energy, in short, the Keystone bill will allow one Canadian company to use the United States as a middleman to ship oil to the highest bidder abroad. The Canadian oil company, TransCanada, refuses to commit to keeping the crude oil or the refined products in America. Canadian tar sands oil is already traveling through gulf coast refineries on its way to foreign markets, and, as the Wall Street Journal has reported, much of the crude oil that would flow through the Keystone XL Pipeline would ultimately be exported as refined product.

Why not add to this bill a requirement that any oil products transported through the Keystone XL Pipeline be consumed in America? Plain and simple, that is exactly what Senator MARKEY's amendment would do. If Republicans are serious about improving our energy security, they will support Senator MARKEY's amendment.

Second, let's talk about whether this is a real jobs bill. Republicans and supporters of the project like to cite that building the pipeline will support American industries and American jobs in iron and steel, but a 2011 analysis by Cornell University found that 50 percent or more of the steel pipe will be manufactured outside the United States.

It is no wonder that even the most optimistic job projections about the Keystone Pipeline are a drop in the bucket compared to just 1 month of job growth in our country. In the final tally, the State Department report says it will create only 35 permanent jobs.

Why not guarantee in the bill that U.S.-made iron, steel, and manufactured goods be used to build the pipeline? That is exactly what Democrats have offered in an amendment worked out by Senators FRANKEN and WYDEN.

These amendments should be bipartisan. Republicans have supported several measures in the past. I know many of my Republican colleagues voted to ban the export of oil drilled in the ANWR in Alaska. I hope they will join us on this amendment as well.

If Republicans oppose us, they will be making it crystal clear to Americans that they are on the side of narrow special interests instead of on the side of America's middle class. They will be supporting special interests over American jobs.

Let me be clear. We think the Keystone Pipeline should not be built, and there are several reasons for that, among them that the pipeline may accelerate global climate change. Tar sands oil is far dirtier than conventional crude oil. Democrats would much rather see an energy bill that promotes clean energy sources such as solar and wind, industries which create far more jobs, both construction and manufacturing, using far cleaner energy than the pipeline.

Why not have a policy that produces many more jobs with the cleanest of energy rather than very few jobs with the dirtiest energy on the North American continent?

But if Keystone is going to be built, we think it shouldn't only benefit Canadian oil companies and overseas steel manufacturers but should actually benefit average families and the American worker.

To conclude, I note that instead of a real energy bill or a real jobs bill or a real infrastructure bill or immigration or any bill to address the greatest

problems facing our country at the moment—the decline in middle-class incomes and the lack of middle-class jobs—for their first proposed action in the 114th Congress, S. 1, Republicans have chosen a permit for a foreign oil company that would create 35 permanent jobs. This is not an opening with a bang; this is an opening with a whimper. It is like leading off a new baseball game with a bunt.

Democrats can't change what bills Republicans put on the calendar, but our amendments will show a clear and stark contrast if Republicans vote no. On these amendments and more, Republicans are going to have to make a choice: Will they continue to fight for narrow special interests or will they work with Democrats to advance America's middle class by creating more jobs and putting more money in the pockets of American families? Time and these votes will tell.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, tonight the President of the United States will lay out his agenda for the year, but unfortunately it sounds as if much of it will be a rehash of the same stale, top-down ideas Democrats have been trotting out for the past 6 years: more taxes, more spending, more regulation—in other words, more government. If Democrats could sum up their agenda in one phrase, it would be "government knows best." But the past 6 years have very clearly demonstrated that government does not know best. The past 6 years of the Obama economy have not been kind to American families.

It is time for new ideas. It is time to change the focus from building up government to building up people. Americans need more jobs, better wages, and lower costs for health care, education, and energy, and the Republicans' priority is meeting those challenges. We want to rebuild the economy from the ground up and increase economic opportunity for every American.

Tonight the President will talk about helping middle-class families, and Republicans are pleased to see the President pivoting back to middle-class concerns—something Republicans have never looked away from. We hope President Obama is serious about wanting to work with Republicans to address the challenges facing the middle class, but it is a little hard to take

the President seriously when he is talking about helping middle-class families while simultaneously issuing veto threats for bills that would benefit them.

Within the past 2 weeks, the President has issued veto threats for two bills that would help create jobs for middle-class families—a bill to fix ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek provision, which is affecting employees' hours and wages, and a bill to approve the Keystone Pipeline. The House passed both of these bills earlier this month, and the Senate is currently in the process of considering the Keystone legislation. If it weren't for the President's veto threat, Keystone XL could be approved in the next few weeks, but thanks to the President, the future of the pipeline is still in doubt.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is supported by bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress. Six of the Senate Keystone bill's original sponsors are Democrats. The American people support the pipeline. Unions—a traditionally Democratic constituency—support the pipeline because their members want the jobs the pipeline would create. In fact, a number of unions sent letters just this month reiterating their support for the pipeline.

This is what James P. Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, said:

The Teamsters Union continues to believe that the Keystone XL pipeline will contribute to enhanced energy security, economic prosperity, and, of critical importance, the creation of good-paying jobs.

Those aren't Republican talking points; that is a letter from James Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Edwin D. Hill, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, said something similar:

At a time when job creation should be a top priority, the Keystone XL Pipeline project will put Americans back to work and have ripple benefits throughout the economy. During construction the project is expected to support at least 42,000 jobs and contribute \$3.4 billion to the U.S. Gross Domestic Product.

Again, that is from Edwin D. Hill, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Yet, despite all this support, President Obama is willing to turn his back on American workers to appease the only people who seem to oppose the pipeline; that is, members of the far-left environmental wing of the Democratic Party.

Over the years, the President has offered various excuses for why he is not yet ready to approve the pipeline. He has cited environmental concerns. The only problem with that, of course, is that the President's own State Department has stated the project will have minimal impact on the environment. The President has also cited the court case over the pipeline's Nebraska route

as a reason for waiting on the pipeline approval. Well, as of a week and a half ago that excuse is gone. The Nebraska Supreme Court has now upheld the pipeline's route. The administration responded by reiterating the President's veto threat.

President Obama has tried to minimize the impact of the pipeline delays by diminishing the importance of the jobs the pipeline would create. He has repeatedly mentioned that most of the jobs the pipeline would create would be temporary. Well, tell that to a construction worker who is looking for a job. Does the President oppose all infrastructure projects because some of the jobs they create are temporary? Or does he just oppose projects when the jobs they create are opposed by the fringe elements of his party?

The Keystone XL Pipeline will be a boon to our economy and to American workers. The President's own State Department has stated that the pipeline would support more than 42,000 jobs during construction and contribute \$3.4 billion to the economy. In my home State of South Dakota the pipeline will support 3,000 to 4,000 jobs during construction and generate over \$100 million in earnings, according to the President's State Department. These are not my figures. These are figures from the President's own State Department.

Keystone will bring in millions of dollars in State and local taxes for a host of local priorities—from schools to law enforcement to roads and bridges. In addition to providing jobs and generating revenue for State and local governments, the Keystone XL Pipeline will also help America's farmers get their goods to the market. Rail backlogs this fall left too many farmers struggling to ship their harvests. Keystone XL would help alleviate future backlogs by taking 100,000 barrels of North Dakota and Montana oil off the rails, which would free up substantial space for farmers and for other rail shippers.

Finally, the Keystone XL Pipeline will strengthen our energy security by reducing our dependence upon energy supplies from volatile countries. This increased energy security will also keep energy prices low for American families. Recent gas price reductions are largely due to increased North American energy development which has reduced our dependence on oil from countries such as Venezuela, Russia, and Iran. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help us continue to replace oil imports from volatile countries with our own oil and imports from our friend and ally Canada. That in turn will help keep American families' energy bills low. With energy bills accounting for more than a quarter of after-tax income for families making less than \$30,000, lowering Americans' energy costs should be a priority.

It is time for the President of the United States to fish or cut bait. Approving the Keystone XL Pipeline should be a no-brainer. Republicans support it, Democrats support it, unions support it, and the American people support it. The pipeline would create jobs. It would increase revenue for local governments. It would strengthen our energy security, and it would do all of this—all of this—without spending a dime of taxpayer money.

President Obama can talk all he wants tonight about helping American workers and middle-class families, but it is his actions that will show whether he really means what he says.

If the President is serious about helping middle-class families, if he is serious about standing with American workers, then he will approve the Keystone XL bill when it gets to his desk.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Arkansas.

STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, tonight we will gather in the House Chamber to listen to the President's State of the Union Address. This will be the first time in Barack Obama's Presidency that he delivers a State of the Union Address to a Republican-led House and Senate. Some see this as a prescription for gridlock. Others, including myself, see this as an opportunity for the executive branch and the legislative branch to work together to actually get some things done. There is recent precedent that shows this arrangement can work. In fact, it is a period of our history where an Arkansan played a huge role.

During the final 6 years of Bill Clinton's Presidency, he faced the same situation as our current President. He worked with Republicans to reform the welfare system. He worked with Republicans to balance the budget—an accomplishment that hasn't been repeated since. He worked with Congress—not tried to go around them.

Now, I don't expect us to always agree. There are stark ideological differences between President Obama and our Republican majority for which there is really no agreement to be had without one side or the other abandoning their principles, and certainly I do not intend to do that. I don't see the President doing that either. What I do hope is that the President will find common ground with not only Congress but the American people. When that happens, work gets done here.

Even in the last Congress, with a Democratic majority in the Senate blocking almost everything in an effort to protect President Obama, we still had flashes of bipartisan agreement. We agreed on the new farm bill, which

ensures the continued safety, affordability, and reliability of our food supply while achieving real savings in Federal spending. We reformed the VA to address the horrific wait times our veterans face while trying to receive the health care they earned. And we passed a spending agreement that brings discretionary spending to its lowest level in almost a decade and has a number of provisions that adhere to conservative principles.

Both parties did not get everything they wanted in any of these instances, but the final product was the result of individuals coming from different starting points and arriving at the same finish line. That is what the American people want, but that takes an honest commitment from all parties involved.

One way the President can show he is really ready to work with Congress is to abandon his misguided plan to circumvent Congress and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants. I anticipate that President Obama will try tonight, once again, to defend his actions by blaming Congress for not passing immigration reform. The truth is everyone in this Chamber is eager to tackle immigration reform.

The President is acting unilaterally because he knows Congress does not support his amnesty proposal. He knows the final product of our work will not include that provision. So he intends to go around Congress to get his way. Now the President seems intent to dig his heels in deeper by threatening to veto our efforts to defund his actions. This is just one of the veto threats President Obama has already issued just weeks into the new Congress. This start doesn't bode well for bipartisanship.

I hope tonight's speech is light on the veto threats and heavy on the areas where we can find common agreement. I think those are plentiful, and I sincerely believe it is possible.

A fair and simple tax system, creating jobs, and making Washington more efficient, effective and accountable—these are the issues that Americans want us to address and areas where compromise is possible. That is where our focus should be and what the country wants—not just what the President wants.

If everyone comes to the table ready to work, I think we can surprise everyone with what we can achieve. But it will take Presidential leadership. An Arkansan showed it can be done. President Obama should look to the example of President Clinton for how to move forward and to work with a Republican Congress.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Markey/Baldwin amendment No. 13 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that oil transported through the Keystone XL Pipeline into the United States is used to reduce United States dependence on Middle Eastern oil.

Portman/Shahen amendment No. 3 (to amendment No. 2), to promote energy efficiency.

Cantwell (for Franken) amendment No. 17 (to amendment No. 2), to require the use of iron, steel, and manufactured goods produced in the United States in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back on the bill before us, a measure that would allow for the permit to be approved to allow for construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline from Canada into the United States. We had good discussion last week, certainly on Friday.

We have several amendments that are pending before the body. The Senator from Massachusetts has one on oil exports, Senator PORTMAN on energy efficiency, and there is another measure sponsored by Senator FRANKEN relating to American steel. Obviously, it is important that we begin to process these amendments because we have a significant amount of interest in the issues in front of us. At this point in time there are—we had over 50 filed amendments as of Friday evening. As of this morning, we maybe have more on deck. There is clearly a great deal of interest not only on Keystone XL but other energy-related amendments as well.

As we work through finalizing the events for this afternoon, I would like to alert Members that we would like to have votes on at least the three pending amendments that are before us that I just mentioned, hopefully by midafternoon. We are aware the Senate will close early today because of the President's State of the Union this evening. So my hope is that we would be able to process these three.

It has come to our attention that Senator PORTMAN's amendment may need to be modified. He is in the process of doing that, and it may be that we will be able to accept that amendment this afternoon by voice vote.

At this point in time, I would encourage Members to come to us as the floor managers here, and let's figure out how we can get these amendments pending before the Senate. On the Republican side we have three folks who are queued up ready to offer theirs when it is appropriate. As we had agreed last week, we will go from side to side in terms of the amendments that will be considered. Hopefully this will be the beginning of a good, constructive week as we turn to regular order here in the Senate processing amendments.

With that, I would turn to my colleague on the energy committee, Senator CANTWELL, for any comments she might care to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, just to reiterate our opposition to this legislation, new polling has come out showing that the American public really does—over 60 percent—support going through a normal process and not subverting what are environmental laws. But we are going to move forward in getting this legislation voted on. My colleague just outlined a process for this afternoon. So I would encourage Members to come to the floor to offer their amendments. I know Senator FRANKEN is coming to speak on his amendment, and I see the Senator from Massachusetts here to speak on his amendment. So hopefully while they are speaking we can get a vote schedule firmed up and talk about other amendments besides the three we have pending. But I would agree with the Senator from Alaska that Members should come down here and talk on their amendments and we should keep the process moving.

With that, I am not sure who is queued up to speak.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I believe the sponsor of this legislation, Senator HOEVEN, would like to address the Chamber for a few minutes this afternoon not only on the amendments that are pending but the bigger picture of Keystone XL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. May I inquire of the Senator from Alaska and Senator HOEVEN how long he intends to speak to make sure our colleague from Massachusetts knows he has his time before we get locked out for lunch?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, my inquiry would be: How much time does the Senator from Massachusetts need? I would be willing to defer my time until later, as long as I know I would

have approximately 10 minutes before the hard break of 12:30 p.m.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I would think that if it is OK to allow the Senator from Massachusetts to proceed, knowing that our hard stop is 12:30 p.m., that at least—I would make this request: that both Senators be allowed to speak for 10 minutes, starting with Senator MARKEY, followed by Senator HOEVEN. If they want to extend their remarks, they can make a unanimous consent request to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. May I ask a parliamentary inquiry. It would be this. Is it possible for me to speak for 5 minutes, then reserve the remainder of my time and have the Senator from North Dakota speak, and then I can reclaim the remainder of my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will take unanimous consent.

Mr. HOEVEN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are about to engage in a historic debate; that is, over whether the Canadians—a Canadian oil company—should be allowed to take the dirtiest oil in the world, the Canadian tar sands oil, to have the United States accede to the construction of a pipeline, like a straw through our country, which would then go down to the Gulf of Mexico, with no promise from the Canadians that they will not export the oil from the United States.

So the issue which is raised, of course, is what is in it for the United States, since there is a very small number of jobs for our country once the pipeline is completed? We understand why the Canadian company wants to do this. If they can get that oil out onto the global marketplace, using the United States as the conduit, they can get a dramatically higher price for that oil. We understand their motivation. But what is in it for the United States of America?

Ultimately, we have to decide what is in our best interests. My amendment says that if this pipeline is constructed, the oil stays here, our country gets the benefit, and our consumers get the benefit. Otherwise, it is not about energy independence; it is not about North American energy independence. It is about a Canadian company exporting the oil, using the United States as a conduit, as a straw, as a pipeline. That is it. What is in it for us?

The American people right now are enjoying historically low oil prices. They love it. It is like a tax cut to every American. If this Canadian oil gets exported, you better believe it is going to act as a spur to raise the price

of oil. The more oil that is here, the better for us. The more oil that leaves our country, the worse for us.

I will give you another number, if you want to know, because this is a Canadian export pipeline. The United States of America right now is the leading importing country for oil in the world. We are No. 1. We import net about 5 million barrels of oil a day. We are No. 1. We are the No. 1 importing country. Then comes China, then comes India, then Japan. Five million barrels a day—how can we be exporting oil when we are the leading importer of oil?

What countries do we import the oil from today, 2015? We import the oil from Saudi Arabia, from Venezuela, from Iraq, from Russia, from Nigeria. How can we be exporting our young men and women in uniform over to the Middle East in order to protect these ships coming in with oil in them and simultaneously be exporting oil out of the United States, while we are still importing 5 million barrels of oil a day?

That is what this debate is all about. It does not make any sense. This is the dirtiest oil in the world. This oil is going to dangerously add to the warming of the planet. The Canadian—the American Petroleum Institute will not promise the oil stays here, even though their ads on TV say that it is all about North American energy independence.

So we have a huge choice we have to make here. Do we want to help our economy? Do we want to help our national security, help our consumers, help our manufacturers by giving them this lower price of energy—which except for labor is the No. 1 component in industry in the United States—and keep that price low? The Markey amendment says: Yes, that oil stays here in the United States of America for our own strength, our own economy, our own consumers, our own job creation, and will not be sent off onto the world so the Canadian oil company can get a much higher price for that oil while we take all of the risk. We would not be Uncle Sam, we would be Uncle Sucker if we did not keep that oil here.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to engage in a discussion with my colleague from Massachusetts on the important issues. He has raised several issues in regard to oil export and then also in regard to the environmental aspects.

If I could take a minute to address both of those, for starters, I would point out that it is interesting that the Senator, my good friend from Massachusetts, is opposed to this pipeline project and talks about our need to import oil, and therefore we should not allow any exports, because we need to import oil. Yet he is opposed to a

project that would not only bring Canadian oil to our country, 830,000 barrels a day, but also would help us move 100,000 barrels of oil a day from my State of North Dakota and my neighboring State of Montana—light sweet Bakken crude. So he objects to that, and he talks about our need to import oil. The irony here is that if he is successful and he and the other critics or opponents of this pipeline and the infrastructure are successful, then what Canada will do is they will build a pipeline to the west coast of Canada, and they will export that oil to China—100 percent of it.

So it appears that his argument is that because some portion of this oil may be exported if we build the pipeline, somehow it is better to force Canada to export 100 percent of it to China. Now, I do not begin to understand that argument. So if we cannot have 100 percent—every single drop—stay here, then we are better off to send all 100 percent to China. That is my opponent's argument. I do not understand it. It does not make sense to me.

The second point I would like to make is if he goes to the environmental impact statement issued by the Obama State Department, the environmental impact statement says that the oil would be used in the United States. If he looks at the Obama administration's Department of Energy report, he will see that the report also indicates that this oil is going to be used in the United States.

Now, that does not mean that we use every drop of it. I will give you some statistics. The United States retains 99 percent of all crude oil within the country that we produce. The United States uses 97 percent of the gasoline that we refine in this country. So, remember, this oil comes to refineries in Patoka, IL, and to the gulf coast. It goes to Cushing, and it gets refined.

The statistics are that we use 97 percent of that gasoline from oil that is refined in our country. The other thing I would point out is that the oil that comes in on this pipeline, along with the crude that comes from the Bakken, is both Canadian and domestic oil. That cannot be exported without approval from the Secretary of Commerce of the Obama administration.

So here again, my good friend from Massachusetts is putting forth an amendment that absolutely no oil in this one pipeline can be exported at any time to anywhere from the country, yet they already have provisions in law that it cannot be exported without the Secretary of Commerce's approval. The Secretary of Commerce is appointed by President Obama.

So, again, if you look at the administration's own reports, and they have been done over more than 6 years that this project has been pending—the administration now has had 6 years to review this project, has done so, and has

produced five environmental impact statements. The conclusion of those environmental impact statements is "no significant environmental impact." That is the administration's own environmental impact statements produced by the State Department.

But after 6 years, they have come out and said: This oil will be used here, and to be exported, it would have to be approved by the Secretary of Commerce, as other oil exports are handled in this country. Furthermore, if we do not build the pipeline, it is either all going to be sent to China—so then we would not get any of it—or we are going to have to move it via railcars—1,400 railcars a day, creating more congestion on our railways.

So at this point, I would inquire as to how much time I have used of my 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. At this point, I would yield back to my good friend from Massachusetts.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator very much. Year 2014 has just been reported by NASA as the single warmest year ever recorded in the history of the planet, going back to the earliest records. You do not have to be a detective to figure out what is going on. The world is dangerously warming. The United States can no longer preach temperance from a bar stool and tell the rest of the world they should be better while we continue to burn these fuels.

But if they are going to build this pipeline, at least the American people should be the beneficiaries of the Canadian activity to sell all of this oil out onto the global market. What we are being told is: No, we do not want any restrictions. We do not want there to be any way in which we can keep that oil here, to keep prices at least low for the American consumer and for American job creation, to keep oil here so we can maybe back out the Saudi Arabian oil, maybe back out the Kuwaiti oil, maybe back out the Russian oil that we are importing right now as we sit here. But we are being told we cannot do that. We are being told the Republican leadership thinks that is a bad idea.

When I asked the head of the Trans-Canada pipeline in the hearing if he agree to keep the oil in the United States, he just looked at me and said no. So this is what is going on.

What happens for the American consumer? Well, I will tell you what happens. It is a very simple formula. Every time there is a \$10 increase in the price of a barrel of oil, it knocks two-tenths of a point to three-tenths of a percentage point off of the growth rate of the American economy.

When Americans pay less for American oil and we import less foreign oil,

consumers have more money in their pockets from that discounted American oil. That is like a direct economic stimulus for middle-class families and small businesses across the country. Analysts say the drop in oil prices will give hundreds of billions back to consumers and other parts of our economy. Every penny reduction in gas prices translates into \$1 billion in consumer savings.

So when the polling is done on this issue and the American people are asked if they would support the exportation of American oil, by a 3-to-1 margin people say, all across the country, regardless of party: No, do not export it. Keep that oil here to make America stronger here at home.

That is not Democrat. That is not Republican. That is not Independent. That is all people being polled across the board.

That is just common sense because they know the more oil we export, the higher the prices are going to be for consumers here because we have less oil. This is a simple debate.

The planet is running a fever. There are no emergency rooms for planets. We have to engage in preventive care. The Republican leadership thinks they have the votes in order to pass this bill which will dangerously warm the planet. My amendment says if that is going to be the case—and I am not voting for that bill—at least let's keep the oil here, at least let's get the benefit for consumers so we keep prices low for gasoline, prices low for home heating oil, prices low for jet fuel, prices low for diesel. Let's keep the oil here, let's get the benefit in our economy, and let's not allow oil companies to set the agenda.

The Republican leadership keeps saying it is all of the above. Ladies and gentlemen, this bill basically says: No. No, it is oil above all. That is what it is all about. It is not even oil that is necessarily going to stay in the United States, so it is a very simple argument I am making.

We import 5 million barrels of oil a day. They come from the worst places in the world that we should be dependent upon—5 million barrels a day. We export young men and women over to the Middle East to protect that oil coming in. The least we owe to those young men and women is when we get a chance to reduce our dependence upon imported oil, we take that chance, that we send that message to the rest of the world that we understand our Achilles' heel. We understand what makes us weak.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I urge an "aye" vote on the Markey amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate this debate. It is an important de-

bate to have. Clearly, the Senator from Massachusetts and I have very different ideas about how this should be addressed, but this is the debate we should have. This is about the energy future we are building for this country.

I am pleased we are engaged in this debate. Let's work to build the kind of energy plan that is going to truly make our country energy secure.

To do that, we not only need to produce energy domestically, we need to work with our closest friend and ally, Canada. At the same time, as we produce that energy, we need the infrastructure to move it to our markets rather than sending it overseas.

So it is ironic on the one hand the Senator is proposing an amendment saying: Oh, no. If we get any of this oil, we have to have all of it. He is making an argument that doesn't work in a global economy, where he is saying if we can't have 100 percent of it every single day—not one drop leaves—then export all of it. I want 100 percent or nothing.

That doesn't make sense.

The whole point is we have just finished showing that the oil will be used here, and for any of it to be exported we need the Secretary of Commerce's approval. But we have to talk about it in a larger context because this debate we are having isn't only about the Keystone Pipeline, it is about the future of energy security for our country.

Are we going to work to produce oil and gas domestically? Are we going to work with Canada to bring their oil and gas that they produce as well to us, rather than having them export it to China, so we are energy secure?

What I mean by that is we produce more oil and gas in North America than we consume. When we do that we become energy secure. As far as this argument about any kind of other source of energy or renewable, that this somehow precludes it, it doesn't. Let's produce all those other energy sources as well. They are not mutually exclusive.

Preventing us from producing more oil and gas and working with Canada to produce more oil and gas so we don't have to get it from OPEC in no way excludes any other type of energy development. They are not mutually exclusive.

So, yes, let's do it all but don't block this effort to make us energy secure in oil and gas so we don't have to depend upon OPEC. That is the real issue underlying this debate. That is why we have to build this vital infrastructure. Right now when Americans go to the pump, they are paying—I think I saw today the national average is about \$2.05 for gasoline. Why is that?

As I have said before on this floor, it is not because OPEC decided to give us a Christmas present. When OPEC can, they will try to push those gas prices right back up. The reason gas prices at

the pump are down now for all our consumers and for all our small businesses is because we are producing more oil and gas at home and we are getting more from Canada.

The United States uses about 18 million barrels per day of oil. Right now we produce about 11 million barrels in the United States. We import another 3 million from Canada. That gets us up to about 14 million, so we are down to only importing about 4 million a day.

If we continue to work with Canada and develop our own energy resources, pretty soon we will be at that point where we produce more energy than we consume, but we have to have this discussion about needing the infrastructure and also our ability to operate in global markets.

I will talk more about that, because if we produce more oil and gas, it puts downward pressure on oil prices on the world market. Most of those world markets are priced off of Brent crude.

As we produce more oil, we not only help ourselves, we help our allies. So we have to understand what it takes to build an energy plan and do it the right way rather than blocking the very infrastructure and doing the very things that have led to incredible benefits today for our consumers at the pump.

If that were a tax cut, that reduction of more than \$1 in the gas prices is \$100 billion in our consumers' pockets. That is the impact.

So it is about jobs. It is about energy, it is about jobs, it is about growing our economy, it is about national security—but not by blocking these efforts that are benefitting our consumers, making our country stronger, safer, and helping our allies but by continuing to move forward with them.

I look forward to discussing that more and the environmental impact.

One more statistic before I turn to my good colleague from Nebraska. Since 1990, the greenhouse gas emissions from oil sands-produced oil have gone down 28 percent, almost one-third, because in Alberta they are taking huge steps to continue to improve the environmental stewardship of this production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I look forward to discussing that further. I think I have control of the floor time until 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is not controlled.

Mr. HOEVEN. All right. Under prior agreement, I turn to my colleague from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I see my colleague from Minnesota who wanted to speak on his amendment which is pending, and I know our colleague from Nebraska is here. She has been waiting, so I hope before we adjourn we could accommodate both of them.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that we turn to my colleague from Nebraska, and I would be willing to confer, as far as time, to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his comments.

Mr. President, I, too, come to the floor to speak on the great improvements to our economy due to energy production.

The American oil and gas surge has created jobs across this country and renewed investments in infrastructure, transforming many unlikely States and cities into energy hubs for fuel production.

Over the past 5 years alone the United States has increased our domestic supply of oil and gas by 50 percent. In an amazing turnaround the United States is now on track to overtake Saudi Arabia as the world's top oil producer, resulting in the creation of thousands of American jobs and greater savings for consumers.

The natural gas industry has also grown tremendously and in the United States has become one of the world's No. 1 producers.

Across this great Nation we are fortunate to have a diverse portfolio of energy resources, including coal, nuclear, hydroelectric, natural gas, and multiple renewable energy resources such as ethanol, wind, and solar. These resources can be used to improve the lives of all Americans.

American consumers are now blessed with multiple options to obtain the affordable, reliable energy that is being produced in an environmentally responsible manner, but in order to maintain and grow our domestic energy security we need to have policies that support that goal.

Unfortunately, President Obama has given only lip service to an "all of the above" energy strategy while pushing a counteragenda that has restricted domestic production and energy choices. That costs Americans billions of dollars.

Meanwhile, the EPA is taking this anti-American energy agenda to a new level with proposals that jeopardize the affordability and reliability of electricity for all Americans.

The EPA's proposed rule for existing powerplants would force the premature retirement of efficient, low-cost coal-fueled generation, leading to the potential loss of billions of dollars of investments made over the past decade to make coal plants cleaner.

These proposals would make it nearly impossible for the United States—which possesses the world's largest reserves of coal—to continue to utilize this affordable and abundant energy source. Nebraska's families and busi-

nesses, which depend on coal-fired generation for nearly two-thirds of their electric needs, are going to be disproportionately penalized under this plan.

Under this administration the Federal Government has quashed energy projects by slow-walking, politicizing, and rejecting routine permits to build energy infrastructure such as the Keystone Pipeline. This important project has the clear capacity to grow our economy and maintain our energy security.

On this floor we have heard many comments during this debate about the Nebraska Legislature and what was done with regard to the Keystone Pipeline. Let me set the record straight. I was in the Nebraska Legislature at that time. In fact, the proposed pipeline route crosses my former legislative district.

By the way, I am a cattle rancher. I live in the Nebraska Sandhills and I live over the Ogallala Aquifer. The legislation was not coerced and the Nebraska Legislature was certainly not confused, as some of my colleagues on the other side have implied.

The Nebraska Legislature is a very open and public process. Every bill—every single bill that is introduced—has a public hearing, and our citizens are welcome and encouraged to come to those public hearings to express their opinions before legislative committees.

We also have three stages of debate. We have three stages of debate on every single bill before that final vote.

The Nebraska Legislature made decisions dealing with the pipeline siting within our borders.

The bill passed on a 44-to-5 vote. I would also mention that the entire Nebraska congressional delegation—which does include a Democratic Congressman from the Second Congressional District who also served in the Nebraska Legislature—is united in our support for this bill. Last week this bill was called an opening gambit or spin by some of my colleagues.

For the vast majority of Nebraskans, this is about certainty. Nebraskans want a decision made. This has been going on for 6 years. It is time for the President to make a decision.

I am also working on some commonsense amendments to improve the arduous NEPA approval process and to protect private property energy production. I am also going to be offering amendments to set commonsense limitations for Federal land designation.

I am excited about the opportunities we have to pursue policies where we can champion the productive use of America's energy resources in this Congress and where we will be able to capitalize on our country's energy prosperity. I am excited and looking forward to an open amendment process where we can do our jobs, where we can

offer amendments, where we can debate those amendments, and most importantly where we can vote because that is the only way we are held accountable to our constituents, the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURPHY be recognized for up to 5 minutes following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an amendment I have offered with Senators STABENOW and MANCHIN, which is amendment No. 17 to S. 1. Our amendment recognizes the importance of the iron and steel industries in our country and ensures that if the pipeline is built, it is built with American iron and steel so we can create more jobs and strengthen our economy.

Congress has had a long history of using "Buy American" provisions in order to maximize the economic benefits of infrastructure projects. "Buy American" provisions ensure that more goods and manufactured items used in infrastructure and other projects are produced here at home. In fact, as recently as 2013 Congress passed a provision in the WRDA Act—the Water Resources Development Act—to require the use of iron, steel, and other domestically produced goods in water infrastructure projects. That is important because it means that we keep jobs and profits here at home instead of sending them abroad.

Unfortunately, there is no such requirement when it comes to construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. In fact, according to TransCanada itself, half of the pipe for the U.S. portion of the pipeline would be sourced from foreign countries. And for the other half that would be put together here in the United States, much of the raw material, such as the steel that goes into the pipe, could be sourced from overseas. This is the problem our amendment addresses. Our amendment would require the use of domestic iron, steel, and other manufactured goods in the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, provided the material is readily available and affordable.

If adopted, the amendment would create jobs for iron ore miners, such as the ones across the Iron Range in my State of Minnesota. It would create more jobs for shippers who ship the ore across the Great Lakes or by rail or down the Mississippi River. It would create more jobs for our steelworkers who work in steel mills across this country.

At the same time, we specify in our amendment that these requirements

would be implemented consistent with our trade agreements.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said we shouldn't put such restrictions on a private company. But we have to remember that this isn't your typical private company. The underlying bill to authorize the pipeline would throw out the established approval process for the construction of a cross-border pipeline by a foreign corporation. That means all of the important assessments regarding things such as safety and the environment that our Federal agencies might have made on this project are tossed by the wayside. So if Congress is going to intervene on behalf of this foreign company, then the least we can do is to make sure the company building the pipeline uses American-made iron and steel.

This is a very pragmatic amendment. We all have different views on the approval process for this pipeline, and while I believe Congress should not circumvent the approval process we have in place, I think we can all agree that we want jobs here in America. So I invite my colleagues to stand up for our domestic iron and steel producers by supporting my amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I come to the floor to support the amendment which is the pending business on the floor today.

This is only my second session in the Senate, but I imagine that it means something to be Senate bill 1. It probably means something even more to be Senate bill 1 in the new Republican-majority Senate. Why? Because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had 8 years in the minority to think about what should be the first bill, the No. 1 priority of this new Republican Senate, 8 years to think about every problem American families are facing, to vet every possible solution to these problems and decide what is going to be the first bill we are going to debate to make this country a better place. There were a lot of measures the new majority could have chosen. We could have been sitting here talking about a tax cut for the middle class or we could have been talking about a proposal to make college more affordable. We could have been talking about a proposal to grow small businesses all across the country. But we are not talking about those things. After 8 years of stewing over the problems America faces, Senate bill 1 is an oil pipeline.

As my colleagues who are in opposition to the underlying bill have said, this isn't just any oil pipeline; this is a pipeline to ship foreign oil right through the heartland of the United States, most likely on its way to for-

eign customers. And it is not just any oil; it is the dirtiest oil you can dream up.

Building this pipeline and increasing the development of tar sands in Canada is the pollution equivalent, according to one study, of putting 4 million new cars on North American roads. But not to worry, say many of the proponents of the bill. Admittedly, many dispute some of those underlying studies. But the real point here is jobs. It is about creating jobs here in the United States.

This is a sight which is familiar to every single American. It is a McDonald's franchise. On average, a McDonald's franchise employs about 30 to 40 people. That is nothing to sneeze at. Thirty to forty people having jobs is a big deal. But the Senate doesn't normally worry itself with debating the establishment of a new McDonald's franchise. It is a big deal to a local community, but it is not something that necessarily moves the needle in terms of the national economy. Yet the Keystone Pipeline would create the same number of permanent full-time jobs as the average McDonald's franchise. Yes, it creates construction jobs, and I don't want to discount the fact that it puts a lot of people to work building the pipeline. But do you know what also puts people to work? Building a new high school. Building a new rail line. Improving our crumbling infrastructure. That puts a lot of people to work as well. In the end, the added value to the economy of a new school or a new bridge or a new rail line dwarfs that of a pipeline which, without the adoption of the Markey amendment to be offered later, will quite possibly just take the oil from one country and send it through the United States to another country—never mind all of the environmental side effects of continuing to develop this oil.

So I am going to oppose the underlying bill, but I am here to support Senator FRANKEN's amendment because if we are going to approve this pipeline, let's do everything we can to ensure that even though we are only going to create 40 full-time jobs, that we are creating as many part-time jobs as possible. That is why it makes sense to require that the iron and steel that are going into this pipeline come from America. And we know we need to pass this amendment because Keystone has already promised that half of the steel and half of the iron is going to come from overseas companies. Mr. President, 330,000 tons of pipeline is going to come from overseas companies.

This concept is not new. We do it all the time. We just passed the WRDA bill with bipartisan consensus. "Buy American" provisions were in there. The American Recovery Act—"Buy American" provisions were in there. We have had laws on the books for a long time that apply "Buy American" provisions to private companies that are doing

business in and around industries regulated or funded by the U.S. Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. So this amendment will just make sure that at least in the short-term we are going to put a few more Americans to work, even if we are not going to do anything about the rather paltry economic numbers in the long run.

I am supporting the Franken amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to make a couple of points. One is that in regard to this amendment, to my knowledge, they are talking about situations where a project is publicly funded, funded with taxpayer dollars. In this case, I would point out by way of closing that this is roughly an \$8 billion project, but it is privately financed. This isn't a publicly funded project; it is financed by private companies and, in fact, will create hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue—State, local, and Federal Government level—to provide dollars back to the taxpayers, with absolutely no tax increase.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:43 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCCAIN).

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I understand we are on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the bill.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, let me say that I rise in general opposition to the Keystone Pipeline, and I rise in favor of Senator MARKEY's amendment. After long and careful deliberation—and after having had the benefit of a hearing on the pipeline in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—I have decided to oppose this bill for four basic reasons.

First, on the bill, I am deeply concerned that if approved this pipeline will be the first of many pipelines opening one of the largest sources of carbon on Earth to exploitation.

Second, contrary to what many believe, I am convinced this pipeline will

simply not enhance, help or—in any positive way—improve our energy profile.

Third, in my view, it is completely absurd for Congress to take the role of permitting pipelines. It is a role we have never assumed and should not assume now.

Fourth, I believe it is ridiculous that our Republican colleagues insist on language banning eminent domain for national parks legislation but oppose it when it comes to foreign or private projects such as Keystone.

Furthermore, we cannot underestimate the environmental impacts of this pipeline. The facts are clear. The resource in Alberta is enormous; the tar sands formation is the size of Iowa; tar sands oil is 17 percent more greenhouse gas intensive than other forms of oil because it takes an enormous industrial process to extract it.

It has been estimated that if this resource were fully exploited, it would release more carbon dioxide in the air than the United States has emitted in its entire history.

As James Hansen, one of the foremost climate scientists in the world, has said, building the Keystone pipeline would be “game over for the planet.”

There are also more local risks. Over the weekend, landowners are seeing the pipeline spill in the Yellowstone River in Montana. It is happening right now, and landowners are wondering if their family farm will be the victim of a similar spill, wondering if property that has been in their family for generations can still be farmed and passed on to the next generation.

While some jobs will be created by the pipeline, the fact is—after 2 years of construction—it will create only 35 permanent jobs—35. That is not a lot of jobs.

If we want to create millions of permanent infrastructure jobs, I urge the supporters of the pipeline to support our efforts to increase transportation funding. I urge them to continue incentives for clean energy. I ask them to do all they can to help local governments rebuild local infrastructure systems. That is how we create permanent jobs that build our economy and help us keep our competitive advantage.

By comparison, the number of jobs created by Keystone is hardly an argument for passage of this legislation. As you all know, we also have the issue of eminent domain—the power of any governmental entity to take private property and convert it to public use subject to reasonable compensation.

Many, including some of my most conservative friends on the other side, were outraged by the idea that eminent domain proceedings could be used to seize private property for private gain. I have been working very closely with Senator CANTWELL on an amendment, and we agree with our conservative col-

leagues that using eminent domain proceedings for private gain is pretty outrageous. Here, on the issue of Keystone, a foreign-owned company is using eminent domain to seize private property so it can better export Canadian oil—a foreign-owned company using eminent domain to seize private property so it can better export Canadian oil. The project is not in the public interest but clearly in the private interest. Senator CANTWELL and I feel this amendment should be a no-brainer—an easy amendment every Senator can support.

In recent years Republicans have insisted on similar language prohibiting the use of eminent domain when we establish national parks. If eminent domain cannot be used to establish a national park in the public interest to conserve our national treasures and preserve America's beauty for future generations, then surely—surely—it should not be used to benefit private interests; in this case, in the interest of a foreign-owned oil company seeking to ship its product around the world, which brings me to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

We know the oil that will flow through this pipeline will flow directly to foreign markets. That is why I support the amendment from the Senator from Massachusetts. Foreign oil is not subject to America's crude oil export ban, but whether it is shipped as crude or refined here and then exported, we all know this oil is not going to help the American consumers.

The intent of the Markey amendment can be summed up very simply, using an old adage that President Reagan was fond of: “Trust but verify.”

For months now supporters of the Keystone XL Pipeline have been telling us the tar sands that will travel through the United States will help advance our energy security. They have been telling us the pipeline will bring a reliable source of fuel from a close ally and that it will reduce prices at the pump, helping U.S. consumers and businesses.

The Markey amendment does nothing more than confirm the promises made—time and time again—by supporters of the pipeline. It would require the tar sands that travel through the United States stay in the United States. It says that if Americans are to accept all of the downsides of the pipeline, if U.S. property owners are to have their lands taken away for TransCanada's benefit, if Americans are forced to live with the risk of an oilspill of dirty tar sands that we do not even know how to clean up properly, then the very least we can do is get a guarantee in law that the United States will reap the benefits that come with all of these risks.

So all this amendment does is put into writing the promises we have

heard over and over again from supporters of the pipeline. It codifies in law what we previously had to take on faith.

I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for offering the amendment, and I would note he has a long history of working to improve America's energy security. He and I have worked closely since he came to the Senate to protect the longstanding requirement that U.S.-produced crude oil stay here at home to benefit the U.S. consumer rather than being shipped across the globe.

This amendment is another common-sense protection to make sure our Nation's energy policy is aimed at helping consumers rather than helping oil companies' bottom line, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

For the last several Congresses I have introduced the American Oil for American Families Act, a bill to ensure that oil or petroleum products that originate within America's public lands or waters are not exported as crude or in refined form. That bill would increase our energy supply at home, lowering prices for consumers and businesses, and I intend to reintroduce that legislation in this Congress.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Markey amendment. I intend to vote against the bill, which in my view is nothing more than an earmark for Big Oil. The pipeline will have enormous environmental impacts, it will not significantly help the American economy, it will not benefit American consumers, and it will needlessly harm landowners for generations.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tonight the President of the United States will address the Nation on the state of our Union and talk a little bit about his priorities for the coming year.

I am not sure how much more there is for the President to say than has already been leaked in the press in the drip, drip, drip of social media and other stories, but I am concerned he simply did not get the message that was delivered loud and clear on November 4 by the American voters.

Just a couple of months ago they sent a message that was loud and it was clear. They are fed up with the way things operate in Washington, DC. They are fed up with the dysfunction, and they are fed up with the lack of real leadership that focuses on their concerns, not Washington's concerns—concerns such as more money in their pocket.

I was amused to listen to our good friend, our colleague from New Jersey, complaining about additional exports of oil or actually gasoline and other fuel. It is actually the supply, the glut

of gasoline onto the global markets that has caused a pay raise for most hard-working, middle-class families. The price of gasoline has plummeted because of the glut of supply.

But we ought to be focused like a laser on how we put more money into the pocketbook of hard-working American taxpayers—after years of stagnant jobs and stagnant wages, the stagnant number of jobs for the record number of Americans who have been looking for them.

So after sending a message loud and clear on November 4, what is the President's response? He says more of the same. He is set to announce a \$320 billion tax hike and hundreds of billions of dollars in more spending—yes, hundreds of billions of dollars more in taxes and hundreds of billions of dollars in more Federal spending. Sadly, the President has doubled down on the same agenda which, in his own words, was on the ballot this last fall and was soundly rejected.

But this agenda and these policies are not only wrong for America today, they are certainly wrong for the America of our future. Future generations deserve a country that provides them more opportunity than our parents had or than we have. That is called the American dream. But hundreds of billions of dollars in new spending and new taxes—when we already face an \$18 trillion debt—well, that makes the American promise one unlikely to be fulfilled.

The cause of this problem is pretty clear: The President remains focused on the priorities in Washington, DC, and not on the priorities of hard-working American taxpayers working from paycheck to paycheck, dealing with rising costs of living when it comes to food and other commodities and who are sorely in need of additional money in their pocket.

Things clearly need to change. That to me was what the voters said on November 4. I think I speak for many Americans and many Texans when I say: Mr. President, enough is enough. The American people expect better, and, more importantly, they deserve better.

Sure, we know there are always going to be big challenges, and they are not easy to deal with by any stretch of the imagination. But surely—surely—we can come up with better solutions than more taxes and more spending. This is really doubling down over the last 6 years. One would think that the President, giving the State of the Union now in his seventh year in office, could come up with something a little bit different, particularly after his own party lost nine Senate seats after this referendum on his failed policies that took place on November 4.

The great news—and there is good news—is we do not have to start from scratch. We need to look no further

than some of the laboratories of democracy—that is what Louis Brandeis called the State: the laboratories of democracy—to see what actually works. We know what does not work. So let's look and see what does work.

We could learn a lot from States such as Arizona, where the Presiding Officer is from, and my home State of Texas. We are not perfect, but I think we have learned a few important lessons we could teach to the policymakers in the White House. Many policymakers in Washington seem to have forgotten the secret sauce, the formula, the recipe by which strong, sustainable economic growth that lifts the middle class in Texas and in so many other States across the country—why that is alive and well and why those policies actually work.

Just last Friday I had the opportunity to visit Southeast Texas. I was in Beaumont, TX, actually, where the existing gulf coast leg of the Keystone Pipeline is already operating.

I bet many of my colleagues would be amazed to know that we are already transporting Canadian crude from Canada all the way across the country, by and large on railcars, to refineries on the gulf coast. The Keystone XL Pipeline—the legislation that we will be voting on today—will increase the supply, which means more product, and hopefully, that will result in downward pressure on prices for hard-working American taxpayers.

While the President stood in the way of the building of this completed pipeline and the tens of thousands of jobs it would support, the gulf coast leg of the Keystone Pipeline in Texas is already booming. But they are hungry for more crude feedstock so they can produce more and thereby create more jobs.

It has been good for communities. I talked to the mayor of Beaumont and other communities. I talked to a county judge. These taxes, which are provided by investment from the Keystone XL Pipeline, not only create good jobs, but the tax base is necessary to educate our kids in K-12 education. They provide the products and services from local businesses that sell goods. In other words, projects such as the Keystone XL Pipeline is a force multiplier when it comes to our economy and economic growth and opportunity, and of course, it has been good for thousands of construction workers who built the pipeline.

I heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle try to denigrate these construction jobs. They say that they are just temporary jobs. Mr. President, you and I have a temporary job. We are elected for a term of office, and if we are not reelected, it is a temporary job. In effect, every job is a temporary job. But to denigrate these good, high-paying construction jobs, including those performed by welders—in Texas, properly trained welders can make \$140,000

to \$150,000 a year. Those are good, high-paying jobs, and we ought to respect and encourage them.

That is just one example of how some of the folks at the White House look down their nose at these construction jobs and try to denigrate the economic contribution of projects such as the Keystone XL Pipeline and what they could learn from this project.

In my State we reduced taxes, cut red tape in favor of sensible regulations, and encouraged businesses to come to Texas to grow and create jobs. If I heard the story one time, I heard it 100 times. In my State, Governor Perry has contacted people in California and said: Come to Texas, where you are welcome and the cost of doing business is lower and the cost of living is cheaper. You can actually buy an affordable home for your family. People have voted with their feet and have come where the opportunity is.

If we add it all up, over the last 6 years two-thirds of all new net jobs created in the United States of America came from just one State, and that is my home State.

Another thing Washington could learn from Texas is how to balance a budget. We actually balance our budget every year. Earlier I mentioned that the President seems to be proud of the fact that the deficit is actually going down. As the Presiding Officer knows, that is the annual difference between what we take in and what we spend.

What he doesn't tell you is that we are actually adding to the debt every year because we are still spending more money than we are bringing in, and it has now gone up about \$8 trillion during his administration to an unprecedented \$18 trillion national debt. We need to roll up our sleeves, and we invite the President to join us and take on the priorities of hard-working American taxpayers in every State across the country.

We know this is not going to be easy, but that is what we volunteered for. I know there are colleagues here in the Senate—Republicans and Democrats alike—who are eager to address the challenges that confront our country—whether it is economic, national security, or you name it. These are things that need to get done.

At the end of the day, it doesn't really matter what I think the State of our Union is or, for that matter, it doesn't really matter what the President thinks the State of our Union is. What matters is whether the teacher in Katy, TX, believes his students will have the opportunities he did growing up or whether the single mom waiting tables in Fort Worth can find enough work to feed her family.

Our Nation is truly strong when its people believe it to be, and I hope the President understands that and tries something new rather than the same old failed policies of the past.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

I wish to urge my colleagues to oppose any motion to table my amendment. My amendment is about making sure that, if we do build the Keystone XL Pipeline, it is built with American iron and steel. Those are jobs. I don't wish to short-circuit the process here, but if the pipeline is built, it should be built with American steel.

The Presiding Officer's State produces a lot of American steel and very often with iron ore from my State. These are American jobs.

TransCanada has said that 50 percent of the iron and steel will be outsourced from other countries, and the iron and steel for some of the other pipes could come from other countries. They also said they can use those pipes in other projects, including other projects in Canada.

I agree with Senator CORNYN when he said these construction jobs that will help build the pipeline are real jobs. Just because they are not permanent jobs does not mean they are not real jobs. Providing the iron and steel and other manufactured products for this project will also provide real jobs. Our amendment will do this entirely and consistently within the language of the bill and within our trade obligations.

I ask that my colleagues not vote to table this amendment because a vote to table this is a vote against American jobs. It is a vote against jobs in Ohio and Minnesota. It is a vote against the shippers who ship our iron ore over the Great Lakes or by rail or over the Mississippi so it can be used to make steel. We have done "Buy America" legislation before. We just did it in 2013 on the WRDA bill. I ask that my colleagues please not vote against American jobs.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will take a couple of minutes before we vote to speak to the Franken amendment. I think all of us want to buy American and buy local whenever and wherever we can. We strongly support that since it does mean jobs—whether we are talking about a pipeline or otherwise.

But I think the bigger question here—and what we have in front of us with the Keystone XL Pipeline—is what this amendment would do. This amendment would mandate specific materials for the Keystone XL pipeline, and I think we need to put this into context. This pipeline is a private project. This is not a federally funded infrastructure project. This would be the first time that Congress has di-

rected or forced private parties to purchase domestic goods and materials.

We actually asked the Congressional Research Service to look into this to see if there was any other instance at the Federal level where private parties were told that they must purchase 100-percent domestic goods and materials, and so far the answer to that inquiry has been that they can find no instance of that.

I think we need to be careful about this as a precedent because if we are going to direct this particular project—the Keystone XL—to have this requirement on it, where do we go next? What will happen to the next project that we have? Will it be the next pipeline or the next renewable energy project? Where does this slippery slope go?

I think it is fair to note that TransCanada has made a commitment to have 75 percent of the pipes for this project come from North America, and fully half of that—more than 332,000 tons of steel will come from the State of Arkansas.

I am with the Senator from Minnesota. We want to make sure we get as many jobs as we absolutely can and make sure they are good-paying jobs—whether it is in steel making or widget making or welders. This is about jobs. This is what we want to do to encourage jobs. I think we need to be very cognizant of what this particular amendment would do. This amendment—for the first time ever—would direct a private entity to utilize all American-made products throughout the process of the construction.

It is important to note that the American Iron and Steel Institute has been a strong supporter of the Keystone XL Pipeline. We have all received a letter—they called it a Steelgram—from the American Iron and Steel Institute. They let us know very clearly and in no uncertain terms that they support Keystone XL. They said it is essential that Congress act to ensure the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline without further delay. Again, I agree.

We need to get moving on it. We need to do it without delay. I do think it is interesting to note that the amendment does allow for the President to waive the requirements for American materials based on certain findings he can make. I appreciate that is in there, and I think that is good. But think about where we are. It has been 3,200-and-some-odd days now where we have been waiting for the President to act to make a decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline. So I don't have any real confidence that he will move to act quickly on any kind of a waiver requirement.

I just wanted to put that out there before we moved to take up the amendments that we have pending before us this afternoon and note that we will be doing that in a few short minutes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Alaska. I wish to say a few things about this private company. This company is asking us to do an extraordinary thing. We are debating this on the floor because they are asking us to circumvent the environmental and safety process here and possibly expose the United States—and the path of this pipeline—to tremendous environmental damage. This is very different.

The Senator asked: Why won't this extend to every private enterprise? This is something we are here debating and voting on, and that should say something about the nature of this issue.

The United Steelworkers have endorsed my amendment. This is about American jobs. The question is: If we do build this pipeline, should it be built with American steel or should it be built with steel from other countries?

Again, in the bill, we make sure this is compliant with our trade obligations. There is nothing to stop us from doing this. This is a private foreign company that is asking us to circumvent our normal processes, and because of that, I feel we have the right to say this should be made with American steel and with jobs in the State of Ohio and in the State of Minnesota—American jobs. If this is about American jobs, let's make it about American jobs.

Again, this is a company that is asking us to circumvent our normal processes. So all I will say is that TransCanada has said the pipes that have been made for this can be used in other projects in Canada.

If we are going to build this project, let's make it about American jobs.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about jobs—especially jobs in the U.S. steel industry.

This November I went to a ceremony at Sparrows Point a former steel plant in Maryland. It was a bittersweet day. I was there to honor the legacy of Bethlehem Steel and all of the Steelworkers in Baltimore.

The site is being demolished but Sparrows Point has over 3,000 acres of land, access to ports, rails, and roads to attract companies to create jobs today and tomorrow.

We don't have steel in Maryland anymore. Many of us still mourn its loss. But we still have steel in America and I am still for steel.

If this Keystone bill is really a jobs bill, then let us put some made-in-America jobs in it and show our support for American steel.

For over a hundred years, workers at Sparrows Point produced the steel that built America. Members of my own family worked at this steel mill. My fa-

ther would open the doors to his grocery store early so that Bethlehem Steel workers could pick up their lunch on their way to work.

America's steel and steelworkers protect the United States and our freedom. At Sparrows Point, they rolled gun barrels, made steel for grenades, shells and landing craft during World War II.

God help us all if America stops making steel. During times of war—will we depend on foreign steel to build our ships, aircraft carriers and weapons?

American steelworkers work hard, play by the rules and serve their country. In war: building ships, tanks and weapons. In peace: making steel for our buildings and cars.

Yet for over 50 years, the steel industry withered—not because steel was unproductive or overpriced. The steel industry withered in America because Congress didn't do everything possible to protect American steel from factors in the international steel market, raw material costs, slumping demand, low steel prices, and a global recession. The government looked the other way when foreign imports began to drive down our prices and drive down our steel mills.

Our government singles out specific industries all the time when it is in our national interest. We single out specific industries and then talk about their value to America. I agree with that.

We single out industries when it is in our national interest because we need them as part of our economy or as part of our national production.

Helping the farmers or the airlines because of the national interest means national responsibility. In 2008, we bailed out the banks and we bailed out the auto industry for stability, security, and American independence. Where is the help for the steel industry and the steelworkers?

I have fought for steel in the past. Now I am fighting for steel again. I fought so hard year after year to protect the lives and livelihoods in Baltimore, in Dundalk.

I have fought for more than 25 years to reverse this tide against American manufacturing and against American steel. I am going to keep on fighting.

I fought to keep Sparrows Point open. And when that wasn't possible, I fought for a safety net for workers Trade Adjustment Assistance, unemployment insurance and health care benefits.

I think about Maryland steelworkers every day—what they are going through these past few years have been tough on workers, their families, and the community.

I am supporting an amendment that protects American steel like steel has protected us. It is simple. Let us put American workers back to work in good, solid steel jobs, by requiring that

the pipeline's construction, connection, operation, and maintenance all be done with made-in-America, U.S. steel.

Let us get to work for American workers and let us put the jobs in this jobs bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 3, AS MODIFIED

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Portman amendment No. 3 be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION B—ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the "Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015".

TITLE I—BETTER BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Better Buildings Act of 2015".

SEC. 102. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) COST-EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term "cost-effective energy efficiency measure" means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides energy savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(3) COST-EFFECTIVE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term "cost-effective water efficiency measure" means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides water savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(b) MODEL PROVISIONS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and after providing the public with an opportunity for notice and comment, shall develop model commercial leasing provisions and best practices in accordance with this subsection.

(2) COMMERCIAL LEASING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection shall, at a minimum, align the interests of building owners and tenants with regard to investments in cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures to encourage building owners and tenants to collaborate to invest in such measures.

(B) USE OF MODEL PROVISIONS.—The Administrator may use the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection in any standard leasing document that designates a Federal agency (or other client of the Administrator) as a landlord or tenant.

(C) PUBLICATION.—The Administrator shall periodically publish the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection, along with explanatory materials, to

encourage building owners and tenants in the private sector to use such provisions and materials.

(3) **REALTY SERVICES.**—The Administrator shall develop policies and practices to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures for the realty services provided by the Administrator to Federal agencies (or other clients of the Administrator), including periodic training of appropriate Federal employees and contractors on how to identify and evaluate those measures.

(4) **STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make available model commercial leasing provisions and best practices developed under this subsection to State, county, and municipal governments for use in managing owned and leased building space in accordance with the goal of encouraging investment in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures.

SEC. 103. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.**—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

“(2) **SEPARATE SPACES.**—The term ‘separate spaces’ means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

“(b) **STUDY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

“(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

“(2) **SCOPE.**—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) descriptions of—

“(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

“(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

“(iii) policies and best practices to achieve reductions in energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

“(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of available incentives;

“(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

“(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether such measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

“(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

“(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) case studies reporting economic and energy savings returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(3) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(4) **PUBLICATION.**—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 423 the following new item:

“Sec. 424. Separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.”.

SEC. 104. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.**—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(2) **SEPARATE SPACES.**—The term ‘separate spaces’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(b) **TENANT STAR.**—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as ‘Tenant Star’, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

“(c) **EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.**—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

“(1) collect, through each Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

“(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by data centers, trading floors, and restaurants; and

“(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption;

“(2) with respect to the first Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey conducted after the date of enactment of this section, to the extent full compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) is not feasible, conduct activities to develop the capability to collect such data and begin to collect such data; and

“(3) make data collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public in aggregated form and provide such data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (d).

“(d) **RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.**—

“(1) **OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which sufficient data is received pursuant to subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

“(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop policies and procedures to recognize tenants in commercial buildings that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

“(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (c) and any other appropriate data sources; and

“(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

“(2) **DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.**—After the study required by section 424(b) is completed, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 (as added by section 103(b)) the following new item:

“Sec. 425. Tenant Star program.”.

TITLE II—GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS

SEC. 201. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) in section 325(e) (42 U.S.C. 6295(e)), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.**—

“(A) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph:

“(i) **ACTIVATION LOCK.**—The term ‘activation lock’ means a control mechanism (either a physical device directly on the water heater or a control system integrated into the water heater) that is locked by default and contains a physical, software, or digital communication that must be activated with

an activation key to enable the product to operate at its designed specifications and capabilities and without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

“(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term ‘grid-enabled water heater’ means an electric resistance water heater that—

“(I) has a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

“(II) is manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

“(III) has—

“(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

“(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

“(BB) 0.00168; or

“(bb) an equivalent alternative standard prescribed by the Secretary and developed pursuant to paragraph (5)(E);

“(IV) is equipped at the point of manufacture with an activation lock; and

“(V) bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

“(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

“(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

“(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

“‘IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.’”

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key for a grid-enabled water heater only to a utility or other company that operates an electric thermal storage or demand response program that uses such a grid-enabled water heater.

“(C) REPORTS.—

“(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

“(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

“(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

“(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

“(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and

comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that—

“(I) grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement; or

“(II) sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually and procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes would not be adequate to prevent such product diversion.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

“(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including any impact on energy savings, electric bills, peak load reduction, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.”;

(2) in section 332(a) (42 U.S.C. 6302(a))—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) for any person—

“(A) to activate an activation lock for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(B) to distribute an activation key for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such activation key will be used to activate a grid-enabled water heater that is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(C) to otherwise enable a grid-enabled water heater to operate at its designed specification and capabilities with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program; or

“(D) to knowingly remove or render illegible the label of a grid-enabled water heater described in section 325(e)(6)(A)(ii)(V).”;

(3) in section 333(a) (42 U.S.C. 6303(a))—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”; and

(B) by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (5) of section 332(a)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”; and

(4) in section 334 (42 U.S.C. 6304)—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”; and

(B) by striking “section 332(a)(6)” and inserting “section 332(a)(7)”. “

TITLE III—ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

SEC. 301. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”; and

(2) by striking “signing the contract,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

“(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

“(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multitenant building owners; and

“(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

“(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.”.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall complete a study—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and any associated building efficiency policies, for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multitenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and television studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure laws and data aggregation for multitenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

(C) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with other relevant agencies, shall maintain, and if necessary create, a database for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) information on buildings that have disclosed energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, only in an anonymous form unless the owner provides otherwise.

(2) COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS.—The database maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall complement and not duplicate the functions of the Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Portfolio Manager tool.

(d) INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.—The Secretary of Energy shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I call for regular order with respect to Markey amendment No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to table the Markey amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There is a unanimous consent request. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Is there a request from the Senator from Massachusetts to speak to this amendment for 1 minute? What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He asked unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

Mr. MARKEY. To this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, this is a motion to table the Markey amendment, which is an amendment to have every Member of the Senate be put on record as to whether or not the oil coming through the Keystone Pipeline is then exported out of the United States. Each Member of the Senate should be recorded on that issue.

We import 5 million barrels of oil per day into the United States. We should not allow the Canadians to use the United States as a straw to be able to then go down to the Gulf of Mexico and send that oil out of the country. We export young men and women over to the Middle East in order to protect oil coming in from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. This is a chance to keep oil in America so we don't have to export it.

I do not believe the appropriate vote for Members is to support a tabling of the Markey amendment so that we don't actually reach the heart of this substantive issue, which is that we should be working to have energy independence in America. When we are importing 5 million barrels of oil a day from Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait, we are in no way independent.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have previously been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.)

YEAS—57

Alexander	Daines	Lankford
Ayotte	Enzi	Lee
Barrasso	Ernst	Manchin
Blunt	Fischer	McCain
Boozman	Flake	McConnell
Burr	Gardner	Moran
Capito	Graham	Murkowski
Cassidy	Grassley	Paul
Coats	Hatch	Perdue
Cochran	Heitkamp	Portman
Collins	Heller	Risch
Corker	Hoeven	Roberts
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rounds
Cotton	Isakson	Rubio
Crapo	Johnson	Sasse
Cruz	Kirk	Scott

Sessions	Thune	Vitter
Shelby	Tillis	Warner
Sullivan	Toomey	Wicker

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WICKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 17

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I now move to table the Franken amendment, No. 17, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.)

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Feinstein	Merkley
Bennet	Franken	Mikulski
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Murphy
Booker	Heinrich	Murray
Boxer	Heitkamp	Nelson
Brown	Hirono	Peters
Burr	Kaine	Reed
Cantwell	King	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Leahy	Schumer
Casey	Manchin	Shaheen
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Donnelly	McCaskill	
Durbin	Menendez	

Tester
Udall

Warner
Warren

Whitehouse
Wyden

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—94

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BURR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 3, AS MODIFIED

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SHAHEEN be recognized to speak for 1 minute and that Senator PORTMAN be recognized to speak for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I join my colleague Senator PORTMAN from Ohio in a bipartisan amendment on energy efficiency. This is a very short version that passed overwhelmingly in the House last year. It doesn't pick favorites in terms of fuel sources, and it is good for every region of the country. This is something we all ought to be able to get behind. I am very pleased and hope we get a very strong vote in the Senate.

I am pleased to support this amendment, and I thank my colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. The Senator from New Hampshire said it well. This is a no-brainer. It is three relatively small provisions, one of which is very timely with regard to water heaters, about which we are very concerned. I ask that we move on this amendment in a bipartisan way. It has already passed the House, so it shouldn't be controversial over there either. We hope we will be able to bring the larger legislation to the floor in the future, but this is a good downpayment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I know of no further debate on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Cooms
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Daines
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Ernst
Feinstein

Fischer
Flake
Franken
Gardner
Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Heller
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markley
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy

Murray
Nelson
Perdue
Peters
Portman
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Scott
Sessions
Shaheen
Shelby
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Udall
Vitter
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—5

Cruz
Lankford

Lee
Paul
Sasse

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The amendment (No. 3), as modified, was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. FISCHER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have disposed of three pending amendments that were before us. As we mentioned earlier, we are looking forward to Members coming down to the floor to offer their amendments. We have agreed to a process here this afternoon.

Today will be a somewhat truncated day on the Senate floor because of the State of the Union Address, but it is our hope that we will be able to get three amendments pending on our side and three amendments pending on the Democrats' side.

The Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER, is prepared to speak to her amendment, and then we will move to the other side of the aisle. After that, I will be calling up an amendment from Senator LEE. We will then go to the Democratic side and come back here for a third round.

Just to give Members an idea of what we will have in front of us, we will not be having votes on these amendments today, but I do think it should be clear to Members that we will be looking forward to doing a similar series of votes tomorrow. So I would encourage folks to come to the floor, talk to us, and let's get this process moving.

With that, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. FISCHER] proposes an amendment numbered 18 to amendment No. 2.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF NEW FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.—In this section, the term “federally protected land” means any area designated or acquired by the Federal Government for the purpose of conserving historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, developmental, or biological resources.

(b) FINDINGS REQUIRED.—New federally protected land shall not be designated unless the Secretary, prior to the designation, publishes in the Federal Register—

(1) a finding that the addition of the new federally protected land would not have a negative impact on the administration of existing federally protected land; and

(2) a finding that, as of the date of the finding, sufficient resources are available to effectively implement management plans for existing units of federally protected land.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, this amendment would create limitations for new Federal land designations to ensure responsible management of our natural resources. These limitations are modeled on those in the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, which authorizes the protection of national marine sanctuaries. Under the act, the Commerce Secretary cannot designate a new sanctuary unless the Secretary publishes a finding that, No. 1, the addition of a new sanctuary will not have a negative impact on the overall system, and No. 2, sufficient resources were available in the fiscal year in which the finding is made to effectively implement management plans for each sanctuary in the system.

These are commonsense limitations that ensure the administration will not add more land to the Federal system without considering the impacts to the overall system and without sufficient funds to manage those resources effectively. At a time when the national park system has a \$13 billion maintenance backlog, we need to consider the impacts to the overall system and whether there are sufficient resources to effectively manage additional land holdings.

In the context of energy policy, we should also consider our stewardship choices. American energy production on private and State-owned lands has increased significantly in recent years

while decreasing on Federal lands. Through leasing restrictions and permitting delays, the Obama administration has tied up energy production on Federal lands in redtape. Since 2009 oil production on Federal lands is down by 6 percent, and natural gas production on Federal lands is down 28 percent. Meanwhile, oil production on non-Federal land has risen by 61 percent, and natural gas production on non-Federal land is up by 33 percent.

By limiting Federal land designations, more land should continue to be held privately or managed by States and local governments, increasing the opportunity for productive and beneficial use.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, as we go back and forth on offering amendments, I wish to turn to the Senator from Hawaii for him to offer his amendment.

Mr. SCHATZ. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. SCHATZ] proposes an amendment numbered 58 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The environmental analysis contained in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referred to in section 2(a) and deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) as described in section 2(a), states that—

(1) “[W]arming of the climate system is unequivocal and each of the last [3] decades has been successively warmer at the Earth’s surface than any preceding decade since 1850.”;

(2) “The [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change], in addition to other institutions, such as the National Research Council and the United States (U.S.) Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), have concluded that it is extremely likely that global increases in atmospheric [greenhouse gas] concentrations and global temperatures are caused by human activities.”; and

(3) “A warmer planet causes large-scale changes that reverberate throughout the cli-

mate system of the Earth, including higher sea levels, changes in precipitation, and altered weather patterns (e.g. an increase in more extreme weather events).”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Consistent with the findings under subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real; and

(2) human activity significantly contributes to climate change.

Mr. SCHATZ. This amendment affirms something very simple; that is, climate change is real and human activities significantly contribute to climate change. It also states that a warmer planet causes large-scale changes, including higher sea levels, changes in precipitation, and altered weather patterns, such as increases in more extreme weather events.

This amendment cites for its evidence the findings of national and international scientific institutions, including the IPCC, the National Research Council, and the U.S. Global Change Research Program. All of these organizations are cited and quoted in the State Department’s final supplemental environmental impact statement on Keystone XL Pipeline. This is the same environmental review document that plays a prominent role in the text of the underlying bill, S. 1, and the substitute amendment.

The purpose of this amendment is simply to acknowledge and restate a set of observable facts. It is not intended to place a value judgment on those facts or to suggest a specific course of action in response to those facts. It is just a set of facts derived from decades of careful study of our land, air, and water.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up Senator LEE’s amendment No. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. LEE, proposes an amendment numbered 33 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To conform citizen suits under the Endangered Species Act of 1973)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ AWARD OF LITIGATION COSTS TO PREVAILING PARTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXISTING LAW.

Section 11(g)(4) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)(4)) is amended

by striking “to any” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting “to any prevailing party in accordance with section 2412 of title 28, United States Code.”.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Very briefly on Senator LEE’s amendment—he will be here to speak to it—this is a measure which would ensure that the rate of legal fees that are paid in Endangered Species Act cases would be consistent with those in other cases that are eligible for lawyer’s fee compensation. Right now there is no cap on the hourly rate lawyers can be paid in connection with lawsuits that are brought regarding violations under the ESA. So this amendment would standardize the award of attorney’s fees to parties prevailing against the Federal Government by applying a \$125-an-hour rate cap under the Equal Access to Justice Act requirement. This applies to small business-related claims, among other things, and this would apply the same standard to ESA cases.

This is a measure Senator LEE will come to the floor to speak to further, but I would just give a little preview of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I would like to call on the Senator from Illinois to offer his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 69.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 69 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that the storage and transportation of petroleum coke is regulated in a manner that ensures the protection of public and ecological health)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF PETROLEUM COKE.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that—

(1) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, promulgates rules concerning the storage and transportation of petroleum coke that ensure the protection of public and ecological health; and

(2) petroleum coke is no longer exempt from regulation under section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42

U.S.C. 9601(14)), which may be established either by an Act of Congress or any regulations, rules, or guidance issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, about 1 year ago I was invited to go to the southeast part of the city of Chicago. It is an area that used to be populated by steel mills and now there are a lot of struggling families. The manufacturing jobs were not replaced.

These are hard-working people—many are Mexican-American people. They sustain what you might expect—great parishes and churches and a great spirit among them, but now they are in a constant struggle. They live in a part of Chicago that has seen better days. They are doing their darndest for their families.

They invited me to see something. They wanted me to see what they were living next door to. I went down to that part of the city of Chicago—within the boundaries of the city of Chicago—and I could not believe what I saw. They live in little houses such as these, and across from them is a mountainous gathering of something called petcoke.

What is petcoke? If you take the Canadian tar sands that will move through the Keystone XL Pipeline to a refinery and put them through a process where you can end up with a viable product, such as gasoline, jet fuel, diesel fuel or whatever it might be, you have to clean out all of this petcoke that creates the tar sands composition that they are dealing with.

When it is all over with—and if the process has been successful—there is a lot of waste. In fact, there are 61 pounds of petcoke for every barrel of oil. Keep in mind that the Senator who is sponsoring the underlying legislation—we are dealing with moving hundreds of thousands of barrels a day through this pipeline.

Now take every one of those barrels and have 61 pounds of petcoke left over as a result of the refining process. What happens to it? This is what happened to it in Chicago. It was dumped in the neighborhood.

The people invited me to come to their homes, and I did. I walked into this woman's home, and she said: I have sealed the windows. I taped them shut because this black, sooty petcoke blows through my windows night and day. I cannot stop it. Is it something to worry about?

It turns out that the petcoke is not a benign material. We are not talking about dust in the air. We are talking about a composition that includes—according to those who have taken a close look at it—heavy metals. Would you want your baby in your home—or my home or my grandchildren—breathing in this filthy, petcoke-infested dust night and day? They are not making it up. They showed me the window sills, and you could see the black, sooty petcoke.

I will tell you the details of the story. The environmental review for the project of Keystone XL notes that communities throughout the Midwest have noticed large piles of petroleum coke—or petcoke—building up as more and more tar sands are processed.

This picture tells a story. This is near a body of water which is carrying this petcoke on the water. These poor folks deal with it as it blows through the air.

This type of crude oil is carried by the Keystone XL Pipeline, a pipeline which the Republican majority has decided is their No. 1 priority in the Senate. Under the new Republican majority it is S. 1. This pipeline, on behalf of a Canadian company, TransCanada, is the topic we are facing.

We just had a vote and unfortunately could not prevail with the notion that at least the oil that comes out of the pipeline ought to be for the benefit of American consumers. We lost that vote. I think the vote was 57 to 42. It was tabled.

Let's talk about the actual process itself. According to the EPA—as I mentioned, the environmental impact statement—every barrel of tar sands contains 61 pounds of petcoke. That means the Keystone XL Pipeline alone will produce 15,400 metric tons of petcoke every day—15,400 metric tons of petcoke every day. Would you like to live next door to that? That is what is happening in the city of Chicago, but it is not the only one.

This petcoke comes from the BP, British Petroleum, refinery in Whiting, IN. It is on the very southern tip of Lake Michigan. We can see it from the city of Chicago. They went through a \$4 billion upgrade and put in new equipment so they could start processing the Canadian tar sands which will come down through the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Soon after they started this processing with \$4 billion of new equipment, the people living in this part of Chicago looked out their windows to see the massive piles of petcoke building up, and as a consequence they got worried. They are worried for their children. On windy days—it is, in fact, the “Windy City”—black clouds of this dust blow from piles into this working-class neighborhood.

It always seems to be the case, doesn't it? If somebody tried to put this on the North Shore of Chicago, they would scream bloody murder. But the company that owns this petcoke put it outside a poor neighborhood—a working-class neighborhood in Chicago. The petcoke dust settles on window sills and porches.

I met the kids running outside. They are producing 6,000 tons of petcoke every single day at the British Petroleum refinery in Whiting, IN—6,000 tons a day. At that rate the plant only has room to store a few days'

worth of production onsite. So they ended up selling the petcoke to a company called KCBX. It is a subsidiary company owned by the Koch brothers—yes, those Koch brothers.

Connect the dots. The highest priority of the Republican majority in the Senate was to call up a bill for a Canadian company to transport tar sands across the United States with no promise that the American consumers would ever be able to access it, and the process of refining the Canadian tar sands ends up inuring to the benefit of many companies, such as British Petroleum and KCBX, which again is owned by the Koch brothers. These are the same Koch brothers who are viable political players in our political campaigns.

This means the people in southeast Chicago are forced to breathe this dirty air that members of National Nurses United say causes severe health threats. Petcoke contains high levels of heavy metals, such as vanadium and nickel, and dust particles get trapped in residents' lungs, triggering asthma and exacerbating heart and lung conditions.

When I go to a school—whether it is rural or urban—I make a point to ask a very basic question: Does any student here know anyone with asthma? Half of the hands are up in every classroom. Our pages are starting to raise their hands, of course.

So here we have a national problem, a respiratory problem, which has been made dramatically worse by the by-product, petcoke, of the Keystone XL Pipeline. That is a fact. What I have argued to you now so far is indisputable.

The community and members of the Southeast Environmental Task Force that I visited with in Chicago are fighting back with the help of the National Resources Defense Council. They worked with Mayor Emanuel and Chicago officials to put standards in place for petcoke storage sites that protect public and environmental health. They have come up with a radical notion—if you want to store this dangerous petcoke, then for goodness' sake put it inside a building so it doesn't blow all over the neighborhood.

They are suing KCBX and Koch Industries for the damages caused by petcoke piles after the Environmental Protection Agency issued a notice to the company of Clean Air Act violations.

The people who hate the EPA like the devil hates holy water do not want them to come in and look at something as outrageous as this and tell you the obvious. This is a public health danger. Petcoke from Canadian tar sands, and part of the Keystone XL Pipeline, is a public health hazard.

Unfortunately, petcoke just isn't an issue in Chicago or Illinois. My colleague from Michigan, Senator GARY PETERS, told me a story earlier. He can

tell you what happened in Detroit when another Koch brothers-owned company decided to store large piles of petcoke on the Detroit River.

If you look online, you can still find the YouTube video of black clouds blowing off the piles of the Koch brothers' petcoke into the river. In fact, Senator PETERS said that at one point this black cloud was so dense it obscured the Ambassador Bridge between the United States and Canada. You could not see it.

It took years of complaints and lawsuits from local communities to get shipping ports in California to require piles of petcoke that was being stored there to be kept in enclosed facilities and covered at all times.

Other communities continue to fight, including my city of Chicago, which I am proud to represent. As the U.S. refines more and more tar sands—that is what this bill is all about, refining more and more Canadian tar sands. Every single day tons of this petcoke is produced with no end in sight and no way of protecting the people who live around that area from the damage it will cause to the lungs of children and other vulnerable people, such as elderly people with respiratory challenges.

Residents in Houston, TX, and the State of Ohio have complained about how these petcoke piles stored in their neighborhoods are damaging their homes and health, but many Americans affected by petcoke don't have the money or power to take on big companies, so it is up to Congress. It is up to us to ensure that every person in America—rich or poor, whether they live in a good neighborhood or a struggling neighborhood—has the protection against public health hazards.

There is a current exemption of petcoke from environmental laws. When you think of all of the things blowing in the air, how in the world did petcoke end up being treated like fairy dust? It is exempt from laws relating to basic things, such as the Superfund. It is exempt from laws relating to hazardous waste and materials. They must have had friends in high places to make sure this miserable source of respiratory problems would be exempt from Federal law.

My amendment would change that. It would end this exemption so they would be held to environmental and public health standards when it comes to this miserable byproduct of Canadian tar sands and the Keystone XL Pipeline.

My amendment goes on to require the EPA and the Department of Transportation to implement rules for petcoke storage and transportation to protect the public health and environment.

Is there anyone here who will tell you that the folks, TransCanada or those refining this, should not have that responsibility? I would not want

to see this anywhere. I would not want to see it in Alaska, and I would not want to see it in Oklahoma. I sure don't want to even see it in the city of Chicago. But to think it goes unregulated—absolutely unregulated—is amazing, and that is what my amendment addresses.

The United States already produces millions of tons of petcoke each year. Building this pipeline is just going to add dramatically to that amount. By fixing the legal status of petcoke and making it subject to the same laws as all other dangerous materials, we can help ensure that clean air and clean water is something everyone enjoys, whether they are rich or poor and no matter what State they happen to live in.

I hope the Senate will have a chance to vote on my amendment to close this loophole for petcoke and establish reasonable guidelines for handling the material.

It is time we put the health and well-being of Americans ahead of the profits of any industry involved in the processing of Canadian tar sands because no community—especially the southeast side of Chicago—should be considered a dumping ground for companies to make money off the lungs and health of vulnerable children, elderly, and poor people.

No family should be forced to live next door to a three-story-high pile of petcoke, and that is what is going on. No kid should have to move from a ball field to play inside so they are not exposed to hazardous chemicals.

I know what will happen. Somebody is going to make a motion to table this amendment. We can run, but we can't hide, just as we can run, but we can't hide from blowing petcoke. If my colleagues won't allow a vote on this amendment to classify this as a material that should be regulated for the safety of the environment and public health, they will be on record if they vote to table this amendment.

I urge my colleagues—even if they dearly love the Keystone XL Pipeline and even if they can't wait to bring in the Canadian tar sands—think about this as if this were your hometown, your neighborhood, and you lived in a house such as this and you looked across the road at that miserable pile, three stories high, of petcoke blowing in for your children and your grandchildren to breathe every day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up the Toomey amendment No. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska, [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. TOOMEY, for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 41 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To continue cleaning up fields and streams while protecting neighborhoods, generating affordable energy, and creating jobs)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ STANDARDS FOR COAL REFUSE POWER PLANTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) 19th-century mining operations left behind more than 2,000,000,000 tons of coal refuse on surface land in various coal mining regions of the United States;

(2) coal refuse piles—

(A) pose significant environmental risks;

(B) have contaminated more than 180,000 acres of land and streams; and

(C) are susceptible to fires that endanger public health and emit an estimated 9,000,000 tons of carbon dioxide each year, in addition to other uncontrolled pollutants;

(3) the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, and the Department of Environmental Protection of the State of Pennsylvania recognize the significant public health benefits of power plants that use coal refuse as fuel;

(4) since the inception of coal refuse power plants, the plants have removed 210,000,000 tons of coal refuse and restored 8,200 acres of contaminated land; and

(5) due to the unique nature of coal refuse and the power plants that use coal refuse as a fuel, those plants face distinct economic and technical obstacles to achieving compliance with regulatory standards established for traditional coal-fired power plants.

(b) DEFINITION OF COAL REFUSE.—In this section, the term “coal refuse” means any byproduct of coal mining, physical coal cleaning, or coal preparation operations that contains coal, matrix material, clay, and other organic and inorganic material.

(c) EMISSION LIMITATIONS FOR CERTAIN ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The general emission limitations established by the Environmental Protection Agency in the final rule entitled “Federal Implementation Plans: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone and Correction of SIP Approvals” (76 Fed. Reg. 48208 (August 8, 2011)) (or a successor regulation) shall not apply to an electric utility steam generating unit described in paragraph (3).

(2) HYDROGEN CHLORIDE AND SULFUR DIOXIDE.—The emission limitations for hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide contained in table 2 of subpart UUUUU of part 63 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), entitled “Emission Limits for Existing EGUs” shall not apply to an electric utility steam generating unit described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF ELECTRIC UTILITY STEAM GENERATING UNITS.—An electric utility steam generating unit referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) is an electric utility steam generating unit that—

(A) is in operation as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) uses fluidized bed combustion technology to convert coal refuse into energy; and

(C) uses coal refuse as at least 50 percent of the annual fuel consumed, by weight, of the unit.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this section takes effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, obviously, Senator TOOMEY will come to the floor to speak to his amendment.

I wish to follow up on the comments of the Senator from Illinois, who was referring to petcoke. Senator TOOMEY in his amendment is attempting to deal with a situation in specific parts of the country that are impacted by coal refuse. Coal refuse, as it is defined in his amendment, effectively comes about from some centuries-old, 19th century mining operations that left behind this coal refuse in certain parts of the coal mining regions around the country. They remain a legacy problem that is acknowledged, a legacy problem that creates environmental issues, including contamination of local streams with heavy metals, acid, and mine drainage, that, again, I think we all recognize there is a responsibility to address.

The good news is there is a solution to cleaning up this problem. Coal refuse powerplants take this coal and these waste piles and turn them into energy and heat for consumers, for businesses. They follow EPA regulations. This is not a situation where we are bypassing EPA regulations when it comes to the emissions issues. But remediating these mine sites, removing these waste piles, and at the same time generating electricity with the coal and applying the basic ash from the process reclaims the land at a lower cost. So we are able to do several things at the same time. We are dealing with an environmental issue that has been in place for far too long. We are generating electricity that can be used to the benefit of consumers and businesses, and we are also able to reclaim the land.

So it is viewed, clearly, as a win here. It also creates some jobs. It improves the environment and it boosts economic growth.

Burning these coal waste piles is basically a carbon-neutral process because the carbon in these piles is currently being emitted into the atmosphere through the slow chemical process that is at play there, and we also have fires that burn within these piles. So just sitting there is not an answer to a better environment and reduced emissions.

The plants that burn this waste coal cannot economically be as clean as plants using higher quality coal. But the side benefits of removing these waste piles, again, from the perspective

of dealing with emissions, generating electricity, and reclaiming the land—the benefits do compensate for the differences that are out there.

Historically, environmental regulators have recognized these benefits. They have carved out the plants from regulatory standards that would cause them to shut down. There have been EPA regulations recently that have failed to sustain this approach and, thus there is the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania that would allow these coal waste plants to run.

I encourage my colleagues to look at this amendment in front of us and consider the merits as Senator TOOMEY has laid out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I know we are running against a time clock here in getting ready for the State of the Union Address tonight. I appreciate my colleague from Alaska going back and forth on these amendments and allowing both sides of the aisle to set up some pending amendments. I will just say the Toomey amendment asks for an exemption of the Clean Air Act which I wouldn't support. I know we will have a chance later on to have that discussion.

Our colleague from Nebraska came to the floor and offered an amendment that would make it incredibly difficult without first proving there was negative management of Federal land to get any more national monuments. National monuments have been big economic drivers in a lot of communities and have preserved some very unique parts of our country. We will have a chance to talk about that a little bit later. But I wish to make sure we get our colleague recognized so he can offer his amendment. Then, I think we will probably, as my colleague from Alaska said, be finished for this afternoon as it relates to offering amendments back and forth. I wish to recognize the Senator from Rhode Island for his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Purpose: to express the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax)

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE] proposes an amendment numbered 29 to amendment No. 2.

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I first wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the energy committee and her ranking member for allowing this process to go forward to the point where I am able to call up this amendment.

It is a convention here when amendments are called up to ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with, but in this amendment, the effective language is only eight words: "Climate change is real and not a hoax." So I went ahead and allowed the clerical staff to read the whole operative text of this amendment.

This is an extremely simple amendment. We are here in this remarkable body in which so much history has taken place and in which so many great achievements have been fought through, many of them with powerful interests and strong arguments on opposite sides. And through that conflict, here in this body, we have been able to generate some of the great compromises and some of the great resolutions that have defined the course of the history of this country. So what a wonderful place this is to have the opportunity to serve.

Now, in this great deliberative body, called by many the greatest deliberative body, we have a great issue before us—perhaps as many say, the issue of our time—and that is what our carbon pollution—the excess carbon that we burn when we burn fossil fuels—is doing to our atmosphere and what it is doing to our oceans. There is no factual debate about what it is doing to our atmosphere and our oceans. It is crystal clear, and the consequences are crystal clear as well.

If my colleagues don't believe me, fine, go ask the U.S. military. Ask Admiral Locklear. Ask the Secretary of the Navy. Ask the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If my colleagues don't want to believe in the military, ask our religious leaders. Ask the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. If my colleagues only believe what corporations tell us, ask some of our biggest and most successful American corporations. Ask Walmart. Ask Coca-Cola. Ask Nike, ask Apple, ask Google. Go on through the corporate heraldry, and virtually every American corporation that is not actively involved in the fossil fuel industry will tell us this is a real and serious problem. And many of them are dedicating an enormous amount of internal effort to try to solve it within their corporate boundaries. Again, Walmart and Coca-Cola come right to the head of the list.

Of course, we don't have to ask our scientists any longer. They are pretty clear. They use words such as "unequivocal" and "undeniable" at every

single scientific society that represents the major elements of the profession in this country. Every single one has made this a priority. If people just want to go out to farmers, foresters, and fishermen, they are already seeing the changes around them.

So here we are in this great deliberative body with this extraordinarily important issue that we have to face, and what do we see? Silence, virtually dead silence, because one side of this body won't even discuss the question. Many refuse to believe that climate change even exists, and for those who do, the political perils of using that phrase have now become so great that there is no serious conversation back and forth about climate change.

In the first week we debated the Keystone Pipeline, which the environmental impact statement said will have a dramatic effect on climate change—the equivalent of 6 million added cars on our highways for 50 years, not to mention the petcoke and the byproducts, and just the carbon effect of it—no mention. The only time it was mentioned was when our distinguished energy committee chairman mentioned the testimony of a witness in her committee. She was good enough to make sure that climate change was raised in her committee, and she mentioned that there had been a witness who in turn mentioned climate change. But there was no direct mention in all of the debate that we heard in that week about climate change. It is the word that cannot be said.

That is wrong. We cannot ignore this problem. It is too real for my fishermen in Rhode Island. It is too real for the people who are living near coasts and are seeing beaches they used to be able to play on eaten away. It is too real for the people whose homes have fallen into the sea. It is too real for us not to discuss it.

Now, it is not going to be easy, and we have to start somewhere. So this is a start. I am going to ask my colleagues to vote on such a simple question: Is climate change real or is it a hoax? Both points of view have been expressed in this body. Where do we come down? Let's actually find out if there are people on the Republican side of the aisle who are willing to say climate change is real. My moose up in New Hampshire, one could say, are suffering unprecedented infestations of ticks because there is no snow for them to fall off and die, and the moose are getting overwhelmed. We could say that in the University of Oklahoma, the leading dean is an IPCC member and led the establishment of Climate Central. One could go to the Carolina coasts and hear from the coastal agencies about sea level rise. One could go to Arizona and hear about the desertification and the drought. We can go all over the place and find these things, and they are real.

We have to have this conversation. It has to begin with as simple a proposition as this. Then, I hope if we can build off this if we can find a few Republican Senators who will say publicly that climate change is real. We can then go on to if it is real, let's have a conversation about what we do about it, because recklessly continuing to dump megatons of carbon into the atmosphere every year is not a solution. And I don't want to be a part of a generation of which our kids and our grandchildren look back and ask: Where were they? Why could they not address this question? There they were in this great deliberative body. There they were with this great issue of our time. Why would they not even discuss it?

So I hope this amendment gets the conversation under way. It is one I look forward to. I think there are very sensible ways to solve this problem, including ways that have been supported by everyone from Republican Secretaries of the Treasury to the lead economist for Ronald Reagan, the famous Mr. Laffer. There are ways we can make these adjustments. But we have to have the conversation, and I hope this begins it.

With that, I yield the floor. Again, I thank the distinguished chairman of the energy committee for her courtesy in allowing us to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I think discussions we have had just in the past hour here since we have had the vote and the various amendments we now have pending before us—this is a good conversation. This is a good discussion and debate for us to be having as a body. We haven't had energy-related issues brought before this floor in some years now. We had a very limited debate on Keystone back in December, but I am hopeful that with the opportunity for amendments—and again, not just some amendments we on our side have hand-picked and then decided what the Democrats might be able to move on their side—an opportunity for some real issues to be brought forward and to be debated on this floor.

The Senator from Rhode Island is very passionate on the issue of climate change. I think it is fair to say that he has singlehandedly raised the awareness not only in this body but for those loyal followers on C-SPAN.

When it comes to the issue of climate change, I think the Senator comes up once a week with his charts and a series of speeches that I think is meant to educate colleagues. I don't agree with all of it. I think that is a fair statement to say. But what is equally fair is that there is a care and concern for not only our country and our country's environment—truly the public safety of our people, a care for our

land, the stewardship we have as Americans—but it goes well beyond our borders to that of our entire globe, our entire planet, and how we care for planet Earth and how we move forward responsibly.

One aspect of the energy debate that I continue to advance is that we must ensure that if we are to make advances when it comes to caring for our environment and truly the whole issue of global climate, we have to be a nation that is economically secure in the sense that the technologies we will have to help us be cleaner in all that we do, do not come without cost. Here in this country, we have been the leaders, we have been the innovators when it comes to clean-energy technologies, and we should challenge ourselves every day to do more in that regard, to build out, to push out that R&D so that we are making—whether it is making clean coal truly clean, whether it is advancing those clean energy technologies.

I, for one, coming from a fossil fuel-producing State, am a huge proponent of nuclear-powered generation in this country because I believe very strongly that it is the cleanest energy source we have at this point in time.

So what are we doing in this country to make sure our energy is abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure? These are the challenges I put out to my colleagues.

I clearly appreciate the need that we have in this body and in this country to be moving forward with technologies that allow us to have reduced emissions, to have a cleaner environment, but I also want to make sure we do so in a way that doesn't cripple our economy. So how we lead in this way, which I believe we must, while keeping our economy where it must be—in the front and moving forward all the time—is our great challenge.

Again, I look forward to the debate we will have. I am pleased we were able to process the amendments we had before us today. I look forward to advancing those that we have pending in front of us now and to good, continued, and robust discussion on this floor.

I note the majority leader is here, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PHILIP M. PRO

Mr. REID. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the career of the

Honorable Philip M. Pro, who is retiring from the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

For more than 25 years, Judge Pro has sat on the district court. He was nominated by President Ronald Reagan, and he took office on July 23, 1987. From 2002 to 2007, he served as chief judge for the district court. Since being appointed to this distinguished position by President Reagan, his consistent leadership and responsiveness to the public and the court have not gone unnoticed. In October 1993, then U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist appointed Judge Pro as chair of the Committee on the Administration of the Magistrate Judges System of the Judicial Conference of the United States. In 2007, U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts appointed Judge Pro to the board of the Federal Judicial Center.

Beyond his remarkable career at the district court, Judge Pro has had a tremendous impact on the entire legal community. He served for several years on the Study Committee to Review the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure. He was actively involved in numerous international rule-of-law programs in countries such as Hungary, Spain, Norway, Malawi, and South Africa. Judge Pro was integral in the establishment of the William S. Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He served on the Law Advisory Committee for the law school and the advisory board of the school's Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution.

In addition to his impressive work in the legal community, he has worked since 1987 to educate Nevada's youth about civic duties through his role with the We, the People . . . the Citizen and the Constitution Program.

On a personal basis, I was chairman of the Nevada Gaming Commission during tumultuous times, when it was discovered mob influences infiltrated Nevada's gaming establishments; Phil was one of my attorneys. We have joked, since then, that he was able to beat, on behalf of the State of Nevada and its gaming authorities, the best lawyers that the adverse interest could buy. He was then an advocate of the law. Phil understood the law, for which I will always be grateful. I would also be negligent if I did not announce to everyone within the sound of my voice my envy for his great voice. He has a deep baritone speaking ability, which sets him apart from almost everyone else. I thank Phil Pro for his friendship.

Through his years of professional and voluntary service, Judge Pro has become a fixture in the Nevada legal community. I congratulate him on his many successes and decades of dedicated public service. I wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying rules for the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

114TH CONGRESS

RULE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. IN GENERAL.—The regular meeting dates of the Committee shall be the first and third Wednesdays of each month. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary, or pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. OPEN MEETINGS.—Meetings of the Committee, or any subcommittee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the Committee, or any subcommittee, on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the Committee, or any subcommittee, when it is determined that the matter to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of Committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of, or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to, a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept se-

cret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

3. STATEMENTS.—Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any subcommittee shall file with the Committee, at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing, a written statement of the witness's testimony in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee prescribes. In the event a witness fails to file a timely written statement in accordance with this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as applicable, may permit the witness to testify, or deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee, or permit the witness to testify in response to questions from members without the benefit of giving an opening statement.

4. FIELD HEARINGS.—Field hearings of the full Committee, and any subcommittee thereof, shall be scheduled only when authorized by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the full Committee.

RULE II—QUORUMS

1. BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND NOMINATIONS.—A majority of the members, which includes at least 1 minority member, shall constitute a quorum for official action of the Committee when reporting a bill, resolution, or nomination. Proxies may not be counted in making a quorum for purposes of this paragraph.

2. OTHER BUSINESS.—One-third of the entire membership of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of all business as may be considered by the Committee, except for the reporting of a bill, resolution, or nomination or authorizing a subpoena. Proxies may not be counted in making a quorum for purposes of this paragraph.

3. TAKING TESTIMONY.—For the purpose of taking sworn testimony a quorum of the Committee and each subcommittee thereof, now or hereafter appointed, shall consist of 1 member of the Committee.

RULE III—PROXIES

When a record vote is taken in the Committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, the required quorum being present, a member who is unable to attend the meeting may submit his or her vote by proxy, in writing or through personal instructions.

RULE IV—CONSIDERATION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

It shall not be in order during a meeting of the Committee to move to proceed to the consideration of any bill or resolution unless the bill or resolution has been filed with the Clerk of the Committee not less than 48 hours in advance of the Committee meeting, in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee prescribes. This rule may be waived with the concurrence of the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the full Committee.

RULE V—SUBPOENAS; COUNSEL; RECORD

1. SUBPOENAS.—The Chairman, with the approval of the ranking minority member of the Committee, may subpoena the attendance of witnesses for hearings and the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials. The Chairman may subpoena such attendance of witnesses or production of materials without the approval of the ranking minority member if the Chairman or a member of the Committee staff designated by the Chairman has not received notification from the ranking minority member or a member of the Committee

staff designated by the ranking minority member of disapproval of the subpoena within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the ranking minority member as provided in this paragraph, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Committee, the quorum required by paragraph 1 of rule II being present. When the Committee or Chairman authorizes a subpoena, it shall be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman. At the direction of the Chairman, with notification to the ranking minority member of not less than 72 hours, the staff is authorized to take depositions from witnesses. The ranking minority member, or a member of the Committee staff designated by the ranking minority member, shall be given the opportunity to attend and participate in the taking of any deposition. Witnesses at depositions shall be examined upon oath administered by an individual authorized by law to administer oaths, or administered by any member of the Committee if one is present.

2. COUNSEL.—Witnesses may be accompanied at a public or executive hearing, or the taking of a deposition, by counsel to advise them of their rights. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of the witness at any public or executive hearing, or the taking of a deposition, to advise the witness, while the witness is testifying, of the witness's legal rights. In the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the Chairman may rule that representation by counsel from the government, corporation, or association or by counsel representing other witnesses, creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness may only be represented during testimony before the Committee by personal counsel not from the government, corporation, or association or by personal counsel not representing other witnesses. This paragraph shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event the witness's counsel is ejected for conducting himself or herself in such manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of a hearing or the taking of a deposition. This paragraph may not be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness or to answer for the witness. The failure of any witness to secure counsel shall not excuse the witness from complying with a subpoena.

3. RECORD.—An accurate electronic or stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings and depositions. If testimony given by deposition is transcribed, the individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his or her presence and the transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony. The transcript with these certifications shall be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee. The record of a witness's testimony, whether in public or executive session or in a deposition, shall be made available for inspection by the witness or the witness's counsel under Committee supervision. A copy of any testimony given in public session, or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session or deposition and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in a public session, shall be provided to that witness at the witness's expense if so requested. Upon in-

specting the transcript, within a time limit set by the Clerk of the Committee, a witness may request changes in the transcript to correct errors of transcription and grammatical errors. The witness may also bring to the attention of the Committee errors of fact in the witness's testimony by submitting a sworn statement about those facts with a request that it be attached to the transcript. The Chairman or a member of the Committee staff designated by the Chairman shall rule on such requests.

RULE VI—BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

Public hearings of the full Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall be televised or broadcast only when authorized by the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the full Committee.

RULE VII—SUBCOMMITTEES

1. HEARINGS.—Any member of the Committee may sit with any subcommittee during its hearings.

2. CHANGE OF CHAIRMANSHIP.—Subcommittees shall be considered *de novo* whenever there is a change in the chairmanship, and seniority on the particular subcommittee shall not necessarily apply.

TRIBUTE TO RYAN RINGEL

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I wish today to honor Ryan Ringel, a member of my Senate staff who recently went to work for a fellow Member of the Senate.

Ryan, who is from Rexburg, ID, has been an invaluable member of my Senate staff for the past 16 years. After attending Ricks College, now Brigham Young University-Idaho, Ryan graduated from Boise State University in 1998 with a bachelor of science degree in political science, international relations, and Spanish. With his strong support for BSU sports, particularly football, he will likely continue to cheer for his team from his new position, even though he is working for another State.

Also in 1998 he joined my campaign as a staff assistant and then interned in my Boise office before moving to Washington, DC to become systems administrator in the Senate office as it opened in 1999. During his Senate tenure, Ryan met his wife, Noelle, and they have built a beautiful family that includes three sons, Zachary, Andrew and Michael.

In addition to being an effective member of my staff, Ryan is a trusted friend. Ryan's high regard for the privilege of serving fellow Idahoans is evident. His know-how and sensible guidance have been instrumental and will be greatly missed. Countless times he has taken my calls at any hour and fixed whatever it was that was broken or in need of replacement. All the while, he brings a good humor to challenges and figures out ways to get things done right.

It is no surprise that Ryan's knowledge and skill have been recognized by others, and I wish Ryan all the best in his future career path. Thankfully, he is not going far, and I will still get to

see Ryan and Noelle in the halls of the Senate. Congratulations, Ryan, Noelle, Zachary, Andrew and Michael, on the start of a new chapter. Thank you, Ryan, for your outstanding service. I wish you all the very best life has to offer.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SAM CHAPMAN

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize my great friend and former colleague Sam Chapman, who is retiring on February 1, 2015, after a long and distinguished career in public service.

I first had the opportunity to work with Sam when we were both county supervisors in northern California. When I was elected to the Marin County Board of Supervisors in 1976, Sam had already served 2 years on the neighboring Napa County Board of Supervisors after successfully defeating an incumbent. He was only 26 at the time, but he had been motivated to launch his underdog run after watching the incumbent fall asleep at a public meeting. Although he called his 1974 win "the beginning of my career in politics," Sam had already shown a deep dedication to the ideals of public service.

After receiving his law degree from the University of California at Berkeley's Boalt Hall School of Law, Sam joined Volunteers in Service to America, VISTA, a national public service program envisioned by President John F. Kennedy and implemented by President Lyndon Johnson to fight poverty in America. He worked with VISTA as a volunteer attorney in the field of poverty law and later became a staff attorney for the Napa County Legal Assistance Agency. He then opened his own general practice law office in Napa prior to running for supervisor.

Sam and I have always shared so many values—he has always been a strong advocate for the environment and other progressive causes—and during the 6 years we served together, we worked to improve the lives of people throughout our North Bay communities. When I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1982, I knew right away that I wanted Sam on my team. For more than 20 years—as press secretary, legislative director, and finally as my chief of staff—Sam worked tirelessly every day to serve the people of the State of California.

In 2004, seeking a new way to serve his community, Sam left the U.S. Senate to become the publisher of the Pacific Sun, a weekly newspaper focused on Marin County. He always had an interest in the news media, having worked as a reporter and editor for the Napa Valley Register prior to receiving

his law degree. In 2010, following his lifelong interest in the environment and renewable energy issues, he became the State and Community Affairs Manager at Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, where he has worked to strengthen the lab's ties with the local and regional community. Throughout his career in public service, Sam also found the time to serve on a number of environmental commissions, lending his expertise to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and California Air Resources Board.

For more than three decades, Sam has been a trusted ally, advisor, and friend. As he begins his retirement and embarks on the next exciting phase of his life, I send him and his family, especially his two beautiful daughters Allegra and Sabrina, my best wishes, deep affection, and abiding gratitude.●

JOHNSON CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CENTENNIAL

● Mr. CORCKER. Madam President, on July 6, 2015, the Johnson City Chamber of Commerce will celebrate its centennial.

For 100 years the chamber has promoted business, enhanced economic and community development, and served as a catalyst for improving the overall quality of life for people in the Tri-Cities.

In many cities across Tennessee, chamber of commerce members are the lifeblood of the community. They are our educators, our bankers, our doctors, our pharmacists, and more, and they share a common dedication to improving the quality of lives of their fellow citizens.

As a former businessman, chamber member and mayor, I know firsthand that what we do here in Washington, including Federal regulations and tax policies, has a direct impact on businesses and communities across Tennessee.

For far too long, Washington has put off addressing these issues as well as what I believe should be our top priority: getting our fiscal house in order.

As I speak with Tennessee chamber of commerce groups, one thing is obvious. They are ready for Washington to govern responsibly and finally focus on growing our economy, repairing our fiscal house and strengthening our Nation's role in the world.

Some of America's greatest achievements and longest-lasting solutions have occurred when one party controls Congress and another the White House.

It will take hard work, but I am optimistic. If the President rolls up his sleeves and provides leadership and if Congress acts responsibly, I truly believe we can begin to solve some of the big issues members of the chamber care most about.

I congratulate the Johnson City Chamber of Commerce on their centen-

nial celebration. I appreciate their input on how we can strengthen our communities and unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of our local businesses. I thank them for making the Tri-Cities a great place to live and do business, and I look forward to working with them for years to come.●

VERMONT ESSAY FINALISTS

● Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the Fifth Annual "What is the State of the Union" Essay contest conducted by my office. These 20 finalists were selected from over 400 entries.

The essays follow:

SAM ANGLUM, BURR AND BURTON ACADEMY
(FINALIST)

We marched along for roughly 5 miles, part of which was right through Times Square. While holding up our signs and chanting what we wanted to see change in our government's priorities, I looked to my left and gazed at the skyline full of skyscrapers atop the canopy of Central Park.

My class and I were marching alongside 400,000 New Yorkers, Americans, and globally aware citizens at the 2014 NYC Climate March. Climate change is a very serious issue that not many people are sensitive enough about. My hopes going into the march were to be a part of bringing global awareness to the massive shift in attitude I feel is going to save the Earth from its imminent doom.

After participating in such a momentous event, I want my voice to echo further than the streets of Manhattan. I want the United States government to consider helping by promoting climate education in schools across the nation so that this kind of action becomes a part of the everyday agenda. As a high school student in Vermont, I urge my very own state senators including Governor Shumlin to consider spreading this type of education across the State of Vermont. I imagine the future generations as the key components to setting goals and battling for solutions to the problems that people are fighting against today.

Not everyone will be an activist, or even care nearly as much as they should, but as long as more of the youth is aware of these pressing global issues, the amount of people that will create change will no doubt be multiplied. Our world's economic foundation is based on the over-extraction of fossil fuels, and because of this one in four carbon emissions comes from humans. I am aware that Vermont has a goal of making restrictions on fossil fuels and ultimately becoming 90 percent renewable by 2050. Every student in Vermont should be aware of this goal. I strongly urge the United States government to contribute to that further by promoting this kind of discussion within classrooms.

New York City Councilman Donovan Richards, a man on the panel for 350.org, spoke to us the night before the march, and his words stuck with me. "Rulership does not coincide with leadership." The streets of Manhattan were full of leaders on Sunday, September 21, and our desire was to influence our rulers. However, if our voice is transmitted to our "rulers" such as yourself, our governments can "lead" us into a more sustainable and renewable world.

CAROLINE ARTHAUD, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION
HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, members of Congress, and fellow Americans:

Theodore Roosevelt once said, "This country will not be a good place for any of us to live in unless we make it a good place for all of us to live in." At this time, it is my duty to lead this country towards such a place. I stand here today to address our successes, but also our deficits. Although Americans have many reasons to be proud of our accomplishments, it is unrealistic and inaccurate to declare ourselves flawless. We must muster the courage to confront the issues that hold us back.

Although the unemployment rate has decreased from 9.7 percent in 2010 to 5.8 percent in November of 2014, there are still 9 million Americans without jobs. This is not acceptable.

Beyond this, our precious environment is deteriorating. What many seem to struggle to understand is that the gradual warming of the earth is not an issue affecting only polar bears and penguins, but a growing danger to humans, as well.

To begin to address issues of unemployment and environment, it is important that we, the American people, do our part to raise awareness and call for action. America needs to initiate large-scale production of renewable energy sources. This will help us in two ways: it will expand employment and create new jobs, and it will also transition this country from dependence on pollution-causing energy sources to cleaner solutions. We can sleep easier knowing that we have stopped engaging in a process sure to leave our children and grandchildren with a world too far gone to rehabilitate.

Yet, another issue has escalated severely in recent years. It is one that has resulted in the violent deaths of 20 innocent six-year-olds in 2012, and that continues to take the lives of an average of 289 Americans daily. Many of us don't want to look at the problem of gun violence, but it has become something we can no longer ignore. We must formulate legislation that demands the renewal of gun permits on a regular basis, and work to improve the quality of mental health treatment. We must insist upon implementing stricter background checks on anyone wishing to bear weapons.

Change is difficult. It's difficult on an individual basis, and vastly more difficult on a national one. However, I believe that the ability to change is a big part of what has made this nation so great. Americans are resilient and creative, and I believe that if we set our minds to it, we can improve the state of our union. I call upon you, all of you, to help continue the legacy of this remarkable country by working with me to better the lives of all Americans. Unemployment, environmental degradation, and gun violence are a lot to take on; however, we live in a country capable of anything.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

HAR WA BI, WINOOSKI HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

"There is a lot that happens around the world we cannot control. We cannot stop earthquakes, we cannot prevent droughts, and we cannot prevent all conflict, but when we know where the hungry, the homeless and the sick exist, then we can help," says Jan Schakowsky, the U.S. Representative from Illinois. We can't help what nature creates, but being homeless is not nature. It is produced by humans and only humans can erase it. It is our nation's fault for letting people become homeless and live in poverty. We

need to help the homeless and not let the poor become homeless.

According to studentsagainsthunger.org in United States, each year more than 3.5 million people become homeless. They are forced to sleep in parks, under bridges, in shelters or cars. In fact, 35 percent of the homeless population are families with children, which is the fastest growing segment of the homeless population. And, 25 percent of the homeless population suffer from some form of mental illness. According to the feedingamerica.org, 45.3 percent of the people lived in poverty in 2013. This included 26.4 million people ages 18 to 64, 4.7 million children under the age of 18, and 4.2 million seniors 65 and older.

I believe poverty happens in the United States because housing and hospital bills are too expensive. Lower-income workers cannot afford food and shelter. After we pay for housing, nothing is left for us. We don't have a higher income, we have food stamps which are low because the government cut it off, including for my family. And, my mom is the only one who works. According to homeaid.org, some part of the homelessness is caused by the loss of loved ones, job loss, domestic violence, divorce and family disputes. Other impairments such as depression, untreated mental illness, post-traumatic stress disorder, and physical disabilities are also responsible for a large portion of the homeless. I want government to help those people who need and try to stop it from happening, and to make our nation become better.

I believe only government can decrease homelessness and help to increase the income, which all poor people need. We need to decrease the cost of hospitals or anything that costs a lot. Please help us poor and homeless because the government is our only hope. We will be waiting for the results of our government's actions.

PETER CAMARDO, SOUTH BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

A democracy is a government ruled by the people. In a democracy, the citizens hold the responsibility of making decisions. This is why United States of America has been successful throughout history. A democracy is the most productive way to run society when its citizens are engaged, but it loses its superiority when the population is plagued by ignorance.

In my lifetime, Americans have been fortunate to live on our homeland without major threat to our national security. We have grown accustomed to lives of guaranteed safety. Unfortunately with this privilege, we have begun to feel entitled and to neglect our responsibility as American citizens. Issues of great concern are being ignored by the American population as if they mean nothing. Americans are sitting back and waiting for others to take action while grave matters are left undebated by the American public. I think back to President Kennedy's inaugural speech, and when he said the famous words, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." It is important that we American citizens remind ourselves of these words in everything we do, and to remember that our government is built upon the strong, independent voices that make up a democracy.

I don't believe there is one significant issue concerning the United States that is more urgent than the rest. Each issue we face is vital for our nation to address appropriately. Regardless of which issue we undertake at which time, the first step to solving it is to become educated, and to stop ignor-

ing problems just because they are not affecting us directly. All the members of a democracy must understand a conflict before it can be solved. In an age where people have infinite information at their fingertips, it can be easy to lose sight of important information. We must be educated before we can solve our issues of today.

The responsibility to educate the public lies with the elected members of our government. It is important for our government to be straightforward and honest. It is important that when there are protests and movements the voices of the American people are heard and represented. Most importantly, the United States Congress should set an example for leadership and communication, and should inspire the people of the United States through proactive legislation and positive inter-party communication.

We are the greatest nation on earth. We are far too experienced and wise to get caught up in a bipartisan conflict. When we get caught up in a battle with ourselves, it dejects us. The reason why the citizens of America have lost a sense of American pride is because our leaders seem to have lost a sense of purpose. The objective of our government is to, "Establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," and the government should put aside their personal beliefs in an effort to make that happen.

TAYLOR DEVANEY, MISSISSQUOI VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

President Obama once said that, "The nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous", and as a young Vermonter, I agree with this statement. I am concerned with the state of our union due to the ever-growing, unequal wealth distribution. As the rich get richer, the poor get poorer, and in many situations wealth distribution gets ignored. The middle class population used to be the backbone of the nation, but every year it gets harder to make ends meet, as they slide lower down the economic class scale. America leads the world in the widest gap between the have and have nots, making the idea of America being the land of opportunity seem more of an unlikely dream.

The most recent studies from the Federal Reserve show that a mere 3 percent of American families own 54 percent of the wealth in the United States. The unbalanced wealth distribution is dangerous for the nation as a whole. Economists Emmanuel Saez and Gabriel Zucman state that in their research that the wealth distribution has grown to the same levels as in the 1920's. The top 1 percent owns upwards of 40 percent of the wealth in the United States. As a nation, we have experienced the disastrous effects of an economic crash during the Great Depression, due to unbalanced wealth. We as a nation have failed to learn from our mistakes and are continuing down a dangerous path. The middle class is still at risk for being hurt the most, as they are left to clean up the mess of the high rollers. An unfair task when their wages remain stagnant, as the profits and wages soar for those at the top of the corrupted corporate ladder. The hard working American people do not deserve to struggle and something must be done.

The mega-rich are not paying appropriate amount of taxes for their wealth, making the middle and lower class make up for the difference. Many of the people who control the tax rates are also the ones who make the most. Members of Congress are creating laws to benefit themselves. Big money and gov-

ernment fit together well, for politicians look for the wealthy to support them financially.

We can no longer only provide for wealthy men and women who indirectly control our government. Creating a scaled taxation system will help balance the wealth in the nation. Making sure the wealthy are paying their fair share is key to balancing out our nation's prosperity. The U.S. can take note from the most famous, and down to Earth business from Vermont, Ben & Jerry's. This company had a system of a pay ratio between the highest paid employee and the lowest paid employee of 5 to 1 in its early years. These numbers are relatively small, but scaling them could make an impact on businesses today. Unequal wealth distribution benefits only a small portion of the country and will be the cause of a failed economy.

CONNOR DROWN, WINOOSKI HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

America. Home of the brave and land of the free. It is at its heart known as a free country, with opportunity just waiting for someone to snatch it up for themselves. It is a land where one desires the "American Dream." Unfortunately, this is not remotely possible, and many citizens of the United States have difficulties living in this country. The United States of America is a great country to live in, if not the best, but is also far from perfect.

Everything in America could be improved in one way or the other. Education and health care are huge government issues that need improvement in order to make the United States of America a more suitable place to live.

Firstly, education in America is one of if not the most important factors to a successful career and life for US citizens. Getting a high school diploma is still very important, but it is now becoming more and more of a necessity to attend college and get a degree. According to usnews.com, the value of a college degree is greater than it has been in nearly half a century, at least when compared to the prospect of not getting a degree. Among millennials ages 25 to 32, median annual earnings for fulltime working college degree holders are \$17,500 greater than for those with high school diplomas only. The only problem is that college has increasingly become less and less affordable.

According to the College Board, the average cost of tuition and fees for the 2013-2014 academic year was \$30,094 at private colleges, \$8,893 for state residents at public colleges, and \$22,203 for out-of-state residents attending public universities. Most Americans don't even consider public schools, which are most often referred to as the least expensive, affordable. According to the Huffington Post, 62 percent said they believe most people are not able to afford the cost of a public college education. If the majority of America could afford college to achieve their career goals, America will be a better and more successful country. If something such as raising taxes benefits colleges in that it will be more affordable, America will have more opportunity to strive for success.

Health care is another issue that I feel should be mentioned. It is said that President Obama and the United States in general wants to make healthcare more affordable to everyone. Government run health care systems, such as Obamacare, are free and low-cost government run programs that result in higher costs and everyone receiving the same poor quality health care. Health care should remain privatized so that the people who

may need better health care and can also afford it without a huge deductible may receive it.

In conclusion, ensuring that health care remains the same and reducing the cost of education will undeniably improve America.

SPENCER ECKERT, WOODSTOCK UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

Remember when you got your first job? I'm sure it was an exciting and proud moment. It could be that you weren't even concerned about your hourly pay, but as time went by, I'm certain that changed and you realized that you work hard and want to be compensated for that. In today's society, it can be hard to earn a good living wage from a "decent" job. But for many people, they don't get good pay even when they should. The low minimum wage today makes it difficult for people to survive and make a living.

There are a number of compelling reasons to increase the minimum wage. Let's begin with the economy. It's simple; raising the minimum wage would have a positive effect on the economy by giving workers more money to spend. It would be good to raise the minimum wage to \$15 because there would be more money being pumped into the economy. If workers get paid more, then they are happier and with a better mood they will want to spend more. It gives people the confidence to spend more and when they spend more they are fueling the economy. "A raise for minimum wage earners will put more money in more families' pockets, which will be spent on goods and services, stimulating economic growth locally and nationally," according to the "Minimum Wage Mythbusters."

Increasing minimum wage has a positive impact on the working family. It helps them to make ends meet, and at the same time enables them to spend some money. When they spend money, they are fueling the economy.

Raising the minimum wage would not cause any job loss or unemployment, and most work places would not go out of business if they were to raise the minimum wage. In fact there would probably be less turnover. Therefore, companies would reduce the amount of money they spend on training. If companies compensate their employees with better wages than those employees are happier and more committed to that company. So raising the minimum wage can have a positive effect on companies. "Raising the minimum wage would be good for our economy. A higher minimum wage not only increases workers' incomes—which is sorely needed to boost demand and get the economy going—but it also reduces turnover, cuts the costs that low-paid employers impose on taxpayers, and pushes businesses toward a high-road, high-human-capital model." (Said T. William Lester, David Madland, and Jackie Odum, in their article Raising the Minimum Wage Would Help, Not Hurt, Our Economy)

One reason why the minimum wage should be increased to \$15 is because it would help a lot of people get out of the poverty level. Too many people in the country who work at minimum wage jobs currently depend on the government for other help. People subscribe to government programs such as food stamps and school breakfast and lunch programs, just to name a few. "According to a Michigan survey shows that families who work at fast food businesses are much more likely to enroll in safety net programs than the workforce as a whole, such as food stamps."

Another reason why the minimum wage should be increased to \$15 is because of the positive psychological benefits. It would

raise people's self-esteem and self-worth and would also allow children in these poverty-level homes to have better opportunities in the future. If these children are able to improve their performance in school, then they are likely to continue education which would allow them to pursue better paying jobs in the future. If they have better paying jobs, they are no longer on government programs and they have the opportunity and confidence to spend money which fuel the economy. It is a positive cycle. "A raise in the minimum wage would not only help many families escape or avoid poverty, but could also significantly boost their children's academic performance and future adult earnings," said Yannet M. Lathrop, a Policy Analyst who has conducted studies on raising the minimum wage.

There really is no downside to raising the minimum wage. Raising the minimum wage to \$15 would be good for employers, workers, families, and the economy. Raising the minimum wage would lead to these dramatic outcomes: getting families out of poverty, giving children a better education and future, giving employers committed workers, putting more money into the economy, giving people the confidence to spend more and making people happy.

JACOB GALLOW, MISSISQUOI VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

Jean-Jacques Rousseau stated, "A man is born free, but everywhere we are in chains." Freedom is something everyone seeks, but most will never experience it. Given more power, the government becomes a wolf among sheep. People flock to the sight of freedom, only to see that even something so great has its limits. Governments tend to give more things to the people, things to give them a sense of security, a place to sleep, somewhere to work, to do as they wish. Those things come at a price, the price of freedom. The more the people receive, especially on the topic of security, the more liberties are contracted.

Are we truly free? America sits in the shadow of threats every day, for there will always be some person who despises the place we call home. Security is something we, as Americans, take for granted. While we sit in the shadows, not even aware of it, brave men and women risk their lives and die every day for the security of their homeland, wishing for a safe place for their friends and family to live. Yet, here we sit in the symbolic country of freedom, with someone always looking over our shoulder. That security we take for granted tends to take away the liberties and freedoms we were given many years ago. The more of a grip the government has on its people, the more the people are caged.

Our troops are out fighting for our government, and our government's wishes, but have we ever stopped to think of what our own troops went through? According to Veteran's Inc., around 529,000 and 840,000 veterans are homeless each year, one in ten veterans are disabled related to war injuries. According to CNN, 22 veterans take their own lives each and every day, some resulting from PTSD, a disorder soldiers get after experiencing the horrors of war. Veteran unemployment rate is another issue among all of these. What can we, as Americans, do to help our Veterans. We surely are not doing enough, and those numbers keep climbing. What about those families of soldiers, what do they have to go through each and every day with a spouse, parent, or sibling off at war, fighting people because our governments wants to be "involved."

We don't need to be caught in everyone else's business, unless it becomes our business, and if we do get involved, we need to back up our soldiers first. Our country had to solve our own problems in 1861-1865, let others do the same.

Freedom isn't really free. Here in America, we are promised freedom, but the securities we receive and the democracy we spread binds us in chains, not allowing us to roam free. Sure there needs to be laws enforced, yes there needs to be security, but we need freedom too. Our government needs to focus on our country. Will we as Americans allow the anaconda, known as the government, to strangle us, the people, as mice?●

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FOOTBALL TEAM

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the University of Oregon's football team for its tremendous season. The Fighting Ducks of Oregon accumulated 13 wins with only 2 losses this year, which accounts for the most wins in team history. This season culminated with the Ducks winning their 11th Pac-12 Conference championship, playing in the first NCAA college football playoff, winning their third-ever Rose Bowl and reaching the National Championship game. It is truly a great year to be a Duck.

Recognition should not only be given to this football team's success on the field but also to the hard work and effort demonstrated by players, coaches, and staff off the field. From volunteering at local afterschool programs to honoring our military, members of the Oregon Ducks football team have shown dedication and commitment to their school and their community.

Special recognition should go to head coach Mark Helfrich—a native Oregonian—for leading this group of young men to success on and off the field. I am also proud to honor Oregon quarterback Marcus Mariota for winning the University of Oregon's first Heisman Trophy. Marcus is the first athlete of Polynesian descent to win this award, which makes him the pride of his home State of Hawaii. His acceptance speech during the Heisman Trophy presentation was truly moving. I am proud to watch him represent the University with such class.

The Oregon Ducks have seen tremendous success throughout this 2014 season, scoring an average of 45.4 points per game, 90 total touchdowns, and amassing more than 3,000 total yards rushing. Marcus Mariota set a school record for single-season passing yards—more than 4,400 yards in 15 games—and, following completion of the regular season, two members of the Oregon football team were honored as first-team All-Americans by the Associated Press.

It has been a remarkable season all around, and I look forward to more years watching Coach Helfrich encourage his players to win the day. Go Ducks!●

REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE
UNION DELIVERED TO A JOINT
SESSION OF CONGRESS ON JANU-
ARY 20, 2015—PM 1

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Congress of the United States:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, my fellow Americans:

We are 15 years into this new century. Fifteen years that dawned with terror touching our shores; that unfolded with a new generation fighting two long and costly wars; that saw a vicious recession spread across our Nation and the world. It has been, and still is, a hard time for many.

But tonight, we turn the page.

Tonight, after a breakthrough year for America, our economy is growing and creating jobs at the fastest pace since 1999. Our unemployment rate is now lower than it was before the financial crisis. More of our kids are graduating than ever before; more of our people are insured than ever before; we are as free from the grip of foreign oil as we've been in almost 30 years.

Tonight, for the first time since 9/11, our combat mission in Afghanistan is over. Six years ago, nearly 180,000 American troops served in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, fewer than 15,000 remain. And we salute the courage and sacrifice of every man and woman in this 9/11 Generation who has served to keep us safe. We are humbled and grateful for your service.

America, for all that we've endured; for all the grit and hard work required to come back; for all the tasks that lie ahead, know this:

The shadow of crisis has passed, and the state of the Union is strong.

At this moment—with a growing economy, shrinking deficits, bustling industry, and booming energy production—we have risen from recession freer to write our own future than any other nation on Earth. It's now up to us to choose who we want to be over the next 15 years, and for decades to come.

Will we accept an economy where only a few of us do spectacularly well? Or will we commit ourselves to an economy that generates rising incomes and chances for everyone who makes the effort?

Will we approach the world fearful and reactive, dragged into costly conflicts that strain our military and set back our standing? Or will we lead wisely, using all elements of our power to defeat new threats and protect our planet?

Will we allow ourselves to be sorted into factions and turned against one another—or will we recapture the sense of common purpose that has always propelled America forward?

In two weeks, I will send this Congress a budget filled with ideas that are practical, not partisan. And in the months ahead, I'll crisscross the country making a case for those ideas.

So tonight, I want to focus less on a checklist of proposals, and focus more on the values at stake in the choices before us.

It begins with our economy.

Seven years ago, Rebekah and Ben Erler of Minneapolis were newlyweds. She waited tables. He worked construction. Their first child, Jack, was on the way.

They were young and in love in America, and it doesn't get much better than that.

"If only we had known," Rebekah wrote to me last spring, "what was about to happen to the housing and construction market."

As the crisis worsened, Ben's business dried up, so he took what jobs he could find, even if they kept him on the road for long stretches of time. Rebekah took out student loans, enrolled in community college, and retrained for a new career. They sacrificed for each other. And slowly, it paid off. They bought their first home. They had a second son, Henry. Rebekah got a better job, and then a raise. Ben is back in construction—and home for dinner every night.

"It is amazing," Rebekah wrote, "what you can bounce back from when you have to . . . we are a strong, tight-knit family who has made it through some very, very hard times."

We are a strong, tight-knit family who has made it through some very, very hard times.

America, Rebekah and Ben's story is our story. They represent the millions who have worked hard, and scrimped, and sacrificed, and retooled. You are the reason I ran for this office. You're the people I was thinking of 6 years ago today, in the darkest months of the crisis, when I stood on the steps of this Capitol and promised we would rebuild our economy on a new foundation. And it's been your effort and resilience that has made it possible for our country to emerge stronger.

We believed we could reverse the tide of outsourcing, and draw new jobs to our shores. And over the past 5 years, our businesses have created more than 11 million new jobs.

We believed we could reduce our dependence on foreign oil and protect our planet. And today, America is number one in oil and gas. America is number one in wind power. Every three weeks, we bring online as much solar power as we did in all of 2008. And thanks to lower gas prices and higher fuel standards, the typical family this year should save \$750 at the pump.

We believed we could prepare our kids for a more competitive world. And today, our younger students have earned the highest math and reading

scores on record. Our high school graduation rate has hit an all-time high. And more Americans finish college than ever before.

We believed that sensible regulations could prevent another crisis, shield families from ruin, and encourage fair competition. Today, we have new tools to stop taxpayer-funded bailouts, and a new consumer watchdog to protect us from predatory lending and abusive credit card practices. And in the past year alone, about ten million uninsured Americans finally gained the security of health coverage.

At every step, we were told our goals were misguided or too ambitious; that we would crush jobs and explode deficits. Instead, we've seen the fastest economic growth in over a decade, our deficits cut by two-thirds, a stock market that has doubled, and health care inflation at its lowest rate in 50 years.

So the verdict is clear. Middle-class economics works. Expanding opportunity works. And these policies will continue to work, as long as politics don't get in the way. We can't slow down businesses or put our economy at risk with Government shutdowns or fiscal showdowns. We can't put the security of families at risk by taking away their health insurance, or unraveling the new rules on Wall Street, or refighting past battles on immigration when we've got a system to fix. And if a bill comes to my desk that tries to do any of these things, it will earn my veto.

Today, thanks to a growing economy, the recovery is touching more and more lives. Wages are finally starting to rise again. We know that more small business owners plan to raise their employees' pay than at any time since 2007. But here's the thing—those of us here tonight, we need to set our sights higher than just making sure Government doesn't halt the progress we're making. We need to do more than just do no harm. Tonight, together, let's do more to restore the link between hard work and growing opportunity for every American.

Because families like Rebekah's still need our help. She and Ben are working as hard as ever, but have to forego vacations and a new car so they can pay off student loans and save for retirement. Basic childcare for Jack and Henry costs more than their mortgage, and almost as much as a year at the University of Minnesota. Like millions of hardworking Americans, Rebekah isn't asking for a handout, but she is asking that we look for more ways to help families get ahead.

In fact, at every moment of economic change throughout our history, this country has taken bold action to adapt to new circumstances, and to make sure everyone gets a fair shot. We set up worker protections, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to protect ourselves from the harshest adversity. We

gave our citizens schools and colleges, infrastructure and the internet—tools they needed to go as far as their effort will take them.

That's what middle-class economics is—the idea that this country does best when everyone gets their fair shot, everyone does their fair share, and everyone plays by the same set of rules. We don't just want everyone to share in America's success—we want everyone to contribute to our success.

So what does middle-class economics require in our time?

First—middle-class economics means helping working families feel more secure in a world of constant change. That means helping folks afford childcare, college, health care, a home, retirement—and my budget will address each of these issues, lowering the taxes of working families and putting thousands of dollars back into their pockets each year.

Here's one example. During World War II, when men like my grandfather went off to war, having women like my grandmother in the workforce was a national security priority—so this country provided universal childcare. In today's economy, when having both parents in the workforce is an economic necessity for many families, we need affordable, high-quality childcare more than ever. It's not a nice-to-have—it's a must-have. It's time we stop treating childcare as a side issue, or a women's issue, and treat it like the national economic priority that it is for all of us. And that's why my plan will make quality childcare more available, and more affordable, for every middle-class and low-income family with young children in America—by creating more slots and a new tax cut of up to \$3,000 per child, per year.

Here's another example. Today, we're the only advanced country on Earth that doesn't guarantee paid sick leave or paid maternity leave to our workers. Forty-three million workers have no paid sick leave. Forty-three million. Think about that. And that forces too many parents to make the gut-wrenching choice between a paycheck and a sick kid at home. So I'll be taking new action to help States adopt paid leave laws of their own. And since paid sick leave won where it was on the ballot last November, let's put it to a vote right here in Washington. Send me a bill that gives every worker in America the opportunity to earn seven days of paid sick leave. It's the right thing to do.

Of course, nothing helps families make ends meet like higher wages. That's why this Congress still needs to pass a law that makes sure a woman is paid the same as a man for doing the same work. Really. It's 2015. It's time. We still need to make sure employees get the overtime they've earned. And to everyone in this Congress who still

refuses to raise the minimum wage, I say this: If you truly believe you could work full-time and support a family on less than \$15,000 a year, go try it. If not, vote to give millions of the hardest-working people in America a raise.

These ideas won't make everybody rich, or relieve every hardship. That's not the job of Government. To give working families a fair shot, we'll still need more employers to see beyond next quarter's earnings and recognize that investing in their workforce is in their company's long-term interest. We still need laws that strengthen rather than weaken unions, and give American workers a voice. But things like child care and sick leave and equal pay; things like lower mortgage premiums and a higher minimum wage—these ideas will make a meaningful difference in the lives of millions of families. That is a fact. And that's what all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—were sent here to do.

Second, to make sure folks keep earning higher wages down the road, we have to do more to help Americans upgrade their skills.

America thrived in the 20th century because we made high school free, sent a generation of GIs to college, and trained the best workforce in the world. But in a 21st century economy that rewards knowledge like never before, we need to do more.

By the end of this decade, two in three job openings will require some higher education. Two in three. And yet, we still live in a country where too many bright, striving Americans are priced out of the education they need. It's not fair to them, and it's not smart for our future.

That's why I am sending this Congress a bold new plan to lower the cost of community college—to zero.

Forty percent of our college students choose community college. Some are young and starting out. Some are older and looking for a better job. Some are veterans and single parents trying to transition back into the job market. Whoever you are, this plan is your chance to graduate ready for the new economy, without a load of debt. Understand, you've got to earn it—you've got to keep your grades up and graduate on time. Tennessee, a state with Republican leadership, and Chicago, a city with Democratic leadership, are showing that free community college is possible. I want to spread that idea all across America, so that 2 years of college becomes as free and universal in America as high school is today. And I want to work with this Congress, to make sure Americans already burdened with student loans can reduce their monthly payments, so that student debt doesn't derail anyone's dreams.

Thanks to Vice President BIDEN's great work to update our job training system, we're connecting community colleges with local employers to train

workers to fill high-paying jobs like coding, and nursing, and robotics. Tonight, I'm also asking more businesses to follow the lead of companies like CVS and UPS, and offer more educational benefits and paid apprenticeships—opportunities that give workers the chance to earn higher-paying jobs even if they don't have a higher education.

And as a new generation of veterans comes home, we owe them every opportunity to live the American Dream they helped defend. Already, we've made strides towards ensuring that every veteran has access to the highest quality care. We're slashing the backlog that had too many veterans waiting years to get the benefits they need, and we're making it easier for vets to translate their training and experience into civilian jobs. Joining Forces, the national campaign launched by Michelle and Jill Biden, has helped nearly 700,000 veterans and military spouses get new jobs. So to every CEO in America, let me repeat: If you want somebody who's going to get the job done, hire a veteran.

Finally, as we better train our workers, we need the new economy to keep churning out high-wage jobs for our workers to fill.

Since 2010, America has put more people back to work than Europe, Japan, and all advanced economies combined. Our manufacturers have added almost 800,000 new jobs. Some of our bedrock sectors, like our auto industry, are booming. But there are also millions of Americans who work in jobs that didn't even exist 10 or 20 years ago—jobs at companies like Google, and eBay, and Tesla.

So no one knows for certain which industries will generate the jobs of the future. But we do know we want them here in America. That's why the third part of middle-class economics is about building the most competitive economy anywhere, the place where businesses want to locate and hire.

Twenty-first century businesses need 21st century infrastructure—modern ports, stronger bridges, faster trains and the fastest internet. Democrats and Republicans used to agree on this. So let's set our sights higher than a single oil pipeline. Let's pass a bipartisan infrastructure plan that could create more than thirty times as many jobs per year, and make this country stronger for decades to come.

Twenty-first century businesses, including small businesses, need to sell more American products overseas. Today, our businesses export more than ever, and exporters tend to pay their workers higher wages. But as we speak, China wants to write the rules for the world's fastest-growing region. That would put our workers and businesses at a disadvantage. Why would we let that happen? We should write those rules. We should level the playing field. That's why I'm asking both

parties to give me trade promotion authority to protect American workers, with strong new trade deals from Asia to Europe that aren't just free, but fair.

Look, I'm the first one to admit that past trade deals haven't always lived up to the hype, and that's why we've gone after countries that break the rules at our expense. But 95 percent of the world's customers live outside our borders, and we can't close ourselves off from those opportunities. More than half of manufacturing executives have said they're actively looking at bringing jobs back from China. Let's give them one more reason to get it done.

Twenty-first century businesses will rely on American science, technology, research and development. I want the country that eliminated polio and mapped the human genome to lead a new era of medicine—one that delivers the right treatment at the right time, in some patients with cystic fibrosis, this approach has reversed a disease once thought unstoppable. Tonight, I'm launching a new Precision Medicine Initiative to bring us closer to curing diseases like cancer and diabetes—and to give all of us access to the personalized information we need to keep ourselves and our families healthier.

I intend to protect a free and open internet, extend its reach to every classroom, and every community, and help folks build the fastest networks, so that the next generation of digital innovators and entrepreneurs have the platform to keep reshaping our world.

I want Americans to win the race for the kinds of discoveries that unleash new jobs—converting sunlight into liquid fuel; creating revolutionary prosthetics, so that a veteran who gave his arms for his country can play catch with his kid; pushing out into the Solar System not just to visit, but to stay. Last month, we launched a new spacecraft as part of a re-energized space program that will send American astronauts to Mars. In two months, to prepare us for those missions, Scott Kelly will begin a year-long stay in space. Good luck, Captain—and make sure to Instagram it.

Now, the truth is, when it comes to issues like infrastructure and basic research, I know there's bipartisan support in this chamber. Members of both parties have told me so. Where we too often run onto the rocks is how to pay for these investments. As Americans, we don't mind paying our fair share of taxes, as long as everybody else does, too. But for far too long, lobbyists have rigged the tax code with loopholes that let some corporations pay nothing while others pay full freight. They've riddled it with giveaways the superrich don't need, denying a break to middle class families who do.

This year, we have an opportunity to change that. Let's close loopholes so

we stop rewarding companies that keep profits abroad, and reward those that invest in America. Let's use those savings to rebuild our infrastructure and make it more attractive for companies to bring jobs home. Let's simplify the system and let a small business owner file based on her actual bank statement, instead of the number of accountants she can afford. And let's close the loopholes that lead to inequality by allowing the top 1 percent to avoid paying taxes on their accumulated wealth. We can use that money to help more families pay for childcare and send their kids to college. We need a tax code that truly helps working Americans trying to get a leg up in the new economy, and we can achieve that together.

Helping hardworking families make ends meet. Giving them the tools they need for good-paying jobs in this new economy. Maintaining the conditions for growth and competitiveness. This is where America needs to go. I believe it's where the American people want to go. It will make our economy stronger a year from now, 15 years from now, and deep into the century ahead.

Of course, if there's one thing this new century has taught us, it's that we cannot separate our work at home from challenges beyond our shores.

My first duty as Commander in Chief is to defend the United States of America. In doing so, the question is not whether America leads in the world, but how. When we make rash decisions, reacting to the headlines instead of using our heads; when the first response to a challenge is to send in our military—then we risk getting drawn into unnecessary conflicts, and neglect the broader strategy we need for a safer, more prosperous world. That's what our enemies want us to do.

I believe in a smarter kind of American leadership. We lead best when we combine military power with strong diplomacy; when we leverage our power with coalition building; when we don't let our fears blind us to the opportunities that this new century presents. That's exactly what we're doing right now—and around the globe, it is making a difference.

First, we stand united with people around the world who've been targeted by terrorists—from a school in Pakistan to the streets of Paris. We will continue to hunt down terrorists and dismantle their networks, and we reserve the right to act unilaterally, as we've done relentlessly since I took office to take out terrorists who pose a direct threat to us and our allies.

At the same time, we've learned some costly lessons over the last 13 years.

Instead of Americans patrolling the valleys of Afghanistan, we've trained their security forces, who've now taken the lead, and we've honored our troops' sacrifice by supporting that country's

first democratic transition. Instead of sending large ground forces overseas, we're partnering with nations from South Asia to North Africa to deny safe haven to terrorists who threaten America. In Iraq and Syria, American leadership—including our military power—is stopping ISIL's advance. Instead of getting dragged into another ground war in the Middle East, we are leading a broad coalition, including Arab nations, to degrade and ultimately destroy this terrorist group. We're also supporting a moderate opposition in Syria that can help us in this effort, and assisting people everywhere who stand up to the bankrupt ideology of violent extremism. This effort will take time. It will require focus. But we will succeed. And tonight, I call on this Congress to show the world that we are united in this mission by passing a resolution to authorize the use of force against ISIL.

Second, we are demonstrating the power of American strength and diplomacy. We're upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small—by opposing Russian aggression, supporting Ukraine's democracy, and reassuring our NATO allies. Last year, as we were doing the hard work of imposing sanctions along with our allies, some suggested that Mr. Putin's aggression was a masterful display of strategy and strength. Well, today, it is America that stands strong and united with our allies, while Russia is isolated, with its economy in tatters.

That's how America leads—not with bluster, but with persistent, steady resolve.

In Cuba, we are ending a policy that was long past its expiration date. When what you're doing doesn't work for 50 years, it's time to try something new. Our shift in Cuba policy has the potential to end a legacy of mistrust in our hemisphere; removes a phony excuse for restrictions in Cuba; stands up for democratic values; and extends the hand of friendship to the Cuban people. And this year, Congress should begin the work of ending the embargo. As His Holiness, Pope Francis, has said, diplomacy is the work of "small steps." These small steps have added up to new hope for the future in Cuba. And after years in prison, we're overjoyed that Alan Gross is back where he belongs. Welcome home, Alan.

Our diplomacy is at work with respect to Iran, where, for the first time in a decade, we've halted the progress of its nuclear program and reduced its stockpile of nuclear material. Between now and this spring, we have a chance to negotiate a comprehensive agreement that prevents a nuclear-armed Iran; secures America and our allies—including Israel; while avoiding yet another Middle East conflict. There are no guarantees that negotiations will succeed, and I keep all options on the table to prevent a nuclear Iran. But

new sanctions passed by this Congress, at this moment in time, will all but guarantee that diplomacy fails—alienating America from its allies; and ensuring that Iran starts up its nuclear program again. It doesn't make sense. That is why I will veto any new sanctions bill that threatens to undo this progress. The American people expect us to only go to war as a last resort, and I intend to stay true to that wisdom.

Third, we're looking beyond the issues that have consumed us in the past to shape the coming century.

No foreign nation, no hacker, should be able to shut down our networks, steal our trade secrets, or invade the privacy of American families, especially our kids. We are making sure our Government integrates intelligence to combat cyber threats, just as we have done to combat terrorism. And tonight, I urge this Congress to finally pass the legislation we need to better meet the evolving threat of cyber-attacks, combat identity theft, and protect our children's information. If we don't act, we'll leave our Nation and our economy vulnerable. If we do, we can continue to protect the technologies that have unleashed untold opportunities for people around the globe.

In West Africa, our troops, our scientists, our doctors, our nurses and healthcare workers are rolling back Ebola—saving countless lives and stopping the spread of disease. I couldn't be prouder of them, and I thank this Congress for your bipartisan support of their efforts. But the job is not yet done—and the world needs to use this lesson to build a more effective global effort to prevent the spread of future pandemics, invest in smart development, and eradicate extreme poverty.

In the Asia Pacific, we are modernizing alliances while making sure that other nations play by the rules—in how they trade, how they resolve maritime disputes, and how they participate in meeting common international challenges like nonproliferation and disaster relief. And no challenge—no challenge—poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change. 2014 was the planet's warmest year on record. Now, one year doesn't make a trend, but this does—14 of the 15 warmest years on record have all fallen in the first 15 years of this century.

I've heard some folks try to dodge the evidence by saying they're not scientists; that we don't have enough information to act. Well, I'm not a scientist, either. But you know what—I know a lot of really good scientists at NASA, and NOAA, and at our major universities. The best scientists in the world are all telling us that our activities are changing the climate, and if we do not act forcefully, we'll continue to see rising oceans, longer, hotter heat waves, dangerous droughts and floods, and massive disruptions that can trig-

ger greater migration, conflict, and hunger around the globe. The Pentagon says that climate change poses immediate risks to our national security. We should act like it.

That's why, over the past 6 years, we've done more than ever before to combat climate change, from the way we produce energy, to the way we use it. That's why we've set aside more public lands and waters than any administration in history. And that's why I will not let this Congress endanger the health of our children by turning back the clock on our efforts. I am determined to make sure American leadership drives international action. In Beijing, we made an historic announcement—the United States will double the pace at which we cut carbon pollution, and China committed, for the first time, to limiting their emissions. And because the world's two largest economies came together, other nations are now stepping up, and offering hope that, this year, the world will finally reach an agreement to protect the one planet we've got.

There's one last pillar to our leadership—and that's the example of our values.

As Americans, we respect human dignity, even when we're threatened, which is why I've prohibited torture, and worked to make sure our use of new technology like drones is properly constrained. It's why we speak out against the deplorable anti-Semitism that has resurfaced in certain parts of the world. It's why we continue to reject offensive stereotypes of Muslims—the vast majority of whom share our commitment to peace. That's why we defend free speech, and advocate for political prisoners, and condemn the persecution of women, or religious minorities, or people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. We do these things not only because they're right, but because they make us safer.

As Americans, we have a profound commitment to justice—so it makes no sense to spend three million dollars per prisoner to keep open a prison that the world condemns and terrorists use to recruit. Since I've been President, we've worked responsibly to cut the population of GTMO in half. Now it's time to finish the job. And I will not relent in my determination to shut it down. It's not who we are.

As Americans, we cherish our civil liberties—and we need to uphold that commitment if we want maximum cooperation from other countries and industry in our fight against terrorist networks. So while some have moved on from the debates over our surveillance programs, I haven't. As promised, our intelligence agencies have worked hard, with the recommendations of privacy advocates, to increase transparency and build more safeguards against potential abuse. And next month, we'll issue a report on how

we're keeping our promise to keep our country safe while strengthening privacy.

Looking to the future instead of the past. Making sure we match our power with diplomacy, and use force wisely. Building coalitions to meet new challenges and opportunities. Leading—always—with the example of our values. That's what makes us exceptional. That's what keeps us strong. And that's why we must keep striving to hold ourselves to the highest of standards—our own.

You know, just over a decade ago, I gave a speech in Boston where I said there wasn't a liberal America, or a conservative America; a black America or a white America—but a United States of America. I said this because I had seen it in my own life, in a nation that gave someone like me a chance; because I grew up in Hawaii, a melting pot of races and customs; because I made Illinois my home—a state of small towns, rich farmland, and one of the world's great cities; a microcosm of the country where Democrats and Republicans and Independents, good people of every ethnicity and every faith, share certain bedrock values.

Over the past 6 years, the pundits have pointed out more than once that my presidency hasn't delivered on this vision. How ironic, they say, that our politics seems more divided than ever. It's held up as proof not just of my own flaws—of which there are many—but also as proof that the vision itself is misguided, and naive, and that there are too many people in this town who actually benefit from partisanship and gridlock for us to ever do anything about it.

I know how tempting such cynicism may be. But I still think the cynics are wrong.

I still believe that we are one people. I still believe that together, we can do great things, even when the odds are long. I believe this because over and over in my 6 years in office, I have seen America at its best. I've seen the hopeful faces of young graduates from New York to California; and our newest officers at West Point, Annapolis, Colorado Springs, and New London. I've mourned with grieving families in Tucson and Newtown; in Boston, West, Texas, and West Virginia. I've watched Americans beat back adversity from the Gulf Coast to the Great Plains; from Midwest assembly lines to the Mid-Atlantic seaboard. I've seen something like gay marriage go from a wedge issue used to drive us apart to a story of freedom across our country, a civil right now legal in States that seven in ten Americans call home.

So I know the good, and optimistic, and big-hearted generosity of the American people who, every day, live the idea that we are our brother's keeper, and our sister's keeper. And I know they expect those of us who serve here to set a better example.

So the question for those of us here tonight is how we, all of us, can better reflect America's hopes. I've served in Congress with many of you. I know many of you well. There are a lot of good people here, on both sides of the aisle. And many of you have told me that this isn't what you signed up for—arguing past each other on cable shows, the constant fundraising, always looking over your shoulder at how the base will react to every decision.

Imagine if we broke out of these tired old patterns. Imagine if we did something different.

Understand—a better politics isn't one where Democrats abandon their agenda or Republicans simply embrace mine.

A better politics is one where we appeal to each other's basic decency instead of our basest fears.

A better politics is one where we debate without demonizing each other; where we talk issues, and values, and principles, and facts, rather than "gotcha" moments, or trivial gaffes, or fake controversies that have nothing to do with people's daily lives.

A better politics is one where we spend less time drowning in dark money for ads that pull us into the gutter, and spend more time lifting young people up, with a sense of purpose and possibility, and asking them to join in the great mission of building America.

If we're going to have arguments, let's have arguments—but let's make them debates worthy of this body and worthy of this country.

We still may not agree on a woman's right to choose, but surely we can agree it's a good thing that teen pregnancies and abortions are nearing all-time lows, and that every woman should have access to the health care she needs.

Yes, passions still fly on immigration, but surely we can all see something of ourselves in the striving young student, and agree that no one benefits when a hardworking mom is taken from her child, and that it's possible to shape a law that upholds our tradition as a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants.

We may go at it in campaign season, but surely we can agree that the right to vote is sacred; that it's being denied to too many; and that, on this 50th anniversary of the great march from Selma to Montgomery and the passage of the Voting Rights Act, we can come together, Democrats and Republicans, to make voting easier for every single American.

We may have different takes on the events of Ferguson and New York. But surely we can understand a father who fears his son can't walk home without being harassed. Surely we can understand the wife who won't rest until the police officer she married walks

through the front door at the end of his shift. Surely we can agree it's a good thing that for the first time in 40 years, the crime rate and the incarceration rate have come down together, and use that as a starting point for Democrats and Republicans, community leaders and law enforcement, to reform America's criminal justice system so that it protects and serves us all.

That's a better politics. That's how we start rebuilding trust. That's how we move this country forward. That's what the American people want. That's what they deserve.

I have no more campaigns to run. My only agenda for the next 2 years is the same as the one I've had since the day I swore an oath on the steps of this Capitol—to do what I believe is best for America. If you share the broad vision I outlined tonight, join me in the work at hand. If you disagree with parts of it, I hope you'll at least work with me where you do agree. And I commit to every Republican here tonight that I will not only seek out your ideas, I will seek to work with you to make this country stronger.

Because I want this chamber, this city, to reflect the truth—that for all our blind spots and shortcomings, we are a people with the strength and generosity of spirit to bridge divides, to unite in common effort, and help our neighbors, whether down the street or on the other side of the world.

I want our actions to tell every child, in every neighborhood: your life matters, and we are as committed to improving your life chances as we are for our own kids.

I want future generations to know that we are a people who see our differences as a great gift, that we are a people who value the dignity and worth of every citizen—man and woman, young and old, black and white, Latino and Asian, immigrant and Native American, gay and straight, Americans with mental illness or physical disability.

I want them to grow up in a country that shows the world what we still know to be true: that we are still more than a collection of red States and blue States; that we are the United States of America.

I want them to grow up in a country where a young mom like Rebekah can sit down and write a letter to her President with a story to sum up these past 6 years:

"It is amazing what you can bounce back from when you have to . . . we are a strong, tight-knit family who has made it through some very, very hard times."

My fellow Americans, we too are a strong, tight-knit family. We, too, have made it through some hard times. Fifteen years into this new century, we have picked ourselves up, dusted ourselves off, and begun again the work of

remaking America. We've laid a new foundation. A brighter future is ours to write. Let's begin this new chapter—together—and let's start the work right now.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless this country we love.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 2015.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-256. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Defense Production Act Annual Fund Report for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-257. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Program; Limited Liability for Noncoal Reclamation by Certified States and Indian Tribes" ((RIN1029-AC66) (Docket ID OSM-2012-0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-258. A communication from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act Regulations; Exemption for the Insider Threat Program" (RIN1090-AB07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-259. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Auxiliary Installations, Replacement Facilities, and Siting and Maintenance Regulations" (Docket No. RM12-11-002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-260. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-261. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit Risk Retention" (RIN1557-AD40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-262. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold Adjustment—Final Rule" (RIN1557-AD90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-263. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Subordinated Debt Issued by a National Bank" (RIN1557-AD73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-264. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Community Reinvestment Act Regulations" (RIN1557-AD89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-265. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules, Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Interim Final Revisions to Definition of Qualifying Master Netting Agreement and Related Definitions" (RIN1557-AD91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-266. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit Risk Retention" (RIN7100-AD70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-267. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-268. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-269. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—January 2015" (Rev. Rul. 2015-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-270. A communication from the Controller, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Awarding Agency Regulatory

Implementation of Office of Management and Budget's Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards" (2 CFR Part 1; 2 CFR Part 25; 2 CFR Part 170; 2 CFR Part 180; 2 CFR Part 200) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-271. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-438, "Workers' Compensation Statute of Limitations Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-272. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-439, "Critical Infrastructure Freedom of Information Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-273. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-441, "Business Improvement Districts Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-274. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-424, "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-275. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-426, "Wage Theft Prevention Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-276. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-452, "Georgia Avenue Great Streets Neighborhood Retail Priority Area Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-277. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-442, "Extension of Time to Dispose of the Strand Theater Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-278. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-425, "Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Waiver Certification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-279. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-451, "Rent Control Hardship Petition Limitation Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-280. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-453, "Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-281. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-420, "Post-Arrest Process Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-282. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-423, "Sustainable Solid Waste Management Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-283. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-437, "Voter Registration Access and Modernization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-284. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-416, "Prohibition of the Harm of Police Animals Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-285. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-565, "Legalization of Possession of Minimal Amounts of Marijuana for Personal Use Initiative of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-286. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-443, "Medical Marijuana Expansion Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-287. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Response to the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-288. A communication from the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-289. A communication from the Clerk of Court, United States Court of Federal Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Court's annual report for the year ended September 30, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-290. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Miscellaneous Changes to Trademark Rules of Practice and the Rules of Practice in Filings Pursuant to the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks" (RIN0651-AC88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-291. A communication from the Staff Director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the United States Commission on Civil Rights renewing the charter of its federal advisory committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-292. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Caregivers Program" (RIN2900-AN94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-293. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Dayton, Ohio)" ((MB Docket No. 14-159) (RM-11735)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-294. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Denver, Colorado)" ((MB Docket No. 14-179) (RM-11736)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-295. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with International Standards (RRR)" (RIN2137-AF05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-296. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Periodic Updates of Regulatory References to Technical Standards and Miscellaneous Amendments" (RIN2137-AE85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-297. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; Driver-Vehicle Inspection Report (DVIR)" (RIN2126-AB46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. Res. 28. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 189. A bill to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 190. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of imported seafood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 191. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to raise the quality of career and technical education programs and to allow local eligible recipients to use funding to establish high-quality career academies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURR, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 192. A bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 193. A bill to provide for the management of certain inventoried roadless areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 194. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and expand Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID:

S. 196. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain Federal land in Garden Valley, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 197. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID:

S. 199. A bill to establish the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in Clark County, Nevada, in order to conserve, protect, and enhance the cultural, archaeological, natural, wilderness, scientific, geological, historical, biological, wildlife, educational, and scenic resources of the area, to designate wilderness area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE:

S. Res. 28. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 29. A resolution condemning the terrorist attacks in Paris, offering condolences to the families of the victims, expressing solidarity with the people of France, and reaffirming fundamental freedom of expression; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Res. 30. A resolution designating the week of January 25 through January 31, 2015, as "National School Choice Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 12

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 12, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 105

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 105, a bill to permit management of the red snapper by Gulf Coast States and for other purposes.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 117, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 123

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 165

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 165, a bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, *supra*.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 184, a bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to require background checks before foster care placements are ordered in tribal court proceedings, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 26

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 26, a resolution commending Pope Francis for his leader-

ship in helping to secure the release of Alan Gross and for working with the Governments of the United States and Cuba to achieve a more positive relationship.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 17 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 23

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 23 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 24 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 26 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 27 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 28

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 28 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 29 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 44

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 44 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 49

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 49 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 194. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator FRANKEN, the Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2015. I thank Senator FRANKEN for his work on this bill and for his support. We introduced identical legislation in the 113th Congress and similar legislation in the 112 Congress. Unfortunately, the Senate has never had the opportunity to consider these bills and the problem we seek to correct.

This bipartisan bill addresses the 2012 United States Supreme Court case *Hall v. United States*. In a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that a provision I inserted into the 2005 Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act didn't accomplish what we in Congress intended. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2015 corrects this and clarifies that bankrupt family farmers reorganizing their debts are able to treat capital gains taxes owed to a governmental unit, arising from the sale of farm assets during a bankruptcy, as general unsecured claims. This bill will remove the Internal Revenue Service's veto power over a bankruptcy reorganization plan's confirmation, giving the family farmer a chance to reorganize successfully.

In 1986 Congress enacted Chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code to provide a specialized bankruptcy process for family farmers. In 2005 Chapter 12 was made permanent. Between 1986 and 2005 we learned what aspects worked and didn't work for family farmers reorganizing in bankruptcy. One problematic area was where a family farmer needed to sell assets in order to generate cash for the reorganization. Specifically, a family farmer would have to sell portions of the farm to generate cash to fund a reorganization plan so that the creditors could receive payment. Unfortunately, in situations like this, the family farmer is selling land that has been owned for a very long time, with a very low cost basis. Thus, when the land is sold, the family farmer is hit with a substantial capital gains tax,

which is owed to the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the Bankruptcy Code, taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service receive priority treatment. Holders of priority claims must receive payment in full, unless the claim holder agrees to be treated differently. This creates problems for the family farmer who needs the cash to pay creditors to reorganize. However, since the Internal Revenue Service has the ability to require full payment, they hold veto power over a plan's confirmation, which means in many instances the plan will not be confirmed. This does not make sense if the goal is to give the family farmer a fresh start. Thus, in 2005 Congress said that in these limited situations, the taxes owed to the Internal Revenue Service would be stripped of their priority and treated as general unsecured debt. This removed the government's veto power over plan confirmation and paved the way for family farmers to reorganize.

Unfortunately, in *Hall v. United States*, the Supreme Court ruled that despite Congress's express goal of helping family farmers, the language inserted into the Bankruptcy Code in 2005 conflicted with the Tax Code. The *Hall* case was one of statutory interpretation. There is no question what Congress was trying to do; rather, did Congress use the correct language? My goal, along with others at the time, was to relieve family farmers from having their reorganization plans fail because of huge tax liabilities to the Federal Government. Justice Breyer noted this in the dissent: "Congress was concerned about the effect on the farmer of collecting capital gains tax debts that arose during (and were connected with) the Chapter 12 proceedings themselves. . . . The majority does not deny the importance of Congress' objective. Rather, it feels compelled to hold that Congress put the Amendment in the wrong place." *Hall v. United States*, 132 S.Ct. 1882, 1897, 2012.

As a result of the *Hall* case, family farmers facing bankruptcy now find themselves caught in a tough spot. The rules have now been changed and must be corrected in order to provide certainty and clarity in the law. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2015 will provide the clarity needed to help family farmers.

This bill adds a new section 1232 to title 11 of the United States Code. This new section, along with other conforming changes to the Bankruptcy Code, gives guidance and certainty to debtors, practitioners, and courts as to how these claims are to be treated during bankruptcy. I am pleased that the bill we are introducing today will help family farmers who are facing hard times. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2015 ensures that what Congress sought to do in 2005 ac-

tually occurs. In the wake of the *Hall* decision, this bill is needed in order to help family farmers reorganize successfully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 194

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

"(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor's discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor's farming operation—

"(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

"(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

"(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

"(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

"(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

"(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in section 523(a)(1).

"(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

"(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

"(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with

paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

"(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking "unless—" and all that follows through "the holder" and inserting "unless the holder";

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking "and" at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).";

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after "all debts provided for by the plan"; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after "allowed under section 503 of this title"; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking "the kind" and all that follows and inserting "a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c)."; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting "except as provided in section 1232(c)" before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking "or" at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed."

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any bankruptcy case that—

(1) is pending on the date of enactment of this Act and relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; or

(2) commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. REID:

S. 196. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain Federal land in Garden Valley, Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 196

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Garden Valley Withdrawal Act”.

SEC. 2. GARDEN VALLEY, NEVADA, WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the approximately 805,100 acres of Federal land generally depicted on the map entitled “Garden Valley Withdrawal Area” and dated July 11, 2014, is withdrawn from—

- (1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
- (2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and
- (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 198

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Corporate Inversions Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

“(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘60 percent’, or

“(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

“(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

“(iii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term ‘substantial business activities’ shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

“(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

“(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

“(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

“(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

“(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating

all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “after March 4, 2003,” and inserting “after March 4, 2003, and before May 9, 2014.”.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”, and

(ii) by inserting “or (b)(2)(A)” after “(a)(2)(B)(i)” in subparagraph (B),

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be,” after “(a)(2)(B)(ii)”,

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”, and

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting “or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,” after “surrogate foreign corporation”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after May 8, 2014.

By Mr. REID:

S. 199. A bill to establish the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in Clark County, Nevada, in order to conserve, protect, and enhance the cultural, archaeological, natural, wilderness, scientific, geological, historical, biological, wildlife, educational, and scenic resources of the area, to designate wilderness area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 199

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Gold Butte National Conservation Area Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA

Sec. 101. Establishment of Gold Butte National Conservation Area.

Sec. 102. Management of Conservation Area.

Sec. 103. General provisions.

Sec. 104. Gold Butte National Conservation Area Advisory Council.

TITLE II—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Sec. 201. Findings.

Sec. 202. Additions to National Wilderness Preservation System.

Sec. 203. Administration.

- Sec. 204. Adjacent management.
 Sec. 205. Military, law enforcement, and emergency overflights.
 Sec. 206. Release of wilderness study areas.
 Sec. 207. Native American cultural and religious uses.
 Sec. 208. Wildlife management.
 Sec. 209. Wildfire, insect, and disease management.
 Sec. 210. Climatological data collection.
 Sec. 211. National Park System land.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 301. Relationship to Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
 Sec. 302. Visitor center, research, and interpretation.
 Sec. 303. Termination of withdrawal of Bureau of Land Management land.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

- Congress finds that—
 (1) the public land in southeastern Nevada generally known as “Gold Butte” is recognized for outstanding—
 (A) scenic values;
 (B) natural resources, including critical habitat, sensitive species, wildlife, desert tortoise habitat, and geology;
 (C) historic resources, including historic mining, ranching and other western cultures, and pioneer activities; and
 (D) cultural resources, including evidence of prehistoric habitation and rock art;
 (2) Gold Butte has become a destination for diverse recreation opportunities, including camping, hiking, hunting, motorized recreation, and sightseeing;
 (3) Gold Butte draws visitors from throughout the United States;
 (4) Gold Butte provides important economic benefits to Mesquite and other nearby communities;
 (5) inclusion of the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in the National Landscape Conservation System would provide increased opportunities for—
 (A) interpretation of the diverse values of the area for the visiting public; and
 (B) education and community outreach in the region; and
 (6) designation of Gold Butte as a National Conservation Area will permanently protect the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources within the area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

- (1) **ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—The term “Advisory Council” means the Gold Butte National Conservation Area Advisory Council established under section 104(a).
 (2) **CONSERVATION AREA.**—The term “Conservation Area” means the Gold Butte National Conservation Area established by section 101(a).
 (3) **COUNTY.**—The term “County” means Clark County, Nevada.
 (4) **DESIGNATED ROUTE.**—The term “designated route” means a road that is designated as open by the Route Designations for Selected Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Located in the Northeast Portion of the Las Vegas BLM District Environmental Assessment, NV-052-2006-0433.
 (5) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the management plan for the Conservation Area developed under section 102(b).
 (6) **MAP.**—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Gold Butte National Conservation Area” and dated May 23, 2013.
 (7) **PUBLIC LAND.**—The term “public land” has the meaning given the term “public

lands” in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(10) **WILDERNESS AREA.**—The term “wilderness area” means a wilderness areas designated by section 202(a).

TITLE I—GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the Gold Butte National Conservation Area in the State.

(b) **AREA INCLUDED.**—The Conservation Area shall consist of approximately 348,515 acres of public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the County, as generally depicted on the Map.

(c) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Conservation Area with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) **EFFECT.**—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct minor errors in the map or legal description.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—A copy of the map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

SEC. 102. MANAGEMENT OF CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—In accordance with this title, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other applicable laws, the Secretary shall manage the Conservation Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources of the Conservation Area.

(b) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the long-term protection and management of the Conservation Area.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall prepare the management plan in consultation with the State, local and tribal government entities, the Advisory Council, and the public.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The management plan shall—

(A) describe the appropriate uses and management of the Conservation Area; and

(B) include a recommendation on interpretive and educational materials regarding the cultural and biological resources of the region within which the Conservation Area is located.

(4) **INCORPORATION OF ROUTE DESIGNATIONS.**—The management plan shall incorporate the decisions in the Route Designations for Selected Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Located in the Northeast Portion of the Las Vegas BLM District Environmental Assessment, NV-052-2006-0433.

(c) **USES.**—The Secretary shall allow only such uses of the Conservation Area that the Secretary determines would further the purpose of the Conservation Area described in subsection (a).

(d) **INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.**—Any land or interests in land located within the boundary of the Conservation Area that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall become part of the Conservation Area and be managed as provided in subsection (a).

(e) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except in cases in which motorized vehicles are needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles shall be permitted only on designated routes.

(2) **MONITORING AND EVALUATION.**—The Secretary shall annually—

(A) assess the effects of the use of motorized vehicles on designated routes; and

(B) in consultation with the Nevada Department of Wildlife, assess the effects of designated routes on wildlife and wildlife habitat to minimize environmental impacts and prevent damage to cultural and historical resources from the use of designated routes.

(3) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage designated routes in a manner that—

(i) is consistent with motorized and mechanized use of the designated routes that is authorized on the date of the enactment of this Act;

(ii) ensures the safety of the people that use the designated routes;

(iii) does not damage sensitive habitat or cultural or historical resources; and

(iv) provides for adaptive management of resources and restoration of damaged habitat or resources.

(B) **REROUTING.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A designated route may be temporarily closed or rerouted if the Secretary, in consultation with the State, the County, and the Advisory Council, subject to subparagraph (C), determines that—

(I) the designated route is having an adverse impact on—

- (aa) sensitive habitat;
- (bb) natural resources;
- (cc) cultural resources; or
- (dd) historical resources;

(II) the designated route threatens public safety;

(III) temporary closure of the designated route is necessary to repair—

- (aa) the designated route; or
- (bb) resource damage; or

(IV) modification of the designated route would not significantly affect access within the Conservation Area.

(ii) **PRIORITY.**—If the Secretary determines that the rerouting of a designated route is necessary under clause (i), the Secretary may give priority to existing roads designated as closed.

(iii) **DURATION.**—A designated route that is temporarily closed under clause (i) shall remain closed only until the date on which the resource or public safety issue that led to the temporary closure has been resolved.

(C) **NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall provide information to the public regarding any designated routes that are open, have been rerouted, or are temporarily closed through—

(i) use of appropriate signage within the Conservation Area; and

(ii) the distribution of maps, safety education materials, law enforcement, and other information considered to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(4) **NO EFFECT ON NON-FEDERAL LAND OR INTERESTS IN NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—Nothing in this section affects ownership, management, or other rights relating to non-Federal land or interests in non-Federal land.

(5) **MAP ON FILE.**—The Secretary shall keep a current map on file at the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(6) **ROAD CONSTRUCTION.**—Except as necessary for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the Secretary shall not construct any permanent or temporary road within the Conservation Area after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) **NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.**—The Conservation Area shall be administered as a component of the National Landscape Conservation System.

(g) **HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.**—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife, including hunting, fishing, and trapping in the Conservation Area.

SEC. 103. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The establishment of the Conservation Area shall not create an express or implied protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Conservation Area.

(2) **PRIVATE LAND.**—If the use of, or conduct of an activity on, private land that shares a boundary with the Conservation Area is consistent with applicable law, nothing in this title concerning the establishment of the Conservation Area prohibits or limits the use or conduct of the activity.

(b) **WITHDRAWALS.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all public land within the Conservation Area, including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States within the Conservation Area after the date of enactment of this Act, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) **SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The establishment of the Conservation Area shall not affect the management status of any area within the boundary of the Conservation Area that is protected under the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

(2) **CONFLICT OF LAWS.**—If there is a conflict between the laws applicable to an area described in paragraph (1) and this title, the more restrictive provision shall control.

SEC. 104. GOLD BUTTE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an advisory council, to be known as the “Gold Butte National Conservation Area Advisory Council”.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The Advisory Council shall be subject to—

(1) the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(d) **MEMBERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Council shall include 13 members to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom, to the extent practicable—

(A) 4 members shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Mesquite, Nevada, City Council;

(B) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Bunkerville, Nevada, Town Advisory Board;

(C) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Moapa Valley, Nevada, Town Advisory Board;

(D) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Moapa, Nevada, Town Advisory Board;

(E) 1 member shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the Moapa Band of Paiutes Tribal Council; and

(F) 5 at-large members from the County shall be appointed after considering the recommendations of the County Commission.

(2) **SPECIAL APPOINTMENT CONSIDERATIONS.**—The at-large members appointed under paragraph (1)(F) shall have backgrounds that reflect—

(A) the purposes for which the Conservation Area was established; and

(B) the interests of persons affected by the planning and management of the Conservation Area.

(3) **REPRESENTATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the membership of the Advisory Council is fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed by the Advisory Council.

(4) **INITIAL APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the Advisory Council in accordance with paragraph (1).

(e) **DUTIES OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—The Advisory Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan, including budgetary matters relating to the Conservation Area.

(f) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for serving on the Advisory Council.

(g) **CHAIRPERSON.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Council shall elect a Chairperson from among the members of the Advisory Council.

(2) **TERM.**—The term of the Chairperson shall be 3 years.

(h) **TERM OF MEMBERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term of a member of the Advisory Council shall be 3 years.

(2) **SUCCESSORS.**—Notwithstanding the expiration of a 3-year term of a member of the Advisory Council, a member may continue to serve on the Advisory Council until a successor is appointed.

(i) **VACANCIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A vacancy on the Advisory Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(2) **APPOINTMENT FOR REMAINDER OF TERM.**—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Advisory Council shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor was appointed.

(j) **TERMINATION.**—The Advisory Council shall terminate not later than 3 years after the date on which the final version of the management plan is published.

TITLE II—DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, and National Park Service in the County contains unique and spectacular natural, cultural, and historical resources, including—

(A) priceless habitat for numerous species of plants and wildlife;

(B) thousands of acres of land that remain in a natural state; and

(C) numerous sites containing significant cultural and historical artifacts; and

(2) continued preservation of the public land would benefit the County and all of the United States by—

(A) ensuring the conservation of ecologically diverse habitat;

(B) protecting prehistoric cultural resources;

(C) conserving primitive recreational resources; and

(D) protecting air and water quality.

SEC. 202. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) **ADDITIONS.**—In furtherance of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following public land administered by the National Park Service or the Bureau of Land Management in the County is designated as wilderness and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) **VIRGIN PEAK WILDERNESS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 18,296 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Virgin Peak Wilderness”.

(2) **BLACK RIDGE WILDERNESS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 18,192 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Black Ridge Wilderness”.

(3) **BITTER RIDGE NORTH WILDERNESS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management comprising approximately 15,114 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Bitter Ridge North Wilderness”.

(4) **BITTER RIDGE SOUTH WILDERNESS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 12,646 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Bitter Ridge Wilderness”.

(5) **BILLY GOAT PEAK WILDERNESS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 30,460 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Billy Goat Peak Wilderness”.

(6) **MILLION HILLS WILDERNESS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 24,818 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Million Hills Wilderness”.

(7) **OVERTON WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 23,227 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Overton Wilderness”.

(8) **TWIN SPRINGS WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 9,684 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Twin Springs Wilderness”.

(9) **SCANLON WASH WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 22,826 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Scanlon Wash Wilderness”.

(10) **HILLER MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 14,832 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Hiller Mountains Wilderness”.

(11) **HELL'S KITCHEN WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 12,439 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Hell's Kitchen Wilderness”.

(12) **INDIAN HILLS WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, comprising approximately 8,955 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which shall be known as the “Indian Hills Wilderness”.

(13) **LIME CANYON WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, comprising approximately 10,069 acres, as generally depicted on the Map, which is incorporated in, and shall be managed as part of, the “Lime Canyon Wilderness” designated by section 202(a)(9) of the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 107-282).

(b) **NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.**—The wilderness areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management shall be administered as components of the National Landscape Conservation System.

(c) **ROAD OFFSET.**—The boundary of any portion of a wilderness area that is bordered by a road shall be at least 100 feet away from the centerline of the road so as not to interfere with public access.

(d) **LAKE OFFSET.**—The boundary of any portion of a wilderness area that is bordered by Lake Mead or the Colorado River shall be 300 feet inland from the high water line.

(e) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of each wilderness area with the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) **EFFECT.**—Each map and legal description under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—Each map and legal description under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

SEC. 203. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **MANAGEMENT.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any reference in that Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(b) **INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.**—Any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a wilderness area that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall be added to, and administered as part of, the wilderness area within which the acquired land or interest is located.

(c) **WATER RIGHTS.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(A) the land designated as a wilderness area—

- (i) is within the Mojave Desert;
- (ii) is arid in nature; and
- (iii) includes ephemeral streams;

(B) the hydrology of the land designated as a wilderness area is locally characterized by complex flow patterns and alluvial fans with impermanent channels;

(C) the subsurface hydrogeology of the region within which the land designated as a wilderness area is located is characterized by

ground water subject to local and regional flow gradients and artesian aquifers;

(D) the land designated as a wilderness area is generally not suitable for use or development of new water resource facilities;

(E) there are no actual or proposed water resource facilities and no opportunities for diversion, storage, or other uses of water occurring outside the land designated as a wilderness area that would adversely affect the wilderness or other values of the land; and

(F) because of the unique nature and hydrology of the desert land designated as a wilderness area and the existence of the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan, it is possible to provide for proper management and protection of the wilderness, perennial springs, and other values of the land in ways different than the methods used in other laws.

(2) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—

(A) **NO RESERVATION.**—Nothing in this title constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the land designated as a wilderness area.

(B) **STATE RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title affects any water rights in the State existing on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water rights held by the United States.

(C) **NO PRECEDENT.**—Nothing in this subsection establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations.

(D) **NO EFFECT ON COMPACTS.**—Nothing in this title limits, alters, modifies, or amends any of the interstate compacts or equitable apportionment decrees that apportion water among and between the State and other States.

(E) **CLARK COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.**—Nothing in this title limits, alters, modifies, or amends the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan with respect to the land designated as a wilderness area, including specific management actions for the conservation of perennial springs.

(3) **NEVADA WATER LAW.**—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the land designated as a wilderness area.

(4) **NEW PROJECTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—In this paragraph, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, and transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(ii) **EXCLUSION.**—In this paragraph, the term “water resource facility” does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(B) **NO LICENSES OR PERMITS.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title, on and after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the land designated as a wilderness area.

(d) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, any Federal land within the wilderness areas, including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States within the Conservation Area after the date of enactment of this Act, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 204. ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.

(a) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—Congress does not intend for the designation of land as wilderness areas to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the wilderness areas.

(b) **NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.**—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness area shall not preclude the conduct of those activities or uses outside the boundary of the wilderness area.

SEC. 205. MILITARY, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND EMERGENCY OVERFLIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act restricts or precludes—

(1) low-level overflights of military, law enforcement, or emergency medical services aircraft over the area designated as wilderness by this Act, including military, law enforcement, or emergency medical services overflights that can be seen or heard within the wilderness area;

(2) flight testing and evaluation; or

(3) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military, law enforcement, or emergency medical services flight training routes, over the wilderness area.

SEC. 206. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the Bureau of Land Management land in any portion of the wilderness study areas located within the Conservation Area not designated as a wilderness area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) **RELEASE.**—Any Bureau of Land Management land described in subsection (a) that is not designated as a wilderness area—

(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c));

(2) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the land management plans adopted under section 202 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1712); and

(B) cooperative conservation agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) shall be subject to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 207. NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.

Nothing in this title diminishes—

(1) the rights of any Indian tribe; or

(2) tribal rights regarding access to Federal land for tribal activities, including spiritual, cultural, and traditional food-gathering activities.

SEC. 208. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this title affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the wilderness areas.

(b) **MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), management activities to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations may be carried out within the wilderness areas, if the activities—

(A) are consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) are carried out in accordance with appropriate policies, such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101-405.

(2) USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—The management activities under paragraph (1) may include the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would—

(A) promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values; and

(B) accomplish the purposes described in subparagraph (A) with the minimum impact necessary to reasonably accomplish the task.

(c) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with appropriate policies such as those set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101-405, the State may continue to use aircraft (including helicopters) to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations, including bighorn sheep, and feral stock, horses, and burros.

(d) WILDLIFE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Subject to subsection (f), the Secretary shall authorize structures and facilities, including existing structures and facilities, for wildlife water development projects, including guzzlers, in the wilderness areas if—

(1) the structures and facilities will, as determined by the Secretary, enhance wilderness values by promoting healthy, viable and more naturally distributed wildlife populations; and

(2) the visual impacts of the structures and facilities on the wilderness areas can reasonably be minimized.

(e) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate, by regulation, areas in which, and establish periods during which, for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws, no hunting, fishing, or trapping will be permitted in the wilderness areas.

(2) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate State agency before promulgating regulations under paragraph (1).

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the wilderness areas—

(1) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the cooperative agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled “Memorandum of Understanding between the Bureau of Land Management and the Nevada Department of Wildlife Supplement No. 9” and signed November and December 2003, including any amendments to the cooperative agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State; and

(2) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

SEC. 209. WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take such measures in each wilderness area as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases (including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency).

(b) EFFECT.—Nothing in this Act precludes a Federal, State, or local agency from conducting wildfire management operations (including operations using aircraft or mecha-

nized equipment) in accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)).

SEC. 210. CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA COLLECTION.

Subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require, nothing in this title precludes the installation and maintenance of hydrologic, meteorologic, or climatological collection devices in the wilderness areas if the facilities and access to the facilities are essential to flood warning, flood control, and water reservoir operation activities.

SEC. 211. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LAND.

To the extent any of the provisions of this title are in conflict with laws (including regulations) or management policies applicable to Federal land within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area designated as a wilderness area, the laws (including regulations) or policies shall control.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. RELATIONSHIP TO CLARK COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act limits, alters, modifies, or amends the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan with respect to the Conservation Area and the wilderness areas, including the specific management actions contained in the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan for the conservation of perennial springs.

(b) CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREAS.—The Secretary shall credit the Conservation Area and the wilderness areas as Conservation Management Areas, as may be required by the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (including amendments to the plan).

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—In developing the management plan, to the extent consistent with this section, the Secretary may incorporate any provision of the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

SEC. 302. VISITOR CENTER, RESEARCH, AND INTERPRETATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, may establish, in cooperation with any other public or private entities that the Secretary may determine to be appropriate, a visitor center and field office in Mesquite, Nevada—

(1) to serve visitors; and

(2) to assist in fulfilling the purposes of—

(A) the Lake Mead National Recreation Area;

(B) the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument; and

(C) the Conservation Area.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the visitor center authorized under subsection (a) is designed—

(1) to interpret the scenic, biological, natural, historical, scientific, paleontological, recreational, ecological, wilderness, and cultural resources of each of the areas described in that subsection; and

(2) to serve as an interagency field office for each of the areas described in that subsection.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may, in a manner consistent with this Act, enter into cooperative agreements with the State, the State of Arizona, and any other appropriate institutions and organizations to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 303. TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.

(a) TERMINATION OF WITHDRAWAL.—The withdrawal of the parcels of Bureau of Land

Management land described in subsection (b) for use by the Bureau of Reclamation is terminated.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcels of land referred to in subsection (a) consist of the Bureau of Land Management land identified on the Map as “Transfer from BOR to BLM”.

(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the land reverting to the Bureau of Land Management under subsection (a).

(2) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(A) the Map; or

(B) the legal description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The Map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 28—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THUNE submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 28

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the committee for the period from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,879,581, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$6,650,710, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,771,129, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended); and

(2) not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required—

(1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate;

(3) for the payment of stationary supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationary, United States Senate;

(4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate;

(5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate;

(6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(7) for the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 29—CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS, OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS, EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF FRANCE, AND REAFFIRMING FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BURR) submitted the following res-

olution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 29

Whereas, on January 7, 2015, armed gunmen violently attacked the offices of the French newspaper Charlie Hebdo in Paris, killing 12 people and injuring at least 11 others;

Whereas, on January 9, 2015, two suspects in the Charlie Hebdo attack were killed after taking hostages in a printing firm and firing at police;

Whereas, on January 9, 2015, another gunman perpetrated an anti-Semitic attack on Hyper Cacher, a kosher supermarket, killing four of 19 hostages before French police stormed the building and rescued the surviving hostages;

Whereas President of the Republic of France Francois Hollande condemned these events as a terrorist attack on the French Republic as a whole and called for a day of national mourning to honor the lives of the courageous political cartoonists, columnists, police officers, and others who were killed and injured;

Whereas the Republic of France is America's oldest ally, and the people of the United States owe France an eternal debt of gratitude for our independence and freedom;

Whereas the people and Governments of the Republic of France and the United States have stood shoulder to shoulder throughout history to defend our shared democratic ideals and values;

Whereas the people of the Republic of France have always expressed solidarity with the people of the United States, including following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, which claimed the lives of thousands of innocent civilians in the United States;

Whereas United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, together with the President of the United Nations General Assembly and the United Nations Security Council, has expressed outrage over these cold-blooded and unjustifiable terrorist attacks in Paris;

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, holds that "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers";

Whereas the show of solidarity from hundreds of thousands of people in the Republic of France, the United States, and worldwide under the banner "Je suis Charlie" ("I am Charlie") makes known that the international community of nations stands together to reaffirm freedom of expression and to denounce terrorism;

Whereas Muslim majority nations around the world, including Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, Malaysia, Morocco, Iran, Lebanon, Indonesia, Bahrain, Morocco, Algeria, and Qatar, and leading institutions such as the Arab League, Egypt's al-Azhar University and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation have all condemned and rejected these terrorist attacks as contrary to the Islamic faith;

Whereas, on Sunday, January 11, 2015, more than 40 world leaders and 1,000,000 people gathered to march in Paris honoring the victims of the terrorist attacks;

Whereas the outpouring of support from people around the world reveals that an attack on the free press in the Republic of France is an attack on human liberties; and

Whereas the people and Government of the United States stand in solidarity with our French allies and renew our common support for democracy and freedom, including freedom of the press and freedom of religion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the terrorist attacks and cowardly murders at the offices of the French newspaper Charlie Hebdo and kosher market Hyper Cacher in Paris;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the families of the victims of these attacks and to the Republic of France;

(3) expresses our solidarity with the people of the Republic of France and pays tribute to our shared values, ideals, and liberties, including the freedom of thought and expression and freedom of the press;

(4) recognizes the statements from Muslim majority nations and leaders across the world that terrorist attacks purportedly conducted in the name of Islam such as the attacks in Paris are an affront to the Muslim faith; and

(5) reaffirms our support for the Government of France to bring the perpetrators of this violence to justice and to prevent future attacks.

SENATE RESOLUTION 30—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JANUARY 25 THROUGH JANUARY 31, 2015, AS "NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK"

Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 30

Whereas providing a diversity of choices in K-12 education empowers parents to select education environments that meet the individual needs and strengths of their children;

Whereas the United States is home to high-quality K-12 education environments of all varieties, including traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, private schools, online academies, and home schooling;

Whereas talented teachers and school leaders in all of these education environments are preparing children to achieve their dreams;

Whereas more families than ever before in the United States are actively choosing the best education for their children;

Whereas greater public awareness of the issue of parental choice in education can inform additional families about the benefits of proactively choosing challenging, motivating, and effective education environments for their children;

Whereas the process of parents choosing schools for their children is nonpolitical, nonpartisan, and deserving of the utmost respect; and

Whereas hundreds of organizations, more than 9,000 schools, and millions of individuals in the United States will celebrate the benefits of educational choice during the fifth annual National School Choice Week, which will be held the week of January 25 through January 31, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of January 25 through January 31, 2015, as “National School Choice Week”;

(2) congratulates the students, parents, teachers, and school leaders from K–12 education environments of all varieties for their persistence, achievements, dedication, and contributions to society in the United States;

(3) encourages all parents, during National School Choice Week, to learn more about the education options available to them; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, events, and activities during National School Choice Week to raise public awareness about the benefits of opportunity in education.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 57. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 58. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 59. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 60. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 61. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 62. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 63. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 64. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 65. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 66. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 67. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 68. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 69. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 70. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 71. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 72. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 73. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 74. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 75. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 76. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 77. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 57. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Key-

stone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the President determines that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, has completed a comprehensive study analyzing the human health impacts of the pipeline described in section 2(a), including—

(1) increased air pollution in communities near refineries that will process the up to 830,000 barrels per day of tar sands crude that will be transported through the pipeline, including assessment of the cumulative air pollution impacts on the communities;

(2) increased exposure of communities to particulate matter and heavy metals from the disposal, storage, and use of petroleum coke that results from the refining of the tar sands crude that will be transported through the pipeline;

(3) increased exposures in communities to benzene, volatile organic compounds, hydrogen sulfide, and other toxic substances that may result from spills or the contamination of water supplies from tar sands crude transported through the pipeline; and

(4) increased cancer rates and exposures to elevated levels of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (“PAHs”), mercury, and other toxic pollutants, where the tar sands crude that will be transported through the pipeline is mined, extracted, upgraded, or refined.

SA 58. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The environmental analysis contained in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referred to in section 2(a) and deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) as described in section 2(a), states that—

(1) “[W]arming of the climate system is unequivocal and each of the last [3] decades has been successively warmer at the Earth’s surface than any preceding decade since 1850.”;

(2) “The [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change], in addition to other institutions, such as the National Research Council and the United States (U.S.) Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), have concluded that it is extremely likely that global increases in atmospheric [greenhouse gas] concentrations and global temperatures are caused by human activities.”; and

(3) “A warmer planet causes large-scale changes that reverberate throughout the climate system of the Earth, including higher sea levels, changes in precipitation, and altered weather patterns (e.g. an increase in more extreme weather events).”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Consistent with the findings under subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real; and

(2) human activity significantly contributes to climate change.

SA 59. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . IMPLEMENTATION.

This Act shall be implemented in a manner that addresses the analysis in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referenced in section 2(a) (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”) and deemed in section 2(a) as having satisfied the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), with regard to climate change and the recommendations made in the FSEIS with respect to measures to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in section 4.14-16 of the FSEIS.

SA 60. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES AND CANADA EFFORTS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Governments of the United States and Canada should continue working towards their shared goal of reducing emissions approximately 17 percent below 2005 levels, by 2020; and

(2) the Government of Canada should join the United States Government’s goal of reducing emissions 26-28 percent below 2005 levels, by 2025.

SA 61. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the transportation sector accounts for 9 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States;

(2) in 2012, the transportation infrastructure of the United States supported the shipment of 19,662,000,000 tons of freight valued at \$17,352,000,000,000;

(3) in 2012, 12,547,000 people were employed in transportation-related industries in the United States;

(4) every dollar invested in the transportation infrastructure of the United States returns \$3.54 in economic impact; and

(5) every \$1,000,000,000 in public infrastructure spending creates 21,671 jobs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) transportation infrastructure is essential to the economy of the United States; and

(2) increased Federal transportation infrastructure investment could create millions of jobs and help businesses grow.

SA 62. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that increased Federal transportation infrastructure investment will—

- (1) create millions of jobs;
- (2) help businesses grow;
- (3) reduce traffic congestion; and
- (4) save lives.

SA 63. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE I—CLOSING BIG OIL LOOPHOLES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes Act”.

Subtitle A—Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes

SEC. 211. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

“(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

“(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

“(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

“(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

“(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘dual capacity taxpayer’ means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

“(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

“(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

“(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘generally applicable income tax’ means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

“(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

“(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 212. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) for the taxable year, the term ‘domestic production gross receipts’ shall not include gross receipts from the production, refining, processing, transportation, or distribution of oil, gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 213. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS; AMORTIZATION OF DISALLOWED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (i), regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary under this subtitle corresponding to the regulations which granted

the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and which were recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such regulations shall also grant the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of wells drilled for any geothermal deposit (as defined in section 613(e)(2)) to the same extent and in the same manner as such expenses are deductible in the case of oil and gas wells. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any costs to which any deduction is allowed under section 59(e) or 291.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(B) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred. For purposes of section 1254, any deduction under this subparagraph shall be treated as a deduction under this subsection.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 214. LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 215. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(2) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of paragraph (1) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 216. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) CERTAIN SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘major integrated oil company’ includes any suc-

cessor in interest of a company that was described in subparagraph (B) in any taxable year, if such successor controls more than 50 percent of the crude oil production or natural gas production of such company.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “except as provided in subparagraph (C),” after “For purposes of this paragraph.”.

(2) TAXABLE YEARS TESTED.—Clause (iii) of section 167(h)(5)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “does not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d)” and inserting “did not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d) for any taxable year after 2004”, and

(B) by striking “does not apply” in subclause (II) and inserting “did not apply for the taxable year”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Subtitle B—Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Natural Gas

SEC. 221. REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 231. DEFICIT REDUCTION.

The net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this title and the amendments made by this title (after any expenditures authorized by this title and the amendments made by this title) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SEC. 232. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this title, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this title, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Subtitle D—Extension of Certain Energy Tax Benefits

SEC. 241. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ELECTRICITY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) WIND.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “, and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015”.

(2) CLOSED-LOOP BIOMASS.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(d) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “, and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015” in subparagraph (A)(i), and

(B) by striking “which before January 1, 2015, is originally placed in service”.

(3) OPEN-LOOP BIOMASS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 45(d)(3) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “any facility owned by the taxpayer which”,

(B) by inserting “owned by the taxpayer and” after “facility” in clause (i),

(C) by striking “ and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015” in clause (i)(I), and

(D) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) any other facility owned by the taxpayer.”.

(4) GEOTHERMAL ENERGY.—Paragraph (4) of section 45(d) of such Code is amended by striking “and which” and all that follows through “Such term shall not” and inserting “and, in the case of a facility using solar energy, which is placed in service before January 1, 2006. Such term shall not”.

(5) LANDFILL GAS.—Paragraph (6) of section 45(d) of such Code is amended by striking “and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015”.

(6) TRASH FACILITIES.—Paragraph (7) of section 45(d) of such Code is amended by striking “and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015”.

(7) QUALIFIED HYDROPOWER.—Paragraph (9) of section 45(d) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “and before January 1, 2015” in subparagraph (A)(i),

(B) by striking “and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015” in subparagraph (A)(ii), and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(8) MARINE AND HYDROKINETIC RENEWABLE ENERGY FACILITIES.—Paragraph (11)(B) of section 45(d) of such Code is amended by striking “and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SEC. 242. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ENERGY INVESTMENT CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION OF ENERGY PERCENTAGE FOR CERTAIN SOLAR PROPERTY.—Subclause (II) of section 48(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “but only with respect to periods ending before January 1, 2017”.

(b) EXTENSION OF ENERGY PROPERTY.—

(1) SOLAR PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 48(a)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “but only with respect to periods ending before January 1, 2017”.

(2) THERMAL ENERGY.—Clause (vii) of section 48(a)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “, but only with respect to periods ending before January 1, 2017”.

(3) QUALIFIED FUEL CELL PROPERTY.—Paragraph (1) of section 48(c) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(4) QUALIFIED MICROTURBINE PROPERTY.—Paragraph (2) of section 48(c) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(5) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER PROPERTY.—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(c)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting “and” at the end of clause (ii)(II), by striking “, and” at the end of clause (iii) and inserting a period, and by striking clause (iv).

(6) QUALIFIED SMALL WIND ENERGY PROPERTY.—Paragraph (4) of section 48(c) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(c) ELECTION TO TREAT QUALIFIED FACILITIES AS ENERGY PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) of such Code is amended by striking “and the construction of which begins before January 1, 2015”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SA 64. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE I—CLOSING BIG OIL LOOPHOLES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes Act”.

Subtitle A—Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes

SEC. 211. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

“(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

“(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

“(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

“(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

“(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘dual capacity taxpayer’ means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

“(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

“(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

“(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘generally applicable income tax’ means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

“(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

“(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or ac-

crued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHOLD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 212. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) for the taxable year, the term ‘domestic production gross receipts’ shall not include gross receipts from the production, refining, processing, transportation, or distribution of oil, gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 213. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS; AMORTIZATION OF DISALLOWED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (i), regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary under this subtitle corresponding to the regulations which granted the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and which were recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such regulations shall also grant the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of wells drilled for any geothermal deposit (as defined in section 613(e)(2)) to the same extent and in the same manner as such expenses are deductible in the case of oil and gas wells. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any costs to which any deduction is allowed under section 59(e) or 291.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(B) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred. For purposes of section 1254, any deduction under this subparagraph shall be treated as a deduction under this subsection.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 214. LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 215. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(2) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of paragraph (1) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 216. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) CERTAIN SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘major integrated oil company’ includes any successor in interest of a company that was described in subparagraph (B) in any taxable year, if such successor controls more than 50 percent of the crude oil production or natural gas production of such company.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “except as provided in subparagraph (C),” after “For purposes of this paragraph,”.

(2) TAXABLE YEARS TESTED.—Clause (iii) of section 167(h)(5)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “does not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d)” and inserting “did not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d) for any taxable year after 2004”, and

(B) by striking “does not apply” in subclause (II) and inserting “did not apply for the taxable year”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Subtitle B—Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Natural Gas

SEC. 221. REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 231. DEFICIT REDUCTION.

The net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this Act and the

amendments made by this title (after any expenditures authorized by this title and the amendments made by this title) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SEC. 232. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this title, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this title, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SA 65. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITS ON LIABILITY FOR OIL SPILLS.

Section 1004(a) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

SA 66. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS UNDER THE SURFACE MINING CONTROL AND RECLAMATION ACT OF 1977.

The Secretary of the Interior may not, before December 31, 2016, issue or approve any proposed or final regulation under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) that would—

(1) adversely impact employment in coal mines in the United States;

(2) cause a reduction in revenue received by the Federal Government or any State, tribal, or local government, by reducing through regulation the quantity of coal in the United States that is available for mining;

(3) reduce the quantity of coal available for domestic consumption or for export;

(4) designate any area as unsuitable for surface coal mining and reclamation operations; or

(5) expose the United States to liability for taking the value of privately owned coal through regulation.

SA 67. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . POWERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

Section 3063(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

SA 68. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are 2,537 wells within 1 mile of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, including 39 public water supply wells and 20 private wells within 100 feet of the pipeline right of way;

(2) 254 miles of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would traverse over the shallow Ogallala Aquifer, the largest underground fresh water source in the United States, underlying 8 States and 2,000,000 people, including 10.5 miles where the groundwater lies at depths between 5 and 10 feet and another 12.4 miles where the water table is at a depth of 10 to 15 feet;

(3) on July 26, 2010, a pipeline ruptured near Marshall, Michigan, releasing 843,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen into Talmadge Creek, flowing into the Kalamazoo River;

(4) the Talmadge Creek tar sands spill is the costliest inland oil spill cleanup in United States history, and the Kalamazoo River continues to be contaminated from the spill;

(5) on March 29, 2013, the first pipeline of the United States to transport Canadian tar sands to the Gulf Coast, the ExxonMobil Pegasus Pipeline, ruptured, spilling 210,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen in Mayflower, Arkansas; and

(6) following the Pegasus Pipeline tar sands spill, individuals in the Mayflower community experienced severe headaches, nausea, and respiratory infections.

(b) PETITION TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNORS.—The President shall provide a copy of the analysis described in paragraph (1) to the Governor of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under paragraph (2), a petition to the President requesting that the pipeline not be located in the affected municipality or county.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—A Governor may withdraw a petition submitted under paragraph (3) at any time.

(5) RIGHT OF ACTION.—A property owner with a private water well drilled into any portion of an aquifer that is below the pro-

posed pipeline described in section 2(a) may sue the owner of the pipeline for damages if—

(A) the well water of the property owner becomes contaminated; and

(B) the property owner demonstrates that the well water was safe prior to construction and operation of the pipeline.

SA 69. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF PETROLEUM COKE.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that—

(1) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, promulgates rules concerning the storage and transportation of petroleum coke that ensure the protection of public and ecological health; and

(2) petroleum coke is no longer exempt from regulation under section 101(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(14)), which may be established either by an Act of Congress or any regulations, rules, or guidance issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SA 70. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PHMSA GREAT LAKES RESOURCES AND STUDY.

The pipeline described in section 2(a) shall not be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained until the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—

(1) certifies to Congress that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has sufficient resources to carry out the duties of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration for pipelines in the Great Lakes; and

(2) submits to Congress the results of a study on recommendations for special conditions on pipelines in the Great Lakes, similar to the recommendations in Appendix B of the environmental impact statement described in section 2(b).

SA 71. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

“(A) TIMELINE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit to drill not later than 30 days after receiving an application for the permit.

“(ii) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may extend the period in clause (i) for up to 2 periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant.

“(iii) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Written notice under clause (ii) shall—

“(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

“(II) include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

“(B) NOTICE OF REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

“(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies; and

“(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

“(C) APPLICATION CONSIDERED APPROVED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application is considered approved, except in cases in which existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are incomplete.

“(ii) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—Existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 180 days after receiving an application for the permit.

“(iii) FAILURE TO COMPLETE.—If all existing reviews are not completed during the 180-day period described in clause (ii), the project subject to the application shall be considered to have no significant impact in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) and section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)) and that classification shall be considered to be a final agency action.

“(D) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

“(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10-day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

“(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date the application is submitted to the Secretary.

“(E) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary carried out in accordance with this paragraph shall not be subject to judicial review.”.

SA 72. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired from willing sellers.

SA 73. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. ____ DELISTING OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN AS THREATENED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the Lesser Prairie-Chicken” (79 Fed. Reg. 19974 (April 10, 2014)), the lesser prairie-chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*) shall not be listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 74. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (referred to in this section as “LIHEAP”) is the main Federal program that helps low-income households and senior citizens with their energy bills, providing vital assistance during both the cold winter and hot summer months.

(2) Recipients of LIHEAP assistance are among the most vulnerable individuals in the country, with more than 90 percent of LIHEAP households having at least one member who is a child, a senior citizen, or disabled, and 20 percent of LIHEAP households including at least one veteran.

(3) The number of households eligible for LIHEAP assistance continues to exceed available funding, with current funding reaching just 20 percent of the eligible population.

(4) The average LIHEAP grant covers just a fraction of home energy costs, leaving many low-income families and senior citizens struggling to pay their energy bills and with fewer resources available to meet other essential needs.

(5) Access to affordable home energy is a matter of health and safety for many low-in-

come households, children, senior citizens, and veterans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that LIHEAP should be funded at not less than \$4,700,000,000 annually, to ensure that more low-income households and children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans can meet basic home energy needs.

SA 75. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are 2,537 wells within 1 mile of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, including 39 public water supply wells and 20 private wells within 100 feet of the pipeline right of way;

(2) 254 miles of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would traverse over the shallow Ogallala Aquifer, the largest underground fresh water source in the United States, underlying 8 States and 2,000,000 people, including 10.5 miles where the groundwater lies at depths between 5 and 10 feet and another 12.4 miles where the water table is at a depth of 10 to 15 feet;

(3) on July 26, 2010, a pipeline ruptured near Marshall, Michigan, releasing 843,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen into Talmadge Creek, flowing into the Kalamazoo River;

(4) the Talmadge Creek tar sands spill is the costliest inland oil spill cleanup in United States history, and the Kalamazoo River continues to be contaminated from the spill;

(5) on March 29, 2013, the first pipeline of the United States to transport Canadian tar sands to the Gulf Coast, the ExxonMobil Pegasus Pipeline, ruptured, spilling 210,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen in Mayflower, Arkansas; and

(6) following the Pegasus Pipeline tar sands spill, individuals in the Mayflower community experienced severe headaches, nausea, and respiratory infections.

(b) PETITION TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNORS.—The President shall provide a copy of the analysis described in paragraph (1) to the Governor of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under paragraph (2), a petition to the President requesting that the pipeline not be located in the affected municipality or county.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—A Governor may withdraw a petition submitted under paragraph (3) at any time.

(5) RIGHT OF ACTION.—A property owner with a private water well drilled into any portion of an aquifer that is below the proposed pipeline described in section 2(a) may sue the owner of the pipeline for damages if—

(A) the well water of the property owner becomes contaminated as a result of—

(i) construction activities associated with the pipeline; or

(ii) a rupture in the pipeline; and

(B) the property owner demonstrates that the well water was safe prior to construction and operation of the pipeline.

SA 76. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION ____ . USE OF FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRODUCTS AND STRUCTURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 327. USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRODUCTS AND STRUCTURES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘energy-efficient product’ means a product that—

“(A) meets or exceeds the requirements for designation under an Energy Star program established under section 324A of the of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6294a); or

“(B) meets or exceeds the requirements for designation as being among the highest 25 percent of equivalent products for energy efficiency under the Federal Energy Management Program; and

“(2) the term ‘energy-efficient structure’ means a residential structure, a public facility, or a private nonprofit facility that meets or exceeds the requirements of American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers Standard 90.1-2010 or the 2013 International Energy Conservation Code, or any successor thereto.

“(b) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—A recipient of assistance relating to a major disaster or emergency may use the assistance to replace or repair a damaged product or structure with an energy-efficient product or energy-efficient structure.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to assistance made available under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act that is expended on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 77. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 610. RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BASE QUANTITY OF ELECTRICITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘base quantity of electricity’ means the total quantity of electric energy sold by a retail electric supplier, expressed in terms of kilowatt hours, to electric customers for purposes other than resale during the most recent calendar year for which information is available.

“(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘base quantity of electricity’ does not include—

“(i) electric energy that is not incremental hydropower generated by a hydroelectric facility; and

“(ii) electricity generated through the incineration of municipal solid waste.

“(2) BIOMASS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘biomass’ means—

“(i) cellulosic (plant fiber) organic materials from a plant that is planted for the purpose of being used to produce energy;

“(ii) nonhazardous plant or algal matter that is derived from—

“(I) an agricultural crop, crop byproduct, or residue resource; or

“(II) waste, such as landscape or right-of-way trimmings (but not including municipal solid waste, recyclable postconsumer waste paper, painted, treated, or pressurized wood, wood contaminated with plastic, or metals);

“(iii) animal waste or animal byproducts; and

“(iv) landfill methane.

“(B) NATIONAL FOREST LAND AND CERTAIN OTHER PUBLIC LAND.—In the case of organic material removed from National Forest System land or from public land administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the term ‘biomass’ means only organic material from—

“(i) ecological forest restoration;

“(ii) precommercial thinnings;

“(iii) brush;

“(iv) mill residues; or

“(v) slash.

“(C) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the term ‘biomass’ does not include material or matter that would otherwise qualify as biomass if the material or matter is located on the following Federal land:

“(i) Federal land containing old growth forest or late successional forest unless the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the removal of organic material from the land—

“(I) is appropriate for the applicable forest type; and

“(II) maximizes the retention of—

“(aa) late-successional and large and old growth trees;

“(bb) late-successional and old growth forest structure; and

“(cc) late-successional and old growth forest composition.

“(ii) Federal land on which the removal of vegetation is prohibited, including components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

“(iii) Wilderness study areas.

“(iv) Inventoried roadless areas.

“(v) Components of the National Landscape Conservation System.

“(vi) National Monuments.

“(3) EXISTING FACILITY.—The term ‘existing facility’ means a facility for the generation

of electric energy from a renewable energy resource that is not an eligible facility.

“(4) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—The term ‘incremental hydropower’ means additional generation that is achieved from increased efficiency or additions of capacity made on or after—

“(A) the date of enactment of this section; or

“(B) the effective date of an existing applicable State renewable portfolio standard program at a hydroelectric facility that was placed in service before that date.

“(5) INDIAN LAND.—The term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(A) any land within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria;

“(B) any land not within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria title to which on the date of enactment of this section was held by—

“(i) the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual; or

“(ii) any Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation;

“(C) any dependent Indian community; or

“(D) any land conveyed to any Alaska Native corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaskan Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

“(7) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term ‘renewable energy’ means electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource.

“(8) RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE.—The term ‘renewable energy resource’ means solar, wind, ocean, tidal, geothermal energy, biomass, landfill gas, incremental hydropower, or hydrokinetic energy.

“(9) REPOWERING OR COFIRING INCREMENT.—The term ‘repowering or cofiring increment’ means—

“(A) the additional generation from a modification that is placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, to expand electricity production at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource;

“(B) the additional generation above the average generation during the 3-year period ending on the date of enactment of this section at a facility used to generate electric energy from a renewable energy resource or to cofire biomass that was placed in service before the date of enactment of this section; or

“(C) the portion of the electric generation from a facility placed in service on or after the date of enactment of this section, or a modification to a facility placed in service before the date of enactment of this section made on or after January 1, 2001, associated with cofiring biomass.

“(10) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ means a person that sells electric energy to electric consumers that sold not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to electric consumers for purposes other than resale during the preceding calendar year.

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ includes a person that sells electric

energy to electric consumers that, in combination with the sales of any affiliate organized after the date of enactment of this section, sells not less than 1,000,000 megawatt hours of electric energy to consumers for purposes other than resale.

“(C) SALES TO PARENT COMPANIES OR AFFILIATES.—For purposes of this paragraph, sales by any person to a parent company or to other affiliates of the person shall not be treated as sales to electric consumers.

“(D) GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘retail electric supplier’ does not include—

“(I) the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or any agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, State, or political subdivision; or

“(II) a rural electric cooperative.

“(ii) INCLUSION.—The term ‘retail electric supplier’ includes an entity that is a political subdivision of a State, or an agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, a State, a political subdivision of a State, a rural electric cooperative that sells electric energy to electric consumers, or any other entity that sells electric energy to electric consumers that would not otherwise qualify as a retail electric supplier if the entity notifies the Secretary that the entity voluntarily agrees to participate in the Federal renewable electricity standard program.

“(b) COMPLIANCE.—For calendar year 2015 and each calendar year thereafter, each retail electric supplier shall meet the requirements of subsection (c) by submitting to the Secretary, not later than April 1 of the following calendar year, 1 or more of the following:

“(1) Federal renewable energy credits issued under subsection (e).

“(2) Certification of the renewable energy generated and electricity savings pursuant to the funds associated with State compliance payments as specified in subsection (e)(4)(G).

“(3) Alternative compliance payments pursuant to subsection (h).

“(c) REQUIRED ANNUAL PERCENTAGE.—For each of calendar years 2015 through 2039, the required annual percentage of the base quantity of electricity of a retail electric supplier that shall be generated from renewable energy resources, or otherwise credited towards the percentage requirement pursuant to subsection (d), shall be the applicable percentage specified in the following table:

Calendar Years	Required Amount percentage
2015	8.5
2016	9.5
2017	11.0
2018	12.5
2019	14.0
2020	15.5
2021	17.0
2022	19.0
2023	21.0
2024	23.0
2025 and thereafter through 2039	25.0.

“(d) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A retail electric supplier may satisfy the requirements of subsection (b)(1) through the submission of Federal renewable energy credits—

“(A) issued to the retail electric supplier under subsection (e);

“(B) obtained by purchase or exchange under subsection (f); or

“(C) borrowed under subsection (g).

“(2) FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be counted toward compliance with subsection (b)(1) only once.

“(e) ISSUANCE OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish by rule a program—

“(A) to verify and issue Federal renewable energy credits to generators of renewable energy;

“(B) to track the sale, exchange, and retirement of the credits; and

“(C) to enforce the requirements of this section.

“(2) EXISTING NON-FEDERAL TRACKING SYSTEMS.—To the maximum extent practicable, in establishing the program, the Secretary shall rely on existing and emerging State or regional tracking systems that issue and track non-Federal renewable energy credits.

“(3) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity that generates electric energy through the use of a renewable energy resource may apply to the Secretary for the issuance of renewable energy credits.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for the issuance of the credits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Secretary that—

“(i) the electric energy will be transmitted onto the grid; or

“(ii) in the case of a generation offset, the electric energy offset would have otherwise been consumed onsite.

“(C) CONTENTS.—The application shall indicate—

“(i) the type of renewable energy resource that is used to produce the electricity;

“(ii) the location at which the electric energy will be produced; and

“(iii) any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(4) QUANTITY OF FEDERAL RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the Secretary shall issue to a generator of electric energy 1 Federal renewable energy credit for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated by the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility.

“(B) INCREMENTAL HYDROPOWER.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purpose of compliance with this section, Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall be based on the increase in average annual generation resulting from the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

“(ii) WATER FLOW INFORMATION.—The incremental generation shall be calculated using the same water flow information that is—

“(I) used to determine a historic average annual generation baseline for the hydroelectric facility; and

“(II) certified by the Secretary or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

“(iii) OPERATIONAL CHANGES.—The calculation of the Federal renewable energy credits for incremental hydropower shall not be based on any operational changes at the hydroelectric facility that is not directly associated with the efficiency improvements or capacity additions.

“(C) INDIAN LAND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue 2 renewable energy credits for each kilowatt hour of electric energy generated and supplied to the grid in a calendar year through the use of a renewable energy resource at an eligible facility located on Indian land.

“(ii) BIOMASS.—For purposes of this paragraph, renewable energy generated by biomass cofired with other fuels is eligible for 2 credits only if the biomass was grown on the land.

“(D) ON-SITE ELIGIBLE FACILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of electric energy generated by a renewable energy resource at an on-site eligible facility that is not larger than 1 megawatt in capacity and is used to offset all or part of the requirements of a customer for electric energy, the Secretary shall issue 3 renewable energy credits to the customer for each kilowatt hour generated.

“(ii) INDIAN LAND.—In the case of an on-site eligible facility on Indian land, the Secretary shall issue not more than 3 credits per kilowatt hour.

“(E) COMBINATION OF RENEWABLE AND NON-RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES.—If both a renewable energy resource and a nonrenewable energy resource are used to generate the electric energy, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits based on the proportion of the renewable energy resources used.

“(F) RETAIL ELECTRIC SUPPLIERS.—If a generator has sold electric energy generated through the use of a renewable energy resource to a retail electric supplier under a contract for power from an existing facility and the contract has not determined ownership of the Federal renewable energy credits associated with the generation, the Secretary shall issue the Federal renewable energy credits to the retail electric supplier for the duration of the contract.

“(G) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE RENEWABLE PORTFOLIO STANDARD PROGRAMS.—Payments made by a retail electricity supplier, directly or indirectly, to a State for compliance with a State renewable portfolio standard program, or for an alternative compliance mechanism, shall be valued at 1 credit per kilowatt hour for the purpose of subsection (b)(2) based on the quantity of electric energy generation from renewable resources that results from the payments.

“(f) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT TRADING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal renewable energy credit may be sold, transferred, or exchanged by the entity to whom the credit is issued or by any other entity that acquires the Federal renewable energy credit, other than renewable energy credits from existing facilities.

“(2) CARRYOVER.—A Federal renewable energy credit for any year that is not submitted to satisfy the minimum renewable generation requirement of subsection (c) for that year may be carried forward for use pursuant to subsection (b)(1) within the next 3 years.

“(3) DELEGATION.—The Secretary may delegate to an appropriate market-making entity the administration of a national tradeable renewable energy credit market for purposes of creating a transparent national market for the sale or trade of renewable energy credits.

“(g) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT BORROWING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2015, a retail electric supplier that has reason to believe the retail electric supplier will not be able to fully comply with subsection (b) may—

“(A) submit a plan to the Secretary demonstrating that the retail electric supplier will earn sufficient Federal renewable energy credits within the next 3 calendar years that, when taken into account, will enable the retail electric supplier to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for calendar year 2015 and the subsequent calendar years involved; and

“(B) on the approval of the plan by the Secretary, apply Federal renewable energy

credits that the plan demonstrates will be earned within the next 3 calendar years to meet the requirements of subsection (b) for each calendar year involved.

“(2) REPAYMENT.—The retail electric supplier shall repay all of the borrowed Federal renewable energy credits by submitting an equivalent number of Federal renewable energy credits, in addition to the credits otherwise required under subsection (b), by calendar year 2023 or any earlier deadlines specified in the approved plan.

“(h) ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS.—As a means of compliance under subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall accept payment equal to the lesser of—

“(1) 200 percent of the average market value of Federal renewable energy credits and Federal energy efficiency credits for the applicable compliance period; or

“(2) 3 cents per kilowatt hour (as adjusted on January 1 of each year following calendar year 2006 based on the implicit price deflator for the gross national product).

“(i) INFORMATION COLLECTION.—The Secretary may collect the information necessary to verify and audit—

“(1)(A) the annual renewable energy generation of any retail electric supplier; and

“(B) Federal renewable energy credits submitted by a retail electric supplier pursuant to subsection (b)(1);

“(2) the validity of Federal renewable energy credits submitted for compliance by a retail electric supplier to the Secretary; and

“(3) the quantity of electricity sales of all retail electric suppliers.

“(j) ENVIRONMENTAL SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Incremental hydropower shall be subject to all applicable environmental laws and licensing and regulatory requirements.

“(k) STATE PROGRAMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section diminishes any authority of a State or political subdivision of a State—

“(A) to adopt or enforce any law (including regulations) respecting renewable energy, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; or

“(B) to regulate the acquisition and disposition of Federal renewable energy credits by retail electric suppliers.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION.—No law or regulation referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall relieve any person of any requirement otherwise applicable under this section.

“(3) COORDINATION WITH STATE PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with States that have in effect renewable energy programs, shall—

“(A) preserve the integrity of the State programs, including programs that exceed the required quantity of renewable energy under this section; and

“(B) facilitate coordination between the Federal program and State programs.

“(4) EXISTING RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS.—In the regulations establishing the program under this section, the Secretary shall incorporate common elements of existing renewable energy programs, including State programs, to ensure administrative ease, market transparency and effective enforcement.

“(5) MINIMIZATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS AND COSTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall work with the States to minimize administrative burdens and costs to retail electric suppliers.

“(l) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—An electric utility that has sales of electric energy that are subject to rate regulation (including any utility with rates that are regulated by the

Commission and any State regulated electric utility) shall not be denied the opportunity to recover the full amount of the prudently incurred incremental cost of renewable energy obtained to comply with the requirements of subsection (b).

“(m) PROGRAM REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under which the Academy shall conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the program established under this section.

“(2) EVALUATION.—The study shall include an evaluation of—

“(A) the effectiveness of the program in increasing the market penetration and lowering the cost of the eligible renewable energy technologies;

“(B) the opportunities for any additional technologies and sources of renewable energy emerging since the date of enactment of this section;

“(C) the impact on the regional diversity and reliability of supply sources, including the power quality benefits of distributed generation;

“(D) the regional resource development relative to renewable potential and reasons for any investment in renewable resources; and

“(E) the net cost/benefit of the renewable electricity standard to the national and State economies, including—

“(i) retail power costs;

“(ii) the economic development benefits of investment;

“(iii) avoided costs related to environmental and congestion mitigation investments that would otherwise have been required;

“(iv) the impact on natural gas demand and price; and

“(v) the effectiveness of green marketing programs at reducing the cost of renewable resources.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report describing the results of the evaluation and any recommendations for modifications and improvements to the program.

“(n) STATE RENEWABLE ENERGY ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a State renewable energy account.

“(2) DEPOSITS.—All money collected by the Secretary from the alternative compliance payments under subsection (h) shall be deposited into the State renewable energy account established under paragraph (1).

“(3) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Proceeds deposited in the State renewable energy account shall be used by the Secretary, subject to annual appropriations, for a program to provide grants—

“(i) to the State agency responsible for administering a fund to promote renewable energy generation for customers of the State or an alternative agency designated by the State; or

“(ii) if no agency described in clause (i), to the State agency developing State energy conservation plans under section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322).

“(B) USE.—The grants shall be used for the purpose of—

“(i) promoting renewable energy production; and

“(ii) providing energy assistance and weatherization services to low-income consumers.

“(C) CRITERIA.—The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria for grants awarded under this paragraph.

“(D) STATE-APPROVED FUNDING MECHANISMS.—At least 75 percent of the funds provided to each State for each fiscal year shall be used to promote renewable energy production through grants, production incentives, or other State-approved funding mechanisms.

“(E) ALLOCATION.—The funds shall be allocated to the States on the basis of retail electric sales subject to the renewable electricity standard under this section or through voluntary participation.

“(F) RECORDS.—State agencies receiving grants under this paragraph shall maintain such records and evidence of compliance as the Secretary may require.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. prec. 2601) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title VI the following:

“Sec. 609. Rural and remote communities electrification grants.

“Sec. 610. Renewable electricity standard.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Perspectives on the Strategic Necessity of Iran Sanctions.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Caitlin Murphy, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 29, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 29) condemning the terrorist attacks in Paris, offering condolences to the families of the victims, expressing solidarity with the people of France, and reaffirming fundamental freedom of expression.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 30, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 30) designating the week of January 25 through January 31, 2015, as "National School Choice Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reso-

lution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDER FOR RECESS AND ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 8:25 p.m. tonight and upon reconvening proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session of Congress provided under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 7; that upon the dissolution of the joint session, the Senate adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 21; I ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; I further ask that the Senate then be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; that following morning business the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. We were able to process several amendments to the Keystone bill today. There are now six more in the queue and pending. I would encourage all Senators who have amendments to file them and to work with Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL to get them pending.

Senators should expect votes related to amendments to the bill throughout the day tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:38 p.m., recessed until 8:25 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ROUNDS).

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear a message from the President of the United States.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, James Morhard, the Secretary of the Senate, Julie E. Adams, and the Vice President of the United States, JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States, Barack H. Obama.

(The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 10:20 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 20, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 20, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

REMEMBERING SHERIFF'S DEPUTY DANNY OLIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Sacramento County Sheriff Deputy Danny Oliver.

Deputy Oliver had served the citizens of Sacramento County for 15 years when he paid the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty this past October.

Later that day, Placer County Sheriff's Investigator Michael Davis, Jr., was shot and killed by the same assailant.

Deputy Oliver grew up in the Del Paso Heights neighborhood of Sacramento and graduated from Grant High School. He loved serving the community where he grew up and dedicated his life to making it better. He was known for being part of the community that he served, answering emails from concerned citizens even when he was off duty, and never declining to attend a neighborhood meeting.

Deputy Oliver was as dedicated to his family as he was to his job, and his family was dedicated to him. His wife, Susan Oliver, worked two jobs while

Danny went through the sheriff's academy, where he graduated at the top of his class academically. She will be my guest tonight at the State of the Union. Susan and Danny have two daughters, Melissa and Jenny.

The lives of Deputy Oliver and Investigator Davis are a reminder that our law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day for our safety. They were true heroes, and we are forever indebted to them and their loved ones. Let's honor their memory by building understanding and trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve, just like Deputy Oliver did.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING AND PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this Nation, including Puerto Rico, celebrated Martin Luther King Day. It is important to pause and reflect upon Dr. King's legacy and its relevance to the issue of Puerto Rico's political status.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Dr. King was the most prominent leader of the civil rights movement for racial equality in the United States. He was physically brave, leading peaceful marches and other protests in parts of the country where some government officials and residents were willing to use violence and intimidation to maintain a system of segregation and discrimination.

Dr. King was also remarkably eloquent. His speeches and writings inspired men and women who already supported the campaign for racial equality, but they also changed the hearts and minds of individuals who initially opposed the cause. He helped many Americans who were living in moral darkness to see the light.

Dr. King was motivated by a sense of urgency. In a letter written from an Alabama jail, he stated that "justice too long delayed is justice denied." But Dr. King was also strategic. Every action he took was carefully designed to advance the cause. He knew that means matter as much as ends, and he had little patience for advocates who lacked a sense of tactics and timing.

Dr. King traveled to Puerto Rico on at least two occasions, but it does not appear that he expressed a considered opinion about the island's political status. Nevertheless, based on Dr. King's

philosophy, it is fair to presume that he would be very troubled by the situation in Puerto Rico.

Dr. King regarded the right to vote as sacred. In a 1957 speech delivered in front of the Lincoln Memorial, he said:

So long as I do not firmly and irrevocably possess the right to vote, I do not possess myself. I cannot make up my mind; it is made up for me. I cannot live as a democratic citizen, observing the laws I have helped to enact; I can only submit to the edict of others.

Nearly 50 years after Dr. King's death from an assassin's bullet, the right to vote in Federal and local elections is guaranteed to all American citizens regardless of race, but only if they reside in a U.S. State. The 3.6 million American citizens residing in the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico are denied this sacred right, unable to vote for the Federal leaders who make the laws that govern every aspect of their lives. We lack the very right that Dr. King lived for and the right he died for.

The movement that Dr. King led was a quest for equal rights and equal opportunities for African Americans. However, the principle that lay behind the movement and that gave it such moral power has broader application. It is the belief that there is only one category of American citizenship, not a first-class citizenship for some and a second-class citizenship for others. Every day that Puerto Rico remains a territory, an undemocratic and undignified status, this principle is violated.

Dr. King taught us that achieving equality requires hard, determined, relentless work. It requires leaders who are both passionate and strategic, just as Dr. King was, but above all, it requires thousands upon thousands of ordinary men and women to unite around the principle, the principle of equality, and to fight for it until it is attained.

Dr. King's life is a testament to the fundamental truth that there is no force on Earth strong enough to stop a righteous cause pursued by righteous means. Our struggle to obtain equal rights and equal opportunities for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico is a struggle for justice, and with tireless effort, we will prevail.

THE LEGACY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what an interesting coincidence. We are here today to hear from the President of the United States, President

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Barack Obama, on his State of the Union.

Just yesterday, millions of Americans honored together the legacy and the message of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I rise today to emphasize that Dr. King's message was not a message for one particular ethnic or racial or religious group, but as I have reflected over the years, he equals the original values of this Nation.

The Constitution begins by saying we have come to order a more perfect Union. It is a small document. The Bill of Rights gives flesh to the bones of the Constitution because it gives us the freedom of religion and speech and access and the ability to move around, and the right to a jury trial and the right to due process and the right to dignity, and it freed the slaves.

But it also is a document that can free us from the biases that sometimes come because of isolation, and that was Dr. King. He sought for America her higher angels. He wanted her to be able to be true to her values. For those who fled persecution in faraway places, he wanted America to be that place that did not see color, religion, ethnicity, did not see differences because one was disabled or gay or straight, but really saw us in an equal manner.

He marched for all people, and I would hope that as we begin this session of Congress, as we listen to the President of the United States, who literally stands on the shoulders of Dr. Martin Luther King—for it was the Civil Rights Act of 1964 where many lost their lives and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 where a young woman by the name of Viola Liuzzo died right after the Selma march. As she was bringing back those protestors and marchers, she was shot dead. She was a white woman from Michigan. And so I pay tribute to Dr. King today, and I look forward to listening to the President's message that will hopefully be a message of hope and the opportunities for America to work together.

At the same time, I remember my own community. I pay tribute to a place called Freedmen's Town, founded by former slaves, and Camp Logan, a place where Black soldiers were isolated in World War I, but they had on the uniform of this country.

I pay tribute to Christie Adair, Zollie Scales, C. Anderson Davis, Reverend F.N. Williams, and, as well, S.J. Gilbert, Reverend J.J. Roberson, and many others who have walked the pathway, the leaders of the NAACP, the leaders of the Urban League, and many of our seniors who came to us to give us knowledge through their sacrifices of World War II, to the Buffalo Soldiers that we see in our community all the time, and to those who have put on the uniform through the ages. All of those persons combined make up the spirit of Dr. Martin Luther King, who leaves us with the most important

statement: "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

As we now go on our new journey, let us look to respect our law enforcement but also look, as we stand alongside of the men and women in blue, that we also find a way to be able to bring justice and opportunity and, as well, fairness to the criminal justice system.

It takes all of us to be able to get that system right side up: our law enforcement officers and their training, and then, of course, the judicial system.

Let us look forward in Dr. King's spirit of coming together, no matter what our race, color, or creed, whatever our body says to do, to be able to do what is right.

I said to young people when I was speaking about Dr. King this weekend, I used one simple theme: he had a humble courage, a quiet courage. He had to make decisions in the quietness of his own presence and his own space to say, "I am willing to do what is right even though there may be danger."

He never announced and never spoke about words that dealt with his own personal courage. He did say that he had a peace that would allow him to see the promised land and to acknowledge to us that he might not get there with us, but he knew that we as a people—and I take that "we" as the American people—will get there some day.

Let us together fix Ferguson and the many Fergusons around the Nation. Let us bring comfort to parents all around this Nation. Let us be reminded of Dr. King's spirit, not just in this weekend of activities and respect and honor, but let us do it always.

I close by simply saying, thank you at home to Mr. Ovide Duncantell. Mr. Duncantell has been the visionary for our efforts in Houston on honoring Dr. Martin Luther King. He first met with Daddy King and named the street, and then we were able successfully, with Federal funds and working with Mr. Duncantell, to place a Martin Luther King memorial, the first built outside of Washington, D.C., in the last 10 years. We are excited about it. We know that his spirit is not in bricks and mortar; it is living within us.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, thank You for giving us another day.

The House prepares this day to welcome the President of the United States and other governmental, judicial, and military leadership of our Nation. The world watches as America's great experiment in civilian self-government is in high relief.

May all who populate these hallways this day be possessed of goodwill and a shared commitment to guarantee the freedoms and responsibilities inspired by the soaring rhetoric and subsequent actions of our American ancestors.

We know that all too often these past congressional sessions the terms of debate and consideration of issues have been more reflective of partisan politics than productive problem solving. Perhaps this is to be expected, given the nature of republican forms of government. Even so, we ask that Your blessing and inspiration come down upon our elected leaders, that they might be moved to negotiations and solutions beyond their own imaginings.

May all that is said and done in this Chamber today redound to the benefit of our Nation and the glory of Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CUMMINGS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE NOVEMBER MEMO AND THE STATE OF THE UNION

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President addresses the Union tonight, promising more government, more spending, and more taxes.

Obviously the President did not read the November memo from America. The majority of the Union rejected the President's policies in the election of persistent Big Government.

King George III and the British imposed the Stamp Act 250 years ago this year. The colonists decried the new tax.

Higher taxes and more confiscation of property and wealth is not a sound solution; after all, taxes are already too high; after all, revenue into the Federal coffers is at a record level; after all, Americans are already hammered by ObamaCare taxes; and after all, raising taxes is not a proven economic theory to grow the economy. We need less tax. We should consider the fair tax that does not discriminate in taxation.

The President should remember history and not follow the old failed policy of King George III of more taxes but should pivot the Union to less taxation, less government, and more freedom for our citizens.

And that is just the way it is.

WE SHOULD HONOR DR. KING EVERY DAY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the day that we honor Martin Luther King's life and legacy—it should be honored every day—a great American who stood for justice, liberty.

Yet in this House, there is not a desire on the other side of the aisle to increase the minimum wage, which would be one of the first things Dr. King would want. There is not a desire on the other side of the aisle to pass a Voting Rights Act for which Dr. King is known to have worked on the march in Selma and help bring about some 50 years ago. And there is no effort to reduce the great disparity in wealth that threatens the middle class and threatens the future of democracy and the way we know America.

We should honor Dr. King every day. Unfortunately, many and most of his values are being neglected by the majority in this House.

REMEMBERING REBECCA D. LOCKHART

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor Rebecca D. Lockhart, a proud Utahn and, in fact, the immediate past speaker of the House of Representatives in Utah. Unfortunately, she passed away just a few days ago at the young age of 46.

Speaker Lockhart was elected to the Utah House in 1998. She was trained as a registered nurse, and she first served on the Health and Human Services Committee but quickly threw herself into transportation issues, for which she was widely known.

After her fourth session, she was appointed to the house leadership as the vice chair of executive appropriations and stayed in leadership the remainder of her time.

In fact, in 2008, then-Representative Lockhart was elected as the assistant majority whip, and in 2010 she became the first female speaker of the Utah House in Utah history. Her tenure was epitomized by a more collaborative bottom-up approach that focused on having an open process where all members of the body could bring forward ideas for discussion.

Becky Lockhart and her husband, Stan, raised their three children in Provo, Utah. They have been stalwarts within the party, and her presence will be keenly missed. Her trailblazing legacy will live on.

May God bless Rebecca D. Lockhart and her family. We thank her for her service, and we will miss her greatly.

LET US FIND AREAS OF COMMON GROUND

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this weekend we observed the celebration of the life of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. He talked about engagement for the American people, for jobs, for justice, for peace, and it was pretty exciting to see the response across the country at a time when all of these issues are in the forefront.

Tonight we will hear from the President of the United States. From what I hear about what he will present, it will reflect what we have seen across the country in terms of what he said last year reflected across the country: about when women succeed, America succeeds; about college affordability; about child care; about sick leave; all the kinds of issues that enable families—not just women, but families—to succeed. Hopefully it will reflect what we talked about on opening day: better infrastructure, bigger paychecks.

As we all know, despite all of the economic gains and all the indicators that tell us that progress has been made in our economy—and, indeed, it has—it isn't reflected in the paychecks of America's working families.

So what we hear tonight, I know, will be in furtherance of increasing that paycheck, starting from the middle, starting from initiatives that benefit the middle class and those who aspire to it, all of it a reflection of the American people's thinking, all of it about engagement for policies that Reverend Martin Luther King talked about, all of it hopefully that we are able to do in a bipartisan way.

Let us find the areas in which we have common ground. Let us work together to get that done, build confidence between us in this body, among

the American people, and keep America number one in education, innovation, and justice and a factor for peace in the world.

RAISING TAXES DESTROYS JOBS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, after 6 years, American workers continue to lose jobs under President Obama's failed economic policies.

The President makes the exaggerated claim of job creation, but workers feel the facts. The administration's policies have caused stagnant wages, weak economic growth, and a shift toward many Americans settling for part-time jobs.

Raising taxes destroys jobs. The Washington Times reports that the 140 million employment payroll in November was up by only 1.2 percent over what it was 4 years previously. The statistic claimed by the President that the unemployment rate has gone down to 5.8 percent is inaccurate because so many people are eliminated as having stopped looking for jobs.

In December, the labor force participation rate fell to the lowest point in over 30 years. This is not an economic recovery to be celebrating, and the American people deserve better solutions for jobs.

House Republicans have passed bipartisan pro-growth bills to create American jobs. We will keep fighting to help Americans get back to work full-time.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

ISIS IS NOT A REFLECTION ON ISLAM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning most Americans woke up to the news that ISIS was holding two citizens of the nation-state of Japan and, in the holding of those citizens, threatening to kill them, asked Japan to give \$200 million.

Mr. Speaker, does that sound like an organization that is dedicated and committed to principles however much we disagree with them, or does it sound like a group of thugs who are willing to do anything to gain money to promote their evil and dastardly acts?

The very existence of ISIS and others is not a reflection on Islam. Over the weekend, we have seen so many that have expressed opposition to these terrible acts. That is why it is so important, as we listen to the President's State of the Union, that the Congress, although with different opinions, agree to work on behalf of what is good for

all of America, both building the economy but fighting against the war on terror, not only with weapons but with educating about democracy and principles and equality and trying to win the hearts and minds.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work to do.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

CONDEMNING THE RECENT TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 37) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the recent terrorist attacks in Paris that resulted in the deaths of seventeen innocent persons and offering condolences to those personally affected by this cowardly act.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 37

Whereas, on January 7, 2015, armed radical Islamist terrorists stormed the offices of the satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo and slaughtered twelve people, including editorial staff of the paper, a visitor, a security guard, a maintenance worker, and a Muslim police officer;

Whereas terrorists Cherif and Said Kouachi, who carried out the attack, were located and killed by police two days later and their hostages rescued;

Whereas Amedy Coulibaly killed a female police officer on January 8, 2015, and intentionally targeted a kosher supermarket, taking multiple hostages and murdering four Jewish men on January 9, 2015, before French police raided the store, killed Coulibaly, and rescued the surviving hostages;

Whereas Amedy Coulibaly stated that he had worked in coordination with Said and Cherif Kouachi and called them “brothers from our team”;

Whereas Hayat Boumedienne, a fourth suspect connected with the attack and the common-law wife of Amedy Coulibaly, remains at large;

Whereas the Kouachi brothers are believed to have traveled to Yemen in 2011 where they are reported to have received weapons training and met with Anwar al-Awlaki, a senior member of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula;

Whereas al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula claimed credit for the Charlie Hebdo attack;

Whereas Amedy Coulibaly claimed to be a member of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria;

Whereas radical Islamist terrorist groups, including the Islamic State of Iraq and the

Levant, al-Qaeda and its affiliates worldwide, the Taliban and Haqqani network in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Ansar al-Sharia in Libya, Boko Haram in Nigeria, al-Shabaab in Somalia, Hizballah in Lebanon and Syria, Hamas in Gaza, and others, pose a growing threat to international peace and stability;

Whereas these terrorist attacks represent an assault on fundamental principles essential to a democratic society, including the universal right to free expression and freedom of religion;

Whereas the increase in anti-Semitic attacks in France and throughout Europe remains of great concern;

Whereas the United States and France share a longstanding cultural, political, and economic relationship that has greatly benefited both nations;

Whereas since the founding of our Nation, France has been an ally of the United States, and French soldiers have fought side-by-side with American soldiers throughout history, including during two World Wars;

Whereas security cooperation between the United States and France plays an essential role in combating violent extremism in West and North Africa, the Middle East and around the world; and

Whereas the United States is committed to supporting its oldest ally France in this difficult time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the recent terrorist attacks in Paris that resulted in the tragic loss of seventeen innocent lives;

(2) extends its deepest sympathies to all those affected by this tragedy;

(3) supports the efforts of the Government of France to ensure that all of those individuals who committed or supported these attacks are brought to justice;

(4) remains concerned regarding the flow of foreign fighters to and from the Middle East and West and North Africa and the threat posed by these individuals upon their return to their local communities;

(5) appreciates and supports France’s continuing efforts to combat terrorism and promote stability throughout the Middle East and West and North Africa;

(6) appreciates France’s contributions to the multilateral effort to destroy the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant;

(7) recognizes the growing threat posed by radical Islamist terrorist groups worldwide and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the multilateral, global fight against such violent extremists;

(8) calls upon all nations to join a global effort to combat violent extremist ideologies and terrorist groups; and

(9) remains committed to the defense of free expression, including religious freedom, as well as other universal values that terrorists seek to destroy through a campaign of cowardly threats and reprehensible violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to add any extraneous material to the RECORD in this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. The resolution condemns the terrorist attack in France carried out by Islamist extremists earlier this month.

On January 7, two armed gunmen entered the offices of Charlie Hebdo, the satirical magazine in Paris, and, in a brutal, premeditated attack, killed 12 people and injured 11 others.

The following day, as we watched this play out on international media, their associate, Amedy Coulibaly, shot and killed a female police officer, and in the following days with the Kouachi brothers on the run, Coulibaly targeted a kosher supermarket where he shot and killed four Jewish shoppers and took multiple hostages. Later that day, courageous French police officers stormed the supermarket, killed the attacker, and freed the hostages.

There are no words that we can speak today, I think, that will comfort the families and the friends of the 17 people murdered in those terrorist attacks.

The victims included cartoonists and maintenance workers, police officers, grocery shoppers, Christians, Jews, and Muslims.

□ 1415

There are no words strong enough to condemn these terrorists and their radical jihadist ideology.

The Charlie Hebdo offices were attacked because their cartoons offended. The magazine’s editor was specifically marked as a target for death by al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula’s online newspaper magazine called Inspire under the not-so-subtle headline, “A Bullet a Day Keeps the Infidel Away.” Indeed, the Kouachi brothers called out the editor’s name before they shot and killed him.

Mr. Speaker, the attack on Charlie Hebdo was an attack on free speech. The right to express ideas and opinions, even if they are unpopular or offensive, is a foundation for a free society—France’s and ours. Frankly, the struggle of the Enlightenment has largely been a struggle against blasphemy laws going all of the way back to the foundation of this Republic and our First Amendment and Jefferson’s concept of freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

It was not the first time that this magazine was attacked by terrorists. And, unfortunately, it probably won’t be the last time a media outlet like this is targeted. That is why this resolution resolves to uphold and defend the basic principle—free speech.

The grocery store victims were murdered because they were Jewish. In the days following, France stationed thousands of police officers to guard

France's Jewish schools and synagogues in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks. Alarming, anti-Semitic forces are on the rise in France and in much of Europe.

This resolution puts the House on record as condemning in the strongest terms possible the Paris attacks and extends the sympathy of every American to those affected by the tragedy. It reiterates our support for France, America's sister republic, our oldest ally, and it calls upon all nations to join the global effort of fighting violent extremism.

This is a time to not just express sorrow for those killed but also a time to show resolve in the face of terror. Our intelligence-sharing with allies, already strong, will need to get much sharper; border checks improved; and coalition efforts to destroy ISIS will need to be stepped up. I urge all Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attacks by radical Islamists in Paris were a tragedy for all who love peace and freedom. What happened at the offices of Charlie Hebdo and the kosher market reminds us this violent extremism remains a critical threat. I am happy to stand with the chairman here in showing strong bipartisanship once again because we grieve with France, our oldest ally. Our hearts break for all those who have lost loved ones in these attacks and for all who watched this carnage spill into their peaceful city streets.

As a New Yorker, I remember the outpouring of support from France following September 11, 2011. But even as we mourn the dead, we draw inspiration from the displays of courage and solidarity on the streets of the City of Light, across Europe, and around the world.

With the attackers still at large, Parisians took to the streets in massive and peaceful vigils. They sent a clear message to the world: freedom and justice will not be cowed by violence and terror.

In these attacks, Mr. Speaker, the ancient evil of anti-Semitism once again showed its ugly face. Anti-Semitism is both a threat with which governments need to deal and a societal challenge requiring honest dialogue, critical self-examination, and constant vigilance. France's deployment of special troops and extra police to Jewish sites was the right thing to do. But much more will be needed in the days ahead to ensure that Europe's largest Jewish community is safe from attack and free from fear.

Just as America stands with the people of France against terrorism, Americans also stand shoulder to shoulder with European Jewry.

That is the message we are sending today with this resolution. Whether in Paris or New York, Moscow or Jerusalem, whether homegrown or imported, whether targeting Jews, Muslims, Christians, or anyone else, violent extremism has no place in a civilized world. We will continue to work with our friends and allies to put a stop to this threat. It is important that Congress go on record as strongly opposed to this violence. We will do whatever it takes to secure the future of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am Jewish—Je suis Juif. I am Charlie—Je suis Charlie.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, and the author of this measure.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this resolution to the House floor so quickly.

Mr. Speaker, it was a cold winter morning in Paris just before lunchtime when two masked men with AK-47s approached a woman standing outside the door of the Charlie Hebdo newspaper, forcing her to let them in.

Once inside the door, they gunned down the security guard in the lobby and ran up to the second floor shouting, "Where is Charb? Where is Charb?" Charb is the nickname of the newspaper's editor, Mr. Charbonnier. After reaching their target, they executed him and 10 others. They exited the building shouting, "Allahu Akbar," or "God is the greatest." Then they sped off. They would kill an injured Muslim police officer lying on the ground before they fled.

The two terrorists got away, but not for long. French law enforcement found and killed the men in a standoff near the Paris airport. That same day, another terrorist killed a female police officer and attacked a kosher supermarket and murdered four Jewish men. Once again, French law enforcement took care of the terrorists and rescued the hostages.

These terrorists killed because they didn't like what people had to say. Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental human right to have freedom of expression, freedom of press, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. No amount of violence can take those rights away from us. It is basic.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution says we are not going to let Islamic radical terrorists steal those rights from anyone, whether it is the French, whether it is someone else in the world or even here in America. Mr. Speaker, after all, they killed at the kosher cafe because they not only didn't like what people

were saying, they didn't like those people because they were Jews.

France did an excellent job bringing swift justice down on these terrorists, but the fight is certainly not over. There may be, and probably are, hundreds of others around the world plotting to kill neighbors and countrymen and people in other Nations because those terrorists don't agree with what those people say or what those people look like or what those people's personal religion may be. They think they have the right to kill in the name of a radical Islamic religion.

Mr. Speaker, the threat is serious and it is deadly. This resolution remembers those folks who were killed because they believed the way they did or because they looked the way they looked or because their religion was different than others. We mourn when the French mourn. As stated earlier, the French are our oldest and first ally.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have two portraits in this House Chamber, one of George Washington and one of Lafayette, the first great Frenchman who helped the United States. We have a close bond with the French. And it is important that we let them, the world, and especially the terrorists know that our bond with freedom-loving countries will remain strong, especially in time of need, when people are attacked because of their beliefs and the idea that they can express a difference of opinion.

I want to congratulate French law enforcement for their speedy and quick resolve in disposing of these terrorists, and we should let them know that we appreciate all law enforcement who fight back against terrorists who want to kill us because we don't agree with them.

Once again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this resolution to the House floor.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL and Mr. POE for their leadership in bringing the House together on a very important issue.

Earlier today I stood and spoke about the tragic news that we heard early this morning of two Japanese citizens being held and ISIS asking for \$200 million.

The work of these individuals in Paris, France, and beyond was in their mind a connectedness to al Qaeda and others, proudly so, as they slaughtered those individuals who chose to lift up liberty in the spirit of the French people and take to the pen and assess the atmosphere of the day and provide humor to it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not comment on one person's opinion, but I do know that liberty, democracy, liberty, and

our own beliefs give every human being dignity and the freedom of expression, the free press, the right to free speech and religion, and I believe these are very valuable ideals. And so this resolution speaks to that by condemning the heinousness of the act.

How many families—children, mothers, and fathers—were impacted by the loss of their loved ones? What a tragedy to see a police officer gunned down in the street who asked, as I reflect on the words as I recall them, to be left alone, and yet was shot again, and other officers in the line of duty being subjected to the violence of these individuals.

This is an intolerable situation that should not be tolerated. But we are hearing from the voices of these terrorist groups that they are now asking individuals to stay in place, to stay at home and create jihad. At the same time, I have heard voices from the Islam extended community, people of the faith, Islamic faith, and I have heard them condemn these violent acts. I have heard them condemn these acts as not reflecting their faith.

Then again, as we watched an individual slaughter Jewish persons in a kosher market purposely because of their faith, we cannot tolerate that. In one single voice, we should rise up as this resolution, H. Res. 37, says to express the affection for all people and their right to exist. That is, if you will, a universal phenomenon, to allow individual persons and individuals to exist without threat of heinous violence. As I talked about Dr. Martin Luther King, I said the very words he has commended to us: Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As we begin this journey into a new year, I don't know how much we will be confronted with these horrible acts. I am on the Homeland Security Committee, and for a long time we were seeing the signs of what I call franchise terrorism. But I do know that it has to be a world, a global effort, but it also has to, as I began to talk about earlier, reach the hearts and minds of young men and possibly women who are being subjected to radicalism on the Internet or elsewhere.

We have to stop that bleeding, if you will, and begin to promote openly our values, which include respect for religious differences. As we do that, I believe it will be well worth the investment because we don't know where this is going to end, and we certainly need to say to the American people that we are committed, in essence that we are on top of it, and that we have many solutions to this tragic problem.

So I rise in support of H. Res. 37 for its condemnation and recognition of

where we are today, and I ask for us to address this in a multitude of ways in order to have peace in this world and in our Nation.

□ 1430

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Je suis Juif, I am Jewish. Mr. Speaker, Je suis Charlie, I am Charlie Hebdo. This is what we are all saying collectively as a Congress as we debate this bill today. This is what the people of France were saying and have been saying ever since the tragedy happened. People with placards and banners were carrying them high above France to show solidarity in the fight against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an important conversation here in the House. I am heartened by the expressions of unity and resolve, and I hope they provide a measure of comfort to those families that are suffering who had loved ones who were killed and those who were wounded by this recent attack.

Symbolism looms hard in foreign affairs, and with this resolution, we deliver a powerful message. We deliver it on the day the President is going to speak with us in the State of the Union, and I think nothing could be stronger than for this House unanimously to fight terrorism, to reject terrorism, and, again, to say, "Je suis Juif, Je suis Charlie."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman POE from Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, for authorizing this important resolution; but I also want to thank our ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL of New York, for his support in bringing this resolution to the floor to ensure that we speak with one voice on issues of violent extremism and to ensure that we stand with our ally France at this difficult time.

Last week, many Members visited the Foreign Affairs Committee to sign a condolence book and greet the French Ambassador in person. Mr. ENGEL and I thanked them for their show of solidarity in this.

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate reality is that these attacks in Paris are indicative of a resurgent terrorist threat from radical Islamist extremists. The brothers were connected to al Qaeda in Yemen, a particularly active and deadly al Qaeda franchise. The kosher market gunman pledged his allegiance to ISIS, which now controls parts of Iraq and Syria and has specifically targeted Americans.

Up to 5,000 Europeans are believed now to have traveled to Syria to fight or get training. Whether from orga-

nized groups or returning foreign fighters or lone wolves, the terrorist threat is real, and it is growing.

These are not criminals united by happenstance but by a militant jihadi impulse united by ideology, by doctrine, and by practice, its adherents drawn all the way from Africa to Southeast Asia, from the Middle East to the Caucasus.

Unlike some of the rhetoric we have heard by some here in Washington, in every corner of the globe, terrorist groups are growing in number, and they are growing in strength. In Europe, France is at the front lines of a dangerous and growing ideology that has, again, demonstrated that it knows no bounds.

As we face an expanding and evolving threat, it is imperative that we unequivocally condemn attacks on freedom of speech, condemn attacks on religious pluralism, and reaffirm our resolve to fight extremism.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 37.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 36

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 36.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 36

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 36.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet tonight in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of purporting to reserve seats prior to the joint session by placement of placards or personal items will not be allowed. Chamber Security may remove these items from the seats. Members may reserve their seats only by physical presence following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1625

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 161, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-3) on the resolution (H. Res. 38) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:35 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2035

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS PURSUANT TO HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7 TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint session will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER);

The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS);

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAULO);

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS); and

The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY);

The Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW); and

The Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador from the Republic of Djibouti.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, my fellow Americans:

We are 15 years into this new century—15 years that dawned with terror touching our shores, that unfolded with a new generation fighting two long and costly wars, that saw a vicious recession spread across our Nation and the world. It has been, and still is, a hard time for many.

But, tonight, we turn the page.

Tonight, after a breakthrough year for America, our economy is growing and creating jobs at the fastest pace since 1999. Our unemployment rate is now lower than it was before the financial crisis. More of our kids are graduating than ever before. More of our people are insured than ever before. And we are as free from the grip of foreign oil as we have been in almost 30 years.

Tonight, for the first time since 9/11, our combat mission in Afghanistan is over. Six years ago, nearly 180,000 American troops served in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, fewer than 15,000 remain.

And we salute the courage and sacrifice of every man and woman in this 9/11 generation who has served to keep us safe. We are humbled and grateful for your service.

America, for all that we have endured, for all the grit and hard work required to come back, for all the tasks that lie ahead, know this: the shadow of crisis has passed, and the state of the Union is strong.

At this moment, with a growing economy, shrinking deficits, bustling industry, and booming energy production, we have risen from recession freer to write our own future than any other nation on Earth. It is now up to us to choose who we want to be over the next 15 years and for decades to come.

Will we accept an economy where only a few of us do spectacularly well, or will we commit ourselves to an economy that generates rising incomes and chances for everyone who makes the effort?

Will we approach the world fearful and reactive, dragged into costly conflicts that strain our military and set back our standing, or will we lead wisely, using all elements of our power to defeat new threats and protect our planet?

Will we allow ourselves to be sorted into factions and turned against one another, or will we recapture the sense of common purpose that has always propelled America forward?

In 2 weeks, I will send this Congress a budget filled with ideas that are practical, not partisan; and in the months ahead, I will crisscross the country, making a case for those ideas. So, tonight, I want to focus less on a checklist of proposals and focus more on the values at stake in the choices before us.

It begins with our economy.

Seven years ago, Rebekah and Ben Erler of Minneapolis were newlyweds. She waited tables. He worked construction. Their first child, Jack, was on the way. They were young and in love in America, and it doesn't get much better than that.

"If only we had known," Rebekah wrote to me last spring, "what was about to happen to the housing and construction market."

As the crisis worsened, Ben's business dried up, so he took what jobs he could find even if they kept him on the road for long stretches of time. Rebekah took out student loans, enrolled in community college, and retrained for a new career. They sacrificed for each other, and, slowly, it paid off. They bought their first home. They had a second son, Henry. Rebekah got a better job and then a raise. Ben is back

in construction and home for dinner every night.

"It is amazing," Rebekah wrote, "what you can bounce back from when you have to . . . we are a strong, tight-knit family who has made it through some very, very hard times."

We are a strong, tight-knit family who has made it through some very, very hard times.

America, Rebekah and Ben's story is our story. They represent the millions who have worked hard and scrimped and sacrificed and retooled. You are the reason that I ran for this office. You are the people I was thinking of 6 years ago today, in the darkest months of the crisis, when I stood on the steps of this Capitol and promised we would rebuild our economy on a new foundation; and it has been your resilience—your effort—that has made it possible for our country to emerge stronger.

We believed we could reverse the tide of outsourcing and draw new jobs to our shores, and over the past 5 years, our businesses have created more than 11 million new jobs.

We believed we could reduce our dependence on foreign oil and protect our planet, and, today, America is number one in oil and gas. America is number one in wind power. Every 3 weeks, we bring online as much solar power as we did in all of 2008. And thanks to lower gas prices and higher fuel standards, the typical family this year should save about \$750 at the pump.

We believed we could prepare our kids for a more competitive world, and, today, our younger students have earned the highest math and reading scores on record. Our high school graduation rate has hit an all-time high, and more Americans finish college than ever before.

We believed that sensible regulations could prevent another crisis, shield families from ruin, and encourage fair competition. Today, we have new tools to stop taxpayer-funded bailouts and a new consumer watchdog to protect us from predatory lending and abusive credit card practices, and in the past year alone, about 10 million uninsured Americans finally gained the security of health coverage.

At every step, we were told our goals were misguided or too ambitious, that we would crush jobs and explode deficits. Instead, we have seen the fastest economic growth in over a decade, our deficits cut by two-thirds, a stock market that has doubled, and health care inflation at its lowest rate in 50 years. This is good news, people.

So the verdict is clear. Middle class economics works, expanding opportunity works, and these policies will continue to work, as long as politics don't get in the way. We can't slow down businesses or put our economy at risk with government shutdowns or fiscal showdowns.

We can't put the security of families at risk by taking away their health in-

surance or unraveling the new rules on Wall Street or refighting past battles on immigration when we have got to fix a broken system. And if a bill comes to my desk that tries to do any of these things, I will veto it. It will earn my veto.

Today, thanks to a growing economy, the recovery is touching more and more lives. Wages are finally starting to rise again. We know that more small business owners plan to raise their employees' pay than at any time since 2007.

But here is the thing. Those of us here tonight, we need to set our sights higher than just making sure government doesn't screw things up and halt the progress we are making. We need to do more than just do no harm. Tonight, together, let's do more to restore the link between hard work and growing opportunity for every American because families like Rebekah's still need our help.

She and Ben are working as hard as ever but have to forego vacations and a new car so that they can pay off student loans and save for retirement. Friday-night pizza, that is a big splurge.

Basic childcare for Jack and Henry costs more than their mortgage and almost as much as a year at the University of Minnesota. Like millions of hardworking Americans, Rebekah isn't asking for a handout, but she is asking that we look for more ways to help families get ahead.

In fact, at every moment of economic change throughout our history, this country has taken bold action to adapt to new circumstances and to make sure everyone gets a fair shot. We set up worker protections, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to protect ourselves from the harshest adversity. We gave our citizens schools and colleges, infrastructure and the Internet—tools they needed to go as far as their efforts and their dreams will take them.

That is what middle class economics is: the idea that this country does best when everyone gets their fair shot, everyone does their fair share, and everyone plays by the same set of rules. We don't just want everyone to share in America's success; we want everyone to contribute to our success.

So what does middle class economics require in our time?

First, middle class economics means helping working families feel more secure in a world of constant change. That means helping folks afford childcare, college, health care, a home, retirement; and my budget will address each of these issues, lowering the taxes of working families and putting thousands of dollars back into their pockets each year.

Here is one example. During World War II, when men like my grandfather went off to war, having women like my grandmother in the workforce was a national security priority, so this country provided universal childcare.

In today's economy, when having both parents in the workforce is an economic necessity for many families, we need affordable, high-quality childcare more than ever. It is not a nice-to-have; it is a must-have.

It is time we stop treating childcare as a side issue or a women's issue and treat it like the national economic priority that it is for all of us, and that is why my plan will make quality childcare more available and more affordable for every middle class and low-income family with young children in America—by creating more slots and a new tax cut of up to \$3,000 per child, per year.

Here is another example. Today, we are the only advanced country on Earth that doesn't guarantee paid sick leave or paid maternity leave to our workers. Forty-three million workers have no paid sick leave. Forty-three million. Think about that. And that forces too many parents to make the gut-wrenching choice between a paycheck and a sick kid at home. So I will be taking new action to help States adopt paid leave laws of their own.

And since paid sick leave won where it was on the ballot last November, let's put it to a vote right here in Washington. Send me a bill that gives every worker in America the opportunity to earn 7 days of paid sick leave. It is the right thing to do.

Of course, nothing helps families make ends meet like higher wages. That is why this Congress still needs to pass a law that makes sure a woman is paid the same as a man for doing the same work. Really. It is 2015. It is time.

We still need to make sure employees get the overtime they have earned. And to everyone in this Congress who still refuses to raise the minimum wage, I say this: If you truly believe you could work full time and support a family on less than \$15,000 a year, try it. If not, vote to give millions of the hardest-working people in America a raise.

Now, these ideas won't make everybody rich, won't relieve every hardship. That is not the job of government. To give working families a fair shot, we still need more employers to see beyond next quarter's earnings and recognize that investing in their workforce is in their company's long-term interest. We still need laws that strengthen, rather than weaken, unions and give American workers a voice.

But, you know, things like child care and sick leave and equal pay, things like lower mortgage premiums and a higher minimum wage, these ideas will make a meaningful difference in the lives of millions of families. That is a fact. And that is what all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, were sent here to do.

Now, second, to make sure folks keep earning higher wages down the road, we have to do more to help Americans upgrade their skills.

America thrived in the 20th century because we made high school free, sent a generation of GIs to college, trained the best workforce in the world. We were ahead of the curve. But other countries caught on, and in a 21st century economy that rewards knowledge like never before, we need to up our game. We need to do more.

By the end of this decade, two in three job openings will require some higher education, two in three. And yet, we still live in a country where too many bright, striving Americans are priced out of the education they need. It is not fair to them, and it is sure not smart for our future.

That is why I am sending this Congress a bold new plan to lower the cost of community college to zero.

Keep in mind, 40 percent of our college students choose community college. Some are young and starting out. Some are older and looking for a better job. Some are veterans and single parents trying to transition back into the job market. Whoever you are, this plan is your chance to graduate ready for the new economy without a load of debt.

Understand, you have got to earn it. You have got to keep your grades up and graduate on time. Tennessee, a State with Republican leadership, and Chicago, a city with Democratic leadership, are showing that free community college is possible. I want to spread that idea all across America, that 2 years of college becomes as free and universal in America as high school is today.

Let's stay ahead of the curve. And I want to work with this Congress to make sure those already burdened with student loans can reduce their monthly payments so that student debt doesn't derail anyone's dreams.

Thanks to Vice President BIDEN's great work to update our job training system, we are connecting community colleges with local employers to train workers to fill high-paying jobs like coding and nursing and robotics. Tonight I am also asking more businesses to follow the lead of companies like CVS and UPS and offer more educational benefits and paid apprenticeships, opportunities that give workers the chance to earn higher-paying jobs even if they don't have a higher education.

And as a new generation of veterans comes home, we owe them every opportunity to live the American Dream they helped defend.

Already, we have made strides towards ensuring that every veteran has access to the highest-quality care. We are slashing the backlog that had too many veterans waiting years to get the benefits they need, and we are making it easier for vets to translate their training and experience into civilian jobs. And Joining Forces, the national campaign launched by Michelle and

Jill Biden—thank you, Michelle; thank you, Jill—has helped nearly 700,000 veterans and military spouses get a new job.

So to every CEO in America, let me repeat: If you want somebody who is going to get the job done and done right, hire a veteran.

Finally, as we better train our workers, we need the new economy to keep churning out high-wage jobs for our workers to fill.

Since 2010, America has put more people back to work than Europe, Japan, and all advanced economies combined. Our manufacturers have added almost 800,000 new jobs. Some of our bedrock sectors, like our auto industry, are booming. But there are also millions of Americans who work jobs that didn't even exist 10 or 20 years ago, jobs at companies like Google and eBay and Tesla.

So no one knows for certain which industries will generate the jobs of the future. But we do know we want them here in America. We know that. And that is why the third part of middle class economics is all about building the most competitive economy anywhere, the place where businesses want to locate and hire.

Twenty-first century businesses need 21st century infrastructure, modern ports and stronger bridges, faster trains and the fastest Internet. Democrats and Republicans used to agree on this. So let's set our sights higher than a single oil pipeline. Let's pass a bipartisan infrastructure plan that could create more than 30 times as many jobs per year and make this country stronger for decades to come. Let's do it. Let's get it done. Let's get it done.

Twenty-first century businesses, including small businesses, need to sell more American products overseas. Today, our businesses export more than ever, and exporters tend to pay their workers higher wages. But as we speak, China wants to write the rules for the world's fastest-growing region. That would put our workers and our businesses at a disadvantage. Why would we let that happen?

We should write those rules. We should level the playing field. That is why I am asking both parties to give me trade promotion authority to protect American workers with strong new trade deals from Asia to Europe that aren't just free but are also fair. It is the right thing to do.

Look, I am the first one to admit that past trade deals haven't always lived up to the hype, and that is why we have gone after countries that break the rules at our expense. But 95 percent of the world's customers live outside our borders. We can't close ourselves off from those opportunities. More than half of manufacturing executives have said they are actively looking to bring jobs back from China. Let's give them one more reason to get it done.

Twenty-first century businesses will rely on American science and technology, research and development. I want the country that eliminated polio and mapped the human genome to lead a new era of medicine, one that delivers the right treatment at the right time. In some patients with cystic fibrosis, this approach has reversed a disease once thought unstoppable. So tonight, I am launching a new Precision Medicine Initiative to bring us closer to curing diseases like cancer and diabetes, and to give all of us access to the personalized information we need to keep ourselves and our families healthier. We can do this.

I intend to protect a free and open Internet, extend its reach to every classroom and every community, and help folks build the fastest networks so that the next generation of digital innovators and entrepreneurs have the platform to keep reshaping our world.

I want Americans to win the race for the kinds of discoveries that unleash new jobs: converting sunlight into liquid fuel; creating revolutionary prosthetics so that a veteran who gave his arms for his country can play catch with his kids again; pushing out into the solar system not just to visit, but to stay.

Now, last month, we launched a new spacecraft as part of a reenergized space program that will send American astronauts to Mars; and in 2 months, to prepare us for those missions, Scott Kelly will begin a year-long stay in space.

So good luck, Captain. Make sure to Instagram it. We are proud of you.

Now, the truth is, when it comes to issues like infrastructure and basic research, I know there is bipartisan support in this Chamber. Members of both parties have told me so. Where we too often run onto the rocks is how to pay for these investments.

As Americans, we don't mind paying our fair share of taxes as long as everybody else does too. But for far too long, lobbyists have rigged the Tax Code with loopholes that let some corporations pay nothing while others pay full freight. They have riddled it with giveaways that the superrich don't need while denying a break to middle class families who do.

This year, we have an opportunity to change that. Let's close loopholes so we stop rewarding companies that keep profits abroad and reward those that invest here in America. Let's use those savings to rebuild our infrastructure and to make it more attractive for companies to bring jobs home. Let's simplify the system and let a small business owner file based on her actual bank statement instead of the number of accountants she can afford. And let's close the loopholes that lead to inequality, by allowing the top 1 percent to avoid paying taxes on their accumulated wealth. We can use that money to

help more families pay for child care and send their kids to college.

We need a Tax Code that truly helps working Americans try to get a leg up in the new economy. And we can achieve that together. We can achieve it together.

Helping hardworking families make ends meet, giving them the tools they need for good-paying jobs in this new economy, and maintaining the conditions of growth and competitiveness, this is where America needs to go. I believe it is where the American people want to go. It will make our economy stronger a year from now, 15 years from now, and deep into the century ahead.

Of course, if there is one thing this new century has taught us, it is that we cannot separate our work here at home from challenges beyond our shores.

My first duty as Commander in Chief is to defend the United States of America. In doing so, the question is not whether America leads in the world, but how. When we make rash decisions—reacting to the headlines instead of using our heads—when the first response to a challenge is to send in our military, then we risk getting drawn into unnecessary conflicts and neglect the broader strategy we need for a safer, more prosperous world. That is what our enemies want us to do.

I believe in a smarter kind of American leadership. We lead best when we combine military power with strong diplomacy, when we leverage our power with coalition building, when we don't let our fears blind us to the opportunities that this new century presents. That is exactly what we are doing right now, and around the globe, it is making a difference.

First, we stand united with people around the world who have been targeted by terrorists, from a school in Pakistan to the streets of Paris. We will continue to hunt down terrorists and dismantle their networks; and we reserve the right to act unilaterally, as we have done relentlessly since I took office, to take out terrorists who pose a direct threat to us and our allies.

At the same time, we have learned some costly lessons over the last 13 years.

Instead of Americans patrolling the valleys of Afghanistan, we have trained their security forces, who have now taken the lead; and we have honored our troops' sacrifice by supporting that country's first democratic transition.

Instead of sending large ground forces overseas, we are partnering with nations from south Asia to north Africa to deny safe haven to terrorists who threaten America. In Iraq and Syria, American leadership, including our military power, is stopping ISIL's advance.

Instead of getting dragged into another ground war in the Middle East,

we are leading a broad coalition, including Arab nations, to degrade and ultimately destroy this terrorist group. We are also supporting a moderate opposition in Syria that can help us in this effort and are assisting people everywhere who stand up to the bankrupt ideology of violent extremism.

Now, this effort will take time. It will require focus. But we will succeed. And tonight, I call on this Congress to show the world that we are united in this mission by passing a resolution to authorize the use of force against ISIL. We need that authority.

Second, we are demonstrating the power of American strength and diplomacy. We are upholding the principle that bigger nations can't bully the small, by opposing Russian aggression and supporting Ukraine's democracy and reassuring our NATO allies.

Last year, as we were doing the hard work of imposing sanctions, along with our allies, as we were reinforcing our presence with the frontline States, Mr. Putin's aggression, it was suggested, was a masterful display of strategy and strength. That is what I heard from some folks. Well, today it is America that stands strong and united with our allies, while Russia is isolated with its economy in tatters.

That is how America leads—not with bluster but with persistent, steady resolve.

In Cuba, we are ending a policy that was long past its expiration date. When what you are doing doesn't work for 50 years, it is time to try something new. Our shift in Cuba policy has the potential to end a legacy of mistrust in our hemisphere. It removes a phony excuse for restrictions in Cuba, stands up for democratic values, and extends the hand of friendship to the Cuban people.

And this year, Congress should begin the work of ending the embargo. As His Holiness, Pope Francis, has said, diplomacy is the work of "small steps." These small steps have added up to new hope for the future in Cuba.

And after years in prison, we are overjoyed that Alan Gross is back home where he belongs.

Welcome home, Alan. We are glad you are here.

Our diplomacy is at work with respect to Iran where, for the first time in a decade, we have halted the progress of its nuclear program and reduced its stockpile of nuclear material. Between now and this spring, we have a chance to negotiate a comprehensive agreement that prevents a nuclear-armed Iran, secures America and our allies—including Israel—while avoiding yet another Middle East conflict.

There are no guarantees that negotiations will succeed, and I keep all options on the table to prevent a nuclear Iran. But new sanctions passed by this Congress at this moment in time will all but guarantee that diplomacy fails—alienating America from its allies, making it harder to maintain

sanctions, and ensuring that Iran starts up its nuclear program again.

It doesn't make sense, and that is why I will veto any new sanctions bill that threatens to undo this progress. The American people expect us to only go to war as a last resort, and I intend to stay true to that wisdom.

Third, we are looking beyond the issues that have consumed us in the past to shape the coming century. No foreign nation and no hacker should be able to shut down our networks, steal our trade secrets, or invade the privacy of American families, especially our kids. So we are making sure our government integrates intelligence to combat cyber threats, just as we have done to combat terrorism.

Tonight, I urge this Congress to finally pass the legislation we need to better meet the evolving threat of cyber attacks, combat identity theft, and protect our children's information. That should be a bipartisan effort.

If we don't act, we will leave our Nation and our economy vulnerable. If we do, we can continue to protect the technologies that have unleashed untold opportunities for people around the globe.

In west Africa, our troops, our scientists, our doctors, our nurses, and our health care workers are rolling back Ebola, saving countless lives and stopping the spread of disease. I could not be prouder of them, and I thank this Congress for your bipartisan support of their efforts.

But the job is not yet done, and the world needs to use this lesson to build a more effective global effort to prevent the spread of future pandemics, invest in smart development, and eradicate extreme poverty.

In the Asia Pacific, we are modernizing alliances while making sure that other nations play by the rules in how they trade, how they resolve maritime disputes, and how they participate in meeting common international challenges like nonproliferation and disaster relief; and no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change.

2014 was the planet's warmest year on record. Now, 1 year doesn't make a trend, but this does: 14 of the 15 warmest years on record have all fallen in the first 15 years of this century.

I have heard some folks try to dodge the evidence by saying they are not scientists and that we don't have enough information to act. Well, I am not a scientist either, but you know what, I know a lot of really good scientists at NASA, at NOAA, and at our major universities.

The best scientists in the world are all telling us that our activities are changing the climate, and if we don't act forcefully, we will continue to see rising oceans; longer, hotter heat waves; dangerous droughts and floods; and massive disruptions that can trig-

ger greater migration, conflict, and hunger around the globe.

The Pentagon says that climate change poses immediate risks to our national security. We should act like it. That is why, over the past 6 years, we have done more than ever to combat climate change, from the way we produce energy to the way we use it; that is why we have set aside more public lands and waters than any administration in history; and that is why I will not let this Congress endanger the health of our children by turning back the clock on our efforts.

I am determined to make sure that American leadership drives international action. In Beijing, we made an historic announcement. The United States will double the pace at which we cut carbon pollution, and China committed for the first time to limiting their emissions.

Because the world's two largest economies came together, other nations are now stepping up and offering hope that, this year, the world will finally reach an agreement to protect the one planet we have got.

There is one last pillar of our leadership, and that is the example of our values. As Americans, we respect human dignity even when we are threatened, which is why I have prohibited torture and worked to make sure our use of new technology, like drones, is properly constrained.

It is why we speak out against the deplorable anti-Semitism that has resurfaced in certain parts of the world. It is why we continue to reject offensive stereotypes of Muslims, the vast majority of whom share our commitment to peace.

That is why we defend free speech; advocate for political prisoners; and condemn the persecution of women or religious minorities or people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. We do these things not only because they are the right thing to do, but because, ultimately, they will make us safer.

As Americans, we have a profound commitment to justice, so it makes no sense to spend \$3 million per prisoner to keep open a prison that the world condemns and terrorists use to recruit. Since I have been President, we have worked responsibly to cut the population of GTMO in half. Now, it is time to finish the job, and I will not relent in my determination to shut it down. It is not who we are. It is time to close GTMO.

As Americans, we cherish our civil liberties, and we need to uphold that commitment if we want maximum cooperation from other countries and industry in our fight against terrorist networks. So while some have moved on from the debates over our surveillance programs, I have not.

As promised, our intelligence agencies have worked hard with the rec-

ommendations of privacy advocates to increase transparency and build more safeguards against potential abuse. Next month, we will issue a report on how we are keeping our promise to keep our country safe while strengthening privacy.

Looking to the future instead of the past, making sure we match our power with diplomacy and use force wisely, building coalitions to meet new challenges and opportunities, and leading always with the example of our values, that is what makes us exceptional. That is what keeps us strong. That is why we have to keep striving to hold ourselves to the highest of standards: our own.

Just over a decade ago, I gave a speech in Boston where I said that there wasn't a liberal America or a conservative America, or a Black America or a White America, but a United States of America.

I said this because I had seen it in my own life in a nation that gave someone like me a chance; because I grew up in Hawaii, a melting pot of races and customs; because I made Illinois my home, a State of small towns, rich farmlands, and one of the world's great cities, a microcosm of the country where Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—good people of every ethnicity and every faith—share certain bedrock values.

Over the past 6 years the pundits have pointed out more than once that my Presidency hasn't delivered on this vision. How ironic, they say, that our politics seem more divided than ever. It is held up as proof not just of my own flaws—of which there are many—but also as proof that the vision itself is misguided, naive; that there are too many people in this town who actually benefit from partisanship and gridlock for us to ever do anything about it.

I know how tempting such cynicism may be, but I still think the cynics are wrong.

I still believe that we are one people. I still believe that together we can do great things, even when the odds are long. I believe this because over and over, in my 6 years in office, I have seen America at its best. I have seen the hopeful faces of young graduates from New York to California and our newest officers at West Point, Annapolis, Colorado Springs, and New London. I have mourned with grieving families in Tucson and Newtown; in Boston; in West, Texas; and West Virginia.

I have watched Americans beat back adversity from the gulf coast to the Great Plains, from Midwest assembly lines to the Mid-Atlantic seaboard. I have seen something like gay marriage go from a wedge issue used to drive us apart to a story of freedom across our country, a civil right now legal in States that seven in 10 Americans call home.

So I know the good and optimistic and big-hearted generosity of the

American people, who every day live the idea that we are our brother's keeper and our sister's keeper, and I know they expect those of us who serve here to set a better example.

So the question for those of us here tonight is how we—all of us—can better reflect America's hopes.

I have served in Congress with many of you. I know many of you well. There are a lot of good people here, on both sides of the aisle. And many of you have told me that this isn't what you signed up for—arguing past each other on cable shows, the constant fundraising, always looking over your shoulder at how the base will react to every decision.

Imagine if we broke out of these tired old patterns. Imagine if we did something different.

Understand—a better politics isn't one where Democrats abandon their agenda or Republicans simply embrace mine.

A better politics is one where we appeal to each other's basic decency instead of our basest fears. A better politics is one where we debate without demonizing each other, where we talk issues and values and principles and facts rather than gotcha moments or trivial gaffes or fake controversies that have nothing to do with people's daily lives.

A better politics is one where we spend less time drowning in dark money for ads that pull us into the gutter and spend more time lifting young people up with a sense of purpose and possibility, asking them to join in the great mission of building America. If we are going to have arguments, let's have arguments, but let's make them debates worthy of this body and worthy of this country.

We still may not agree on a woman's right to choose, but surely we can agree it is a good thing that teen pregnancies and abortions are nearing all-time lows and that every woman should have access to the health care that she needs.

Yes, passions still fly on immigration, but surely we can all see something of ourselves in the striving young student and agree that no one benefits when a hardworking mom is snatched from her child, and that it is possible to shape a law that upholds our tradition as a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants. I have talked to Republicans and Democrats about that. That is something that we can share.

We may go at it in campaign season, but surely we can agree that the right to vote is sacred, that it is being denied to too many, and that on this 50th anniversary of the great march from Selma to Montgomery and the passage of the Voting Rights Act, we can come together, Democrats and Republicans, to make voting easier for every single American.

We may have different takes on the events of Ferguson and New York, but

surely we can understand a father who fears his son can't walk home without being harassed, and surely we can understand the wife who won't rest until the police officer she married walks through the front door at the end of his shift, and surely we can agree that it is a good thing that for the first time in 40 years the crime rate and the incarceration rate have come down together, and use that as a starting point for Democrats and Republicans, community leaders and law enforcement, to reform America's criminal justice system so that it protects and serves all of us.

That is a better politics. That is how we start rebuilding trust. That is how we move this country forward. That is what the American people want. That is what they deserve.

I have no more campaigns to run. I know, because I won both of them.

My only agenda for the next 2 years is the same as the one I have had since the day I swore an oath on the steps of this Capitol—to do what I believe is best for America.

If you share the broad vision I outlined tonight, I ask you to join me in the work at hand. If you disagree with parts of it, I hope you will at least work with me where you do agree. And I commit to every Republican here tonight that I will not only seek out your ideas, I will seek to work with you to make this country stronger.

Because I want this Chamber, I want this city to reflect the truth—that for all our blind spots and shortcomings, we are a people with the strength and generosity of spirit to bridge divides, to unite in common effort, and to help our neighbors, whether down the street or on the other side of the world.

I want our actions to tell every child, in every neighborhood: Your life matters, and we are committed to improving your life chances, as committed as we are to working on behalf of our own kids.

I want future generations to know that we are a people who see our differences as a great gift, that we are a people who value the dignity and worth of every citizen—man and woman, young and old, Black and White, Latino, Asian, immigrant, Native American, gay, straight, Americans with mental illness or physical disability. Everybody matters. I want them to grow up in a country that shows the world what we still know to be true: that we are still more than a collection of red states and blue states; that we are the United States of America.

I want them to grow up in a country where a young mom can sit down and write a letter to her President with a story that sums up these past 6 years: "It is amazing what you can bounce back from when you have to . . . we are a strong, tight-knit family who has made it through some very, very hard times."

My fellow Americans, we, too, are a strong, tight-knit family. We, too, have made it through some hard times. Fifteen years into this new century, we have picked ourselves up, dusted ourselves off, and begun again the work of remaking America. We have laid a new foundation. A brighter future is ours to write. Let's begin this new chapter—together—and let's start the work right now.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless this country we love.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet; the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, January 19, 2015.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the 114th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Attachment.

(Adopted January 14, 2015)

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Rules of the Committee. The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as is applicable.

(b) Rules of the Subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the

Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as is applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

RULE 2. MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Days. The Committee shall meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The chairman of the Committee may, at his discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the ranking minority member.

(b) Additional Meetings. The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) Notice. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting of the Committee scheduled on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday when the House will be in session shall be announced at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting. The date, time, place, and subject matter of other meetings when the House is in session shall be announced to allow Members to have at least three days notice (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) of such meeting. The date, time, place, and subject matter of all other meetings shall be announced at least 72 hours in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(d) Agenda. The agenda for each Committee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours in advance of such meeting.

(e) Availability of Texts. No bill, recommendation, or other matter shall be considered by the Committee unless the text of the matter, together with an explanation, has been available to members of the Committee for three days (or 24 hours in the case of a substitute for introduced legislation). Such explanation shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the matter to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(f) Waiver. The requirements of subsections (c), (d), and (e) may be waived by a majority of those present and voting (a majority being present) of the Committee or by the chairman with the concurrence of the ranking member, as the case may be.

RULE 3. HEARINGS

(a) Notice. The date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee shall be announced at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing, unless a determination is made in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner.

(b) Memorandum. Each member of the Committee shall be provided, except in the case of unusual circumstances, with a memo-

randum at least 48 hours before each hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the hearing and (2) the names of any witnesses.

(c) Witnesses. (1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least two working days in advance of his or her appearance, sufficient copies, as determined by the chairman of the Committee of a written statement of his or her proposed testimony to provide to members and staff of the Committee, the news media, and the general public. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the chairman. Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of the argument. The chairman of the Committee or the presiding member may waive the requirements of this paragraph or any part thereof.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any federal grant or contract or foreign government contracts and payments related to the subject matter of the hearing received during the current calendar year or either of the two preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. The disclosure shall include (i) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(d) Questioning. (1) The right to interrogate the witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between majority and minority members. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to question witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate a witness until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose. The chairman shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee.

(2) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side. The chairman with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may also permit committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(3) Each member may submit to the chairman of the Committee additional questions for the record, to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the clerk of the Committee no later than ten business days following a hearing. The chairman shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee to the appropriate witness and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record. After consultation with the ranking

minority member, the chairman is authorized to close the hearing record no earlier than 120 days from the date the questions were transmitted to the appropriate witness.

RULE 4. VICE CHAIRMEN; PRESIDING MEMBER

The chairman shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as vice chairman of the Committee, and shall designate a majority member of each subcommittee to serve as vice chairman of each subcommittee. The vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting or hearing, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting or hearing.

RULE 5. OPEN PROCEEDINGS

Except as provided by the Rules of the House, each meeting and hearing of the Committee for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing, shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, consistent with the provisions of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 6. QUORUM

Testimony may be taken and evidence received at any hearing at which there are present not fewer than two members of the Committee in question. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for those actions for which the House Rules require a majority quorum. For the purposes of taking any other action, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 7. OFFICIAL COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) Journal. The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, show those present at each meeting, and include a record of the vote on any question on which a record vote is demanded and a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition voted. A copy of the journal shall be furnished to the ranking minority member.

(2) Record Votes. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. No demand for a record vote shall be made or obtained except for the purpose of procuring a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum. The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form on the Committee's website and in the Committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in Rule XI, clause 2(e) of the Rules of the House, within 24 hours. Such result shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the committee present but not voting. The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may from time to time postpone record votes ordered on amendments to be held at a time certain during the consideration of legislation.

(b) Archived Records. The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3 (b)(3) or

clause 4 (b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The chairman shall consult with the ranking minority member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Establishment. There shall be such standing subcommittees with such jurisdiction and size as determined by the majority party caucus of the Committee. The jurisdiction, number, and size of the subcommittees shall be determined by the majority party caucus prior to the start of the process for establishing subcommittee chairmanships and assignments.

(b) Powers and Duties. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the chairman of the Committee with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(c) Ratio of Subcommittees. The majority caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party members for each subcommittee and the chairman shall negotiate that ratio with the minority party, provided that the ratio of party members on each subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the majority than that of the full Committee, nor shall such ratio provide for a majority of less than two majority members.

(d) Selection of Subcommittee Members. Prior to any organizational meeting held by the Committee, the majority and minority caucuses shall select their respective members of the standing subcommittees.

(e) Ex Officio Members. The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

RULE 9. OPENING STATEMENTS

(a) Written Statements. All written opening statements at hearings and business meetings conducted by the committee shall be made part of the permanent record.

(b) Length. (1) At full committee hearings, the chairman and ranking minority member shall be limited to 5 minutes each for an opening statement, and may designate another member to give an opening statement of not more than 5 minutes. At subcommittee hearings, the subcommittee chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee shall be limited to 5 minutes each for an opening statement. In addition, the full committee chairman and ranking minority member shall each be allocated 5 minutes for an opening statement for themselves or their designees.

(2) At any business meeting of the Committee, statements shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the chairman and ranking minority member (or their respective designee) of the Committee or subcommittee, as applicable, and 3 minutes each for all other members. The chairman may further limit opening statements for Members (including, at the discretion of the Chairman, the chairman and ranking minority member) to one minute.

RULE 10. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND OTHER MATTERS

All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of receipt by the Committee unless action is taken by the full Committee within those two weeks, or by majority vote of the members of the Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee. In the case of legislation or other matter within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, the chairman of the Committee may, in his discretion, refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration, or may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and also refer the matter to one or more additional subcommittees for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction. Such authority shall include the authority to refer such legislation or matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chairman, with the approval of the Committee, from the members of the subcommittees having legislative or oversight jurisdiction.

RULE 11. MANAGING LEGISLATION ON THE HOUSE FLOOR

The chairman, in his discretion, shall designate which member shall manage legislation reported by the Committee to the House.

RULE 12. COMMITTEE PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFF APPOINTMENTS

(a) Delegation of Staff. Whenever the chairman of the Committee determines that any professional staff member appointed pursuant to the provisions of clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who is assigned to such chairman and not to the ranking minority member, by reason of such professional staff member's expertise or qualifications will be of assistance to one or more subcommittees in carrying out their assigned responsibilities, he may delegate such member to such subcommittees for such purpose. A delegation of a member of the professional staff pursuant to this subsection shall be made after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and with the approval of the subcommittee chairman or chairmen involved.

(b) Minority Professional Staff. Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the ranking minority member of the Committee and not to the chairman of the Committee, shall be assigned to such Committee business as the minority party members of the Committee consider advisable.

(c) Additional Staff Appointments. In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee shall be entitled to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the Committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee. Such appointee shall be assigned to such business of the full Committee as the chairman of the Committee considers advisable.

(d) Sufficient Staff. The chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee.

(e) Fair Treatment of Minority Members in Appointment of Committee Staff. The chair-

man shall ensure that the minority members of the Committee are treated fairly in appointment of Committee staff.

(f) Contracts for Temporary or Intermittent Services. Any contract for the temporary services or intermittent service of individual consultants or organizations to make studies or advise the Committee or its subcommittees with respect to any matter within their jurisdiction shall be deemed to have been approved by a majority of the members of the Committee if approved by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee. Such approval shall not be deemed to have been given if at least one-third of the members of the Committee request in writing that the Committee formally act on such a contract, if the request is made within 10 days after the latest date on which such chairman or chairmen, and such ranking minority member or members, approve such contract.

RULE 13. SUPERVISION, DUTIES OF STAFF

(a) Supervision of Majority Staff. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman who, in consultation with the chairmen of the subcommittees, shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(b) Supervision of Minority Staff. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

RULE 14. COMMITTEE BUDGET

(a) Administration of Committee Budget. The chairman of the Committee, in consultation with the ranking minority member, shall for the 114th Congress attempt to ensure that the Committee receives necessary amounts for professional and clerical staff, travel, investigations, equipment and miscellaneous expenses of the Committee and the subcommittees, which shall be adequate to fully discharge the Committee's responsibilities for legislation and oversight.

(b) Monthly Expenditures Report. Committee members shall be furnished a copy of each monthly report, prepared by the chairman for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by the Committee and subcommittees, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel.

RULE 15. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the Committee, the subcommittee chairman, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House.

RULE 16. SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chair of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall

notify the ranking minority member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the Chair shall consult with the ranking minority member at least 72 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority. The chairman shall report to the members of the Committee on the issuance of a subpoena as soon as practicable but in no event later than one week after issuance of such subpoena.

RULE 17. TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Approval of Travel. Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following: (1) the purpose of the travel; (2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (3) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) Approval of Travel by Minority Members and Staff. In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party professional staff for the purpose set out in (a), the prior approval, not only of the chairman but also of the ranking minority member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the ranking minority member in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

RULE 18. WEBSITE

The chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purposes of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain an official website for the purpose of carrying out official responsibilities, including communicating information about the activities of the minority members of the Committee to Committee members and other members of the House.

RULE 19. CONFERENCES

The chairman of the Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the chairman considers it appropriate.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI, the Committee on Rules' rules of procedure for the 114th Congress are transmitted herewith. They were adopted on January 7, 2015 by record vote of 7 yeas and 4 nays.

RULE 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and its subcommittees so far

as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(d) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2.—REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

Regular Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet at 5:00 p.m. on the first day on which votes are scheduled of each week when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair, there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair.

Notice for Regular Meetings

(b) The Chair shall notify in electronic or written form each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting and shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least 24 hours before the time of each regular meeting:

(1) for each bill or resolution scheduled on the agenda for consideration of a rule, a copy of—

(A) the bill or resolution;
(B) any committee reports thereon; and
(C) any available letter requesting a rule for the bill or resolution; and
(2) for each other bill, resolution, report, or other matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the bill, resolution, report, or materials relating to the other matter in question; and

(B) any report on the bill, resolution, report, or any other matter made by any subcommittee of the Committee.

Emergency Meetings

(c)(1) The Chair may call an emergency meeting of the Committee at any time on any measure or matter which the Chair determines to be of an emergency nature; provided, however, that the Chair has made an effort to consult the ranking minority member, or, in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

(2) As soon as possible after calling an emergency meeting of the Committee, the Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the time and location of the meeting.

(3) To the extent feasible, the notice provided under paragraph (2) shall include the agenda for the emergency meeting and copies of available materials which would otherwise have been provided under subsection (b) if the emergency meeting was a regular meeting.

Special Meetings

(d) Special meetings shall be called and convened as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 3.—MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES IN GENERAL

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules).

(4) Before a motion to report a rule is offered, a copy of the language recommended shall be furnished to each member of the Committee.

Quorum

(b)(1) For the purpose of hearing testimony on requests for rules, five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence on measures or matters of original jurisdiction before the Committee, three members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(3) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of: reporting any measure or matter; authorizing a subpoena; closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)); or taking any other action.

Voting

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a majority of the members of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of any member.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) A record of the vote of each member of the Committee on each record vote on any measure or matter before the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours, and with respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

Hearing Procedures

(d)(1) With regard to hearings on matters of original jurisdiction, to the greatest extent practicable:

(A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of the appearance a statement of proposed testimony in written and electronic form and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to a brief summary thereof; and

(B) In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar

years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

(C) The disclosure referred to in subdivision (B) shall include—

(i) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(D) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(2) The five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of each witness before the Committee until each member of the Committee has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(3) The provisions of clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House shall apply to any hearing conducted by the Committee.

Subpoenas and Oaths

(e)(1) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(2) The Chair may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period of longer than three days.

(3) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(4) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

RULE 4.—GENERAL OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of House rule X.

RULE 5.—SUBCOMMITTEES

Establishment and Responsibilities of Subcommittees

(a)(1) There shall be two subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, which shall have general responsibility for measures or matters related to relations between the Congress and the Executive Branch.

(B) Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, which shall have general responsibility for measures or matters related to process and procedures of the House, relations between the two Houses of Congress, relations between the Congress and the Judiciary, and internal operations of the House.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such

other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

Referral of Measures and Matters to Subcommittees

(b)(1) No special order providing for the consideration of any bill or resolution shall be referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

(2) The Chair shall refer to a subcommittee such measures or matters of original jurisdiction as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities.

(3) All other measures or matters of original jurisdiction shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(4) In referring any measure or matter of original jurisdiction to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(5) The Committee by motion may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

Composition of Subcommittees

(c) The size and ratio of each subcommittee shall be determined by the Committee and members shall be elected to each subcommittee, and to the positions of chair and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the full committee may designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chair.

Subcommittee Meetings and Hearings

(d)(1) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it.

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the full Committee is being held.

(3) The chair of each subcommittee shall schedule meetings and hearings of the subcommittee only after consultation with the Chair.

Quorum

(e)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony, two members of the subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) For all other purposes, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of a subcommittee.

Effect of a Vacancy

(f) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee.

Records

(g) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6.—STAFF

In General

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional, and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) The appointment of all professional staff shall be subject to the approval of the Committee as provided by, and subject to the provisions of, clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

Associate Staff

(b) Associate staff for members of the Committee may be appointed only at the discretion of the Chair (in consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party associate staff), after taking into account any staff ceilings and budgetary constraints in effect at the time, and any terms, limits, or conditions established by the Committee on House Administration under clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

Subcommittee Staff

(c) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee, that the minority party of the Committee is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

Compensation of Staff

(d) The Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff.

Certification of Staff

(e)(1) To the extent any staff member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees does not work under the direct supervision and direction of the Chair, the member of the Committee who supervises and directs the staff member's work shall file with the Chief of Staff of the Committee (not later than the tenth day of each month) a certification regarding the staff member's work for that member for the preceding calendar month.

(2) The certification required by paragraph (1) shall be in such form as the Chair may prescribe, shall identify each staff member by name, and shall state that the work engaged in by the staff member and the duties assigned to the staff member for the member of the Committee with respect to the month in question met the requirements of clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

(3) Any certification of staff of the Committee, or any of its subcommittees, made by the Chair in compliance with any provision of law or regulation shall be made—

(A) on the basis of the certifications filed under paragraph (1) to the extent the staff is not under the Chair's supervision and direction, and

(B) on his own responsibility to the extent the staff is under the Chair's direct supervision and direction.

RULE 7. BUDGET, TRAVEL, PAY OF WITNESSES

Budget

(a) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

Travel

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the

Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

Pay of Witnesses

(c) Witnesses may be paid from funds made available to the Committee in its expense resolution subject to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 8.—COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION REPORTING

(a) Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee—

(1) The Chair or acting Chair shall report it to the House or designate a member of the Committee to do so.

(2) In the case of a bill or resolution in which the Committee has original jurisdiction, the Chair shall allow, to the extent that the anticipated floor schedule permits, any member of the Committee a reasonable amount of time to submit views for inclusion in the Committee report on the bill or resolution. Any such report shall contain all matters required by the Rules of the House of Representatives (or by any provision of law enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House) and such other information as the Chair deems appropriate.

(3) In the case of a resolution providing for consideration of a measure, the Committee report accompanying such resolution shall include an accurate explanation of any waivers of points of order, including a detailed explanation of all points of order.

Records

(b)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and

distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

Audio and Video Coverage

(c) The Chair shall provide, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) complete and unedited audio and video broadcasts of all committee hearings and meetings; and

(2) for distribution of such broadcasts and unedited recordings thereof to the public and for the storage of audio and video recordings of the proceedings. Proceedings shall be broadcast live on the Majority Committee website and recordings shall be made available on such website within one calendar day of the proceeding.

Committee Publications on the Internet

(d) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

Journal

(e)(1) The Committee shall maintain a Committee Journal, which shall include all bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to or reported by the Committee and all bills, resolutions, and other matters reported by any other committee on which a rule has been granted or formally requested, and such other matters as the Chair shall direct. The Journal shall be published periodically, but in no case less often than once in each session of Congress.

(2) A rule is considered as formally requested when the Chairman of a committee of primary jurisdiction which has reported a bill or resolution (or a member of such committee authorized to act on the Chairman's behalf):

(A) has requested, in writing to the Chair, that a hearing be scheduled on a rule for the consideration of the bill or resolution; and

(B) has supplied the Committee with the bill or resolution, as reported, together with the final committee report thereon.

Other Procedures

(f) The Chair may establish such other Committee procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out these rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee and its subcommittees in a manner consistent with these rules.

RULE 9.—AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended or repealed, in the same manner and method as prescribed for the adoption of committee rules in clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each Member at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting at which the vote on the change occurs. Any such change in the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after their approval.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

79. A letter from the Principal Military Deputy, Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice that the Navy intends to donate the historic destroyer ex-Charles F. Adams (DDG 2) to the Jacksonville Historic Naval Ship Association for permanent berthing and public display; to the Committee on Armed Services.

80. A letter from the Speaker, Okinawa Prefectural Assembly, transmitting a resolution Requesting the Relinquishment of a Plan to Build a New Military Base in Henoko, Based Upon Respect for the Will of the Prefectural Citizens; to the Committee on Armed Services.

81. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-458, "Protecting Pregnant Workers Fairness Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

82. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-440, "Special Election Reform Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

83. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, and management's response, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

84. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod Pot Gear Fishing Closure in the Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone in the Bering Sea; Amendment 103 [Docket No.: 120706220-4964-02] (RIN: 0648-BC34) received January 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

85. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Chinook Salmon Bycatch Management in the Gulf of Alaska Non-Pollock Trawl Fisheries; Amendment 97 [Docket No.: 130710606-4972-02] (RIN: 0648-BD48) received January 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

86. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2015 Atlantic Shark Commercial Fishing Seasons [Docket No.: 140429387-4971-02] (RIN: 0648-XD276) received January 8,

2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

87. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — List of Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.: 1140325271-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE13) received January 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

88. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Periodic Updates of Regulatory References to Technical Standards and Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0337; Amdt. Nos. 192-119; 193-25; 195-99; 198-6; 199-26] (RIN: 2137-AE85) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

89. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30994; Amdt. No. 517] received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

90. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Revisions to Direct Fee Payment Rules [Docket No.: SSA-2010-0025] (RIN: 0960-AH21) received January 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 38. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-3). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 405. A bill to require greater accountability in discretionary and direct spending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 406. A bill to amend section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide incentives for the development of

new combination drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 407. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 408. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 409. A bill to reinstate the 10-year statute of limitations period applicable to collection of amounts paid to Social Security beneficiaries by administrative offset, and prevent recovery of overpayments from individuals under 18 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 410. A bill to provide family members and close associates of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 411. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote early voting in elections for Federal office and to prevent unreasonable waiting times for voters at polling places used in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 412. A bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BERA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COLE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 413. A bill to establish the American Infrastructure Fund, to provide bond guarantees and make loans to States, local governments, and infrastructure providers for investments in certain infrastructure projects, and to provide equity investments in such projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 414. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain additional disclosure requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DOGETT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 416. A bill to amend chapter 178 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit during a 4-year period States to enact statutes that exempt from the operation of such chapter, lotteries, sweepstakes, and other betting, gambling, or wagering schemes involving professional and amateur sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 417. A bill to reduce the total number of civil service employees in the executive branch of the Government through attrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 418. A bill to amend the securities laws to require that registration statements, quarterly and annual reports, and proxy solicitations of public companies include a disclosure to shareholders of any expenditure made by that company in support of or in opposition to any candidate for Federal, State, or local public office; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 419. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 420. A bill to establish a certification process for opting out of the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOHIO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BENISHEK, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 421. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the mental health treatment provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to veterans who served in classified missions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FARR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr.

ISRAEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HECK of Washington).

H.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LIPINSKI introduced a bill (H.R. 422) for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

Additionally, since the Constitution does not provide Congress with the power to provide financial support to U.S. political parties, the general repeal of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund for this purpose is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendments IX and X to the United States Constitution.

Further, Article I Section 8 defines the scope and powers of Congress and does not include this concept of taxation in furtherance of funding U.S. political parties within the expressed powers.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of The Constitution of the United States of America

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

As it is the purpose of the government of the United States to protect and defend the natural and inalienable rights of the American citizen, it is necessary and proper for the Congress to legislate, when necessary, to ensure the ability of the citizenry to keep and bear arms and to travel with such arms while taking reasonable precautions to ensure the safety of his/her fellows and to respect state and local laws.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization". The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), "that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government." And, as the Court found in *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting *Boutilier v. INS*, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), "[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress' 'plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.'"

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.J. Res. 22.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 36: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BOST, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. BARTON.
 H.R. 114: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 154: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 158: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 159: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 160: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. HARDY, Mr. PALMER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 161: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SALMON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 173: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
 H.R. 174: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 178: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 179: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 199: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 213: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. STEFANK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. VALADAO, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 226: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 232: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. PIN-GREE, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 242: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 247: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 248: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. JONES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 249: Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 254: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 258: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 264: Ms. MOORE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 304: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 315: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 346: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 348: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 353: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 374: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 381: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 399: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 402: Mr. BARR, Mr. DENT, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. MESSER.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 11: Mr. WOODALL.

H. Res. 12: Ms. BASS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. YODER.

H. Res. 28: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 37: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 36 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 161 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mrs. ELLMERS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING BLACK JANUARY

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Co-Chairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I want to honor the people of Azerbaijan by recognizing the tragic events of 1990 commonly referred to as "Black January."

Twenty-four years ago yesterday, approximately 26,000 heavily armored Soviet soldiers poured into Azerbaijan's capital city of Baku and, with total indifference to human life, launched an assault on a crowd of peaceful demonstrators. Ultimately 131 civilians were killed by the aggressing Soviets. In addition, over 600 were injured, 841 arrested, and 5 went missing.

The Human Rights Watch report "Black January in Azerbaijan" described the Soviet's approach as though they were attacking "an enemy position intended for military destruction." It states Soviet soldiers fired on clearly marked ambulances, crushed civilians with armored tanks, and used both automatic weapons and bayonets on the civilian population. Many believe that the destruction inflicted on Baku was a warning to other Republics of the Soviet Union in an attempt to stop the dissolution of Communist rule.

Ultimately, the atrocities of Black January united Azerbaijan like never before. The brutal show of force erased any residual hope for a reformed Soviet Union, such that Azerbaijan declared its independence twenty months later.

I thank the Azerbaijan people for their continued friendship with the United States and extend my deepest sympathies to the family and friends of those who lost their lives for the independence of Azerbaijan.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF AIR
FORCE CHIEF MASTER SER-
GEANT JAY A. WILSON**HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Chief Master Sergeant Jay A. Wilson, United States Air Force for his 26 years of service to our nation and to congratulate him on his announced retirement.

Chief Master Sergeant Wilson is the Mission Director in the Enterprise Operations Squadron, Enterprise Management Operations Center, National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) in Chantilly, Virginia. As the first enlisted member entrusted as a Mission Director, he leads 65 joint military, civilian and contractor teams and

manages two separate 24 hour, 7 day a week operations centers that command and control a \$10 billion global network. Wilson also serves as the NRO Air Force Reserve Senior Enlisted Advisor and he mentors over 65 reservists in support of the NRO.

Chief Wilson began his Air Force career in May 1973 entering under the delayed enlistment program. He reported to Lackland AFB, TX for Basic Military Training in September 1973. After serving on Active Duty for nearly four years, he separated from the Air Force in June 1977. In July 1991 Chief Wilson returned to the Air Force, as a Communications/Computer Systems Controller joining the California Air National Guard's 234th Combat Communications Squadron, Hayward, Calif. Four years later, a civilian job change brought Chief Wilson to the 231st CCSQ of the Washington D.C. Air National Guard. In May 1999, the 231st CCSQ was activated under Presidential orders for deployment to Bosnia. In November 1999, Chief Wilson transferred to the Air Force Reserve as an Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) with the Defense Information Services Agency as a Watch Officer in the newly formed Joint Task Force for Computer Network Defense (JTF-CND). In 2002, Chief Wilson transferred to the NRO as a Watch Commander, National Reconnaissance Operations Center (NROC) and in 2010 Chief Wilson became Mission Director in the Enterprise Operations Squadron.

During his service to our nation, Jay has received multiple awards and decorations including: Defense Meritorious Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Joint Service Achievement Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal, Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal with two devices, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Armed Forces Reserve Medal with 'M' device.

A model citizen-airman, Jay has actively volunteered and held positions in multiple military and veteran affiliated organizations. He served on and trained new recruits for the NRO Honor Guard. He has been an active member of the American Legion and was his local post's Sergeant at Arms and Color Guard lead. He has also served the American Legion at the District level. As a member of the American Legion's 16th District he has served as Sergeant at Arms and Honor Flight Committee Chair. He organizes and officiates for the Manassas Veteran's Day Parade. He served as the Sergeant at Arms for the Potomac Regional Veteran's Council, conducting ceremonies at Quantico. He has routinely taught flag etiquette to the eighth grade class at All Saints Catholic School. He has also been an active member and organizer in the 40 and 8 Society holding the position of the Guard de la Porte at the state and national level. Finally,

he has served on the 40 and 8 Society's National Convention Planning Committee and has had the distinct honor of carrying the U.S. flag into and out of the Amphitheater during the Memorial Day Service at the National Cemetery at Arlington.

Chief Master Sergeant Wilson has excelled throughout his distinguished career and I am honored to pay tribute to this Airman. I thank Chief Master Sergeant Jay Wilson, his wife, Gail, and their daughters, Genevieve and Catherine, for their service to our country. I wish them Godspeed, and continued happiness as they start a new chapter in their lives.

DR. POATE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dr. John M. Poate for his prominent career and service to energy conservation and environmental research. For over fifty years Dr. Poate has been active in research and development in the renewable energy sector. His personal research activities span several areas of solid state physics, materials science and engineering. He led a distinguished research career at Bell Labs where he headed the Silicon Processing Research Department. Since then he has served as Dean at New Jersey Institute of Technology, Chief Technology Officer of a semiconductor capital equipment company, and the vice president of Research and Technology Transfer at the Colorado School of Mines.

Dr. Poate has served on many advisory panels during his career such as NATO, NSF, NRC, DOE and International Universities. He continues his work on the Board of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and chairing the Director's Review Committee for the Physical and Life Sciences of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. He is a Fellow of the American Physical Society and Materials Research Society, MRS past-president, and the John Bardeen award winner of the TMS.

To say he is an accomplished research scientist is an understatement. Dr. Poate's dedication and enthusiasm for research is reflected in his authorship of over 300 publications in archival journals as well as 12 patents.

I extend my deepest thanks to Dr. Poate for his service to the science community. Thank you for your continuous dedication to research.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATED
SERVICE OF NORTHWEST FLOR-
IDA'S JANIS K. SIMMONS

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Northwest Florida's Janis K. Simmons upon the occasion of her retirement from the Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS), Santa Rosa County Extension Office, after more than thirty-two years of dedicated service.

A lifelong resident of Florida's First Congressional District, Mrs. Simmons was born to Easter and Bennie Harris and was raised in Chumuckla, Florida. After graduating from Chumuckla High School, she attended Pensacola Junior College and began working for her father's business, Harris Masonry. After gaining valuable experience at Harris Masonry, Mrs. Simmons and her husband, Bobby, established Simmons Masonry, which they successfully operated for ten years.

In 1982, the IFAS Santa Rosa County Extension Office welcomed Mrs. Simmons to its team. Mrs. Simmons served as the Jay Office Secretary for nearly thirty-three years and assisted the office in a myriad of ways. Throughout her career, whether it was through her work with the Santa Rosa Pest Management Association, her assistance with local farmers in processing their applications, bookkeeping, providing financial management, or maintaining permit files and regulations, her diligence never wavered, and she proved to be an invaluable asset to the Santa Rosa County Extension Service.

IFAS employees will forever remember Mrs. Simmons for her willingness to help others and her famous spaghetti meals. As she leaves behind a career that has touched the lives of thousands in Northwest Florida, Mrs. Simmons looks forward to continuing to serve her church, Ebenezer Church, in a greater capacity, gardening, and most of all, spending time with her grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to congratulate Janis K. Simmons on her retirement and thank her for her service to Northwest Florida. My wife Vicki and I wish her and her husband, Bobby; sons, Steven and Dale; and grandchildren, Lela, Brayden, and Makenna all the best.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID LOESACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. LOESACK. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable absence from the House floor, I was unable to vote on the bills under consideration Wednesday, January 14, 2015. I would like to submit how I would have voted.

On final passage of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Businesses Burdens Act, I would have voted no.

On final passage of H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act and the five amendments offered by the Majority I would have voted no. While I strongly support the underlying bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security, I could not support the bill after the Majority added amendments that would put our nation's security at risk in order to make political points.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER MILLER

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Jennifer Miller, who has worked tirelessly both in my personal office and for the Appropriations Committee for the last twenty-five years.

Jennifer returned to her Kentucky roots when she began her career in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1989 by joining my personal office staff. In 1996, she was asked to join the staff of the Appropriations Committee and since then she has worked diligently for various subcommittees, as well as in the front office. Most recently she has been responsible for the oversight of the intelligence community's budget for the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Jennifer is a dedicated and passionate professional. She knows the Congressional rules and the legislative process better than anyone. She has always been willing to put the Committee first and has sacrificed countless hours, weeks, and years to further enhance the work of the Committee. Nothing better exemplifies her dedication than when in March 2007, Jennifer remained at my side in the Committee hearing room during a mark-up of a supplemental bill for two hours longer than planned, leaving her short on time to catch a flight to Italy—for her wedding! Thankfully she made it to the airport in time, and now has a supportive husband, Pete, as well as a cherished daughter, Emma.

More recently, Jennifer again displayed her true dedication to the Committee during the first several months that I was Chairman, by not only working for the Defense Subcommittee but also in the front office, aiding with the transition process and assembling the current fiscal year's consolidated appropriations bill. To this day she continues to use her indispensable knowledge by assisting other subcommittees through the legislative process and particularly when Committee bills are being debated on the House floor.

I have said before, and I will say again, the Appropriations Committee has the best staff on Capitol Hill. However, hopefully just this once, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is gaining traction by hiring Jennifer away from us. I will miss Jennifer's contributions and leadership; but we thank her for her dedication and wish her well in her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD O. "DICK"
DEIGNAN

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute an extraordinary Hoosier, Richard O. "Dick" Deignan, who passed away on January 13, 2015. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his and his late wife Joan's leadership and service in my hometown of Munster, Indiana, in the Indianapolis, Indiana community and in other parts of our state.

First, Mr. Deignan was willing to put the welfare of his fellow Americans above his own self interests. His service aboard the USS *Hugh Purvis* as a sailor in the United States Navy remained one of his proudest achievements and an obligation he was happy to undertake to ensure that our nation remained free and his children and grandchildren were afforded the same liberty promised by our Founding Fathers.

Mr. Deignan was an astute businessman and well known in our community, not only as a Burger King franchise owner, but for the way he trained his employees, many of whom were seeking their first job. He sought to hire high-quality employees, train them well and empower them. In doing so, what he really did was help grow responsible members of the community.

Dick built his business from nothing. Starting out, he had very little wealth or other resources. But what he, and so many others who have helped build and maintain this great country had, was a dream and the tireless work ethic to make it reality. He also recognized that what he and Joan built couldn't be done just anywhere in the world. Dick understood, and always promoted, our exceptionalism as the reason the United States had the ability to be the freest, most prosperous nation world history had ever seen, and the greatest force for good on earth.

In his free time, he was a staunch advocate and supporter of the Munster Booster Club, aiding the purchase of athletic and scholastic equipment and supplies for the Munster School System.

As a close friend of the Deignan children, Kerry and Owen, I quickly came to know the entire family, who lived on Chestnut Lane in Munster for years. They were typical of the best of American families, having and practicing the values we often talk about on this very floor.

Joan Deignan was one of the best teachers I had in grade school. And Dick was the very first community leader to support my successful bid for Indiana Secretary of State. They believed in me as a product of a community in which they believed even more.

Mr. Deignan leaves two children and three grandchildren to carry on his legacy of community service and joins Joan, in eternity. On behalf of Hoosiers, I am humbled to honor Dick here today. He will be missed for his friendship, leadership, work ethic and his character. His legacy is evidence that hard work

combined with the opportunities of American exceptionalism can lead to the realization of the American Dream, however an individual wants to define it. Rest in peace my friend, and thank you for your example and leadership.

RECOGNIZING MR. BOB GODSHALL

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend of mine, Pennsylvania State Representative Bob Godshall for the 50 years of service he has given to our community, and the state of Pennsylvania. Representative Godshall has served 32 years in the Pennsylvania Legislature representing the 53rd District in Montgomery County, PA—an area which encompasses the Indian Valley portion of my Congressional District.

Prior to his work in the legislature, Bob served 3 years as Montgomery County Controller, and 17 years on the Souderton School Board. He also served 3 years as Montgomery County Open Space Director, where he helped bring Montgomery County's beautiful park system to fruition. Bob was also instrumental in the creation of the United States Constitution Center in Philadelphia—a place where thousands of visitors come to pay tribute to the founding fathers each year.

NOTING LOS ANGELES CITY DESIGNATION OF JANUARY 16, 2015 AS DR. LA-DORIS MCCLANEY DAY

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize and celebrate the designation of January 16, 2015 by the City of Los Angeles, California as Dr. La-Doris McClanley Day, in honor of the noteworthy career and remarkable generosity of La-Doris McClanley, Ph.D.

The McClanley family has risen from the humblest of roots: Dr. McClanley's mother, Eula McClanley, grew up picking cotton with her sharecropper parents in Orion, Alabama and was self-educated after the sixth grade. Nonetheless, a powerful drive to succeed, personal discipline, strong faith, and a talent for entrepreneurship built a real estate business that allowed Mrs. McClanley and her family not only to thrive but also to lift others as they climbed.

La-Doris McClanley and her late sister Burnie McClanley worked with their mother to expand both their business and their philanthropy across six states, donating buildings and money to improve the lives of others. Dr. La-Doris McClanley shares both her mother's aptitude for business and her deep commitment to charitable works. Over her 40-year career in real estate and philanthropy, Dr. McClanley has contributed 10% of her gross

income to charities large and small, amounting to many millions of dollars. She gives of herself as well, writing, and lecturing, assisting families in need, and mentoring African American college students and sponsoring their tuition. Dr. McClanley holds a masters degree from Pepperdine University and a doctorate degree from Bethune Cookman College, and the themes of education and health research emerge from a brief review of those receiving her charitable contributions: American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, American Lung Association, Bethune Cookman College, The Christian Broadcasting Network, City of Hope, King Drew School of Medicine, Save African's Children, and the United Negro College Fund, among many others.

Dr. McClanley has been recognized over 500 times with commendations, awards, resolutions and honors for her many good works. I congratulate her and I commend the City of Los Angeles for celebrating her many contributions.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,079,608,395,519.69. We've added \$7,452,731,346,606.61 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

VICTOR LOVELADY—THE AMERICAN BREED

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, two years ago, one of my constituents—Mr. Victor Lovelady—was killed in Algeria after being taken captive by terrorists. Before his death, Victor displayed some of the very best qualities of the American spirit: courage, compassion, and selflessness. I would like to take a moment to tell you his story.

Like many Americans, Victor Lovelady was a hard worker who put in long hours to provide for his family of four. For most of his life, Victor worked as an industrial engineer and master electrician in his hometown of Nederland, Texas.

However, when work in his area slowed, he spent nearly three years traveling back and forth daily to work in Houston from Nederland. He did this so that his children would not have to change schools. The 150 mile round trip was an hour and a half each way. After his kids finished high school, Victor moved to

Atascocita, Texas (25 miles north of Houston) where I live Congressional District 2. Victor never had a pension plan and always had to pay his family's insurance by himself. He never had more than two weeks off in a year. He longed to be able to retire and spend more time with his wife and children.

When Victor was given the opportunity to work overseas for British Petroleum he weighed the pros and cons. He knew a few years at this new job would provide him with enough money to retire and be with his family. He also believed that working in Africa would be safe.

On January 9, 2013, Victor arrived in the remote area of In Amenas, Algeria to begin his new job at the BP Gas facility. In the early hours of January 16th, an army of gun-wielding terrorists crashed their trucks through the gates of the gas plant. Within minutes they had seized control of the facility and held hundreds of its employees hostage. Victor Lovelady and several other workers were having tea when suddenly a colleague entered the cantina with a gunshot wound to his stomach. The man had been shot when Mokhtar Belmokhtar's al-Qaeda linked terrorists stormed the facility and opened fire on the innocent workers.

Putting thoughts of himself aside and disregarding the sound of gunfire, Victor began cleaning and dressing the man's wound. Victor then hid him in a food container for his safety.

Even as the sound of gunshots grew louder and louder, Victor immediately lifted other men into the cantina's false ceiling to hide them from the attackers. In total, Victor secretly secured three men into the ceiling hiding spot. Heavily armed jihadists were going room to room at the plant to capture victims. Only when it sounded like the militants had finally entered the cantina did Victor quickly try to hide and save himself. Unfortunately, he fell and injured his ankle attempting to climb into the ceiling. Moments later, the terrorists captured him and held him hostage. The facility was under the control of the terrorists for three grueling days. Hostages were rounded up one by one, handcuffed and strapped with explosive devices. The terrorists were threatening to blow them up if the U.S. and Algeria did not release jihadi prisoners.

Sadly, Victor was killed when Algerian military forces moved in to rescue the victims and attack the terrorists. In total 40 civilians from 10 countries were killed by the terrorists and in the rescue attempt. 29 terrorists were also killed.

Victor's selfless and heroic actions saved four lives that day. A once ordinary man became extraordinary in the face of danger and violence. Courage like this should be applauded and remembered. This is why I nominated Mr. Lovelady for the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The Presidential Medal of Freedom is our nation's highest civilian honor and recognizes individuals who have made "an especially meritorious contribution" to our society. It is clear that Victor Lovelady not only meets, but exceeds this standard.

The events in Algeria last year have disappeared from public view in the sands of time. The media has moved on to other tragic events. There have been more terrorist attacks throughout the world. Americans and

non-Americans have been murdered. But it is the Americans such as Victor that we should always remember and honor. While we continue to mourn their loss we should, to paraphrase General George Patton: "Thank God that such people ever lived."

Two years after his death, Victor Lovelady may not be a household name, but there is no doubt that he is an American hero. He worked hard to provide an honest living and when in danger, thought first to protect others instead of himself. When people hear Victor's story today, they are inspired because of his acts of bravery, conviction, and compassion—in other words, to act as a true American. Four people live today, because Victor died hiding them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and all of our colleagues take a moment today to remember the heroism of Victor Lovelady. Our prayers are also with his wife, Maureen, and his two children, Erin and Grant, who carry on his legacy. I am honored to call this Texan my constituent and we will continue to honor the sacrifice he made as a courageous husband, father, and American.

Victor Lovelady was from an amazing breed—the American breed.

And that's just the way it is.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF WSEC/PBS SPRINGFIELD

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, later this month, on January 31, WSEC/PBS Springfield will celebrate 30 years of quality and educational television broadcasting in the Springfield and Jacksonville, Illinois area.

For three decades, PBS Springfield has delivered a service known for excellence in programming to the people of West Central Illinois. Their mission to impact children's literacy and their commitment to the lifelong learning of adults have impacted thousands of people across the viewing area.

Learning and literacy have been at the forefront of this station's values. Over the years, they have sponsored numerous events such as training workshops to help parents and teachers use television as a tool for teaching kids about music, art, and reading.

Over the past 30 years, PBS Springfield has enriched communities by building partnerships with local organizations. Through its First Book Program, PBS Springfield has impacted the hundreds of families by distributing free books to underprivileged children.

As someone who grew up watching PBS, and as the father of three children who also enjoyed their shows, I recognize the importance of educational programming for our children and I thank PBS Springfield for its commitment to education. To everyone at PBS Springfield, congratulations on 30 successful years on the air.

IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN TERRY TIMLEY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a respected public servant, outstanding citizen, and dear friend, Captain Terry Timley. Sadly, Captain Timley passed away on Saturday, January 10, 2015. Funeral services were held on Friday, January 16, 2015 at 1:00 p.m., at the Macon Centreplex in Macon, Georgia.

Captain Timley worked for almost 38 years in the Macon Police Department, which consolidated with the sheriff's office in January 2014 to become the Bibb County Sheriff's Office. He was the head of Criminal Investigations of Property Crimes within the Criminal Investigations Division.

Captain Timley devoted nearly four decades of dedicated service to the people of Macon through his meaningful contribution of energy, skill, and genuine passion. In 2013, the Macon Police Department presented Captain Timley with a Distinguished Service Award along with a Merit Award in recognition of his noble commitment to the safety of his community as well as the lasting impact he made within the workplace. Beyond these achievements and the respect held for him by his peers in law enforcement, he was an honorable human being who loved deeply and, in return, was deeply loved.

Maya Angelou once said, "A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies." Captain Timley is one such great soul, who served humanity in a special way. Each day he graced the people around him with an enthusiastic sincerity of presence. His impression on this earth extends beyond himself to the very wellbeing of the Macon community, and for it he will be remembered by the community for time to come.

On a personal note, my staff and I will always remember and cherish the times Captain Timley would poke his head into our Macon District Office to check on us just to see how we were doing and offer his help.

Captain Timley is survived by his wife, Gwendolyn; children, Terry, Jr. and Tyler; siblings, Walter, William, Thelma, Jerry, and Raymond; and a host of other family members and friends.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 700,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Captain Terry Timley for his dedicated service and exceptional impact on Macon, Georgia. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Captain Timley's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING BASEBALL LEGEND CARL RUSSELL LONG

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today it is with a heavy heart that I rise to commemorate the life of Mr. Carl Russell Long, a passionate leader, public servant, and trailblazer who played baseball in the Negro League and later went on to become the first African American to integrate the Carolina League. Mr. Long will be greatly missed in his community of Kinston, throughout our great state of North Carolina, and by his fans across the country.

Carl Russell Long was born May 9, 1935 in Rock Hill, South Carolina to William Long and the former Ella Griffin. In 1952, he joined the Negro League and began playing in the outfield for the Birmingham Black Barons and a number of other teams until joining the Kinston Eagles in 1956 where he became the first African American to play in the Carolina League.

During his career, Mr. Long played for at least eight baseball teams and had more than 1,600 at bats. He had 57 home runs and a .275 batting average. In 1956, he was named the Carolina League's All-Star and was also recognized as the League's RBI leader.

After retiring from baseball, he returned to the City of Kinston where he continued to be a trailblazer. He became Lenoir County's first African American Deputy Sheriff and, in 1970, became the first African American detective to work for the county sheriff.

Carl Long was a member of the Negro League Players Association and in 2003 was inducted into the Kinston Professional Baseball Hall of Fame. In 2013, he was one of only a dozen former Negro League players who were invited to the White House to meet President Barack Obama.

Mr. Long leaves behind his loving wife of 58 years, Ella Long, two children, Sotello and Cynthia Long Hightower, two grandchildren, Latoyha Polk Washington and John Polk, and one great-grandson Breytan Polk.

Mr. Speaker, Carl Russell Long was a loving husband, father, and public servant. His untimely passing will surely be felt by all of those whose lives he touched. He will forever be missed but never forgotten in the City of Kinston, across North Carolina, and by baseball fans everywhere.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015, on Roll Call #2 on the question of the Election of the Speaker, I am not recorded due to weather-related flight delays. Had I been present, I would have nominated NANCY PELOSI to be Speaker of the House.

IN RECOGNITION OF MIKE
MCGOWAN

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of former Yolo County Supervisor Mike McGowan, to celebrate his career and many accomplishments. Mr. McGowan served the people of West Sacramento and Yolo County for nearly three decades and now is a leader with the State of California's Department of Motor Vehicles. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring him and celebrating his incredible contributions to our community.

A lifetime Yolo County resident, Mr. McGowan served his nation in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam War. After the war, he returned to Sacramento and graduated from California State University, Sacramento and the University of Pacific's McGeorge School of Law. He and his wife, Sue, have a daughter, Becky, and two grandchildren, Phoebe and Franklin.

In 1987 Mr. McGowan began his illustrious career in public service. He was instrumental in the formation of the City of West Sacramento, serving as the city's first Mayor and continuing to serve on the City Council for six years. After his time on the City Council, Mr. McGowan was elected to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, where he represented the people of West Sacramento and Clarksburg for over two decades. He would serve as chairman of the Port of West Sacramento Commission, and as a board member of a number of organizations including Yolo County Transportation District, Delta Protection Commission, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Yolo County Housing Commission, Sacramento Regional Counties Sanitation District, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Local Mental Health Board, Sacramento Area Trade & Commerce Advisory Board, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management Board and as an officer on the California State Association of Counties' executive committee.

Mr. McGowan worked tirelessly to protect our region's natural resources, promote agricultural growth, and improve Yolo County's economy. As a Supervisor, he worked with Governor Jerry Brown on the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. I have always enjoyed working closely with Mr. McGowan, as he has been a true partner on a number of critical issues; including complex water, flood protection and transportation projects.

In 2013, Mr. McGowan was appointed by Governor Brown as Deputy Director of Strategic Planning and Policy for the Department of Motor Vehicles. In recognition of his steadfast commitment to the City of West Sacramento, the city named a bridge over the Barge Canal, the Mike McGowan Bridge and the West Sacramento Chamber of Commerce has renamed their annual leadership award the Mike McGowan West Sacramentan of the Year Award. With these honors, future generations will know what Mike McGowan has meant to West Sacramento and Yolo County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking and recognizing former Supervisor

Mike McGowan for his many years of exemplary public service and to wish him continued personal and professional success.

HONORING DAVID R. SHEDD

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to David R. Shedd, one of the premier leaders of our nation's intelligence community. Mr. Shedd was named Acting Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency in August 2014, following four years of service as the Deputy Director. He leads the Defense Intelligence Enterprise workforce, which comprises more than 16,500 military and civilian employees worldwide. Mr. Shedd retires on January 23, 2015, with 32 years of honorable service. Throughout his distinguished career, Mr. Shedd has displayed remarkable vision, leadership, and an unwavering commitment to our nation's security that are worthy of our recognition.

A driving force in the intelligence community, Mr. Shedd initiated necessary improvements to information sharing and intelligence integration, better preparing the IC as a whole to confront national security threats. From May 2007 to August 2010, Mr. Shedd served as the Director of National Intelligence Deputy for Policy, Plans, and Requirements, where he was responsible for overseeing the formulation and implementation of major IC policies across the full spectrum of issues, from information sharing and IC authorities to analytic standards, among others. In particular, he led the review of Executive Order 12333, the foundational U.S. intelligence policy, which was revised by President George W. Bush in July 2008. Additionally, Mr. Shedd developed and implemented a National Intelligence Strategy for the IC that was published in August 2009, and led all strategic planning efforts to determine future intelligence priorities for the Community and the nation. In all these positions, Mr. Shedd was at the forefront of our nation's most critical intelligence reforms during a crucial point in our history.

From May 2005 to April 2007, Mr. Shedd served as Chief of Staff and later as Acting Director of the Intelligence Staff to the Director of National Intelligence. Prior to the creation of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Mr. Shedd held intelligence policy positions at the National Security Council from February 2001 to May 2005. He served as the NSC's Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Intelligence Programs and Reform. Mr. Shedd has been directly involved in the implementation of intelligence reform stemming from the 9/11 Commission report in July 2004, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, and the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission's report to the President in March 2005.

From 1984 to 1993, Mr. Shedd was posted overseas in U.S. Embassies in Costa Rica and Mexico. Mr. Shedd has also held various senior management assignments at the Central Intelligence Agency, including Chief of Congressional Liaison.

Mr. Speaker, as the Acting Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Mr. Shedd provided vision and continuity at an important and transformational time in the Agency's history. He worked to strengthen integration and collaboration with the Combatant Commands, and to make DIA more flexible and responsive to intelligence requirements. DIA is more ready today than at any other time in its history to support our warfighters through expeditionary operations and robust reach-back support. Through his exceptional knowledge and superb communication skills, Mr. Shedd served as a critical bridge between the military intelligence community and its civilian overseers on time-sensitive intelligence issues. During this period of fiscal austerity, Mr. Shedd also addressed several significant issues concerning workforce shaping in order to better position DIA to be more relevant and mission capable. Of note, Mr. Shedd acted as an effective mentor for DIA's workforce, generously making himself available to the most junior employees and providing expert guidance, judgment, and counsel at every opportunity. Without question, the bedrock principles of placing people first and selfless service defined all of David Shedd's leadership decisions. He leaves behind a more innovative and collaborative DIA, one that will be ready to face our national security challenges and support its most important customers: the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and civilians who stand in harm's way around the world.

Mr. Speaker, while the Intelligence Community will be losing a leader who has answered the call time and again at critical points in our nation's history, I know David will be happy to spend more time with his wife Lisa and their sons Jeremy and DJ, as well as DJ's wife Megan. Despite giving so much to the nation during his remarkable career, David always ensured that he was an exemplary husband and father as well as a devoted son. On behalf of a grateful nation and my colleagues in the U.S. Congress, I thank David and his family for his many years of faithful service and a job well done, and I wish him the very best of luck in his future endeavors as a teacher and speaker, and in his charitable endeavors that are so close to his heart.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and not present for roll call vote number 32, Salmon of Arizona Part B Amendment No. 4 to H.R. 240. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on the amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 2015, on Roll Call #17 on the Motion

to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 203—Clay Hunt SAV Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 12, 2015, on Roll Call #18 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 33—Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #20 on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 27, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #21 on H. Res. 27, Providing for consideration of H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act; H.R. 185, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015; and H.R. 240, Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #23 on Agreeing to the McKinley of West Virginia Amendment to H.R. 185, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #24 on Agreeing to the Johnson of Georgia Amendment to H.R. 185, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #25 on Agreeing to the Jackson Lee of Texas Amendment to H.R. 185, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #26 on Agreeing to the Connolly of Virginia Amendment to H.R. 185, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #27 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 185, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 13, 2015, on Roll Call #28 on Passage of H.R. 185—Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #29 on Agreeing to the Aderholt of Alabama Amendment to H.R. 240, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #30 on Agreeing to the Blackburn of Tennessee Amendment to H.R. 240, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #31 on Agreeing to the DeSantis of Florida Amendment to H.R. 240, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #32 on Agreeing to Salmon of Arizona Amendment to H.R. 240, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #33 on Agreeing to the Schock of Illinois Amendment to H.R. 240, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #34 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit of H.R. 240, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #35 on Passage of H.R. 240—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #36 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit of H.R. 37, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On January 14, 2015, on Roll Call #37 on Passage of H.R. 37—Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

HONORING HENRY A.J. APICE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in grateful acknowledgement of his service to our country in World War II, I note the passing of Henry A.J. Apice, of Southampton, Bucks County. A proud member of the United States Marine Corps during World War II, Mr. Apice joined the National Guard in 1938. Later, while serving as a Marine he saw action in the South Pacific and was a survivor of the battle for Iwo Jima. In the post-war years, he continued his activities with various veterans' organizations and was a life member of the Order of Devil Dogs. Most recently, he was a member and Guardian of the Washington Crossing National Cemetery, where he will be buried with full military honors. He is survived by his wife, Marjorie, his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and great-great grandchildren, along with six siblings. Mr. Apice will be remembered for his devotion to his family and country and now joins the proud line of veterans from all our nation's wars who, throughout history, have been the guardians of our liberty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 21, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 21, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

PRISONERS ARE BEING RELEASED FROM GUANTANAMO AT AN ALARMING RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced last week as a companion piece to a bill offered by Senator KELLY AYOTTE to protect the safety of the United States and its allies and restrict the transfers of detainees from Guantanamo Bay.

Since mid-November, the President and his administration have ramped up an effort to make good on a campaign promise to increase the number of Guantanamo detainee transfers. Last night during his State of the Union Address, the President reaffirmed his commitment to close this facility once and for all, and he is releasing prisoners at an alarming rate. Twenty-one terrorists have been released just in November alone to foreign countries. This comes at the expense of our own national security.

H.R. 401, the Detaining Terrorists to Protect America Act of 2015, would suspend the transfer of high- and medium-

risk detainees and prohibit any detainee transfers to Yemen as well as increase transparency regarding the remaining Guantanamo detainees.

Detainees at GTMO pose a real threat to our national security. When I speak with folks at home, my constituents, moms and dads, and they ask me how safe we really are, this rate of reengagement comes to mind. The U.S. intelligence community reports that the number of former GTMO detainees who reengage in terrorism has steadily increased since 2002.

According to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, they reported the combined and suspected confirmed reengagement rate of former GTMO detainees has risen to more than an alarming 30 percent. Before we proceed with any more additional transfers, we must ensure the transfer process is further examined and improved.

In order to protect our fellow Americans, we must stop releasing some of the world's most dangerous terrorists, especially given the fact that they are already reengaging in hostilities against the United States and our allies.

This measure would repeal current law that has allowed the administration to transfer prisoners to foreign countries and reduce the population at GTMO down to 127. The bill also would prohibit transfers of terror suspects to a foreign country if there has been a confirmed case where an individual was transferred from GTMO and engaged in any other terrorist activity.

The bill would also prohibit the transfer of terror suspects considered to be high or medium risk. Some of the most recent transfer detainees fell into those categories.

In addition, this bill would stop the transfer of detainees to Yemen because the country has become a hotbed for terrorist activities. It makes no sense to send terrorists to a country where there is an active al Qaeda network that we know has been engaged in targeting the U.S.

Most importantly, Yemen's branch of al Qaeda, commonly known as AQAP, was founded by former GTMO detainees. Counterterrorism experts have declared AQAP to be al Qaeda's most effective affiliate, posing the greatest danger to the American homeland.

We cannot risk trusting the world's most dangerous terrorists to its most dangerous places, nor should we simply cut them loose in rich, stable countries with no security safeguards in place.

We have to ask ourselves today: How much are we really willing to risk with our own national security in our American homeland?

I want to thank Senator AYOTTE for working with me, and I look forward to working with her to advance this legislation. I look forward to continuing our partnership to prevent the release of dangerous terrorists who seek to reengage in terrorism against the U.S. and our allies. This bill ensures our homeland remains safe from those terrorist attacks.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CONGRESS CAN LEARN FROM CHERYL STRAYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night for the State of the Union address by President Obama, my guest was a Portlander, Cheryl Strayed, the author of the best-selling book, "Wild," who is currently being portrayed on the big screen by Reese Witherspoon. This epic story is about how a young woman, reeling from the loss of her mother and the cascading challenges of her life, undertook a journey 1100 miles along the Pacific Coast Trail. It was 96 days of an amazing struggle, overcoming all sorts of difficulties, adversities, as she helped work out her own challenges and issues.

I invited her because I thought the story that she portrayed, the experience that she had, was an interesting metaphor for the sorts of things that we should be doing here. Perhaps we might be able to come together as a Congress, supporting legislation that would help protect some of those special places that are portrayed in her powerful book and in the excellent movie.

In the course of her visit, another thought has made its way to me as I watched her interact with dozens of young people in a variety of meetings on Capitol Hill, fellow Members of Congress, and many other people who were touched by the story of her journey and it made a profound effect on them. She continues to receive hundreds of emails a day from people who were inspired by that effort and her magnificent book.

It occurs to me that it is an appropriate metaphor for what our challenge is as Members of the 114th Congress,

because this, after all, is a 2-year journey on behalf of the American people. The question for us is: If we can struggle with that heavy pack, navigate areas where sometimes the trail is a little obscure, can we put our trust in strangers who help us along this difficult journey? Can we be resolute in putting one foot in front of another on behalf of the American public?

Mr. Speaker, it was a very profound experience to watch those interactions, after having seen the movie, and having been entranced by the book. I am absolutely convinced that this is our moment, our journey into something that doesn't necessarily have to be "Wild," even though there is a roller coaster of legislative activity. I am convinced there ought to be enough common interest, common commitment, common goals that we ought to be able to tease out elements that enable us to be successful in our journey.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will reflect on that experience of this young woman who was able to overcome adversity and open up an amazing chapter in her life and beyond. I hope we will be able to do the same for the people we represent.

BATTLE OF THE BULGE 70TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind everybody about a real-life story of being outnumbered 10 to 1, a story of courage, will, discipline, suffering, immense sacrifice, and success, a tale of two great militaries, surprise, weather, overwhelming force, and sheer resolve. It is marked with the graves of thousands and exemplifies the struggle for the very future of freedom in our world.

The story ends with the 101st Airborne and Patton's Armor being victorious in January and February of 1945, and I think it is important to recognize the accomplishments of all the units who struggled and suffered greatly under the German siege of a small town in Belgium named Bastogne. This January and the recent December marks the 70th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge.

Most people know of the 101st Airborne, nicknamed the "batting Bastards of Bastogne," and the plight of Patton's Armor, as chronicled in so many stories and movies now burnished into the collective consciousness of our Nation, and rightly so.

However, Mr. Speaker, on this 70th anniversary, I want to remind us of an often untold story of the other heroes of the Battle of the Bulge and the little but critical town of Bastogne. It is a story of the American soldiers of the 28th Division from Pennsylvania, who held at all costs.

In late October to mid-November of 1944, the battle of the Hurtgen Forest was described as a meat grinder. The 28th Division was in a fierce battle with the German 73rd Corps. For the 28th, the battle losses were 248 officers and 5,452 enlisted men. After the battle, the weary division needed a rest.

The Ardennes Forest was thick and seemingly impenetrable. It was known as a quiet sector in which the 28th could reequip, reorganize, and assimilate thousands of new replacements into the ranks while the division rested.

Greatly weakened by the previous battle, the 28th Division was spread out over some 25 miles along a front which was more than double that which was recommended in standard practice by any division at the time.

On the morning of 16 December 1944, the peace was shattered by the opening barrage of the Germans opening up one of the largest displays of artillery bombardment ever, signaling the start of Hitler's last great offensive on the Western Front in World War II.

For the next 4 days, without any sleep, often without food, elements of the 28th Division and their affiliates fought continuously, often until the last bullet and life, to deny the enemy success. It was exceptionally cold, foggy, damp, and, of course, snow covered, exactly what Hitler had counted on, as the winter would only add to the element of surprise.

The German 5th and 15th Panzer Armies, 6th SS, and 7th Army attacked the U.S. 8th Army in a line between Aachen and Bastogne with a plan to go as close as possible down the seam between American, Canadian, and British forces to split them.

After crossing the Meuse River, the attacking Panzers were to turn north and capture the port city of Antwerp, thus collapsing the supply lines and the alliance.

The timetable established by the German general staff and German high command called for the capture of the entire 28th Division sector early in the morning of 16 December and the capture of Bastogne by the same evening of that day. Bastogne was a major road junction which was needed by the Germans for armor and resupply units.

In the early morning hours of 16 December, the 28th Division received a message telling them to hold at all costs. Keystone, as they were known, were dug in and began the slow and painful art of trading space for time, trading space for time and life.

The 110th Regiment was soon surrounded and fought to the last round. From 0530 that morning of the 16th until sometime late in the afternoon of the 18th and early on the 19th in some locations, men of the 110th Infantry Regiment fought and held, giving ground only when forced out, but all the while buying precious time for

General Eisenhower to find and move reserves forward from deep inside France.

The other two regimental combat teams of the division, the 109th and 112th Infantry Regiments, did only slightly better. The 110th Regiment stayed in place as they were assigned the center sector of the division. The regiment alone fought elements of five German divisions, of which it was outnumbered at times 7 to 1.

I must abbreviate due to time.

While there are many things that come to mind when we think of the Battle of the Bulge like the 101st Airborne, Patton's Armor, or Easy Company from the Band of Brothers, please also remember the names and places familiar to those others who held at all costs: the 103rd, the 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th of the 28th. These are the echoes of the 28th Division and the men who held at all costs and traded space for time so that the 101st and Patton's Third Army could get into position in time to defeat the German offensive.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, we can learn a lot from these dedicated soldiers who refused to surrender but fought on for what they believed in. I just wanted to remind everyone and to offer my salute to these finest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind everybody about a real life story of being outnumbered 10 to 1.

A story of courage, will, discipline suffering, immense sacrifice and success. A tale of two great militaries, surprise, weather, overwhelming force and sheer resolve. A story marked with the graves of thousands, and that exemplifies the struggle for the very future of freedom in our world.

The story ends with the 101st Airborne Division and Patton's Armor victorious in January and February of 1945.

We must recognize the accomplishments of all the units that struggled and suffered greatly under the German siege of a small town in Belgium named Bastogne.

This past December 2014 through the end of January 2015 marks the 70th Anniversary of the one of the most significant and deadly battles of World War II—the Battle of the Bulge.

We must also remember the German units and the actions of their Soldiers committed to their nation's cause. We must recount their actions as well—the cause of their leadership, the unfortunate actions that occurred in those desperate hours and learn from that history so that we may never again have to re-endure them.

Most people know of the 101st Airborne (nicknamed the "Batting Bastards of Bastogne") and the plight of Patton's Armor as chronicled in so many stories and movies now burnished into the collective consciousness of our Nation—and rightly so. However Mr. Speaker, on this 70th Anniversary, I'm reminded of an often untold story of other heroes of the Battle of the Bulge, in the little but critically important town of Bastogne. It's the

story of the American Soldiers of the 28th Division from Pennsylvania who held at all costs.

In late October to mid-November of 1944, occurred the Battle of the Huertgen Forest—described as “the meat grinder”—where the 28th Division fought a fierce and deadly battle with the German 73rd Corps. For the 28th, battle losses were 248 officers and 5,452 enlisted men, after which the battle-weary Division needed a rest and were moved to the Ardennes Forest, thick and seemingly impenetrable but quiet sector in which the 28th Division could reconstitute, reorganize and assimilate thousands of replacements into the ranks while the Division recovered. Greatly weakened by the previous battle, the 28th Division was spread out over some 25 miles along a front more than double that which was recommended in standard practice by any division at the time. On the morning of 16 December 1944, the peace was shattered by the opening barrage of the Germans in one of the largest and most deadly artillery bombardments ever—signaling the start of Hitler’s last great offensive on the Western Front in WWII. For the next four days without any sleep, and often without food, elements of the 28th Division and their Allies fought tirelessly—to the last bullet in most cases—as well as to the last life, to deny the enemy success.

The day and night were punishing—freezing, wet, foggy and snow-covered—exactly what Hitler had counted on, as the winter would only add to the element of surprise and exponentially increase his chances for success. The German 5th and 15th Panzer Armies, 6th SS and 7th Army attacked the U.S. 8th Army and aligned between Aachen and Bastogne with a plan to fight as close as possible down the seam between American, Canadian and British forces in order to split them. After crossing the Meuse River, the attacking Panzers were to turn north and capture the port city of Antwerp, thus collapsing the supply lines and the Alliance. The timetable established by the German General Staff and High Command called for the capture of the entire 28th Division sector early in the morning of 16 December, and the capture of Bastogne by the same evening. Bastogne was a major road junction that was needed by the Germans for armor and resupply units.

In the early morning hours of 16 December the 28th Division received the order to “Hold at all costs!”

“Keystoners”, as they were known, were dug in and began the slow and painful art of trading space and lives for time—time enough for the 101st Airborne and Patton’s Armor to get into the fight, and win it.

The 110th Infantry Regiment soon was surrounded and fought to the last bullet. From 0530 hours on 16 December, until sometime late in afternoon of the 18th and early on the 19th in some locations, men of the 110th Infantry fought and held—giving ground only when forced out—but while buying precious time for General Eisenhower to find and move reserves forward from deep inside France.

The other two Regimental Combat Teams of the Division—the 109th and 112th—did only slightly better, and the 109th ran out of ammunition on the 18th. These scattered and battered units of the 28th Division held out in the face of overwhelming odds—delaying the Ger-

mans as long as they was by any standard a miraculous feat because of the complete and massive confusion of the Battle.

However, the 110th Regiment stayed in place as they were assigned the center sector of the Division. This Regiment alone fought elements of five German divisions, outnumbering the Americans 7 to 1.

Overall the 28th Division would identify elements of 9 divisions in its sector before the Battle was over. Early on, the force ratios reached 10 to 1 in the Germans’ favor, but still Pennsylvania’s 28th Division valiantly held its ground.

Small determined units, low on ammunition, food, water, anti-tank weapons, and morale, continued to stand and fight until forced to retreat, captured or killed.

The old 110th, which had served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation since 1873, started to fight with just over 2200 Soldiers. When all was said and done, less than 750 officers and men could be found still fighting. Some unit strength reports have it just around 500 unit members still standing. The German Fifth Panzer Army was so ravaged by the Keystoners that many say it ultimately cost the Germans the battle.

The Division held until it could hold no more, and it never ordered a single retreat. It was a continuous fighting withdraw under fire—described as “We made the Germans pay for every yard, every road junction, and fighting house by house, floor by floor, often hand-to-hand when the ammunition ran out.”

The 28th inflicted 11,700 casualties on the enemy at a cost of 3850 Americans killed and wounded, and another 2000 captured when they simply ran out of ammunition.

There are many footnotes to this intense Battle:

On 17 December, Allied prisoners of war were executed in cold blood by elements of the 6th SS Panzer Army. Some 100 prisoners were killed where they stood at Malmédy on direct orders from German Colonel Joachim Peiper.

On 19 December, 6000 Allied Troops surrendered to the encircling German Army at Schnee Eiffel.

On 20 December, the 101st Airborne Division at Bastogne completely was encircled by the German 47th Panzer Corps and the US 10th and 19th Armored Divisions completely were encircled by the German advance. After holding on to Bastogne for a full week while encircled, the 101st repelled the final German thrust with the arrival of the 4th Armored Division.

On 25 December, the 2nd Panzer Division was stopped by a combined force of British and American armor made up of General Montgomery’s 29th Armored Brigade and the American 2nd Armored Division.

7 February 1945 marked the end of the battle where the German casualty count was a staggering 82,000 men, matched only by the 77,000 casualties suffered by the American Army.

While many things come to mind when we think of the Battle of the Bulge—like the 101st, Patton’s Armor or Easy Company (made famous by the book and movie, “Band of Brothers”), please also remember the names and places familiar to the others that held at all costs:

The 103rd, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th Infantry Regiments; the towns and grounds of Clervaux, Wilt, the Clerf River, Foy and Noville; and the other units like Combat Command B, 48th Armored Field Artillery, Combat Command R, 158th Engineer Battalion, 630th Tank Destroyer Battalion, 1278th Engineer Battalion and the 299th Engineer Battalion who suffered and fought to reconstitute and support this brave endeavor. These are the echoes of the 28th Division and the men and units who held at all costs and traded space for time so that the 101st and Patton’s 3rd Army could get into position in time to defeat the German offensive.

Mr. Speaker, we could learn so much from these dedicated Soldiers who not only refused to surrender, but fought for what they believed in.

I remind us all of this tale of heroism, tireless and selfless service, and salute these brave Americans.

MAINTAINING AMERICA’S INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the prior gentleman’s commendation of those who fought on behalf of liberty at the Battle of the Bulge. We bow before them. They bequeathed liberty to this generation. It is a heavy burden. Let us hope that we can measure up to it in tribute to their valor.

At last night’s State of the Union Address, passing a transportation and infrastructure bill to repair America and build forward a new century, as we create hundreds of thousands of jobs, got the broadest bipartisan applause. You could hear it on both sides of the aisle. So I come to the floor this morning to say, Let’s do it. Let’s do it. Chairman BILL SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFazio are two Members who can get us there. We want to help them. I know the majority of Members feel that way. So my words to them are: Onward, gentlemen; lead America forward by passing that bill through us.

On another front, I rise to express deep dismay at what I believe to be Republican efforts to weaken and begin dismantling the Social Security and disability insurance program that so many Americans depend upon. The headline in yesterday’s Politico reads: “Social Security disability under attack by the GOP.”

As this Congress starts, Republicans have quietly and without consulting Democrats tucked into the rules of this House a point of order provision that aims to harm our Nation’s 8,950,000 disabled citizens and weaken the related Social Security earned benefit program. The number of Americans on disability today in a Nation of over 310 million people amounts to less than 3 percent of our population. That is actually a very small number when you

think about it. God has been good to most of us, but that isn't true physically and mentally with many of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, even though the number of disability approvals has been declining since 2010, Republicans have begun this Congress by singling out the disabled. They haven't targeted Wall Street moguls who brought our economy down and stole trillions of dollars of home equity and the very homes from our families. No, Republicans are targeting the injured, the suffering, and those not able to fend for themselves. Even to touch this subject so callously is a cruelty. It causes worry and trepidation. It makes life more uncertain.

Why should such an important change not be debated on this House floor? Republicans instead hope to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people by hiding it in an obscure rule that was part of a massive parliamentary package for this 114th Congress. But I tell you what, not all Americans have been fooled. Despite this subtle attempt to pit Social Security pensioners against disabled beneficiaries, our office has already received a great number of calls and letters from citizens sick over the possibility that a 20 percent benefit cut could adversely affect our neighbors and relatives most in need.

These proposed cuts in Social Security and disability insurance—and I underline the word “insurance”—set the stage for what Republicans truly want, and I fear: severe cuts, a weakened Social Security system, and ultimately dismantling one of our greatest American legacies, earned Social Security benefits and earned disability benefits for our old, our ill, and our disabled. Our disabled and senior citizens have the right to live out their lives with dignity. And for so many, their lives are not easy.

I remind my colleagues who visit nursing homes and who have neighbors or relatives in their own family who endure pain every day how vital these programs are. There but for the grace of God go you.

This Congress should oppose these backhanded cuts, and at the same time we should support the passage of the transportation and infrastructure jobs bill to build our Nation forward. There are items we can agree on, and there will be items that we disagree on. But our roads, our bridges, our harbors, our airports, our rail systems, the St. Lawrence Seaway System, and navigable waters all deserve our attention. We can make it happen this year. Let's do it.

[From POLITICO, Jan. 20, 2015]

REPUBLICANS TARGET SOCIAL SECURITY
DISABILITY

(By David Rogers)

Like Mrs. O'Leary's cow, House Republicans kick-started a bigger fire than many

imagined with an opening day rules change that revived Social Security as a hot issue for this Congress—and the 2016 presidential elections.

The GOP's immediate target is Social Security's sprawling disability insurance program, which has grown at a pace far beyond its revenues and will exhaust its trust fund reserves by December 2016, threatening a 19 percent cut in benefits.

In the past, Congress has simply shifted revenues from Social Security's larger retirement account to fill holes in the disability fund. But the new House rule throws up a roadblock by creating a point of order against any such bill that does not improve the “actuarial balance” of the combined funds.

“What we want to do is not kick the can down the road anymore,” said Rep. Sam Johnson (R-Texas), who promoted the change as chairman of the Social Security panel on the House Ways and Means Committee. “The rule is intended to get the Congress to at least take a first step toward solving the Social Security problem. If we continue the way we are, it's a go-broke operation.”

“If all they're doing is rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul, that's going to be subject to a point of order, and rightly so in my opinion,” added Rep. Thomas Reed (R-N.Y.). “We have to protect the retirement fund and the retiree.”

It all sounds like “good government,” but the politics are rich.

House Democrats were not consulted on the rules change, and liberals accuse the GOP of trying to cull the weak from the herd, pitting the disabled against pensioners to undermine the larger Social Security coalition.

In fact, the new rule's fine print leaves an escape hatch for Republicans to move tens of billions into the disability fund if this gambit fails. Still, the upshot could be a one-two punch Democrats most fear: a first-round debate over disability funding in 2016 followed by a bigger battle over all of Social Security in 2017, when Republicans hope to control both Congress and the White House.

“They're looking for a new weapon,” said Michigan Rep. Sander Levin, the ranking Democrat on Ways and Means. “What they're doing in this rule is to use any problems within disability as a way to attack the whole system. It's dangerous doubletalk when they have been the problem, not the answer.”

Adding to Levin's fears was testimony last week before Ways and Means, in which Harvard economist Martin Feldstein promoted the idea of Congress gradually raising the eligibility age for full Social Security benefits to as high as 70. That would increase labor-force participation among people older than 65, expanding the economy, Feldstein said. But raising the retirement age would add to the strain on the disability fund, which has had to cover more workers longer since the retirement age was raised from 65 to 67.

These tensions fueled a separate uproar last week over remarks by 2016 presidential hopeful Sen. Rand Paul about the disability program.

Testing the waters in an appearance in New Hampshire, the Kentucky Republican suggested that half the people on Social Security disability had no more to worry about than achy backs and anxiety in the morning. “Join the club. Who doesn't get up a little anxious for work and their back hurts,” Paul said disparagingly.

After video of his remarks went online, Paul quickly backtracked: “We absolutely

should take care of those truly in need of help,” he said in a statement.

At this stage, the White House and Treasury show no sign of backing down from their intent to pursue a straight reallocation of funds from the retirement account, formally known as the Old Age Survivors Insurance or OASI trust fund. Given all the divisions already in Washington, adding a new procedural hurdle is “unhelpful,” an administration official said icily.

Indeed, transfers between the two Social Security funds have gone on for years. Each relies on a percentage of the same payroll tax, and the disability program helped the retirement trust fund in the 1980s by reducing its own share of the tax revenue.

What's most changed now is that critics are singling out the disability fund as the profligate partner—and a harbinger of bad times ahead for all.

Without doubt, the growth of the disability program has been explosive.

In the past 20 years, the number of workers getting disability payments has more than doubled to 8.95 million last month. About \$140 billion went out the door in fiscal 2013, double what the costs were just 10 years before. And like food stamps in the Farm Bill debate, disability payments are common enough now to be a whipping boy for conservatives like Paul, playing on resentment toward people receiving government aid during hard economic times.

At one level, this is all political catnip for Democrats, eager to be seen as defenders of Social Security and its New Deal heritage. But given their history, Republicans don't come to the table with clean hands.

For example, the GOP's 2011 budget deal with President Barack Obama held out the promise of millions in appropriations to help the Social Security Administration fight precisely what Republicans complain about in the disability program: medical fraud. But for 2012 and 2013, House Republicans failed to approve the money, thereby adding to Social Security's woes.

Moreover, an analysis by Social Security's chief actuary, Stephen Goss, suggests there's less to the new House rule than meets the eye. That's because the point of order is triggered only if lawmakers exceed a “0.01 percent” threshold, which equates to a \$38.6 billion cap on what any one Congress can move from the retirement fund, Goss told POLITICO.

That leaves too little room for some long-term, multiyear reallocation of payroll tax revenues but it is enough to get past 2016, by Goss' calculations.

“We're projecting [disability] trust funds will be depleted in December of 2016. . . . The shortfall for the ensuing 12 months would come to about \$29 billion,” Goss said. “What that means is that we could have a tax rate reallocation that could apply in 2016 or 2016 and 2017 that would generate up to \$30 billion or even \$35 billion transferred to the [disability] trust fund, which would at least extend its reserve depletion date for one more year.”

It's a stop-and-go scenario that serves neither party's goals in the end. Much depends in the interim on Johnson and new Ways and Means Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.).

Ryan has boasted that Ways and Means will be “command central” for the GOP's agenda, and he has installed his own staff in Johnson's Social Security subcommittee. In the previous Congress, the disability debate among Republicans was shaped by flamboyant personalities such as the now-retired

Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.) and Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.), who has had to surrender his platform as chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. But now, Ryan would like to be the architect for reforms in the social safety net.

There is room for compromise. The crisis is no surprise—as long ago as 1995, Social Security's actuaries were predicting 2016 as a breaking point for the disability fund. And multiple academic papers from the center-left and center-right outline changes Congress could consider.

Three potential areas of agreement: First, find a dedicated source of money for Social Security to expedite so-called continuing disability reviews, which have been shown to generate savings. Second, limit recipients' "double-dipping" among disability and other government benefits. And third, experiment with ways to help people with disabilities to stay in the workforce or return more quickly.

The past year has seen some turnaround on funding for the disability reviews. In the fiscal 2014 and 2015 Social Security budgets, House Republicans finally agreed to the extra "program integrity" appropriations that the budget deal had called for. The Social Security Administration says every dollar spent here can lead to \$9 in long-term savings, and in 2013—the latest year for which data are available—more than 17,000 workers were disqualified as a result of these medical reviews.

The administration estimates that as many as 790,000 continuing disability reviews will be conducted this year, a 50 percent increase over 2014 and double the annual average from 2009–2013. To maintain this effort, the 2016 budget that Obama proposes in February is expected to ask again for close to the \$1.4 billion provided in 2015.

The White House is also expected to come back to Congress with a set of demonstration programs to test and gather data on the effectiveness of early intervention—with workers and employers—rather than individuals simply surrendering to going on disability. The omnibus bill approved in December provided \$35 million for this purpose, far less than what the administration had hoped for.

"I think it's clear that the system needs to be improved," said Jeffrey Liebman, a Harvard professor who served in the Office of Management and Budget during Obama's first term. "I also think it's clear that we don't yet know enough about the cost and benefits of specific proposals to make wholesale changes."

Part of the challenge for policymakers is the unique nature of disability insurance.

Unlike many other disability programs, Social Security's covers only total disability—not partial or short term. Benefits are a function of how much a worker previously earned and put into the system, but on average these run under \$1,200 per month. On top of this, a worker is allowed to earn some outside income, but this is capped at less than \$1,100 a month.

The result is that many households can be locked in at 200 percent of poverty or lower once the decision is made to go on disability. That's why early intervention can help both the government and the worker. But how early to intervene—and at what cost—remain big questions.

"They are really only biting at the outer edges of the issue. Their idea of early intervention is way too late," said Richard Burkhauser of Cornell University and the University of Melbourne. Burkhauser argues

that the U.S. must look to European countries like the Netherlands that "have really done major things that have fundamentally altered their system."

The Dutch model, for example, requires employers to cover more of the first two years of disability costs, thereby encouraging more management involvement in trying to help employees rehabilitate themselves and stay in the workforce. Yet selling this to a pro-business Republican Congress may take more than a little doing.

"The Dutch still spend more of [gross domestic product] than we do on disability benefits," Liebman said. "They came from spending a lot more than we do to spending more than we do."

Johnson is certainly not eager for big new expenditures. But for all his famous crustiness, the Texas conservative was not unsympathetic to people who depend on the current system.

"We want to work to protect the disability program, but we want to consider how to help those who can and want to work," Johnson said. "And those who can or want to work ought not to be sentenced to a lifetime of near poverty with no way out."

For all the partisanship now, the disability insurance program was born in the mid-1950s under a Republican president, Dwight Eisenhower. Ronald Reagan triggered bitter fights 25 years later when he sought cuts in the early 1980s. That sparked a backlash from Democrats in Congress, which led to changes making it easier for more people to qualify.

But the enrollment numbers really took off in the mid-1990s, as more baby boomers moved into their late 40s and began applying during an otherwise strong economy. The Great Recession accelerated this trend as workers turned to disability as a last resort after unemployment benefits ran out. But the prime mover for the past 20 years has been demographics—changes set in motion generations ago.

These include not just the baby boom, but the fact that women have worked long enough now to qualify for disability benefits. All this comes, most importantly, at a time when the drop in birth rates has left fewer younger workers to help absorb the costs.

If all these forces make disability insurance the black sheep now, it will soon have company: The retirement side of Social Security is feeling the same forces, while new enrollment numbers suggest the spike in disability has peaked. Data show a steady drop in the number of new disability awards since their high in 2010.

"The increasing effects of [disability insurance] are over. We're done with that," Goss said. "The bad news is now the boomers are moving to the higher ages and once they get there, they'll have the lower-birth-rate generation below them. . . . This is unfortunately kind of like the tide."

As the waters recede, rural low-income states like Kentucky, Arkansas, Mississippi and Maine face a larger concentration of disability cases as a percentage of the population. Workers complain of a slow, almost Dickensian application process that can put their lives on hold for months. This same environment can attract aggressive attorneys, who boast in phone book ads that this is their briar patch—just call.

Fresh indictments this past week in Puerto Rico are a reminder of the risk of fraud—and collusion among doctors, lawyers and administrative judges. Government Accountability Office reports have raised questions about workers double-dipping, by stringing together payments from Social Security dis-

ability along with jobless benefits or non-combat-related disabilities covered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

None of this alters the 2016 deadline.

"The trust fund programs really are special because they cannot borrow. The reserves deplete. Congress has to act," Goss said. "We'll still have revenue come in, but our projection is we'll only have 81 cents of tax revenue coming at that time for every dollar of benefits."

But under the new House rule, Goss said, any single piece of legislation can give the program at most "a one-year or slightly more than a one-year extension of the reserve depletion date."

Does that mean Congress should do more than one year?

The actuary chuckled. "The good news," he said, "is that given we have 535 members of Congress, we'll hear lots of arguments and that will likely be one."

ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues would agree that we have many needs in our districts. For example, my district has an inlet that cannot be dredged, which causes an economic problem. And the reason it cannot be dredged is because of lack of funds. We continue to spend billions of dollars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but there is no money for necessary infrastructure projects back here in North Carolina and across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been outspoken on the continuation of war in Afghanistan. I would like to recite a segment from Rudyard Kipling's poem, "Epitaphs of the War," as Ron Paul did when we went into Iraq: "If any question why we died, tell them because our fathers lied."

Mr. Speaker, a recent letter to the editor of the Marine Corps Times echoed the same sentiment. Bryan Chou wrote:

"Remember the part I said about ending the Marines' presence in Afghanistan? I lied," said every politician.

I assume Mr. Chou was referring to the President's recent statement that the war in Afghanistan is over.

How can the war be over when we just committed to a 10-year bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan to keep thousands of troops there while spending millions of dollars? The Afghan Parliament voted on the bilateral security agreement while we in Congress had no discussion and no debate.

According to the Constitution, the President does not need to come to Congress for permission on an agreement, but I think we have a responsibility to the American taxpayer and our men and women in uniform to discuss an agreement that will keep more taxpayer dollars and more troops in Afghanistan in the coming years.

Just a couple of weeks ago the Marine Corps announced that the marines at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina's Third District, which I represent, are getting ready to deploy to Afghanistan. When does it end, Mr. Speaker? When does it end?

I would like to quote Grant Filbeck from Erie, Pennsylvania, who wrote a letter to the Marine Corps Times last week about Afghanistan:

I believe in the mission 100 percent, but we have given the Afghans the tools to succeed, and it's up to them to use them. We have been in the country for more than 13 years. That is ridiculous. We have spent so much money funding these guys. If the Afghans want to fight for their country, then they will, or the Taliban will take over without much of a fight.

These two men whose letters I referenced are marines who have been to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this is a poster from a book titled, "How U.S. Taxpayers Bankroll the Taliban." It was written several years ago by Douglas Wissing. It is a great expose on how the taxpayers' money ends up in the hands of the Taliban, to kill Americans and to blow up the buildings that we built for them with taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we owe it to the American people, our military, and our Constitution to debate war. As James Madison wrote: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature." I agree with James Madison and urge the Congress to meet its constitutional duty to debate war and not let any President have an AUMF to send our young men and women overseas to die and see the taxpayers' money wasted.

May God continue to bless our troops, and may God continue to bless America.

A SQUANDERED OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the address by the President last night in this Chamber.

Twenty years ago, President Clinton was in a similar position. He realized his policies weren't working; they had just been overwhelmingly rejected by voters and he faced the first Republican Congress in 40 years. So in his State of the Union Message 20 years ago, President Clinton changed course, proclaiming: "The era of Big Government is over." And he made good on that proclamation. He reached across the aisle to the Republican Congress, and together they achieved some amazing things for the American people.

Together, they reduced Federal spending by a remarkable 4 percent of

GDP. They reformed entitlement spending—in Bill Clinton's words, "ending welfare as we know it." They approved what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They produced the only four balanced budgets that we have seen in 50 years.

And the economy blossomed. We enjoyed one of the longest periods of economic expansion in our Nation's history.

It wasn't a bipartisan lovefest. They clashed bitterly on matters great and small. Yet their accomplishments produced prosperity for our Nation and ensured President Clinton's popularity that endures to this day.

President Obama thus has a working, proven model to salvage the last 2 years of his failed Presidency, and instead, he is squandering it. The President says he wants to sock it to the wealthy by placing new and heavy taxes on investment. But the simple truth of the matter is, when you tax something, you get less of it. When you tax investment, you get less investment at precisely that time when our economy desperately needs greater investment for more and better-paying jobs.

A smaller percentage of our people are working today than at any time in more than 30 years. Until last year, median family income had fallen throughout this administration. The American people don't want more government handouts. They need more jobs and better jobs, and that means more investment, not less. They need a job market that isn't flooded with millions of illegal immigrants undercutting their wages and opportunities. Indeed, it was recently estimated that the number of illegal immigrants working in direct defiance of Federal law is as much as the net increase in jobs throughout this administration. Most Americans are not getting ahead.

We now suffer the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, and American businesses are fleeing from it.

Who would have thought that socialist Sweden would today be considered a tax haven compared to the United States? Our people need those American jobs back in America.

Yet the President seeks to raise taxes still further at a time when the Federal Government is already extracting record tax revenues from our people. The percentage of our economy now consumed by Federal taxes is well above the 40-year average. Our economic problems are not the fault of taxpayers for not paying enough taxes.

The President says he wants to help the middle class, but the proposals he set before us last night would drag the middle class still further down the dark road of debt and doubt and despair that we have been on. If higher taxes and more burdensome regula-

tions were the path to prosperity, we should be enjoying a new economic golden age today. If higher government spending and soak-the-rich policies were the antidote to income inequality, we should today be enjoying an egalitarian paradise.

The reality is these policies have never worked. They have suppressed what should have been a robust economic recovery. They have increased the economic inequalities in our society. They have buried our children under a mountain of debt that will stalk them for the rest of their lives.

The answer to income inequality and economic stagnation is genuine economic growth that requires reducing the burdens that government has placed on our economy. It worked when Bill Clinton did it, when Ronald Reagan did it, and when John F. Kennedy did it. In fact, Kennedy was right: a rising tide lifts all boats. Yet Barack Obama clings obstinately to the opposite policies. It shouldn't surprise us that he is getting the opposite results.

□ 1030

He had a fleeting opportunity last night to bend to the will of the voters, reverse these policies, and redeem his place in history. Instead, Whittier's words seem appropriate this morning:

Of all sad words of tongue or pen, this saddest are these: "It might have been."

HONORING WILLIAM M. ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this past December, the community of Pinellas County, Florida—indeed, the Nation—lost an American hero, William M. Allen.

Bill Allen was 83 years old and had served in the United States Army from 1949 to 1953 as a sergeant, Charlie Company, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division.

Mr. Allen was a prisoner of war from January 1, 1951, until August 1953, held captive during the Korean war after being overcome by Chinese troops. Mr. Allen was just 19 years old at the time.

To those who knew Mr. Allen, he was one of those remarkable people that left a lasting impression on you after just a single encounter. He was a patriot. He would share his stories not for his own attention, but to impart on each of us the story of sacrifice that our men and women in uniform make so that the United States—all Americans—might live in peace, protected by those who serve.

Mr. Allen's story was most human. In his own words, he wrote this about his enlistment in the Army and subsequent deployment:

Then there are people like myself, the little guy who went to Korea as a young kid, still wet behind the ears, fresh out of high

school, who joined a peacetime army, but soon found himself in one of this country's most controversial military and political situations known at that time.

When it was over, we came home as veterans; no longer were we the kids down the street. We were now that guy home from war, the war that only a very few knew very much about, a war that was unpopular, and a war that was soon to be forgotten, forgotten only by those who didn't have to fight it.

Mr. Allen did fight that war for us, and his sacrifice truly became real the day he knew he had been overcome by Chinese forces. He recalls wondering at that very moment would they shoot him, and in those brief moments, Mr. Allen recalled that he knew then that the course for his life would forever change. Two things he said he knew for sure: one, he was still alive; and, two, he was now a prisoner of war.

Indeed, the course of Mr. Allen's life had changed forever. He endured many terrible moments as a POW. His family endured much grief, much worry, much pain; but his life had also changed forever because Mr. Allen would later find another calling in life, that of teaching others the importance of service, teaching about the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, sharing with others the true cost of freedom.

He would share these lessons with anyone he would encounter, but he also did something very special. He contributed many of his personal items from the war—letters, telegrams, newspaper articles—to the Armed Forces History Museum in Largo, Florida, for a permanent display dedicated to his POW story. Moreover, he then volunteered his time to teach young people at the museum the very lessons of service, to share with visitors his deeply personal story.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Allen served our Nation in war, but he then served his community here at home, passing down a rich legacy to generations that follow. I was one of those individuals who had an opportunity to share in that story, and I am blessed by my experiences with Mr. Allen.

For his military service, Mr. Allen was awarded many medals, including the Combat Infantry Badge, the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and others.

Mr. Allen is survived by his wife, Helen, of whom he once wrote:

If she was not with me, I don't know what I would have done. She was not only my wife, but she is my best friend.

Mr. Allen is also survived by his children, Susan and Bill, and many grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, before Mr. Allen's passing, he presented me with a copy of his book, "My Old Box of Memories," and inscribed on the inside jacket is his message, "Freedom is not free." Indeed, we know freedom is not free.

Today, I rise to remember and honor Mr. Allen, to remember and honor his legacy, a legacy that will live on

through the many people he has touched and, most importantly, through individuals, children, and youth that he devoted his time to educating about the cost of war, the importance of sacrifice, and the dignity of service.

I thank Mr. Allen today for his service to our Nation and to pay a most fitting tribute, that for a man who sacrificed so much on behalf of our Nation, today is remembered in the well of this House—the people's House—by Members of Congress and by a grateful Nation.

May God bless Bill Allen; may God bless his wife, Helen; may God bless his family; and may God richly bless each and every American who today serves and protects and defends the United States of America.

RESTORE AN OPPORTUNITY GOVERNMENT THROUGH RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, last night, we gathered here in the House of Representatives for a great American tradition: the State of the Union—the Presidential address where we celebrate openness and transparency in our government, where a vision is laid out that we are free to disagree with or agree with components of but, nonetheless, points to this great American ideal that we are a people who self-govern and that we are accountable in an open way to the people who sent us here, even in the midst of deep philosophical divides about the direction of our Nation—and, of course, the world was watching.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important, though, that we take a moment of reflection and be honest about this moment in time and the current conditions in our society. Many Americans do face downward mobility, stagnant wages, and an increased cost of living.

Many people feel very abandoned in the face of a Washington-Wall Street axis, where more and more power is concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. But I think we have to be careful about something. We have to be careful about seeing the solution as lying in more government.

I think our Nation deserves a smart and effective government, and I think our job here in Congress is to continue in an open way, look at the past, and see what worked and see what doesn't work, to let go of that which is tired and old and worn out and continues to linger, and to invest more in that which is smart and effective and can truly build a good society that creates opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that we shouldn't divide ourselves by class and

income and that, in a healthy economy, it is one that is focused on small business. This is where most new jobs are created in our country.

Particularly for young people, I think we need to create a culture of creativity, one in which a person who has an idea can seize the moment and use the gifts of their own two hands and their own intellect to make good things, to create benefit for others, to create jobs, hire people, protect families, and to make a contribution to society.

Many young people want to pursue these avenues; yet we have to be honest about what is happening. We are entering, in this country, into an entrepreneurial winter. What does that mean? In other words, the number of startup businesses—small businesses—is less than the number of small businesses dying.

We do not have a net increase in the number of small businesses; and, again, this is where most Americans live and work, making good things for others, in small business. That is where jobs are created.

How do we address this problem? Well, the tendency, again, in our body is to think about public solutions, but let's examine—not through my opinion but just the analytics—as to why small businesses are not creating new jobs and are not starting up as aggressively as they have in the past.

It is really two things. It is health care and regulations. Smart regulations are necessary to protect the health and well-being of all Americans, but when you have oppressive regulations that tend to stack the deck toward those who are larger and can hire an army of lawyers and accountants, it represses the ability of small businesses to take risks and create jobs.

The second problem we have is health care. Mr. Speaker, I got an email yesterday from someone who said: "Congressman, my health care has gone up so much that I have to move into government housing." Now, think of the irony of that.

Again, we need the right type of health care reform, one that is going to reduce costs and improve health care outcomes while we protect vulnerable persons. But what has happened? Some people have been helped by the new law, but many, many families have been hurt with escalating health care costs, and, again, it creates an environment in which small business is repressed.

Mr. Speaker, again, I think our government should be smart and effective, and I think that is what most Americans want, but Washington continues to remain mired in mediocrity, and political dysfunction and partisan gridlock have made smart and proper government difficult.

This arthritic recovery has dimmed the financial prospects of too many individuals who, again, have stagnant

wages or who have given up hope and feel directionless, isolated, and alone. We can do better, and we must do better.

Despite these challenges, I believe the start of a new Congress is an exciting time to renew our government and this promise of our Nation. I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker: there is nothing wrong in America that can't be fixed by what is right in America, but it is going to require bold resolve, innovative public policy, and a return to our highest ideals.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Most Reverend Richard Pates, Bishop of the Diocese of Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Blessed are You, Lord God of all creation. You bless us with life. You fill each lengthening day with more light, a generous light which shines on all people.

We seek Your light, O God, in our midst this day, for each woman and man of this House, each entrusted to cooperate in the making of just laws which promote the flourishing of human freedom.

Let Your light break forth among these, our public servants. Give us faith that as each new day is bright with promise, so too is Your spirit's power to transform blame and bitterness into concord and unity, for the sake of the common good.

To You, therefore, generous Spirit of God, we commend our work this day, that we might walk freely in Your light, one people whose future is filled with hope.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POMPEO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

WELCOMING MOST REVEREND RICHARD PATES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce and recognize my friend Bishop Richard Pates of the Des Moines Diocese.

Born in St. Paul, Minnesota, and a huge Vikings fan, Bishop Pates attended Nazareth Hall Seminary and St. Paul Seminary in his hometown.

The bishop went on to graduate school at the North American College in Rome from the prestigious Gregorian University. In 1968, Bishop Pates was ordained at St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

Bishop Pates' education laid the foundation for his impressive pastoral and administrative service to the church and, I am proud to say, led Bishop Pates to Iowa in 2008, when he was appointed by Pope Benedict XVI to be the ninth bishop for the Diocese of Des Moines. The bishop is also chair of the Iowa Catholic Conference, for which I thank him again for his service to the church and to Iowa.

I want to thank Bishop Pates for opening the House today with a prayer, thank him for his friendship, and ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Bishop Richard Pates to the people's House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. POMPEO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow hundreds of young people from across Kansas will join thousands of Americans, young and old, on The National Mall for the March for Life.

They are here to remind us all that, in the midst of all the important issues we talk about here in Washington, D.C., every single life is a gift.

This year is the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade. Since then, over 55 million abortions have been performed in the United States. This stain upon our Nation has been allowed to continue for far too long. Yet in the face of this continuing tragedy, I am encouraged by the fact that today the pro-life movement is stronger than ever.

I see the evidence of that movement in the eyes of the young people, young people that will come to Washington tomorrow from Benedictine College, from Conway Springs High School, from Bishop Carroll High School, from Kapaun Mt. Carmel, and from both Kansas State University and Newman University. It will encourage me to continue my efforts to protect the unborn each and every day.

While some just talk the talk, tomorrow the young people from Kansas will walk the walk, and I look forward to joining with them on this very special and important day to protect this very important right.

AMERICA'S FAILING INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday a bridge collapsed in Cincinnati, Ohio, killing one person and injuring another. This tragedy calls to mind the collapse of the Schoharie Creek Bridge in New York in 1987, which killed 10 people, and the collapse of the I-35 West bridge in Minneapolis in 2007, which left 13 dead.

I don't know if more transportation funding would have prevented these collapses, but I do know that every second of every day seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient. There are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges in the Nation; there are over 99 structurally deficient bridges in western New York alone. These numbers are unacceptable. Congress is failing the American people by failing to address this issue.

Last night we heard from the President a plan to increase funding for infrastructure. That is a start, but I say we can and must do more. I encourage my colleagues to pass an infrastructure bill that is large enough to address the real needs of this Nation.

RECOGNIZING THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE SHOWMEN'S ASSOCIATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize

the men and women of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association. These small business owners have been working together since 1967 to keep the outdoor amusement industry alive and strong through their combined efforts to remain one of the best forms of American family entertainment.

I am proud to have many of these individuals and families in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District, such as the Bartlebaughs, Carters, Garbricks, and Snyders.

Above and beyond providing good fun and family entertainment, members of the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association have remained dedicated to giving back by supporting both youth educational scholarships and FFA programs. Since 2005, the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association has raised and donated over \$350,000 to youth educational scholarships and FFA programming through the work of more than 100 of their volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania State Showmen's Association put their individual goals aside for the common goals of the industry to serve the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. Their generous record reflects their success, and I thank them for their efforts.

WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS MUST BE RESPECTED

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, this must be Groundhog Day because this House continues to revisit over and over again a woman's right to make decisions about her own health.

Roe v. Wade has long established a woman's constitutional right to have an abortion prior to a fetus' viability, yet Republicans continue to introduce legislation like H.R. 36 to ban abortions beginning at 20 weeks, with very limited exceptions.

In Congress and in several States, politicians are interfering in complicated private medical decisions that should be left to a woman, her family, and her doctor. That is why I am proud to reintroduce the Women's Health Protection Act, a bill making it unlawful for States to pass restrictive legislation that will endanger women's health and safety. Women's reproductive rights must be respected.

RECOGNIZING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42-year anniversary since the Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade. Since then, millions of innocent lives have been lost.

This is also a time to renew hope, as Americans continue to advocate for the respect of all human life. Tomorrow, upwards of a quarter of a million people from across the Nation and many from my district will march from The National Mall to the Supreme Court.

In Congress, we are working to help their efforts. I am cosponsoring H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would limit abortion after the age at which evidence shows an unborn child can experience pain.

We must continue to stand for legislation that defends the right to life, without which all other rights are impossible.

REMEMBERING SISTER ANN KEEFE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Ann Keefe, who passed away on Sunday, January 18.

In 1982, Sister Ann joined the ministry at Saint Michael's in Providence and began her lifelong fight for those who had no voice and those particularly vulnerable and marginalized. Recognizing the challenges that faced our city and our State, Sister Ann took action to help the poor, empower workers, advocate nonviolence, and promote justice for all.

Providing 30 years of service to our community, she cofounded the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, which is credited with helping to sharply cut the city's murder rate. She started Providence City Arts to help at-risk youth through the arts, and she was involved in creating two dozen other organizations that continue to create opportunity for so many.

I had the extraordinary honor of working with Sister Ann over many years and treasured our friendship. She was a remarkable and strong woman who leaves behind a great legacy. Her passing is a tremendous loss for Rhode Island, but her presence will continue to be felt in the community through the organizations she helped found and run and the positive impact she has had on so many.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family and loved ones.

Rest in peace, Sister Ann.

FIXING THE VA IS DIFFICULT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the President drove right past the Phoenix VA hospital, the facility at the center of the biggest scandal plaguing our Nation's veterans, without taking a second to stop.

Last night in his hour-long speech, the President hardly skimmed the surface in addressing the major challenges our veterans are facing, but he did mention we need to do more to provide our veterans more job opportunities.

We agree. In fact, on this same floor just a few weeks ago, Members of the House passed legislation that would do just that: encourage our employers to hire more of our heroes.

Astonishingly, though, our President failed to even mention one word about the excessive wait times, second-rate care, fraudulent records, destroyed files, and complete incompetence that had been brought to light last year in the VA.

He made no mention on the appeals process or recommendations to improve the lengthy process our veterans face to access the care and treatment they deserve, a topic the House is scheduled to have a hearing on tomorrow.

Fixing the VA is difficult but not impossible. We are here to provide solutions, but we need our leader to be ready to work with us, to be ready to help us so we can finally give our veterans a system that works for them, not against them, in a timely fashion.

THE MIDDLE CLASS DESERVES A BREAK

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, the three most important topics in the President's State of the Union last night were, in order of importance: middle class, middle class, and middle class.

Now, some have called the President's desire to strengthen the middle class with a tax cut class warfare. Well, I have got to tell you, if you have been in the middle class, you feel like you have survived a war over the past many years.

There was the Great Recession, which was created by bad economic policies between 2000 and 2008. You lost your home values. You lost your 401(k). You watched your paychecks shrink.

Now you have gone through a recovery where the statistics tell you that things are going well: the economy has improved 12 percent; that is good news. Corporate profits are up 46 percent; that is good news. The stock market is up 92 percent; that is good news. But you look at your pay stub and say: Where is my good news? I am not keeping pace with everybody else.

In 1992, Jim Carville famously said, "It's the economy, stupid." In 2015, it is my paycheck, stupid. It is paramount that this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, find ways to provide tax cuts to provide the break that the great middle class deserves and the break that has eluded them for too long.

This is not class warfare, Mr. Speaker. This is growing the great and strong middle class of this country.

□ 1215

HONORING LEGACY OF BAYARD WINSLOW "CHIP" KENNETT II

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and legacy of Chip Kennett from Conway, New Hampshire, who passed away this weekend at the age of 34 after a heroic 2-year battle with lung cancer.

Chip was a dedicated public servant on Capitol Hill, devoted friend, father, husband, and inspiration to us all. Upon his diagnosis, Chip used his Capitol Hill experience to advocate on behalf of lung cancer research, testifying before a Senate Aging Committee hearing in 2014 to increase the awareness of the disease. He worked to erase the stigma associated with lung cancer and, in doing so, left a legacy that will continue touching countless lives.

To those who mourn with us today, we rest easier knowing that we could not help but profit from his friendship, his optimism, and his sense of humor. He loved life completely and lived it for others. We are all immeasurably better for having known him.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones during this difficult time, especially his wife, Sheila; their two children, Joe Kennett and Crosby Reynolds; as well as his parents, Bayard and Theresa Kennett.

OPPOSING ATTACK ON WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against H.R. 36, a bold attack on reproductive freedom. While in the North Carolina House, I fought tirelessly for women's reproductive choice. As the 100th woman in Congress, I will do the same in the U.S. House. The fight begins with speaking against this unconscionable bill.

Mr. FRANKS, women's health decisions are personal. They should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor—not the North Carolina House and not the U.S. House.

H.R. 36 would add barriers for women who often face complicated, heart-breaking circumstances. I join other women who adamantly oppose this bill, including many of my Republican colleagues.

Today, I stand with Senators, Representatives, and NARAL activists in delivering 150,000 American signatures

opposing this bill. I respectfully urge my colleagues not to support this legislation.

A woman cannot call herself free who does not own or control her own body.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WILLIAM TRAMMELL

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor an American hero, Mr. William Trammell, born January 28, 1920. A lifelong resident of Anderson County, he graduated from Clemson University in 1941 in the exceptional class of graduates known as the "wartime class," where 57 of his classmates lost their lives in World War II. They composed the backbone of what we understand today as the Greatest Generation.

Captain Trammell joined the 1st Engineer Amphibian Brigade during the war, and he was sent to Europe to fight the Nazis. He participated in the North Africa invasion, as well as campaigns in Tunisia, southern Italy, and southern France. Fortunately, he returned home after 3½ years overseas suffering only minor injuries.

Once home, he pursued the American Dream. Mr. Trammell successfully operated three businesses, one of which is still in operation today and operated by his oldest son, Steve.

Mr. Trammell, along with his wife, Thelma, worked on the Eisenhower campaign. To this day, he represents the highest quality of individual that we expect as Americans. He has served his community and country with honor, dignity, and love. Today I would like to wish Mr. Trammell a happy 95th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House, as well as all Americans, to strive to live life as this exceptional man has and to dedicate their lives to something greater than themselves.

WORKING TOGETHER ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last night President Obama called on Congress to work together on behalf of the American people. It is a call I hear from my constituents in Illinois every day. So as we begin the 114th Congress, I rise on their behalf to urge my colleagues to rise above partisanship, to strengthen our economy and put even more Americans back to work.

Today, all signs point to our economy being the strongest it has been in nearly a decade. Businesses are flourishing. We have gained nearly 3 million

new jobs. But there are still 8.7 million Americans living in the shadow of the economic crisis who are struggling with chronic unemployment. They deserve a Congress that is focused and united in putting them back to work.

Let's work to reduce the tax burden on the middle class, putting more money in their pockets and making it easier for them to afford their homes and to send their kids to school so that the American Dream is within everyone's reach. Americans want a Congress that can overcome partisan gridlock to put the people first.

I urge my colleagues to put politics aside, to find a middle ground to help our middle class and put more Americans on the path to opportunity and prosperity.

YAKIMA COUNTY CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as the newly elected Congressman from central Washington, I rise to mark the 150th birthday of Yakima County, a county at the heart of my congressional district and the county where I was born and am proud to call my home. The Washington Territorial Legislature created Yakima County in 1865, nearly 25 years before Washington itself became a State.

I am a third-generation Yakima County farmer. My family and I continue to operate a 600-acre farm near the city of Sunnyside. Even before the creation of Yakima County, the agricultural industry recognized the vast environmental benefits of the region. Today, agriculture remains the lifeblood of Yakima County's economy, and I am pleased to represent those interests before the House Committee on Agriculture.

Today marks Yakima County's sesquicentennial. Happy 150th birthday. It is an honor to represent you in Congress.

FREE TRADE DEALS DISPROPORTIONATELY HURT COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, when jobs are shipped overseas because of bad trade deals, communities of color bear the huge brunt of the loss of those jobs. Of the 2.7 million jobs lost to China as a result of past trade deals, nearly 1 million of those jobs lost belong to people of color—one million jobs.

Even after they lost their jobs, bad trade deals continued to harm them. When they found another job, it was on

average for a nearly 30 percent lower wage. Trade deals like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is being negotiated in secret, wreak havoc on communities of color. We cannot allow more bad trade deals to be enacted, especially when unemployment rates and poverty rates in these communities are much too high already.

Congress must consider the consequences of these trade deals on communities of color and all workers in our country given the terrible impacts of past trade deals. We must demand transparency, ensure that environmental and labor standards and food safety standards are protected, and insist that Congress exercise its constitutional responsibility in ensuring fair and free trade. TPP is certainly not fair and must be defeated.

NO MORE ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL FEDERAL DICTATES

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the American people spoke loud and clear in November, but it is evident from last night's State of the Union that President Obama wasn't listening. Despite a rejection of his policies at the ballot box, the President continues to propose outdated, Washington-centered ideas that simply don't work.

The American people want Washington to stop interfering in their lives, and they don't need more one-size-fits-all Federal dictates. Republicans have a vision for the future, but President Obama appears to be mired in the past.

Last night, the President expressed a willingness to work with Republicans, and I hope that gesture is sincere. In the past, working together too often meant agreeing with whatever the President said. It is time for President Obama to live up to his rhetoric. House Republicans are eager to work together to increase opportunities for all Americans and empower people, not Washington.

A WOMAN'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 36. This bill is a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling 42 years ago in *Roe v. Wade*. It is a dangerous attack on a woman's constitutional right to choose.

The bill does not include an exception for the physical or emotional health of a woman. It fails to provide sufficient protections for victims of rape and incest, and it has only a very narrow exception when a woman's life is in danger.

In short, the bill significantly reduces the safe, legal options that women have and prevents doctors from providing the most medically appropriate care for their patients.

Republicans have repeatedly demonstrated a disregard for women's health care, and this bill is just one more example of their continuing attack on women's rights. It is a step backward for women's health and, quite simply, a distraction from the important work that we should be undertaking. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF CAROL I. GLOVER

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary woman and admired constituent, Carol Glover, who passed away on Monday, January 12, as a result of the tragic incident aboard Metro train 302.

Carol was a devoted mother who raised her two sons in Alexandria, Virginia. Many of her friends and family describe her as "the ultimate sports mom cheerleader" because she could often be found cheering on the sidelines of her sons' football, soccer, and basketball games. Carol was also the den mother for her sons' Cub Scouts troop and was said to treat all like her own children.

Carol had a successful 20-year career as a contractor for the Federal Government. She studied computer programming at Drexel University, where she graduated with honors, and she recently received the Employee of the Year honor. It is clear she was as diligent in her work as she was in raising her children.

Carol will be remembered as a woman of strong faith with a gentle demeanor and warm heart. At her funeral her mother said: "In life we all have a dark tunnel to go through. Stay on track, and you will see the light at the end of the tunnel." Her mother believed that Carol had found that light.

Carol leaves behind sons Anthony, who served in the Marines for 13 years, and Marcus, who works for a Christian nonprofit here in Washington, D.C.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to Carol's family, friends, and to all those whose lives were touched by this amazing woman.

WORKING TOGETHER

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to attend the State of the Union Address last night for the first time, representing the

Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

After listening to the President's speech, I hope that he will find common ground and work with Congress on a number of complex issues facing our Nation, including enacting job-creating policies for hardworking families, fixing our broken health care system, and reining in our out-of-control debt, and that is just to name a few.

But unfortunately, there were a number of veto threats and proposals which amount to more government overreach into the lives of hardworking taxpayers.

Americans are looking for Congress and the President to work together, not for the President to take a go-it-alone approach and repeatedly threaten use of veto power. We are not looking to grow our Federal government any further.

That said, I agree specifically with the President's desire for improving cybersecurity legislation and creating more economic opportunity for our Nation's veterans. I disagree with his approach on other matters discussed, specifically, certain tax reform measures that will ultimately amount to a trickle-down tax increase on middle class Americans.

I am confident we can find some common ground and adequately fund our Nation's transportation and infrastructure needs, and I look forward to doing that.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 39

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Nunnelee to rank immediately after Mr. Womack.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Garrett; Mr. Diaz-Balart; Mr. Cole; Mr. McClintock; Mrs. Black; Mr. Rokita; Mr. Woodall; Mrs. Blackburn; Mrs. Hartzler; Mr. Rice of South Carolina; Mr. Stutzman; Mr. Sanford; Mr. Schock; Mr. Womack; Mr. Brat; Mr. Blum; Mr. Mooney of West Virginia; Mr. Grothman; Mr. Palmer; Mr. Moolenaar; and Mr. Westerman.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 161, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 38

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1230

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 38 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 161, the Nat-

ural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The rule before us today, Mr. Speaker, provides for consideration of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is truly fitting that the House considers this legislation in the shadow of the 42nd anniversary of the Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton decisions that gave Americans abortion on demand at any stage of pregnancy.

This legislation is a commonsense step in recognizing the truth that science has made more clear with the passage of time: the unborn child in the womb is alive and a functioning member of the human family.

Science has shown us that the most fundamental precursors to an unborn child feeling pain are already in place by 8 weeks in development. Necessary connections between the brain and spinal cord are in place and complete by 18 weeks.

The House Judiciary Committee heard testimony by expert physicians that the earlier premature babies are delivered, the more acutely they feel pain. It is clear that unborn children at 20 weeks of development are capable of feeling pain and deserving of protection.

In spite of the 60 percent of Americans who believe we should limit abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to protest this sensible legislation, seeking to keep us in the company of only seven other nations that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks, which includes such well-known human rights leaders as North Korea, China, and Vietnam.

This vital, lifesaving legislation is not the only important legislation the House will consider this week. This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act recognizes the positive impact America's shale revolution has had on energy prices and the potential it holds to lower them further. We are in the midst of another hard winter, and red tape reduction is necessary to ensure we have the infrastructure needed to ensure low-cost natural gas is able to reach our coldest States when they need it most without price shocks or shortages.

H.R. 161 introduces critical reform to ensure prompt consideration of necessary permitting requests for construction or updates to natural gas pipelines, providing certainty to energy companies and the consumers they serve.

The legislation would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve or deny a requested pipeline certificate no later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed and has engaged in the prefiling process.

H.R. 161 also ensures that relevant agencies provide approval or denial within 90 days of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission completing its final environmental document.

Finally, the legislation would put permits into effect, notwithstanding agencies' failures to provide approval within the time mandated, with allowances for the addition of conditions consistent with the final environmental document.

H.R. 161 is the reintroduction of H.R. 1900, which passed this House on a bipartisan basis in the 113th Congress. H.R. 1900 received extensive committee consideration, including numerous hearings on the underlying issues, prompting the legislation, as well as the subcommittee hearing and subcommittee and full committee mark-ups on the bill.

Both H.R. 36 and H.R. 161 are truly important legislation that Americans would be well-served to have considered this week, and I commend both my bills to my colleagues as deserving of their support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while I have great respect for the gentlewoman from North Carolina, I don't have a lot of respect for this process. I would like to begin today by saying a word or two about the process being used by the Republicans here on the floor—actually, three words: "It stinks. Again."

We are all very happy—delighted even—to hear our Republican friends say that they wanted to make this Congress into a place where we could work together, but actions speak louder than words, and here are some of their actions: five closed rules.

Until yesterday, 100 percent of our Rules Committee meetings have been called so-called emergency meetings, and 100 percent of the bills the committee has sent to the floor have drawn a veto threat, and once again, the Republicans are using one rule for multiple bills. This is a disturbing pattern that is quickly becoming a bad habit.

The Republican leadership apparently isn't content to exclude Democrats from offering substantive, germane, and thoughtful amendments. They are also shutting down the debate itself.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is only a few weeks old. We have 23 months left to go. Are the Republicans really saying that we can't find an extra hour for debate during the next 23 months? Of course we can. They just prefer not to. It is unfair, it is undemocratic, it is unnecessary, and it needs to stop.

Now, as to the bill that is before us today, last night, as we all know,

President Obama laid out a bold, clear, and exciting agenda to spur economic growth and ensure that prosperity is shared by all Americans, not just the wealthy few and special interests. I thought it was a terrific speech.

Apparently, my Republican friends weren't paying very close attention. I know they were there in this Chamber because I saw many of them. The Speaker himself was sitting right behind the President. Maybe they were sending each other cat videos or taking selfies because the President made it very clear that if Congress sends him bills that move us backward, he will veto them, and both of these bills deserve his veto.

The first, H.R. 161, is a solution in search of a problem. It is as simple as that. The bill would automatically approve natural gas pipeline projects if FERC or other Federal agencies do not act on required permits or certificates within a rigid, unworkable timeframe.

A GAO report concluded that FERC's pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent, with 91 percent of pipeline applications receiving a decision within 12 months. During committee testimony last Congress, even industry representatives agreed that the current permitting process is "generally very good." It is not every day that regulators and industry agree that the current system works.

So why would we move forward on a bill that disrupts a system that works is beyond me. In fact, this bill makes it more likely that FERC will deny more projects just to comply with the severe timeline.

In Massachusetts, we are dealing with the proposed Tennessee Gas pipeline which would run through parts of my district and would cut through a number of environmentally sensitive lands, including Northfield State Forest and the Montague aquifer and management area.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment with my good friend Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS, whose district would also be affected by the proposed pipeline, to keep the existing review process in place for proposed pipelines that cross Federal, State, or local conservation or recreation lands because, if we have already invested Federal and State money into identifying these lands as environmentally sensitive, it doesn't make any sense to expedite the approval of a pipeline that could bulldoze right through them.

It is worth a debate. Unfortunately, Republicans on the Rules Committee voted down this commonsense amendment in a party-line vote.

As the gentlewoman from North Carolina pointed out, both of these rules are completely closed. Even though they did not go through regular order, even though there were no hearings in this Congress or no markup, no

body—no Democrat, no Republican—can offer an amendment.

Then there is H.R. 36. This is just the latest Republican assault on women's reproductive rights. It is their latest attempt to put politicians in the middle of the private medical decisions of women. It is blatantly unconstitutional, and it fails to take into consideration the fact that some pregnancies can have catastrophic, heartbreaking complications, even after 20 weeks.

To make matters worse, this legislation lacks a reasonable exception for victims of rape and incest by requiring victims to report cases of rape and incest to law enforcement in order to have access to an abortion, this despite the fact that research shows that the majority of sexual assaults are unreported, and on top of that, the exception on incest is only for minors.

Mr. Speaker, what really bothers me about bills like this is that the same people who vote for them routinely vote to cut the WIC program, to cut Head Start and childcare programs and SNAP and school lunch programs, and elementary and secondary education funding. This hypocrisy is breathtaking.

Mr. Speaker, leading medical groups agree that doctors, in consultation with women and their families, should make medical decisions, not the politicians.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. They deserve a better process, and they deserve better legislation. We certainly have a lot to do to help get this country to continue on the road to prosperity, to make sure that everybody can share in this economy's growth.

I urge my colleagues: let's focus on those issues, let's come together and do something for the American people, and enough of these message bills.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I need to remind this House that during the Democrats' time in the majority, there were two rules packages providing consideration of seven unrelated measures.

In the 110th Congress, their first year in the majority, the rules package provided for consideration of five measures.

In the 111th Congress, the Democrat majority provided for the consideration of two separate measures in the rules package.

The Democrat majority went directly to the floor with these bills, with no committee consideration and without even allowing the Rules Committee to debate these measures or report an appropriate rule for consideration.

In the 110th Congress, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and Democrats on the Rules Committee reported three addi-

tional closed rules, starting the Congress out with eight closed rules in the opening weeks.

In the 111th Congress, Democrats reported out two additional closed rules, for a total of four closed rules in the opening weeks of that Congress.

Unlike our Democrat colleagues, the Speaker and Chairman SESSIONS had provided the opportunity to have hearings before the Rules Committee.

It is our goal to return to regular order now that our committees are organizing, but the false attacks by my colleagues do not stand up to the light of day when you compare our records.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the preeminent defenders of life in this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend for yielding and thank her for her strong leadership for human rights and for the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, pain—we all dread it, we avoid it, we even fear it, and we all go to extraordinary lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration; yet an entire age group of human beings are, today, subjected to a deadly, extraordinarily painful procedure, one of which is called the dismemberment method, the D&E.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion. Children, including children with disabilities, Mr. Speaker, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

One leading expert in the field of fetal pain, Dr. Anand, at the University of Tennessee, stated in his expert report, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice:

The human fetus possesses the ability to experience pain from 20 weeks of gestation, if not earlier, and the pain perceived by a fetus is possibly more intense than that perceived by term newborns or older children.

□ 1245

Dr. Colleen Malloy, assistant professor, Division of Neonatology at Northwestern University, in her testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, said:

When we speak of infants at 20 weeks postfertilization, we no longer have to rely on inferences or ultrasound technology, because such premature patients are kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the neonatal intensive care unit.

In other words, there are children the same age who, in utero, can be killed by abortion—and painfully—or who have been born and who are now being given lifesaving assistance. She went on to say:

In today's medical arena, we resuscitate patients at this age and are able to witness their ex-utero growth.

Dr. Malloy concludes:

I could never imagine subjecting my tiny patients to horrific procedures such as those that involve limb detachment or cardiac injection.

Again, that is what the abortionists do.

Surgeons today, Mr. Speaker, are entering the womb to perform life-enhancing and lifesaving corrective surgeries on unborn children. They have seen those babies flinch, jerk around, move around, and recoil from sharp objects and incisions. As they seek to heal, surgeons are today routinely administering anesthesia to unborn children in the womb—a best medical practice—to protect them from pain. We now know that the child ought to be treated as a patient and that there are many anomalies, sicknesses, and disabilities that could be treated with a degree of success while the child is still in utero. The child ought to be seen as a patient. When those interventions are performed, again, anesthesia is given.

Last June, *TIME* Magazine's cover story, "Saving Preemies," explored the preemie revolution and how cutting-edge medicine and dedicated caregivers are helping the tiniest babies to survive and thrive. *TIME* says:

Thanks to advances that had not been made even a few years ago, the odds of surviving and thriving are improving all the time.

Abortionists, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, are in the business of ensuring that children neither survive nor thrive. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, I yield myself such time as I may consume as I want to respond to this issue about process.

When Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of this House, in his opening speech, one of the things he said was:

You will always have the right to a robust debate and an open process that allows you to represent your constituents—to make your case, to offer alternatives, and to be heard.

Clearly, we have not been granted that in any way, shape, or form.

While the gentlewoman may point to the sins of the past of Democratic majorities, nothing compares to what the Republicans did in the last Congress. The Republicans presided over the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

I mean, you made history, and that is not something to be proud of.

When my friends talk about openness and transparency and about the desire to allow this to be a deliberative place where people of varying viewpoints can have a forum to debate, it is not reflective of reality. We are beginning this Congress just as my colleagues con-

ducted the last Congress—in the most closed way possible. I regret that very much, especially on bills that have not even been through the committee hearing process in this Congress or that have not been marked up.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I want to thank my colleague for his great work and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, *The Wall Street Journal* polled the American public and found that these are their top three priorities: creating jobs, defeating ISIS, and reducing the Federal budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I insert that piece from *The Wall Street Journal* into the RECORD.

[From *The Wall Street Journal*]

POLL FINDS AGENDA GAP BETWEEN LEADERS,
AMERICAN PEOPLE
(By Janet Hook)

Republicans are trying to burnish their party's image—and Congress—by promising to "get things done" now that the GOP controls both the House and Senate. But a new *Wall Street Journal*/NBC News poll shows that the public doesn't care much about some of the first things the GOP, or President Barack Obama, is trying to do.

The poll conducted from Jan. 14–17 found that two of the major issues congressional Republicans and the White House have identified as candidates for bipartisan action—trade and simplification of the tax code—didn't even make the top five issues that people feel need to be addressed urgently.

The poll tried to identify the issues that are most important to Americans by asking which issues they considered an "absolute priority" for Congress and the president to act on this year, as opposed to issues that they think could be delayed.

The list was topped by enduring concerns: job creation, fighting Islamic militants in Iraq and Syria, reducing the federal deficit and securing the U.S. border.

But people are virtually yawning at the prospect of expanding U.S. trade, a priority for an administration trying to finalize a new free-trade agreement with Asian and Pacific Rim countries. Only 20% said that was an urgent priority for this year, 59% said it could be delayed until next year and 16% said it shouldn't be pursued at all.

"It's a reminder that this is for the most part a very distant economic issue and it's not one that people focus on," said Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster who conducted the poll with Democrat Fred Yang.

The apathy about trade is bipartisan. Only 22% of Republicans and 21% of Democrats said it was a top priority.

Simplifying the tax code is also an issue that's not a top-five policy priority for most Americans, but is treated like a motherhood issue by politicians of both parties. Just over half polled said it was an urgent priority—less than the percentage who wanted to make "efforts to address Iran's nuclear program" a top agenda item.

Even some of the issues Washington lawmakers are fighting over are matters of only marginal concern to many people. Republicans have acted quickly on a bill to finish construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, and Mr. Obama threw down his first veto

threat over it. But nearly four in ten people polled said they didn't know enough about the issue to have an opinion.

The survey of policy priorities underscored another trend that doesn't bode well for bipartisan cooperation: On all but a handful of issues, such as job creation and infrastructure repair, the poll found big disparities in the interests of the two parties. So, while 67% of Democrats identified income inequality as an urgent priority, only 19% of Republicans did. U.S. border security was a top priority for 79% of Republicans but only 43% of Democrats.

It's not surprising, then, that the poll found people were down on the idea of having divided government. Mr. Obama and Republicans in Congress may agree on the need to "get things done." The problem is there isn't a lot of agreement on what "things" should get priority.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, why am I bringing that up? The offense, to me, is that there are so many people in Congress who always want to bring up this issue of eating away at *Roe v. Wade*. They don't have the nerve, I think, really, to try to take that away.

Roe v. Wade gave women a choice, and I believe that, if you don't want to have that choice yourself, don't use it; but what right do people who do not agree with choice have to make it the law of the land—to require everybody to live under what they believe is true?

Now, there is not a scintilla of scientific evidence that at 20 weeks pain is felt. The neural connections are not there to have that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to insert into the RECORD what scientists—the executive vice president and others—have said from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in that this is not possible.

JANUARY 21, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, We, the undersigned medical and public health organizations, stand in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the so-called "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act," sponsored by Representative Trent Franks (R-AZ) and Representative Marsha Blackburn (R-TN). Politicians are not doctors and should not interfere in personal, medical decisions.

If enacted, H.R. 36 would ban most abortions in the United States at 20 weeks after fertilization, clearly before viability. The bill threatens providers with fines and/or imprisonment for providing professional and compassionate care, and is intended to intimidate and discourage doctors from providing abortion care. This bill places health care providers in an untenable situation—when they are facing a complex, urgent medical situation, they must think about an unjust law instead of about how to protect the health and safety of their patients.

Politicians are not medical experts. H.R. 36 disregards the health issues and real life situations that women can face in pregnancy. Every woman faces her own unique circumstances, challenges, and potential complications. She needs to be able to make decisions based on her physician's medical advice and what is right for her and her family.

H.R. 36 would force a doctor to deny an abortion to a woman who has determined that terminating a pregnancy is the right decision for her, including women carrying a

pregnancy with severe and lethal anomalies that may not be diagnosed until after 20 weeks in pregnancy and women with serious medical conditions brought on or exacerbated by pregnancy. H.R. 36 contains no exception to preserve the health of the woman. Instead, it includes a vague life endangerment exception which exposes doctors to the threat of criminal prosecution, limiting their options for care that is often needed in complex, urgent medical situations.

Moreover, H.R. 36 would dictate how physicians should care for their patients based on inaccurate and unscientific claims. Conclusive research shows that contrary to the sponsors' claims, the fetus doesn't have the neurological structures needed to experience pain until significantly later in pregnancy.

We strongly oppose governmental interference in the patient-provider relationship and criminalizing provision of care to women and their families. H.R. 36 jeopardizes the health of women in the U.S. by limiting access to safe and legal abortion and replaces personal decision-making by women and their doctors with political ideology. Our organizations urge you to oppose passage of H.R. 36.

Sincerely,
American College of Nurse-Midwives,
American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists,
American Medical Students Association,
American Medical Women's Association,
American Nurses Association,
American Society for Reproductive Medicine,
Association of Reproductive Health Professionals,
Medical Students for Choice,
National Abortion Federation,
National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health,
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association,
Physicians for Reproductive Health,
Planned Parenthood Federation of America,
Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine,
Society of Family Planning.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, as a scientist, I have learned that this Congress does not take scientific facts as facts but that it views them as, maybe, suggestions. Yet how often it is that we are playing with people's lives. It is the most personal decision one could ever make, and it should be made between the woman, her family, or whomever she wants to consult—her doctor, her priest, her pastor—anybody—but not the Congress of the United States.

Why do men in blue suits and red ties get to make that decision when it has nothing to do with scientific or medical facts? It is absolutely astonishing to me that this continues over and over again; and in the States that have passed 20-week abortion bills, the bills have always been overturned with regard to the constitutional question, and this will be as well.

Time and time again, when asked about it, neurobiology specialists, obstetricians, and gynecologists the world over have refuted the scientific and factual premises of this bill, but nobody cares about that here. I saw a great button that called the people here who are trying to do this today

"gyneticians." A "gynetician" is described as a politician who knows more about women's health than doctors do.

We can go on with this, but what we need to remember is that, last night, half of the President's speech dealt with people who are underpaid and who struggle to live in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the chase here.

Barney Frank, our former colleague, said that many people believe that life begins at conception and ends at birth.

I want to know how this Congress is going to comply with what the President asked us last night: Will you give more money for child care? for daycare? Will you give more money for early education? Will you make sure that mothers are paid as much as the men they are working with and that the same jobs pay the same? Will you do something about paid sick leave? Will you help these children get to college?

Absolutely not. The record has been clear on all of these issues.

There is something really awful when we take up the time to please the base of some sort out there against all scientific belief and everything that we know about medicine. I wish this Congress would stop the folly. We are faced with a lot of serious problems in this country. Again, as my colleague points out, we have no ability to amend it. Nobody else can be heard on anything else. It is simply going to be voted on; the Senate may or may not ever take it up; and the President will not sign it. It is the same thing that we did over and over in the last session—kill health care.

Do everything you can. Nothing is going to be signed. No bills will be made. It is a shame. I have labeled it before as "legislative malpractice," and that is exactly what is going on with this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, we find ourselves in a position in which we must correct the record.

Over the last 4 years, Republicans have implemented reforms to make the U.S. House of Representatives more open and transparent than ever. Under this GOP majority, Members on both sides of the aisle have been allowed to offer significantly more amendments—and the House has operated under far more open rules—than were allowed under the previous Democrat-controlled House.

The GOP majority allowed nearly 1,500 amendments to be considered on the House floor in the 113th Congress. Under Speaker PELOSI, the House did not consider a single bill under an open rule throughout the 111th Congress.

That is the definition of a closed process, Mr. Speaker, and it is precisely what Speaker BOEHNER successfully changed to start the 112th Congress and to continue throughout the 113th Congress. Under the current GOP majority, the House has considered 38 open or modified open rules.

When you compare the record of the Republican majority and the most recent Democrat majority, any fair analysis will show that Republicans are running a more open, transparent House of Representatives that allows for greater participation by all Members.

The problem throughout the last Congress resided in the Senate and its failure to act on almost everything passed by the House. When the Senate did decide to act, then-majority leader, Democrat HARRY REID, virtually locked down the amendment process on the Senate floor. When you compare the nearly 1,500 amendments considered on the House floor with the Senate's record of inaction, a more accurate picture emerges.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, most importantly, of the underlying bill, H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. I encourage all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this important job creation bill.

The great State of Maine is home to the most skilled papermakers in the world. Even so, last year, mills in Bucksport, Old Town, and Millinocket closed, laying off 1,000 of our workers. Soon, a fourth mill, which is in Madison, will temporarily shut down, furloughing another 215 workers.

For each mill, the high cost of electricity to run its machinery was a primary reason for closure. Almost half the power plants in New England burn natural gas to generate electricity. We must allow the increased production and transportation of natural gas to drive down the cost of electric power and save our mills, our factories, and save our jobs.

Today, I am proud to cosponsor this new legislation in order to expedite the permitting to construct more and larger capacity natural gas pipelines throughout America. I ask my Republican and Democrat colleagues to band together in supporting this critically important jobs bill. It is the fair and the right thing to do.

Hardworking American taxpayers deserve a more effective government that works together to solve our serious problems. We have the responsibility and the authority to help our families live better lives, with fatter paychecks and more financial security. Let's get this done.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say for the record that facts are facts are facts. There is no denying that the last Republican Congress held the record for the most closed rules in the history of the United States.

Maybe I am misunderstanding the current rule, but to the best of my knowledge, not a single amendment is allowed, notwithstanding that in this Congress there have been no hearings and no markups.

Is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask unanimous consent to amend H.R. 36 and make it an open rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina would have to yield for such a request to be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will not yield.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So there it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the ranking member for yielding, for his leadership, and for really making it clear exactly what we are dealing with today and why many of us strongly oppose this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. Over 40 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled that a woman could make her own personal health care decisions without interference from politicians. Yet here we are again, in 2015, debating this constitutionally protected right.

H.R. 36 would ban all abortions at 20 weeks, with extremely limited exceptions. A ban on an abortion after 20 weeks makes it harder for women who are already facing difficult circumstances. This is so bad. This is so wrong.

□ 1300

Every woman has a right to a safe medical procedure. And this decision, while difficult, is hers to make, not yours and not mine. This is her decision.

This bill is part of a broader effort to chip away at abortion access, a right that has already been decided by the Supreme Court and is the law of the land. Yet Republicans once again are focused on dictating what women can do with their bodies, denying their rights and endangering their health.

Mr. Speaker, this radical GOP bill undermines women's constitutional rights under *Roe v. Wade*. This is a dangerous assault on women's health freedoms. Women should not have to justify their personal medical decisions.

Abortions later in a pregnancy can involve rare, severe fetal abnormalities or pose serious risks to the health of women, but these procedures may be medically necessary to save the woman's life.

This is an agonizing decision that a woman should make with her doctor, her family, or whomever, but not her congressional Representatives. We have seen what happens when politicians interfere in these deeply personal medical decisions and tie doctors' hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Let me just say that the AMA has stated very clearly that this bill compromises a doctor's ability to provide medical treatment in the best interest of the patient.

Members of Congress have no right to interfere in health care decisions of women. This is a private matter. And the last time I looked, I thought we do have a right to privacy in this country.

So we have got to continue to fight against these attacks on women's health, on our constitutional rights, and on the right to privacy. I hope you vote "no" on this rule and "no" on this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well that the number of closed rules last Congress was a procedural effect of Republicans' efforts to reopen the government. America tires of this debate. Let's return to real issues with an impact on Americans' lives.

Mr. Speaker, we go to extraordinary lengths in this country to save the lives of born human beings because we value life so much. However, there are many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for the more than 1 million unborn babies who lose their lives every year. There is nothing more important than protecting voiceless unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, over these next 2 days, you will hear many of my colleagues rise in support of H.R. 36, as well they should. This bill protects pain-capable, pre-born children from being subjected to violent, dismembering abortions, also known as D&E abortions.

One former abortionist, Dr. Anthony Levatino, testified in May 2013 before the House Judiciary Committee and described the procedure by saying:

A second-trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure. Picture yourself reaching in with a Sopher clamp and grasping anything you can. Once you have grasped something inside, squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard—really hard.

This is from a former abortionist describing the procedure:

You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about 6 inches long. Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

How disgusting. How repugnant. How wrong. Any nation, any party, any person that claims to respect human rights and accepts basic science must reject this pain-filled act of barbarism.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and, most important, in supporting H.R. 36.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill. This bill is just as unconstitutional as it was when it was introduced in the last Congress. It poses just as serious a risk to the health and civil liberties of American women. And this time around, it comes with an additional slap in the face to women because, if this rule passes, the bill will come to a vote on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*.

By attempting to outlaw almost all abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy, this bill would clearly violate the constitutional principles the Court laid down in that decision a generation ago. Women must be allowed to decide their health care decisions. They need to do it in consultation with their doctors, with their families, and with their clergy and not have those decisions made for them by Washington politicians.

The Republican majority always claims to be against government overreach and for science. Well, they should take a look at the legislation they bring to the floor. This bill would extend the Federal Government's reach all the way into the doctor's office. And it denies medical science. It threatens providers with jail for performing a procedure that is constitutionally protected and often medically necessary. It places obstacles in the way of rape victims who seek help. It would put thousands of women at risk.

In short, this is another Republican ideological assault on women. We should reject it wholeheartedly. Our priority should be to help American workers with jobs, with increased wages—including women—and not turning the clock back to the 1950s with this kind of unconstitutional posturing.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and the underlying bill and truly vote for women in the United States today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to respond to the charge that this legislation is unconstitutional. In 2007, the Supreme Court upheld the Federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act as an appropriate use of Congress' powers under

the Commerce Clause. This legislation follows that act's model by asserting Congress' authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Commerce, Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the 14th Amendment.

It is sad that opponents of this legislation are attempting to use the Constitution as a roadblock to prevent life-saving legislation, but the Supreme Court's position is clear.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, a great shadow looms over America, the home of the brave.

More than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States today.

Almost every other major civilized nation on Earth protects pain-capable babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting them. And yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary painful cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that today the winds of change have begun to blow and the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today we take up the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

It is not perfect, Mr. Speaker. Each one of us would have written it a little differently if we could have done so. However, no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand, and, ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to these babies is real—and we all know it—and it is time to change and protect them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), a champion for women's rights.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Instead of prioritizing the needs of

women and families, we are once again discussing a bill that attacks women's rights.

When I ask women in my district what they need, they talk about not being able to find quality, affordable child care. But here in Congress we are talking about a bill that tells women they don't have a right to plan their own family.

Women in my district talk about making sure they receive equal pay for equal work. What are we talking about? A bill that tells women that politicians are better able to make their health decisions than they are.

Women in my district talk about making sure victims and survivors of domestic violence have the resources they need to build a better life. But we are talking about a bill that tells women that if they become pregnant because they were raped, they better have a police report to prove it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. American women pay taxes, raise their families, contribute to our economy, and are over half of the electorate. Yet rather than helping these women succeed and grow our economy, we give them this bill that forces backward ideological beliefs into women's private medical decisions.

I urge my colleagues to get back to work for women and families of this country and reject this dangerous bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is disappointing to hear my colleagues criticize this legislation in this way. We consider many weighty issues in this body with great implications for our future, but few of those issues command our attention as much as those that impact children, as this legislation does. This is right and appropriate.

I fear for both our future and our present if we continue to tolerate the death of innocent children in the womb. Every life matters. It is my hope that a culture of life will take hold and all children will be protected in law in the near future, but today we have an opportunity to come together and find consensus that nearly fully developed, viable children should be protected, particularly as individuals capable of experiencing great pain.

The necessity of that protection is made even clearer when considering the type of abortion these growing children are subjected to.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the American people understand exactly what happens when they hear the word "abortion." According to Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in America, babies aborted at 14 weeks or later are often subjected to dis-

memberment abortions, which are incredibly gruesome and painful.

What follows is heart-wrenching to describe, Mr. Speaker, but we must face the truth of what we are currently permitting. As if in a horror movie, the abortionist begins by suctioning out the amniotic fluid, then rips the limbs from the infant's body with a steel tool and finishes by crushing the skull of the infant he has dismembered.

Take a moment to consider that. This is the most common abortion performed in the second trimester, not a rare tragedy.

As a Nation, we rightfully give the safety of our children the highest importance. In spite of that, we continue to allow these horrific procedures that an overwhelming majority of nations in the world have sworn off. As I mentioned before, only seven nations allow elective abortions after 20 weeks' gestation.

□ 1315

How can America continue to be one of them? We must leave this practice behind.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the underlying legislation to prohibit elective abortions in the United States past 20 weeks. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is a commonsense reform to our American principles of protecting life as the most fundamental constitutional right.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. After all the talk by our Republican friends about focusing their efforts on jobs and growing the economy, so far their rhetoric does not match their record.

Last week, we took up a pipeline bill that, according to the State Department, would only create 34 jobs, and the bill that we have on the pipeline today probably won't create one single job, but what it will do, it will make it easier to damage the environment.

The majority has also introduced six antichoice bills in the past 7 days, and what all these bills have in common is that they will not create one single American job.

Instead of a jobs agenda, the majority seems bound and determined to attack women's rights, to take away a woman's constitutional right to make for herself the most private and personal and intimate decisions.

Now, we are taking up this bill, H.R. 36, which is based on the insulting belief that women are incapable and unprepared to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health care.

Forty-two years ago this week, the Supreme Court, in *Roe v. Wade*, made

it clear that a woman has a constitutional right to decide for herself these private issues concerning her own health and well-being.

This is not only insulting to the women of this country, it is just another pointless exercise in political posturing. It will never become law. It is a waste of Congress' time. What we should be doing instead is focusing on any idea or measure that can help create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

The President pointed out last night that our economy is on the rise. Under his leadership, we are experiencing the strongest private sector job growth we have had in 17 years, over 11 million new jobs.

Let's not squander this opportunity. Let's work together to create real jobs, not political posturing for the American people.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thankfully, the American people recognize that we are speaking about protecting vulnerable lives here. A March 2013 poll conducted by The Polling Company found that 64 percent of the public supports a law like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act prohibiting an abortion after 20 weeks, when an unborn baby can feel pain, unless the life of the mother is in danger.

Supporters include 47 percent of those who identified themselves as "pro-choice" in the poll. The poll also found that 63 percent of women believe that abortion should not be permitted after the point where substantial medical evidence says that the unborn child can feel pain. That finding was not an unusual outlier. It is representative of the true beliefs of the American people.

According to a 2013 Gallup Poll, 64 percent of Americans support prohibiting second trimester abortions, and 80 percent support prohibiting third trimester abortions. Even The Huffington Post found in 2013 that 59 percent of Americans support limiting abortions after 20 weeks.

Let no one believe that our concern is only for the child. A study in the *Obstetrics and Gynecology* journal found that a woman seeking an abortion after 20 weeks' gestation is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she would have been from an abortion in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die. Abortion is a danger to both lives, the mother and the child.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot sit idly by while this grotesque and brutal procedure, which rips the tiny baby apart, limb from limb in the womb, and threatens the life of the mother, is performed in our country. This is why it is necessary for Congress to pass H.R. 36 and protect the lives of these unborn children from excruciating pain.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), somebody who believes in protecting women's rights.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. McGovern.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that pain is a subterfuge. This bill is not about pain to the fetus. This bill is about outlawing abortion and repealing *Roe v. Wade*.

The other side knows that the Supreme Court has set out in *Roe v. Wade* the conditions of viability, and viability is 22-24 weeks. Well, they couldn't get past that in the Court, they knew they couldn't, so they created this new class of when the baby, the child, can feel pain.

They found a doctor that said he assumes they can feel pain, and they base their whole premise on that, an argument to try to repeal *Roe v. Wade* and to not give the women of this country the opportunity to exercise choice on their own lives and when they produce children.

This has been the law in this country since 1973. I consider it the right law. I was in law school when the Supreme Court brought down *Roe v. Wade*. It was progress, and we continue to march forward, but the other side wants to stop progress. If they could outlaw all abortions, they would do it, and this is the first step toward doing it.

They don't provide for the life of the mother in the bill. They don't provide for exceptions for rape and incest, and they didn't allow any amendments because they knew if they had amendments they would carry, and the full rape and incest exceptions which are in the law today would be put on this bill, and that would be difficult for them to swallow.

This is a sham on pain. This is an attempt to take women's rights away and to repeal *Roe v. Wade*. I would ask that when the bill comes up that we vote "no" and vote women first and progress.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this time until the gentleman from Massachusetts is ready to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sadly, we have seen all too well how money has polluted our politics and is undermining our democracy, so I am going to urge people to vote against the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of a sensible constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 22, a measure that I have sponsored with my friends, TED DEUTCH of Florida, DONNA EDWARDS of Maryland, and JOHN SARBANES of Maryland, to overturn these decisions and make clear that Congress and States have the au-

thority to regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money to influence elections.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, a leader in the fight to get money out of politics.

Last night, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama called on Republicans and Democrats in Congress to embrace a better politics where we spend less time fundraising and spewing sound bites and more time debating issues in good faith to find common ground.

A better politics, that is something all Americans want to see, and there is no better way to restore their faith in Congress than by getting Big Money out of politics.

Today, my friends, is the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's 5-4 ruling in *Citizens United v. FEC*, which granted corporations and megamillionaires a First Amendment right to buy unlimited influence in our elections. The results of *Citizens United* has been elections dominated by super-PACs and unaccountable outside groups, backed by a small group of the wealthiest Americans.

Indeed, during the 2012 Presidential election cycle, 93 percent of super-PAC funding came from just over 3,000 donors, amounting to less than .01 percent of the American population; likewise, the 2014 midterm election cycle was the most expensive in history, with recordbreaking spending by outside groups.

That is why, today, I ask the majority to join me and more than 80 of my colleagues in support of H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment. This amendment will restore what the Supreme Court took away in *Citizens United*: the right of Congress and the States to pass laws limiting the influence of Big Money in our elections.

Seniors on Social Security don't have millions to funnel into super-PACs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. And low-income children are not among the wealthy donors who hit the limits struck down in last year's *McCutcheon* ruling.

The sad truth is that, for most Americans, their influence in Washington has shrunk each time the Supreme Court has invited more money into our elections and allowed special interests to set the agenda.

Let's build a better politics by bringing H.J. Res. 22, the Democracy for All amendment, up for a vote today. Together, we can ensure that every American's voice, once again, is heard in America's democracy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on ordering the previous question, so that we can consider the constitutional amendment, the Democracy for All amendment, that would rein in the excesses that have been unleashed by Big Money on our political system. That occurred 5 years ago in the Citizens United decision.

We have an opportunity, acting on behalf of the millions of Americans who feel their voices are drowned out, to push back on the influence of Big Money in this town and on this Chamber.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every week we get another example of how Big Money is influencing policy here in Washington. Last week, it was the influence of Wall Street leaning on the institution to pass legislation that would get them out from reasonable regulation. This week, it is the energy industry leaning on the institution with respect to this Keystone bill that we are going to see—example after example of how Big Money has undue influence here in Washington.

It is time that we fought on behalf of the American people and made sure that their voices are the ones being heard, not the voice and the megaphone of Big Money.

Let’s vote against ordering the previous question. Let’s consider the amendment to the Constitution that would allow us to push back on the undue influence of Big Money here in Washington.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer if we defeat the previous question in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just recap for my colleagues here. First of all, vote “no” on this rule. This continues a trend that has

nothing but contempt for regular order. These bills had no hearings in this Congress. There was no markup, and now, they are brought to the floor with no amendments—two closed rules.

Notwithstanding the pledge of the Speaker for a more open and transparent process, people who have other ideas on ways to improve or change these bills are denied that opportunity.

I would say, with all due respect to my colleague from North Carolina, we can’t use the excuse that we have got to keep the government running. We are in the beginning of the session. We are not doing much of anything. Clearly, the bills that we are debating in their current form are going to be vetoed anyway.

□ 1330

Secondly, I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule because of the bills that are being brought up: this bill that is clearly an attack on women’s health and reproductive rights, which does not belong on this floor; and the other bill is a bill that basically allows there to be a process for pipelines to be approved without necessarily going through all the proper oversight.

And I am going to urge Members to vote against the previous question so we can bring up this bill that I talked about earlier on campaign finance reform.

Look, the legislative agenda in this Congress is about rewarding the highest donors. I think to any objective observer, when you see what is coming on the floor, including this pipeline bill which is not in the interest of the American people, we are not out there trying to protect their safety and well-being. It is a big kiss to the energy industry. And I would argue that the reason why bills like that—or some of the tax bills that are brought to this floor that reward big corporations and the wealthiest individuals—are brought to the floor is because those people who represent those wealthy interests have the most sway in this Congress. They are the biggest donors to political parties. They are the biggest donors to Members of Congress.

And while that is happening every day here, average people who can’t contribute tens of thousands of dollars to political parties, who can’t contribute millions of dollars, are increasingly becoming marginalized. The issues that matter most to working people, those struggling in the working class, those struggling to get into the middle class, we don’t even get a chance to debate those issues on the House floor.

I will say to my Republican friends: I have had many conversations with you over the years about how you hate raising money as much as I hate raising money. Too much of our attention in this Congress, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, is about raising

money for the next election, and it is getting worse and worse every election cycle. It is time to do something about that. It is time to give Congress the authority to regulate or put a cap on how much campaigns cost. I mean, we are going to spend billions of dollars in the next Presidential election. It is obscene. With all the problems that we have in this country, we ought to be spending more time debating those problems and not worrying about raising money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we can bring up this commonsense campaign finance proposal, and I also urge a “no” vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said at the opening of this debate, this rule will provide for consideration of H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act. That legislation, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis last Congress, will reduce red tape and ensure that Americans in all parts of the country will be able to benefit from the energy revolution that has occurred on our Nation’s private lands.

It is the coldest season of the year. It is my strong hope that we will be able to enact this legislation soon, to ensure that in winters to come residents of the northeast and other high-cost areas of the country are able to heat their homes affordably.

Before we consider our budgets or the foolishness of red tape, though, we must return to our founding principles. We must remember that life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given.

Even the President said in last night’s speech: “I want our actions to tell every child, in every neighborhood: Your life matters, and we are committed to improving your life chances, as committed as we are to working on behalf of our own kids.”

But, Mr. Speaker, millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

Before liberty, equality, free speech, freedom of conscience, the pursuit of happiness, and justice for all, there has to be life; and yet for millions of aborted infants, life is exactly what they have been denied. An affront to life for some is an affront to life for every one of us.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected Court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history. But until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot, and we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

May we, in love, defend the unborn; may we, in humility, confront this national sin; and may we mourn what abortion reveals about the conscience of our Nation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my frustration in the process by which this bill was brought to the floor and my disappointment that the process has yielded a bill that I cannot support.

This bill did not go through regular order. The Judiciary Committee did not hold any hearings or markups on the bill. And now under a Closed Rule, Members do not have the opportunity to offer amendments, let alone debate the merits of specific sections they wish to change.

I submitted an amendment to H.R. 36 that would have extended the exception for all incest victims. Under a Closed Rule, this amendment was rejected.

Incest victims are victims regardless of their age. What some people call "consensual incest" often begins as child sexual abuse. Even if the relationship continues into adulthood, there is still a perpetrator and still a victim. In addition, it is hugely unfair to require an incest victim to report a relative to the police.

In the future, should the House again consider legislation railing to abortion, I urge my colleagues to bring the bill through regular order so that all Members can participate in the debate over this sensitive issue.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 38 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion ex-

cept one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the joint resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 22.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Ellmers	Kinzing (IL)
Aderholt	Emmer	Kline
Allen	Farenthold	Knight
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Amodei	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Babin	Fleming	Lamborn
Barletta	Flores	Lance
Barr	Fortenberry	Latta
Barton	Fox	LoBiondo
Benishek	Franks (AZ)	Long
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Bishop (MI)	Garrett	Love
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Lucas
Black	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Blackburn	Gohmert	Lummis
Blum	Goodlatte	MacArthur
Bost	Gosar	Marchant
Boustany	Gowdy	Marino
Brat	Granger	Massie
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Buchanan	Griffith	McHenry
Buck	Grothman	McKinley
Bucshon	Guinta	McMorris
Burgess	Guthrie	Rodgers
Byrne	Hanna	McSally
Calvert	Hardy	Meadows
Carter (GA)	Harper	Meehan
Chabot	Hartzler	Messer
Chaffetz	Heck (NV)	Mica
Clawson (FL)	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Cole	Hice (GA)	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY)	Holding	Mullin
Comstock	Hudson	Mulvaney
Conaway	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Newhouse
Cramer	Hunter	Noem
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Nugent
Crenshaw	Hurt (VA)	Nunes
Culberson	Issa	Olson
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
Dent	Jolly	Pearce
DeSantis	Jones	Perry
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pittenger
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Pitts
Dold	Katko	Poe (TX)
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Poliquin
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Pompeo
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	Posey

Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford

NAYS—182

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)
Carter (TX)
Duckworth

Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Hastings
Hinojosa

Hoyer
Johnson, Sam

Nunnelee
Perlmutter

□ 1404

Messrs. REED and SALMON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 181, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

AYES—238

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culbertson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry

Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur

Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart

Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

NOES—181

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Castro (TX)
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOT VOTING—14

Brady (TX)
Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Edwards
Fincher

Forbes
Harris
Hastings
Hinojosa
Hoyer

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PERMITTING REFORM ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 38, I call up the bill (H.R. 161) to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act”.

SEC. 2. REGULATORY APPROVAL OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS.

Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) The Commission shall approve or deny an application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a prefired project not later than 12 months after receiving a complete application that is ready to be processed, as defined by the Commission by regulation.

“(2) The agency responsible for issuing any license, permit, or approval required under Federal law in connection with a prefired project for which a certificate of public convenience and necessity is sought under this Act shall approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval not later than 90 days after the Commission issues its final environmental document relating to the project.

“(3) The Commission may extend the time period under paragraph (2) by 30 days if an agency demonstrates that it cannot otherwise complete the process required to approve or deny the license, permit, or approval, and therefor will be compelled to deny the license, permit, or approval. In granting an extension under this paragraph, the Commission may offer technical assistance to the agency as necessary to address conditions preventing the completion of the review of the application for the license, permit, or approval.

“(4) If an agency described in paragraph (2) does not approve or deny the issuance of the license, permit, or approval within the time period specified under paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable, such license, permit, or approval shall take effect upon the expiration of 30 days after the end of such period. The Commission shall incorporate into the terms of such license, permit, or approval any conditions proffered by the agency described in paragraph (2) that the Commission does not

find are inconsistent with the final environmental document.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘prefired project’ means a project for the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of a natural gas pipeline with respect to which a prefiling docket number has been assigned by the Commission pursuant to a prefiling process established by the Commission for the purpose of facilitating the formal application process for obtaining a certificate of public convenience and necessity.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 161.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to natural gas production, we are number one. What was once a pipe dream is now a global reality, thanks to American ingenuity and technology. An impressive accomplishment, especially considering where we were only a decade ago—fearful of running out of supplies.

With this new wealth of natural gas, folks in Michigan and across the country should no longer worry about access to affordable energy. But budget-busting power bills are still hitting too many Americans.

The New York Times recently reported that customers in New England could expect electricity rates to spike close to 40 percent higher this winter. Why? Well, we may have fixed our supply problems, but now we have a serious distribution problem. Our archaic energy infrastructure and outdated regulatory system is blocking American consumers from reaping the benefits of our energy abundance. We have the gas, but we don't have the pipelines to get cheap energy directly to families and businesses that need it most.

This legislation seeks to fix the problem, inserting accountability into the permitting process for natural gas pipelines and establishing firm deadlines for agency reviews. It does not exempt any environmental laws. It just makes sure pipeline projects get sited and built without unnecessary delay.

Last night, the President here made the case for more Federal funding of transportation infrastructure projects like roads and bridges as one way to

create jobs while modernizing our economy. But the energy infrastructure projects unleashed by this pipeline bill are every bit as necessary, with all of the economic benefits, and the best part is, since they will be paid for by the private sector, it won't cost taxpayers a dime.

We voted on this legislation last Congress, and it passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. With the President's comments last night about wanting to work with Congress, I hope the President can join us in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense energy and jobs solution. Now that we are the leader in energy production, there is no reason America shouldn't be number one in energy affordability as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, when he said that the likelihood is that we are going to have more and more pipelines constructed, pipelines that have to go through the FERC process, and that is certainly true, but all the more reason why we shouldn't be voting or supporting this bill.

I have to say I am talking not just in general in the abstract but from personal experience. In my district a few years ago, when I was a Congressman, in Edison, New Jersey, we had a natural gas pipeline explosion. Fortunately, no one was killed or seriously injured, but a whole apartment complex was wiped out, not just one building but a series of them. There was a real danger of loss of life.

It scares me, Mr. Speaker, to think that we would want to change the process whereby FERC has the opportunity to look at the safety of these pipelines when they are proposed for permitting and somehow short-circuit that process because of my own experience in my congressional district in Edison, New Jersey. Durham Woods was the name of the complex.

So many of these pipelines, as a lot more pipelines are being built, a lot of them are in densely populated areas. So it is a major concern that FERC has to look at when reviewing these pipelines and deciding whether to issue a permit. It is not as if they are in places with no people. They are often in densely populated areas, like in my State of New Jersey.

In addition, this bill is unnecessary. The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office concluded that the FERC pipeline permitting process is predictable and consistent and gets pipelines built. In fact, over 90 percent are approved or at least decided within the 12-month cycle limitation that this bill is proposing.

The pipeline companies actually testified before the GAO that the process

for permitting through FERC “is generally very good” and that the sector “enjoys a favorable legal and regulatory framework for the approval of new infrastructure.”

So if the process is fine, why are we now trying to move ahead and endanger safety by coming up with limitations on the process that actually is very good?

I would also say that if you have a 12-month limit, which is what this bill proposes on FERC’s ability to issue a permit, it is very possible that the process of permitting could be slowed down because if FERC decides that they don’t have enough time within 12 months to decide whether a pipeline should be built and it is safe, they may just decide to not grant the permit and deny it for fear that they haven’t had enough time to deal with it over the 12 months. I think it is not only unnecessary, but it may actually even be counterproductive to what the sponsors are trying to accomplish.

I would also point out that we are wasting our time because the President has issued a Statement of Administration Policy saying that if H.R. 161 were to reach his desk, that he would actually veto it. I am not going to get into all the specifics of why because I think they are a lot of the same reasons I am mentioning myself.

Now, let me say what happens. When faced with this 12-month deadline, not only FERC but also other agencies that deal with the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act or the Endangered Species Act, other agencies that have the authority to review this and permit this under the bill, would actually only have 3 months, 90 days. So after the 12-month period ends for FERC, then there is a 90-day period for the other agencies to act. And if they don’t act within 90 days, then FERC is required under this legislation to issue a permit and say that those other regulatory concerns are met.

So now you are going to have FERC not only limited in its 12-month review but also then issuing permits under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and these other environmental regulations, which it has nothing to do with. Essentially you are saying the other agencies have no role anymore because if they don’t decide within 90 days, FERC has to approve those permits as well. FERC doesn’t normally deal with these other issues.

Another thing which I think is important is the eminent domain issue. If the permit is approved by FERC, then that means the company that is building the pipeline has the right to use eminent domain for the land where the pipeline is going to go through. I have a lot of concern about whether or not eminent domain should be used in those circumstances, particularly if the permit process has been short-circuited.

So I think that sometimes my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don’t understand that these permits are very detailed documents. They include emission limits, technology operating requirements, conditions to protect the environment. FERC doesn’t have the expertise or the resources to issue the permits for these other statutes like the Clean Air Act and the Endangered Species Act.

So I am just saying that I think that this legislation from a practical point of view is entirely unworkable. It just doesn’t work. It doesn’t work. The GAO has said that the process that we have now is fine. And for those of us who have had these accidents where we have had explosions and danger, the last thing that we want is these pipelines going through densely populated areas that haven’t had the proper review to protect the safety and the health of our residents. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) who is the author of H.R. 161.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in support of H.R. 161.

We are tens of thousands of miles of pipeline capacity short of the necessary pipelines to carry natural gas to consumers who need it and businesses who demand it today in America. You don’t have to take my word for it—prices will tell you.

The gentleman from New Jersey just said he opposes this bill. Allow him to explain to his constituents why they pay six or seven or eight times as much for natural gas as someone else in the Midwest, or in places where there is adequate pipeline capacity today. It is unnecessary; it is unconscionable. America now has the resources to provide this gas to all Americans so they can heat their homes and cool their homes, so businesses can use natural gas to build products here in America. We no longer live in a world with energy scarcity here in America. We have an opportunity to get this product from where it is found to the consumers and businesses that are demanding it.

The other side of the aisle may tell you we don’t have a problem, but I will tell you that as you talk to your constituents, as one who does this all the time, constituents say: I am paying too much for my product. This is a solution that will work.

We don’t make in this legislation a single change to the Clean Water Act, not one change to the Clean Air Act, not a single change to any legislation that has to do with pipeline safety. Not one. All those laws remain in effect. All we ask the government to do is its job. We give them a timeline. We give

them ample time. If 12 months is not enough, I am happy to give them 13. We will change the legislation.

But, in fact, the opposition isn’t because this is being rushed but because in fact this will speed the process. That is why folks are opposed. They know this will produce this gas in a way that is safe and reasonable, and we will have great outcomes. And yet they want to keep this product in the ground. That is the real reason for opposition to this bill.

So those of us who want to get this energy to the consumers, to where it needs to go, I urge them to support this.

Frankly, when you read the articles about the challenges of pipeline capacity in America, the place it impacts the most isn’t the place from which I hail. It is not Kansas; it is not the Midwest. It is, in fact, the densely populated areas of the Northeast. They are the places that need this energy the most and the soonest and the safest, and we can get it for them. I urge those who live in those places to talk to their constituents and to do the work to make sure that they understand what H.R. 161 can accomplish for the people in the areas that they represent.

You know, this administration has taken a lot of efforts to reduce the capacity of coal to provide energy for businesses and consumers. I regret that. I am doing my best to push back in every place that we can, as I know our chairman is as well. But as coal-fired power plants become more difficult to build, the need for natural gas will become even more increased.

□ 1430

This legislation is aimed directly at making sure that we don’t have shortages and outages and catastrophes in energy production and energy delivery that America cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 161.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 161, the so-called Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

My home State of Massachusetts, like many areas around the country, faces serious energy challenges. We need careful and strategic long-term planning in order to lower energy prices and increase reliability. Increasing access to additional sources of natural gas could help address some of New England’s energy challenges, including energy prices, which have historically been above the national average.

However, this legislation would move us in the wrong direction. This bill would force FERC to rush decision-making, including environmental reviews and assessments of the need for

natural gas, while also hobbling decisions regarding the appropriate size of the proposed pipeline. It would turn FERC into a superpermitting agency, an authority that FERC neither wants nor has the expertise to carry out.

In my home district, we are currently navigating the FERC process that this bill purports to improve. The company is proposing to build a new 250-mile natural gas pipeline that crosses three States, including seven communities that I represent. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents expressing their concerns with this project.

Construction of the pipeline could jeopardize local wildlife and will impact both State and federally designated conservation lands, as well as Massachusetts' scarce farmland.

Thanks to extensive public review and input, the pipeline route has already been adjusted to minimize some of the environmental impacts, but there are still many outstanding concerns that deserve careful scrutiny. The proposed route still passes through local farmland, parks, wildlife management areas, wetlands, near schools, and across drinking water supplies.

My constituents have been grateful for a process that has given them the time to provide input. This bill would short-circuit that process and short-change my constituents' right to be heard.

I proposed an amendment to this legislation with my colleague Mr. McGovern that would exempt any pipeline from the arbitrary timelines established in the bill if the proposed route crosses Federal, State, or local land designated for conservation or recreation. However, the majority blocked this simple amendment from coming to the floor and receiving an up-or-down vote.

In Massachusetts, we have a long-standing history of preserving national habitats and protecting open spaces for the public benefit, and we have invested significant public resources towards these goals. Members should have been given the opportunity to vote on whether or not we should allow for a thorough review process to protect State investments.

On behalf of my constituents, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act.

Increased production of American natural gas has led to lower prices and more demand for this energy source all across the Nation. That is especially true in cold, energy-dependent regions like upstate New York and the Northeast. We need new infrastructure, spe-

cifically pipelines, to safely transport fuels to markets where they are needed.

Unfortunately, the Government Accountability Office reported that an average processing time for interstate natural gas pipeline projects was 558 days. This bill would expedite the government's review process for pipeline applications, to make sure that we are doing all we can to build infrastructure in a timely and responsible manner.

More access to affordable American natural gas will help fuel farms, heat homes, and power small businesses in upstate New York and throughout this country. Building pipelines will create good-paying jobs, as well as boost revenues and development in communities across the Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some of my Republican colleagues just suggested that this bill would not waive any environmental requirements. For instance, yesterday, at the Rules Committee, the sponsor of the legislation indicated that H.R. 161 did not waive or alter any applicable environmental requirements under the Clean Air Act or NEPA.

While it is true that this legislation does not actually amend any provisions of the Clean Air Act or other environmental statutes, the bill would require automatic issuance of a pipeline-related permit under statutes like the Clean Air Act, if the responsible agency, such as EPA, has failed to act within the 90 days. This is the 90 days beyond the 1 year that I mentioned before.

Basically, that makes FERC the agency that would issue the Clean Air Act permit. Under this bill, FERC would decide how to create a BLM right-of-way permit or a Clean Water Act discharge permit. As a result, the legislation would effectively override the permitting decisions of agencies like EPA or DOI and turn FERC into a superpermitting agency.

I just want to point out, while it is true that the text of the actual Clean Air Act might remain unchanged under this bill, the effect of the bill would be that the Clean Air Act permits would be automatically issued by FERC if EPA fails to act within 90 days.

That is a major and substantive change from the way these laws work and, in effect, amounts to a waiver of environmental requirements for all practical purposes, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 24 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to clarify that H.R. 161 is certainly not any drastic piece of legislation.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 designated the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the lead agency charged with coordinating and reviewing natural gas pipeline project applications; therefore, FERC conducts the environmental review of each project as required under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and is given authority to set deadlines for other agencies to issue an approval or denial of an associated permit.

When these applications are filed at FERC, the application also is given to other agencies that may have jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, maybe like the Corps of Engineers, the Clean Air Act, the EPA perhaps, or Endangered Species; so it is not like they just have 90 days to look at this. They get the application the same time as FERC does.

The problem that FERC has had—and they have had both Democrat and Republican Commissioners come to Congress and say that they need more authority over these other agencies, so this bill does precisely that.

Once FERC has made a final determination and completed its process, it gives the other agencies another 90 days—even though they have been working on it for a year in advance of that—another 90 days to complete it, and if they want another 30 days, then they can do that as well.

I would just say that this is not rushing the process; it is simply completing the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gives FERC authority. We give them authority, but we don't give them any enforcement mechanism, and so this is precisely what this legislation does.

I might also add that having deadlines for agencies to act when doing environmental reviews or issuing permits is not really that strange or unique of an idea. Canada, Australia, and most European Union nations have deadlines for their environmental regulatory agencies to act.

Any person that is doing any kind of business in America knows the bureaucracy that we all run into, and it is easy to criticize bureaucracies. We know that they are dedicated, committed citizens trying to protect the environment, protect the American people, and we commend them for doing that, but we also know that they frequently let things slide.

It is easy to lose the process. We hear common complaints—nonstop—about delay, delay, delay. We know from hearings on this—this bill has already passed the House once—but we know from hearings that the Northeastern United States is really vulnerable to not having sufficient natural gas to meet their needs.

They are closing nuclear power plants. The President is making sure

you can't build a new coal plant in America. Existing coal plants, many of them are going to be going out of business because of extreme regulations of this climate-driven administration. We have heard testimony about the escalating prices of electricity for people.

This is designed to provide the infrastructure to get the natural gas where it needs to be, and the Northeast is one of those areas. That is really what this bill is about. It is about giving FERC some real authority, setting in statute that these agencies must act within a certain amount of time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really don't understand. I respect my colleague from Kentucky a great deal, but he seems to be arguing that we need the deadlines in this bill to hold Federal agencies accountable and ensure that they don't just somehow sit on the applications.

As I have already noted, since 2009, FERC has completed action on 91 percent of natural gas pipeline applications within 12 months, so a 12-month deadline isn't needed for more than 90 percent of the applicants.

My colleagues have asked: Well, what is the problem with holding the remaining 9 percent to a 12-month deadline? Well, the problem is it becomes a one-size-fits-all approach that fails to consider a wide range of applications that FERC has to review.

Some of the applications are for new projects—again, a small number—which span hundreds of miles, cross waterways and wetlands, and pass through neighborhoods and habitats of threatened wildlife; and questions of eminent domain need to be considered. In these cases, there can be unresolved safety, environmental, and legal issues at the local or State level.

Again, as I said, the President has said that he would veto this bill. In the Statement of Administration Policy, they specifically say:

The small percentage of decisions that have taken longer than 1 year involve complex proposals that merit additional review and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a complex project or there is some unaddressed risk to safety or the environment, we need to allow FERC or other Federal agencies the time to ensure that the pipeline is safe, so we don't have an accident like what occurred in Edison, New Jersey, in my district.

The last thing anyone needs, including the pipeline owner, is a pipeline explosion or other dangerous pipeline malfunction, and these things have occurred. I witnessed it myself in my district.

I am just saying don't put a hard deadline on the most complex projects that raise the possibility that FERC will be forced to approve a pipeline that is not safe or to reject an applica-

tion solely because the Commission lacks sufficient time for an adequate review that will hinder rather than help us get more natural gas where it needs to go.

Now, my colleague also mentioned the issue about the Northeast electricity supply or prices, and I just wanted to address that concern. New England is using more natural gas to generate electricity and more natural gas for heating homes than in the past, and on the coldest winter days, when natural gas is needed for heating or electricity, there is more demand, but this bill doesn't do anything to solve that problem.

The problem in New England isn't caused by pipeline applications that take too long to get approved by FERC; the problem is that the pipeline companies aren't even submitting the applications because they haven't figured out who is going to pay for these new pipelines. The pipeline companies haven't been satisfied there is a sufficient year-round demand to justify and finance the pipelines.

That is an issue that FERC is looking at and has been holding stakeholder conferences about, but this has nothing to do with Mr. POMPEO's bill.

□ 1445

Cutting corners on the permitting process isn't going to help additional pipeline capacity built for the Northeast. I don't think we ought to be blaming the government for every problem, which is what I hear my colleagues on the Republican side doing. The reality is that FERC and the government didn't create this problem. It is a problem of economics, and the faster we understand that the faster we can try to find a solution, but let's not act as if FERC's inability to act is the problem here. That is not the case.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When we had hearings on this bill, the natural gas pipeline industry estimated that by the year 2035 an estimated \$8 billion each year would need to be spent to keep pace with the anticipated need for more pipeline infrastructure.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is absolutely correct in that Congress can't make these decisions. Private companies have to make the decision if they are going to invest the dollars to build these pipelines, but they have talked to us—the FERC Commissioners have talked to us—about the fact that some of these agencies are just delaying for no apparent reason. As I said earlier, when the application is filed at FERC, the other agencies receive those applications, and they have the same amount of time to work on it. This legislation simply sets some guidelines for these

Federal agencies so that, when FERC completes its chore—and it is the quarterback in the decision of approving these pipelines—these agencies must also step up to the plate.

This legislation is not radical in any way. It is certainly not rushing the process. It is not doing that. Pursuant to the 2005 Energy Policy Act, it is simply making it a more efficient, speedy process while, at the same time, protecting the environment and the best interests of the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey have additional speakers?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am not going to read the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, but I did just want to make reference to some part of the Statement of Administration Policy's saying that the President would veto the bill:

The administration recognizes the need for additional energy infrastructure and supports the timely consideration of project applications. The administration, however, strongly opposes the bill because it would allow the automatic approval of natural gas pipeline projects if the FERC or other Federal agencies do not issue the required permit, license, or approval within rigid, unworkable timeframes.

H.R. 161 could create conflicts with existing statutory and regulatory requirements and practices and preclude opportunities for engaging the public and potentially impacted communities, thereby causing confusion and the risk of increased litigation. The bill's requirements could force agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available, including potential environmental and community impacts of the proposed pipelines, within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved but for the lack of sufficient review time. For these reasons, the bill may actually delay projects or lead to more project denials, undermining the intent of the legislation.

I stress to my colleagues on the other side that we understand there is a need for more pipelines, and we understand that these pipelines have to be approved in a timely fashion, but there is no reason to believe that that is not happening now. The danger here is that, in a case when these do have to have a more intensive review because of safety or health or environmental concerns, we may actually do the opposite. Either they are going to be denied because the agencies don't have enough time, or, God forbid, they get approved when they shouldn't be.

Again, I just don't quite understand what this is all about. It seems like the Republicans have a bill that they think is going to accomplish their goal and won't but that has a danger of really risking the safety of residents, and I have already witnessed that in the case of a pipeline explosion in my district.

I just think that what the Republicans are doing is blaming FERC and

that they are trying to come up with a solution for a problem that doesn't exist; but in the process of all of that, they are going to jeopardize the possibility of the fact that some of these pipelines might be approved without enough safety or environmental or health concerns. It seems to me that it makes no sense at all to put FERC in the position of deciding issues with regard to statutes like the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, which they really have nothing to do with.

We considered this bill in the last Congress, Mr. Speaker, and FERC made it clear that it was not necessary or helpful, and the administration threatened to veto the bill. Nothing has changed. The administration has again threatened to veto this bill. It is very early in this new Congress. I remain committed to developing sound energy policy with my Republican colleagues. If they want to have some hearings on this bill and go through the regular order of the committee process, that is fine as there will be more opportunity to review it.

I don't think this bill will help anyone, but I think it may hurt a lot of people, including those who want to build the pipeline. Instead of spending our time debating a bill that will never become law, I hope we can begin soon to have some serious discussion about sound and sustainable energy policy. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this particular piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in summation, I urge the passage of H.R. 161, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would note once again that, during the hearings on this legislation, Commissioners at FERC—both Republican and Democrat—said that more accountability was needed for agencies that issue permits that are necessary to construct natural gas pipelines.

Many people have raised the issue that the President has said he would veto this bill. That is his job, that is his responsibility, and that is the type of government we have. We have a legislative branch, we have an executive branch, and we have a judiciary branch. The legislative branch's responsibility is to pass legislation that it deems necessary. If the President wants to veto it, let him veto it and give his reasons. Then the American people can listen to both sides and decide what they think is the right direction to go.

I would stress once more that the Energy Information Agency data from last year's winter cold snap during the month of January showed that residential natural gas prices in Pennsylvania were 14 percent above the national average; in New Jersey, 18 percent higher; in New York, 24 percent higher; in

Vermont, 60 percent higher. One of the reasons given is the lack of infrastructure to get natural gas to where it needs to go in the Northeast.

This is a commonsense bill that is being presented to help solve this problem of energy needs in America. If we are going to be competitive in the global marketplace, yes, we need good, low-cost residential electricity prices, but we also need low-cost manufacturing and heavy industry electricity prices in order to compete in the global marketplace. That is what H.R. 161 is about, and I would urge Members to support this legislation that was drafted by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 161, a bill that claims to expedite applications for construction of natural gas pipelines in the United States.

First, let me say as a native Houstonian and as a Democrat, I support American energy development.

The energy revolution that has taken place over the last decade is unlike anything I've seen in my lifetime.

The natural gas plays currently developed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas are solely responsible for the recovery the U.S. has seen.

Low natural gas prices have given our industries an advantage over international competitors.

Low natural gas prices have given our homeowners cheaper electric bills.

Low natural gas prices have resulted in lower emissions and smaller contributions to climate change.

To reap those benefits, however, we need pipelines to move that product from the field to market.

I can confidently say, I am a big supporter of pipelines.

The stacks of raw materials and finished pipe in my district are probably unlike any other district in the country.

Pipelines are the most economically efficient and environmentally sound method of moving oil and natural.

I am an advocate of building more pipelines.

I have co-sponsored legislation to build domestic and international pipelines to facilitate energy development.

I have advocated for expediting the application process, so that our federal agencies provide private investors certainty.

Unfortunately, I cannot support H.R. 161.

While I am an advocate of all things natural gas, I am not in favor of completely circumventing the permitting process.

About a decade ago, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which has jurisdiction over pipeline approvals, had some issues.

We worked closely with the industry and the agency to improve the processes and timelines so that we could get pipe built in this country quickly.

FERC has done an admirable job working with industry and other key stakeholders to improve the process.

Currently, FERC approves the majority of permits in less than 18-to-24 months.

Where there are problems and delays with other permits, namely at the local and state level and FERC is working to resolve those issues.

Unfortunately, this bill does nothing to address those issues.

This bill sets a timeline for FERC and if that timeline expires, then any permit is approved.

Our federal agencies have an oversight role to play and allowing permit applications to essentially "run out the clock" when issues arise is a way to circumvent our federal process.

In Energy and Commerce, we put a lot of work into this bill and I want to thank my colleagues for working closely with our side.

But, I cannot support H.R. 161 and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 38, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PALLONE. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pallone moves to recommit the bill H.R. 161 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. PIPELINE OWNER RESPONSIBILITY IN THE EVENT OF AN EXPLOSION.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect unless the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, determines that in the implementation of this Act—

(1) taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a natural gas pipeline explosion; and

(2) pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for damages in any community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including for loss of life.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned during the general debate, I and my constituents witnessed and went through a few years ago, when I was in Congress, a natural gas pipeline explosion. It was devastating to the community. We had many people who lost their homes. It was, actually, several apartment buildings. Even to this

day, the memory of that is very much ingrained in the minds of the residents of Durham Woods, which is the largest municipality that I represent in Edison, New Jersey.

Basically, what we are saying in this motion to recommit is that the provisions of this act will not take effect unless the FERC determines that taxpayers will not be held liable for any repair or environmental cleanup from a gas pipeline explosion and that the pipeline owners will bear full responsibility for the damage to the community resulting from a natural gas pipeline explosion, including loss of life. It seems to me that that is the minimum we should expect when there is such an explosion.

Believe me. At the time that that explosion occurred in Durham Woods in my district, there were many instances when we had to have environmental cleanups and when the community was exposed to tremendous damage. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, this motion to recommit makes perfect sense.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that there have been many pipeline explosions, but I am not going to go through the entire list. In fact, the one in my district is one that is mentioned here. Beginning in just the last 10 or 15 years, there have been numerous explosions, so we are not talking about something that doesn't happen.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, natural gas pipeline explosions do happen.

Last week, a pipeline exploded in Mississippi. Last year, pipelines exploded in Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Kentucky. In 2013, a pipeline south of Dallas exploded. Reports described the massive explosion as "shooting flames high in the air and prompting evacuations from nearby homes and a school district," with black smoke visible for some 20 miles. In 2010, a natural gas pipeline exploded in San Bruno, California, in my home State, causing an explosion that killed eight people and destroyed 38 homes. Even as technology has improved, pipelines have failed.

We should make clear with this legislation that, in the event of the catastrophic failure of a pipeline, taxpayers are not liable for the hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in damages that these explosions can cause. Companies are responsible for the safety and reliability of their pipelines, and we should ensure that they are also liable for the damages caused by those pipelines.

□ 1500

Last year, when this very bill came before the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the president of the Pipeline Safety Trust testified. This group is a national, independent, nonprofit

watchdog organization created using funds from a settlement reached in the aftermath of a pipeline explosion in Washington State that killed three people. The Trust's president testified that "rushed, or worse, incomplete reviews resulting in automatic approvals pose a threat to public safety."

To be clear, this is not an organization that opposes new pipelines. They only focus on pipeline safety, and they have serious problems with this bill and its effects on public safety for new pipelines. Their president pointed out that this bill treats a "10-mile pipeline across a barren desert the same as a 1,400-mile pipeline that crosses multiple ecosystems and through dense population areas where it could pose a threat to the life or property of citizens living nearby."

Mr. Speaker, pipelines can fail. And those failures can have disastrous effects on communities and the environment. This commonsense amendment would protect taxpayers from ever having to pay the costs of a pipeline explosion. I hope we never see another natural gas pipeline explosion, but that would require that history not repeat itself.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit and to vote against the underlying bill because of the danger it poses to the communities and the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, once again, I listened to my colleague from California talk about the dangers from pipelines. These dangers are real. We have had many explosions over the years, including in my own district. I think this bill really puts at risk the possibility of another pipeline explosion. It doesn't provide for enough safety or environmental review.

I urge that Members support the motion to recommit because, at a minimum, it would provide some liability in some way to effectuate a cleanup and pay for the damages that come from an explosion that might take place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from New York for raising this safety issue because, obviously, safety is of paramount importance to all of us. That is why we do have the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA, which has the responsibility of making sure that these pipelines operate in as safe a manner as

possible. We also recognize that we never get to a point where it is absolutely safe.

Really, H.R. 161 does not have anything to do with PHMSA. Our committee does have jurisdiction over PHMSA. We have had a lot of hearings on it. We are going to continue to have hearings because we want to maximize pipeline safety.

This legislation is not about anything except perfecting the 2005 Energy Policy Act that gave FERC the quarterbacking authority for approving these natural gas pipelines from the aspect of their impact on clean water, clean air, and endangered species.

And so this legislation simply gives FERC the authority that many of its Commissioners asked for, and that is that they have some authority to convince these agencies to start looking at the impacts of the applications earlier in the process rather than at the end. And so even after the 1-year process is over, they still have 90 days. They may ask for another 30 days.

Because of that reason—that this is not a pipeline safety bill, it is a process bill—I would respectfully request that we defeat this motion to recommit. And I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Jersey and others on pipeline safety as we have hearings and legislation about PHMSA.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—182

Adams	Capuano	Costa
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Courtney
Ashford	Carney	Crowley
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beatty	Cartwright	Cummings
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Beyer	Chu (CA)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	DeGette
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Boyle (PA)	Clay	DeBene
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Dingell
Bustos	Connolly	Doggett
Butterfield	Conyers	Doyle (PA)
Capps	Cooper	Edwards

Ellison	Lieu (CA)	Ruiz	Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Cramer	Katko	Roby
Engel	Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry	Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Eshoo	Loeb	Rush	Moorenaar	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi	Crenshaw	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Esty	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Rohrabacher	Tipton	Cuellar	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Fattah	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda T.	Mullin	Rokita	Trott	Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Foster	Lowey	Mulvaney	Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Turner	Curbelo (FL)	Kline	Rokita
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sanchez, Loretta	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton	Davis, Rodney	Knight	Rooney (FL)
Fudge	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Sarbanes	Newhouse	Roskam	Valadao	Denham	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Gabbard	Maloney, Carolyn	Schakowsky	Noem	Ross	Wagner	Dent	LaMalfa	Roskam
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Schiff	Nugent	Rothfus	Walberg	DeSantis	Lance	Ross
Garamendi	McCollum	Schrader	Nunes	Rouzer	Walden	DesJarlais	Latta	Rothfus
Graham	McDermott	Scott (VA)	Olson	Royce	Walker	Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Rouzer
Grayson	McGovern	Scott, David	Palazzo	Russell	Walorski	Dold	Long	Royce
Green, Al	Meeks	Serrano	Palmer	Ryan (WI)	Walters, Mimi	Duffy	Loudermilk	Russell
Grijalva	McGuire	Sewell (AL)	Paulsen	Salmon	Weber (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Love	Ryan (WI)
Gutiérrez	McGuire	Sherman	Pearce	Sanford	Webster (FL)	Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Salmon
Hahn	McGuire	Sinema	Perry	Scalise	Wenstrup	Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Heck (WA)	McGuire	Sires	Pittenger	Schock	Westerman	Emmer	Lummis	Scalise
Higgins	McGuire	Slaughter	Pitts	Schweikert	Westmoreland	Farenthold	MacArthur	Schock
Himes	McGuire	Smith (WA)	Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Whitfield	Fincher	Marchant	Schrader
Honda	McGuire	Smith (WA)	Poliquin	Sensenbrenner	Williams	Fitzpatrick	Marino	Schweikert
Hoyer	McGuire	Speier	Pompeo	Sessions	Wilson (SC)	Fleischmann	Massie	Scott, Austin
Huffman	McGuire	Swalwell (CA)	Poser	Shimkus	Wittman	Fleming	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Takai	Price (GA)	Shuster	Womack	Flores	McCaul	Sessions
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Takano	Ratcliffe	Simpson	Woodall	Fortenberry	McClintock	Shimkus
Jeffries	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Reed	Smith (MO)	Yoder	Fox	McHenry	Shuster
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Thompson (MS)	Reichert	Smith (NE)	Yoho	Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Simpson
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Titus	Renacci	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)	Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Sinema
Jones	Norcross	Tonko	Ribble	Smith (TX)	Young (IA)	Garrett	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Kaptur	O'Rourke	Torres	Rice (SC)	Stefanik	Young (IN)	Gibbs	McSally	Smith (NE)
Keating	Pallone	Tsongas	Rigell	Stivers	Zeldin	Gibson	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (IL)	Pascarella	Walsh	Roby	Stutzman	Zinke	Gohmert	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Kennedy	Payne	Vargas				Goodlatte	Messer	Stefanik
Kildee	Pelosi	Veasey				Gosar	Mica	Stewart
Kilmer	Peters	Vela				Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Kind	Peterson	Velázquez				Graham	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Kirkpatrick	Pingree	Visclosky				Granger	Moorenaar	Thompson (PA)
Kuster	Pocan	Walz				Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Thornberry
Langevin	Polis	Wasserman				Graves (LA)	Mullin	Tiberi
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Schultz				Mullin	Mulvaney	Tipton
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Waters, Maxine				Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Trott
Lawrence	Rangel	Watson Coleman				Griffith	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Lee	Rice (NY)	Welch				Grothman	Neugebauer	Upton
Levin	Richmond	Yarmuth				Guinta	Newhouse	Valadao
Lewis	Roybal-Allard					Guthrie	Noem	Vela
						Hanna	Norcross	Wagner
						Hardy	Nugent	Walberg
						Harper	Nunes	Walden
						Harris	Olson	Walker
						Hartzler	Palazzo	Walorski
						Heck (NV)	Palmer	Walters, Mimi
						Hensarling	Paulsen	Weber (TX)
						Herrera Beutler	Pearce	Webster (FL)
						Hice (GA)	Perry	Wenstrup
						Hill	Peters	Westerman
						Holding	Peterson	Westmoreland
						Hudson	Pittenger	Whitfield
						Huelskamp	Pitts	Williams
						Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
						Hultgren	Poliquin	Wittman
						Hunter	Pompeo	Womack
						Hurd (TX)	Poser	Woodall
						Hurt (VA)	Price (GA)	Yoder
						Issa	Ratcliffe	Yoho
						Jenkins (KS)	Reed	Young (AK)
						Jenkins (WV)	Reichert	Young (IA)
						Johnson (OH)	Renacci	Young (IN)
						Jolly	Ribble	Zeldin
						Jones	Rice (SC)	Zinke
						Jordan	Rigell	
						Joyce		

NOT VOTING—10

□ 1532

Messrs. GROTHMAN, BARLETTA, CLAWSON of Florida, BURGESS, MOOLENAAR, HUELSKAMP, and YODER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CUELLAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 169, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—253

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham

Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Honda

NAYS—241

Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica

Hoyer	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Huffman	Matsui	Schiff
Israel	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Jackson Lee	McDermott	Scott, David
Jeffries	McGovern	Serrano
Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Sherman
Kaptur	Meng	Sires
Keating	Moore	Slaughter
Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Kennedy	Nadler	Speier
Kildee	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Kilmer	Neal	Takai
Kind	Nolan	Takano
Kirkpatrick	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Kuster	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Pascarella	Titus
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Tonko
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Torres
Lawrence	Pingree	Tsongas
Lee	Pocan	Van Hollen
Levin	Polis	Vargas
Lewis	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lieu (CA)	Quigley	Velázquez
Lipinski	Rangel	Visclosky
Loeb sack	Rice (NY)	Walz
Lofgren	Richmond	Wasserman
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Lowey	Ruiz	Waters, Maxine
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
(NM)	Rush	Welch
Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)
(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	Yarmuth
Lynch	T.	Sarbanes
Maloney,	Sanchez, Loretta	
Carolyn		

NOT VOTING—11

Brat	Hastings	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Heck (WA)	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Forbes	Johnson, Sam	

□ 1542

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 40

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Ms. Adams, Ms. Graham, and Mr. Ashford.

(2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Yarmuth (to rank immediately after Mr. Van Hollen), Mr. Norcross, and Mr. Moulton.

(3) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Ms. Lofgren and Mr. Vargas.

(4) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mrs. Torres, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Takai, and Mr. Gallego.

(5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Lieu of California, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. DeSaulnier, and Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. Beyer.

(7) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mrs. Lawrence.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Miss Rice of New York.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-5)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 2015.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. MULLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I believe every life is a gift. Our Nation was built on the right to life. Our Founding Fathers wrote that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by the Creator with certain undeniable rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our government was instituted to secure these rights, not take them away.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with hundreds of thousands of people from across the country who have traveled to our Nation's Capital to tell lawmakers that we must protect the innocent and that we must fight for those who cannot defend themselves. I am proud of the many young people who are in Washington, D.C., this week to defend life. You are a voice for the voiceless, and you are the future.

I am proud to join so many of my colleagues in this Chamber today to defend life and spread this message that every life is a gift.

PAYCHECK PROGRESS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, as the President noted in his State of the Union address last evening, we should be proud of the progress we have made since the Great Recession. But there is too much to do still on growth, especially on the issue of paycheck progress.

For most Americans, especially in the San Francisco Bay Area, here is our reality: costs all around us are going up, and wages are staying flat. That is a right angle that is taking American families in the wrong direction.

For paycheck progress we must invest in infrastructure, reform our Tax Code so that it is fairer for all Americans, and, finally, ensure equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Speaker, instead of addressing these issues, many House Republicans are calling for giveaways to special interests, rolling back critical women's health protections, and holding Homeland Security funding hostage to win political points. Let's be real. In the nineties it was: It is the economy, stupid. You ask any American family today: It is my paycheck, stupid.

If we focus on one thing this Congress, let's make sure that it is the paycheck of working-class Americans. The American people deserve better than what is being served up. Let's work together on paycheck progress, not partisanship.

42ND ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, 3,288 per day, 137 per hour, one every 26 seconds—that is how many children are denied their God-given right to life each and every day. As we mark the 42nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we should remember each of those children and the potential each had.

Mr. Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life and have been a longtime supporter of efforts to protect the unborn. Because every human life is precious, we must continue to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves.

Today I stand on behalf of those children and of future children who may never have a chance. We must stand together and never forget until the battle for life is won.

THE GRAND JURY REFORM ACT

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Grand Jury Reform Act, which requires the appointment of a special prosecutor to conduct an investigation and present the results to a judge in an open courtroom proceeding whenever a police officer kills an individual while on duty.

After police officers killed two unarmed black men in 2014 and secret grand juries failed to indict these officers, I am honoring Dr. King's legacy by offering legislation that restores trust in our justice system while ensuring a fair process for all.

Mr. Speaker, we are the beneficiaries of Dr. King's legacy, and we must face our challenges with the same resolve as he did. I urge my fellow colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the thousands of students from across the country who are participating in tomorrow's March for Life event. I am praying for safe travels for all the groups from my district, including St. Thomas More High School, St. Louis Parish—the parish I attended Mass at this weekend—Holy Trinity in Stonington, Illinois, and the Illinois Life Caravan as they drive through the night and travel almost 800 miles to come to Washington to stand up for what they believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I have renewed hope and faith in our Nation's young people as I see students from high school to elementary school age showing their commitment to life. I am proud to be pro-life. I believe it is my duty and part of my faith to stand up for those who cannot speak for themselves, and I will continue to do so as I serve in this great Congress.

In the words of Pope Francis:

All life has inestimable value. Even the weakest and most vulnerable, the sick, the old, the unborn, and the poor are masterpieces of God's creation, made in His own image, destined to live forever and deserving of the utmost reverence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of those who are standing here for life with us.

AMERICA STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, last night President Obama addressed the Nation and reminded us of the crossroads at which we stand: Do we continue on the path we are on where only a select few prosper while so many families struggle? Or will we instead work to rebuild our middle class, grow our economy, and create new opportunities for success?

But here today, Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is clear that the priorities of this body's majority are not in line with the majority of Americans.

The American people don't want more of the same. They want better access to education, better infrastructure, and an honest chance at the American Dream. They want a fair college loan system, and they want the relief of knowing that their retirement and their parents' retirement is safe and sound, not left to the whims of Wall Street. As President Obama made clear, they want a tax system that rewards work, not wealth.

I am proud to support many of the priorities laid out in last night's speech because they put practicality above partisan politics. Let's hope for the sake of the American people that this Congress does the same.

THE 42ND ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, on the 42nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, I stand with my colleagues in defense of innocent human life. My wife and I were blessed with seven beautiful children, each with their own unique gifts. Since *Roe v. Wade*, more than 56 million unborn babies have been robbed of

the chance to reach their true potential.

Our Nation's role as a defender of the rights to life and liberty erode with each innocent life that is taken. This is not a partisan issue or a judgment of others. But we must never stop defending the rights of those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in an era where common ground can be hard to find, I am honored to serve with the men and women dedicated to the protection of these most basic of liberties.

THE PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this House tomorrow will consider H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I will support that bill because it protects most of the children in these circumstances. But I will do so with a heavy heart because it does not protect all children. Every child at 20 weeks and older deserves protection from the violence perpetrated on them in the womb by late-term abortions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not protect all children because it gives an exception for children conceived in rape and incest. No child 20 weeks and older should be subjected to that, regardless of the circumstances in which they are conceived.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to work to try to correct that injustice as well, and I hope efforts are afoot to make this bill perfect in the sense that it would protect every single child 20 weeks and older because none of them deserve less.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and respect of the thousands of people who will come to our city to rally to give support to the life of the unborn. Twenty-five years ago while in London I saw a video that depicted the life, as they described it, of the baby. It wasn't anything less than a baby.

Mr. Speaker, I am a father, and I am a grandfather. I have got nine grandchildren. Every life is precious. Who is to know, Mr. Speaker, that that unborn baby might be the curer for cancer or might be the curer for Alzheimer's? Only God knows.

I thank the leadership for bringing forth this legislation tomorrow. I respect them for doing it. We need to rally in support to show our commitment to the life of the unborn.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of our Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO SERVE AS THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 4(d) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals to serve as the Governing Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics:

Nominated by the Speaker with the concurrence of the Minority Leader:

Mr. Porter J. Goss, Florida, Chairman

Mr. James M. Eagan, III, Colorado

Ms. Allison R. Hayward, Virginia

Ms. Judy Biggert, Illinois, alternate

Nominated by the Minority Leader with the concurrence of the Speaker:

Mr. David Skaggs, Colorado, Co-Chairman

Brigadier General (retired) Belinda Pinckney, Virginia

Ms. Karan English, Arizona

Mr. Mike Barnes, Maryland, alternate

□ 1600

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Missouri, ANN WAGNER.

Ms. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and thank the gentleman for yielding and for hosting this very important Special Order today and for his lifetime of service in protecting the rights of the unborn, those who have no voice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the sanctity of life. Sadly, tomorrow is the 42nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, and hundreds of thousands of people, including pro-life advocates from my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, will gather in our Nation's capital in honor of the over 56 million precious angels we have lost since that infamous Supreme Court decision, not to mention the millions of women who have been adversely affected in the aftermath of their abortion, both physically and emotionally.

I first participated in the March for Life 25 years ago this week, in 1990. I was 28 years old with a real bad hairdo, and I was 12 weeks pregnant with my son Stephen. At that point, at 12 weeks in my pregnancy, Stephen was able to suck his thumb. A few weeks later, at 15 weeks, he could make facial expressions and he had taste buds. By 17 weeks, Stephen began to kick. By week 18, his ears had developed and he could hear. By week 20, not only was Stephen able to recognize my voice as his mother, but he was capable of feeling pain.

While killing an unborn child is unconscionable at anytime, it is especially abhorrent at the 20-week mark when a child is able to feel the pain of an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the theme of this year's march is "Every Life is a Gift," and I truly believe that life at all stages, from conception to natural death, is, indeed, a gift. I am for the life of the baby. I am also for the life of the mother and oftentimes the victim.

I will continue to work and to pray for the day when abortion is not only illegal, but abortion is unthinkable.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Ms. Wagner for her very eloquent statement and for her long service on behalf of the unborn and equally for their mothers as well.

I yield to TIM WALBERG.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for putting this Special Order together on the 42nd anniversary of an infamous decision, *Roe v. Wade*. Mr. Speaker, where I believe the Supreme Court stepped out of their role and unconstitutionally set up the course that has gone on to this day, the murder of innocents and, ultimately, murder of innocence of our country as well that in its inception was established on a principle that was well known, well understood, and put into our Declaration of Independence that said:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among them the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It all begins with life. I will never forget 8 years ago as I stood in a maternity ward at Northwestern University Hospital and waited for word from the room where my daughter-in-law was giving birth to our first two grand-

children, twins John Timothy and Micah Todd.

Micah Todd is now 8 years old, happy, healthy, moving forward. John Timothy we look forward to seeing him again some day in heaven. For 8 days he lived on this Earth. He fought after being born with his twin brother at 26 weeks. I watched them as they fought for life. I watched them at less than 12 inches long, one pound, 12 ounces, fighting for life, understanding in their own way that this is what they were supposed to do. They were capable of pain. They were capable of doing what nature's God had enabled them to do.

That changed my life more than ever before, though back in 1982 I ran for the State house on the issue of life itself. That is what brought me out of the pulpit as a pastor and brought me into the arena to try to promote life and go away from that terrible decision that the Supreme Court put upon us.

Now I think 42 years later we have seen gains in this country, as we will see millennials come out of Metro tubes tomorrow, as we will see young people standing in front of us speaking for life, declaring their desire to see abortion ended, and I am hopeful that in our day we will see that take place not because of religion, not even because of politics, but because of people understanding the sanctity of life, understood by the prophet Jeremiah when he said after the words of God himself:

Before I was formed in my mother's womb, you knew me and declared the days of my life.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New Jersey, all of my colleagues who will stand in defense of life, I say thank you. Let's not give up, because we are on the right side.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana, MARLIN STUTZMAN.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his tireless work on this, such an important issue for our day and age.

Mr. Speaker, on this 42nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we must remember the innocent lives who were never given a chance to live the American Dream. Since 1973, tens of millions of innocent unborn children have been denied an opportunity to grow and to be successful.

In America, we are always espousing the belief that anything is possible, that anyone can achieve their dreams if they set their minds to it, and yet it is here in this country where we deny those dreams to so many.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in 1976, and I am so thankful that my mother, at the age of 17, chose life and gave me the gift of life, because my Federal Government at the time 3 years earlier said it was okay for her to end it if she so chose.

Most of us have very strong feelings about the value of life. We must continue to seek opportunities to promote

a culture of life that protects the innocent.

Tomorrow, tens of thousands of people from all across the country will descend on The National Mall to champion the belief that every life is a gift, and Congress will have an opportunity to act and show that we are listening through the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a bill that I urge my colleagues to support.

We may meet some obstacles, but the pro-life movement will not be shaken. We will continue to fight to protect the unborn. We will continue to fight and provide a voice for those who do not have one. We will continue to fight because we believe that America should be a place where everyone is protected by law and welcomed to life. This is our goal, and I pray that together we will achieve it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my friend for his, again, very fine statement and for his leadership as well.

I yield to CHRIS STEWART from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in thanking my friend Mr. SMITH for giving us this opportunity to address such an important and a deeply personal issue.

I am the proud father of six children, and nothing in the world means more to me. My life changed forever the first time I held my first son. I look at my sons and daughters, and I am humbled by the responsibility it is to be their parent, and I am touched always by the power and the blessing of life.

Now I am a grandfather, and that fact alone makes my life very good. This week we commemorate the anniversary of one of the most significant Supreme Court cases in the history of the United States, of course, *Roe v. Wade*.

We also welcome thousands of pro-life activists who came to our Nation's Capital to participate in the March for Life. Think about that title for a moment, the March for Life. It is extremely important as Members of Congress to stand up for those who do not have a voice to stand up for themselves, our precious unborn children.

Tomorrow the House will vote on H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which protects the lives of unborn by banning abortions at or after 20 weeks of pregnancy. With medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain by at least 20 weeks, if not earlier, I will support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well. Think of what we would be saying if we were to reject this bill.

Now, I understand that there are exceptions, and I recognize the woman's health is just as important as her child. Thus, we made reasonable medical judgment exceptions, which would be made in the case of rape, incest, or an endangerment of the mother's life.

As I conclude, I would like to reiterate my opening remarks. Each life is sacred. Each life has a right to protection. I urge my colleagues to help to defend the innocent lives of America's unborn children and represent those who cannot represent themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. STEWART, thank you very much for your statement and your leadership as well.

I now yield to Mr. YOHO, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear colleague, Mr. SMITH, for holding this important pro-life Special Order that gives a life to the unborn.

I stand here today in defense of the thousands of unborn children whose lives were ended through no fault of their own. These children are precious gifts and cannot defend themselves. They do not have the luxury to debate whether or not society should recognize them as living beings.

As a Christian and the proud father also of three children, I strongly believe in the sanctity of life and that it begins at conception. My heart aches for the thousands of unborn children who will never have that chance to experience the wonder of life.

Life is truly a miracle granted through the grace of nature's God, and I am here today to say every life is a gift and every life does matter.

It has been 42 years since the Supreme Court made their ruling in *Roe v. Wade*. Since that ruling, an estimated—and I want to repeat this, an estimated—55 million lives have been lost. That is more than the total population of the northeast States. That is more than the population of the State of California.

Future generations will look back and judge us. They will judge us on our failure to protect the most innocent among us. They will judge us for allowing infanticide, human genocide of our next generation yet to come.

This week, the defenders of life in the thousands have and will come to Washington, D.C., to support the sanctity of life. This has grown into the largest pro-life event in the world. I want them to know we will keep fighting to defend the silent, unborn child.

How can we as a nation—how can we as a nation—have laws that protect the embryo of a sea turtle or bald eagle but yet refuse to protect the same of our own species? Shouldn't the lives of the unborn children matter as much as these in the eyes of the law?

These lives, these gifts, these human beings deserve to be protected and defended.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to DOUG LAMALFA from California.

□ 1615

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for leading this Special Order today, and also for the comments started out by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), very heartfelt, that reflect the importance of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the sanctity of human life and to recognize those who will be in Washington, D.C., tomorrow for the March for Life. I am pleased to join my colleagues and individuals who have traveled from near and far to be in solidarity to protect the rights of the unborn. I applaud those marchers who come here year after year despite snow, rainy conditions, and cold conditions to stand up for such a vital cause. It is their efforts and determination which gives substance and meaning to this year's theme, "Every Life is a Gift"—and to march for the truth.

As a parent, I wish all parents would understand what the gift is that the Lord has bestowed with one of these young lives upon you. That is part of our mission, to help them understand, to educate. That is part of the mission of the March for Life, to appreciate that these are gifts, even through the hard times. We have struggles in all matters of our lives, and that is an important one we have to get through as well. To understand these blessings that these lives are.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to convey to these marchers that their voice will be heard and will continue to be heard as we fight for the dignity of human life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his incisive comments and for welcoming the marchers tomorrow, which will be a great celebration of life but also a restatement of the determination we have in defending life.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. What a privilege it is to be here with the gentleman from New Jersey, who has been fighting this fight for a very long time. I remember back to my college days in the 1980s seeing you standing for life.

I rise today to commemorate the 2015 March for Life, appropriately themed "Every Life is a Gift." Life begins at conception and must be defended at every stage. Whether for the unborn, the disabled, the elderly, we must promote a culture of life. This can and must be done through our public policy that is made here in Washington, D.C., just as it is being done throughout the country in our communities.

Across the country there are many places, thousands of pro-life pregnancy centers, places like Choices Pregnancy Services in western Pennsylvania, which does important work helping families say "yes" to life by offering free medical and counseling services and helping women in need.

As we prepare to march tomorrow on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that the late Justice Byron White described as an exercise in raw judicial power, I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to defend the sanctity of life. I also ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. ROTHFUS for his statement today. He has been a true rising star and a leader in defending the sanctity of life.

I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a physician who has delivered over 5,000 babies.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Before I start, I want to say a few things about my good friend CHRIS SMITH. Of the 435 of us who serve here in the House of Representatives, no one in this body has been a stronger voice for life than CHRIS. CHRIS, thank you. Hopefully one day we will see this egregious law overturned. Your perseverance over now four decades is exemplary. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, as an OB-GYN, I have personally delivered over 5,000 babies, and I strongly support the sanctity of life. Using technology like the 3-D ultrasound has given us a window into the womb that shows the unborn child as a living, breathing, feeling human being. I have looked through that window with my own eyes literally thousands of times, and I have seen human development occur from the earliest stages of conception. When you see a heartbeat at 26 days post-conception, already dreams are being developed by that mother and father about what this baby will be in their lifetime. I have been fortunate enough to experience that three times, and it is a wonderful feeling to know that this little person is going to be your child and grow up to be who knows what. All of the way through birth we see this, which strengthens my conviction in the right to life.

Life is a precious miracle from God that begins at conception. It is our responsibility and privilege as legislators to protect those who do not have a voice. I will always fight for life because it is my conviction that we are all unique creations of a God who knows us and loves us before we are born.

Tonight we mark one of the most tragic, misguided Supreme Court cases in our Nation's history: *Roe v. Wade*. Since 1973, more than 50 million babies, as has been stated here numerous times, have been denied the most basic right in this country, protected by our Constitution, which is the right to life. We must make our laws consistent with our science now and restore full legal protections to all those who are waiting to be born. If government has any legitimate function at all, it is to protect those, the most innocent among us.

For over 30 years Congress has prevented taxpayer-funded abortions. Unfortunately, this door has been reopened with the passage of *ObamaCare*, the largest expansion since the pivotal *Roe v. Wade* decision was made 42 years ago. Members who stand here before you today pledge themselves to protect those without a voice, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure this promise is kept. It is only by making good on this oath that we can expect to restore the trust that the American people have in their own government, and in doing so, ensure that the door to taxpayer-funded abortions remains closed.

Let me just tell a brief story I was telling Congressman SMITH before we came onto the House floor. Over 25 years ago, my partner delivered a baby, and I will just say "Smith" for privacy purposes. Baby Smith weighed about 1 pound 6 ounces over 25 years ago. Well, the chances of that baby surviving were minimal. Baby Smith got down to less than one pound. I went by the intensive care nursery and saw this tiny baby that I thought would never make it. Well, Baby Smith did make it, and I was on a trip to Walmart with my kids one day, and there was this youngster there with a pair of glasses on, just like his doctor had. He was 2 years old, and he was doing like any other 2 year old—he was knocking everything off the shelf at Walmart. Wouldn't it have been a shame—and we are aborting babies much larger than Baby Smith—and Baby Smith is alive and well today, thriving in our country and being a productive citizen in this country.

As a father and a grandfather, I am privileged to be here on the House floor tonight with other legislators fighting for the rights of the unborn.

CHRIS, thank you, and I thank my colleagues. God bless each and every one of you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for your kind statement, and also for your leadership both as a physician, a obstetrician, and also as a lawmaker. It has made a huge difference. I want to say that publicly. You provide insight and guidance that all of us benefit from.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congressman. I know we probably sound like a broken record—and for the marchers coming in tomorrow, that is something that they used before there were CDs. Isn't that great—we have all of these marchers coming in who don't even know what a record is because they are so young. In the battle for life, we are winning with this generation. They understand the reality of when life begins. I am so thankful for that, and I am so thankful for CHRIS SMITH's leadership.

Like one of my earlier colleagues, I remember being on the other side of

the rally watching the Congressman and saying: Gosh darnit, I wish I could be like him. What can I do?

That is what I would like to talk about tonight: What can we do to make a difference? Of course, as we will see tomorrow, a tremendous level of political involvement with tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of folks showing up here from all over the country. Generally you have people from Kansas to lead the march, and it is great to see some kids from Benedictine College and throughout my district as well getting involved, making a difference, both here in Washington and in their State capital, coming here for the March for Life, which we hashtagged "Why We March."

What else can we do? Very quickly, we can help and assist women and families in crisis pregnancies. There are hundreds and hundreds of facilities across the country that offer free help and free care, outreach for those in very difficult situations. We can do that.

The second thing we can do is encourage families, current families, encourage marriage. Marriage is a founding block of our society, of our civilization. The more we can encourage marriage, the more we can encourage families and the more we can help our unborn.

We can also consider adoption. For those who are listening today who are wondering, maybe that should be for me—sometimes it might be one spouse. Sometimes it might be another. I was with a couple of friends this weekend just talking about that, saying, think about it, pray about it, consider it, because there are literally tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of young folks who are looking for homes. So please consider that.

And lastly, I ask, please pray for the unborn, please pray for birth families, and please pray for those who are considering adoption.

Lastly, I want to briefly thank the four birth families who blessed our family with children. Some of them I know, some of them I do not. Two of them are in foreign countries and two of those families are here in this country. But that is a tough decision. I am so thankful for the men and women of this country that chose life and offered up their children for adoption.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much for sharing that very personal story, which is very touching.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate my friend from New Jersey yielding me this time, and I rise today to join my colleagues and thousands of Americans who will be marching on Washington, D.C., tomorrow because every life truly is a gift, which is this year's Right to Life march theme. It has been talked about, the millions of

young lives that have been tragically cut short.

But I, like my colleague and our friend from Kansas, who was just talking about his personal experience with adoption, I come from a place in western Michigan that has really embraced the notion of adoption. We have a number of friends and neighbors who have done both domestic and international adoption. In fact, one family is now on their third adoption from Africa, and this time they are coming home with a brother and sister for four kids, adding to their own natural five that they have. And I must add that, a little jokingly, we are not Catholic typically in western Michigan, we are just passionate Protestants. We are wanting to share that gift of life and opportunity for those children who have that potential that their parents see and go through a difficult decision to put them up, and whether it is domestically or internationally, we are so pleased that they have done that.

It is also why, because life being so precious, why my wife, Natalie, and I have been active through our church and Michigan Right to Life, and my wife particularly through the Lakeshore Pregnancy Center, a crisis pregnancy center that she has been on the board of for a number of years that is helping young men and women make those difficult choices in those difficult life circumstances.

I understand, and I know my colleagues know this as well. This is very difficult. It is very emotional. These are issues that have affected so many of us. As we deal with difficult circumstances where these pregnancies have arisen, whether it is through rape or through mistakes that have been made to have these unplanned pregnancies, I think we need to show that love and that mercy that we have been shown at various times in our life.

I do want to encourage my colleagues in the House, though, to take a close look at a loophole, an issue that I became aware of a couple of years ago. Over the previous two Congresses, I introduced something called the Homeland Security Respect For Life Act and worked with my friend and Appropriations member, Representative ADERHOLT, to attach language to the annual Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

This commonsense bill simply prevents hardworking taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions through the DHS programs that currently would fund abortions for detainees who lack lawful status here in the United States. In fact, this bill codifies pro-life language that is already found in the ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, manual on detention standards. But since this manual lacks a basis in law and the weight of law, it can be changed at any time by unelected bureaucrats.

Well, I think it is time for us to put the DHS in line with other departments of the government and codify this and make sure that this is crystal clear. Our current policy prohibits Federal taxpayer funding for abortions for law-abiding citizens on Medicaid, as well as citizens who are in Federal prison, why not the DHS and why not in these detention areas? It only makes sense to apply those same life-affirming standards to immigration detainees as well.

□ 1630

This is an easy fix, Mr. Chairman, and I am hopeful that this year the Senate and the President will agree to our bill language and follow the precedent as consistent with current administration policy in the other Federal agencies. I, too, want to say thank you for your leadership in this area and appreciate the opportunity to spend some time on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. HUIZENGA. I want to thank you, BILL, for your leadership on pro-life issues in general, but especially for your legislation that deals with the detainees issue because that could quickly emerge as a trouble spot if we are paying for abortions of people who make it across the border. That would be unconscionable to think that we would be enabling the killing of those precious children, so thank you. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and also, I want to extend my thanks for all your many, many years of work and leadership to protect the life and lives of the unborn. We really appreciate everything you have done, and I know, across the country, it is appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to voice my support for the right to life of unborn children. During my time in the Ohio General Assembly and, now, as a Member of Congress, I have always been a strong supporter of pro-life legislation. I firmly believe we must be vigilant in protecting the sanctity of human life.

As previously mentioned by other Members, it is heartbreaking to know that, since 1973, there have been more than 55 million abortions in the United States. Fortunately, a report released in February 2014 found abortion rates and ratios are continuing to decline in the United States and the rate of abortion has dropped to its lowest since its legalization; however, there is still more work to be done. That is why I continually support legislation to protect the unborn.

Tomorrow, tens of thousands of our fellow citizens will be in Washington to participate in the March for Life, and I salute them for their steadfastness in our cause for life. They will be here to let their voices be heard.

I can speak that, in our church, I know that we sponsor a couple of buses that will be coming down from Bowling Green State University, my alma mater. There will be high schoolers from across my district that will be here, and we salute them, again, for making sure that they are here to have their voices heard.

I also want to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to those who have tirelessly worked for years to defend the right to life; and, again, I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. LATTA.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. SMITH, for yielding, and thank you also for calling this Special Order, particularly as Congress, tomorrow, will take up an important issue relating to the unborn.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, of all the responsibilities given to Congress under our Constitution, none is more important than to protect and preserve life.

Throughout the history of governments, through the entire course of the world as we know it, governments have had the power to decide who dies and who lives. Our Founding Fathers established the United States to ensure the protection of first life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all of our citizens.

As the people's Congress, we pass laws that define life. We pass laws that define life for all Americans, including the unborn. No matter that comes before this Congress or our society is more important than the matter of protecting the lives of our citizens; and, my colleagues, no citizen is more vulnerable or helpless than the unborn.

Our Nation, in respect for life and the unborn, must not waver. Protecting human life at every opportunity must be our only option and certainly our moral responsibility.

As thousands of pro-life Americans express their support for the unborn at our Nation's Capital this week, I welcome them, and I also hope and pray that their voice is heard.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Chairman MICA.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOE PITTS, and just before I do, I note that Mr. PITTS not only chairs the Subcommittee on Health for the Energy and Commerce Committee, but prior to coming to Washington, he was one of the prime authors of a sweeping pro-life law in Pennsylvania that has saved countless lives.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank CHRIS SMITH for his leadership over the years. He is one of the people, along with Henry Hyde, that I admired from afar, and when I was elected 18 years ago, I told him I want to come and hold up his arms in this fight for life. He has been a real champion and

just a terrific leader here in the Congress. I want to thank him for that.

I heard in a congressional life forum a few years ago a lady by the name of Frederica Mathewes-Green—she was president of the Feminists for Life—and she said something I will never forget. She said:

Abortion is the most violent form of death known to mankind. It is death by dismemberment, decapitation, and poisoning.

She said:

Abortion breaks a mother's heart.

She said:

There are always two victims in an abortion. One is the baby, and one is the mother; one is dead, one is wounded.

I never forgot those statements of this great feminist leader. I think her focus is right. We need to keep that focus where it is, where she had it: on the mother, on the baby.

We are talking here about babies who are in their 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th month of pregnancy. For the first 5 months, a woman could have an abortion, but after that, it bans abortion, and I want to say this: I was first elected in 1972, inaugurated 3 weeks before Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, so I have been involved in these battles for the whole time.

This is the first time in my memory that our leadership has moved substantive legislation on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade on the day of the march. They should be applauded for that. This is significant.

In 2 years, if things go the way we hope, with a new Republican President and a House and a Senate, 2 years from tomorrow, we could very well see this legislation signed into law. That is how important this is. It moves the bar back on Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, those two infamous decisions that have resulted in 55 million unborn children and women being affected by abortion.

As CHRIS said, I was involved in authoring the Pennsylvania Abortion Control Act, but I also was involved in the Medicaid funding cutoff bill that passed in Pennsylvania—I think that was about 1978—and we had a reporting requirement in that bill, so that the abortions that were due to rape and incest had to be reported to the appropriate law enforcement or social service agencies.

The year before our bill was passed into law, there were some 740 abortions, Medicaid-funded abortions, due to so-called rape. The year after our bill was signed into law, there were 38. This shows the importance of that provision into law of reporting to the appropriate authorities.

If you remove that provision from the law—and some people want to do that—that would create a loophole for late-term abortions. As I said, for the first 5 months, a woman could have an abortion, but in the later term, they could not without the appropriate reporting to appropriate authorities. It

would, I think, be a mistake, as some would like to do, to remove those requirements.

I just might conclude by saying that we are one of only seven countries that allow abortion at any point of pregnancy. Some countries are appalled that the United States would permit these late-term abortions. We had a famous case in Pennsylvania, the Kermit Gosnell clinic, which was outrageous when people find out what happened in those late-term abortions.

Scientific studies tell us that children feel pain in the womb. These are the children at this age who smile in the womb, who suck their thumb, who hiccup, who have dream patterns on the brainwaves, who react to light if it is intrauterine or a pinprick.

These are very tiny but knowing, learning individuals. They have no one to speak for them. They are voiceless, so we have an obligation to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, who can't run away, who face this horrific type of death, and the mothers who carry them.

I would urge Members, just like as shown in the public polls, the majority of Americans support the legislation. I would like to thank the leadership for moving the legislation and like to say that we are admonished in the scriptures that if we see someone drawn to death and we do not speak up, we do nothing, that we will be held responsible because, really, nothing is doing something, silence is consent.

With the other pro-life people, Members, and our great champion, I urge the Members to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. PITTS. Again, I want to thank you for your leadership both at the State and, now, Federal level, especially as chairman of the committee that deals with health. Thank you so much.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who has also been an outspoken champion of the right to life.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42nd anniversary of the infamous Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision, which legalized elective abortion in the U.S.

Elective abortion is an abhorrent practice that tragically remains a common medical procedure performed in the U.S. Every year, over 1 million abortions are performed here.

Since 1973, when Roe v. Wade was decided, 57 million babies have been lost to abortion—57 million, Mr. Speaker. To put this in perspective, according to the last census numbers, 57 million is about 18 percent of the U.S. population. This staggering loss of children's lives is unconscionable.

My wife, Jeanie, and I have been blessed with five children and two grandchildren, with one more on the

way. I firmly believe that every life is a precious gift from God, and I am wholly committed to protecting the sanctity of life.

One critically important step towards protecting life is the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act that we will be voting on tomorrow. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill that will prohibit anyone from performing an abortion on an unborn child that is 20 weeks or older.

Medical research has shown that at least by the 20th week of a pregnancy, unborn babies can feel pain. Polls have consistently shown that a majority of Americans support banning abortions after 20 weeks. Abortions after the 20th week are painful, violent, and harmful, even to the mothers. It is time to end this horrible procedure.

This week, we will continue to mourn the lives cut short in the inhuman wake of Roe v. Wade. We pray for God's continued comfort, grace, and mercy to those touched by abortion.

Every life has value, and we have a duty to protect the lives of those who are the most innocent among us. I will continue to be among those fighting to do just that.

□ 1645

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, DOUG.

I would like to now close, and I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for their eloquent statements in defense of life.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago tomorrow marks the U.S. Supreme Court's infamous, reckless, and inhumane abandonment of women and babies to the abortionists—42 years of victims, dead babies, wounded women, shattered families; 42 years of government-sanctioned violence against women and children. Since 1973, more than 56 million—maybe 57 million—children have been killed by abortion—a staggering loss of children's lives, a death toll that equates to the entire population of England.

The passage of time has not changed the fact that abortion is a serious, lethal violation of fundamental human rights. Rather than gull our consciences to the unmitigated violence of abortion, however, the passage of time has only enabled us to see better and to understand better the innate cruelty of abortion and its horrific legacy—victims—while making us more determined than ever to protect the weakest and most vulnerable.

In his inaugural speech, President Obama said in pertinent part:

Together, we resolve that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, that all are created equal, and our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

Yes, Mr. President. We must care for the vulnerable, but that also includes unborn children and their mothers. No

one gets left out or left behind. All people are created equal, and our journey is not complete until all of our children, including the child in the womb, are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm.

Last night, right here in this Chamber, the President said to tell every child in every neighborhood, "Your life matters." Again, Mr. Speaker, the President is leaving out a whole class of human beings, who because of the fact they are in utero—the fact that they are yet to be born—they are construed to be excluded from humanity and, therefore, from their basic human rights. It is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. It is unconscionable.

Let me also say, in talking about victims, a couple of years ago, I met a woman named Linda Shrewsbury—an academic, an African American, with a degree from Harvard, who had an abortion. She said:

The lies that brought me to that day and to its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind—falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing and media campaigns and endless repetition led to a tragic, irreversible decision—the death of my first child.

Ms. Shrewsbury went on to say:

I really didn't understand back then. At age 20, I had no inkling of the mental and emotional darkness I was about to enter. I couldn't have grasped the immense psychological toll it would take for years into the future—unrelenting tears, guilt, shame, and depression. After spending many years in denial, I did eventually find healing.

Linda goes on to say:

When I understood and rejected distortions about fetal development, doublespeak about choice, rights, and planned and wanted children, I understood the reality and victimhood of my aborted child.

She went on and concluded:

I understood the absence of moral basis for choosing to disentitle an innocent human being of life. When I embraced the truth, the truth set me free, and I, finally, gained inner peace.

Some of my colleagues have mentioned the historic vote that we will take tomorrow on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and who are pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I, like, I think, most people, avoid pain at almost all costs. When I have surgeries—when anyone has surgeries—I am put locally or generally under anesthesia so that I do not have to feel the pain. The unborn child, when he or she is getting an intervention to help cure a disability or to deal with disease or illness, gets anesthesia because we now know beyond any reasonable doubt that unborn children who are at least at 20-weeks' gestation feel that pain.

When the abortionist commits a D&E abortion or one of the other abor-

tions—D&E is literally a way of dismembering the child—they feel this pain—"they" being the children—and it is excruciating. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

I would point out to my colleagues the expert testimony of Dr. Anthony Levatino's before the House Judiciary Committee. He is a former abortionist who has performed hundreds of dismemberment abortions. He described D&E. He said:

The baby can be in any position inside the uterus. Just reach in with a Sopher clamp, and grasp whatever you can.

The former abortionist went on to say:

Pull really hard, and out pops an arm. Reach in again and again, and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

Pull out a severed arm. Tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs. This is child abuse, Mr. Speaker. Not only is this assault on a child inhumane, it is extremely painful as the child experiences that dismemberment. Again, I say that children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Again, tomorrow is the March for Life, and there will be tens of thousands of people there who are speaking out for the unborn and equally for their mothers. There will be numbers of women there from the Silent No More Awareness Campaign—all women who have had abortions and who now speak out eloquently and with great compassion to say to women who are post-abortive that there is hope, that there is reconciliation. Face the truth, and that is the beginning to that reconciliation.

We will be there tomorrow, praying, working, of course—even fasting—for that day when every life is cherished as a gift, every life loved despite one's disability, race, sex, color, religion, or condition of dependency, when every life is welcomed no matter the inconvenience.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONTRASTING VIEWS OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and to address the country this afternoon and to do so with colleagues of mine from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) to draw a contrast between the view of government represented by our side of the aisle and of that which we heard last night from our President, a President who seemingly ignored the will of the people as

expressed by the ballot box in November and who, instead, doubled down on an agenda that we believe on our side of the aisle is the wrong view of government and the wrong direction for our Nation. So I rise with my colleagues today to talk about just a few of the very substantive points and to do so very constructively and to present why we have a different view of government and why we think that is important.

I would start by suggesting this. If we think about what the President said last night, in his words, the President declared from the rostrum that no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change. Now, I understand the sympathetic position on climate change. I am from a coastal State, and, frankly, I am a member of the Republican Party who believes that, indeed, the climate is changing, but I do not believe that the greatest challenge facing our future generations is that of climate change.

In fact, you can harken back to the words of Thomas Jefferson. He had a very different opinion than our President had last night. He said that public debt is the greatest of dangers for our Nation to fear. I would suggest that Jefferson was right, that the greatest threat to our future generations is actually economic security and domestic security. I would like to speak for just a couple of moments about that and allow my colleagues to talk about other portions of the President's remarks.

Let's first talk about the long-term threat to our economic security—our national debt—a topic that was completely ignored in the President's address to the Nation last night.

Understand the significance of where we sit historically when it comes to the national debt. When this President took office, our national debt was just over \$10 trillion, meaning it had taken 220 years for our Republic—220 years—to accumulate just over \$10 trillion in debt, a number already far too high. In the 8 years of this administration, an additional \$10 trillion will be added under this President's watch. When he leaves his office, our debt will be over \$20 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, that is a threat to our national security. The greatest threat, perhaps, to our national security, arguably, could be unwatched, out-of-control spending and debt that ultimately collapses our economic system and ensures that we are no longer the world's greatest superpower. In fact, George Washington, himself, admonished that we have a moral obligation to pay off our debts during the life of the majority, during our lifetimes.

Rather than hearing from a President who doubled down on a very progressive agenda and who suggested with the rare audacity, as he did, that our Nation is fine in that conflicts and

wars are over, in that our economy has returned, in that we have faster job growth than European nations—and yet the President suggested last night that he wants to grow our government in the very same manner that these European nations have today—and rather than tell us how to grow a government we already can't afford, I would ask the President to present a plan to pay for the government we already have.

The greatest threat to future generations is not climate change. It is our economic security, and it is also our homeland security. Many on this side of the aisle have grave reservations about the President's current plan to combat the war against ISIS, or ISIL—against radical extremists-terrorists who intend to bring harm to the United States. That is a threat. That is a real threat.

The President called for something last night that I strongly agree with. I think this body should have a robust debate about an authorization to use military force. We owe it to the American people, who sent us here, to represent them on this very critical issue of what is our national policy to protect our homeland, to protect American lives.

In fact, what is the current plan to arm Syrian rebels, and what is the likelihood that that will actually be successful when we have seen a lack of success in areas like Iraq?

Despite the declarations of last night, I would challenge that we are not as safe as, perhaps, the President suggested. From the Middle East, to Africa, to Paris, to Yemen, to our very own border, what is that plan?

House Republicans passed a border security bill that reflected the will of the people last July, yet we heard nothing last night—not a single comment—about how to secure our border. It is a sharp contrast. We heard about negotiating with Iran. We heard about releasing prisoners from GTMO. We heard nothing about securing our borders and securing our homeland, so we have taken this time today to present a constructive contrast between the President's view of government and our view of government and what we believe are the right priorities of our government.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues today, and I would yield now to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend and colleague from Florida, and thank you to my good friend and colleague from Alabama for joining us, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity to talk about what we heard in this Chamber, just slightly less than 24 hours ago, from this President, who is from my home State of Illinois. We heard a lot of ideas and a lot of talk

and a lot of promises, but if it is anything like the State of the Union Addresses that I have had an opportunity to sit on in this Chamber over the last 2 years, we are not going to see a lot of action.

There was a lot of talk about the economy. The economy is getting better. Frankly, it can't have gotten much worse when you compare it to a few years ago. Of course, it is going to get better, but the reality is there are still 8.7 million Americans who are out of work, and 7 million Americans are in part-time jobs but are looking for full-time jobs.

□ 1700

The President's solution to many of the issues that were brought up was to tax more American families—to tax American families who have been saving for their children's college education to pay for a grandiose idea he has yet to give us the details on.

The President also talked about helping our heroes: our veterans. This one is personal to me because just a few weeks ago, the day we got sworn in for the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, we were able to unanimously pass a bill called the Hire More Heroes Act, which I sponsored. This wasn't an idea that came from Washington. It was an idea that came from Illinois. Brad Lavite, the superintendent of the Madison County, Illinois, Veterans Assistance Commission, came to me during the last Congress and said, Why is it that veterans who are getting their health care through TRICARE and through the Department of Defense count towards the ObamaCare 50-employee limit in the employer mandate?

I came here, took his idea, and garnered hundreds of cosponsors to put this on the floor of the House. It passed in the last Congress, but it got held up in the Senate. It passed unanimously in this Congress on day one, and that bill should go through the Senate and get to the President's desk. If he wants to help veterans get jobs, I hope the President signs that immediately when it hits his desk, hopefully, in no more than a few weeks.

These are the types of solutions that are bipartisan solutions that the President told us he wanted to put forth, but he talked to us in a manner that I didn't think was bipartisan at all. Most of his speech talked about what he was going to do. I would have rather heard the President talk about what we are going to do together because, frankly, that is what my constituents in Illinois want us to do. They want us to come here and govern together.

That is why I am so glad to be here and be a part of this Special Order with my good friend, Mr. JOLLY. Hopefully, we can begin a good banter about discussing what our thoughts are on where America needs to go to move forward and work with this President but

do it in a way that is a lot less confrontational than what we heard last night.

Mr. JOLLY. With that, I yield to a real leader in this institution, a colleague of ours from the great State of Alabama, Mr. BRADLEY BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentlemen from Florida and Illinois. Those were eloquent words spoken from the heart, because I know both of these gentlemen mean everything they just said.

Last night was an interesting moment for me. One of the President's big plays is this proposal regarding community colleges.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself. I am the first person in my family to go to college. Both of my parents grew up during the Depression. There wasn't any money for college, but I was privileged to go to college. During the time that I went, my parents were not doing well financially. Like very many other people, I was a financial aid student.

We didn't have Pell grants back then. You got Federal student loans and maybe a Federal student work-study job. Lots and lots of people in my generation did that. I don't ever complain about that because that is the best money I ever borrowed and the best work I ever did because it gave me the opportunity to do what I have done in life. But it also taught me how important it is to give people an opportunity for a real education so that they can move up in their lives.

This May, the last of my four children will finish college. We have had somebody in college in my family since 2003. I have been writing those tuition checks, fees, et cetera. So I look at this also from the point of view of someone who has had to be there writing those checks, sending their young people to college. But I am also the former chancellor of post-secondary education for the State of Alabama. It was my job to be the CEO of Alabama's 2-year college system, the community colleges for the State of Alabama. And so I bring a certain level of experience and expertise to this issue that may be a little different from others in this body.

When the President first proposed this, his office just gave us a heads up. It didn't check and say, Do you think this is a good idea? Given your background, do you think this is something we can do? He said, This is what we're going to do.

Our first question we asked was, How much will it cost? The initial answer we got from the White House was, We don't know how much it's going to cost. Now that should cause us all to ask a question about how serious this proposal is when, in the very first instance that they decide that they are going to propose it, they can't even tell us how much it costs. Even after they decided how much they think it is going to cost—\$60 billion—they

couldn't tell us how they were going to pay for it.

So it led me to ask this question: Is this a serious idea? Because, you see, over a third of our community college students in America are already on Federal Pell grants, which cover all—or virtually all—of their tuition and fee costs when they go to community college. And for the people that don't have the eligibility to get Pell grants, there are a combination of other things that they can get.

My experience as somebody who ran a community college system was that covering tuition and fees was usually not the real problem most community college students face. Most of them face a more difficult problem, and that is they are not adequately academically prepared or they have other problems in their lives, whether it is from their homes or jobs or whatever. It is hard for them to stay in college and stay up with the work that they have got to do. And so they need a lot of extra help. And the President doesn't talk about that.

Now here is the worst thing about this proposal. We heard a lot last night from the President of the United States that he was all about the middle class. Let me tell you one of the taxes that he is going to raise that is going to pay for these proposals. He is going to tax 529 plans.

For people that don't know what those are, 529 plans are savings accounts, essentially, that moms and dads and grandmoms and granddads put money in over time and they use that money that they saved over time to put their young people through college. And the good thing about that is while they pay taxes on the money that they make before they put it into the plans, if, when they take the money out of those plans, there has been some appreciation—it has gone from being this much money to that much money—they don't have to pay taxes on it.

It is an incentive for them. It is a way for middle class people to save for college for their young people. It is the only way middle class people in this country have a real savings plan for the young people. And this President, who stood up right behind me last night and talked about being for the middle class, wants to tax those middle class savings plans and take them away from people. Twelve million people use those plans in this country, 12 million people like my parents, like my wife and me, and like many, many other people in America. They shouldn't have their plans taxed.

So I say to my colleagues from Florida and Illinois, if you look at just that one part of what he proposed, it is hard to say he was serious. Because if he really cares about higher education in America, he would think about the other needs of these community col-

lege students. But most importantly, he would think about those 12 million parents that are saving for their young people, middle class people whom he is trying to take money away from with this proposed tax.

I think that sort of gives you a flavor of my appreciation of that one part of what he said last night.

Mr. JOLLY. You bring much education experience as a layperson but also somebody with very specific political convictions. The President talked about free community college. And as an example, he used two local areas that now provide it. Well, I think that is the point of departure for our view of government.

If a local community decides that they want to provide education through whatever tax levy that the residents there might support, that is a great opportunity. But to suggest that somehow Washington, which so often fails in orchestrating through the heavy hand of government a new type of education economics, is going to work better than those two communities that he cited last night is exactly where the view of government between our side of the aisle and his begins to depart.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to know how many community colleges the administration contacted to talk about whether or not this was a good idea. The example that I have heard since this idea was put forth was that Tennessee is going to do it. Well, great for Tennessee, because they are probably going to use their lottery funds, from what I have read, to pay for it.

Let me give you an example in Illinois, where I live, the President's home State. Unless we are going to get a brand new crop of lotto players, if the lotto is going to fund it, then you know what? That money would be robbed from our K through 12 system to create what is tantamount to grades 13 and 14 in our community colleges, which may not have the faculty or may not have the facilities to handle the influx—and then to top it off by taxing savings plans that many middle class Americans have been using to be able to send their children to college at a time when the cost to go to any college is rising exponentially much faster than the inflation rate.

I don't know if this is a conflict of interest or not because this is just a proposal from the White House, but I have a 529 plan. We have been saving for my three kids to go to college. And to be taxed now, after investing since they were very young—my daughter is now 17—I can tell you from the standpoint as a dad that I can empathize with many families who aren't in the financial position that we are able to be in

because we are blessed enough to serve our districts in this institution.

It is flabbergasting to me to be able to hear the President talk about these great ideas. Frankly, I just don't know how many of us sat in this room last night and believed that it was going to get beyond the idea stage. And I don't know how much effort he is going to put in to try and pass this plan, but I would urge our colleagues to take a good, hard look at this and also never forget the possible impact it is going to have on our 4-year institutions, both private and public. I serve nine of those in my district in Illinois. What kind of impact is it going to have on those institutions when you take a good percentage of students that will now go, if his plan is implemented, to the community colleges, which provide a great education?

I would love to hear more about what you think and the impact it might have on the community college systems that you are so familiar with, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. That is an important point because when you look at education, there are different parts of it. Each part serves its own special need. The 4-year colleges are different from the 2-year colleges, and they are different from high schools, et cetera. So there is a role that each of them play, but sometimes we start fuzzing them together and we miss the importance of each one of them.

I think there will be some negative effects on 4-year colleges. I already heard from some 4-year college people about that. They don't want to pick on the 2-year colleges because they don't want to be seen to do that, but they understand there could be some negative effects.

But the point you and the gentleman from Florida were making that is even more important to this, these are mainly local and State decisions. The Federal Government is inserting itself in things that traditionally, under our Federal understanding of government, the Federal Government didn't get involved in.

I talked to our colleagues in this House from the State of Tennessee, Democrat and Republican, and said, What do you think about us taking your Tennessee plan and nationalizing it? They said, We think it's a bad idea. We are proud of our Tennessee plan. We think it's a good plan. We're proud that our State is doing it.

It is one thing to talk about it from a State level—I understand they have one in Chicago at the local level—but it is different when you blow it up to be a national thing.

So the President wants to take this good idea from a single State or a single city and blow it up into a national thing, and we are not really stoked here to do that. We don't really understand how to do that.

Here is what happens now: we send the money out. And what happens after we send the money? Rules and regulations and mandates come flowing down after it, and Washington starts telling Tennessee and Illinois and Florida and Alabama how to run our colleges. And that, my friends, is a very bad idea. I don't think anybody in higher education wants the heavy hand of the Federal Government telling us how to run our institutions of higher education.

Let me end on this one point. America is known as having the best institutions of higher education in the world. And the reason we do is because each one of our institutions is different from one another. They specialize in who they are and they focus on quality. And if we start robbing that from them by trying to stamp some one-size-fits-all concept of higher education, which the President is trying to do right now with this rating system he wants to put on higher education, then we may start losing in an area in which we are the preeminent leader in the world. And I don't think the people of Alabama sent me here to let the Federal Government do that to the fine institutions of higher education we have in the State of Alabama.

Mr. JOLLY. In our remaining time, I would like to revisit another topic—it is one on which I think the solutions on our side of the aisle reflect the will of the people that we saw at the ballot box in November—and that is border security.

□ 1715

We need to reclaim this issue, as conservatives. We need to redefine this national conversation. The President likes to continually say that if Congress would just send him a bill, then all would be okay, and it is usually followed by suggesting that if we send a bill that we pass, he will veto it. What he means is we have to send him his bill.

I just want to point out something because we do have solutions on this side of this aisle, and we have acted responsibly on behalf of that. In July, we passed a border security bill that put facilities closer to the border to keep those who enter illegally closer to the border.

We changed the policy to “last in, first out,” so if you get in, you don't get to linger for years before you are returned if you don't have a humanitarian claim that merits staying.

We also increased funding for judges, created tele-courtrooms so that we could more expeditiously process those who come here illegally—and rightfully so—and we should do so very responsibly. We are a loving nation made better for immigration, but we should show everybody the rule of law and how you responsibly immigrate here.

Mind you, we also passed a bill that provided for the health care of those

who come here and while they are detained here, but I want to point out something very specific. In the coming weeks, this Congress is going to offer another bill—because that one was never accepted by the Senate or went to the President—to require operational control of our border.

That is a great urgency, to have operational control of our border, not to just address the traditional border security issue, but to address what we know is a growing concern about our domestic and homeland security.

We have seen the threats around the globe. Most certainly, that has to be an area where we can reach agreement with the White House, and I hope we can take up the President on his offer to put a bill on his desk and ask him to sign it, just as he has pledged to do so.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding, and you bring up a great point. This isn't just a border security issue because of an immigration issue. This is a border security issue because of a homeland security issue.

We have to make our border secure. We are going to have what our vision for border security is in this institution pass now to the Senate, and the President will get his wish. We will put a bill on his desk. It may not be the bill he wants, but my message to the administration—to the White House—is: come work with us.

In my first 2 years here, I just haven't seen that happen on a wide variety of issues. It seems like every idea that we come up with in this institution, even some that passed by huge bipartisan majorities, they threaten a veto. Well, that is okay, but that is not conducive to working together to find solutions, and that is what I think we are here for.

I think we, on this side, there are many of us who are out here to find solutions to the Nation's problems, not to create more problems, and that is exactly the message I hope to send to the American people tonight, that we are willing to work with the President on border security, on education, on a wide variety of issues, but we also have to have some response back, and that is what I think we are lacking.

Mr. BYRNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I look at border security as national security.

Let me give you a story from a trip that several of us on the Armed Services Committee took to the Middle East back in August and September. We visited several countries over there. As you know, it is a very dangerous part of the world, clearly.

One of the countries we went to is Morocco. Morocco, if you think about where it is, should have lots of problems, but you don't really hear much about Morocco having terrorist incidents. When we were over there, we asked a lot of questions. How is that so?

It is because they take their border security very seriously. They use a lot of the military aid that America provides to Morocco for their border security, and they keep the bad guys out, and so you don't hear in this country that is in some of the most troubled parts of the world, you don't hear about the problems there because they control their borders. They understand that their internal and national security is dependent upon that.

We had two brothers, the Tsarnaev brothers, who grew up in Boston. One of them was allowed to go back to where they were from and one of the satellite countries from Russia—obviously was trained by terrorists.

We allowed him to come back into this country, after we were warned by the Russians where he had gone, and he and his brother tragically ignited those bombs at the Boston Marathon, seriously wounding a lot of people and killing some.

Well, what sort of a security situation do we have that we allowed him back into this country? What sort of security situation do we have today?

This is not just about the southern border; it is about the northern border. It is about our security of the entire Nation, and if we will start looking at border security as national security, which is the way we on this side of the aisle understand this issue, then we can protect the American people.

It definitely does take us working with the President because he runs the Department of Homeland Security through his appointee to that Secretary's position, and it is his policies through that Department that determine whether or not we are going to be protected, and protecting our borders is a part of protecting Americans from international terrorism, including international Islamic terrorism.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. DAVIS, any more comments this evening?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. If the gentleman would inquire how much time we have left.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am just excited to be able to talk about what happened at the State of the Union last night, our perspective. In closing, it kind of frustrates me that

we didn't see real solutions to the exploding cost of higher education.

If the solution is what the President laid out, which is going to actually put more of a burden on middle class families by taxing their savings plans that they have been saving for—for sometimes decades—that is a wrong approach to bringing down the cost of higher education to making Pell grants go further.

The President also mentioned another point last night about equal pay. Well, it would have been nice to have the President and the White House actually do that in the White House, where women make an average of 18 percent less than men, so it is not just enough to talk about it here in this Chamber. Do it when you have control over the opportunity to make things happen.

That is why I hope it is not just rhetoric on many issues, but I want to see action.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time. I hope what the American people have seen and our colleagues have seen is a Congress with solutions.

We will be passing through this House border security solutions, a homeland security solution. Frankly, addressing the constitutional overreach we saw from the President, we will be passing energy independence solutions, education solutions, tax reform solutions. We are committed to doing that on behalf of the American people.

I look forward to working with our colleagues, and frankly, we remain hopeful that we will have the opportunity to work with the President on this as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WHY WE ARE REALLY HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is January 22, 2015. It marks exactly 42 years to the day since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down from the United States Supreme Court. Since then, every foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of more than 55 million of its own unborn children. Incomprehensibly, those who have profited from it most have hailed it as freedom.

We should all remember the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fa-

thers, and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that when, in the distant future, some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that "their posterity"—that is us, Mr. Speaker—that "their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began."

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all of those who founded this Nation and dreamed of what America could someday be and for the sake of all of those since then who have died in darkness so America could walk in the light of freedom, it is so very important that those of us who are privileged to be Members of the United States Congress pause from time to time and remind ourselves of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government."

The phrase in the Fifth Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says that no person shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

The 14th Amendment says no State shall deny "to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here; yet, today, a great shadow looms over America. When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report:

Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it "snipping." Over the years, there were hundreds of "snippings."

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she defined one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth but, in her words, was making like this "screeching" noise, and it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we truly are? Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children like the one I just described; yet, if he had killed these babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in much of the United States of America.

If there is one thing that we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode, it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly; he is just the visible face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America.

Mr. Speaker, more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the greatest atrocity in the United States.

According to the Bartlett study, a woman seeking an abortion at 20 weeks is 35 times more likely to die from an abortion than she was in the first trimester. At 21 weeks or more, she is 91 times more likely to die than she was in the first trimester.

Regardless of how supporters of abortion on demand might try to suppress it, it is undisputed and universally accepted by every credible expert that the risk to a mother's health from abortion increases as gestation increases.

There is no valid debate on that incontrovertible reality; yet supporters of abortion on demand try to suppress that.

□ 1730

They also have tried for decades, Mr. Speaker, to deny that unborn babies ever feel pain, even those at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Mr. Speaker, almost every other major civilized nation on this Earth protects pain-capable unborn babies at this age, and every credible poll of the American people shows that they are overwhelmingly in favor of protecting these children. Yet we have given these little babies less legal protection from unnecessary pain and cruelty than the protection we have given farm animals under the Federal Humane Slaughter Act. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that beggars my ability to articulate.

But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America. Because tomorrow we will vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber, and it will be a vote that every one of us will always remember and for which we shall be held accountable.

And no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisted words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, it remains a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies

from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand; and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I heard Barack Obama speak very noble and poignant words that, whether he realizes it or not, apply so profoundly to this subject. Let me quote, if you will, excerpted portions of his comments. He said: "This is our first task, caring for our children. It's our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That's how, as a society, we will be judged."

The President asked: "Are we really prepared to say that we're powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of our freedom?"

The President also said: "Our journey is not complete until all our children are cared for and cherished and always safe from harm."

"That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American."

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Obama as those I have just quoted. How I wish that somehow we could all open our hearts and our ears to these incontrovertible words and ask ourselves in the core of our souls why these words that should apply to all children cannot include the most helpless and vulnerable of all children. How does any child become more vulnerable than these little pain-capable unborn babies?

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are never quite so eloquent as when we decry the crimes of a past generation, and we are never quite so staggeringly blind as when we assess an atrocity in our own time.

What we are doing to these babies is real, and all of us here know that in our hearts. Medical science regarding the development of unborn babies beginning at the sixth month of pregnancy now demonstrates irrefutably that they do, in fact, feel pain. Many of them cry and scream as they die, but because it is amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we can't hear them. It is, Mr. Speaker, the greatest human rights atrocity in the United States of America today.

I began and I close with the wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln to all of us. He said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation."

Mr. Speaker, it is time to open our eyes and our souls and recognize that protecting pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family. It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and recognize that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here. And, Mr. Speaker, it is time for all Americans to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 416

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H.R. 416.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2150

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-4) on the resolution (H. Res. 42) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 22.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as required by clause 2(a) of House rule XI, I respectfully submit for the RECORD the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which were adopted earlier today at a public meeting of the Committee.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"), to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged non-debatable motions in Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum, and the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall make every effort to ensure that the relevant Ranking Minority Member or another Minority Member is present at the time a hearing is convened. One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the full Committee by a subcommittee unless half of the subcommittee is actually present. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee

shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any labor rule of the House of Representatives. No person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The relevant Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the relevant Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(b) Hearings

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from non-participatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) A Member of the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the Committee may not be recognized to participate in a Committee or Subcommittee hearing except by the unanimous consent of Committee Members present at such hearing. Participatory recognition of a non-Committee Member shall occur only after all Committee Members seeking recognition, both majority and minority, have had their opportunity to participate and question any witnesses.

(5) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this subsection vote to close one (1) subsequent day of hearing.

(6) No congressional staff shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with rule XX of the House of Representatives.

5. CONVENING HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(a) Hearings. Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the relevant Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the taking of action, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Markups and Other Meetings to Transact Business

(1) Convening. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may call or convene, as the relevant Chairman considers necessary, meetings of the Committee or subcommittee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, or for the conduct of other Committee or subcommittee business.

(2) Notice. Public announcement shall be made by the Chairman of the full Committee of the date, place, and subject matter of any markup or other meeting to conduct business at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of such markup or meeting, unless the relevant Chairman determines, in consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member, that there is good cause to begin such a markup or meeting on an earlier date. If such determination is made, the

Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring in that determination, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(3) Agenda and Texts. The relevant Chairman shall provide to all Committee or subcommittee Members an agenda for each Committee and subcommittee markup or other meeting to transact business, setting out all items of business to be considered, including whenever possible a copy of any measure scheduled for markup, at least 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting.

Bills on subjects not listed on such agenda shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee, or by the Chairman of the full Committee with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member. The text of any measure to be marked up shall be made publicly available in electronic form at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of the markup meeting, or at the time of an announcement under subparagraph (b)(2) made within 24 hours before such meeting.

(c) Publication. Public announcement of all hearings and markups shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record and made publicly available in electronic form. Members shall be notified by the Staff Director of all meetings (including markups and hearings) and briefings of subcommittees and of the full Committee.

(d) Member Seating. During Committee and subcommittee hearings and markups, chairs on the dais are for Members. No staff member other than a Committee or subcommittee staff director, counsel, or professional staff member may occupy a chair on the dais, unless authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Full Committee. Only one staff member each from the majority and the minority may occupy chairs on the dais at any time during a hearing or markup.

6. WITNESSES

(a) Interrogation of Witnesses

(1) In so far as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption subject to reasonable time constraints imposed by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with questioning by the Committee Members taking place afterward. Members should refrain from questions until such statements are completed.

(2) In recognizing Members, the relevant Chairman shall, to the extent practicable, give preference to the Members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the Members actually present. A Member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the relevant Chairman and not the witness.

(3) Subject to paragraph (4), each Member may interrogate the witness for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5-minute period. After all Members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the relevant Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may permit one (1) or more majority Members of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman to question a witness for a specified period of not longer than 30 minutes. On such occasions, an equal number of minority Members of the Committee designated by the Ranking Minority Member shall be permitted to question the same witness for the same period of

time. Committee staff may be permitted to question a witness for equal specified periods either with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee or by motion. However, in no case may questioning by Committee staff proceed before each Member of the Committee who wishes to speak under the 5-minute rule has had one opportunity to do so.

(b) **Testimony of Witnesses**

(1) **Advance Filing Requirement.** Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee is required to file testimony with the Committee or subcommittee at least two (2) business days in advance of that appearance. For purposes of this subsection, testimony includes the written statement of a witness, as well as any video, photographs, audio-visual matter, posters, or other supporting materials that the witness intends to present or display before the Committee. Such testimony should be provided in electronic form to the extent practicable. The Committee or subcommittee shall notify Members at least two business days in advance of a hearing of the availability of testimony submitted by witnesses. In addition, each witness shall provide sufficient copies, as determined by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, of his or her proposed written statement to be provided to Members and staff of the Committee or subcommittee, the news media, and the general public. The text of the written statement provided pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered final, and may not be revised by the witness after the Committee meeting at which the witness appears.

(2) **Witness Preclusion and Waiver.** The requirements of paragraph (1) or any part thereof may be waived by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or the presiding Member, or the Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee as it relates to witnesses who are called by the minority to testify, provided that the witness or the relevant Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has submitted, prior to the witness's appearance, a written explanation to the reasons testimony has not been made available to the Committee or subcommittee. If a witness who is not an official of the U.S. Government has not submitted testimony as required by paragraph (1) and no such written explanation has been submitted, the witness shall be released from testifying unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee votes to accept his or her testimony.

(3) **Remote Witness Participation.** The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall promptly, and not later than 48 hours beforehand if possible, notify the relevant Ranking Member of any witness who is likely to present testimony other than in person, such as by videoconference. A witness may not testify via telephone or other audio-only medium without the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee. The relevant Chairman shall make reasonable efforts to verify the identity of any witness participating remotely.

(4) **'Truth In Testimony' Disclosure.** In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall, to the extent practicable, include: a curriculum vitae; a disclosure of the amount and source of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), or of any contract or payment originating with a foreign government, received during the current fiscal year

or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness, to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, the hearing; and a disclosure of whether the witness is an active registrant under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA). Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy, safety, or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(5) **Witness Presentation.** A witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of his or her written statement.

(6) **Translation.** A witness requiring an interpreter or translator should include in the testimony provided pursuant to paragraph (1) the identity of the interpreter or translator that the witness intends to use. Unless properly noticed as a separate witness, an interpreter or translator appearing before the Committee should not present views or statements other than those expressed by the witness.

(c) **Oaths.** The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or any Member of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness appearing before the Committee.

7. PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and markup sessions. Members of the Committee and any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own remarks and may make any grammatical or technical changes that do not substantively alter the record. Any such Member or witness shall return the transcript to the Committee offices within seven (7) calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of the transcript, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Any information supplied for the record at the request of a Member of the Committee shall be provided to the Member when received by the Committee.

Transcripts of hearings and markup sessions (except for the record of a meeting or hearing which is closed to the public) shall be printed as soon as is practicable after receipt of the corrected versions, except that the Chairman may order the transcript of a hearing to be printed without the corrections of a Member or witness if the Chairman determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time to correct such transcript and such transcript has not been returned within such time.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

8. EXTRANEOUS MATERIALS IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS PRINTS

No extraneous material shall be printed in either the body or appendices of any Committee or subcommittee hearing, except matter which has been accepted for inclusion in the record during the hearing or by agree-

ment of the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee within five (5) calendar days of the hearing. Copies of bills and other legislation under consideration and responses to written questions submitted by Members shall not be considered extraneous material.

Extraneous material in either the body or appendices of any hearing to be printed which would be in excess of eight (8) printed pages (for any one submission) shall be accompanied by a written request to the relevant Chairman. Such written request shall contain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing such material.

9. INFORMATION ON COMMITTEE ACTION

(a) **Record Votes.** The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee outside of executive session shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Such result shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and against, and the Members present but not voting.

(b) **Adopted Amendments.** Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the text of each such amendment shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) **Hearing and Markup Attendance.** Member attendance at each Committee hearing and markup shall be recorded and included in the Committee print of the transcript of that hearing or markup.

10. PROXIES

Proxy voting is not permitted in the Committee or in subcommittees.

11. REPORTS

(a) **Reports on Bills and Resolutions.** To the extent practicable, not later than 24 hours before a report is to be filed with the Clerk of the House on a measure that has been ordered reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall make available for inspection by all Members of the Committee a copy of the draft Committee report in order to afford Members adequate information and the opportunity to draft and file any supplemental, minority or additional views which they may deem appropriate.

With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in any Committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) **Prior Approval of Certain Reports.** No Committee, subcommittee, or staff report, study, or other document which purports to express publicly the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or a subcommittee may be released to the public or filed with the Clerk of the House unless approved by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day). In any case in which clause 2(1) of rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives does not apply, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be given an opportunity to have views or a disclaimer included as part of the material filed or released, as the case may be.

(c) Foreign Travel Reports. At the same time that the report required by clause 8(b)(3) of rule X of the House of Representatives, regarding foreign travel reports, is submitted to the Chairman, Members and employees of the Committee shall provide a report to the Chairman listing all official meetings, interviews, inspection tours and other official functions in which the individual participated, by country and date. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chairman may waive the listing in such report of an official meeting, interview, inspection tour, or other official function. The report shall be maintained in the Committee offices and shall be available for public inspection during normal business hours. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no Member or employee of the Committee will be authorized for additional Committee travel until the reports described in this subsection have been submitted to the Chairman for that person's prior Committee travel.

12. REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Except in extraordinary circumstances, bills and resolutions will not be considered by the Committee unless and until the appropriate subcommittee has recommended the bill or resolution for Committee action, and will not be taken to the House of Representatives for action unless and until the Committee or a relevant subcommittee has ordered reported such bill or resolution, a quorum being present.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that contains exclusively findings and policy declarations or expressions of the sense of the House of Representatives or the sense of the Congress shall not be considered by the Committee or a subcommittee unless such bill or resolution has at least 25 House co-sponsors, at least 10 of whom are Members of the Committee.

For purposes of this rule, extraordinary circumstances will be determined by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and such other Members of the Committee as the Chairman deems appropriate.

The Committee or a subcommittee shall not consider a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that expresses appreciation, commends, congratulates, celebrates, recognizes the accomplishments of, or celebrates the anniversary of, an entity, event, group, individual, institution, team, or government program, or that acknowledges or recognizes a period of time for such purposes, except in circumstances determined by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

13. STAFF SERVICES

The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in the field of foreign affairs to the Committee, the subcommittees, and all its Members. The staff shall include persons with training and experience in foreign affairs, making available to the Committee individuals with knowledge of major countries, areas, and U.S. overseas programs and operations.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee, except as provided in paragraph (c), shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman with the approval of the ma-

jority of the Members in the majority party of the Committee. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman, and they shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assignments are to be authorized by the Chairman or by the Staff Director under the direction of the Chairman.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee assigned to the minority shall be appointed, their remuneration determined, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. Such staff shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member with the approval or consultation of the minority Members of the Committee.

The Chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee. The Chairman shall ensure that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

14. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Full Committee. The full Committee will be responsible for oversight and legislation relating to: foreign assistance (including development assistance, Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Millennium Challenge Account, HIV/AIDS in foreign countries, security assistance, and Public Law 480 programs abroad); national security developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers, treaties, executive agreements, and the deployment and use of United States Armed Forces; peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions; arms control and disarmament issues; the United States Agency for International Development; activities and policies of the State, Commerce, and Defense Departments and other agencies related to the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, including export and licensing policy for munitions items and technology and dual-use equipment and technology; international law; promotion of democracy; international law enforcement issues, including narcotics control programs and activities; Broadcasting Board of Governors; embassy security; international broadcasting; public diplomacy, including international communication and information policy, and international education and exchange programs; and all other matters not specifically assigned to a subcommittee. The full Committee will have jurisdiction over legislation with respect to the administration of the Export Administration Act, including the export and licensing of dual-use equipment and technology and other matters related to international economic policy and trade not otherwise assigned to a subcommittee, and with respect to the United Nations, its affiliated agencies, and other international organizations, including assessed and voluntary contributions to such organizations. The full Committee may conduct oversight and investigations with respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee as defined in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subcommittees. There shall be six (6) standing subcommittees. The names and jurisdiction of those subcommittees shall be as follows:

(1) Functional Subcommittee. There shall be one subcommittee with functional jurisdiction:

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade: Oversight and legislative responsibilities over the United States' efforts to manage and coordinate international programs to combat terrorism as coordinated by the Department of State and other agencies, and efforts to bring international terrorists to justice. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, oversight of, and legislation pertaining to, nonproliferation matters involving nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction, except for legislation involving the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, and sanctions laws pertaining to individual countries and the provision of foreign assistance (which is reserved to the full Committee). Oversight of matters relating to international economic and trade policy; commerce with foreign countries; international investment policy; the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency; commodity agreements; and special oversight of international financial and monetary institutions; the Export-Import Bank, and customs. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, legislative jurisdiction over measures related to export promotion and measures related to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency.

(2) Regional Subcommittees. There shall be five subcommittees with regional jurisdiction: the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific; the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats; the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa; and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. As detailed below, two of the regional subcommittees also shall have functional jurisdiction.

The regional subcommittees shall have jurisdiction over the following within their respective regions:

(1) Matters affecting the political relations between the United States and other countries and regions, including resolutions or other legislative measures directed to such relations.

(2) Legislation with respect to disaster assistance outside the Foreign Assistance Act, boundary issues, and international claims.

(3) Legislation with respect to region- or country-specific loans or other financial relations outside the Foreign Assistance Act.

(4) Legislation and oversight regarding human rights practices in particular countries.

(5) Oversight of regional lending institutions.

(6) Oversight of matters related to the regional activities of the United Nations, of its affiliated agencies, and of other multilateral institutions.

(7) Identification and development of options for meeting future problems and issues relating to U.S. interests in the region.

(8) Oversight of base rights and other facilities access agreements and regional security pacts.

(9) Concurrent oversight jurisdiction with respect to matters assigned to the functional subcommittees insofar as they may affect the region.

(10) Oversight of foreign assistance activities affecting the region, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee.

(11) Such other matters as the Chairman of the full Committee may determine.

The Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: international health issues, including transboundary infectious diseases, maternal health and child survival, and programs related to the global ability to address health issues; population issues; the United Nations and its affiliated agencies (excluding peacekeeping and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions); the American Red Cross; and the Peace Corps. In addition, legislation and oversight pertaining to: implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; other matters relating to internationally-recognized human rights, including legislation aimed at the promotion of human rights and democracy generally; and the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and related issues.

The Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, oversight related to emerging foreign threats to the national security and interests of the United States.

15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) In General. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it.

(b) Scheduling. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, the relevant Ranking Minority Member and other appropriate Members, with a view toward minimizing scheduling conflicts. Subcommittee meetings shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full Committee. Hearings shall not be scheduled to occur prior to the first vote or subsequent to the last vote of a legislative week, or outside of Washington, D.C., without prior consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member. In order to ensure orderly administration and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, the subject, time, and location of hearings and meetings shall be arranged in advance with the Chairman through the Staff Director of the Committee.

(c) Vice Chairmen. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall designate a Member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chairman.

(d) Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may attend the meetings and participate in the activities of all subcommittees of which they are not Members, except that they may not vote or be counted for a quorum in such subcommittees.

(e) Required Oversight Hearings. During each 180-day period following organization of the Committee, each subcommittee shall hold at least one hearing on oversight of U.S. Government activities.

16. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee and to the extent practicable, all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks. In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee, legislation may also be referred to additional subcommittees for consideration. Unless otherwise directed by the Chairman, such subcommittees shall act on or be discharged from consideration of legislation that has

been approved by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks of such action. In referring any legislation to a subcommittee, the Chairman may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the full Committee.

Subcommittees with regional jurisdiction shall have joint jurisdiction with the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations over legislation regarding human rights practices in particular countries within their regions.

The Chairman may designate a subcommittee Chairman or other Member to take responsibility as manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House of Representatives.

17. PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

The majority party caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party Members for each subcommittee. Party representation on each subcommittee or conference committee shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member are authorized to negotiate matters affecting such ratios including the size of subcommittees and conference committees.

18. SUBCOMMITTEE FUNDING AND RECORDS

Each subcommittee shall have adequate funds to discharge its responsibility for legislation and oversight.

In order to facilitate Committee compliance with clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be promptly made available to the full Committee for inspection by the public in accordance with rule 9 of the Committee.

All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as Chairman of the subcommittee. Subcommittee records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairmen on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting need not be held if there is no business to conduct. It shall be the practice at such meetings to review the current agenda and activities of each of the subcommittees.

20. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Authorized Persons. In accordance with the stipulations of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all Members of the House who have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives shall be authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

Members of the Committee staff shall be considered authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee when they have the proper security clearances, when they have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and when they have a demonstrable need to know. The decision on whether a given staff

member has a need to know will be made on the following basis:

(1) In the case of the full Committee majority staff, by the Chairman, acting through the Staff Director;

(2) In the case of the full Committee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, acting through the Minority Staff Director;

(3) In the case of subcommittee majority staff, by the chairman of the subcommittee;

(4) In the case of the subcommittee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee.

No other individuals shall be considered authorized persons, unless so designated by the Chairman of the full Committee.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to information classified Confidential. Such designated persons must have the proper security clearance, have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and have a need to know as determined by his or her principal. Upon request of a Committee Member in specific instances, a designated person also shall be permitted access to information classified Secret which has been furnished to the Committee pursuant to section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended. Upon the written request of a Committee Member and with the approval of the Chairman in specific instances, a designated person may be permitted access to other classified materials. Designation of a staff person shall be by letter from the Committee Member to the Chairman.

(c) Location. Classified information will be stored in secure safes in the Office of the Security Officer and in the Office of the Minority Staff Director. All materials classified Top Secret or higher must be stored in a Secure Compartmentalized Information Facility (SCIF).

(d) Handling. Materials classified Confidential or Secret may be taken from Committee offices to other Committee offices and hearing rooms by Members of the Committee and authorized Committee staff in connection with hearings and briefings of the Committee or its subcommittees for which such information is deemed to be essential. Removal of such information from the Committee offices shall be only with the permission of the Chairman under procedures designed to ensure the safe handling and storage of such information at all times. Except as provided in this paragraph, Top Secret materials may not be taken from approved storage areas for any purpose, except that such materials may be taken to hearings and other meetings that are being conducted at the Top Secret level when necessary. Materials classified Top Secret may otherwise be used under conditions approved by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(e) Notice. Appropriate notice of the receipt of classified documents received by the Committee from the Executive Branch will be sent promptly to Committee Members through the Survey of Activities or by other means.

(f) Access. Except as provided for above, access to materials classified Top Secret or otherwise restricted held by the Committee will be in approved Committee spaces. The following procedures will be observed:

(1) Authorized persons will be permitted access to classified documents after inquiring of the Staff Director or an assigned staff member. Access to the SCIF will be afforded during regular Committee hours.

(2) Authorized persons will be required to identify themselves, to identify the documents or information they wish to view, and to sign the Classified Materials Log, which is kept with the classified information.

(3) The assigned staff member will be responsible for maintaining a log which identifies:

(1) authorized persons seeking access, (2) the classified information requested, and (3) the time of arrival and departure of such persons. The assigned staff member will also assure that the classified materials are returned to the proper location.

(g) Divulgence. Classified information provided to the Committee by the Executive Branch shall be handled in accordance with the procedures that apply within the Executive Branch for the protection of such information. Any classified information to which access has been gained through the Committee may not be divulged to any unauthorized person. Classified material shall not be photocopied or otherwise reproduced. In no event shall classified information be discussed in a non-secure environment. Apparent violations of this rule should be reported as promptly as possible to the Chairman for appropriate action.

(h) Other Regulations. The Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such additional regulations and procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Members of the Committee will be given notice of any such regulations and procedures promptly. They may be modified or waived in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

21. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

All Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage in accordance with the provisions of clause 3 of House rule XI.

The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall determine, in his or her discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room, but shall not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two (2) representatives from each medium.

Such coverage shall be in accordance with the following requirements contained in section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and clause 4 of XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) If the television, Internet or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, Internet or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) The allocation among cameras permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing room

shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and Member of the Committee or its subcommittees or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(f) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee or subcommittee is in session.

(g) Floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the current state-of-the-art level of television coverage.

(h) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos, United Press International News pictures, and Reuters. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(i) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the Members of the Committee or its subcommittees.

(j) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(k) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(l) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery Committee of Press Photographers.

(m) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

22. SUBPOENA POWERS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the

Members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present.

Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

23. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever the Speaker is to appoint a conference committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Members of the Committee who are primarily responsible for the legislation (including to the full extent practicable the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House), who have actively participated in the Committee or subcommittee consideration of the legislation, and who agree to attend the meetings of the conference. With regard to the appointment of minority Members, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

24. GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Not later than February 15th of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of rule X of the House of Representatives.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2(n) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee or a subcommittee thereof shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in programs within its jurisdiction, as documented in reports received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States that have been provided to the Ranking Minority Member prior to the notice of the hearing pursuant to Committee rule 5.

25. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Any additional procedures or regulations may be modified or rescinded in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 22, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

91. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: OCC-2013-0010] (RIN: 1557-AD40) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

92. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: OCC-2013-0010] (RIN: 1557-AD40) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

93. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. A letter from the Delegate of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Education, transmitting notification that, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), OMB Circular A-76, and OMB Memo M-12-09, dated March 26, 2012, the Department's report for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 is now available online; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

95. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report entitled "The Impact of Recruitment Strategy on Fair and Open Competition for Federal Jobs", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

96. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights state advisory committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Kent Narrows Draw Bridge Repairs, Kent Island Narrows; Queen Anne's County, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0898] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

98. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards — Gust and Maneuver Load Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0142; Amdt. No.: 25-141] (RIN: 2120-AK12) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

99. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0708; Amendment No.: 91-334; SFAR No.: 114] (RIN: 2120-AK61) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 42. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit tax-

payer funded abortions (Rept. 114-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 7. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFALCIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY,

Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BERA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 20. A bill to reform the financing of Congressional elections by broadening participation by small dollar donors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 423. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, to establish a system of public financing for Congressional elections, to promote the disclosure of disbursements made in coordination with campaigns for election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 425. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 426. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to begin with fertilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JONES, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr.

RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LONG, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BARR, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NUNNELLE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YODER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 427. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 428. A bill to provide for the expedited approval by the Secretary of Energy of liquefied natural gas exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 429. A bill to provide that in the case of a law enforcement officer who uses deadly force against a person, and thereby causes the death of that person, a hearing shall be conducted before a judge to determine whether there is probable cause for the State to bring criminal charges against the law enforcement officer relating to the death of the person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 431. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 432. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr.

DENT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 433. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 523 East Railroad Street in Knox, Pennsylvania, as the "Specialist Ross A. McGinnis Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 434. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Clean Air Act relating to the expansion of the renewable fuel program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 435. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 436. A bill to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 437. A bill to provide for the retention of the name of Mount McKinley; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 438. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Joanne King Herring and posthumously to each of Charles "Charlie" Wilson and Gustav Lascaris "Gust" Avrakotos, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to the country; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 439. A bill to suspend foreign assistance to certain countries related to unlawful migration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 440. A bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health care coverage mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 441. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 442. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Federal prohibition against hate crimes in

order to provide greater protections to persons who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 443. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 444. A bill to expand the research and education on and delivery of complementary and alternative medicine to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 445. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that scientific studies used in a rule making be published, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr.

LYNCH, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 446. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 447. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the limit on the amount of certain contributions which may be made to a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for

herself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBBACH, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VISLOSKY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 448. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 449. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 450. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit criminal corporations from making disbursements of funds in connection with a campaign for election for Federal, State, or local office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 451. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Ms.

SINEMA, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. UPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 452. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify when certain academic assessments shall be administered; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr.

LIPINSKI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 453. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to award grants on a competitive basis to public and private entities to provide qualified sexual risk avoidance education to youth and their parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 454. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for him-

self, Mr. MESSER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YOHO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BYRNE, Mr.

RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 456. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include the cost of applying to an institution of higher learning as part of the benefits provided under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 457. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to exclude the State of New Jersey from the prohibition on professional and amateur sports gambling to the extent approved by the legislature of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit multiemployer plans in critical status to modify plan rules relating to withdrawal liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. DUN-

CAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 459. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish goals for an all-of-the-above energy production plan strategy on a 4-year basis on all onshore Federal lands managed by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr.

MCCAUL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself,

Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the donation of wild game meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr.

LYNCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CAPUANO,

Mr. COOPER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEFALZO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate political campaign contributions and expenditures, including independent expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HONDA):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of No Name-Calling Week in bringing attention to name-calling of all kinds and providing schools with the tools and inspiration to launch an on-going dialogue about ways to eliminate name-calling and bullying in their communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FOX:

H. Res. 39. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 40. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 41. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Res. 43. A resolution expressing the sense of the House recognizing and honoring the Fire Department of New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 462) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress's Power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 20.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of our Land and Naval Forces.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressional power to provide for public financing of campaigns arises under the General Welfare Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, of the Constitution.

In *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 91 (1976), the Supreme Court upheld the congressional power to enact public financing of presidential elections under this Clause. The Supreme Court stated with regard to the provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 establishing a presidential public financing system, "In this case, Congress was legislating for the 'general welfare'—to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 that states that Congress shall have the Power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Additionally, Section 1 of the XIV Amendment states, "... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law..." and under Section 5 of the XIV Amendment, "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill is Section 4 of Article I, which gives Congress the power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "To establish Post Offices and post Roads."

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached legislation falls under Congress' enumerated constitutional authority to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 1 and Article 1, Section 9.

"All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 8, Section 18.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution the preceding enumerated powers. It is necessary and proper for Congress to eliminate the National Technical Information Service in the Department of Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 18 in section 7 of section of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which states: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states the Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof"

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8—to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution.

Article I, Sec. 9—no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants

Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution (relating to Congress' power to regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . .). The United States Congress initially enacted ERISA under the Commerce Clause in order to stabilize employee pension plans that employees carry with them across state lines. This bill modifies ERISA and is thus a regulation of commerce—specifically pension plans—among more than one state.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII Section 1, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Section 2, "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.J. Res. 23.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

By Mr. POCAN:

H.J. Res. 25.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 38: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 90: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 114: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 131: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 132: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 139: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 143: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 146: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 148: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 153: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 154: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 159: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 167: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 169: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 187: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 197: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 199: Mr. WALZ and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 204: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 210: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 217: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 223: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 243: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 247: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 270: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 275: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 283: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 284: Mr. FORBES and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 285: Mr. ROSKAM and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 290: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 291: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 333: Mr. AMODEI, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 344: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 350: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 351: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 353: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUGENT, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 357: Mr. KLINE and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 367: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 383: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 386: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 388: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 393: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 399: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 401: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 402: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 403: Ms. MOORE, Mr. FARR, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 414: Mr. KING of New York.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. YOHO.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 34: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 35: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 36: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 416: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

SENATE—Wednesday, January 21, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we love You. You are our rock, fortress, and deliverer. You have provided protection for our Nation, surrounding it with the shield of Your favor. How worthy You are of our praise.

Strengthen our lawmakers for today's journey. Give them strong hearts, sound minds, and diligent hands. May they do their ethical best to represent You, joining their plans to Your will in order to accomplish Your purposes. Incline their hearts to Your wisdom and love as You keep them on the path of integrity.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate is continuing to consider S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and there are six amendments pending, three from each side. We will begin voting on those amendments as soon as Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL work out an orderly schedule. Senators should expect votes throughout the day in relation to these amendments and any others in the queue.

POSITIVE CHANGES FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last night, the American people heard two very different addresses. One was focused on the middle class and how Washington can work together in a serious way for better jobs, higher wages, and more opportunity. It was a call for

constructive cooperation. It was a call for new ideas.

I wish to commend Senator ERNST for her thoughtful address. She understands the needs of working people in a way those of a particular mindset in Washington simply don't understand. She knows that the middle class is looking for Washington to function again and that hard-working Americans want DC to focus on their needs instead of the demands of powerful special interests. That is just what they told us in November when they sent this new Republican Congress here on their behalf.

I was hoping for something similar from President Obama—not identical, of course. We don't agree on all the issues; that is clear enough. But there are enough areas of common ground where we should be able to work together. It would have been most constructive if he had put the focus of his address on those areas of potential agreement. The moment of high purpose called for the leader of the free world to show America what could be accomplished through constructive, bipartisan engagement.

The State of the Union can be about more than veto threats or strident partisanship. This kind of partisanship is what we have become accustomed to from the President. We know the President may not be wild about the people's choice of a Congress, but he owes it to the American people to find a serious way to work with the representatives they elected.

On some issues, such as cyber security, he sent a positive sign. He also began what I hope will be a sustained effort to move his own party forward to encourage them to work with us to help create more jobs by breaking down foreign trade barriers and allowing America to sell more of what it makes and grows.

Those were the good signs. But that was only part of the speech. There is not a lot serious lawmakers can do with talking points designed specifically not to pass. Members in both parties would have welcomed serious ideas about how to save and strengthen Medicare, how to protect Social Security for future generations, and how to balance the budget without tired tax hikes.

We listened closely for specific details on how he would work with both parties to achieve comprehensive tax simplification that focuses not on growing the government but on creating jobs.

The President has expressed some support for ideas such as this pre-

viously. He should have expanded on it last night. There is still time for him to do it. But whatever he chooses, the new Congress will continue working to send good ideas to his desk.

One of those good ideas is a bipartisan infrastructure project the Senate will resume working on today—the Keystone jobs bill. It is heartening to see a real debate and an amendment process on the floor of the Senate again. It is a result of a new spirit of reform that is being brought to Congress. It aims to give Members of both parties a stake in positive solutions so we can get Washington functioning again on behalf of our people.

We are looking to the President to join us in our positive mission for the middle class. It is what the American people just voted for last November. It is what Senator ERNST articulated so well last night. And if the President is willing to put the veto threats away and the designed-to-fail talking points aside, we can still cooperate to get some smart things done for the people we represent.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

PROGRESS FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last night the President talked about the economy and the progress we have made. The United States grew 2.6 percent last year, and in the third quarter alone our economy grew by 5 percent. Nearly 3 million jobs were created—the best year for the U.S. labor market since the height of the economic boom under President Bill Clinton. Lower gasoline prices are providing relief to many families and consumer confidence is up. The deficit has been cut in half.

Yet we know that while the economy is growing and unemployment is declining, sadly, much of the benefit is going to those at the very top of the ladder. The top 1 percent of American wage earners saw 49 percent of the decline in incomes during the recession, but they have seen 95 percent of the income gained since the recovery started. Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent of wage earners have seen 95 percent of the gains since our economy has recovered.

The gap between wages for low-income and middle-income families and

those at the top is staggering. Forty-seven people in America own more than 160 million Americans combined. That has to change.

This isn't just a Democratic observation. Even Republicans have publicly agreed with us that working families are falling behind. Let me quote a few. Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush, a potential candidate for President, said: "Here's reality: If you're fortunate enough to count yourself among the privileged, much of the rest of the Nation is drowning." Jeb Bush said that.

Mitt Romney, a former Republican candidate for President and perhaps a Republican candidate for President again—here is what he said last week as he has rekindled his dream for the Presidency: "... the rich have gotten richer, income inequality has gotten worse, and there are more people in poverty than ever before."

Even Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said this in an interview:

The top third of America are doing pretty good. The bottom two-thirds are really being squeezed.

So how do we address these challenges? Our parties look at it differently.

The Republican majority in this Chamber had to pick the first bill they would bring to the floor of the Senate once they reached the majority. There were a lot of initiatives they could have considered. We know what they chose—the Keystone XL Pipeline—a pipeline owned by a Canadian company. That is the No. 1 priority of the Republicans in the Senate, bar none. When they wanted to respond to President Obama's State of the Union Address with Senator ERNST of Iowa, they focused on the Keystone XL Pipeline. What a limited vision of the future—one pipeline.

Then we took two votes yesterday on this pipeline, and it started to become clear what this pipeline is all about. It is moving Canadian tar sands from Canada, through the United States, and to a refinery in Texas. We learned yesterday the Republicans will not even support the proposition that the refined oil products coming out of this refinery will help America.

We had a simple amendment Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts offered which said that at the end of the pipeline, the refinery's oil products will be sold in America. The Republicans defeated that amendment. So all this argument about how this oil out of this pipeline is going to help our economy in the future? Nope, don't expect it to happen. Yesterday's overwhelming Republican vote made it clear.

There was a second part that was considered yesterday. This bill—the No. 1 priority of the Senate Republican majority—is going to build a pipeline, that is for sure. We said, good, if it is going to be built, use American steel in building the pipeline. That is not an

outrageous suggestion. If this is such a priority for the Republicans, wouldn't they want to put Americans to work to make the steel to build the pipeline? We offered that as an amendment yesterday. Senator FRANKEN offered that amendment and the Republicans rejected it. The Republicans rejected the premise that the steel that goes into the most important pipeline in the history of America, from their point of view, should actually come from America. That is the second amendment we considered.

This special interest project, the Keystone XL Canadian-owned pipeline, is going to continue to be the No. 1 dominant issue in the Senate for days to come.

Republicans plan to do everything they can to help build a pipeline, but they want to deny millions of Americans access to health care. That is what the House Republicans have come up with. They want to come up with a plan that will literally take away the coverage of health care from Americans. Is there anyone in this country who thinks that is the right thing for our future? We are trying to reduce the number of uninsured. The Republican changes to the Affordable Care Act would increase the number of uninsured and increase the number of Americans dependent on government-sponsored health care. It doesn't sound like a Republican idea to me, but it is. That is what is coming from the House of Representatives.

There are pretty clear differences in how we help working families. For the Senate Republicans, it is to build a Canadian pipeline. Don't use American steel, don't keep the oil in America, but build this pipeline—No. 1 priority. The House Republicans take away health insurance coverage for hundreds of thousands of Americans at a time when we know that leaves people in a precarious position.

Here is what the President said last night: We want to make certain we focus on projects and programs and new ideas that can leave our children a better world and our grandchildren as well. Do we want an economy where everyone has an opportunity to climb that economic ladder or do we want a world where those who are born into lives of luxury set the rules and always come out ahead? Do we want an economy that rewards those who work hard and play by the rules or an economy where corporations rig the game so it is tails you lose, heads I win?

We know that an economy with a strong middle class is key to growing America. Yet it is becoming harder and harder for families to even reach the middle class. Working families aren't looking for a handout—not in my State. They just want a chance for a better life for their kids.

There is a way we can do this. It is called the earned-income tax credit.

This is an idea supported by Republican Presidents in the past. Historically both parties have supported it. The earned-income tax credit is designed to encourage work by providing a tax credit to working families.

The President's proposal, similar to one that SHERROD BROWN and I have introduced, would expand the credit to help the only group that our Tax Code pushes into poverty: childless workers. What a difference this would make for millions of working families, the difference between paying a heating bill or putting it off, the difference between getting a prescription filled or waiting. A small refundable tax credit for these workers can make a bigger difference than many U.S. Senators would ever realize.

The President also proposed making 2 years of community college free for responsible students and giving motivated students a path to a solid educational foundation without debt. This is not a Democratic idea. The President acknowledged last night that this idea came from a Republican Governor in Tennessee. I might add that a Democratic mayor, Rahm Emanuel of Chicago, has a similar program, but the President went to Tennessee to acknowledge that the Republican legislature and the Republican Governor had come up with a good idea. So to argue this is somehow a partisan idea, it sure isn't in Tennessee. If it is partisan, it is a Republican partisan idea.

The President understands that in the 20th century, maybe K-12 was just enough to make it. In the 21st century it is not enough. K-14, most of us understand, is the ticket to a good-paying job.

I called in to some of the media this morning from Illinois, and they said, oh, this community college free tuition idea—another Federal mandate. Well, let me disabuse you of this idea. This is voluntary. It is original. States decide if they want to be part of it, but I think those States that want to be part of free community college tuition for good, achieving, hard-working students are on the right track, and those who ignore it may fall behind.

The jobs of this century will require more training and education than ever. I think this notion is a good one. Have we ever gone wrong in the history of the United States by investing in education, investing in our students, investing in our future? That is what the President's proposal does. It has been dismissed out of hand by the Republicans, even though it had a Republican origin. That is a mistake. We should count on our community colleges, the affordable alternative for higher education for 40 percent of America's college students. And thank goodness it steers these kids away from these God-forsaken for-profit colleges and universities which too often exploit these young people, these young men and

women, sink them deep in debt and, if they are lucky, hand them a worthless diploma at the end of the day. Community colleges are the affordable ticket in Kentucky, in Illinois, and across America.

The President reminded us last night that we live in a great country and our economy is recovering. But while the wealthiest Americans are doing fine, more American families are spending hours at the kitchen table trying to figure out how to make ends meet. Let's help those families. Let's agree to help those families. One Canadian-owned pipeline is not the answer. We need to think about education, we need to think about a Federal transportation bill, and we need to think about investing in America and its future.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the recent terror attacks in France, it is tough to know what the House of Representatives is thinking. Last week, the U.S. House of Representatives threatened to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. That is the government agency responsible for protecting America from the threat of terrorism.

Why are we debating full funding for the Department of Homeland Security? Every other government agency, I might add, has been properly funded through the omnibus bill. But the Republicans insisted on not funding the Department of Homeland Security, which fights terrorism in the regular orderly appropriations process. They insisted this Department be funded only through the end of February. Does that mean that America is safe from terrorism? I wish it were true. But we know that we are only one terrorist away from a terrible incident in America.

One of the Departments with the major responsibility of protecting us is the Department of Homeland Security. So why did the Republicans decide they wanted to make the funding of this Department uncertain and contingent?

Well, the reason was they are so angry with President Obama's Executive order on immigration that they are putting America at risk by failing to properly fund the Department of Homeland Security. Then last week, the bill the House passed made the appropriation for this Department contingent on five riders. A rider is an addition. It is language that doesn't relate to a budget or appropriation, and it relates to the Executive orders that were established by the President.

The House bill passed last week would defund President Obama's immigration policies, including the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA, which has been in place for over 2 years.

What does DACA do? By the President's Executive order, it puts on hold the deportations of immigrant students who grew up in America. It allows these young people to continue to live and work in this country on a temporary basis. They are known, in shorthand, as the DREAMers.

I know a little bit about this because I introduced the first DREAM Act 14 years ago in the U.S. Senate. It has become a very familiar term, but when I first started, no one had ever heard of it. What I found was there were young people brought to the United States by their parents at a very early age who had, obviously, no voice in the decision, raised in America, undocumented, went through our schools, were successful, had no criminal problems, and wanted a future.

They couldn't get a future under American law. The DREAM Act would give them that opportunity to move to legal status. We have already invested in these young people, in their education, so why would we want to give up on their talents by deporting them after they are educated? That is exactly what the U.S. House of Representatives has proposed.

In 2010, I joined with Republican Senator Richard Lugar. We wrote a letter to President Obama. It said: Why would we deport these young DREAMers? They offer so much potential for America.

A year later, 22 Senators joined me in sending a followup letter to the President, and he issued his Executive order called DACA.

Six hundred thousand eligible DREAMers have signed up for DACA, which means for these 600,000, they can live and work in America without the fear of deportation. It makes a big difference. Thirty thousand of them live in Illinois. We estimate there are another 1.5 million eligible.

The Center for American Progress says these young people aren't just taking up space, they are going to add to the economy because of their talents. They estimate that these DREAMers will add \$329 billion to our economy and create 1.4 million new jobs by 2030. That is a pretty tall prediction to think that these young people could have that impact on our economy.

Let me tell you the story of one of the DREAMers whom the House Republicans would deport, and you may understand why this estimate of the profound, important impact of these DREAMers on our economy is realistic.

As I mentioned, I introduced the DREAM Act 14 years ago. I have come to the floor over 50 times to tell stories of these DREAMers who, frankly, make the case for passing the DREAM Act and for defeating this hate-filled provision that was passed by the U.S. House. I am going to continue to update these stories about these DREAMers so you

can understand why giving up on these DREAMers is giving up on the future of this country.

I want to tell you the story about Carlos Martinez. Here is a picture of him. Carlos is holding his DACA card under the President's Executive order. Carlos and his brother were brought to the United States in 1991. Carlos was 9 years old. He came to this country and didn't speak one word of English, and his father told him, "Estudien para que no batallen en la vida como yo." What it means in English is: Study so you don't have to struggle in life like I have.

Carlos took his father's advice to heart. At high school in Tucson, AZ, Carlos graduated ninth in his class. Then he enrolled at the University of Arizona. He was undocumented at the time. He had never owned a computer, but he loved math and he dreamed about being a computer engineer.

Four years later, in 2003, Carlos Martinez graduated with a bachelor of science degree in computer engineering and a minor in computer science, electrical engineering, and math. He was named the top Hispanic graduate in his class.

For the record, Carlos Martinez did not qualify for 1 penny of Federal assistance to go to college, and you can imagine in Arizona probably not 1 penny of State assistance. But he made it through, graduating as the top Hispanic in his class from the University of Arizona. But after he graduated, reality set in. He received job offers from Intel, IBM, and a host of tech companies, but then they found out he was undocumented. He couldn't be hired.

He didn't give up. He enrolled in the master's program for software systems engineering at the University of Arizona. He completed a 2½ year program in a year and a half.

Carlos Martinez was also nominated for the University of Arizona Graduate School Centennial Award, given to the school's top graduate student.

Carlos Martinez submitted his application for DACA when President Obama created this opportunity in August of 2012. The first day the forms were available, he was in line. He was one of the first to be approved. As soon as he received the notification he had been approved under this Executive order, Carlos Martinez went to a career fair at the University of Arizona and handed out his resumes to IBM, Intel, and other high-tech companies. Today Carlos Martinez is working for IBM. Out of more than 10,000 applicants for the job he filled, he was one of only 75 who were hired.

Is America a better place to have that kind of educated individual working with good ideas, creating new products, expanding employment opportunities? Of course it is.

So now the U.S. House of Representatives has decided the best thing for the

future of America is to deport Carlos Martinez and deport those other young students who hold such potential for this country. That is the House Republican approach to immigration—deport Carlos Martinez.

There are so many other DREAMers around this country with the same talents as Carlos. I want the American people to understand the human cost of the proposal that has been sent to us by the House of Representatives under Republican control. The House Republicans want to end DACA. Hundreds of thousands of people such as Carlos Martinez, protected by DACA, would be deported, and 1.5 million eligible to apply for DACA would never have that chance. It is shameless, shameless to play politics with the lives of nice young people who grew up in America and want to be part of our future, and it is so shortsighted.

Will America be stronger if Carlos Martinez is gone? The House Republicans say yes, he should leave. After all of this investment, K-12, bachelor's degree at the University of Arizona, the top graduate student in his master's program at that same university, the House Republicans say, "Deport Carlos Martinez." They feel so strongly about this they are willing to hold up the appropriation for the Department of Homeland Security, the agency responsible for protecting our Nation.

Let me be clear. Democrats are not going to be swayed by this blackmail. We will insist the Department of Homeland Security be properly funded to protect America and to do it now. This President made it clear he is ready to sign that bill, the sooner the better. Let's not assume that America has somehow been immunized or inoculated and never can be threatened again by terrorists. Let us properly fund the Department of Homeland Security, and let us not pursue that shameless agenda sent to us by the House Republicans. Let's remove these riders and give Carlos Martinez and thousands of others just like him a chance to be part of America's future.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last night the President delivered the State of the Union Address. So it was interesting to hear the acting minority leader talking about homeland security, budgeting for homeland security. I know the Presiding Officer, through his service to our Nation overseas, wearing a uniform, keeping us safe, keeping us free—the Presiding Officer has concerns, as do I, about what we heard last night.

It was interesting to hear some of the commentary after the President's speech as we talk about securing the homeland and what it means for the American public. Andrea Mitchell, MSNBC, "I think that on foreign policy his"—meaning President Obama's—"projection of success against terrorism and against ISIS, in particular, is not close to reality." The President of the United States, "not close to reality."

I have just come back from a trip to the Middle East, been to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Israel. I concur with Andrea Mitchell; that on the specifics of the President's assessment of success against terrorism and against ISIS, this President "is not close to reality." So Republicans are going to continue to bring forth the issues to the American people of what reality is like in the world, in spite of the way the President may address it, because of the specific failures of this President and his foreign policy.

It is interesting. Last night in the State of the Union Address, the President started by saying that "the state of the Union is strong." The state of our Union is strong. But President Obama mistakenly took credit for that strength. He implied it was because of his policies, because of his actions. On that point this President could not have gotten it more wrong. The state of our Union is strong because of the strength of the American people.

Americans are resilient. Americans are hardworking. In the November elections, the American people showed they can act decisively. It is interesting, this morning's headline, New York Times: "Staunchly Liberal Wish List Brushes Off G.O.P.'s Gains." Headline, New York Times, bright, bold, above the fold. "Staunchly Liberal Wish List Brushes off G.O.P.'s Gains."

So we are a resilient nation. People know what they believe. They know how they feel. They voted those beliefs. When the American people chose Republicans to lead both Houses of Congress, they said clearly they wanted change, a change from Barack Obama, a change from the direction he has been taking this country. People want Democrats to start working with Republicans to get things done.

The American people said in the November elections they are tired of the gridlock, they are tired of the dysfunc-

tion, tired of Democrats running the Senate to protect their own jobs and not caring about the jobs of middle-class Americans.

President Obama had a great opportunity last night, an opportunity to show that he understands what Americans have been telling him. Instead he went out and he gave the same speech he always gives. It was a partisan attack on Republicans and the Americans who voted to put the Republicans in charge in the House and in the Senate.

It is interesting listening to the commentary after the speech. Wolf Blitzer, CNN, said, "I don't remember a State of the Union address where I heard a President issue so many veto threats to the opposite party in the Congress."

So we have Andrea Mitchell, MSNBC, saying that in terms of foreign policy the President's views "are not close to reality." CNN, Wolf Blitzer, "I do not remember a State of the Union address where I heard a President issue so many veto threats to the opposite party in the United States Congress," especially when it is at a time, as the New York Times pointed out, of GOP gains in the elections, the President specifically ignoring what has happened across this country in the November elections. President Obama seems to have missed the November elections entirely.

Republicans know we have an obligation to the American people to deliver effective, efficient, and accountable government. We have an opportunity and an obligation to put Americans first. Last night President Obama showed he still wants to put Washington first. Republicans are not willing to help this President continue down the same wrong road that the American people have rejected. Let's be honest. This past election was a rejection election, rejecting the policies of this President, this administration.

We are charting a new course and a better direction. We are already making progress. The Senate is working like it has not worked in years. We are debating actual legislation, laying on the floor the Keystone Pipeline jobs bill. We are allowing Senators to offer amendments. We actually had votes on three amendments yesterday. We are going to pass this bill. We are going to send it to the President's desk.

Then we are going to turn to more jobs bills and the important issues the American people care about. We are going to work on reforming our health care system. In his speech last night President Obama offered no solutions on the major issues facing this country. Instead, he offered the same old tired policies of higher taxes, more Washington spending, more bureaucracy, more obstruction of bipartisan solutions coming out of the new Congress.

The President said Congress should focus on areas where we agree. That is

exactly what Republicans have been doing. We are moving bipartisan bills, bills that overwhelming majorities of Americans support. The President continues to threaten to veto them, things such as the Keystone XL Pipeline bill that supports 42,000 American jobs. That is not my number. That is what the State Department—the President's own State Department—said, it would support 42,000 American jobs.

In a poll last week, 65 percent of Americans said the President should sign that into law. We will pass bills to allow for more exports of American energy and to give the President trade promotion authority that he has asked for and that America needs. We will pass commonsense reforms to America's health care system, to end many of the outrageous and expensive mandates for coverage that people do not want, do not need, cannot afford.

We will pass bipartisan education reform to give all of America's 50 million students a better chance to succeed. We will push for tax simplification, to make taxes less fair, less complicated. That is what Americans need to compete in the 21st century. We do not need higher taxes, more debt to pay for spending and more IRS agents, things the American people do not believe we need.

Republicans are going to send the President bills that will help expand our economy by growing the private sector, not by growing the Washington bureaucracy. We are going to pass bills that increase how much families earn and how much of that they actually get to keep, not just how much Washington gets to take and the President gets to spend.

So the state of our Union is strong. It is also in greater agreement than it has been in years about the direction this country should take. President Obama could have taken the opportunity last night to actually talk about this. He could have offered a positive plan to work with Republicans and Democrats in Congress instead of the defiant tone he placed upon the country.

He made threats to veto bipartisan legislation. He chose to double down on more obstruction, more unaccountable Washington bureaucracy, more wasted tax dollars. The American people have rejected this course. The American people want a better path, not the same old tired speech from a President now in the final quarter of his time as President.

The speech is over. Now the President needs to decide what he is actually going to do. Is he ready to get on board with bipartisan ideas or does he want to spend the next 2 years as a lameduck. There are Democrats in this body who agree it is actually time for the Senate to get back to work. They are ready to listen to ideas, good ideas, work with Republicans to help America, to help the American people thrive.

This President should work with all of us. That is what Americans want. They want us to work together. They want us to change the direction our country has been headed for the first 6 years of President Obama's time in office. This Republican Congress is listening to the American people. The President continues to ignore them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, similar to the rest of the country, I listened with close attention to the President's State of the Union Address last night. I had a pretty good seat down front. I got to listen to the President very closely. Of course I was interested because this presented a great opportunity for the President, following a very eventful election on November 4, to state his vision for the country and most particularly to talk about his plans for working with the new Congress that was elected in November.

It was a big election for a lot of reasons but one was that we got nine new Republican Members of the Senate. I have been in the Senate in the minority and I have been in the Senate in the majority. I can tell you I like it a lot better in the majority. But the fact is that notwithstanding a very good election, from my perspective, on November 4, one that sent a real clear message, I was left to wonder whether the President got that message.

While I believe this was a referendum on Washington's dysfunction in dealing with so many of the issues that face hard-working American families, what the President seemed to promise was more dysfunction. But I for one am here to say we are not going to follow the President down this low road. We will try to find areas where we can work with the President. He did mention a few: things such as trade, things such as criminal justice reform. There are a few things the President seemed to indicate were not partisan issues. We look forward to working with him on those issues.

But the biggest problem we have and which still faces our country is the fact that notwithstanding one pretty good quarter of economic growth, our economy and our recovery are still pretty fragile. We know the number of people, the percentage of Americans in the workforce is at about a 30-year low. Some of that is because they have looked for work and they cannot find work, Americans who are seeking full-time work and have to settle for part-time work. Part of it is because of the President's own policies, things such as the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—which incentivizes employers to put people on part-time work in order to avoid some of the penalties.

But notwithstanding my optimism after this important election we had in November and the potential we have

working together—the President and Congress—to try to address the challenges that face our country, my optimism was quickly tempered. Why only tempered optimism? I heard, as the Senator from Wyoming, my friend Mr. BARRASSO, mentioned, the President has issued seven veto threats since the election—seven veto threats; this from a President who in the first 6 years of his term of office has only vetoed one bill.

But the first thing he does after this election, where it should have been a wake-up call to him and others—should have been a wake-up call to all of us—he is issuing seven veto threats to bills that have not even been voted out of the Senate, that have not even made their way to his desk. To me that sends a very disturbing message that the President, instead of just being Commander in Chief, wants to be the obstructionist in chief. I do not know how else to interpret that.

Then there is the President's disquieting tendency to take credit for things other people have done, and for his own failures, to blame them on someone else. It is truly disturbing. Since this new Congress has convened, it seems to me it has been a tale of two branches of government.

While the Congress has shown a commitment to working together—and in my private conversations with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them are eager to work with us to try to find solutions to these challenges on a bipartisan basis.

This is one reason why the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, chose the Keystone XL Pipeline legislation, because it enjoys broad, bipartisan support. We thought it was important to demonstrate, right out of the starting gates, that we actually listened to what the American people told us on November 4—that they want us to work together and they are tired of the dysfunction. But it appears the President hasn't noticed or, perhaps more accurately, he doesn't really care what the American people said on November 4.

If the President isn't going to listen to the American people and the voters who voted in a referendum on his policies—those are not my words; those are his—I wish he would at least listen to what he himself has said. He has said time and again that elections have consequences.

Well, I agree with that. Who wouldn't. But this is the same President who 22 times said he did not have the authority to issue an Executive action on immigration and then turned around and did it. Twenty-two times he said he didn't have the authority, and then he did it.

What I have learned in Washington is we can't just listen to what people say. We have to watch what they do. We have a track record of the past 6 years

of what this President has done and not just what he has said.

As I say, the intransigence and the tone deafness was pretty shocking last night. Notwithstanding, the President gave a good speech. What I think the President really hadn't cracked the code on—as anybody in elected office has to understand—is that there is a difference between running for office and actually governing once the election is over. But this President seems to be in a perpetual campaign mode, making promises that sound like campaign promises rather than recognizing the reality of divided government and looking for opportunities to work together to actually solve problems.

So he is back on the campaign trail again. I think he is going to Idaho and other places around the country touting his new agenda—hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes. Of course, somebody has to pay the bills, but the President mainly talked about free stuff last night. Free stuff is always pretty popular. I am surprised he didn't offer Americans free beer and pizza while he was at it. It is very popular.

But the American people are not dumb. They understand somebody is going to have to pay the bill, and the President ignored that entirely. He also ignored that for the past 6 years this President has added \$7 trillion to the national debt. It is now over \$18 trillion.

Now, I know that it is impossible for the human mind to wrap itself around a figure that big. That is so big that it is incomprehensible in many ways. But we didn't hear a thing about the President adding \$7 trillion to the national debt.

What he did take credit for—this is interesting because I have mentioned he takes credit for things he had nothing to do with and he blames other people for his own failures. But here is where he was half right. He did say that the deficit—the difference between the money we bring in and the money we spend—actually had gone down a little bit.

That is true, but the fact remains that we are still adding to the national debt for every dollar of deficit spending. But what the President also did not say is the main reason why the annual deficit had gone down was because he advocated one of the largest tax increases in recent history—perhaps in all of American history—during the fiscal cliff debate. Then, of course, there was the sequester, which are the caps put on discretionary spending, which the President railed against even though he was the one who thought this up during the so-called supercommittee deliberations.

I couldn't help but think, as the President kept talking about raising taxes, increasing spending, and not dealing with problems such as the looming debt, that he was turning us

more into Europe, a welfare state, where everybody would look to the government to take care of them, not a country that we were left by our parents and grandparents, where we could exercise our individual freedom and seek opportunities to rise above what we had been left by previous generations.

To me that is the most important difference in what the President said last night and what he might have said, because our children do deserve more opportunities. The truth is that for most of us who are people my age, we are going to be OK. But the fact is the next generation, my children and beyond, have been bequeathed more debt.

Now the President wants to add on to that debt—more taxes, more spending, bigger government.

If there was one thing that was rejected in this last election, it was what we have had for the past 6 years. What we have had for the past 6 years was a grand experiment in government. We have always had this debate about the size and the role of the Federal Government, but we have never had such an aggressive attempt to grow the size of the government in recent memory, certainly since the New Deal, as under the past 6 years. What the American people, I believe, rejected was this experiment in big government.

Perhaps that would be understandable if there weren't examples of what actually does work, what does grow the economy, what does put more money in hard-working taxpayers' pockets, and what does provide more jobs and opportunity. One reason why it seems somewhat obvious to me is because I see what has been done in places such as my home State of Texas, and it has been done in other States where they put their trust in people and not in bigger government that somebody has to pay for.

The formula is not all that unique. Governor Perry, who just left office after 14 years, when people talked about the "Texas miracle," said: No, it is not a miracle; a miracle is a supernatural event. This is the Texas model. It is a conscious effort to choose policies that actually work, that grow the economy and create jobs, lower taxes, and result in less red tape and a balanced budget.

Wouldn't that be nice? We haven't had a balanced budget in Washington since 2009. It is really malpractice.

There are other policies that would foster a better business environment and encourage businesses to invest and grow because that creates jobs, that creates rising wages and a successful middle class. So the fact is that if it works in the States, it can work here too.

Now, measures such as reforming the Tax Code to provide tax relief in a way that incentivizes people to work harder

and produce more are pro-growth tax policies—not regressive policies such as the President has proposed, which would make it harder.

Improving infrastructure projects—the President talked about infrastructure last night, but he has also issued a veto threat on the Keystone XL Pipeline. We are—I agree with the Senator from Wyoming—going to approve it, put it on his desk, and then it is up to him. Then, of course, there is putting Americans back to work and repealing oppressive government overreach—such as ObamaCare.

There is a difference between governing and campaigning. The President—there is no doubt about it—is a world class campaigner. He is right that he won two elections by running very successful campaigns, but he seems absolutely disinterested, detached, and, indeed, actually an obstacle to governing, which is the job in front of us.

In closing, I would say the state of the Union is always a work in progress, but it should always be improving. It is my sincere hope the President will realize the hand he has been dealt, which is one of divided government, and that rather than campaigning perpetually, making promises for free stuff, higher taxes, and bigger government, that he would work with us to solve some of the very clear challenges that confront us, primarily ones that will help grow our economy and put Americans back to work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I thought last night, as the majority whip just mentioned, that the President once again showed his sense of why the majority in the Congress and the majority of people in the country support the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is not just about the pipeline, even though he doesn't quite seem ever to get that. It is about whether we are going to truly take advantage of more American energy.

Clearly, the President suggested that was one of the great accomplishments of his administration. I think we could make the argument—and make it effectively—that his administration hasn't done much to implement the great steps we have made forward. In fact, on public lands and other measures that we were in the process of considering when he became President, they have backed away from that rather than stepped forward.

We seem to be unwilling to step forward and embrace this great opportunity that is so much more than the jobs for just the pipeline itself.

I filed two amendments today on the pipeline bill—the topic we are talking about, the topic my good friend from North Dakota has done so much to bring attention to since the day he arrived in the Senate.

It was 4 years ago, when the Keystone XL Pipeline application was only 2 years old at the time. Now 6 years later, we are continuing to miss an opportunity. It seems that on this topic, as once was said about seeking a solution to the Middle East, we can't seem to miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

But the two amendments I have filed deal with a couple of critical issues that relate to our energy future and our infrastructure future. One would be a community affordability amendment where we would have to have a study to look at the impact that all of these EPA regulations have on communities. These are EPA's unfunded mandates on communities, where they tell communities they have to do things but really don't give the community any idea how to pay for it.

The Presiding Officer and I are from two States that have many small communities. Those small communities often have a water system, a sewer system, and a storm water system, and the EPA comes in and says: Here is what we want you to do—maybe not with one of those, maybe with all of those—the air quality, the water quality.

I know the EPA has one regulation on water where the solution can't cost more than 2 percent of the median income over a specific period of time.

Now, 2 percent of your income, if you haven't been paying it for your water bill, your sewer bill or your whatever bill—2 percent of your income is taken right off the top of your income. It makes a difference to most families, but at least there is a cap there. But you can have that 2 percent on increasing the cost of the water system and another 2 or 4 or 5 percent on increasing the storm water system, and somebody has to pay those bills.

What this amendment does is suggest that we figure out who is paying those bills, what is a reasonable way to pay those bills, and how those bills can be paid. We know on the Senate floor, and the President knows, and the EPA knows who pays those bills and the people who have access to those services. There is no mythical payee here. The person who pays your utility bill is you, and if there is increased cost to the utility system, that comes to you. The person who pays your water bill is you.

So I believe we need to have a coordinated effort to see how those projects impact communities, impact families, and understand how this works.

So this amendment that I filed today directs the EPA to collaborate with the National Academy of Public Administration to review existing studies of costs associated with major EPA regulations. The amendment also directs the administration to determine how different localities can effectively fund these projects. The end result would be to come up with a working definition of a phrase they use a lot—individual and community affordability—but I can't find any evidence that this phrase—individual and community affordability—really means anything.

The amendment I filed today has already been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the chamber of commerce in my hometown, Springfield, MO.

The other amendment I am filing, submitted as a sense of the Senate, is that the President's U.S.-China greenhouse gas amendment would be looked at in a different way. This amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE. It talks about the agreement negotiated between the President and the People's Republic of China and, in fact, says this agreement really has no force and effect because frankly, Mr. President, it already has no force and effect in China. Of the two parties the President says have agreed to this, we are the only one who would have to do anything. We think this is a bad idea—Senator INHOFE and I—and I think others will join us. It is a bad deal for our country, it is economically unfair, it is environmentally irresponsible, and once again it produces exactly the opposite result of what we would want.

First of all, I think the Constitution is pretty clear on agreements negotiated between countries. There is a Senate role to be played. It requires the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate should insist we do that job. Whether it is here or on any other agreements with other countries, those agreements need to be consented to by the Senate. It happens to say that in the Constitution.

These agreements, under this amendment, also would have to be accompanied by actions that may be necessary to implement the agreement, including what it costs to implement. The amendment says the United States should not sign bilateral or other international agreements on greenhouse gases that will cause serious economic harm to the United States. It also says the United States should not agree to any bilateral or international agreement imposing unequal greenhouse gas commitments on the United States.

The reason I filed this amendment is simple. The agreement the President unilaterally negotiated with China and announced last November is a bad deal for workers and a bad deal for families,

whether those workers are in Missouri or Arkansas or anywhere else in the country today. The agreement requires the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from 26 to 28 percent below the 2005 levels by 2025. It allows the Chinese to increase their emissions until 2030.

So last night the President said in his State of the Union Address that the United States will double the pace at which we cut carbon pollution and China committed for the first time to limiting their emissions. Well, let's be very frank about that. The President is actually right. He has agreed that we would double the pace, somewhere around 26 to 28 percent below the 2005 levels in the near term, but the Chinese have agreed actually to be allowed to increase their emissions for another 15 years and then they would consider—they would consider—reducing emissions after that. What this does is drive jobs and opportunity to China and other countries that care a lot less about what comes out of the smokestack than we do. We lose the jobs we otherwise would have had. We try to solve a global problem on our own even though we have made great strides already, some of which were cost-effective, but they get less cost-effective all the time.

I am grateful my colleagues allowed me to have a few extra minutes. I have filed these amendments, and we will be talking more about them and the Keystone XL Pipeline issue over the next few days. I look forward to having a vote on these amendments and the vote on the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are in morning business and the minority is now entitled to 30 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in morning business on the pending issue on the floor, and I am glad my friend and colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, is on the floor as well. Perhaps we can do something unprecedented and actually have a dialogue on the issue, if the Senator is open to that suggestion. After I make some opening remarks, I will try to request that through the Chair but only if the Senator is interested.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I certainly would welcome that opportunity and look forward to joining the Senator from Illinois in that dialogue.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota and warn him that we are getting perilously close to a

Senate debate, which almost never happens. So we want to alert all the news bureaus that this might even turn into a debate on the floor of the Senate.

This is Senate bill 1. It is the highest priority of the Senate Republican majority. It is their first bill in the majority. They decided their first bill would be the Keystone XL Pipeline bill. The Keystone XL Pipeline is not owned by an American company; it is owned by a Canadian company, is my understanding, TransCanada. What they are doing is shipping tar sands from Canada—at least it is proposed here—into the United States, across the Midwest, to be refined in Texas and then turned into refined oil products, which could include, of course, gasoline, diesel fuel, jet fuel, and other things.

Yesterday we had two votes on the floor of the Senate about this pipeline and what it is going to produce, and they were interesting votes.

In the first vote we said: Well, if we are going to have this pipeline come into the United States of America and bring Canadian tar sands to be refined, then whatever oil it produces, the products it produces, should be used in America to help Americans reduce the cost of gasoline, to make it cheaper for manufacturing concerns to use their products.

The Republicans rejected that notion that the oil and products produced by the Keystone XL Pipeline would be used in America. They rejected that. I think the vote was 57 to 42. Three or four Democrats joined them, but all of the Republicans, if I am not mistaken, voted to say the products coming out of this pipeline wouldn't be used in America.

Then we offered a second amendment. The second amendment said: Well, if we are going to build this pipeline—and a lot has been said about this being the Keystone jobs bill—shouldn't we use American steel, use American products to build it so that it truly does create jobs in the steel industry and demand for steel products?

The Republicans rejected that amendment as well. So their idea of a Keystone jobs pipeline is a pipeline that produces a product that won't be sold in America and a pipeline that is built with foreign steel. That is their idea of an American jobs bill?

There is also another aspect of this, on which I have introduced an amendment. There is a dirty little secret about this Keystone XL Pipeline which we will get to vote on today. This is what it comes down to. For the longest time nobody looked at Canadian tar sands as a viable source of a product that could be refined into gasoline or diesel fuel. The reason it was never considered viable was the price of a barrel of oil was too low. They knew that in these tar sands up in Canada, there was the potential of drawing oil

after they went through a lengthy and expensive process, and they couldn't afford it until the price of oil started knocking on the door of \$80, \$90 and \$100, and then Canadian tar sands became viable. They could afford to refine the product and make some money. And that is what happened.

The Canadian tar sands were developed in Alberta, and they were shipped to the United States and other places to be refined. In fact, the first Keystone pipeline, I would argue—although it went by a different name—actually went to Illinois. It went to Wood River, IL, to the Conoco refinery, and I have seen it. I have seen the refinery since it has been receiving these tar sands.

The reason why it is more expensive to use Canadian tar sands to produce oil products is you have to take out the tar sands. That is a viscous, nasty product that has to be dealt with with extraordinary refining capacity, which they developed at Wood River, what is now the Phillips refinery. I have seen it.

The dirty little secret about this process is that after they have taken off the worst parts of it—the parts that are not really economically valuable to most—they have to do something with it, and it turns out that in this process they generate huge amounts of what is known as petcoke. Petcoke is the by-product of Canadian tar sands. Petcoke is what is left over after they take what is valuable out of Canadian tar sands. And there is a lot of it.

Proponents of the bill would like to tell you the pipeline won't have any harmful environmental impact, but a lot of communities across America know better—Detroit, Chicago, and Long Beach, CA, for three. These communities have seen what happens when big refineries near their homes start processing large amounts of Canadian tar sands.

Let me show an illustration. This is from the city of Chicago—the city of Chicago. This is a Chicago neighborhood. If you didn't know better, you would assume it is someplace in a remote area. It is not. This Chicago neighborhood looks an awful lot like Little Rock, AR; Fargo, North Dakota, except take a look at what is next door to these little bungalows and homes. This is a petcoke dumpsite.

The British Petroleum refinery receives Canadian tar sands in Whiting, IN, refines them, and the leftover product—this petcoke sludge—is shipped over to the city of Chicago, where it is deposited in piles that are three- and four-stories high. I have seen them.

The residents started noticing these mountain-like piles of petcoke appearing right over the train tracks from their homes and at a local baseball field after the Whiting refinery began processing tar sands. You might imagine that on windy days, giant clouds of petcoke dust swirl above these storage

piles and cover the neighborhoods. I have seen them. I have visited them. So these working families, when the wind is blowing in their direction, end up with this petcoke blowing into their homes, into the lungs of their children.

Often, the dust from these petcoke piles means that people living in the southeastern part of Chicago are forced to breathe dirty air that one organization—National Nurses United—says causes severe health threats. You see, petcoke—this product from Canadian tar sands—contains heavy metals such as nickel, vanadium, and selenium. Nickel causes cancer. Chronic exposure to nickel can cause neurological and developmental defects among children. You can see this nasty petcoke on the windowsills and buildings around this neighborhood, but you can't see it in the lungs of the children until it is too late.

The National Institute For Occupational Safety and Health warns that inhaling nickel-laced dust increases your risk for lung cancer and fibrosis.

Petcoke dust also contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, which have been linked to cancer as well. And it is not just because the chemical composition of petcoke is toxic; the dust particles themselves are extremely dangerous. When you inhale petcoke, that dust can get trapped in your lungs, causing respiratory problems. Once in the lungs, these tiny particles can aggravate asthma, leading to premature death in people with heart or lung disease, and cause heart attacks.

Yesterday I made the point that when I visit schools across my State to ask how many students in the classroom know someone who has asthma, without fail, rural or urban schools, half the hands go up. I invite my colleagues to do the same. So anything we do to aggravate this asthma threat we face is something we ought to think about very carefully. Some safety documents even note that long-term exposure to petcoke might cause damage to the lung, liver, and kidney.

Because of petcoke dust, the city of Chicago has advised residents in this neighborhood and around it to limit the time they are outdoors. In addition, Mayor Emanuel and the city are working with residents and local environmental organizations to limit the amount of petcoke that can be stored in the city and to require that it be enclosed in facilities that would protect it from blowing around.

This isn't the first city in America to face this danger from Canadian tar sands, which will be transported, if built, by the Keystone XL Pipeline. The city of Detroit, shipping ports near Los Angeles, they have dealt with petcoke piles too. We need to do more.

Many of these cities have had to act because for years petcoke has been exempt from regulation under many Federal environmental laws, and it has not

been forced to comply with Federal cleanup standards.

The Federal Government's views on the official side of the ledger—the regulatory side of the ledger is that these petcoke piles are benign, not to be worried about. The health information tells us they are wrong.

That is why I proposed an amendment to end petcoke's exemptions and require the EPA and Department of Transportation to promulgate rules on how to store and transport petcoke to protect public and ecological health. It closes the environmental loophole for petcoke.

My amendment would require we make these changes before construction is allowed to begin on this pipeline. It is important because tar sands transported by the Keystone XL Pipeline—this Canadian company—will dramatically increase the amount of petcoke produced in this country.

In the year 2013 the United States produced a record amount of 57.5 million metric tons of petcoke.

According to the environmental impact statement for the Keystone XL Pipeline, the No. 1 priority of the Senate Republican majority, this pipeline will produce over 15,400 metric tons of petcoke every day.

Under current law all of this new petcoke would continue to be shipped to local communities for storage and disposal in the same large open piles we see in this photograph in Chicago. That isn't right. We in Congress should deal with the acres of petcoke piles that are already out there before we build a pipeline that will create 15,400 metric tons of it a day. Incidentally, the BP refinery that has created this mess is generating 6,000 tons a day. More than twice as much will come out of the Keystone XL Pipeline, the No. 1 Republican Senate majority issue, S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline, Canadian company, 35 permanent jobs but 15,400 metric tons of petcoke every single day somewhere in America.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment to treat petcoke for what it is. It is a dangerous byproduct that shouldn't be stored in open-air piles near neighborhoods, ballparks, children, and elderly people.

End the regulatory loophole for petcoke and establish reasonable guidelines for handling this dangerous material. This would help ensure that clean air and clean water is something everyone can enjoy—even if you happen to have the bad luck of living in a neighborhood near a petcoke dump site such as this one near the city of Chicago.

I see the Senator from Minnesota is seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent for the Senator from North Dakota and myself to enter into a 3-minute dialogue so we don't hold up my friend from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I know the Senator is a reasonable man and has been Governor of a State and understands responsibility.

Is it too much to ask that we regulate petcoke so it is not a public health hazard to the people who happen to live next door to these dumps?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to my esteemed colleague from the State of Illinois.

Of course the answer to the question is that in fact it is a regulated substance, and it is primarily regulated at the State and local level.

In the State of Illinois, for example, petcoke would be regulated by the State of Illinois. What I understand the Senator from Illinois to be saying is that he is dissatisfied with the way the State of Illinois has chosen to regulate petcoke.

But in fact the EPA has found that petcoke has a low hazard potential. According to the Congressional Research Service, most toxicity analysis of petcoke, as referenced by EPA, finds it has low health hazard potential in humans, has no observed carcinogenic, reproductive or developmental effects. In fact, it is a byproduct of not just oil from the oil sands but also some of the oils from California, Venezuela, and other places.

So it is a byproduct that in fact is recycled. It is used in products such as aluminum, steel, paint. It is used to produce electricity.

Here is a case of a product that actually can be and is in fact recycled. I would argue that what we want to do as we produce energy is continue to invest in these new technologies that will help us produce more energy but also do it with better environmental stewardship, which means we not only work on CCS, carbon capture and storage—which is a major undertaking in the oil sands right now; and I would be willing to engage in that discussion as well—but then also work to find uses for these byproducts in things such as steel and aluminum.

For example, the President last night talked about how the auto industry is making a resurgence, and he talked about the CAFE standards. One of the things they are doing in Detroit with new automobiles is they are using more aluminum in the construction of the cars to reduce the weight to try to meet those CAFE standards.

So here is a product from the oil sands oil that is actually used in aluminum to make those vehicles lighter to achieve one of the things the President talked about in the State of the Union Address last night as a byproduct from the oil sands oil.

So I appreciate the question and look forward to further dialogue.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming for a brief followup. I want to make sure I understand the Senator's position.

The Senator's position is we should not establish any Federal standards on the safety of petcoke and leave it up to the States.

He also argues it is not a danger, it is not carcinogenic, and it is low hazard, in his words. I don't know if the Senator has seen petcoke neighborhoods that have this blowing into them.

I would just say to the Senator, this notion that somehow petcoke is going to be some fabulous discovery for new inventions—maybe it will, but at this point it is being sold to China and they are burning it to generate electricity. I would just try to imagine for a moment what is coming out of those smokestacks in China, where sadly the air pollution is awful at the moment.

I yield the floor, but I don't think it is adequate to say that the city of Chicago should be regulating this substance. We have a nation which will be affected by a national pipeline from this Canadian company. We ought to have a national standard to protect Americans from the dangers of petcoke. Whether we are talking about Fargo, Little Rock or Juneau, I wouldn't want to live this close to these petcoke piles.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds for a simple point of clarification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, the characterizations of petcoke are from the EPA and from the Congressional Research Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the President's speech from last night. I think it was very important. It was a major event. All Members of Congress were there. To me, it was a call to action. It wasn't just ideas, it was about how to turn ideas into action. It was a strong speech focused on the middle-class economy and how we can strengthen our economy. I thought there was a lot of energy.

I know some of my colleagues in the last few months have predicted that the President was somehow going to slide down because of the actions he took on immigration or the actions he took on Cuba, and I think what we are seeing around the country is quite the opposite. I think people are excited that there is an energy, and they are certainly pleased we have seen some major improvements in the economy.

I would say to my colleagues across the aisle, whom I take at their word when they say they want to work with us to govern this country, that I think we know—if we didn't know it before, after last night—that the President is not going to be spending his next year-and-a-half slouched in an armchair planning his Presidential library. I think what we saw last night is a President who wants to get things done in his remaining time in office, and I think we see an energized country that also wants to get through the gridlock and move forward.

First of all, I think the President did a very good job of laying out the status of the economy, and I think it is very important, when there are so many numbers out there and information and people throwing things out, that we step back and look at that. Because when we look at where we are going to move forward, we need to understand from where we came and how we ended up where we were a few years back in the midst of a recession.

So as I look at these young pages—thinking about how difficult it was for so many years for young people to find employment and that we are now finally seeing hope for young people out in the job market and how we can build what we have got.

So what do we know? We have had 58 straight months of private sector job growth. Our national unemployment is below 6 percent. In fact, in my State it is down to 3.7 percent. Our unemployment rate last year went down faster than in any other year we have seen since 1984. We are now No. 1 in oil. This fall we surpassed Saudi Arabia as the No. 1 oil and gas producer in the world. That is what our country has done because of the work in North Dakota—I see my friend Senator HOEVEN over there—because of the work going on all over this country.

As the President also pointed out last night, we also are increasing our renewable energy in wind. I would add, from the State of Minnesota, that the renewable fuel standard and the fact that we have better gas mileage standards—all of these things have helped to bring down our consumption and to raise our production, bringing these prices down in our country.

I thought one of the most interesting statistics last night was a fact I had never heard before. Since 2010, America has put more people back to work than the combined countries of all of Europe, Japan, and all advanced economies across the world. That shows that our workers are so good—something we know. It shows that our businesses are so good. I think this is an opportunity we now have to finally in this Chamber govern from opportunity, not just be governing from a state of crisis. That is what we need to do.

One of my favorite parts, of course, was Rebekah and Ben Erler from Min-

nesota, who were mentioned right near the beginning of his speech, sitting right up in the First Lady's gallery in the House, a woman who had gone through some hard times. Her husband had lost his job in the construction industry, but because of the strength of our State and the strength of her family, her personal strength to want to go back to work and go to a community college, her family is now stabilized. As the President pointed out, maybe their big treat is getting together for a pizza on Friday, but the point is that they have gotten through some very hard times, as have so many resilient people in this country.

So the question we now have is this: How do we get ahead? How do we keep going? I am going to go through a few of the ideas that the President discussed last night that are near and dear to my heart.

The first is community college. I would not be standing in the Senate right now if it wasn't for community college. My grandpa worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines in Ely, MN. He never even graduated from high school. At age 15 he had to quit school. Even though he was getting A's in math, he had to quit school to go and help support his family. Within a few years he was down in those mines. That is where he worked his whole life. He had dreamed of a life at sea. He had dreamed of a life in the Navy. He had dreamed of a life where he could use his education, but he worked in that mine because he believed, more than anything, in the American dream—in his two young boys, in his wife, in his family, in the nine brothers and sisters he raised because both of his parents died. That is why, at ages 15 and 16, he and his brother went to work. They went to work to help their family. When the youngest kid, Hannah, had to go to an orphanage for a year and a half, my grandpa borrowed a car a year and a half after that and went and got her back, as he promised.

So what did he do for my dad? He saved money in a coffee can in the basement so he could send my dad to college, and my dad is a proud graduate of Ely Junior College, a 2-year community college. From there he was able to go to the University of Minnesota, get a journalism degree and interview everyone from Ronald Reagan to Mike Ditka, to Ginger Rogers. That is our family's story.

My sister never graduated from high school. She had some trouble in high school. So what did she do? She was able to get her GED, go to a community college, and move on from there to finalize her 4-year degree and get an accounting degree.

Those stories are all over America. The President's devotion to talking about these 2-year community colleges and using them as a launching pad for kids' careers is the right one.

I am hoping, given the support I have seen from businesses across my State—where we don't have enough welders, we don't have enough people to work the technology in a lot of the factories. I am hoping my colleagues will join us because of the strong business support, because of the need we have in our country to get more people into these jobs.

We have 5 million job openings. We have 8 million people who are unemployed. We need to match those two numbers. And the way we do it, I think, is by doing more with these 1- and 2-year degrees and doing more with kids in high school.

The second topic I appreciated that the President talked about was the middle-class tax cut. We all know the numbers. We all know the facts that due to the widening gap we have seen in income distribution, about 80 percent of families have \$1 trillion less in income than they did during the Reagan time—\$1 trillion less than during the Reagan time. The top 400 people in the country have more wealth than the bottom half of the country combined. So as we look at where we should be giving tax cuts and who we should be helping, it is clearly the middle class of this country.

That includes help with childcare and childcare credits that the President talked about. We are the only advanced country, as he pointed out last night, in the world that doesn't have some kind of sick leave or paid maternity leave. When I go and talk to women all over my State and I ask them what they most want, so many of them say time. They want time to be able to be with their kids when they are sick. They want time to be able to be with their baby when their baby is born. That is the best thing for our country. So I don't believe the naysayers that say we cannot work across the aisle to start talking about these important middle-class issues.

As the President pointed out, he is not running again, and he has nothing to do but to try to move forward with this country.

I appreciated the words of so many of my Republican colleagues who talked about governance, who said they wanted to get back to the real business of government, which is governing. I also appreciated those who have put out innovative ideas on things such as infrastructure. The simple idea that perhaps we can get some of these foreign earnings that are stuck there overseas that are just sitting there, billions of dollars—why don't we do something to bring that money back and make sure a portion of it goes into infrastructure? No one knows that better than our State. Our State is a State where a bridge fell down in the middle of a summer day—not just a little bridge, an eight-lane highway eight blocks from my house; a highway my family

would drive over every single day—down into the middle of the Mississippi River on a summer day. That is infrastructure and that is a problem.

There are 75,000 bridges in this country that have been found to be structurally not efficient, not able to function. That is what is happening in this country right now.

So I truly appreciated the fact that the President talked about, yes, we are going to be defending something, we are going to be arguing about things in this Chamber. That is what this is set up to do. That is democracy. That is government. But there are also some very clear areas of agreement, and one of them is helping the middle class. Let's move. Let's go forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Fischer amendment No. 18 (to amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land.

Schatz amendment No. 58 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change.

Murkowski (for Lee) amendment No. 33 (to amendment No. 2), to conform citizen suits under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Durbin amendment No. 69 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that the storage and transportation of petroleum coke is regulated in a manner that ensures the protection of public and ecological health.

Murkowski (for Toomey) amendment No. 41 (to amendment No. 2), to continue cleaning up fields and streams while protecting neighborhoods, generating affordable energy, and creating jobs.

Whitehouse amendment No. 29 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back again with the Keystone XL Pipeline, S. 1, the bipartisan 60-sponsor bill in front of us. We had a good day yesterday debating three amendments and ultimately disposing of them. We have a half dozen of them in front of us this morning and this afternoon.

I think it is worth noting, there have been several Members who have come to the floor to give comments about the State of the Union last evening de-

livered by President Obama. It was his sixth official State of the Union Address. It marked the sixth address that he has given to the Congress and the Nation while this project has been under review the whole time throughout his entire administration. Every one of those State of the Union Addresses has happened at a time when the Keystone XL application has been pending. It puts into context how long we have been considering this legislation.

The President didn't really speak much to the demerits or the opposition to Keystone XL—it was basically a quick reference—but he did in a manner attempt to compare this bipartisan, subsidy-free bill to major taxpayer-funded infrastructure projects. Whether it is our highways or bridges, the need is clear. But I think we also recognize those are projects that are taxpayer-funded that will require millions and perhaps billions of dollars a year. What we are talking about with the Keystone XL is something where we don't have any Federal subsidies going in. It is not taxpayer-funded. I think it is important to make sure that we understand the difference.

What we didn't hear last night was how this project could be advanced. Once again, there was no indicator. I would like to remind everyone that we are sitting at over 2,300 days where we have not had a Presidential decision. I think the good news for us here on this floor is the debate on this issue is not going to last that long, thankfully.

Again, we moved into regular order, and I think it was helpful for Members of the body to not only know that there was a series of amendments that were called up, but that we were able to have debate on them, and then we were able to dispense with them.

The majority of the Senate voted to table two of those proposals, but then when it came to the Portman-Shaheen bill, the energy efficiency provision, we were able to move that by a vote of 94 to 5, demonstrating again a great deal of support for this small energy efficiency provision. I wish it had been bigger, in fairness to the bill sponsors who have been working so hard for years on that. We just advanced a very small piece of that. I think we have more to do in the area of energy efficiency, and I am looking forward to working with them on that.

What we have in front of us now at this point in the process is we have a bill that will approve the cross-border permit for the Keystone XL Pipeline and we will work to deal with some aspects of energy efficiency. I think that is some good progress.

Once again this morning I will encourage Senators. We have called for an open amendment process, but as the leader has reminded us, it is not open-ended. We are not going to be on this bill indefinitely. So move to file your

amendments. If you want a vote on them, you need to be filing them now and talking to us now.

We are at 77 amendments that have been filed and that was as of last night. So there is clearly already a line, and my hope is we will be able to dispense with this half dozen today.

Briefly speaking to the measures that we have from each side, we have Senator FISCHER's amendment 18; Schatz amendment No. 58; No. 33 is the Lee amendment; we have Senator DURBIN's amendment 69; we have Senator TOOMEY's amendment 41, as well as the Whitehouse amendment No. 29.

I spoke a little bit on a couple of these measures yesterday, and I will be speaking more this afternoon before we move, hopefully, to votes.

I do want to take a minute before I turn it over to Senator CANTWELL to be recognized and then to Senator HOEVEN. There have been several sense-of-the-Senate amendments that have been filed—presented on the issue of climate change. I think it is important for people to note that in order to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, as the legislation itself lays out, there is no climate change provision that is required. I find it a little ironic that in neither of the two pending amendments that we have before us—Senator SCHATZ's and Senator WHITEHOUSE's—neither of them actually quotes the parts of the State Department's final EIS that explains, I think in pretty fair detail, that this project will not significantly contribute to climate change. In fact, the State Department found that without the Keystone XL Pipeline greenhouse gas emissions associated with transporting Canadian oil could actually increase, and the estimate is increasing somewhere between 28 and as high as 42 percent. One might ask, how can that be? The reality is that not only is a pipeline less costly and more efficient, but it has the least environmental impact in terms of any additional emissions.

So I think it is important to recognize that when we are talking about the oil coming from Canada, oil that Canada is producing for lots of different reasons that benefit Canada, that that oil is going to move. So our challenge is, is that oil going to move in a manner that benefits Americans with increased jobs and opportunities? Is it going to help fill our refineries in the gulf coast? Is it going to help from a safety perspective in terms of transporting a product in the safest manner as well as providing the least environmental impact?

The State Department also provided in the EIS that:

Approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil sands supply costs,

transport costs, and supply and demand scenarios.

I think we are going to have some discussion this afternoon about what is contained in the State Department EIS. At 1,000 pages the full EIS is substantive. There is an executive summary that helps us all out and distills all of this. But I think it is important that Members look at what that report outlines.

I previously mentioned that we have about 77 amendments in front of us that have been filed at this point in time. We have nine, as of this morning, separate sense-of-the-Senate or sense-of-the-Congress amendments relating to climate change.

I have noted that this is the first time we have had an energy-related bill on the floor in a while where there has been an opportunity for debate. You will recall that this same measure was on the floor in December when the Democrats were in charge. The floor was managed at that point in time by the Senator from Louisiana, obviously very passionate in her support of the Keystone XL Pipeline. But in that debate there was no opportunity for amendments. You didn't see colleagues on either side of the aisle able to offer any amendments. We didn't see any amendments on climate. Now we have nine climate-related amendments here. So when you think about the urgency, we are having folks coming down and saying we must act on this now. I will remind people the reason we are able to have this debate and the reason we are able to have votes on this issue is because we are operating under a regular order process where we are allowing for amendments, whether it is on issues such as climate change or whether it is on issues such as dealing with exports as we took up yesterday. We are not going to agree in many of these areas, but at least we are going to get back to being a deliberative body that not only talks about issues, but has an opportunity to vote on them.

So, again, I think we are probably going to hear a lot of different conversations about climate change.

I want to point out an article before I conclude this morning. This is an article that ran November 27, 2014, just a few months ago. It ran in the Financial Post, and it is entitled "New emissions from Canada's oil sands 'extremely low,' says IEA's chief economist." The article has some interesting quotes that I think are relevant to our discussion.

The first line of that article states:

As an energy advisor to some of the world's most developed economies, Fatih Birol worries about critical issues including security of energy and the impact of fossil fuels on the climate. One issue he does not spend any time worrying about, however, is carbon emissions from oil sands.

Mr. Birol is quoted as saying: "There is a lot of discussion on oil sands

projects in Canada and the United States and other parts of the world, but to be frank, the additional CO₂ emissions coming from the oil sands is extremely low."

So here we have a statement by IEA's chief economist. If we combine that with what we have contained in the State Department's final EIS—again, I think these are important statements of support or fact to have on the record.

As we are debating these amendments today, I encourage everyone to keep in mind that oftentimes much of what we hear can be a little amped-up. I understand the passion that goes on, but we need to make sure we are looking critically at the facts as they exist.

I am just going to conclude my comments this morning by saying that what is happening in Canada—the simple facts are that Canada is producing its oil and it will move that oil to markets. Canada is our strongest partner, and they supply us with more oil than any of our other trading partners. So Canada is going to continue to produce oil, and they will move that oil.

The question is, Who will ultimately benefit from that production of oil? Will the United States gain the benefit of those construction jobs? Will the United States gain the benefit from the crude that will come down through the line and go into the gulf coast and benefit from the refineries that are built to handle and process that heavy crude coming from the north?

I want the United States to be a participant in this important project for a lot of different reasons, and I am encouraged that more than 60 of my colleagues seem to share that view.

We will continue the discussion through the series of amendments we have before us today. I know my colleague from North Dakota is prepared to speak, but at this time I will turn it over to my ranking member, the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Alaska helping us to work through this process and being down here to talk about how we move forward. I heard her say we are obviously thinking about how we move through the amendment process, and I am sure she and I will get a chance to talk about the potential votes we will have later on as we continue with this amendment process.

Like her, I wish to add a few comments to this morning's comments about the State of the Union Address last night because I do feel as though it was the first time we heard a speech from a President of the United States that was all about an innovation economy.

As someone from Seattle and the Pacific Northwest, I know a lot about innovation, and I was glad to hear he ba-

sically spoke about the whole perspective of what it takes to have an innovation economy and how we have to think about research and development and investing in our workforce. He mentioned trade and a variety of things that are all components of an innovation economy and how we can continue to move forward. I was very glad to hear that level of innovation, including his community college effort because it is about training the workforce for the future.

I also heard him talk about making improvements in infrastructure. The one thing I didn't hear him talk about was the issue of plug-in vehicles or electric cars. The reason I bring that up is because I think for most of the Bush administration, and maybe even some of the earlier days of this administration, I constantly heard talk about how we had to get electric vehicles and plug-in cars so we could get off our dependence on foreign oil.

We should take pride that in last night's speech we didn't have to listen to that because we have made progress in plug-in electric cars. Plug-in electric cars are in the marketplace, and we are making great progress in that area. We are also making progress in getting off foreign oil, and we are seeing how fuel efficiency is having a positive impact on our savings.

The President of the United States was asking what is the next level of innovation we have to do and how do we move forward while still protecting ourselves from what has been the deterioration of our environment from the greenhouse gases and the threat it makes to our planet.

Again, being from the Pacific Northwest, I consider those threats to be very real. The shellfish industry has been almost ruined due to the lack of oxygen in the water and the amount of carbon that basically sinks into our oceans and causes damage to the shellfish.

I see the Presiding Officer is also from the great State of Alaska.

When it comes to sources of feeding for Pacific Northwest salmon, there are not a lot of great food sources for the salmon. Climate change is having an effect on the ecosystem and the economy, so you can bet that climate issues are very important to our State. Those issues are no longer hidden and there is no longer a way to escape from that. It is on our plate right now.

The President of the United States said: Let's deal with that and move forward, and instead of talking about one pipeline, let's talk about an energy plan and an infrastructure investment for the Nation.

I will point out to my colleagues: You are becoming dangerously close to saying we can't do something like PORTMAN. How many times were my colleagues from Ohio and New Hampshire held up on energy efficiency because no one would let us vote on that?

How long—1 year, 2 years? Then yesterday we finally had a vote, and 95 of our colleagues voted yes on moving forward on energy efficiency.

I will also point out that energy efficiency is, I believe, key to our economy of the future. If the United States is a leader in making energy—no matter what source it comes from—more efficient, we will write the playbook around the globe because so many people will want to make very dear energy resources more usable, better utilized, and have lower costs to their individual businesses and consumers.

Energy efficiency is incredibly important, but we never got to energy efficiency. It is almost as if the other side of the aisle is saying: You will only get energy efficiency if we pair it with other legislation where we are rolling back environmental rules, and that is the objection I have and the people from the State of Washington have as well.

People want people to play by the rules. They want to know that if you propose a pipeline, you will actually follow the laws to protect the environment, such as the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and follow the process of what is in the public interest. We should be having that debate. We should not usurp the President of the United States in determining what is the national interest of this country.

At the very time the State Department was saying to this company, TransCanada, you have a pipeline proposal we don't like because it goes right through an aquifer, at the very moment when the State Department was telling them we don't like the proposal and you need to adhere to the environmental laws, the same people were in Congress trying to get Senators and House Members to vote on legislation that would have said pass the pipeline right through the aquifer.

I believe the President should be given the due diligence to drive home with this foreign company the fact that we have a national interest, that this national interest will be met, and that we will set the standard for whether these environmental laws are going to be complied with. I don't believe we should be usurping them. I think my colleagues are now offering amendments on the other side that also usurp other environmental laws.

I hope my colleagues will think about this because it will certainly give the Senator from Alaska and myself something to think about. As we try to move forward on energy legislation, we are going to have to think about how we are going to pass something that has bipartisan support.

Since I have been on the energy committee—and I have been on the committee now the entire time I have been in Congress—I have had the opinion that you should not hold up good energy legislation just to try to get bad

energy legislation. I have the opinion that we should pass energy bills every year. That is the transformation our country is going under.

I wish we would have helped the Senators who wanted to usher in energy efficiency 2 years ago, but it is telling that 95 of our colleagues have always thought that was an easy lift. We should keep moving forward on those issues that are easy lifts and ensure the businesses that need predictability and certainty that we can move forward on that.

Another example is the clean energy tax credits. While we are trying to overwrite environmental rules to give a foreign interest a pipeline through our country—I should say, people thought the pipeline that went through Yellowstone was safe, and we just had a big spill there this past weekend. It is not as if these spills don't happen.

We had a colleague from Michigan talk about the spill that happened in Kalamazoo. I just saw the Commandant of the Coast Guard again last night at the State of the Union Address and we talked about how we don't have a solution for cleaning up tar sands in the water, and that is why we in the Pacific Northwest are so interested in this issue.

Let's not hurry through a process of special interest when we can do things that we need to give predictability and certainty on, such as the energy tax credits that are germane and are within the boundaries of what Congress is supposed to be deciding on. The American people are asking us to debate those issues and to come up with a resolution on them. I don't know that the American people are asking us to override a process and usurp what is the right of the President to make sure our national interests are considered in this policy debate.

I do appreciate the Senator from Alaska working through this process, and I do appreciate the fact that I think she is serious about she and I sitting down and talking about a larger energy bill. I pride myself on having a Pacific Northwest view; that is, there are things that are good for both Alaska and Washington and we should work on them together. Maybe there are some things that are well and good for Alaska and Washington but maybe the rest of the country doesn't agree with, but we will work through a process together.

I say to my colleagues, as we look at these next tranches of votes, we should consider what the President said last night. We need a broader innovation strategy for our economy. I believe there are ways to get there. I think these amendments we are considering—I don't think we need to change the Antiquities Act. I am a big believer in the fact that there are some tremendous national beauties that have been established through the Antiquities

Act both—actually by lots of Republican Presidents, and I don't feel we have to change the Antiquities Act. I certainly don't think we need to change the Endangered Species Act, and I don't think we need to overrule the Clean Air Act, as the amendment does of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

We will have more time to talk about these amendments on the floor, but I hope my colleagues will understand that we want environmental rules to be followed, and we want people to follow a process. We want these issues to move forward from an energy policy that will move America to a 21st century energy policy and not continue to hold on to the 19th century pollutions that are challenging our economy.

I am sure we are going to hear from our colleagues when they come down to debate these issues as it relates to greenhouse gases and other things. Again, I appreciate my colleague from Alaska helping us to work through this process. I appreciate that it is a debate and that all of my colleagues will have a chance to come down and express their opinions.

With that, I yield back to my colleague on whatever process we are going to follow to go back and forth on amendments.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the comments of the ranking member of the energy committee and her focus on energy innovation. I think we can look to that as not only a bright spot in our economy where we have seen great progress in recent years, but we have also seen great enthusiasm and an optimism about the future of our country when we allow our great minds to work on some of the problems of the day to get us to these advanced solutions.

The Presiding Officer and I come from an energy-producing State. We are also a State that has some of the highest energy costs in the country. Right now in the village of Fort Yukon, they are paying \$7.25 for a gallon of fuel. Up in Kobuk—in the northwest part of the State—they are paying \$10 for a gallon of fuel. The rest of the country is enjoying a price break because of the drop in fuel, but in Alaska, when there is no neighborhood filling station that is connected to a road that is connected to someplace that brings people somewhere, people have to bring in their fuel by barge or by plane. The contract for that fuel in July—July's prices were not what they are now. Folks are locked in. Talk about being frozen in someplace—well, their prices are also frozen in.

So we know and understand the challenges when it comes to energy. We know and understand the challenges when it comes to paying to keep your house warm or your lights on. We have every interest—every interest—to

make sure that we are pushing out, that we are being innovative, that we are being as efficient as we possibly can be when it comes to energy use and consumption. I want to urge us, to push us, to be really aggressive in pushing us toward those technologies that will allow us, in a small-population State that has no real energy grid, so to speak, to figure out how we can be more self-sufficient, get us off diesel, get us off \$10-a-gallon oil in Kobuk, AK. We have to figure this out.

We are talking about the challenges we face, but as we begin this good, robust debate on issues such as the climate, I think we need to be careful about what we are doing in response to the issue of a changing climate. If the answer is to increase energy costs, if it is to implement a carbon tax, if it is to make it more expensive, if it is to cripple our economy, then we don't have the ability to move out on these technologies because they are expensive.

We need to have a strong economy. We need to figure out how we can address climate through adaptation, mitigation, and new technologies that are going to take us to cleaner fuel sources, to renewable energy sources we have in great abundance in Alaska and elsewhere. But it takes money. It takes a strong economy. So I am not willing to do anything that is going to put the brakes on our economic strength and viability.

This is a good part of the discussion. It is very germane to where we are right now.

I mentioned in my comments that we currently have six amendments pending to the bill. Our side would like to set up votes on these amendments, with a 60-vote threshold required for any amendment that is not germane. We are working on a side-by-side right now on the Schatz amendment as well as a potential modification to the Fischer amendment. But I don't think there is any reason why we wouldn't be voting on most, if not all, of the pending amendments shortly after lunch today. Once we have gotten through those amendments, Senator CANTWELL and I will queue up the next batch of two to three amendments from each side so we can continue to make progress on this bill.

At this time, I turn to my colleague Senator HOEVEN, the sponsor of S. 1, who has been waiting to address the body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HOEVEN be followed by the Senator from Vermont to speak for 10 minutes about an amendment he has filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to verify that I have 10 minutes before my time expires. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not aware of a limit on the time of the Senator from North Dakota.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I don't know how much time the Senator from North Dakota is seeking this morning. Maybe that would help the Senator from Vermont in understanding the schedule.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, that is fine. I will use 10 minutes at this point, and I will use more later.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Vermont is just going to speak to an amendment he has filed. He is not seeking to call up the amendment; is that correct?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct. I will probably need about 5 or 6 minutes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. No objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont is only going to speak for 5 minutes, then I will defer to him. I may go longer than 10 minutes, so I will defer to him if we would like to proceed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his usual courtesy, and I appreciate it.

As the most senior Member of this body, I have served in both the majority and minority numerous times, under three Democratic Presidents, four Republican Presidents, and Democratic and Republican majorities. Throughout that time, I learned that the Senate can be productive. The Keystone Pipeline legislation we are considering today, though, is not one of those productive topics.

I hoped we would begin the 114th Congress by showing the American people that Congress is putting the needs of hard-working American families over those of powerful special interests, from job creation to charting a sustainable energy future for this country. We ought to be considering legislation that supports the highway trust fund. That would create tens of thousands of jobs across the country. We should be considering tax legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to respond regarding the legislation that is currently on the floor in several regards. I would like to discuss some of the environmental arguments that have been brought up. I wish to also reference the issue of export as well as touch on some of the comments of the President relative to this project and comments others have made regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline approval bill, S. 1, being the first bill we brought up.

One of the things we hear is, well, this is a private investment, it is \$8 billion, but we should somehow be doing something else. The reality is this is an \$8 billion shovel-ready project, good to go. It is vital energy infrastructure for this country. So it is important in its own right. To compare it to the highway bill, which is all funded by Federal tax dollars, whereas this is a private investment which is going to generate revenues in addition to providing vital infrastructure and providing jobs—that is not a fair comparison.

The point in bringing up this bill first was not only because this is important energy infrastructure but also because we wanted to try to get the Senate back to regular order, to an open amendment process. We just spent the last session and even before where we couldn't get amendments offered. Whether Republican or Democrat, we could not come to the floor of this body—the most deliberative body in government—and offer amendments, have the debate, and get a vote.

So understand that bringing up this legislation is important in its own right, particularly as we consider how we best build the energy future of the United States and have this important energy debate.

Look what is going on at the pump right now. We pull up to the pump and gas is down more than a dollar. I think the national average price of gasoline is \$2.05, when it was up between \$3 and in some cases \$4 in some markets. That is a huge savings. That is hundreds of billions of dollars in consumers' pockets. That didn't just happen; that happened because we are building the right energy future for this country.

We are working to create energy security for the United States by producing more oil and gas in this country, along with other types of energy, and working with Canada to produce more oil and gas so we don't have to get it from OPEC, so OPEC doesn't get to dictate terms to American consumers and American businesses. And why don't they get to dictate terms? Because we are producing more energy. As we produce more energy and we get more energy from Canada, our closest friend and ally in the world, we become energy secure. That is more energy, that is more jobs, that is economic growth, that is national security, and that is what the American people want.

So when we talk about why this bill is up first, it is because we want to build an energy plan that works for this country. We want our Nation to be energy secure. This is how we do it. This kind of infrastructure is a vital part of building that energy plan where we produce more energy than we consume. So, together with Canada, we truly have North American energy security. That means lower prices, that means a stronger economy, and that means we don't have to depend on OPEC for our energy.

Now look what is happening. OPEC is pushing back, aren't they? We are now in this market fight, a fight for market share. So what do we do? Do we continue to build our energy resources here in this country or do we say: No, we are not going to build the infrastructure. We are not going to continue to produce more oil and gas in this country. We are not going to work with Canada. We are going to have Canada send that oil to China because they want it.

Then we will go right back to where we were before, where our energy shrinks back down and we don't work with Canada, and OPEC is right back in business. That has to be music to OPEC's ears. They probably love it when they hear that the President is going to block our efforts to build vital energy infrastructure—and private investment, mind you, not taxpayer dollars—that will create hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue for all of these States as they collect property taxes and payment in lieu of taxes. OPEC is doing great.

When we shrink our industry back down and Canada sends its energy to China, who is back in business? Who is back in the driver's seat? OPEC and the other petro-dependent countries, such as Russia. Russia finances virtually 50 percent or more of their economy on what? Petro dollars. Iran is a petro-dependent state. Do we want to be in the driver's seat or do we want to keep them in the driver's seat? Do we want to repeat history or do we want to take control of our own destiny? That is why this is an important issue.

It is also an important issue because it is about getting this body back to a regular order so we break the gridlock. We are offering amendments. We are saying to Republicans and Democrats: Come down and offer amendments.

We voted on three amendments yesterday. We have six pending amendments right now. We are looking for more. This is about breaking the gridlock and getting the important work of the country done.

It is the difference between the President giving a speech wherein he outlines all of his initiatives—OK, everybody, do it my way—and then spends the second half of the speech talking about how if we do it his way, somehow that is a compromise—that is not the case. That versus a project he has talked about vetoing.

Let's take a look at whether this is a bipartisan project where people have come together.

No. 1, it has been reviewed by the administration for more than 6 years. How long do we have to hold up private enterprise before we let them build the vital energy infrastructure we need—infrastructure that will not only move Canadian crude to our refineries but will move light sweet Balkan crude from my State and from Montana to

other refineries as well. So it is moving domestic crude as well as Canadian crude. If we can't move it on this pipeline, it will be 1,400 railcars a day. How do we move our agriculture products and other goods when we have that kind of congestion on our railroads?

The whole point is that the President talks about coming together on issues that have broad bipartisan support. Let's think about it. We have broad bipartisan support in the House. This bill has already passed the House. We went through cloture in this body with 63 votes. The last time I checked, 63 votes out of 100 is a pretty strong majority. So we have bipartisan majority support in the Congress.

Second, in the polling over the 6 years that this project has been under review and under study, the public has overwhelmingly supported it. They said: Yes, we want to be energy independent in this country. We don't want to get our oil from OPEC. We would rather get it from Canada and produce it here at home, and we need the infrastructure to move it around. So in the polls, 65, 70 percent of the people consistently said: Build it. Build it.

By the way, all six States on the route, including Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, have all approved it. It wasn't as though they had to rush because they had 6 years to do it, but they have all approved it. Is the U.S. Federal Government the only entity that can make a good decision around here? All of these States, their legislatures, their Governors—they don't know what they are doing? The only one who can make a decision about whether this works or not is the administration?

What are we saying to our friends in Canada? They are our largest trading partner in the world. Think about our relationship with Canada. What if the situation were reversed and Canada wanted to work with us on a project of this importance to them and we said: No, go work with China.

When we think about all of these things, it brings home the reality. People can have their opinions on all kinds of issues, but those are the facts as they relate to this project.

So now I just want to take a few minutes and reference a couple of specific things, both on the environmental aspects that have been brought up and then also on whether this oil will be exported or used here at home. Again, this is an open-amendment process. So people can come down and offer amendments on climate change or all those other things. Everybody is entitled to their opinion and to advocate for whatever they want to advocate for. But at the end of the day, we are going to keep bringing them back to the facts on this project. Those facts were laid out in not one but five reports, three draft environmental impact state-

ments and two final impact statements done by the Obama administration's Department of State.

When we come down and people want to use different discussions and talk about their views on climate change and all these other things, they can do that and we can vote on amendments in regard to those things. They can come down and talk about their views on whether oil should or shouldn't be exported and all of those kinds of things. They can offer amendments on them, and that is the process. But at the end of the day, we are going to work to bring them back to the facts. The facts are this is the finding in the Obama administration's environmental impact statements—three draft statements and two final statements done over 5 years. The Keystone XL Pipeline will have no significant environmental impact according to the U.S. Department of State environmental impact statements.

There is one thing I want to add to that. I talked about the fact that if we don't build a pipeline, if we are going to get the oil, it is going to have 1,400 railcars coming in here on a daily basis. The environmental impact statements point out that we get more greenhouse gas without the pipeline than with it because without the pipeline we are either going to move that by railcar or it is going to China. And if it goes to China, it goes in tanker ships, and they produce more greenhouse gas. It is refined in Chinese refineries, and they have higher emissions than our refineries. And we still have to bring our oil in from the Middle East. So now you have more greenhouse emissions from those tankers. The environmental impact statement itself points out that we have more emissions without the pipeline than if we actually build it.

I also want to take a minute to talk about the effort going on in Alberta for carbon capture and sequestration. In other words, one of the things I have always talked about in terms of building the right kind of energy plan for this country is that instead of holding up the investment, we empower the investment. If we empower private investment, we not only produce more energy here at home and with our closest ally in the world, we not only produce more energy, we not only get the infrastructure we need to move it—now understand, I am talking about private investment, just getting the government out of the way and letting the private sector do what they do. If we empower that investment, we not only get the infrastructure we need to move energy around, we not only get the new technologies that develop that energy more cost-effectively and more efficiently, we get better environmental stewardship.

New technologies produce better environmental stewardship. We are seeing that over and over. Take directional drilling in my State of North Dakota. We now drill down 2 miles off one ECO-Pad. We can put as many as 16 wells on one ECO-Pad. We drill down 2 miles, and we go out 3 miles and more in all different directions underground. Whereas before we would have seen wells all over the terrain, now we see one spot where there is a well for miles, and it is producing for miles around.

Think how much you reduced that environmental footprint, right? It is the same with carbon capture sequestration. People talk about clean coal technology. They talk about carbon capture sequestration. There are other fossil fuels such as oil and gas. The only way we are going to get to that is by stimulating private investment and encouraging not only the research and development that creates those technologies but actually getting them to deploy those technologies. That is exactly what is happening right now in the oil sands up in the Province of Alberta.

Since 1990 the greenhouse gas footprint of oil produced in the oil sands has gone down 28 percent. Because of better drilling techniques, because of cogeneration, because of other processes that have been put in place, the greenhouse gas emissions on a per-barrel basis for the oil producing oil sands has gone down by almost a third, 28 percent. Right now major companies are continuing not only to produce more oil in the oil sands but to find ways to reduce the greenhouse gas and do what is called carbon capture and sequestration—carbon capture and storage.

I will just touch on two of those for a minute and then relinquish the floor to the good Senator from Vermont, because there is more that I will pick up on related to this environmental aspect as we debate this legislation, as well as this whole issue of making sure that we get our country to energy security. But let me just touch for a minute on two projects. Exxon is one of the companies that produces oil up in the oil sands region, and they are investing on the order of \$10 billion in that oil development and production. Their Kearl project, which is a huge part of it, will use cogeneration for steam and low-energy extraction processes to recover oil and heat integration between the extraction and the treatment facilities to minimize energy consumption. As a result, oil produced from Kearl will have about the same life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions as many other crude oils refined in the United States as a result of technologies which significantly enhance environmental performance.

Other environmental innovations for Kearl include onsite water storage to eliminate river withdrawals and low-

flow periods and progressive land reclamation which will return the land to the boreal forest.

The plan is this. They are developing these new technologies so the environmental footprint is the same as conventional drilling. That is what they are working to develop. How else are we going to develop this technology to reduce the carbon footprint if we continue to block these investments? That is what we have heard from opponents of the project is: Oh, well, gee, we don't want to have oil from Canada if it has higher greenhouse gas emissions or a higher environmental footprint.

Yet we pointed out that oil produced in California, oil that produced in Venezuela right now has the same level of carbon emissions, and we have huge projects going on up here to actually reduce greenhouse gas emissions and develop that technology that will not only reduce the environmental footprint up here and reduce the greenhouse gas emissions up here but technology that we can use in the United States and around the globe.

That is how we get better environmental stewardship, by developing those technologies that help us do it. And who better to accomplish it, who better than the ingenuity of American companies and Americans—American entrepreneurs. That is how we make it happen. So the reality is—another one is the Quest project that Shell is undertaking. They are working right now with the Provincial government in Alberta on carbon capture and storage. So the Province of Alberta actually has a program where they work with these companies on carbon capture and storage. This is a tremendous opportunity to develop those technologies we hear talked about on this floor so often if we are willing to work with these companies and allow them to make the investments to do it.

My question to opponents or critics to the project is: How in the world are we going to develop these new technologies to improve environmental stewardship if we block the very projects that are trying to do it?

I see the Senator from Vermont is here, and so I want to provide him with his time to introduce his amendment, as well as the Senator from Louisiana. I will stop at this point. We will continue this debate, but I want to end on this very important subject by saying, again, the environmental impact shows we will have higher greenhouse gases without this project versus with it. Again, I understand people can come down and talk about their opinions, but that is what the reports determine—five reports done over 6 years. Furthermore, what I am pointing out is that doesn't even take into account the kind of carbon capture and other projects that are being done in a huge way up here to develop really the technologies that are not only going to

help us in terms of reducing emissions and the environmental impacts of energy production in the oil sands but will help us in the United States and technology that can be adopted in other countries around the globe.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MR. LEAHY. I thank my friend from North Dakota for his usual courtesy shown earlier. Unfortunately, I had a nose bleed, and I had to stop my speech. I think I am not used to the elevation—the altitude of the Senate—but after over 40 years I should be.

I was saying earlier, I had hoped we begin this 114th Congress by showing the American people that Congress is putting the needs of hard-working American families first. I wish we were considering legislation to support the Highway Trust Fund. That supports tens of thousands of jobs around the country in every one of our States. I wish we were considering tax legislation to bring investments to our small local businesses and encouraging energy efficiency in construction and investment. I wish we were finding places to support the educational pursuits of our children. I would like to maintain our status as a premier leader on the world stage.

Instead, we are considering legislation that puts Canadian tar sands—which are intended for export, not to be used in the United States—as our priority. The pipeline will support 35 permanent jobs—just 35—not hundreds, not thousands—35. I would like to be considering legislation that creates thousands of jobs. It is hard not to question whether the new Senate majority is truly focused on the needs of hardworking Americans.

Some who support the legislation claim the pipeline is truly “shovel ready.” They claim the project has been thoroughly studied and analyzed, and that the Administration sat for 6 years with no decision on the permit.

Even before the Nebraska Supreme Court recently released its decision on the location of this pipeline, the Republican leadership said this should be our priority even ahead of that decision. The decision did not clarify lingering questions about the process. In fact, the majority of the justices said the decision to circumvent the public process and block Nebraskans' ability to raise concerns about the pipeline was unconstitutional. Four of the seven justices said that it is unconstitutional under State law. But in their state procedure, you need a supermajority of 5 of the 7 justices to halt this project, so the landowners' appeal was rejected.

What bothers me is not only that the majority opinion is being ignored in Nebraska but that the legislation approved last week by the House in consideration here would remove consideration of all appeals. You have to take

them out of local Federal courts and put them before the DC Circuit. In other words, if you are in a State where this pipeline goes through your community and you have a question, you would have to make an appeal to the DC Circuit. What that is saying is that Congress believes that Washington knows best. Frankly, the people in my State of Vermont—and I suspect in States across the country—would prefer to trust the courts in their States.

We ought to be showing the American people that Congress cares more about the public process and the public's access to their courts, than about the wishes of foreign special interests. That is why I have offered an amendment that would strike the judicial review provision and restore the role of local federal district courts in reviewing challenges arising from the Keystone Pipeline.

The majority leader promised an open debate and open amendment process. I appreciate that. I certainly have concerns about circumventing what would be normal court procedure and the President's approval process, and I want to be able to address that. But more than that, I hope this debate can be an open and honest conversation, not about a pipeline that supports special interests but about the direction in which our country is moving on sustainable energy, on job creation, and on issues as fundamental to all Americans—Republicans or Democrats—as who will have access to our courts. Will it just be special interests or will it be the American people? I prefer the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I have an amendment on this important bill at the desk, amendment No. 80. I am not going to offer that amendment now because the minority side is blocking the offering and calling up of additional amendments until we dispose of those presently called up. I want to do that right now. But hopefully, I will be doing that in the very near future. I look forward to a full debate and a vote on this amendment, probably in the next tranche of amendments on the bill.

My amendment is about energy. It is about a very crucial part of the domestic policy, something I believe will absolutely be a huge positive incentive and factor to allow us to produce even more American energy, to become even more energy independent, and to provide an even greater boost to our economy; that is, through revenue sharing, sharing the revenue produced by domestic energy production with the producing States.

That is fair for two reasons: one, because those producing States do bear costs and burdens and impacts, includ-

ing environmental impacts, and, two, providing that incentive is the most important way we can boost even further important domestic energy production. That energy production is vital for our country and our economy. In fact, we are not in recession right now because of those U.S. energy jobs.

If it were not for those oil and gas and related jobs in America, we would still be in a technical recession right now. Last night President Obama talked glowingly of the state of our economy. I think he exaggerated that significantly. However, we would be in a technical recession and we would be in a far different and worse place were it not for those domestic oil and gas and energy jobs. That is what this amendment would boost and would improve even further.

Again, the heart of this amendment is revenue sharing, establishing and expanding revenue sharing for producing States. So rather than all the royalty and revenue produced by this domestic production just going to the Federal Treasury, we need to share that. A lot will go to the Federal Treasury. Most will go to the Federal Treasury. But we need to give producing States a fair share.

Again, as I stated, that is for two reasons—two very important, very basic reasons. First of all, those States bear a burden. They have impacts from that production, including environmental impacts. They need funds to deal with those impacts. It is manageable and it is worth doing, but there are impacts.

Secondly, and maybe even more importantly, providing that revenue sharing for producing States—host States—is the most important way that we will get more producing States, that we will get more host States, that we will have more American energy. So that is what this is all about.

My amendment, again, will be amendment No. 80. I look forward to a vote on the Senate floor soon. It is simple and straightforward. It does several important things. First, it would expedite Outer Continental Shelf lease sales and move forward with a positive OCS lease plan. By expediting leasing and opening up more areas to production, we can create jobs and further enhance and build our manufacturing renaissance and our American energy revolution.

In recognizing concerns for production in the North Atlantic Planning Area as well as the North Aleutian Planning Area in Alaska, this proposal excludes lease sales in those particular regions. Secondly, the bill would increase revenue sharing for Gulf States, and it would establish revenue sharing for brand new production in other areas, such as Alaska and the east coast.

Again, revenue sharing is fair, and it is the most powerful, positive thing we can do to get more States into the act

in a positive way of producing American energy, helping our economy, and helping our energy independence. So that would provide revenue sharing for the first time for the Atlantic States of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. It would provide that revenue sharing for the first time for new production we would be authorizing for Alaska—a clear net gain for North Carolina, Virginia, South Carolina, and Alaska.

This is critical. I know my colleagues from those States are all very supportive of that offshore energy activity. So again, for Alaska, for the first time, Alaska would enjoy revenue sharing with the potential for significant dollars from offshore production going to Alaska. Now, one might ask: What about the Federal revenue impact? What about the fiscal impact? This amendment is fully offset in terms of the Federal Treasury. It is fully offset with revenue from two sources: No. 1, expedited and increased lease sales in our OCS that will produce more Federal revenue, and No. 2, trimming our Federal workforce by attrition, a policy laid out by the Simpson-Bowles Commission—bipartisan, straightforward, and exactly what we need to do in a fiscally responsible way.

Now, on that piece, the legislation would not fire anyone. It would simply reduce the Federal workforce through attrition. For every three Federal workers who retire, only one could be hired. That is exactly what Simpson-Bowles proposed. Two exemptions exist to this rule that could be used by the President in a state of war or extraordinary emergency—again, exactly the Simpson-Bowles proposal.

This amendment is very important in the area of energy and to be fair to producing States and to be a powerful incentive—the single most powerful incentive possible to get more producing States, more American production into the act. That is vital for our energy independence. It is also vital for our economy. This amendment, No. 80, would be a big, positive boost over time for our economy.

As I said, right now we would be in a recession still were it not for those American energy jobs. That energy renaissance has led the way in our economy. But for those jobs, we would still be in a recession. This can make a good thing better. This can provide more incentives to go further in a powerful, responsible way. It will also be a responsible way on the environment.

Let me note that in Louisiana, you know what we do with our revenue sharing? We spend all of it on environmental concerns, mostly coastal restoration. We are losing our coastline. We are losing a football field of Louisiana coastal area every 38 minutes—every 38 minutes, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. That is the biggest environmental issue we have by

far. That is what this money goes to in Louisiana—proper environmental stewardship.

So with that, I urge bipartisan support of this important amendment. I look forward to formally calling it up soon, after we vote on the pending amendments early this afternoon. I look forward to a vote on this on the Senate floor—hopefully, a strong bipartisan vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 58

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, yesterday I offered an amendment to the Keystone XL bill which is really straightforward and will not affect the underlying legislation. I do think it has the potential to get strong bipartisan support. That is because my amendment states a simple set of facts—that climate change is real and humans are contributing to it.

This is an opportunity for people on either side of the Keystone debate to agree on something; that is, the facts. It will inform, I think, what happens next in energy policy. As intense as this debate over this pipeline is, the real question in front of us, after we dispose of this legislation and it goes to the President's desk for a certain veto, is that then we have to contend with our national energy policy.

We need to agree on the set of facts that everyone outside of this Congress agrees on. These claims require evidence, and my amendment provides those pieces of evidence. It cites the final supplemental environmental impact statement prepared for the Keystone Pipeline by the State Department, which says that "human activities . . . have added to the greenhouse gas accumulation and exacerbated the greenhouse . . . effect, resulting in greater amounts of heat being trapped in the atmosphere."

Now, this is not controversial. It also states: "These climate change shifts can . . . affect other processes and spark changes that cascade through natural systems to affect ecosystems, societies, and human health." Only in the halls of Congress is this a controversial piece of legislation.

This impact statement, in turn, cites the work of thousands of scientists who have contributed to reports by the IPCC, the National Research Council, and the U.S. Global Change Research Program. These independent fact-finding bodies have conducted decades of research on questions related to climate change. They have been subject to intense scrutiny both internally and externally. Their work has held up to repeated concerns about impartiality and accuracy.

This scrutiny helps. It has forced these organizations to improve their methodology and be increasingly deliberate as they develop their findings and

present the facts and only the facts. Human-caused climate change is accepted by Fortune 500 companies, school teachers, religious groups, and the U.S. Department of Defense. It is accepted by nurses and doctors, professional sports leagues, the majority of other countries, more than 97 percent of scientists, and many of my colleagues in the House and Senate.

For most people, climate change existing is not a controversial issue. Certainly, the Keystone Pipeline is a controversial issue. Once we together set the premise of climate change facts, there is plenty to argue about. What approach ought we take with respect to solving this problem? Is a carbon tax the right approach? Is the President's clean powerplant the right approach? Ought we to wait for or accelerate our actions with respect to international coalitions and agreements?

Those are legitimate debates to have. But we have to agree on the facts. That is why a vote on my amendment is so important. The Senate has before it a bill to approve a pipeline and an environmental impact statement touted by Keystone supporters as a comprehensive, accurate document that impartially assesses the environmental impacts of the pipeline. Within that impact statement is a comprehensive review and an acknowledgment of the reality of the facts of climate change.

Many of my colleagues who support Keystone might be the same ones who question the reality of climate change, but I want to try to create a political space where one can be for Keystone XL and still want action on the climate. Now, I think Keystone XL is the wrong direction to move in. I think it is absolutely doubling down on fossil fuel energy and the tar sands oil. So I will be voting against Keystone.

But I understand there are people of good faith and plenty of knowledge who are going to be supporting the pipeline. What we need to do after this legislation is disposed of—and it will be relatively quickly—is agree on a set of facts and move forward with intelligent, bipartisan climate policy.

Last week, we learned that 2014 was the hottest year on record according to two separate studies by our Nation's brightest scientists at NASA and NOAA. That means that the 10 hottest years on record have all occurred since the year 2000. A warmer planet means big changes in weather patterns, rising sea levels, and increases in extreme weather events.

Sea level has been rising more than twice as fast since 1990 as it did over the previous century, nearly doubling the likelihood of storm surges such as the one we experienced during Hurricane Sandy. Over the years, the issue of climate change has, unfortunately, become a partisan issue. It did not used to be that way. It does not need to be that way going forward.

We may not agree on the solutions, on the path forward or even on some of the details, but I do believe it is time for us to begin to agree on a basic set of facts. The purpose of my amendment is to take a step back, to take a deep breath on a very contentious issue, and to give the Senate an opportunity to come together and state with no value judgment that we accept the work of thousands of the world's brightest and most dedicated scientists, including those working at U.S. agencies and for U.S. companies; that we accept the reality our farmers, our fisherman, and our families see with the every passing season.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is an opportunity to restate a set of facts with which a majority of Americans already agree. It makes no presumptions about where we go from here.

I am hopeful that we will have a big bipartisan vote this afternoon on this amendment. I think there is an opportunity for common ground.

Obviously, Keystone XL is dividing not just this Congress but the Democratic conference, so I understand that. But agreeing on the set of facts related to climate change is a good predicate for all of us moving forward.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I rise today to speak on behalf of my amendment to the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline bill. I thank Senators BENNET, CARPER, LEAHY, MENENDEZ, WARREN, and WHITEHOUSE for cosponsoring this amendment.

My amendment is extremely simple. It is about 1½ pages, and I think it is easily understood by anyone who reads it. It says:

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that—

- (1) climate change is real;
- (2) climate change is caused by human activities;
- (3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;
- (4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and
- (5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is it. That is the entire amendment.

What this amendment does is simply ask the Members of the Senate whether they agree with the overwhelming majority of scientists who have told us

over and over and over again that climate change is real, that climate change is caused by human activity, including the emission of carbon, that climate change is already causing devastating problems in the United States and around the world, and that if we are going to leave our children and our grandchildren a planet that is habitable, we must transform our energy system away from fossil fuels.

Progressives, conservatives, and people in between have many disagreements on issues—and that is called democracy. There is nothing to be ashamed about that; that is the democratic process. We all have differences of opinion. But what is not a good thing is when we make public policy in contradiction to what the scientific community tells us. That is not a good thing.

When we look at medical issues such as cancer or heart disease, what we do is look at the scientific communities and medical doctors for their opinions as to how we should proceed.

When we look at infrastructure issues, the issues of roads and bridges, we look at engineers for their opinion as to how we should proceed.

When we look at education and try to understand how best kids can best learn, we look at educators and those people who know most about education for advice as to how we should proceed.

In terms of the issue of climate change, the process should not be any different. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC, is the leading scientific body that deals with the issue of climate change. I will very briefly quote what the IPCC said last fall:

Warming of the climate system is unequivocal as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice and rising global average sea level.

More than 97 percent of the scientific community in the United States and across the globe agrees with these findings, including the American Chemical Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Meteorological Society, and the American Geophysical Union, to name just a few.

In fact, at least 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations and national academies of science, and 21 medical associations, all agree that climate change is real and is significantly caused by human activities.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations and national academies, and 21 medical associations which all have gone on record as stating that climate change is real and is significantly caused by human activity.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Virtually every major scientific organization in this country and throughout the world have said that climate change is real, climate change is caused by carbon emissions and human activity, and that climate change is already causing devastating problems in the United States of America and around the world.

This list includes at least: 37 American scientific organizations, 135 international scientific organizations, 21 medical associations, 4 religious organizations.

37 AMERICAN SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS

American Anthropological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Association of Geographers, American Association of State Climatologists, American Astronomical Society, American Chemical Society, American Fisheries Society, American Geophysical Union, American Institute of Biological Sciences, American Institute of Physics, American Meteorological Society, American Physical Society, American Quaternary Association, American Society for Microbiology, American Society of Agronomy, American Society of Plant Biologists, American Statistical Association, Association of American Geographers, Association of Ecosystem Research Centers, Botanical Society of America.

California Academy of Sciences, Crop Science Society of America, Ecological Society of America, National Academy of Engineering, National Academy of Sciences (USA), National Association of State Foresters, New York Academy of Sciences, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Society of American Foresters, Society of Systematic Biologists, Soil Science Society of America, The Geological Society of America, The Wildlife Society, United States National Research Council, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

135 INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC ASSOCIATIONS

Academia Brasileira de Ciências (Brazil), Academia Chilena de Ciencias (Chile), Academia das Ciências de Lisboa (Portugal), Academia de Ciencias de la República Dominicana, Academia de Ciencias Físicas, Matemáticas y Naturales de Venezuela, Academia de Ciencias Médicas, Físicas y Naturales de Guatemala, Academia Mexicana de Ciencias, Academia Nacional de Ciencias de Bolivia, Academia Nacional de Ciencias del Perú, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, China, Académie des Sciences et Techniques du Sénégal, Académie des Sciences (France), Academy of Athens, Academy of Science for South Africa, Academy of Science of Mozambique, Academy of Sciences Malaysia, Academy of Sciences of Moldova.

Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Academy of Sciences of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Academy of Scientific Research and Technology, Egypt, Accademia dei Lincei (Italy), Africa Centre for Climate and Earth Systems Science, African Academy of Sciences, Albanian Academy of Sciences, Amazon Environmental Research Institute, Australian Academy of Science (Australia), Australian Coral Reef Society, Australian Institute of Marine Science, Australian Institute of Physics, Australian Marine Sciences Association, Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society, Bangladesh Academy of Sciences, Botanical Society of America, British Antarctic Survey,

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Cameroon Academy of Sciences, Canadian Association of Physicists, Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences, Canadian Geophysical Union, Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society.

Canadian Society of Soil Science, Canadian Society of Zoologists, Caribbean Academy of Sciences, Center for International Forestry Research, Chinese Academy of the Sciences, Colombian Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (Australia), Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cuban Academy of Sciences, Delegation of the Finnish Academies of Science and Letters, Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina (Germany), Ecological Society of Australia, European Academy of Sciences and Arts, European Federation of Geologists, European Geosciences Union, European Physical Society, European Science Foundation, Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Societies.

Geological Society of Australia, Geological Society of London, Georgian Academy of Sciences, Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, Indian National Science Academy, Indonesian Academy of the Sciences, Institute of Biology (UK), Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Institute of Marine Engineering, Science and Technology, Institution of Mechanical Engineers, UK, InterAcademy Council, International Alliance of Research Universities, International Arctic Science Committee, International Association for Great Lakes Research, International Council for Science, International Council of Academies of Engineering and Technological Sciences, International Research Institute for Climate and Society, International Union for Quaternary Research, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, Islamic World Academy of Sciences, Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Kenya National Academy of Sciences, Korean Academy of Science and Technology, Kosovo Academy of Sciences and Arts, Latin American Academy of Sciences, Latvian Academy of Sciences, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Madagascar National Academy of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, Mauritius Academy of Science and Technology, Montenegro Academy of Sciences and Arts, National Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences, Argentina, National Academy of Sciences of Armenia, National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic, National Academy of Sciences, Sri Lanka, National Council of Engineers Australia, National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research, New Zealand, Natural Environment Research Council, UK, Nicaraguan Academy of Sciences, Nigerian Academy of Science, Norwegian Academy of Sciences and Letters, Organization of Biological Field Stations.

Pakistan Academy of Sciences, Palestine Academy for Science and Technology, Polish Academy of the Sciences, Romanian Academy, Royal Academies for Science and the Arts of Belgium (Belgium), Royal Academy of Exact, Physical and Natural Sciences of Spain, Royal Astronomical Society, UK, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Royal Irish Academy, Royal Meteorological Society, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Royal Scientific Society of Jordan, Royal Society of Canada, Royal Society of Chemistry, UK, Royal Society of New Zealand, Royal Society, UK,

Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Russian Academy of Sciences, Science Council of Japan.

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Society of Biology, UK, Society of Systematic Biologists, Sudanese National Academy of Science, Tanzania Academy of Sciences, The Geological Society (UK), The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS) for the developing world, Turkish Academy of Sciences, Uganda National Academy of Sciences, Union der Deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften, World Meteorological Association, Zambia Academy of Sciences, Zimbabwe Academy of Sciences, Sudan National Academy of Sciences.

21 MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Lung Association, American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Thoracic Society, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Australian Medical Association, Children's Environmental Health Network, Health Care without Harm, Hepatitis Foundation International, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Association of Local Boards of Health, National Environmental Health Association, Partnership for Prevention, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Trust for America's Health, World Federation of Public Health Associations, World Health Organization.

4 RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Interfaith Power and Light, National Association of Evangelicals, Presbyterian Mission Agency, The Pope.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for Wildlife Veterinarians, American Society of Civil Engineers, International Association for Great Lakes Research, Institute of Professional Engineers New Zealand, Natural Science Collections Alliance, Organization of Biological Field Stations, The Institution of Engineers Australia, The World Federation of Engineering Organizations, World Forestry Congress.

Mr. SANDERS. I know that recently a number of my colleagues have made the point that they are not scientists and they cannot formulate an opinion on this subject. Well, let me be clear: I am not a scientist. I had a lot of problems with physics when I was in college. I am not a scientist.

But these are scientists. These are 37 American scientific organizations and 135 international scientific organizations. These are scientists who tell us that climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and that it is imperative we transform our energy system away from fossil fuel.

I will read an excerpt from a letter sent to the Senate in 2009 signed by virtually every major scientific organization in this country:

Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary

assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer reviewed science. Moreover, there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change will have broad impacts on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increase risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and a disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

Once again, I am not a scientist, but that is what the scientific community overwhelmingly in the United States and around the world is saying. It is imperative the Senate goes on record in saying we agree with science.

Climate change is one of the great threats facing our country and the entire planet. It has the capability of causing severe harm to our economy, to our food supply, to access to water, and to national security.

According to NASA and NOAA, 2014 was the warmest year ever recorded. The most recent decade was the Nation's warmest on record. Across the globe, the 10 warmest years on record have all occurred since 1997. We know that the Earth's climate is warming and doing so quickly.

According to NOAA, October, August, June, and May were the hottest October, August, June, and May months ever recorded.

The consequences of this rapid and dramatic rise in global temperatures will have a profound impact on billions of people throughout the world. What we can expect are more severe weather disturbances, more flooding, more heat waves, more droughts, more forest fires, and saltwater inundation of water supplies and agricultural land.

As the New York Times reported in August, droughts in the Western and Southwestern United States appear to be intensifying as a result of climate change:

Over the past decade, droughts in some regions have rivaled the epic dry spells of the 1930s and 1950s . . . The country is in the midst of one of its most sustained periods of increasing drought on record.

China's heat wave 1½ years ago was the worst in at least 140 years. As ClimateWire reported in November, the Sao Paulo region in Brazil is suffering from its worst drought in 80 years. In the United States, fire suppression costs have increased from roughly \$1 billion annually in the mid-1990s to an average of more than \$3 billion in the past 5 years.

Our oceans are not only getting warmer, they are also becoming more acidic, threatening fish, coral reefs, and other sea life. As a study published in the journal Science reported, carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere are driving a rate of change in ocean acidity that is already thought to be faster than any time in the past 50 mil-

lion years. The authors warned that we may be "entering an unknown territory of marine ecosystem change."

Extreme storms, weather disturbances, are also becoming more common and more intense with extraordinary impacts. When Typhoon Haiyan struck the Philippines over 1 year ago, it displaced more than 4.1 million people, killed thousands, and cost that country at least \$15 million in damages.

The situation clearly is bad today in the United States and around the world, but—according to the scientific community—if we do not get our act together, if we do not cut carbon emissions, it will only get worse in years to come.

The IPCC estimates—and I hope people listen to this—that without any additional efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions—in other words, if we continue to go along our merry old way of dependency on fossil fuels—"warming is more likely than not" to exceed 4 degrees Celsius, which is 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit, by the end of the century.

Let me repeat that extraordinary observation. If we continue along our present course, "warming is more likely than not" to exceed 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century.

Similarly, just last year the White House released the National Climate Assessment warning that global warming could exceed 10 degrees Fahrenheit in the United States by the end of this century. Take a deep breath and imagine what it will mean to this country—the huge impact on every aspect of our life, on our economy, on agriculture, on health—if the temperature of the United States rises, as some are predicting, by 10 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century. It is almost unthinkable. Yet that is what the scientific community is telling us.

The World Bank is by no means a radical institution. It is a very conservative institution. It tells us that temperature increases by even just 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit would bring about unprecedented heat waves, severe drought, and major floods in many regions, with serious impacts on human systems, ecosystems, and associated services.

The IPCC reports that sea levels are likely to rise by another 10 to 32 inches by the end of this century. As the New York Times reported, a sea level rise of less than 4 feet—less than 4 feet—would inundate land on which some 3.7 million Americans live today. We are talking about Miami, New Orleans, New York City, and Boston all being highly vulnerable to rising sea levels. Similarly, of course, this problem will impact people all over the world.

According to the IPCC:

Many small island nations are only a few meters above present sea level. These states may face serious threat of permanent inundation from sea-level rise. Among the most vulnerable of these island states are the Marshall Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Tonga, the

Federated States of Micronesia, and the Cook Islands.

The Army Corps of Engineers has predicted that the entire village of Newtok, AK, could be underwater by 2017 and that more than 180 additional Native Alaskan villages are at risk. Parts of Alaska—one of our great and beautiful States—are already vanishing as a result of climate change.

The evidence is overwhelming, and it is no longer good enough for people to say: I am not a scientist; I don't know. We may not be scientists, but we can read and we can listen to what the overwhelming majority of scientists are telling us. That is our job—to listen to the experts who know something about this issue.

As we debate the Keystone Pipeline, what disturbs me very much is that in the face of this overwhelming evidence from the scientific community, in the face of deep concerns about climate change all over the world, what is the Senate going to be doing in the next week or two as part of the Keystone Pipeline? Are we going to be voting to impose a tax on carbon so we can break our dependence on fossil fuel? Is that what we are going to be voting on? No, I don't think so. Are we going to be voting to pass legislation that moves us aggressively toward energy efficiency and weatherization and such sustainable energies as wind, solar, and geothermal? Is that what we are going to be voting on as we listen to the scientific community? No, I don't think so. Are we going to be passing a bill investing in research and development so that we can make our transportation system more energy efficient? Is that what we are going to be voting on? No, we are not. In fact, what we are going to be voting on is a bill that will allow for an increase in the production and transportation of some of the dirtiest oil on this planet. That is what we are going to be voting on. What we are voting on is a proposal that moves us in exactly the opposite direction from what the scientific community wants us to do.

Let me conclude by saying this: Honest people can and do have disagreements on many issues, but it is not a good thing for the United States to reject what the scientists and the experts are telling us. That is not a good thing. So I hope very much that on the amendment I have brought forth—which says nothing more than to listen to the scientists on this important issue; do not reject science—that we can get widespread bipartisan support for the amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 33

Mr. LEE. Madam President, excessive litigation under the Endangered Species Act has become an obstacle to the act itself and the good it promises to do for the American people.

According to the Department of Justice, more than 500 Endangered Species Act-related lawsuits have been filed or opened against the Federal Government since 2009. As a result, Federal agencies have to spend their time, their energy, and taxpayer-funded resources fighting lawsuits instead of protecting endangered species.

One of the primary reasons for this excessive litigation is the potential for massive awards of attorney's fees under section 11(g)(4) of the Endangered Species Act. These awards can be granted regardless of whether the parties seeking the attorney's fee award prevails, and there is no limit on the hourly fee that can be collected. These attorney's fees can reach upward of \$700 per hour. In one case involving a series of lawsuits related to the operation of hydroelectric power facilities in the Northwestern United States, attorney's fees were awarded in an amount totaling nearly \$2 million—in one case lasting just a few years. Such lofty levels of compensation would be high even in a private law firm setting, even in a big city, but they are completely indefensible when one considers they are paid for by American taxpayers, often to well-funded activist organizations.

Excessive awards of attorney's fees also create perverse incentives for cottage industries of lawyers to sue the Federal Government in order to advance specific policies—policies that cannot be achieved through the legislative process and are therefore sought out by these very same lawyers in the courts. This is what many call a sue-and-settle strategy: Sue the Federal Government and then settle with the Federal Government. Achieve what you want to achieve and then get paid by the court without limit. Sue-and-settle is the dishonest, distorted practice of suing the Federal Government not to achieve a judicial outcome in court but to resolve the suit in a settlement with terms that advance narrow political ends, narrow political goals. The recent decision by the Fish and Wildlife Service to grant Gunnison sage-grouse protected status under the Endangered Species Act is the result of this precise sue-and-settle strategy.

Congress must put an end to policy-making by litigation, and it must do so by removing the incentives to engage in this kind of litigation. My amendment would do just that by bringing a citizen's suit provision of the Endangered Species Act into harmony with a similar provision of the Equal Access to Justice Act. The Equal Access to Justice Act limits awards for attorney's fees to \$125 per hour and allows those awards to be granted only to prevailing parties. Any departure from this limit has to be approved by the judge based on some unique circumstance in that case. If such terms are acceptable for nearly every other

type of lawsuit against the Federal Government, certainly they should be acceptable as applied to the Endangered Species Act. This simple fix would deter the frivolous lawsuits that so often end up in closed-door settlements with Federal agencies.

There is a lot of work to do to reform the implementation of the Endangered Species Act. This amendment is just one of many reforms I am developing with my colleagues in the Senate and our counterparts in the House of Representatives.

I ask for support on this amendment. Again, this is something that just brings into harmony section 11(g)(4) of the Endangered Species Act with requirements that are already in existence, already on the books in connection with the Equal Access to Justice Act. We need those same limitations in this Endangered Species Act that already exist in the Equal Access to Justice Act. I ask all my colleagues to support this amendment and to help us resolve this problem that has crept into Federal law based on an inequity and imbalance in these two statutory regimes.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Before I begin my comments, let me commend the Presiding Officer on her excellent presentation last night. The Presiding Officer did an extraordinary job and made all of us very proud.

FORTY HOURS IS FULL TIME ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, 2 weeks ago Senator JOE DONNELLY and I reintroduced bipartisan legislation that we call the Forty Hours is Full Time Act. It would correct a serious flaw in the Affordable Care Act that threatens the hours and pay of part-time workers all across America. Our bill would change the definition of "full-time" work under ObamaCare from 30 hours a week to the standard 40 hours a week, a commonsense threshold that has always been the standard for full-time work. In fact, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, it is 40 hours a week that defines "full time," after which workers are eligible in many cases for overtime.

Information I received from the Home Care & Hospice Alliance of Maine demonstrates that this illogical

definition of “full-time” work could result in hundreds of home health care workers losing their jobs and 1,000 seniors losing access to home care services in the State of Maine alone.

The impact would be just as severe outside of Maine, a point driven home by a letter I recently received from the National Association for Home Care & Hospice, an organization that represents caregivers who provide in-home health and hospice services to chronically ill, disabled, and dying Americans. The association just conducted a survey of its members that reveals the devastating impact this definition will have on home care and hospice services around the country if Congress does not act to change it. Let me share with my colleagues just a few of the key findings of this survey.

Nationally, four out of five home care and hospice providers are unable to provide health benefits to their employees because they rely on government programs such as Medicaid, with its low reimbursement levels, and because they provide services to people with limited incomes.

So it is not as if they can simply boost their rates. In many cases their rates are set by Medicaid and at a very low level. In other cases they are serving people with limited incomes who simply cannot afford more expensive home care.

Another finding: Three out of four providers will have to cut the hours of their caregivers. That means those caregivers who are engaged in such compassionate and skilled work will have smaller paychecks on which to live.

Nine out of ten providers expect patients to lose access to home care in their communities.

One in five providers of home care and hospice services will actually have to close their doors. Think of the impact closing one in five home care and hospice agencies would have on America's seniors and our disabled citizens. In my view, taking action to spare this vulnerable population would, by itself, justify restoring the threshold for full-time work to the standard 40 hours a week.

But this is not the only reason to do so. Reforming the law would also help protect the caregivers who provide the services as well as their patients, and ironically it would protect taxpayers as well. Data from Maine's Medicaid Program shows that home care services are extremely cost-effective compared to alternatives. If access to these services is restricted because of the application of the 30-hour rule, those in need of these services will be forced into costlier forms of care paid for by Medicaid and Medicare, such as hospitals and nursing homes, driving up both Federal and State costs. In addition, the patients now served by home health care providers would no longer

be able to receive vital care in the comfort, privacy, and security of their own homes.

So whether we look at it from the perspective of the patients served or the caregivers employed or the taxpayers who pay for the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, this hurts all three groups. Of course, there is obviously a lot of overlap among those groups.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, an excellent letter from the National Association for Home Care & Hospice which elaborates on the problems created by this definition under ObamaCare.

Of course, the justification for using the standard definition of full-time work extends far beyond the field of home care services to the full breadth of our economy. Raising the threshold for full-time work to 40 hours a week is necessary not only to protect the paychecks of workers employed by private sector businesses, such as restaurants and hotel staff, but also to protect those who work in the public sector, such as substitute teachers, ed techs, and schoolbus drivers, to name just a few.

The 30-hour rule will not only harm school staff who want and need more work, but it will also hurt our students by causing unnecessary disruption in the classroom. It does not make sense to have to limit substitute teachers to 29 hours a week because of the definition of “full-time” work under ObamaCare. That means there will be a revolving door of substitutes in our classrooms and lower paychecks once again for those substitute teachers.

I have also heard of a school district that has been forced to cut field trips and transportation to athletic events and employees who used to work more than 30 hours total in two jobs who have been forced to give up one of their jobs, thus hurting their financial security.

Several Maine municipalities have described to me the impact on their workers, particularly volunteer and oncall firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and employees of the parks and recreation and public works departments.

Although the IRS adopted regulations last year in an attempt to exclude volunteer firefighters from the calculation of the employer mandate, these regulations do not give our towns and cities the level of protection provided by the Forty Hours is Full Time Act.

In most Maine communities, the fire department is staffed by volunteers and oncall firefighters who typically have health care coverage through their regular day jobs. In fact, in Maine, oncall firefighters for our smaller communities often serve as full-time firefighters—receiving full health care benefits—in a neighboring

community. They help the smaller towns by serving as on-call firefighters. Unfortunately, under ObamaCare it doesn't matter that these on-call firefighters already have health care coverage; the towns that employ them for more than 30 hours a week may still face the \$2,000 penalty per on-call firefighter for doing so. This makes no sense whatsoever.

For example, one town in southern Maine has told me that the 30-hour rule will require it to offer health care coverage to more than a dozen volunteer and on-call firefighters who do not qualify for coverage from the town today. The cost of doing so will drive up that town's health care budget by 20 percent at a time when its budget is already stretched to the breaking point.

Another Maine community has employees who work part time but year-round performing various tasks, including plowing and salting the roads in the winter. These employees typically work 30 to 34 hours a week, and they do not qualify for health benefits under the town's plan. Since the town cannot afford to add them to its health care plan, it simply will have no choice but to cut their hours back to 29 hours a week. The town doesn't want to do that. The workers don't want to have their hours cut. As anyone who has lived in Maine or any Northern State can tell you, snowstorms do not keep to a schedule. Mother Nature seems not to have heard about the 30-hour workweek under ObamaCare. So it will be a challenge for this town to keep its roads safe, clear, and passable in the winter while making sure its part-time employees don't exceed 29 hours a week. So, once again, what is the result? Reduced hours, a smaller paycheck for part-time workers, and more costs for the town and more disruption in the services it provides.

Winters are long in Maine and summers are short. Towns have to manage their workers' schedules to match the season, but the 30-hour rule will make it very difficult for them to do so.

For example, one town in central Maine told me that a number of its employees work full time in its parks and recreations department in the summer, and then they work part time in the winter. Because of the 30-hour rule, however, this town won't be able to stagger the schedules of these employees in the winter the way it used to and will have to lay them off instead and then, adding insult to injury, pay them unemployment during the layoff period. So here we have a case where the law is actually going to force the town to lay off part-time employees who want to work. This makes no sense.

Part-time workers who are hired to help with snow removal are often shifted to other departments in the spring and summer months to assist full-time employees or to take their place when they are on vacation. But the 30-hour

rule once again takes away the flexibility towns need to do this.

For example, one town in northern Maine has told me that the part-time workers it has relied upon to help cover vacation time for its firefighters in the summer months will have to be cut back to 29 hours a week because the town cannot afford to pay the \$2,000 penalty it will face for each employee if they work their usual hours. Raising the threshold for full-time work to 40 hours a week would restore the flexibility this town needs to manage its workforce, give these part-time workers more hours and the bigger paychecks they need, and help full-time firefighters get a break after a long, tough winter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 1 more minute.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Today I have described just some of the damage the 30-hour rule is doing to municipal employees, to providers of home health care and hospice services, and to those who work in our school systems. Nationwide, 100 school systems have had to scale back the hours of their workers already. Employees in all industries—for-profit and non-profit, private sector and public sector—are similarly affected.

Regardless of the varying views of Senators in this Chamber on the Affordable Care Act, surely we ought to be able to agree to fix this problem in the law that is hurting workers' paychecks and creating chaos for employers. Senator DONNELLY has introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator JOE MANCHIN and Senator LISA MURKOWSKI that would do just that. It is the Forty Hours is Full Time Act, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting it.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
FOR HOME CARE & HOSPICE,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2014.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOE DONNELLY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND DONNELLY: I am writing to offer our support for the "Forty Hours is Full Time Act." The National Association for Home Care & Hospice (NAHC) is the leading association representing the interests of the home care and hospice community since 1982.

Currently the provision in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) that imposes penalties on employers with more than 50 full-time equivalent employees for not providing health insurance for their "full time" workers defines

an employee working just 30 hours a week as full time. This definition of full time is entirely out-of-keeping with standard employment practices and could cause irreparable harm to many home care agencies and the patients they serve.

The great majority of the estimated 25,000 home care agencies are small businesses under the standards of the Small Business Administration, but most are considered "large employers" subject to the employer mandate under the ACA because of the number of workers they employ. All told, there are over 2 million persons employed in home care. These home care agencies are innovative job creators that provide much needed compassionate, high quality care to elderly and disabled individuals in their homes and communities.

The majority of personal care home care workers do not receive employee health insurance because home care agencies have three problems that are fairly unique: reliance on government programs such as Medicaid where payment rates as low as \$11 an hour won't cover the increased costs of providing health insurance; consumers of private pay home care who are often elderly and disabled with fixed, low incomes; and a home care workforce with widely varying work hours primarily to accommodate the needs of their infirm clientele.

Home care agencies that are unable to provide health insurance or absorb the ACA penalties will have to restrict their employees to no more than 29 hours per week to ensure their workers are considered part-time under the ACA. A survey that NAHC concluded in December 2014 showed that the employer mandate would weaken patient access to care, reduce wages and working hours of home care staff, and require home care companies to restructure their operations to rely on part-time caregivers. Home care companies that primarily provide Medicaid services and those that service private pay personal care clients were most susceptible to these adverse outcomes as Medicaid funding is already stretched and seniors on limited incomes are unable to spend more on home care.

Our survey showed:

1. 82.54% of home care and hospice companies do not provide health insurance to all of their employees because of reliance on government program payments and service to individuals with limited incomes
2. 46.2% of those companies face a financial penalty under the employer mandate ranging as high as \$4.5 million
3. 73.3% of the companies would reduce the working hours of employees to under 30 per week in order to avoid the cost of health insurance or financial penalties that they cannot afford
4. 22.16% of the businesses expect to close because of the financial penalties
5. 83.2% of the companies expect that access to home care in their community would be reduced with fewer providers of care, more restrictive patient admission criteria to fit a part-time workforce, and restrictions on service areas.
6. 88.46% expect that access to Medicaid home care will no longer be sufficient to meet client's needs.

Home care agencies are an essential part of the network of services that our growing population of elderly and persons with disabilities rely on. The last thing we need is an obstacle to helping them grow and create much needed jobs. Simple common sense solutions are often the best answers to complex problems. As far as most people are con-

cerned 40 hours a week equates with full time employment.

Thank you for offering this important legislation.

Sincerely,
VAL J. HALAMANDARIS,
President, National Association
for Home Care & Hospice.

DECEMBER 19, 2014.

Hon. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of AASA: The School Superintendents Association, the Association of Educational Service Agencies, the National Rural Education Association and the National Rural Education Advocacy Coalition, I write to express our support for the Forty Hours is Full Time Act. Collectively, we represent public school superintendents, educational service agency administrators and school system leaders across the country, as well as our nation's rural schools and communities. We have followed closely the Affordable Care Act and stand ready to implement the law, and see your proposed legislation as one way to alleviate an unnecessarily burdensome regulation.

The Forty Hours is Full Time Act would change the definition of 'full time' in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to 40 hours per week and the number of hours counted toward a 'full time equivalent' employee to 174 hours per month. The current ACA arbitrarily sets the bar for a full work week to 30 hours. This is inconsistent with how most Americans think: full-time is a 40-hour work week. The current definition causes confusion among employers who struggle to understand and comply with the new requirements, especially ones that are in conflict with long-standing practices built on the long-standing 40-hour work week premise.

We welcome the opportunity to ensure our employees have a positive work environment and we remain committed to providing a robust set of work benefits. We are concerned that the ACA, as currently written, puts additional, undue burden on school systems across the nation, many of whom will struggle to staff their schools to meet their educational mission while meeting the strict 30-hour regulation.

We applaud your continued leadership on this issue and look forward to seeing the Forty Hours is Full Time Act move forward.

Sincerely,
NOELLE M. ELLERSON,
AASA, The School Superintendents
Association, Associate Executive Director,
Policy & Advocacy, AESA, NREA and NREAC
Legislative Liaison.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today to propose three important amendments to S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

First of all, I want to make it very clear that I strongly oppose the Keystone XL Pipeline plan. I have serious concern about the effects this project would have on our health and safety; I have serious concerns about the environmental impact; and I am skeptical of the real, permanent jobs it could create.

This project has many risks and very few advantages, and I will be voting against it. But if this legislation does

pass the Senate, we should at least try to make it a better bill. There is no excuse why we cannot turn the Keystone XL Pipeline Act into an opportunity to protect our clean drinking water and ensure that polluters have to pay to clean up their own messes.

First, I have offered amendment No. 48, which would remove the Halliburton loophole from the Safe Drinking Water Act and finally require gas storage and gas drilling companies to comply with our clean water laws. Every other industry has to do it. Our farmers have to do it. Construction companies have to do it. Yet our gas companies have been exempt for years.

It should give my colleagues pause that fracking companies are allowed to ignore our clean water laws when they pump chemicals deep into the ground. In this country, when we turn on the tap for a glass of water, we need to know that our drinking water is safe. So let's be fair and hold the gas industry to the same environmental and public health standards as everyone else.

Second, I worked with Senator MENENDEZ on amendment No. 65, which would make oil companies financially responsible for the damages they cause when they spill on our land and leak into our waterways. Under current law, when an onshore oilspill occurs, the company that causes the spill is only liable for \$350 million in damages, including cleanup and compensation. Yet a major oilspill into a river or lake, such as the one this week in Montana, could easily result in damage well above that arbitrary limit.

Hard-working taxpayers should never be stuck paying for an oil company's mess, and local property and businesses should not have to slog through endless litigation just to get the compensation they deserve from a negligent oil company. This amendment would finally place the burden on companies to clean up after themselves.

Third, I have proposed amendment No. 76, which would allow our homeowners and business owners whose property has been damaged by natural disaster to use Federal disaster assistance funds to upgrade their property's energy efficiency. Under current law, the disaster assistance can only be used to replace what was lost even if that property was antiquated and not up to current standards. We need to have much more forward-looking policies that actually make sense.

Due to the effects of climate change, we have seen a growing number of natural disasters in recent years, from blizzards, to hurricanes, to raging fires, to endless droughts. When we pick up the pieces after a major storm, we want to make sure that when we rebuild, we rebuild in the smartest way possible, and that includes not only protections against the next disaster but also proactive measures to save en-

ergy, reduce emissions, and lower costs.

As I said, I don't support the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, but if this new Congress is intent on sending this bill to the President, then we need to make sure the bill keeps our drinking water safe, holds companies accountable for their own messes, and encourages efficiency in our economy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. I congratulate the Presiding Officer for sitting in that chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 18

I wish to speak about the Fischer amendment which is slated to be voted on at some point. While I respect where my neighbor from Nebraska is coming from with this effort, the proposal unfortunately misses the mark by a mile.

The amendment would set up a new and unprecedented process for protective land designations. It says the Secretary of the Interior or Agriculture has to publish in the Federal Register two findings before any congressional protections on public lands would go into effect. First, the Secretary has to find that new, protected land would not adversely affect our efforts to administer existing protected land. Second, the Department has to have "sufficient resources"—whatever that is—to implement plans for existing protected land. While perhaps innocuous sounding, these would be huge changes in how we do business around here.

Coming from a State that is over a third Federal land, I prefer that drastic reform proposals such as this at least have the benefit of a committee hearing before we vote on them on the floor. That way, we can hear expert testimony as to whether this is a good idea or consider ways we might be able to improve the measure. But as far as I know, this language hasn't had a hearing in this Congress, or any other Congress, for that matter.

Proponents of this amendment are going to argue it simply ensures that our land agencies can afford to keep up with the maintenance of new protected lands. Listen, I am the first—and I have been on this floor year after year after year talking about the fiscal condition of this country—to believe we need more fiscal discipline around here, but this is not the way we should get it. I am also a huge believer that we shouldn't be overburdening these agencies, and we shouldn't be overregulating through them, either.

Unfortunately, this amendment takes a hatchet when the absolute

most that is needed, if anything, is a surgical fix. In fact, under the amendment, the opponents of protected lands could reduce funding for our land agencies through the appropriations process and then turn around and say the Secretary got a veto of the new proposals because sufficient resources aren't available. As one of my friends from Colorado said in the paper this morning: "This amendment would be a one-two punch—first starve conservation agencies of needed funding and then block any new protections."

This amendment is drafted in a way that it leaves huge discretion to a future Secretary to approve or veto protections that Congress has seen fit to create. If the amendment passed, nothing would stop a future Secretary from finding that every single conservation bill this Congress has passed should not take effect, all because he or she failed to publish the vague set of findings laid out in this proposal.

Historically, we don't give a member of the executive branch any discretion as to whether they implement the laws that Congress passes and that the President has signed. Yet, this measure would do just that.

I think keeping that historical precedent—where the legislative branch makes the laws and the executive branch implements them—is important. We have heard a lot about that on this floor recently, particularly in a case such as this where we are talking about our national heritage.

Coloradans, and all Americans, love their public lands and want to see more done to protect them. Instead, this amendment creates new layers of red-tape and makes enacting protective designations even more difficult than it has been.

Once again, I wish to say on this floor that I appreciate the effort of the Senator from Nebraska and I would be happy to work with her to address some of her concerns. But I would argue that the investments we make in our public lands are worthwhile ones, and I would invite anyone in this Chamber to come to Colorado and see what I am speaking about.

Protected lands and wide-open spaces are a huge driver of economic growth all across our country. They help sustain a \$600 billion outdoor recreation economy, and a lot of those businesses, for obvious reasons, are headquartered in Colorado. On top of the economic benefits, wilderness areas, national monuments, and national parks are a fundamental part of the fabric of our country and of our country's history. It is important to preserve these lands for our kids and our grandkids, just as our grandparents preserved them for us. It is worth investing some money to do that so the next generation and the one after that can experience the greatness that all Americans feel when they first visit the Grand Canyon or Rocky

Mountain National Park, or Chimney Rock National Monument, or the Everglades, or wherever we find the next beautiful or historically significant area that Congress or the President decides to protect.

This discussion is actually a timely one because just this past December we passed a large package of conservation measures into law on a bipartisan basis. That package included a bill that we worked on in Colorado called the Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act. Let me say at the outset that our office may have introduced that bill in Congress, but it was really the people I represent in southwest Colorado who wrote that bill. This legislation grew from the grassroots up from day one—Republicans, Democrats, Independents working together to cement a long-term plan for their community's future. Not only was it bipartisan at the local level, but also in Congress. My friend SCOTT TIPTON championed the bill on the House side.

The Hermosa Creek Watershed deserved to be protected. That is why the community came together to keep it just as it is. That was the plan in the community, and that is what our bill finally accomplished at the end of the last Congress. However, if we were to pass the amendment in front of us today, all the hard work that went into passing the Hermosa bill could be undone by the Secretary of the Interior. Every single meeting that took place in southwest Colorado, every single conversation that led to the improvement of this legislation—all of that could be gone in an instant, not because the Congress undoes the law but because some administrator, using their fiat, is able to undo the law. It is unlikely—I can't say this for sure, but it is unlikely that person is going to have any idea what is in the Hermosa Creek bill or any of the other bills we have worked on in the past. That is just simply not how we do business around here, and there is a good reason for that.

I am compelled, therefore, to urge other Senators in this body to please oppose the Fischer amendment so we can avoid such a scenario. Rejecting the amendment will preserve our conservation legacy—a legacy that goes straight back to President Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican, who signed the Antiquities Act into law in 1906. It includes the formal establishment of the national park system almost 100 years ago.

This is an extraordinarily beautiful country that we all have the privilege to represent. We ought to encourage conservation efforts, not make them harder to achieve. We ought to build on the legacy of generations of Americans and generations in this body of Republicans and Democrats working together to preserve our natural heritage.

I will, therefore, oppose the Fischer amendment when it comes up for a

vote, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to share some thoughts about the debate we are having on the Keystone Pipeline, climate change, and how the two intersect. The concept that climate change is real, I completely understand and accept. To the point of how much man is contributing, I don't know, but it does make sense that manmade emissions are contributing, and the global warming effect, the greenhouse gas effect, seems to me scientifically sound. The problem is how we fix this globally is going to require more than just the United States to be involved.

This deal with China where they have to do nothing for 20 years is probably not exactly where I want to be. The bottom line is that the solutions coming from our Democratic friends about how to deal with greenhouse gas emissions turn our economy upside down and do more damage to the economy and to the welfare of the American people than it will in terms of helping the environment.

Our liberal friends give us a false choice. You have to reorganize the economy in a draconian fashion to help the environment. Some people on my side believe that the whole climate change experience is scientifically unsound. I am not a scientist, but I have heard enough regarding those who make it their life's work to be convinced that manmade emissions are causing the problem and contribute to the overall warming of the planet.

About the Keystone Pipeline, my Democratic friends are making an argument that is just absolutely false. The product that Canada will produce from the oil sands is going to be used by us, the world community through the gulf port or by China.

Those who believe denying the building of the pipeline protects the planet from fossil fuels do not understand what Canada is about to do. Canada is going to sell the product to somebody. The question for us is, Would we benefit from building a pipeline that will create American jobs and help us put oil into that pipeline within the United States in a joint venture with Canada or we will say no to the Canadians and they will go build a pipeline and send it to China?

The product is going to be burned. It is going to be used. The only question for this Congress is, Do we want the pipeline to go West and export the

product to China or do we want to build the pipeline so we will have more product from a friend rather than enemies?

Dirty oil is oil that comes from people who hate your guts. The sulfur content of oil sands product is higher than Mideast sweet crude but no different than the oil we find off the coast of California. The actual carbon content is no different than the oil we find off the coast of California. To lock this country and the world into buying more Mideast product seems to me to be a very bad idea at a very dangerous time. So when I hear Members of the Democratic Party take the floor and say: Don't build this pipeline because it will help the environment, you obviously don't realize what Canada is about to do. Canada is going to sell the oil to another customer, build a new pipeline, and the only question for you is, How do you justify that? How do you justify destroying the ability to create thousands of jobs in the country at a time when we need them? How do you justify not building a pipeline that could be used to help us with product from North Dakota and other places within our own country?

You can justify it, but you can't say it is based on climate change because the product you are talking about is going into the environment. It is going to be used. It is either going to be used coming to America to our benefit or the pipeline will be built west and it will go to China.

To our friends in Canada, I imagine your patience is about to run out with us, and I don't blame you one bit if you get tired of dealing with an American Government that seems completely out of sync with reality. In terms of the lawsuits, it is a procedural issue. In Nebraska the pipeline is one of thousands of pipelines we already have in America.

To the President last night, instead of one pipeline, why don't we have a comprehensive infrastructure strategy? I am all for that. But you are threatening to veto building this pipeline. Why? Because your judgment has been taken over by the environmental community which is hell-bent on no fossil fuels anywhere, anyway, anyhow.

That is not the world in which we live. I embrace the fact that a lower carbon economy will be beneficial over time. My view is: Find more fossil fuels from friendly people, including our own backyard—Canada, the United States—to replace fossil fuels we have to buy from foreign entities that do not like us very much. That concept is a reality. We are not going to be able to replace fossil fuels any time soon.

We can invent technology to make it cleaner. We can find alternatives. But at the end of the day it comes down to this: If you are using climate change as a reason not to build this pipeline, you are kidding yourself or you are misleading the public because the product

is going to be used. They are going to build a pipeline in Canada. The question is, Do they build a pipeline that we get no benefit from or do they build a pipeline in collaboration with us that helps us with our job problems and our energy needs?

I don't understand how you can justify voting against the Keystone Pipeline based on a concern about climate change because it has absolutely nothing to do with the issue in this regard. The product is going to be used by somebody, and they are going to build a pipeline somewhere. For you to deny us the ability to build this pipeline that would make us more energy independent from overseas' fossil fuels is shortsighted and does not advance the cause of climate change.

To the people who believe in climate change, it is gimmicks such as this and tricks such as this that hurt your cause. You are undercutting a real genuine debate. You made climate change a religion rather than a problem. It is a problem, but you are taking a draconian approach to the problem to the point that you are denying our country the ability to build a pipeline that we would benefit from economically and energy security-wise. The alternative you are leaving this country is that the same product will go somewhere else, and the next pipeline will not benefit America. So it is stunts like this that undercut your overall efforts.

I wish you would change your mind about the pipeline and work with Republicans who are willing to work with you to deal with emissions in a realistic way and stop selling what I think is a fraud when it comes to this debate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WICKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am on the floor to say a few words about my amendment No. 29, which we will be voting on shortly after 3 o'clock, I am told. That is the simple amendment that says it is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

It is, perhaps, a telling coincidence that we are having this conversation on the floor of the Senate now on the fifth anniversary of the Citizens United decision, because before Citizens United came along, there was actually a pretty robust conversation between Democrats and Republicans about carbon pollution, climate change, and what needed to be done about it.

For instance, Senator JOHN MCCAIN ran for President on a robust platform

of addressing the carbon that causes climate change.

Senator COLLINS worked with the current energy ranking member, Senator CANTWELL, on a very robust climate bill that would have put a cap on carbon pollution and paid a dividend back to the American people.

Senator MARK KIRK voted for Waxman-Markey when that bill was on the floor of the House, the famous cap-and-trade bill.

Senator FLAKE wrote an article in his home State paper expressing the value and merit of a carbon fee when it is offset by reductions in other taxes as a way to help workers and address the pollution problem.

Over and over again there were these joint actions all the way back to when I first came to the EPW Committee and Senator John Warner of Virginia was its then ranking member. He wrote Warner-Lieberman with our colleague, then Senator Lieberman.

Then came Citizens United. Then came the massive influx of polluter money into our political system, much of it dark money. At about the spring of 2010—and Citizens United was decided in January of 2010—that was the end of the conversation.

So here we are today. We are just now reaching agreement on several votes by which I believe our Republican colleagues will, for the first time since Citizens United—some of them, at least—acknowledge that climate change is real.

Indeed, we just heard my friend Senator GRAHAM come to the floor and speak—right there—saying that climate change is real, that humans had a significant role in causing it, and it was something we ought to pay attention to.

This is new. Today, after 5 years of more or less silence. I have spoken on this floor, as everybody knows, a great deal on this subject, and nobody has ever come from the other side of the aisle to respond to me, except for the now-chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, to maintain his view that climate change is actually a hoax that is perpetrated by the scientific community in order to get grants and funding.

So it has been a long drought. It has been a long, long drought. Frankly, it has been a drought that does not reflect the best traditions of this body.

This body has taken on big issues in the past. It took on civil rights. It tried to hold this country together over the issue of slavery.

This body has been significant in the history of the United States at important junctions, and here we are at this important junction where our energy policy needs to change and half of the body basically was mute.

Today that seems to have changed.

That, to me, is very significant. I look forward to a vote on my amend-

ment. As I said, it is very simple. Climate change is real and not a hoax. I hope that is something we can agree on as a body. If we do, then it becomes a predicate for beginning to advance an important conversation.

I am not going to agree with all of my Republican colleagues about their views on how to respond to this problem, and I don't expect my Republican colleagues to agree with all of my views on how we should respond to this problem. But the dark days of denying that there actually is a problem may very well have seen their first little break of dawn right now.

If that is so, that is exciting news because, as many Republicans have noted—Republicans such as Secretary Schultz, Republicans such as Secretary Paulson, Republicans such as Ronald Reagan's economic adviser, the economist Arthur Laffer—there are smart, conservative ways to address this problem.

I continue to think that the idea that Senator FLAKE signed off on all those years ago is still the right one to do: Raise a fee by putting a price on carbon that reflects the economic fact that it creates harm for so many other folks, the so-called externalities, what the economists would say. The costs that burning carbon causes to fishermen, to foresters, to homeowners, to people who live near the sea, those costs—build them into the price of the product. That is economics 101. Then take every single dollar that we raise and lower working people's taxes.

I am completely comfortable with that notion. That is one that has been over and over again brought up in the context of Republican and conservative discussions, including a very good recent paper jointly authored by a writer from the American Enterprise Institute.

I see the deputy minority leader on the floor. I had the pleasure of traveling with him and with our ranking member on the Judiciary Committee and other colleagues to Cuba. When we spent time with Cuban officials, Cuban religious leaders, Cuban—just regular folks on the street, over and over again we heard the same phrases coming at us, that it was a time of hope and it was a time of promise.

If there is going to be a time of hope and a time of promise in Cuba, let's hope it can be a time of hope and a time of promise in this body on climate change. It starts with admitting that you have a problem, just like in so many other areas of human life. So I hope that, frankly, every Member of the Senate will vote for my amendment. We appreciate the opportunity to work with the new majority on ways that we can address this telling problem.

I will close by saying this. I am never going away on this subject. It is too important to my home State of Rhode

Island. There is no Senator in this body who, if they had an issue as important to their home State as this issue is to Rhode Island, I would not expect and respect to fight all the way through to the bitter end for the interests of their State. My fishermen are not finding the fish where they have been for generations. People who have built homes on the shore are losing them into the sea in big storms. These are real consequences, and we—I promise you one way or the other—are going to do something about it. I hope this is the dawn of that new day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Rhode Island. He and I did travel to Havana, Cuba, earlier this week. Interestingly enough, we sat down with the scientists and the people responsible for the oceans and other natural benefits in Cuba to discuss global warming, and the conversation started at the same place. Even with these scientists, there is no question they can see the impact, and they started their predictions about the rise of the ocean levels—and the Senator from Rhode Island knows this far better than I do—with their anticipation that the ocean levels will rise over a foot in just 10 or 20 years and then twice that over a period of 50 years or more. That will have a profound impact on the island, the archipelago of Cuba, and the United States.

Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, more than any other Senator, has really brought this issue home—not just to his home but to the Atlantic Coast States—and has reported on the impacts they face. Now, I live smack dab in the middle of the country—in Illinois. I can tell you we appreciate there are changes taking place on this planet that are not in our best interests—nor will they leave our children and grandchildren a better place to live.

The obvious question we face is what will we do in this generation. This bill, S. 1, which has been chosen by the Republican majority, has given us a venue finally to raise some important environmental issues which have been ignored for too long.

I know the object of this bill was to build a pipeline. TransCanada, a Canadian company, wants to build a pipeline through the United States. They may or may not sell any oil from it in the United States. We had a vote on that yesterday, and the Republicans overwhelmingly said they would not require them to sell their oil in the United States. They may or may not use American steel to build their pipeline. We had that amendment yesterday, and the Republicans voted overwhelmingly that there is to be no requirement to use American steel to build this pipeline. Yet it is characterized as an American jobs bill. It is hard to understand that characterization.

If nothing else, whatever happens to this bill—and it may not have a great fate ahead of it, if it is not changed significantly because the President has already threatened to veto it—what the Senator from Rhode Island said is significant. After years of denial from the other side of the aisle about the issues of global warming, we may have just reached a point where we are finally, on a bipartisan basis, going to acknowledge the obvious—the scientific facts which have been given to us over and over and over. That is a step in the right direction, and so I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Let me take 2 minutes to say a word about my pending amendment, which may come up for a vote shortly. It is amendment No. 69.

What I have said on the floor is there is a dirty little secret about the Keystone Pipeline. You don't take Canadian tar sands and turn them into gasoline and diesel fuel without filtering and refining out some pretty horrible things. What is filtered out is called petcoke, and petcoke is going to be produced in the refining process if this pipeline is ultimately built—over 15,000 tons a day of petcoke, the byproduct of this refining process.

If you look at it and you think to yourself what impact will that have, it could have a very negative impact. In my city of Chicago, which I am very proud to represent, as well as in other communities, petcoke piles have become a challenge to the public health and the people in the community. I am asking in my amendment that we establish a standard of safety when it comes to petcoke—that we establish a standard of transportation and storage of petcoke to protect American families and children from the hazards of breathing petcoke dust.

This is a simple public health amendment, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I inquire of the Senator—we will be shortly voting on a number of measures. One is a side-by-side to the Schatz amendment which includes a quotation from an environmental impact statement, and the quotation is as follows:

... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios.

Does the Senator recall when the EIS was written and what the oil prices were that were expected at the time this document was prepared?

Mr. DURBIN. Until very recently, of course, the price of a barrel of oil was high enough to justify tar sands, their extraction, the cost of transportation and the additional cost of refining them into a final product. Since that time, the cost of oil is almost half today what it was when that report was written.

I don't remember the exact date, perhaps the Senator has it handy.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Indeed, I would say the breakpoint for that study was at \$75 per barrel, and it was at that point that the environmental impact became very real from this harmful tar sands fuel. Not only are we not just under \$75 per barrel, we have hit as low as below \$50 per barrel.

So I just want to make sure, as long as we are voting on this language very shortly, that it is clear in the RECORD of the Senate that the environmental impact statement was hinged on that the "expected oil prices" were north of \$75 per barrel; that they are now well below that, around \$50 per barrel. And, indeed, I would add that the Canadian Research Institute has said the tar sands can't be properly extracted at prices less than \$85 per barrel.

So that puts in context what we will be voting on that I thought should be in the RECORD.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

It is significant that the first bill of the Senate Republican majority is a bill to build a pipeline for a Canadian company to bring tar sands across the United States to be refined in Texas and then sold overseas. That is the highest priority of the Republican majority.

There are those who, based on what the Senator just said, question whether this is economically viable with the price of a barrel of oil today. I am not an economist in energy, but it strikes me there has been a significant change in the premise of this whole project.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Indeed, in my remarks earlier, I referred to this pipeline as possibly an economic zombie at the current oil prices. I have not seen a single report that this pipeline can be built and operated properly at oil prices where they are right now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for Senator HOEVEN or his designee to offer his amendment No. 87, as

modified; further, that the time until 3:15 p.m. this afternoon be equally divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate then proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Lee, No. 33; Durbin, No. 69; Toomey, No. 41; Whitehouse, No. 29; Hoeven, No. 87, as modified; and Schatz, No. 58; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, as my colleague from Alaska just said, we are making progress. We have another group of amendments we are going to be voting on shortly. I would encourage any of the Members on our side who would like to take a few minutes to go over their amendments before the vote—we have a few minutes between now and 3:15 p.m.—to do so. During this series of votes coming up, we will be working with our colleagues to get the next set of amendments and to continue to move forward.

I will have a little more to say, but I see a couple of our colleagues here, so I will give them a chance to talk about their amendments.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. My understanding is that we have time equally divided between now and 3:15, before the votes start.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

Mr. DURBIN. Seeing no one on the floor, I would like to say a word about an amendment which will be voted on. I believe it is the second in the queue, and it is the amendment I have offered relative to petcoke.

Petcoke is the product derived from the refining of Canadian tar sands, and if you happen to live in some communities in America, petcoke can be a real problem.

This is the city of Chicago, IL. You can see some of the bungalows and houses here, and right across the railroad tracks you can see mounds of petcoke coming in from the British Petroleum refinery. They generate somewhere in the range of 6,000 tons a day of

this petcoke and pile it up right here. It is ultimately transported to different places, but it sits here. It obviously is a hazard to people who live nearby. It blows in the wind, creating public health issues and real concern for families with children with asthma, respiratory disease.

I have an amendment, and it is very basic. No. 1, the amendment talks about making sure there are standards and rules for the storage enclosure of petcoke. Most of the cities—whether it is Long Beach, CA; or Detroit, MI; or Chicago, IL—are trying to find established standards to enclose this petcoke so it doesn't blow freely in the atmosphere.

Senator HOEVEN spoke earlier and said it was not carcinogenic. Those findings related not to the breathing in of this dust but to the ingestion of petcoke itself. We have yet to establish that this is a benign substance, and we are trying to take care to protect families who might be exposed to it.

I am not surprised to see that there has been a letter issued by the National Association of Manufacturers opposing my amendment. They start by saying that petcoke is a valuable, essential commercial product that is used in a wide array of applications. I am not stopping that at all. Anyone who wants to take this petcoke and use it to produce energy and power generation, cement kilns, steel, glass, as long as they comply with basic environmental standards, be my guest. But to store it in such a fashion that it can blow all over and cause public health hazards is unacceptable—it should be—in a modern society. Secondly, if those who store it end up, we find over the long haul, creating a long-term hazard to the environment, they should be held legally responsible.

That is the extent of my amendment. I am not surprised that the National Association of Manufacturers would oppose it. But I would ask each and every Member to consider the possibility that if they lived across the tracks from this kind of petcoke conglomeration—I have seen it. It is horrible, and we are fighting it in the city of Chicago. The company that owns the petcoke—the Koch Brothers. So it shouldn't be any surprise that the National Association of Manufacturers took the position they did.

I hope that all of us who may be subject to this kind of dumping of petcoke near a city in our State will think twice. Let's at least have some standards for storage and enclosure to protect the people in our States, and let's make certain that if there is ultimately environmental damage here, that the parties who make the profit off of petcoke are ultimately responsible.

That is the extent of my amendment. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 33

Ms. CANTWELL. I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the Lee amendment, No. 33, which is going to be voted on shortly. I know my colleagues are going to have 2 minutes divided before the vote, so people can add comments as they wish.

This amendment makes it very difficult for citizens to retain counsel, particularly related to the Endangered Species Act. I don't know why we would be handicapping legal cases just because they deal with the environment. I mean, I guess if you are not interested in protecting the environment, you would want to make it harder for people to retain lawyers. But when I think about property rights and clean water and clean air and all of those issues, I think that is something on which we ought to go the extra mile and make sure they get representation and counsel, not handicap them and make it harder just because we don't want companies to adhere to environmental laws.

I believe this is important because my colleagues should remember that the ESA was signed into law in 1973 by then-President Richard Nixon and was intentionally drafted to manage and to engage citizens in the protection of endangered species.

Now, in general, litigants in the country must bear their own costs, and the prevailing party is not ordinarily entitled to collect his or her expenses in a defending suit from the loser. But both the courts and Congress have provided an exemption from that rule, and so they have allowed in certain circumstances for judges to shift the cost to litigants in the interest of fairness and to further protect the public interest.

So that is what is at stake this morning. I think the Endangered Species Act is a prime example of why the courts decided they wanted to have this kind of leeway and protection. Congress knew when it enacted the Endangered Species Act that it would be difficult and the Nation would want to make sure that ordinary citizens had the opportunity to help ensure compliance with the law. So Congress recognized that when a citizen did so, he or she did not do so necessarily by themselves alone but with the counsel of a private attorney. Congress recognized this reality in statute.

So this is what we are going to be addressing. In contrast, the Lee amendment would weaken the prevailing citizen's request for reimbursement under

an Endangered Species Act—and narrow those restrictions of equal access to justice. This is because the cap on fees would include the Equal Access to Justice Act, which often falls well below the market-based rate for attorneys. Basically, what the Lee amendment does is say you will not be able to recap on the attorneys' fees at the cost of doing business, and their hope is that citizens will then not have representation before the courts on issues such as clean air, clean water, and other environmental issues.

I say to my colleagues—and I have said this to the now-ranking member on the EPW Committee—I don't know why we are not taking up the Superfund bill. To me, getting the Superfund reauthorized—these are polluters that have polluted our country, and they are not even paying the tax that it would cost to clean up the pollution.

Instead, we are considering an amendment that says: Let's roll back the environmental law on this issue and make sure that citizens don't have the right to help enforce environmental law.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the Lee amendment when we get to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 87, AS MODIFIED, TO
AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment, as modified. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HOEVEN] proposes an amendment numbered 87, as modified, to amendment No. 2.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The environmental analysis contained in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referred to in section 2(a) and deemed to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) as described in section 2(a), states that—

(1) “[W]arming of the climate system is unequivocal and each of the last [3] decades has been successively warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850.”;

(2) “The [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change], in addition to other institutions, such as the National Research Council and the United States (U.S.) Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), have concluded that it is extremely likely that global increases in atmospheric [greenhouse gas] concentrations and global temperatures are caused by human activities.”;

(3) “A warmer planet causes large-scale changes that reverberate throughout the climate system of the Earth, including higher sea levels, changes in precipitation, and altered weather patterns (e.g. an increase in more extreme weather events).

(4) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16–1, section 4.16.;

(5) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES–34, section ES.5.4.2.); and

(6) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES–16, section ES.4.1.1.).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Consistent with the findings under subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—

- (1) climate change is real; and
- (2) human activity contributes to climate change.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 33

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to amendment No. 33, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry—I wish to speak on the Hoeven amendment and take the 1 minute.

Excuse me. I withdraw my request.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 69 offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is the petcoke amendment. There are communities in this Nation—Chicago, Detroit, Long Beach, CA—and it may be coming to other areas soon. Petcoke is the byproduct of Canadian tar sands when it is refined. This pipeline will generate 15,000 tons a day of petcoke that has to be stored. We are asking that it be stored responsibly so it doesn't blow through towns and neighborhoods that I and my colleagues represent, and let's establish standards for that purpose. It can still be used legitimately for many products, but let's make sure it doesn't cause respiratory problems for the people we represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. When Canadian oil sands are refined, they produce petroleum coke, which is this high-energy, mostly carbon, coal-like substance, but it does have economic value. It can be used for fuel; it can be used for smelting; it can be used for producing dry cell batteries and other purposes.

The EPA's own Web site states—and this is from their Web site—petroleum coke itself has a low level of toxicity, and there is no evidence of carcinogenicity. The EPA's hazard characterization has also shown there are no adverse environmental effects associated with petroleum coke piles and the EPA's words are “they are essentially inert.”

I have listened to the comments of my colleague from Illinois, and I appreciate the concerns those in neighborhoods have, but I think it is important

that we recognize we are not trying to skip the science. We are not trying to add regulations for the transport and storage of something that is apparently not hazardous, according to the EPA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—58

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 41

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 41, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, before we proceed to hear from the spon-

sor of this amendment, I would just remind Members that these are 10-minute votes. It would be good—we have four more that we need to do. It would be good if we could stick to our 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to thank Senators CASEY and HATCH for joining me in this amendment. For almost 200 years, we have been mining coal in Pennsylvania. Some of it came out of the ground, and it turns out it was not suitable for the steel industry for which it was intended. The unsuitable coal has been piled up for decades. It forms mountains. Pennsylvania alone has 2 billion tons and 180,000 acres of contaminated land. These mountains of coal poison our water. They poison our air when they spontaneously combust and burn—sometimes for over a year—releasing pollutants with no controls whatsoever.

So we have an industry that is solving this problem, systematically turning this coal into electric power. Senators CASEY, HATCH, and I have an amendment that will simply allow this cleanup to continue, to exempt these 19 powerplants from the particularly onerous regulations in utility MACT and from the cross-air pollution regulations.

A vote in favor of this amendment is a vote to continue to clean up this environmental disaster that we have on our hands. I would be very grateful for Member support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, in speaking in opposition to the Toomey amendment, it is an attack on the Clean Air Act. I want to speak in favor of making sure that we are doing everything the Supreme Court said we need to do, which is to enforce the Clean Air Act.

While my colleague is making a point, I do not know why we should give some powerplants in Pennsylvania an exemption to the Clean Air Act. Obviously, there are businesses all across America that have to comply with environmental laws. By voting against this amendment, we can continue to fight against these pollution issues and make sure that special interests are not getting another narrow carve-out in this legislation.

So I would ask my colleagues to make sure that we are not creating a special exemption for the mercury and air toxic standards in the Clean Air Act and vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Toomey amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, is any time remaining at all?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Barrasso	Flake	Murkowski
Blunt	Gardner	Paul
Boozman	Graham	Perdue
Burr	Grassley	Portman
Capito	Hatch	Risch
Casey	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Sessions
Cotton	Kirk	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Manchin	Tillis
Enzi	McCain	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Vitter
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—45

Alexander	Feinstein	Murray
Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 29, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Colleagues, I almost hate to use my minute because I am so eager to hear what will be said during the minute when our energy chairman will follow me, but I am hoping that after many years of darkness and blockade, this vote will be a first little beam of light through the wall that will allow us to at least start having an honest conversation about what carbon pollution is doing to our climate and to our oceans. This is a matter of vital consequence to my home State, the Ocean State, my home, Rhode Island, and to many of yours as well.

I hope this is a place where we can get together and have a strong, positive vote that sends a signal that this Senate, at this time in history, is ready to deal with reality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I yield 1 minute on our side to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to the Whitehouse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Climate is changing. Climate has always changed, and it always will. There is archaeological evidence of that, there is biblical evidence, and there is historical evidence. It will always change. The hoax is that there are some people who are so arrogant, who think that they are so powerful that they can change the climate. Man can't change the climate.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Whitehouse-Inhofe amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In the time remaining, I recognize and thank the cosponsors on my side of the aisle, Senator SANDERS, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator LEAHY. Senator INHOFE and I are not alone on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Coats	Gardner
Ayotte	Cochran	Gillibrand
Baldwin	Collins	Graham
Barrasso	Coons	Grassley
Bennet	Corker	Hatch
Blumenthal	Cornyn	Heinrich
Blunt	Cotton	Heitkamp
Booker	Crapo	Heller
Boozman	Cruz	Hirono
Boxer	Daines	Hoeven
Brown	Donnelly	Inhofe
Burr	Durbin	Isakson
Cantwell	Enzi	Johnson
Capito	Ernst	Kaine
Cardin	Feinstein	King
Carper	Fischer	Kirk
Casey	Flake	Klobuchar
Cassidy	Franken	Lankford

Leahy	Paul	Shaheen
Lee	Perdue	Shelby
Manchin	Peters	Stabenow
Markey	Portman	Sullivan
McCain	Reed	Tester
McCaskill	Risch	Thune
McConnell	Roberts	Tillis
Menendez	Rounds	Toomey
Merkley	Rubio	Udall
Mikulski	Sanders	Vitter
Moran	Sasse	Warner
Murkowski	Schatz	Warren
Murphy	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murray	Scott	Wyden
Nelson	Sessions	

NAYS—1

Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 87, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 87, as modified, offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have an amendment before us, a side-by-side to the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Hawaii, and what we do within this side-by-side is effectively lay out findings contained within the administration's EIS that outline the environmental impact of a Keystone XL Pipeline, recognizing the impact to the environment will be less if this line is actually constructed.

We further go into a sense of the Senate that acknowledges—again after the vote we just had—that climate change is real and that there is an impact.

With that, I would recommend that folks look at the language that has been offered. I will be supporting the Hoeven amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we are about to vote on something that I think will be recorded as a breakthrough moment in the climate debate. For the first time we will go on record saying the following: Climate change is real and human activity contributes to climate change.

What a breath of fresh air this amendment is, and I urge an "aye" vote very strongly.

The front part of the amendment accurately quotes the EIS, parts of which a lot of us agree with and parts of which we don't. Let it be known that the parts we don't agree with are under review by various agencies, but this is accurate. This is a quote from the current EIS.

You are not voting to endorse the EIS, you are just voting to acknowledge that is what it says. But you are

voting on original language written by Senator HOEVEN that says climate change is real and human activity contributes to it.

I urge an "aye" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Hoeven amendment, as modified.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Hatch	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Paul
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Heller	Portman
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Kaine	Rounds
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Kirk	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Toomey
Corker	McCain	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Ernst	Roberts
Blunt	Fischer	Rubio
Boozman	Gardner	Sanders
Burr	Grassley	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Scott
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Perdue	
Enzi	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 affirmative votes for the adoption of the amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. THUNE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to

a vote in relation to amendment No. 58 offered by the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. My colleague from Hawaii, Senator SCHATZ, wishes to speak on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Thank you, Mr. President.

This has been a surprisingly productive day on the issue of climate debate. I know there has been a lot of consternation and discussion, but that is a good thing.

We have one final amendment to consider today, and it simply takes a portion of the language from the EIS for the Keystone XL and adopts it. That language says, in summary, that climate change is real and that climate change is caused by humans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SCHATZ. That language simply states that climate change is real, that climate change is caused by humans and principally by carbon pollution.

So the simple vote in front of us is: Do you agree with the factual evidence? Will you concede to the facts? We have an opportunity to set a new chapter in this climate debate. Today has been good progress.

So I urge my colleagues for a big bipartisan vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I urge colleagues to oppose the Schatz amendment. There is a distinct difference between this amendment and what was previously considered in the sense of the Congress, which would refer to human activity that significantly contributes to climate change, and the issue of degrees. And I would suggest to colleagues that the inclusion of that word is sufficient to merit a "no" vote at this time.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander
Ayotte

Baldwin
Bennet

Blumenthal
Booker

Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Collins
Coons
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Heinrich

Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray

Nelson (FL)
Peters
Reed (RI)
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—49

Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Corker
Coryn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Enzi
Ernst
Fischer

Flake
Gardner
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Lankford
Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue

Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HOEVEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I know Senators are interested in coming to the floor and offering their amendments. We have been discussing a process forward on this side of the aisle.

Earlier in the day Senator FISCHER had been working on an amendment that she has agreed to modify. I understand that the other side has a side-by-side that they will ask for consideration on.

I know the Senator from Louisiana will be on the floor to speak on an amendment he would like considered, and I understand there are a couple of other Senators on the other side who wish to speak as well.

There will be no more votes today on these amendments, but again, given the interest in this subject, I encourage Members to come down and speak to their amendments. We would like to figure out that process to get a series of amendments pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I again thank the Senator from Alaska for working through this process and the due diligence given. I think we are very close to having the side-by-side language, and once that is done, we will give it out to everyone for review.

We need to get the Fischer amendment and the side-by-side figured out.

Everybody is asking about the process. If we could get the next set of amendments offered by colleagues, it will give us a chance to proceed on figuring out when the next votes will be scheduled.

With that, I understand Senator SANDERS wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL for working on a sensible process.

I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the current amendment and call up my amendment No. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 24 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that—

- (1) climate change is real;
- (2) climate change is caused by human activities;
- (3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;
- (4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and
- (5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I especially wish to applaud Republican Senators. I believe, for the very first time, a number of them stood up and said: Climate change is real and climate change is caused by human activities. This is a significant step forward, and I think that in the months and years to come more and more Republicans will accept that position because that is the position of the scientific community.

What my amendment does is in fact repeat what we heard today and what we voted on; that climate change is real and that it is caused by human activities, but it also has three other provisions in it. It says climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world.

I think it is hard to argue against that. Whether it is drought or flooding—in the United States or around the world—increased forest fires in the Southwestern United States, rising sea levels or extreme weather conditions and the damage that does, it is very hard to argue that climate change has not caused severe and devastating problems in the United States already.

This amendment also says that a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffers irreparable harm. Again, that is what the scientific community is telling us. They are saying that damage is being done today, now, and it will only get worse in years to come. We have a brief window of opportunity to prevent very serious problems. I hope my colleagues will support that provision.

Lastly, and what logically follows from the previous four positions, is the following: It is imperative that the United States transforms its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible. That doesn't mean you close down every coal-burning plant in America tomorrow, but it does mean we move away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

I think in terms of this bill we have already made some good progress. I will look for bipartisan support tomorrow so the Senate goes on record supporting the overwhelming percentage of scientists who are in agreement with what this amendment says.

With that, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Purpose: To provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf)

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 80, which I discussed previously today and which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER], for himself and Mr. CASSIDY, proposes an amendment numbered 80 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

AMENDMENT NO. 80, AS MODIFIED

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING REVENUE

SEC. .01. REVENUE SHARING FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF WIND ENERGY PRODUCTION FACILITIES.

The first sentence of section 8(p)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting after "27 percent" the following: ", or, in the case of projects for offshore wind energy production facilities, 37.5 percent".

SEC. .02. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based on the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area.

"(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program, and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such program under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

"(C) In this paragraph, the term 'available unleased acreage' means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

"(6)(A) In the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that—

"(i) is estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

"(ii) is estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

"(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled 'Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, 2006'."

SEC. .03. DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (11) as paragraphs (6) through (12), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) COASTAL STATE.—The term 'coastal State' means—

"(A) each of the Gulf producing States; and

"(B) effective for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, each of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.";

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues' means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States—

"(i) received on or after October 1, 2016, from leases entered into on or after December 20, 2006, with respect to the Gulf producing States; and

"(ii) from leases entered into on or after October 1, 2015, with respect to each of the coastal States described in paragraph (5)(B)."; and

(4) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated), by striking "Gulf producing State" each place it appears and inserting "coastal State".

(b) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "FROM 181 AREA, 181 SOUTH AREA, AND 2002-2007 PLANNING AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO";

(2) by striking "Gulf producing State" each place it appears (other than paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)) and inserting "coastal State";

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

"(A) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to Gulf producing States—

"(i) 75 percent to Gulf producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

"(ii) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title; and

"(B) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to coastal States described in section 102(5)(B), 100 percent to the coastal States in accordance with subsection (b).";

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "GULF PRODUCING STATES" and inserting "COASTAL STATES";

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) ALLOCATION AMONG CERTAIN ATLANTIC STATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THEREAFTER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), effective for fiscal years 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be allocated to each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

“(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(B).”; and

(D) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)”; and

(5) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available to coastal States under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

“(A) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(A),

“(i) \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025; and

“(ii) \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2065; and

“(B) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(B)—

“(i) \$500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025; and

“(ii) \$749,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2055.”.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 72 to protect private property from unjust seizure by a foreign corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], for himself and Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment numbered 72 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity)

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired from willing sellers.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It prohibits TransCanada from using eminent domain proceedings to seize private property in order to build the Keystone XL Pipeline.

As we all know, eminent domain is the power of a governmental entity to take private property and convert it into public use subject to reasonable compensation. Traditionally, property

could only be seized for public use, such as a public park or a public road, but increasingly the exercise of eminent domain has been used for private gain.

Many, including some of my most conservative friends on the other side of the aisle, are outraged by the idea that eminent domain proceedings could be used to seize private property for private gain.

President Bush issued an Executive order restricting the use of eminent domain by the Federal Government for “the purpose of benefitting the general public and not merely for the purpose of advancing the economic interest of private parties.”

The senior Senator from Texas introduced the Protections of Homes, Small Businesses, and Private Property Act of 2005, which would have prohibited the use of eminent domain by Federal, State, or local government entities for private economic development.

I have been working very closely with Senator CANTWELL on this amendment, and we agree with our conservative colleagues that using eminent domain proceedings for private gain is outrageous.

On the issue of Keystone, a foreign-owned company is using eminent domain to seize private property so it can better export Canadian oil. The project is not in the public interest, but it is clearly in the special interest.

I do not begrudge the fact that a Canadian company wants its subsidiary to build this pipeline so it can export foreign oil to distant shores through American infrastructure. They want to make a profit, and I understand that. But I do not think we should allow our sovereignty to be compromised in order to do it.

Right now the U.S. Federal Government is trying to build a ferry terminal in Canada to serve Alaska, but Canadians are protecting their sovereignty and objecting to U.S. steel and other U.S. content from being the sole source for the ferry terminal. I disagree with Canada on that point, but I understand they want to protect their sovereignty. Similarly, we need to protect American sovereignty and American landowners from a Canadian-owned company that wants to seize our private lands for private gain and force Americans to take a risk of Canadian pollution.

Over the weekend landowners along the route of the Keystone XL Pipeline were seeing a pipeline spill on the Yellowstone River in Montana. It is happening now. If we were to see pictures of it, we would see that the efforts to clean up the spill are being hindered by a sheet of ice. Who knows what damage is being done by 50,000 gallons of oil in this river. We might not know until spring. Landowners are wondering if their family farm will be the victim of a similar spill, wondering if property

that has been in their family for generations can still be passed on to the next generation.

One landowner who has seen firsthand what can happen when a pipeline is put on your property is Lori Collins. In October of 2012 Lori Collins walked outside her home to find construction workers for a TransCanada contractor trying to clear the way for the southern leg of the Keystone Pipeline. They had dug up the lines to her septic system, completely destroying it. When she asked the workers to repair the damage, they did not. Instead, they piled dirt over the damage and clogged the system. The result was raw sewage flooding back into the Collins' home, staining walls and carpets, leaving a black mold throughout their house, and leaving Lori Collins with severe respiratory problems. The Collins family was eventually forced to move out of their home. While they were able to get a settlement after suing TransCanada, the family says they can never repair the damage to their lives.

Jim Tarnick, a farmer in Nebraska, has heard of TransCanada's track record and fears that he might have to suffer similar damage or, worse, face an oil spill. TransCanada wants to put the pipeline right through his front yard on his property that has been in his family for over 100 years.

Mr. Tarnick's farm sits near the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides critical freshwater for farmers and ranchers in the heart of U.S. farm country. A pipeline spill such as the one on the Yellowstone River over the last few days could damage the aquifer and therefore jeopardize a resource relied on by Nebraskan farms and ranches. Mr. Tarnick fears he will be served with papers invoking eminent domain on his property any day now. TransCanada is asking that he and other Nebraskans trust that they will protect the Ogallala Aquifer and the livelihoods it supports.

Instead of forcing Mr. Tarnick to host the Keystone Pipeline against his will, let's instead let TransCanada work with landowners who are willing to take the risk and will be paid what they feel is fair rather than what TransCanada's lawyers can convince a judge is fair.

Senator CANTWELL and I believe this amendment is one of simple fairness and should be a no-brainer, an easy amendment every Senator can support. In recent years Republicans have insisted on similar language prohibiting the use of eminent domain when we establish national parks. If eminent domain cannot be used to establish a national park in the public interest to conserve our national treasures and preserve America's beauty for future generations, then surely it should not be used to benefit private interests—in this case, in the interest of a foreign-owned oil company seeking to ship its product around the world.

I call on my colleagues to be consistent, stand on principle and logic, protect landowners, and support my amendment to protect private property from seizure by foreign corporations, preserve our sovereignty, and preserve the rights of U.S. citizens along the way.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAP AND TRADE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me address what happened today because I think it is significant. I think a lot of people are a little bit confused over what did happen, and it was somewhat of a surprise.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I have been leading the opposition to this whole idea of cap and trade. It originated way back in 2001. Since that time, we have voted on it many times. I will always remember that back in those days most people believed that manmade gases were contributing to global warming and that the world was going to come to an end because of manmade gases and CO₂ emissions.

At that time, early on, I was on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I think at that time I was not chairman, but I was the chairman of one of the subcommittees, and I thought, it must be true, everybody says it.

Well, some time went by and we got a report. The first one came from the Wharton School where they talked about the fact that if we were to pass cap and trade—at that time there were two bills before the U.S. Senate—not in the House, just in the Senate—and those bills would have been cap-and-trade types of bills. So they calculated what this would cost if we in the United States passed cap and trade. This was way back in 2002, 2003. They said that the range of the cost to the American people would be between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year.

I do something that I don't think very many people do, but I always do it. Every time I hear a large number, I go back and get the latest figures from my State of Oklahoma as to how many families file a Federal tax return, and then I do the math to determine how much it is going to cost an average family who pays taxes. It came back in excess of \$3,000 a year. I thought, that is a lot of money. Let's be sure there is

science behind this idea, knowing it all came from the United Nations. That is what started this whole thing.

By the way, this IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and that is within the United Nations. That is where it all started. If my colleagues remember, that was during the Clinton-Gore administration, when Al Gore went to South America and came back with this idea of the Kyoto Treaty. We were all going to sign it, and if we didn't, then we were all going to die because of manmade gases.

So we started looking at it to see if the science really was there because the only science we had heard about was the IPCC. Well, sure enough, we started getting phone calls from scientists all over the country. This was a long time ago. I started naming the scientists and groups of scientists who were calling in. We got up to 100 and then to 1,000 and then to 4,000. This is all on my Web site even though it was a long time ago. We can see all of these renowned scientists.

Richard Lindzen is with MIT. He is one who is considered by a lot of people to be the foremost authority on this, and he is the one who came out adamantly and said: No, the science is not there. It is not settled.

So several others started calling in.

In fact, I will quote him, if I have it here, what Richard Lindzen actually said at that time. He said: "Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life."

That is what bureaucrats would like to do. The Presiding Officer understands that because he has served in the other House and is new here in the Senate.

Lindzen also said, talking about Al Gore—Al Gore at that time was Vice President of the United States. He was the one who was really pushing this. He said: To treat all change as something to fear is bad enough. To do so in order to exploit that fear is much worse.

Of course, what Richard Lindzen of MIT was talking about was the fact that Al Gore at that time—they speculated he would be the first environmental billionaire. That was speculated in the New York Times. Anyway, after that happened, all the other scientists started checking in. These are scientists who cannot be challenged—these individuals. We have hundreds more, and I have a make on each one of these that I would be glad to discuss or debate with anyone. But at the same time, other things were happening.

One of the universities here in Virginia commissioned a poll to be done of all of the weathercasters on TV. They came back with 63 percent of the weathercasters saying that any global warming that occurs is a result of natural variation and not human activities.

So when I hear people—I have good friends on the other side that really be-

lieve this, and I think that one sometimes has to open it up and realize there is another side to this story. When they say that 97 percent, 98 percent of the scientists agree, it just isn't true. We have the names and things that have actually been said.

I think one item that people are going to have to remember—let me first of all say what happened today because I know they have been told I would explain what happened today.

My good friend, Senator WHITEHOUSE, had an amendment. The amendment was one sentence. It says that climate change is real and it is not a hoax. There is a ruling against talking about your own votes on the Senate floor, so I can't do that. But that hoax came from a totally different interpretation. The hoax was the idea that this is happening—climate change. That it is due to manmade gases. In other words, man is causing it.

So what I said on the Senate floor today is: How arrogant is it for people to say that man can do something about changing climate? Climate has always changed. I quoted this morning—I said it has changed. Go back and look at the archeological findings. They talk about climate from the beginning of time having changed and changed both ways. The Scriptures talk about it. This is something on which everyone has agreed, and no one would debate that it has always happened. The debate is whether man is causing that to happen.

So here we have a chart that shows—do you remember the hockey stick? The hockey stick was the concept that one of the guys with the IPCC came out with and said that it is like a hockey stick. We had this weather going like this for a long period of time. Then all of a sudden it shot up, and it resembled a hockey stick.

What they forgot was to put these two things in the hockey stick where it is supposed to be level. One is the medieval warming period that is between 1000 and 1500 A.D. We are talking recently. Then that went into the little ice age. Those were left off the chart. We have looked back, and everything you look at talks about how many years in the past we have had this change that is taking place in climate.

I am going to do this from memory. There are—in addition to these major changes such as you are seeing on this chart, which is a chart that—this actually is the IPCC's chart. No one is going to argue with that because they are the ones who dreamed up this whole idea. That is an intergovernmental panel on climate change. But within that—I can remember when I first heard the terms global warming and ice age, it was when they went back and they started tracing not long-term trends in climate change in weather but short term. Starting in 1895, from 1895 to 1918, they had what

they referred to as a cooling spell, possibly another little ice age. Then in 1918, it started getting warm again. So from 1918 to 1945 there was a little warming period. That took place kind of every 30 years. Then in 1995, from that period until 1975, for 30 years again, it went into a cooling period.

Here is the key. No one will argue with the fact that 1945 was the year that we had the maximum increase surge in CO₂ emissions. That precipitated not a warming period but a cooling period. Then, of course, 1975 came along.

Where are the charts that showed that in 1974—Time magazine or one of those? Here it is. This is Time magazine. This is the front. They said: Is another ice age coming? This is 1974. This is making the case. Everybody believed it. They talked about global warming before that and then another ice age. We are all going to die one way or another.

Put up the other chart, which is also Time magazine. This is when they said: Oh, no, here is the last polar bear and all the ice—so we have another global warming period. Both of them are from Time magazine. Both are 30 years apart. This is what has been happening for a long period of time.

Recognizing this, we had a little experience that—getting back, I made a determination that I would not only support the Whitehouse amendment, since it was just one sentence, it said that climate is changing, and it is not a hoax, but that I could clarify that and maybe become a cosponsor to his amendment. So I did that on the floor just a few minutes ago. I said on the floor that, yes, it is changing—no question about that. But the hoax is that there are people who are so arrogant they think they have the power to change climate. That is the hoax—not the fact that climate is changing. So that is what has been happening.

When some of the scientists came out and they started changing back and forth and all of a sudden people realized this whole thing was cooked up by the United Nations—IPCC was part of that group—then they found out that some of the scientists who were behind this were discovering that they had some emails that were sent out saying and proving conclusively that they were cooking the science, that these scientists were lying.

One of the things that was discovered and came out was an email from one of the scientists to another. It was 1999 and it read: I have just completed Mike's nature trick, adding in the real temperatures of each of the series for the last 20 years.

In other words, they were cooking the science at that time. This thing was such a scandal that throughout the world—we didn't hear nearly as much in the United States, but we did throughout the world. The UK Tele-

graph, which is maybe the largest communication in the UK, said that it is the worst scientific scandal of our generation.

What they are talking about is the scientific scandal. They are trying to make it sound as if man is responsible for all of these things. The Financial Times came out and said the closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science is surprising even to me. The stink of an intellectual corruption is overpowering.

One of the IPCC physicists said that climate-gate was a fraud on a scale I have never seen before. This went on and on, and we could quote Newsweek, the Guardian, and all the rest of them. It was known worldwide as a scandal. What was the scandal? It was that they had a bunch of scientists who were saying we are going to have to pass something like cap and trade because man is causing the world to come to an end.

So that is really what that was all about. We are going to have the debate. We want to do that. I chair the Committee on Environment and of Public Works. I chaired it 8 years ago. Then when the Democrats got control of the Senate—and now I am back in that position. We will have a chance to have hearings. We are going to have hearings with prominent scientists to come in and talk about this issue because all they say now is: Oh, the science is settled; the science is settled.

The science is not settled. That is the reason my good friend Senator WYDEN wants to make some remarks. That is the reason I made that statement today. I think we will have that very healthy debate. But let's keep in mind what the President was suggesting last night. It would cost the American people \$479 billion a year, and that would constitute the largest tax increase in the history of America. That is one of his legacies which he is trying during the last part of his presidency and which he announced last night that he is going to put as a top priority. We will be there to be the truth squad in that and make sure that my kids and grandkids—I have 20—are not going to be encumbered with the largest tax increase in the world, particularly when their own director said: If you pass it, it will not reduce CO₂ emissions.

I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up and make pending Wyden amendment No. 27 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. INHOFE. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 27 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **CLARIFICATION OF TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL FOR EXCISE TAX PURPOSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4612(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) CRUDE OIL.—The term ‘crude oil’ includes crude oil condensates, natural gasoline, synthetic petroleum, any bitumen or bituminous mixture, any oil derived from a bitumen or bituminous mixture, and any oil derived from kerogen-bearing sources.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 4612(a) of such Code is amended by striking “from a well located”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to oil and petroleum products received, entered, used, or exported during calendar quarters beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment closes a tax loophole that currently places Canadian tar sands oil ahead of the American taxpayer. While oil produced here in the United States, in places such as North Dakota and Texas, pays into a cleanup fund for oil spills, tar sands does not. The bottom line here is simple—when Canadian tar sands oil is spilled on American soil, the American taxpayer pays up. In effect, it is possible to state what this is all about in straight forward English: right now, our Tax Code is so out of date that it says that oil from the tar sands isn't actually oil. Put your arms around that for a second. The Tax Code is in a time warp. Under the current policy, what concerns me is a judgment that oil from the tar sands isn't actually oil.

All other crude oil product refiners have to pay an 8-cent-per-barrel tax to support the oilspill liability trust fund that pays for cleaning up the spills.

This puts our own domestic producers at a competitive disadvantage.

I see my colleague from Colorado who cares greatly about these issues. I am saying to myself, in Colorado or Texas or North Dakota—in effect the policy that we have today on tax law—and I am the ranking Democrat on the Senate finance committee—as I looked

at it, the first thing that came to mind is we have a tax policy here that, without the amendment I offer with my Senate finance colleagues, Senator MARKEY and others, we are putting domestic American producers—whether it is Colorado, North Dakota or Texas—at a competitive disadvantage. While domestic producers willingly contribute to clean up the oil spills, their Canadian competitors, and the tar sands up north of Edmonton, simply do not. This just defies commonsense.

Oil from the tar sands is just as likely to spill as other kinds of oil. Unfortunately, you don't have to look much beyond today's headlines to get a sense of what an oil spill actually means for communities across our country.

This past weekend an oil pipeline ruptured in Montana, pouring about 50,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River, 5 miles upstream from the city of Glendive. Now local residents are reporting that their water smells like diesel fuel. The officials tested the water in Glendive and found oil in the drinking water and along with it elevated levels of benzene, a cancer-causing agent.

That is what is under consideration with this amendment, making sure that all of the parties responsible—no matter where they are from—would pay their fair share when they put our citizens' health and safety at risk.

The double standard—the standard that is much more exacting on our domestic producers than it is on the Canadian tar sands producers—ought to be fixed.

Tar sands oil producers ought to pay into the same fund as other oil producers to clean up the spills. Because, make no mistake about it, at the end of the day, without this amendment that closes the tar sands loophole, Canadian tar sands oil will keep getting a free ride.

The last point I want to mention, is just to put this issue in context. Before I chaired the Senate Finance Committee in the last Congress, I had the honor of chairing the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. In session after session of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, proponents of the pipeline said: We have got to have this to lower gas prices. If we are really going to lower gas prices, said the proponents—this was session after session after session—we have got to build the pipeline.

Well, we have all seen that prices have fallen dramatically. To a great extent it is due to exciting developments in the Bakken and others. We are now essentially the Saudi Arabia of oil production. This is good news. This is like a tax cut for working-class families across the country.

One of the judgments I reached in making the decision to oppose the pipeline is I did not think it made much sense to tamper with something

that was such a promising development as real rate relief at the pump. A fair number of experts—yes, there is a difference of opinion, but a fair number of experts—are concerned that the pipeline, if it is built, could actually raise prices, particularly for vulnerable parts of the country. The Midwest could be one, but certainly there could be others.

So I had reservations about this from a variety of standpoints, including the standpoint that tar sands are a very carbon-dense material. But I am particularly concerned tonight about the inequity of the tar sands loophole, where the Canadians get a free ride at the expense of communities all across the Nation.

My amendment would close this flagrant abuse, close this loophole, help us put our tax priorities in order, and protect American citizens and American communities, rather than giving an undeserved advantage to foreign oil.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, to reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to clarify that those products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum. I hope this amendment will generate bipartisan support. No matter how a Senator feels with respect to the pipeline, I do not see how you can make the case that you should not correct something that defies common sense.

Before the Presiding Officer came in, I made mention that right now the absence of the amendment that I offer puts a disadvantage—a serious disadvantage—on all of America's domestic producers. We did an awful lot to make it possible for Americans to get relief at the pump. That does not make any sense. So I hope my colleagues tomorrow will support this amendment on a bipartisan basis to close a flagrant tax loophole, to end what amounts to an inequity that hurts at a minimum our producers, but puts at risk our communities needlessly.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 71 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a procedure for issuing permits to drill)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.

Section 17(p) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(p)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO DRILL REFORM AND PROCESS.—

“(A) TIMELINE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall decide whether to issue a permit to drill not later than 30 days after receiving an application for the permit.

“(ii) EXTENSION.—The Secretary may extend the period in clause (i) for up to 2 periods of 15 days each, if the Secretary has given written notice of the delay to the applicant.

“(iii) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Written notice under clause (ii) shall—

“(I) be in the form of a letter from the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary; and

“(II) include the names and titles of the persons processing the application, the specific reasons for the delay, and a specific date a final decision on the application is expected.

“(B) NOTICE OF REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the application is denied, the Secretary shall provide the applicant—

“(i) in writing, clear and comprehensive reasons why the application was not accepted and detailed information concerning any deficiencies; and

“(ii) an opportunity to remedy any deficiencies.

“(C) APPLICATION CONSIDERED APPROVED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary has not made a decision on the application by the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date the application is received by the Secretary, the application is considered approved, except in cases in which existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) are incomplete.

“(ii) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—Existing reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be completed not later than 180 days after receiving an application for the permit.

“(iii) FAILURE TO COMPLETE.—If all existing reviews are not completed during the 180-day period described in clause (ii), the project subject to the application shall be considered to have no significant impact in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) and section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2)) and that classification shall be considered to be a final agency action.

“(D) DENIAL OF PERMIT.—If the Secretary decides not to issue a permit to drill in accordance with subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) provide to the applicant a description of the reasons for the denial of the permit;

“(ii) allow the applicant to resubmit an application for a permit to drill during the 10-day period beginning on the date the applicant receives the description of the denial from the Secretary; and

“(iii) issue or deny any resubmitted application not later than 10 days after the date the application is submitted to the Secretary.”

“(E) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Actions of the Secretary carried out in accordance with this paragraph shall not be subject to judicial review.”

Mr. LEE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me talk a little bit this evening about amendment No. 77 that I filed. This is an amendment I filed to the bill that is pending that we are now on, what I would call the oil sands pipeline. It has been called a jobs bill, I know, on the other side. But, you know, the reality is, there are good construction jobs here. But as soon as the pipeline is built, the permanent jobs are really very small.

What we need to do—my belief—in terms of energy, is work to where there are larger numbers of jobs. I do not know whether people know this, but the energy that is being added to the system now worldwide and in the United States is renewable energy. Sometimes it is wind, sometimes it is solar, to a lesser extent biofuels, biomass and things like that. But the renewable sector is growing. The new energy is growing. Some of this is rather dramatic in terms of the numbers and the size. That is the direction clearly we need to head, because we want to in the future be lessening our carbon footprint. There is absolutely no dispute that we need to be moving in that direction. That is where all the scientists are.

We are even seeing today in the amendments that we have on the floor our friends across the aisle agreeing that we have got a real problem with climate change and that human beings are causing this and we need to address this. I applaud them stepping forward and saying that. How do you do this? How do you encourage more of the renewable forms of energy?

Let me say before I get into that, my hope is to have a discussion with the two Senators who are on side who are leading the debate here, Senator BOXER and Senator CANTWELL, about offering this amendment and getting in line in the next tranche of amendments.

But how do you get moving in the direction of more renewable energy? Well, we already know we have got a very good pattern here. We have started in the States and started in the District of Columbia, where more than half of our States in the United States of America have adopted what have been called renewable electricity standards. New Mexico has one. We have 15 percent by 2015. Some of our bigger States have been more aggressive. States such as California and New York are really pushing the envelope. They are saying by about 2025 we are going to have 30 percent or close to 30

percent renewable energy. So, really, what they are doing by putting a standard in place is they are saying to their power companies in their State: This is important to do. We know it is cost effective. Go out and develop your portfolio so that you put more renewable energy in it.

The remarkable thing, looking around the country, is how many States have done this. We have seen 29 States, I believe, including the District of Columbia, for a number of years now that have put a renewable electricity standard in place. So that is something that we know is working at the State level.

In fact, my Senator from New Mexico—who retired just a couple of years ago, Senator Bingaman—one of the things he did was go out to Stanford and study all of these renewable electricity standards that were in place and came up with ideas on the best practices and where there were disadvantages. He has actually published a report with a bunch of other researchers. So there is good wealth of knowledge about what is working and what isn't working.

But the major thing that is working is when we encourage a marketplace in renewable energy. We don't necessarily call out winners and losers. I know that is something that on both sides of the aisle we object to when we said: This is going to be a winning form, that is not going to be a winning form.

What we are doing is saying: Let's try to move toward renewables. Let's put a goal out there and then let's let the marketplace work on that. Let's see innovation. Let's move forward down that road. We have seen the 29 States do it and the District of Columbia.

My proposal in this amendment—and it is one I have worked on—has a good history. One of the things we know is when Senator Bingaman was in the Senate and head of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, he was able to pass through the Senate three times, over his career as chairman, a renewable electricity center out of the Senate.

When I was in the House of Representatives from 1998 to 2008, my cousin Mark Udall and I worked on a renewable electricity standard in the House. For the first time we were able to get a bill through the House of Representatives. So our big challenge always was we were never able to match the House bill and the Senate bill and put in place something that a President can sign and have a national standard. That is where we are today. We have had good support, and really what this amendment would do is set up a national marketplace. Many States across the Nation, and almost every State, have renewable energy. If you go into the South, it may be more biomass than it is of solar. If you go to

the West and Midwest, it may be more wind and solar, but it depends on location.

What is clear from all of the experts who looked at this is it is very easy to focus on when you have a goal, and you say, in the case of this amendment, by 2025, let's get 25 percent of our energy from renewable sources. So if we have a goal like that, we could get there.

I am urging everybody to take a look at this amendment to see what it is that we should be doing.

If we are talking about moving down the road with this proposal that we have before us, where we are scavenging, in a way, for the dirtiest forms of energy, these tar sands—which are much dirtier than the environmental impact statement said. Not only are they dirtier by about 17 percent, but when you tear down all those forests, which are taking carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere, you are putting yourself in a position where you are headed down the wrong road in terms of easing our carbon footprint.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a look at this amendment. I will visit with the leaders on the floor about this amendment and see if we can't get it in line in terms of being considered.

This is an important debate about our energy future. There is a lot of work to be done. I hope we can work together.

We are at a crossroads in our energy policy. We can lead the world in clean energy production with wind, solar, and advanced biofuels. We can reduce global warming pollution. We can become energy independent—and create permanent American jobs.

That is our future. That should be our priority. We have the technology. We have the resources. We need the commitment. That is why we need a national Renewable Electricity Standard. It takes us forward.

My amendment would require utilities to generate 25 percent of electricity from renewable resources—by 2025.

There are many benefits to a national RES. It would create 300,000 jobs. Over 50 percent of these jobs are in manufacturing. It would save consumers \$64 billion by 2025—and \$95 billion by 2030—in their utility bills. There would be \$263 billion in new capital investment. It would provide over \$13 billion to farmers, ranchers, and other landowners in the form of lease payments, creating new economic activity in rural communities across the U.S. It would add more than \$11 billion in new local tax revenues—and revitalize communities, especially rural communities.

I have pushed for this ever since I came to Congress. The House passed it. The Senate has passed a version of this three times.

New Mexico and over half the States already have an RES. The States are

moving in that direction. The Nation needs to move in that direction.

I have long said we need to do it all, and do it right as an energy policy. That includes traditional energy sources. Oil and gas play an important role in my State. New Mexico is a leading producer of both. We have strong, independent companies. They employ over 12,000 New Mexicans. They help pay for our schools and other public services.

We invested in the oil industry. We also need to invest in wind, solar, and biofuels.

The U.S. has incredible wind energy potential—enough to power the Nation 10 times over. My State has some of the best wind resources in the Nation—enough to meet more than 73 times the State's current electricity needs.

Wind power has almost no carbon pollution. It uses virtually no water. It already saves folks in my State 470 million gallons of water a year.

The U.S. solar industry employs more than 143,000 Americans—more than coal and natural gas combined. Solar jobs grew 10 times faster than the national average.

These are well-paying, local jobs. These are permanent jobs, and they won't be shipped overseas.

Now is the time to build on the momentum and invest in a clean energy economy. Now is the time to create energy at home and jobs at home—now, not later. We can't lose this market to our overseas competitors in Germany, China, and elsewhere. They can see the future too—and they are going after it.

A national Renewable Electricity Standard gives certainty to business, to companies that are looking to invest billions of dollars in our economy, to manufacture wind turbines, solar panels, and other renewable energy components.

We have a great opportunity to grow our manufacturing sector, to create jobs, and to move toward a cleaner energy future.

This is a new Congress. Let's find common ground, and let's move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BLUNT, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 78, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. BLUNT, for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 78 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BILATERAL OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On November 11, 2014, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China announced the “U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation” (in this section referred to as the “Agreement”) reflecting “the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances”.

(2) The Agreement stated the United States intention to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by one-quarter by 2025 while allowing the People's Republic of China to double its greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2030.

(3) While coal fired electricity remains the least expensive energy alternative, the reduction of coal use because of the Agreement would result in a 25 percent increase in electricity prices in the United States in 2025, according to analysis conducted by the Energy Information Administration.

(4) The people of China will not see similar electricity price increases as they continue to use low cost coal without limit for the foreseeable future, at least until 2030.

(5) Increases in the price of electricity can cause job losses in the United States industrial sector, which includes manufacturing, agriculture, and construction.

(6) The price of electricity is a top consideration for job creators when locating manufacturing facilities, especially in energy-intensive manufacturing such as steel and aluminum production.

(7) Requiring mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States while allowing nations such as China and India to increase their greenhouse gas emissions results in jobs moving from the United States to other countries, especially to China and India, and is economically unfair.

(8) Imposing disparate greenhouse gas emissions commitments for the United States and countries such as China and India is environmentally irresponsible because it results in greater emissions as businesses move to countries with less stringent standards.

(9) Union members, families, consumers, communities, and local institutions like schools, hospitals, and churches are hurt by the resulting job losses.

(10) The poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes are hurt the most by the President's promised increased electricity rates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Agreement negotiated between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China has no force and effect in the United States;

(2) the Agreement between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China is a bad deal for United States consumers, workers, families, and communities, and is economically unfair and environmentally irresponsible;

(3) the Agreement, as well as any other bilateral or international agreement regarding greenhouse gas emissions such as the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris in December 2015, requires the advice and consent of the Senate and must be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the Agreement and an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the Agreement;

(4) the United States should not be a signatory to any bilateral or other international agreement on greenhouse gases if it would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States; and

(5) the United States should not agree to any bilateral or other international agreement imposing disparate greenhouse gas commitments for the United States and other countries.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are wrapped up here for the evening so far as amendments, and I just want to thank colleagues for the discussion we have had today, the opportunity to bring forward some issues that clearly generate their own level of passion and emotion, and again the chance to bring forth issues we have been waiting for some period of time to have before us.

While some may suggest these are hard issues and hard votes to take, nobody ever said voting should be easy here in the Senate. The issues that come before us are issues the Nation considers and that we as their representatives should take seriously. So sometimes there are hard votes, and we will argue and debate over the wording and critically, and that is appropriate.

So again, looking forward to tomorrow, we have an opportunity to have now eight amendments that will be pending tomorrow afternoon, and I look forward to the continued discussion and a new day.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning

business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

REMEMBERING BECKY LOCKHART

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Becky Lockhart, former Speaker of the Utah House of Representatives, who tragically passed away on January 17, after a brief battle with a rare and devastating disease.

Becky Lockhart was the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House in the State of Utah. She did so in a truly extraordinary manner. She established a pattern of leadership that will be a model and a guide for wise legislative leaders in our State and across this great Nation for many, many years to come.

I affectionately yet admiringly refer to Speaker Lockhart as the iron lady of Utah as she possessed so many of the qualities of the original iron lady, Margaret Thatcher. Grounded in conservative principles, passionate about policy, and committed to federalism and local control, she knew where she stood and she stood firm every single time.

She followed the admonition of another great leader in American politics, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "I will stand with anybody that stands right, stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong."

Professionally trained as a nurse, Speaker Lockhart also understood the softer yet equally important gifts of compassion and concern, as well as listening and laughter. Even in the most heated discussion, she could change a room with a flash of her charismatic smile, a wink and a grin, or even some well-worded sarcasm to provide a little bit of levity.

Combining her nurse's intuition and strong leadership made her the perfect combination of satin and steel. She could and would and did stand up to any political or business bureaucracy, forcefully correct a colleague, rebuke an inaccurate report, and challenge the small-minded ideas and thinkers. Less reported was her impact and influence as a mentor to new members of the Utah House of Representatives, her work in helping more women become involved in the political process, and how she gave voice to those who did not have a strong voice of their own.

Above all, Speaker Lockhart looked out for, longed to be with, cherished and loved her family. She knew that the work she did in the walls of her own home was the most important work she would or could ever do. Becky also recognized that family is the bulwark of society and the strength of our Nation.

More than the ink of good press and the accolades of others, Speaker

Lockhart knew that her most important legacy would not be recorded in history books, it would not be recorded in the Utah State code that has so many of her words written on it. No, it would be written in the hearts of her family and her friends.

I have been lifted by Becky Lockhart's leadership, inspired by her insight and her integrity, and encouraged by her commitment to the U.S. Constitution, and her love of country and am most blessed to call her my friend. Speaker Becky Lockhart, the iron lady of Utah, will indeed be heralded for her satin-and-steel leadership in the Utah House of Representatives. She will indeed be remembered for all that she did, but more significantly she will hold a special place in countless hearts because of who she was.

I pay tribute to this special person, this amazing leader, and this beloved friend, whose loss we mourn this very week, and who some Members of this body were privileged to know. It is my honor to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me say to my cousin, my heart goes out to you, and my condolences on what you have talked about here today. I really appreciate you coming down and talking so sincerely about that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to pay tribute to a remarkable woman, a loving wife, and a caring mother—former Utah Speaker of the House Rebecca "Becky" Lockhart.

After weeks of battling a rare degenerative disease, Becky quietly passed away on January 17, 2015, with her loving family gathered at her bedside. Becky leaves behind a legacy of leadership and passionate advocacy that will resonate for years to come. It was this same passion and resilience that defined her tenure as Speaker of the Utah House. She was a dedicated public servant who always rose to meet our State's challenges with wisdom and strength.

Becky's career was a model of selfless service. Guided by a desire to help others, she studied nursing at Brigham Young University. Before entering public service, Becky worked as a registered nurse for 7 years, during which time she treated thousands of patients and became intimately familiar with health care issues affecting Utah families. Her experience as a nurse would later shape her career as a legislator, and as Speaker of the House, she became a powerful advocate for State-based health care reform. I had the opportunity to discuss these and many other issues with Becky throughout the years. In doing so, I was always impressed with her eloquence, her intelligence, and her commitment to the State of Utah.

Becky was first elected to the Utah House of Representatives in 1998, and

she quickly distinguished herself as a persuasive collaborator, a passionate legislator, and one of the hardest-working representatives in the legislature. Her colleagues recognized her leadership abilities and elected her Assistant Majority Whip in 2008. Just 2 years later, Becky made history when she became the first woman to serve as Speaker of the House in Utah. Through her remarkable career, she trail-blazed a path for generations of women to follow and became known as Utah's "Iron Lady."

Utah grew under Becky's leadership. She championed legislation that modernized our State's transportation system, strengthened our infrastructure, and promoted technological advancement. During her last year as Speaker, she spearheaded an ambitious education initiative aimed at putting technology directly into the hands of Utah students. Her leadership spurred a much-needed discussion on ways to improve Utah's education system to equip our students with the resources they need to succeed academically.

Many are familiar with Becky's public life, but of even greater importance was her personal life. Before she was House Speaker and even before she became a well-known political figure, Becky was, first and foremost, a wonderful wife and a loving mother. Becky and her husband, Stan, created a strong partnership in politics and in parenthood as they lovingly raised their three children, Hannah, Emily, and Stephen. I know that Stan and his family will miss Becky most of all. During this time of heartrending loss, I pray that they may feel the comforting embrace of God's love and find peace in the memories they share with this remarkable woman.

I, too, will miss Becky dearly. May her memory always serve as a model of compassion, selflessness, and dedicated public service.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Jurisdiction

Rule XXV, Standing Rules of the Senate

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the

power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

(h)(1) Committee on Environment and Public Works, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Air pollution.
2. Construction and maintenance of highways.
3. Environmental aspects of Outer Continental Shelf lands.
4. Environmental effects of toxic substances, other than pesticides.
5. Environmental policy.
6. Environmental research and development.
7. Fisheries and wildlife.
8. Flood control and improvements of rivers and harbors, including environmental aspects of deepwater ports.
9. Noise pollution.
10. Nonmilitary environmental regulation and control of nuclear energy.
11. Ocean dumping.
12. Public buildings and improved grounds of the United States generally, including Federal buildings in the District of Columbia.
13. Public works, bridges, and dams.
14. Regional economic development.
15. Solid waste disposal and recycling.
16. Water pollution.
17. Water resources.

(2) Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to environmental protection and resource utilization and conservation, and report thereon from time to time.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

RULE 1. COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN GENERAL

(a) **REGULAR MEETING DAYS:** For purposes of complying with paragraph 3 of Senate Rule XXVI, the regular meeting day of the committee is the first and third Thursday of each month at 10:00 a.m. If there is no business before the committee, the regular meeting shall be omitted.

(b) **ADDITIONAL MEETINGS:** The chair may call additional meetings, after consulting with the ranking minority member. Subcommittee chairs may call meetings, with the concurrence of the chair, after consulting with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the committee.

(c) PRESIDING OFFICER:

(1) The chair shall preside at all meetings of the committee. If the chair is not present, the ranking majority member shall preside.

(2) Subcommittee chairs shall preside at all meetings of their subcommittees. If the subcommittee chair is not present, the ranking majority member of the subcommittee shall preside.

(3) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by paragraphs (1) and (2), any member of the committee may preside at a hearing.

(d) **OPEN MEETINGS:** Meetings of the committee and subcommittees, including hearings and business meetings, are open to the public. A portion of a meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by roll call vote of a majority of the members present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; or

(3) constitute any other grounds for closure under paragraph 5(b) of Senate Rule XXVI.

(e) BROADCASTING:

(1) Public meetings of the committee or a subcommittee may be televised, broadcast, or recorded by a member of the Senate press gallery or an employee of the Senate.

(2) Any member of the Senate Press Gallery or employee of the Senate wishing to televise, broadcast, or record a committee meeting must notify the staff director or the staff director's designee by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting.

(3) During public meetings, any person using a camera, microphone, or other electronic equipment may not position or use the equipment in a way that interferes with the seating, vision, or hearing of committee members or staff on the dais, or with the orderly process of the meeting.

RULE 2. QUORUMS

(a) **BUSINESS MEETINGS:** At committee business meetings, and for the purpose of approving the issuance of a subpoena or approving a committee resolution, seven members of the committee, at least two of whom are members of the minority party, constitute a quorum, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) **SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS:** At subcommittee business meetings, a majority of the subcommittee members, at least one of whom is a member of the minority party, constitutes a quorum for conducting business.

(c) **CONTINUING QUORUM:** Once a quorum as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) has been established, the committee or subcommittee may continue to conduct business.

(d) **REPORTING:** No measure or matter may be reported to the Senate by the committee unless a majority of committee members cast votes in person.

(e) **HEARINGS:** One member constitutes a quorum for conducting a hearing.

3. HEARINGS

(a) **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Before the committee or a subcommittee holds a hearing, the chair of the committee or subcommittee shall make a public announcement and provide notice to members of the date, place, time, and subject matter of the hearing. The announcement and notice shall be issued at least one week in advance of the hearing, unless the chair of the committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to provide a shorter period, in which event the announcement and notice shall be issued at least twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing.

(b) STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES:

(1) A witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the committee or a subcommittee shall file 100 copies of the written testimony at least 48 hours before the hearing. If a witness fails to comply with this requirement, the presiding officer may preclude the witness' testimony. This rule may be waived for field hearings, except for witnesses from the Federal Government.

(2) Any witness planning to use at a hearing any exhibit such as a chart, graph, diagram, photo, map, slide, or model must submit one identical copy of the exhibit (or representation of the exhibit in the case of a model) and 100 copies reduced to letter or legal paper size at least 48 hours before the hearing. Any exhibit described above that is not provided to the committee at least 48 hours prior to the hearing cannot be used for

purpose of presenting testimony to the committee and will not be included in the hearing record.

(3) The presiding officer at a hearing may have a witness confine the oral presentation to a summary of the written testimony.

(4) Notwithstanding a request that a document be embargoed, any document that is to be discussed at a hearing, including, but not limited to, those produced by the General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, Congressional Research Service, a Federal agency, an Inspector General, or a non-governmental entity, shall be provided to all members of the committee at least 72 hours before the hearing.

RULE 4. BUSINESS MEETINGS: NOTICE AND FILING REQUIREMENTS

(a) **NOTICE:** The chair of the committee or the subcommittee shall provide notice, the agenda of business to be discussed, and the text of agenda items to members of the committee or subcommittee at least 72 hours before a business meeting. If the 72 hours falls over a weekend, all materials will be provided by close of business on Friday.

(b) **AMENDMENTS:** First-degree amendments must be filed with the chair of the committee or the subcommittee at least 24 hours before a business meeting. After the filing deadline, the chair shall promptly distribute all filed amendments to the members of the committee or subcommittee.

(c) **MODIFICATIONS:** The chair of the committee or the subcommittee may modify the notice and filing requirements to meet special circumstances, with the concurrence of the ranking member of the committee or subcommittee.

RULE 5. BUSINESS MEETINGS: VOTING

(a) PROXY VOTING:

(1) Proxy voting is allowed on all measures, amendments, resolutions, or other matters before the committee or a subcommittee.

(2) A member who is unable to attend a business meeting may submit a proxy vote on any matter, in writing, orally, or through personal instructions.

(3) A proxy given in writing is valid until revoked. A proxy given orally or by personal instructions is valid only on the day given.

(b) **SUBSEQUENT VOTING:** Members who were not present at a business meeting and were unable to cast their votes by proxy may record their votes later, so long as they do so that same business day and their vote does not change the outcome.

(c) PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT:

(1) Whenever the committee conducts a rollcall vote, the chair shall announce the results of the vote, including a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast against the proposition by each member of the committee.

(2) Whenever the committee reports any measure or matter by rollcall vote, the report shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to the measure or matter by each member of the committee.

RULE 6. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Regularly Established Subcommittees: The committee has four subcommittees: Transportation and Infrastructure; Clean Air and Nuclear Safety; Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight; and Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP:** The committee chair, after consulting with the ranking minority member, shall select members of the subcommittees.

RULE 7. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS: No project or legislation proposed by any executive branch agency may be approved or otherwise acted upon unless the committee has received a final environmental impact statement relative to it, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, and the written comments of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with section 309 of the Clean Air Act. This rule is not intended to broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the class of projects or legislative proposals for which environmental impact statements are required under section 102(2)(C).

(b) PROJECT APPROVALS:

(1) Whenever the committee authorizes a project under Public Law 89-298, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965; Public Law 83-566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; or Public Law 86-249, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; the chairman shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record, and the committee shall publish periodically as a committee print, a report that describes the project and the reasons for its approval, together with any dissenting or individual views.

(2) Proponents of a committee resolution shall submit appropriate evidence in favor of the resolution.

(c) BUILDING PROSPECTUSES:

(1) When the General Services Administration submits a prospectus, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, for construction (including construction of buildings for lease by the government), alteration and repair, or acquisition, the committee shall act with respect to the prospectus during the same session in which the prospectus is submitted.

A prospectus rejected by majority vote of the committee or not reported to the Senate during the session in which it was submitted shall be returned to the General Services Administration and must then be resubmitted in order to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress.

(2) A report of a building project survey submitted by the General Services Administration to the committee under section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, may not be considered by the committee as being a prospectus subject to approval by committee resolution in accordance with section 7(a) of that Act. A project described in the report may be considered for committee action only if it is submitted as a prospectus in accordance with section 7(a) and is subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this rule.

(d) NAMING PUBLIC FACILITIES: The committee may not name a building, structure or facility for any living person, except former Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former Justices of the United States Supreme Court over 70 years of age, or Federal judges who are fully retired and over 75 years of age or have taken senior status and are over 75 years of age.

RULE 8. AMENDING THE RULES

The rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended by vote of a majority of committee members at a business meeting if a quorum is present.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator BLUMENTHAL, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. MEETINGS

(A) Unless otherwise ordered, the Committee shall meet on the first Wednesday of each month. The Chairman may, upon proper notice, call such additional meetings as deemed necessary.

(B) Except as provided in subparagraphs (b) and (d) of paragraph 5 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public. The Committee shall prepare and keep a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceedings of each meeting whether or not such meeting or any part thereof is closed to the public.

(C) The Chairman of the Committee, or the Ranking Majority Member present in the absence of the Chairman, or such other Member as the Chairman may designate, shall preside over all meetings.

(D) Except as provided in rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no meeting of the Committee shall be scheduled except by majority vote of the Committee or by authorization of the Chairman of the Committee.

(E) The Committee shall notify the office designated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the time, place, and purpose of each meeting. In the event such meeting is canceled, the Committee shall immediately notify such designated office.

(F) Written or electronic notice of a Committee meeting, accompanied by an agenda enumerating the items of business to be considered, shall be sent to all Committee Members at least 72 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) in advance of each meeting. In the event that the giving of such 72-hour notice is prevented by unforeseen requirements or Committee business, the Committee staff shall communicate notice by the quickest appropriate means to Members or appropriate staff assistants of Members and an agenda shall be furnished prior to the meeting.

(G) Subject to the second sentence of this paragraph, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless a written or electronic copy of such amendment has been delivered to each Member of the Committee at least 24 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) before the meeting at which the amendment is to be proposed. This paragraph may be waived by a majority vote of the Members and shall apply only when 72-hour written notice has been provided in accordance with paragraph (F).

II. QUORUMS

(A) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (B), eight Members of the Committee shall

constitute a quorum for the reporting or approving of any measure or matter or recommendation. Five Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of transacting any other business.

(B) In order to transact any business at a Committee meeting, at least one Member of the minority shall be present. If, at any meeting, business cannot be transacted because of the absence of such a Member, the matter shall lay over for a calendar day. If the presence of a minority Member is not then obtained, business may be transacted by the appropriate quorum.

(C) One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of receiving testimony.

III. VOTING

(A) Votes may be cast by proxy. A proxy shall be written and may be conditioned by personal instructions. A proxy shall be valid only for the day given.

(B) There shall be a complete record kept of all Committee actions. Such record shall contain the vote cast by each Member of the Committee on any question on which a roll call vote is requested.

IV. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

(A) Except as specifically otherwise provided, the rules governing meetings shall govern hearings.

(B) At least one week in advance of the date of any hearing, the Committee shall undertake, consistent with the provisions of paragraph 4 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make public announcements of the date, place, time, and subject matter of such hearing.

(C)(1) Each witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the Committee shall submit 40 copies of such witness' testimony to the Committee not later than 48 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) before the witness' scheduled appearance at the hearing.

(2) Any witness who fails to meet the deadline specified in paragraph (1) shall not be permitted to present testimony but may be seated to take questions from Committee members, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member determine there is good cause for the witness' failure to meet the deadline or it is in the Committee's interest to permit such witness to testify.

(D) The presiding Member at any hearing is authorized to limit the time allotted to each witness appearing before the Committee.

(E) The Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses and the production of memoranda, documents, records, and any other materials. If the Chairman or a Committee staff member designated by the Chairman has not received from the Ranking Minority Member or a Committee staff member designated by the Ranking Minority Member notice of the Ranking Minority Member's non-concurrence in the subpoena within 48 hours (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) of being notified of the Chairman's intention to subpoena attendance or production, the Chairman is authorized following the end of the 48-hour period involved to subpoena the same without the Ranking Minority Member's concurrence. Regardless of whether a subpoena has been concurred in by the Ranking Minority Member, such subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Committee. When the Committee or Chairman authorizes a subpoena, the subpoena may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or of any

other Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman.

(F) Except as specified in Committee Rule VII (requiring oaths, under certain circumstances, at hearings to confirm Presidential nominations), witnesses at hearings will be required to give testimony under oath whenever the presiding Member deems such to be advisable.

V. MEDIA COVERAGE

Any Committee meeting or hearing which is open to the public may be covered by television, radio, and print media. Photographers, reporters, and crew members using mechanical recording, filming, or broadcasting devices shall position and use their equipment so as not to interfere with the seating, vision, or hearing of the Committee Members or staff or with the orderly conduct of the meeting or hearing. The presiding Member of the meeting or hearing may for good cause terminate, in whole or in part, the use of such mechanical devices or take such other action as the circumstances and the orderly conduct of the meeting or hearing may warrant.

VI. GENERAL

All applicable requirements of the Standing Rules of the Senate shall govern the Committee.

VII. PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS

(A) Each Presidential nominee whose nomination is subject to Senate confirmation and referred to this Committee shall submit a statement of his or her background and financial interests, including the financial interests of his or her spouse and of children living in the nominee's household, on a form approved by the Committee, which shall be sworn to as to its completeness and accuracy. The Committee form shall be in two parts:

(1) Information concerning employment, education, and background of the nominee, which generally relates to the position to which the individual is nominated and which is to be made public; and

(2) Information concerning the financial and other background of the nominee, to be made public when the Committee determines that such information bears directly on the nominee's qualifications to hold the position to which the individual is nominated.

(B) At any hearing to confirm a Presidential nomination, the testimony of the nominee and, at the request of any Member, any other witness shall be under oath.

(C) Committee action on a nomination, including hearings or a meeting to consider a motion to recommend confirmation, shall not occur until at least five days (not counting Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays) after the nominee submits with respect to the currently pending nomination the form required by this rule unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, waives this waiting period.

VIII. NAMING OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FACILITIES

It is the policy of the Committee that a Department of Veterans Affairs facility may be named only after a deceased individual and only under the following circumstances:

(A) Such individual was:

(1) A veteran who (i) was instrumental in the construction or the operation of the facility to be named, or (ii) was a recipient of the Medal of Honor or, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, otherwise performed military service of an extraordinarily distinguished character;

(2) A Member of the United States House of Representatives or Senate who had a direct association with such facility;

(3) An Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a Secretary of Defense or of a service branch, or a military or other Federal civilian official of comparable or higher rank; or

(4) An individual who, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, performed outstanding service for veterans.

(B) Each Member of the Congressional delegation representing the State in which the designated facility is located must indicate in writing such Member's support of the proposal to name such facility after such individual. It is the policy of the Committee that sponsoring or cosponsoring legislation to name such facility after such individual will not alone satisfy this requirement.

(C) The pertinent State department or chapter of each Congressionally chartered veterans' organization having a national membership of at least 500,000 must indicate in writing its support of such proposal.

IX. AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be changed, modified, amended, or suspended at any time provided, however, that no less than a majority of the entire membership so determine at a regular meeting with due notice or at a meeting specifically called for that purpose. The rules governing quorums for reporting legislative matters shall govern rules changes, modification, amendments, or suspension.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VERMONT ESSAY FINALISTS

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the Fifth Annual "What is the State of the Union" Essay contest conducted by my office. These 20 finalists were selected from over 400 entries.

The essays follow.

LIAM GIBBONS, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

We learn in school and from our parents that America is the land of opportunity. Yet that is not the case. When the wealth gap is steadily increasing, as women earn 70 cents for each dollar a man makes, as the U.S. government spends more on defense than on its disenfranchised, the land of opportunity seems no longer under boot, but instead a distant reality. Equal protection under the laws for every citizen, promoting the general welfare, rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. All of these things are printed on our country's most sacred documents, these things which need to be an attainable reality for every American.

Perhaps one of the most egregiously neglected groups in the U.S. is women. Wage inequality combined with the control of their own bodies in the hands of the government all add to the fact that women are among the most disparaged people within the U.S. Throughout America, women are denied the right to a safe and constitutional abortion. Some of the biggest contenders for the presidency have voiced their belief that women shouldn't have this constitutional right even in the context of rape or incest. Because of *Roe v. Wade*, because of its con-

stitutionality, a safe abortion should be as accessible to the women in Texas as much as the women in Vermont.

A law needs to standardize how abortion clinics are made and run, and if there is an issue regarding states' rights and federalism, then an amendment must be made. Because not only are women not currently in control of their own bodies, they also lack the ability to earn equal wages as men. In 1977, the Equal rights amendment lost by the votes of three states. Who in their right minds would vote against equal rights in 2015. In order to ensure true equality and civil rights bring back the ERA, and this time ratify it.

Another group of people who lack this promised opportunity is the poor. Most Americans are employed, but many of them aren't earning livable wages. An American shouldn't have to work three jobs to support their family. An American shouldn't have to ride a bus three hours a day in order to work for privatized welfare. An American should be able to work for 40 hours a week, and be able to live comfortably. And this is possible if we raise the minimum wage so that it equates to a livable wage. However, no American should not have to strive for the minimum, each citizen should have a chance at exceeding, each American should be able to go to college.

In Germany, in Sweden, in Norway college is free. In Syria, a week of bombing by the U.S. costs the same as the tuition of 40,000 American students. If we were to take a fraction of our defense budget and give it to the impoverished for higher education, if we were to reallocate the budget, we would be seeing a lot more opportunity.

ELI HULSE, VERMONT COMMONS SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As the United States moves into 2015, we have achieved many things that have furthered the nation, and improved the security of the people economically, socially, and militarily. Some of these advancements include electing Janet Yellen as the first female Chair of the Federal Reserve, reducing the unemployment rate from 6.7 percent to 5.8 percent; the lowest it has been since 2008, and helping foreign forces fight against the militant group ISIS. However, there are many problems that the United States faces and needs to address over the next year.

The single most important issue that the United States needs to recognize and correct is the disparity of income. Although it is true that the gap in income causes problems with equality between the social classes, there are concerns that the percentage of income that the upper class has is causing instability in the United States economy as a whole. People who have more money do not spend as much of percentage of it as poorer people, which means that that money sits in savings accounts, and is not paid to businesses in return for products. As the income gap widens, less money will be introduced into the economy, and it will leave the economy in a precarious position.

Another serious issue that the United States needs to address is the spread of Ebola in Africa. Although domestic cases of Ebola have been isolated and treated, an unstable Africa would allow Ebola to potentially spread to the United States and other countries, and could be catastrophic. It is important that the United States government continues its support of Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and other countries that are struggling to create the infrastructure to treat this deadly disease.

Finally, it is key that the United States continues its resistance to terror threats

both domestically and internationally. Although currently not a direct threat to the United States or to the general populous, ISIS has the potential to cause great damage to the European Union and eventually to the United States. A military force this size has not been seen in a long time, and the influence that it has in the countries it overtakes is alarming and needs to be kept in check. The United States needs to keep this in mind when making international policy decisions, and needs to continue supporting countries that are actively fighting ISIS.

The United States continues to be one of the largest influencers on the international playing field. However, policy makers need to keep in mind many domestic problems, and begin working across the aisle in order to keep the government of the United States secure and capable. 2014 has seen a whole array of new policies, and these policies have ensured the security of the American people. In 2015, new policies will be created, that will hopefully fix some of the problems in our society. God bless the United States of America.

KATHY JOSEPH, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

America has undoubtedly grown in the past year, but the many problems plaguing our nation continue to persist. The United States economy is stronger. We added 300 thousand jobs in November, the best in nearly three years. The unemployment rate is at 5.8%, a post-recession low point. President Obama struck a climate change deal with China—the two countries with the largest energy consumptions agreed to curb their carbon emissions by 2030. The war on terror in Afghanistan officially ended. Relations with Cuba have been reopened, which will make educational travel to Cuba easier and is a new approach to dealing with the oppressive regime that is currently leading Cuba.

All of these are steps America has taken in the past year in the right direction. However, we still face many challenges. The US has a growing income gap—the rich are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. This is highlighted in the spending bill passed in December to prevent the government shutdown. In it there were several provisions to cut welfare spending, such as Medicare and spending on the Women and Children support while there was another provision essentially written by the banks to reverse the Dodd Frank act. That act was written after the recession, but now things will go back to the way they were. Lobbyists for banks and for the wealthy have louder voices in Washington. Over 50% of Congress people are millionaires, while millionaires make up only 5% of the US population. This helps explain why income inequality is only getting worse, and is something that the American people must change.

It is harder for students to afford college. Student loans are not of importance in Washington, which is something that needs to be changed. More people are afraid of the debt they will be in after getting their degree, and would rather start working out of high school. This is not the path we should be going on, and it is time for Congress to start listening to the students and prioritizing education.

The media have recently brought the nation's attention to police brutality, racial discrimination, and our broken criminal justice system. President Obama allocated \$263 million for police body cameras and training, which is an acknowledgement of the need for reform but does not solve the root problem. Although there was footage available for the

strangling of Eric Garner, the officer had no charges filed against him. These injustices seem to be occurring only more frequently, and Congress should focus its attention on real solutions that will lead to demilitarization of the police and a stop to the criminal justice system disproportionately affecting minority groups.

We are still moving forward as a nation, but in 2015 we must work to reverse trends such as the growing income gap, increased police brutality, and losing sight of our priorities. There is still hope for a brighter future if we remember what values America really stands for.

EMILY (EMERY) MEAD, MISSISQUOI VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As a young Vermonter, just getting ready to begin my college journey, there are some concerns that trouble me most about the future of our country. Please consider my advice as you prepare your address on the state of our union. My main concern is about how the transgender community is treated in America. Things have gotten better for them, but there's still quite a bit of discrimination against transgender people. Many people don't think trans folk deserve rights, but they're still just humans. I am a part of this community so I know about its difficulties personally. I am physically female but I identify as male.

One of the difficulties I have is the bathrooms and I'm not the only one, it's one of the biggest problems for us. I am literally terrified to go to the bathroom at school and in other public places because I use the men's bathroom and every time I do I'm afraid I will be ridiculed or kicked out and have been confronted by kids telling me to stay out of the guys bathroom at school. No one should be afraid to pee.

I don't have it that bad, for some people it's a lot worse. A friend of mine came out as transgender to his family and they kicked him out and disowned him. Luckily he has a very supporting girlfriend who he's currently living with and good friends who helped him with his struggles. Some people don't have that kind of support. Some are kicked out of their houses or run away from abusive families to live on the dirty streets and beg for money to pay for food or to buy a blanket to keep them warm on cold nights. An article about gay and transgender youth homelessness on americanprogress.org gives these stats which I have paraphrased: There is an estimated 1.6 million to 2.8 million homeless youth in the United States; 20 to 40 percent of that are gay or transgender kids; an estimated 320,000 to 400,000 gay and transgender youth are facing homelessness each year. Some are lucky enough to find a shelter or housing for transgender people, but not everyone lives near one or knows about one near them. It's not right for these kids to have no place to sleep.

These problems are very serious and need to be addressed and fixed. A possible solution for the bathroom problem is to fund more unisex bathrooms in more public places; I strongly believe this will help reduce the awkwardness and fear of going to the bathroom; even for those who are just uncomfortable with using public bathrooms. As for the shelter problem, putting more of these shelters around the country and making them more advertised and well known these kids won't be forced to live on the streets anymore.

Thank you for your consideration.

ALICIA MUIR, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As a global powerhouse, the United States is bestowed with a responsibility. This coun-

try stands upon its obligation and ability to be innovative, to provide opportunity and to maintain a respectable quality of living for every citizen. I would like to take this moment to address where we stand on these principles and how far we still have to go.

In our current state, economic problems are most apparent. While the economy rests in a steady stage of recovery, many of our neighbors struggle to obtain and secure an adequate standard of living. We can try to justify yearly improvement by pointing out that unemployment rates and gas prices are down. But despite such progress, the standard of living is always increasing. Paired with this fact is the abundant number of citizens who struggle to survive on a wage that is not livable. The obvious action to take is to raise the federal minimum wage, which has been set at \$7.25 since 2009. For a single person working 40 hours a week, the basic costs of food, housing, medical care, utilities, and other necessary expenses should be attainable with the lowest margin of pay. As of now, it is not. Starting in 2015, many states have already decided to raise their minimum wage. If we increase the pay benchmark on the federal level, every state will have to do the same.

When high school graduates are launched into adulthood, college is the promising route that comes with a discouraging debt sentence. Higher education is needed to be competitive in the job market. Rather than pouring mass amounts of money into defense spending and other well budgeted programs, legislators should create a larger budget for student loans and grants. I urge the United States to make college more accessible. In addition to the budget, the federal government can offer incentives for universities that will encourage them to administer greater financial aid packages and cut tuition costs. Specific criteria can even be established to provide free education to certain financial groups based on their low incomes.

Transitioning to a problem that is often neglected, I believe that as a country we must address the gender wage gap. To this day, a vast majority of women make on average only 75% of what men make. First, the United States has to establish a paid pregnancy leave at the standard of other industrialized nations. This will allow women to balance earning a sustainable income and raising a family. We can also regulate companies that retaliate against workers who discuss their wages, as well as increase the limitations on gender based pay discrimination. It's time to finally stop employers from paying less for equal work. Let us break down the glass ceiling.

To affirm that these programs will take place, and that these solutions will triumph, it is vital that the Congress disregards the party polarization that has crippled the government for so long. With collaboration and determination, the United States can prosper and prevail.

CURTIS RICHARDSON, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

My country, our country, is something I love and wish that everyone within its borders receives the highest amount of happiness possible and lives a life well fed and secure.

With that said an issue not talked about as much as it should. Homelessness. People spend their nights in cold dark alleyways covered only by the warmth of the Sunday paper. Shelters are full, stomachs empty. There are children who are homeless. There should never be a child without a warm place

to sleep. By enacting programs which employ the homeless, and renovating buildings that serve no purpose, transforming them into shelters and low income housing we can find a solution to this problem and make sure that every American does not have to worry where they are going to sleep.

The poverty level in the United States is at 14.5 percent 42,000,000 Americans. A percentage that is entirely too high. A percentage of those Americans may work well over 40 hours a week, put in overtime and are yet still unable to rise above the poverty level. This is because the national minimum wage is at \$7.25. The minimum wage is not a livable wage. By raising the national minimum wage to over \$10 we can make sure that those hard working Americans are not living below the poverty line.

There is always a need for jobs in America. Many jobs are being outsourced for big business to make more money. By federally regulating how much a company can outsource jobs from America we can make companies open more factories in America and by doing so will open the way for more jobs spread throughout these United States.

While there are many domestic issues that are very important there are international ones as well. With the terrorist group Isis still at large we must ensure the security of citizens in the United States and places overseas. That is why we will have troops ready to be deployed. As long as there is a terrorist presence we will protect the people of the United States and its allies.

Bees are needed in order to pollinate flowers and grow many of the foods we eat. The bees are dying off and without them many of the foods we eat will increase in price and will deplete. Opening bee farms in America and increasing the bee population we can save many crops and flowers that the bees greatly assist with, and the federal government would also be assisting those small bee farmers who may be running low on business and this will be supporting the hard working Americans and not big business.

This cannot be accomplished alone. It will take the country as a whole cooperating with one another to make everything here into a reality. Working past party lines and finding an answer that's the best solution will ensure that these problems are solved.

FRIEDEMANN SCHMIDT, BRATTLEBORO UNION
HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

Under the presidency of Ronald Reagan the United States turned within four years from the biggest creditor nation in the world in 1981 to the world's largest debtor in 1985. Supported by numerous foreign assignments of the U.S. Armed forces, the public debt increased constantly, reaching a figure of \$18 trillion in recent years. This is a very serious issue for the United States not only because it deepens the dependence on creditor nations like China or Saudi Arabia which neglect values like freedom and equality, but also it directly affects everyone.

In 2013 the interest payments of the U.S. public debt made up 6% of the federal budget excluding an actual debt reduction. With a steadily growing budget deficit, primarily due to outrageous defense spending, that figure will even form a larger part of the annual budget plan. Presumably that will lead to cuts in secondary areas like education, transportation and social as well as scientific endeavors. This symbolizes a threat to the belief of the founding fathers in equality and perhaps makes a myth of the United States offering fair chances for everyone, regardless of status.

By decreasing the governmental funding of social programs, like the free/reduced meal

program offering meals to 20% of food insecure students in Vermont, the living status of numerous hard-working middle and lower class would drop. A declining federal funding of universities and colleges throughout the country would further increase the college tuition for individuals, creating an unaffordable higher education for hundreds of thousands of young, talented Americans—a problem America already faces.

The social injustice created by enlarging the gap between rich and poor, would weaken the unity of the United States as much as decreasing the funding of America's world-leading role in science and innovation, the key to economic success and human progress itself. Former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich states that due to the fact that "Inequality has become worse, the danger to the economy and democracy had become worse."

The public debt will be one of the major challenges for United States politics in the near future. Facing it will have to lead to changes of American policies and its lead in world policy. Priorities have to be set and compromises have to be made. Martin Luther King Jr. once said: "A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death." It is the responsibility of every U.S. citizen to prevent that in order to maintain the prosperity and values for which America stands.

SOPHIA SEMAN, ESSEX HIGH SCHOOL (FINALIST)

As our nation ages and evolves, the problems it faces become more complex. Some of the greatest challenges we face today are those of police brutality, a flawed naturalization process, and the daunting cost of higher education.

In the past few months, cities in the US have erupted in protests over police brutality. Starting in Ferguson, marching feet have spread to New York and California. One solution to the spreading mistrust in law enforcement is the use of body cameras that would provide an account of each interaction. While many speculate that this would be an invasion of privacy, the departments that have tested these devices decided the benefits outweigh the risks. Rialto, CA has seen a "60 percent reduction in officer use of force incidents following camera deployment" and an "88 percent reduction in number of citizen complaints". The federal government should issue categorical grants to any department that opts to implement the use of this technology. The cost to supply all the law enforcers with cameras may seem too high, but eventually, the money saved in lawsuits would counter the initial pay out.

This year, college students returned to school with considerably lighter pockets, as state tuition climbed another 2.9 percent. While many politicians realize the need for a highly educated work force for the future economy, few are willing to throw their weight behind the necessary reforms to make it more affordable. If young adults are expected to pay their way through college, they must have viable options in student loans. Unfortunately, "private college loans are much cheaper than federal student loans now". It is the responsibility of our government to help budding adults pay for higher education and mold themselves into conscientious citizens by lowering federal interest rates on loans.

The US has always been a nation of immigrants. However it is the unfortunate American tradition that the newest wave of immigrants is detested by those who have formed roots. Today it is the Latinos who face a

wave of prejudice. As much as it pains some lawmakers to admit, we need the fresh faces and new ideas as much as these prospective citizens need refuge from the turmoil of their home country. It is time for a renovation of the naturalization process. Because the US does not have an official language and many new citizens site English as "one of the biggest obstacles", the English portion of the test should be eliminated. Questions pertaining to civil rights should be emphasized on the Civics Test, rather than superfluous ones about history, as citizens should be more aware of their rights and responsibilities than the War of 1812.

The most pressing issues facing the Union today are those of police brutality, rising college and university costs and the labyrinthine naturalization process. They demand quick, effective solutions, such as police-worn cameras, lowered interest rates on student loans, and a revised naturalization test.●

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DE- CLARED ON JANUARY 23, 1995, WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—PM 2

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2015.

The crisis with respect to grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to

foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA,

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 21, 2015.*

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-298. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia; Interstate Movement and Import Restrictions on Certain Live Fish" (Docket No. APHIS-2007-0038) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-299. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Assistance Loans, Loan Deficiency Payments, and Sugar Loans" (RIN0560-AI28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-300. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance From the U.S. Department of Agriculture" (RIN0503-AA57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-301. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Guard Youth Challenge Program 2014 annual report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-302. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a real estate lease transaction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-303. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities), Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-304. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Logistics and Material Readiness), Department of Defense, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-305. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of

Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cuban Assets Control Regulations" (31 CFR Part 515) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-306. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine" (RIN0694-AG43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-307. A communication from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Foreign Policy Report on the imposition of a license requirement on exports, reexports, and transfers (in-country) to the Crimea region of Ukraine; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-308. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce's 2014 Report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-309. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13346 of July 8, 2004, the annual certification of the effectiveness of the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-310. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-311. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Proximity Detection Systems for Continuous Mining Machines in Underground Coal Mines" (RIN1219-AB65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-312. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-313. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department of Labor's 2012 and 2013 FAIR Act Inventory of Inherently Governmental Activities and Inventory of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-314. A communication from the Vice President for Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-315. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-440, "Special Election Reform Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-316. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-458, "Protecting Pregnant Workers Fairness Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-317. A communication from the Director of the Office of Financial Reporting and Policy, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "FY 2014 Agency Financial Report"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-318. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting proposed legislation relative to data breach notification; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-319. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Ruling: 2015 Prevailing State Assumed Interest Rates" (Rev. Rul. 2015-02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-320. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Automatic Approval of Change in Funding Method for Takeover Plans" (Announcement 2015-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-321. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reporting Sick Pay Paid by Third Parties" (Notice 2015-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-322. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of Retroactive Increase in Excludable Transit Benefits" (Notice 2015-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-323. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update to Rev. Proc. 2014-4" (Rev. Proc. 2015-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-324. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2015-3" (Rev. Proc. 2015-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-325. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update to Rev. Proc. 2014-6" (Rev. Proc. 2015-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-326. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update to Rev. Proc. 2014-8" (Rev. Proc. 2015-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-327. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Property Qualifying for the Energy Credit under Section 48" (Notice 2015-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-328. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-329. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Land Acquisitions in the State of Alaska" (RIN1076-AF23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-330. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 18 to the Salmon Fishery Management Plan" (RIN0648-BC95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-331. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015; Correction" (RIN0648-BE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-332. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2015 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Specifications and 2015 Commercial Summer Flounder Quota Adjustments" (RIN0648-XD651) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-333. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XD653) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-334. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Regulatory Amendment to Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries Trawl Rationalization Program for the Start of 2015" (RIN0648-BE34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-335. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Porbeagle Shark Fishery" (RIN0648-XD659) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-336. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expansion of the Fair Play Viticultural Area" (RIN1513-AC07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-337. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fisheries Off Alaska" (RIN0648-BE06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-338. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress Under Section 319 of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-339. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Saab, AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0460)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-340. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket

No. FAA-2013-0072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-341. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0981)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-342. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0366)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-343. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0771)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-344. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0848)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-345. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0759)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-346. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0257)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-347. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0566)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-348. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0448)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-349. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0453)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-350. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0057)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-351. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0053)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-352. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Limited Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0717)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-353. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1029)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-354. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2008-0256)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-355. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0450)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-356. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Area Boundary Descriptions; Cape Canaveral, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0875)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-357. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (4); Amendment No. 517" ((RIN2120-AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-358. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Elimination of the Air Traffic Control Tower Operator Certificate for Controllers Who Hold a Federal Aviation Administration Credential With a Tower Rating" ((RIN2120-AK40) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-359. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Simferopol (UKFV) and Dnipropetrovsk (UKDV) Flight Information Region (FIR)" ((RIN2120-AK56) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0225)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-360. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR)" ((RIN2120-AK61) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0708)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-361. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Harmonization of Airworthiness Standards—Gust and Maneuver Load Requirements" ((RIN2120-AK12) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0142)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 203. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 31. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 32. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 200. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of major revenue legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BURR, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 201. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 202. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. COATS):

S. 203. A bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 204. A bill to reinstate the 10-year statute of limitations period applicable to collection of amounts paid to Social Security beneficiaries by administrative offset, and prevent recovery of overpayments from individuals under 18 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 205. A bill to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 206. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reauthorize the State infrastructure bank program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KING, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 207. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 208. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 209. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 211. A bill to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 212. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that voters in elections for Federal office do not wait in long lines in order to vote; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 213. A bill to improve requirements for entering into commerce of imitation firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 214. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 216. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 217. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 218. A bill to facilitate emergency medical services personnel training and certification curriculums for veterans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 219. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 220. A bill to prohibit discrimination and retaliation against individuals and health care entities that refuse to recommend, refer for, provide coverage for, pay for, provide, perform, assist, or participate in abortions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 221. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to authorize additional funding for the pregnancy assistance fund; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 222. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 223. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program on awarding grants for provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 224. A bill to ensure the United States promotes women's meaningful inclusion and participation in mediation and negotiation processes undertaken in order to prevent, mitigate, and resolve violent conflict and implements the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 225. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a def-

inition under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 226. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 227. A bill to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 228. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide for congressional and State approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 229. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 230. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S.J. Res. 4. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the rights of the American people that were taken away by the Supreme Court's decision in the Citizens United case and related decisions, to protect the integrity of our elections, and to limit the corrosive influence of money in our democratic process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms.

HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. Res. 31. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. Res. 32. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; from the Committee on Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 165

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 165, a bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor to S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to

direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 176

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 176, a bill to advance integrated water management and development through innovation, resiliency, conservation, and efficiency in the 21st century, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 19 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 24 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 27 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 29 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 29 proposed to S. 1, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 30

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 30 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 50

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 50 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 58

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 58 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 73

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 73 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 74

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from

Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 74 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 77

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 77 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 202. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 202

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CHANGE TO THE MEDICARE LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITAL MORATORIUM EXCEPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 114(d) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1395ww note), as amended by sections 3106(b) and 10312(b) of Public Law 111-148, section 1206(b)(2) of the Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-67), and section 112 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-93), is amended, in paragraph (7), by striking “The moratorium under paragraph (1)(A)” and inserting “Any moratorium under paragraph (1)” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 112 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-93).

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself,
Mr. TESTER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr.
HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MORAN
and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 209. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I introduce the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act Amendments of 2015.

In recent years, the Committee on Indian Affairs has received concerns from Indian tribes and the energy industry that the Federal laws governing the development of tribal energy resources are complex and often lead to significant costs, delays and uncertainty for all parties. These costs, delays and uncertainties discourage development of tribal energy resources and drive investments away from tribal lands.

According to the National Congress of American Indians, Indian tribes hold nearly a quarter of American onshore oil and gas reserves. Yet, existing tribal energy production represents less than 5 percent of the current national production. If we can remove the costs and delays of developing energy on Indian lands, we could potentially see the country's energy production, and thus energy independence, increase significantly.

Nearly 10 years ago, Congress passed the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act. This act created a new, alternative process for Indian tribes to take control of developing their energy resources on their own lands without the burdens of administrative review, approval, and oversight.

This approach gives Indian tribes the option to enter into tribal energy resource agreements with the Secretary of the Interior. Once an Indian tribe enters into this agreement, it has the authority to enter into subsequent leases, business agreements, and rights-of-way affecting energy development, without further review and approval by the Secretary—a significant departure from the standard laws, and consequent bureaucracy, applicable to tribal contracts.

That law was a step in the right direction. However, these agreements have not been utilized to the extent that they could be, primarily because the implementation of the act has been made more complex than it should be.

It is past time we make key improvements to the law so that Indian tribes can take advantage of these agreements and significantly reduce bureaucratic burdens to energy development. Years of consultation and outreach to Indian tribes have produced targeted solutions to address the concerns about the process for entering these agreements. The bill that I am introducing today would streamline the process for approving the tribal energy resource agreements and make it more predictable for Indian tribes.

I would like to highlight some of the key provisions in this bill. This bill includes a number of amendments to improve the review and approval process for the tribal energy resource agreements. For example, the bill provides clarity regarding the specific information required for tribal applications for these agreements.

In addition, the bill sets forth specific time frames for Secretarial determinations on the agreement applications. Moreover, if an application is disapproved, this bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to provide detailed explanations to the Indian tribe and steps for addressing the reasons for disapproval.

The bill has various provisions that would improve technical assistance and consultation with Indian tribes during

their energy planning and development stages. It also includes an amendment to the Federal Power Act that would put Indian tribes on a similar footing with States and municipalities for preferences when preliminary permits or original licenses for hydroelectric projects are issued.

Additionally, this bill would allow Indian tribes and third parties to perform appraisals to help expedite the Secretary's approval process for tribal agreements for mineral resource development.

My bill does not focus on only traditional resource development, but includes renewal resource development components as well. For example, the bill would create tribal biomass demonstration projects to provide Indian tribes with more reliable and potentially long-term supplies of woody biomass materials.

This bill is intended to provide Indian tribes with the tools to develop and use energy more efficiently. In passing this bill, Congress will enhance the ability of Indian tribes to exercise self-determination over the development of energy resources located on tribal lands, thereby improving the lives and economic well-being of Native Americans.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank Senators FESTER, MCCAIN, HOEVEN, ENZI, and FISCHER for joining me in cosponsoring this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in advancing this bill expeditiously.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WARNER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 229. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the DISCLOSE Act of 2015.

Simply put, this bill would end the massive undisclosed spending in elections that is undermining public faith in our democracy, creating what one newspaper called “a tsunami of slime.”

Today marks the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's disastrous 5-4 decision in *Citizens United v. FEC*. With that feat of judicial activism, which will likely go down with *Lochner v. New York* as one of the Supreme Court's worst decisions, the conservative bloc of the Supreme Court overturned the laws of Congress protecting our elections' integrity, thwarted the will of the American people, and allowed unlimited anonymous corporate money to flood into our elections.

Worse still, even though the justices decided 8-1 that laws promoting disclosure of outside spending were necessary and appropriate, everything that has happened since has shown a concerted effort to prevent and frustrate disclosure. So the billionaires and corporations spending tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars on elections can continue to do so with no public knowledge and no accountability.

The *Citizens United* decision hangs on a series of irretrievably flawed assertions. Among them is the premise that unlimited corporate expenditures would be fine because there would be a regime of "effective disclosure" that would "provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters."

However, following *Citizens United*, that regime of "effective disclosure" has completely broken down, with billionaires and corporations spending unlimited secret money in elections. In the 2014 elections, the most expensive midterm elections in our history, with over \$3.6 billion spent, the Washington Post reported that at least 31 percent of all independent spending was spent by groups that are not required to disclose their donors. And that doesn't even count spending on so-called "issue ads," which is also not reported.

The first line of defense for campaign finance laws is supposed to be the Federal Election Commission. However, 5 years after the fact, the FEC just held a public meeting to consider rules to implement the Court's decision in *Citizens United*, and incredibly, the commissioners did not even consider rules to require disclosure.

That has left the problem largely to the Internal Revenue Service, because so many of the offending organizations are non-profits. And they mangled this. First, they failed to investigate big non-profit groups spending hundreds of millions of dollars on elections making what appeared to be illegal, material false statements about election spending on these IRS forms. Then the IRS singled out organizations for scrutiny based on words in their names suggesting that they were politically active. Recently, the Treasury Department and the IRS proposed new rules to require disclosure by 501(c)(4) groups. Along with fifteen of my col-

leagues, I commended the effort to ensure disclosure by these non-profits. However, the IRS withdrew the proposed rules, and the latest reporting says that new rules won't be ready for the 2016 elections, another failure of disclosure.

The DISCLOSE Act would put some transparency into the "tsunami of slime." The bill, which is unchanged from the version introduced last Congress, would require organizations spending money in elections—including super PACS and tax-exempt 501(c)(4) groups—to promptly disclose donors who have given \$10,000 or more during an election cycle. The bill includes robust transfer provisions to prevent political operatives from using complex webs of entities to game the system and hide donor identities. This is not a new idea. Many Republicans, including several in the Senate, used to support disclosure.

Senator ALEXANDER has said, "I support campaign finance reform, but to me that means individual contributions, free speech, and full disclosure."

"I don't like it when a large source of money is out there funding ads and is unaccountable," said Senator SESSIONS. "To the extent we can, I tend to favor disclosure."

Or as Senator CORNYN put it, "I think the system needs more transparency, so people can more easily reach their own conclusions."

Senator MCCONNELL once summed it up nicely: "Virtually everybody in the Senate is in favor of enhanced disclosure, greater disclosure. That's really hardly a controversial subject."

And he was right—until *Citizens United*. Suddenly Republicans are fighting to keep the American people in the dark to protect their wealthy funders.

The high disclosure threshold and other provisions in the bill protect membership organizations from having to disclose their member lists, and from having to disclose any donor who does not wish his or her contribution to be used for political purposes.

Our campaign finance system is broken. Immediate action is required to fix it. Americans of all political stripes are disgusted by the influence of unlimited, anonymous corporate cash in our elections, and by campaigns that succeed or fail depending on how many billionaires the candidates have in their pockets.

Passing this law would remove the dark cloud of unlimited, anonymous money from our elections, and would prove to the American people that Congress is committed to fairness, equality, and the fundamental principle of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." As Republican former Federal Election Commission Chairman Trevor Potter has said, the DISCLOSE Act is "appropriately targeted, narrowly tailored, clearly constitutional and desperately needed."

I thank our 35 cosponsors of this bill so far, and Representative VAN HOLLEN for introducing in the House, and I urge my colleagues to support the DISCLOSE Act of 2015.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 229

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light On Spending in Elections Act of 2015" or the "DISCLOSE Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. CAMPAIGN DISBURSEMENT REPORTING.

(a) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED.—

(1) TREATMENT OF FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF EXPRESS ADVOCACY AS INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE.—Subparagraph (A) of section 301(17) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(17)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, or is the functional equivalent of express advocacy because, when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the election or defeat of a candidate, taking into account whether the communication involved mentions a candidacy, a political party, or a challenger to a candidate, or takes a position on a candidate's character, qualifications, or fitness for office; and"

(2) EXPANSION OF PERIOD DURING WHICH COMMUNICATIONS ARE TREATED AS ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 304(f)(3)(A)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)(i)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subclause (III) as subclause (IV); and

(B) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

"(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than the President or Vice President, is made during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election);

"(III) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and"

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS MADE PRIOR TO ENACTMENT.—The amendment made by paragraph (2) shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2016, except that no communication which is made prior to such date shall be treated as

an electioneering communication under subclause (II) or (III) of section 304(f)(3)(A)(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as amended by paragraph (2)) unless the communication would be treated as an electioneering communication under such section if the amendment made by paragraph (2) did not apply.

(b) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR CORPORATIONS, LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, AND CERTAIN OTHER ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 324. DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS BY COVERED ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any covered organization that makes campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000 in an election reporting cycle shall, not later than 24 hours after each disclosure date, file a statement with the Commission made under penalty of perjury that contains the information described in paragraph (2)—

“(A) in the case of the first statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the first such disclosure date; and

“(B) in the case of any subsequent statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the previous disclosure date and ending on such disclosure date.

“(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph is as follows:

“(A) The name of the covered organization and the principal place of business of such organization.

“(B) The amount of each campaign-related disbursement made by such organization during the period covered by the statement of more than \$1,000, and the name and address of the person to whom the disbursement was made.

“(C) In the case of a campaign-related disbursement that is not a covered transfer, the election to which the campaign-related disbursement pertains and if the disbursement is made for a public communication, the name of any candidate identified in such communication and whether such communication is in support of or in opposition to a candidate.

“(D) A certification by the chief executive officer or person who is the head of the covered organization that the campaign-related disbursement is not made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with or at the request or suggestion of a candidate, authorized committee, or agent of a candidate, political party, or agent of a political party.

“(E) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using exclusively funds in a segregated bank account consisting of funds that were paid directly to such account by persons other than the covered organization that controls the account, for each such payment to the account—

“(i) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

“(ii) the date and amount of such payment; and

“(iii) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date;

but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the account in an aggregate amount of \$10,000 or more during

the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date.

“(F) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using funds other than funds in a segregated bank account described in subparagraph (E), for each payment to the covered organization—

“(i) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

“(ii) the date and amount of such payment; and

“(iii) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date;

but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the covered organization in an aggregate amount of \$10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the disclosure date.

“(G) Such other information as required in rules established by the Commission to promote the purposes of this section.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS.—The requirement to include in a statement filed under paragraph (1) the information described in paragraph (2) shall not apply to amounts received by the covered organization in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments (other than investments by the principal shareholder in a limited liability corporation) in the covered organization.

“(B) DONOR RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The requirement to include in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) the information described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not apply if—

“(i) the person described in such subparagraph prohibited, in writing, the use of the payment made by such person for campaign-related disbursements; and

“(ii) the covered organization agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the payment in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(C) AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM AFFILIATES.—The requirement to include in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) the information described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not apply to any amount which is described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(i).

“(4) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(A) DISCLOSURE DATE.—The term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(i) the first date during any election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000; and

“(ii) any other date during such election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such election reporting cycle.

“(B) ELECTION REPORTING CYCLE.—The term ‘election reporting cycle’ means the 2-year period beginning on the date of the most recent general election for Federal office.

“(C) PAYMENT.—The term ‘payment’ includes any contribution, donation, transfer, payment of dues, or other payment.

“(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—

“(1) OTHER REPORTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION.—Information included in a statement filed under this section may be excluded from statements and reports filed under section 304.

“(2) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUND.—A segregated bank account referred to in subsection (a)(2)(E) may be treated as a separate segregated fund for purposes of section 527(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(c) FILING.—Statements required to be filed under subsection (a) shall be subject to the requirements of section 304(d) to the same extent and in the same manner as if such reports had been required under subsection (c) or (g) of section 304.

“(d) CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘campaign-related disbursement’ means a disbursement by a covered organization for any of the following:

“(1) An independent expenditure consisting of a public communication.

“(2) An electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)(3).

“(3) A covered transfer.

“(e) COVERED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered organization’ means any of the following:

“(1) A corporation (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(2) An organization described in section 501(c) of such Code and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of such Code).

“(3) A labor organization (as defined in section 316(b)).

“(4) Any political organization under section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, other than a political committee under this Act.

“(f) COVERED TRANSFER DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any transfer or payment of funds by a covered organization to another person if the covered organization—

“(A) designates, requests, or suggests that the amounts be used for—

“(i) campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(B) made such transfer or payment in response to a solicitation or other request for a donation or payment for—

“(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(C) engaged in discussions with the recipient of the transfer or payment regarding—

“(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) donating or transferring any amount of such transfer or payment to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(D) made campaign-related disbursements (other than a covered transfer) in an aggregate amount of \$50,000 or more during the 2-year period ending on the date of the transfer or payment, or knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment made such disbursements in such an aggregate amount during that 2-year period; or

“(E) knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment

would make campaign-related disbursements in an aggregate amount of \$50,000 or more during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the transfer or payment.

“(2) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘covered transfer’ does not include any of the following:

“(A) A disbursement made by a covered organization in a commercial transaction in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments made by the covered organization.

“(B) A disbursement made by a covered organization if—

“(i) the covered organization prohibited, in writing, the use of such disbursement for campaign-related disbursements; and

“(ii) the recipient of the disbursement agreed to follow the prohibition and deposited the disbursement in an account which is segregated from any account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(3) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS AMONG AFFILIATES.**—

“(A) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS AMONG AFFILIATES.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘covered transfer’ does not include an amount transferred by one covered organization to another covered organization if such transfer—

“(I) is not made directly into a separate segregated bank account described in subsection (a)(2)(E); and

“(II) is treated as a transfer between affiliates under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) **SPECIAL RULE.**—If the aggregate amount of transfers described in clause (i) exceeds \$50,000 in any election reporting cycle—

“(I) the covered organization which makes such transfers shall provide to the covered organization receiving such transfers the information required under subsection (a)(2)(F) (applied by substituting ‘the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle and ending on the date of the most recent transfer described in subsection (f)(3)(A)(i)’ for ‘the period covered by the statement’ in clause (i) thereof); and

“(II) the covered organization receiving such transfers shall report the information described in subclause (I) on any statement filed under subsection (a)(1) as if any contribution, donation, or transfer to which such information relates was made directly to the covered organization receiving the transfer.

“(B) **DESCRIPTION OF TRANSFERS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.**—A transfer of amounts from one covered organization to another covered organization shall be treated as a transfer between affiliates if—

“(i) one of the organizations is an affiliate of the other organization; or

“(ii) each of the organizations is an affiliate of the same organization; except that the transfer shall not be treated as a transfer between affiliates if one of the organizations is established for the purpose of making campaign-related disbursements.

“(C) **DETERMINATION OF AFFILIATE STATUS.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the following organizations shall be considered to be affiliated with each other:

“(i) A membership organization, including a trade or professional association, and the related State and local entities of that organization.

“(ii) A national or international labor organization and its State or local unions, or an organization of national or international unions and its State and local entities.

“(iii) A corporation and its wholly owned subsidiaries.

“(D) **COVERAGE OF TRANSFERS TO AFFILIATED SECTION 501(c)(3) ORGANIZATIONS.**—This paragraph shall apply with respect to an amount transferred by a covered organization to an organization described in paragraph (3) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code in the same manner as this paragraph applies to an amount transferred by a covered organization to another covered organization.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 304(f)(6) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by striking “Any requirement” and inserting “Except as provided in section 324(b), any requirement”.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF DISCLOSURE RULES TO SUPER PACS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (e) of section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126), as amended by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) A political committee with an account that accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the contribution limits or source prohibitions under this Act, but only with respect to such accounts.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Paragraph (4) of section 324(e) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30126), as amended by section 2, is amended by inserting “(except as provided in paragraph (5))” before the period at the end.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as provided in section 2(a)(3), the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after January 1, 2016, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 31—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. INHOFE submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 31

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,060,871, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$4,666.67 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,166.67 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$5,247,208, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$8,000, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$2,000, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$2,186,337, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$3,333.33, may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$833.33, may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) **EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) **VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.**—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 32—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. ISAKSON submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 32

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,283,522, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$3,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$2,200,323, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the

committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$916,801, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$8,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 78. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 79. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 80. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 81. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 82. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 83. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 84. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 85. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 86. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 87. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 88. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 89. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 90. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 91. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 92. Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 93. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 94. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 95. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which ordered to lie on the table.

SA 97. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which ordered to lie on the table.

SA 98. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 78. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BILATERAL OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On November 11, 2014, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China announced the "U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation" (in this section referred to as the "Agreement") reflecting "the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances".

(2) The Agreement stated the United States intention to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by one-quarter by 2025 while allowing the People's Republic of China to double its greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2030.

(3) While coal fired electricity remains the least expensive energy alternative, the reduction of coal use because of the Agreement would result in a 25 percent increase in electricity prices in the United States in 2025, according to analysis conducted by the Energy Information Administration.

(4) The people of China will not see similar electricity price increases as they continue to use low cost coal without limit for the foreseeable future, at least until 2030.

(5) Increases in the price of electricity can cause job losses in the United States industrial sector, which includes manufacturing, agriculture, and construction.

(6) The price of electricity is a top consideration for job creators when locating manu-

facturing facilities, especially in energy-intensive manufacturing such as steel and aluminum production.

(7) Requiring mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States while allowing nations such as China and India to increase their greenhouse gas emissions results in jobs moving from the United States to other countries, especially to China and India, and is economically unfair.

(8) Imposing disparate greenhouse gas emissions commitments for the United States and countries such as China and India is environmentally irresponsible because it results in greater emissions as businesses move to countries with less stringent standards.

(9) Union members, families, consumers, communities, and local institutions like schools, hospitals, and churches are hurt by the resulting job losses.

(10) The poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes are hurt the most by the President's promised increased electricity rates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Agreement negotiated between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China has no force and effect in the United States;

(2) the Agreement between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China is a bad deal for United States consumers, workers, families, and communities, and is economically unfair and environmentally irresponsible;

(3) the Agreement, as well as any other bilateral or international agreement regarding greenhouse gas emissions such as the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris in December 2015, requires the advice and consent of the Senate and must be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the Agreement and an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the Agreement;

(4) the United States should not be a signatory to any bilateral or other international agreement on greenhouse gases if it would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States; and

(5) the United States should not agree to any bilateral or other international agreement imposing disparate greenhouse gas commitments for the United States and other countries.

SA 79. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. STUDY ON COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL AFFORDABILITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACADEMY.—The term "Academy" means the National Academy of Public Administration, an independent, nonpartisan, and non-profit organization chartered by Congress.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall contract with the Academy to conduct an independent study to create a definition of

and framework for the term "community and individual affordability".

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study, the Academy shall—

(A) consult with—

(i) the Administrator;

(ii) State and local governments;

(iii) organizations that specialize in affordability issues; and

(iv) popularly elected governance organizations such as the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(B) review existing studies of the costs associated with major regulations under such laws as—

(i) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(ii) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(iii) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(iv) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and

(v) the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) (commonly known as the "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976"); and

(C) recommend a new affordability threshold and describe how different localities can effectively fund municipal projects.

(3) TIMING.—The Administrator shall contract with the Academy not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after entering into an arrangement with the Administrator under subsection (b)(1), the Academy shall submit to Congress and the Administrator a report that includes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Academy.

SA 80. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION B—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING

TITLE I—OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING REVENUE

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2010–2015 issued by the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) shall be considered to be the final oil and gas leasing program under that section for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.

(b) FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Secretary is considered to have issued a final environmental impact statement for the program applicable to the period described in subsection (a) in accordance with all requirements under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Lease Sales 214, 232, and 239 shall not be included in the final oil and

gas leasing program for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2020.

(d) **EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO NOT INCLUDED.**—Nothing in this section affects restrictions on oil and gas leasing under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432).

SEC. 102. REVENUE SHARING FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF WIND ENERGY PRODUCTION FACILITIES.

The first sentence of section 8(p)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting after “27 percent” the following: “, or, in the case of projects for offshore wind energy production facilities, 37.5 percent”.

SEC. 103. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based on the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area.

“(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program, and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such program under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘available unleased acreage’ means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

“(6)(A) In the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that—

“(i) is estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

“(ii) is estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

“(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled ‘Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation’s Outer Continental Shelf, 2006’.”.

SEC. 104. DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 102 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (11) as paragraphs (6) through (12), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) **COASTAL STATE.**—The term ‘coastal State’ means—

“(A) each of the Gulf producing States; and

“(B) effective for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter—

“(i) the State of Alaska; and

“(ii) each of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.”;

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues’ means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after—

“(i) December 20, 2006, with respect to the Gulf producing States; and

“(ii) October 1, 2015, with respect to—

“(I) the State of Alaska; and

“(II) each of the coastal States described in paragraph (5)(B)(ii).”;

(4) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated), by striking “Gulf producing State” each place it appears and inserting “coastal State”.

(b) **DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.**—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**FROM 181 AREA, 181 SOUTH AREA, AND 2002-2007 PLANNING AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO**”;

(2) by striking “Gulf producing State” each place it appears (other than paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)) and inserting “coastal State”;

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

“(A) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to Gulf producing States—

“(i) 75 percent to Gulf producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

“(ii) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title; and

“(B) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to coastal States described in section 102(5)(B), 100 percent to the coastal States in accordance with subsection (b).”;

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “**GULF PRODUCING STATES**” and inserting “**COASTAL STATES**”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) **ALLOCATION AMONG CERTAIN ATLANTIC STATES AND THE STATE OF ALASKA FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THEREAFTER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), effective for fiscal years 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be allocated to each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) that is closest to the geo-

graphic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

“(B) **MINIMUM ALLOCATION.**—The amount allocated to a coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(B).”;

(D) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)”;

(5) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available to coastal States under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

“(A) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(A)—

“(i) \$500,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(ii) \$699,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2054;

“(B) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(B)(ii)—

“(i) \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025; and

“(ii) \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2065; and

“(C) in the case of the State of Alaska, \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2065.”.

TITLE II—OFFSET

SEC. 201. FEDERAL WORKFORCE REDUCTION.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency”—

(A) means an Executive agency, as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) does not include the Government Accountability Office.

(2) **APPLICABLE MAXIMUM.**—The term “applicable maximum” means—

(A) in the case of a quarter before the target-attainment quarter, the difference obtained by subtracting—

(i) the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) the number of Federal employees separating from agencies during the period—

(aa) beginning on the first day following the baseline quarter; and

(bb) ending on the last day of the quarter to which the applicable maximum is being applied; by

(II) %; from

(ii) the total number of Federal employees determined for the baseline quarter; and

(B) in the case of the target-attainment quarter and any quarter thereafter, the number equal to 90 percent of the total number of Federal employees as of September 30, 2014.

(3) **BASLINE QUARTER.**—The term “baseline quarter” means the quarter in which occurs the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.**—The term “Federal employee” means an employee, as defined under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) **QUARTER.**—The term “quarter” means a period of 3 calendar months ending on March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31.

(6) **TARGET-ATTAINMENT QUARTER.**—The term “target-attainment quarter” means the earlier of—

(A) the first quarter occurring after the baseline quarter for which the total number of Federal employees does not exceed 90 percent of the total number of Federal employees as of September 30, 2014; or

(B) the quarter ending on September 30, 2018.

(7) **TOTAL NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—The term “total number of Federal employees” means the total number of Federal employees in all agencies.

(b) **WORKFORCE LIMITS AND REDUCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President, through the Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management), shall take appropriate measures to ensure that, effective with respect to each quarter beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, the total number of Federal employees determined for such quarter does not exceed the applicable maximum for such quarter.

(2) **METHOD FOR ACHIEVING COMPLIANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any reductions necessary in order to achieve compliance with paragraph (1) shall be made through attrition.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—If, for any quarter, the total number of Federal employees exceeds the applicable maximum for such quarter, until the first succeeding quarter for which such total number is determined not to exceed the applicable maximum for such succeeding quarter, reductions shall be made through both attrition and a freeze on appointments.

(3) **COUNTING RULES.**—For purposes of this section—

(A) any determination of the total number of Federal employees or the number of Federal employees separating from agencies shall be made—

- (i) on a full-time equivalent basis; and
- (ii) under subsection (d); and

(B) any determination of the total number of Federal employees for a quarter shall be made as of such date or otherwise on such basis as the Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management) considers to be representative and feasible.

(4) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive any provision of this subsection, with respect to an individual appointment, upon a determination by the President that such appointment is necessary due to—

- (i) a state of war or for reasons of national security; or
- (ii) an extraordinary emergency threatening life, health, safety, or property.

(B) **NONDELEGATION.**—The authority under this paragraph may not be delegated.

(c) **LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OF SERVICE CONTRACTS.**—The President, through the Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management), shall take appropriate measures to ensure that there is no increase in the procurement of service contracts by reason of the enactment of this section, except in cases in which a cost comparison demonstrates that such contracts would be to the financial advantage of the Government.

(d) **MONITORING AND NOTIFICATION.**—The Office of Management and Budget (in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management) shall—

- (1) continuously monitor all agencies and, for each quarter to which the requirements of subsection (b)(1) apply, determine whether or not such requirements have been met; and
- (2) not later than 14 days after the end of each quarter described in paragraph (1), submit to the President and each House of Congress, a written determination as to whether or not the requirements of subsection (b)(1) have been met.

(e) **REGULATIONS.**—The President may promulgate any regulations necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 202. FEDERAL DEFICIT REDUCTION.

Any savings generated as a result of section 201 that are not needed to offset the costs of carrying out title I (including any amendments made by title I) shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for Federal budget deficit reduction or, if there is no Federal budget deficit, for reducing the Federal debt in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

SA 81. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ APPLICATION.

This Act shall not apply until the date on which the President (or a designee) determines, in consultation with the Chief of the Forest Service and other relevant Federal agencies, that increased greenhouse gas emissions, including emissions from the pipeline described in section 2(a), will not contribute to any of the following:

- (1) An increased frequency of wildfires in the United States.
- (2) An increased range of wildfires in the United States.
- (3) An increased severity of wildfires in the United States.
- (4) An increased prevalence or frequency of invasive pests, including the spruce beetle, the bark beetle, and the hemlock woolly adelgid.

SA 82. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ APPLICATION.

This Act shall not apply until the date on which the President (or a designee) determines, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, and other relevant Federal agencies, that increased greenhouse gas emissions, including emissions from the pipeline described in section 2(a), will not have a significant negative impact on farmers and ranchers due to any of the following:

- (1) An increased frequency or severity of drought in the United States.
- (2) An increased risk of invasive agricultural pests in the United States.
- (3) A decrease in available irrigation water from reduced snowpack in the United States.

SA 83. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr.

CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ ENHANCED PROTECTIONS FROM RETALIATION.

(a) **APPLICABILITY TO WORKERS IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY.**—Section 11 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 660) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO WORKERS IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No person shall discharge or cause to be discharged, or in any manner discriminate against or cause to be discriminated against, any employee because—

“(A) such employee has filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any proceeding under or related to this Act;

“(B) such employee has testified or is about to testify before Congress or in any Federal or State proceeding related to safety or health;

“(C) such employee has refused to violate any provision of this Act; or

“(D) of the exercise by such employee on behalf of himself or others of any right afforded by this Act, including the reporting of any injury, illness, or unsafe condition to the employer, agent of the employer, safety and health committee involved, or employee safety and health representative involved.

“(2) **PROHIBITION OF RETALIATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—No person shall discharge, or cause to be discharged, or in any manner discriminate against, or cause to be discriminated against, an employee for refusing to perform the employee’s duties if the employee has a reasonable apprehension that performing such duties would result in serious injury to, or serious impairment of the health of, the employee or other employees.

“(B) **GOOD-FAITH BELIEF.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the circumstances causing the employee’s good-faith belief that performing such duties would pose a safety or health hazard shall be of such a nature that a reasonable person, under the circumstances confronting the employee, would conclude that there is such a hazard. In order to qualify for protection under this paragraph, the employee, when practicable, shall have communicated or attempted to communicate the safety or health concern to the employer and have not received from the employer a response reasonably calculated to allay such concern.

“(3) **COMPLAINT.**—Any employee who believes that the employee has been discharged, disciplined, or otherwise discriminated against by any person in violation of paragraph (1) or (2) may seek relief for such violation by filing a complaint with the Secretary under paragraph (5).

“(4) **STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An employee may take the action permitted by paragraph (3) not later than 180 days after the later of—

- “(i) the date on which an alleged violation of paragraph (1) or (2) occurs; or
- “(ii) the date on which the employee knows or should reasonably have known that such alleged violation occurred.

“(B) **REPEAT VIOLATION.**—Except in cases when the employee has been discharged, a

violation of paragraph (1) or (2) shall be considered to have occurred on the last date an alleged repeat violation occurred.

“(5) INVESTIGATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employee may, within the time period required under paragraph (4), file a complaint with the Secretary alleging a violation of paragraph (1) or (2). If the complaint alleges a prima facie case, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation of the allegations in the complaint, which—

“(i) shall include—

“(I) interviewing the complainant;

“(II) providing the respondent an opportunity to—

“(aa) submit to the Secretary a written response to the complaint; and

“(bb) meet with the Secretary to present statements from witnesses or provide evidence; and

“(III) providing the complainant an opportunity to—

“(aa) receive any statements or evidence provided to the Secretary;

“(bb) meet with the Secretary; and

“(cc) rebut any statements or evidence; and

“(ii) may include issuing subpoenas for the purposes of such investigation.

“(B) DECISION.—Not later than 90 days after the filing of the complaint, the Secretary shall—

“(i) determine whether reasonable cause exists to believe that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred; and

“(ii) issue a decision granting or denying relief.

“(6) PRELIMINARY ORDER FOLLOWING INVESTIGATION.—If, after completion of an investigation under paragraph (5)(A), the Secretary finds reasonable cause to believe that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the Secretary shall issue a preliminary order providing relief authorized under paragraph (14) at the same time the Secretary issues a decision under paragraph (5)(B). If a de novo hearing is not requested within the time period required under paragraph (7)(A)(i), such preliminary order shall be deemed a final order of the Secretary and is not subject to judicial review.

“(7) HEARING.—

“(A) REQUEST FOR HEARING.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A de novo hearing on the record before an administrative law judge may be requested—

“(I) by the complainant or respondent within 30 days after receiving notification of a decision granting or denying relief issued under paragraph (5)(B) or paragraph (6), respectively;

“(II) by the complainant within 30 days after the date the complaint is dismissed without investigation by the Secretary under paragraph (5)(A); or

“(III) by the complainant within 120 days after the date of filing the complaint, if the Secretary has not issued a decision under paragraph (5)(B).

“(ii) REINSTATEMENT ORDER.—The request for a hearing shall not operate to stay any preliminary reinstatement order issued under paragraph (6).

“(B) PROCEDURES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A hearing requested under this paragraph shall be conducted expeditiously and in accordance with rules established by the Secretary for hearings conducted by administrative law judges.

“(ii) SUBPOENAS; PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE.—In conducting any such hearing, the administrative law judge may issue subpoenas. The respondent or complainant may request the issuance of subpoenas that re-

quire the deposition of, or the attendance and testimony of, witnesses and the production of any evidence (including any books, papers, documents, or recordings) relating to the matter under consideration.

“(iii) DECISION.—The administrative law judge shall issue a decision not later than 90 days after the date on which a hearing was requested under this paragraph and promptly notify, in writing, the parties and the Secretary of such decision, including the findings of fact and conclusions of law. If the administrative law judge finds that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the judge shall issue an order for relief under paragraph (14). If review under paragraph (8) is not timely requested, such order shall be deemed a final order of the Secretary that is not subject to judicial review.

“(8) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of notification of a decision and order issued by an administrative law judge under paragraph (7), the complainant or respondent may file, with objections, an administrative appeal with an administrative review body designated by the Secretary (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘review board’).

“(B) STANDARD OF REVIEW.—In reviewing the decision and order of the administrative law judge, the review board shall affirm the decision and order if it is determined that the factual findings set forth therein are supported by substantial evidence and the decision and order are made in accordance with applicable law.

“(C) DECISIONS.—If the review board grants an administrative appeal, the review board shall issue a final decision and order affirming or reversing, in whole or in part, the decision under review by not later than 90 days after receipt of the administrative appeal. If it is determined that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the review board shall issue a final decision and order providing relief authorized under paragraph (14). Such decision and order shall constitute final agency action with respect to the matter appealed.

“(9) SETTLEMENT IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At any time before issuance of a final order, an investigation or proceeding under this subsection may be terminated on the basis of a settlement agreement entered into by the parties.

“(B) PUBLIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS.—Neither the Secretary, an administrative law judge, nor the review board conducting a hearing under this subsection shall accept a settlement that contains conditions conflicting with the rights protected under this Act or that are contrary to public policy, including a restriction on a complainant’s right to future employment with employers other than the specific employers named in a complaint.

“(10) INACTION BY THE REVIEW BOARD OR ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The complainant may bring a de novo action described in subparagraph (B) if—

“(i) an administrative law judge has not issued a decision and order within the 90-day time period required under paragraph (7)(B)(iii); or

“(ii) the review board has not issued a decision and order within the 90-day time period required under paragraph (8)(C).

“(B) DE NOVO ACTION.—Such de novo action may be brought at law or equity in the United States district court for the district where a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) al-

legedly occurred or where the complainant resided on the date of such alleged violation. The court shall have jurisdiction over such action without regard to the amount in controversy and to order appropriate relief under paragraph (14). Such action shall, at the request of either party to such action, be tried by the court with a jury.

“(11) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) TIMELY APPEAL TO THE COURT OF APPEALS.—Any party adversely affected or aggrieved by a final decision and order issued under this subsection may obtain review of such decision and order in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit where the violation, with respect to which such final decision and order was issued, allegedly occurred or where the complainant resided on the date of such alleged violation. To obtain such review, a party shall file a petition for review not later than 60 days after the final decision and order was issued. Such review shall conform to chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subparagraph shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the final decision and order.

“(B) LIMITATION ON COLLATERAL ATTACK.—An order and decision with respect to which review may be obtained under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to judicial review in any criminal or other civil proceeding.

“(12) ENFORCEMENT OF ORDER.—If a respondent fails to comply with an order issued under this subsection, the Secretary or the complainant on whose behalf the order was issued may file a civil action for enforcement in the United States district court for the district in which the violation was found to occur to enforce such order. If both the Secretary and the complainant file such action, the action of the Secretary shall take precedence. The district court shall have jurisdiction to grant all appropriate relief described in paragraph (14).

“(13) BURDENS OF PROOF.—

“(A) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION.—In making a determination or adjudicating a complaint pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or court may determine that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred only if the complainant demonstrates that any conduct described in paragraph (1) or (2) with respect to the complainant was a contributing factor in the adverse action alleged in the complaint.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a decision or order that is favorable to the complainant shall not be issued in any administrative or judicial action pursuant to this subsection if the respondent demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent would have taken the same adverse action in the absence of such conduct.

“(14) RELIEF.—

“(A) ORDER FOR RELIEF.—If the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or a court determines that a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) has occurred, the Secretary or court, respectively, shall have jurisdiction to order all appropriate relief, including injunctive relief and compensatory and exemplary damages, including—

“(i) affirmative action to abate the violation;

“(ii) reinstatement without loss of position or seniority, and restoration of the terms, rights, conditions, and privileges associated with the complainant’s employment, including opportunities for promotions to positions with equivalent or better compensation for which the complainant is qualified;

“(iii) compensatory and consequential damages sufficient to make the complainant whole, (including back pay, prejudgment interest, and other damages); and

“(iv) expungement of all warnings, reprimands, or derogatory references that have been placed in paper or electronic records or databases of any type relating to the actions by the complainant that gave rise to the unfavorable personnel action, and, at the complainant's direction, transmission of a copy of the decision on the complaint to any person whom the complainant reasonably believes may have received such unfavorable information.

“(B) ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS.—If the Secretary or an administrative law judge, review board, or court grants an order for relief under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or court, respectively, shall assess, at the request of the employee against the employer—

“(i) reasonable attorneys' fees; and

“(ii) costs (including expert witness fees) reasonably incurred, as determined by the Secretary, administrative law judge, review board, or court, respectively, in connection with bringing the complaint upon which the order was issued.

“(15) PROCEDURAL RIGHTS.—The rights and remedies provided for in this subsection may not be waived by any agreement, policy, form, or condition of employment, including by any pre-dispute arbitration agreement or collective bargaining agreement.

“(16) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any employee who exercises rights under any Federal or State law or common law, or under any collective bargaining agreement.

“(17) ELECTION OF VENUE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An employee of an employer who is located in a State that has a State plan approved under section 18 may file a complaint alleging a violation of paragraph (1) or (2) by such employer with—

“(i) the Secretary under paragraph (5); or

“(ii) a State plan administrator in such State.

“(B) REFERRALS.—If—

“(i) the Secretary receives a complaint pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall not refer such complaint to a State plan administrator for resolution; or

“(ii) a State plan administrator receives a complaint pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii), the State plan administrator shall not refer such complaint to the Secretary for resolution.

“(18) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘employee’ means an individual employed by—

“(A) an operator of an oil well, as described in the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 213111;

“(B) a petrochemical manufacturing plant assigned the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 213112, 324, or 32511; or

“(C) an entity assigned the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 23712 or 486.”

(b) RELATION TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 17(j) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 666(j)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: “, including the history of violations under section 11(d)”.

SA 84. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr.

BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORTING REQUIREMENT REGARDING SAFETY FOR OIL WELLS, PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURING PLANTS, AND PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION OR TRANSPORTATION ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each issuer that is required to file reports pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a) or 78o(d)) and that is, or that has a subsidiary that is, an operator of an oil well or an operator of a petrochemical manufacturing plant or pipeline construction or transportation entity shall include, in each periodic report filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the securities laws on and after the date of enactment of this Act, the following information for the time period covered by such report:

(1) For each oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity of which the issuer or a subsidiary of the issuer is an operator—

(A) the total number of serious violations of mandatory health or safety standards at an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline transportation or construction entity, including health hazard violations under section 9 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 658);

(B) the total number of citations issued, including serious, willful, and repeated violations, under such section;

(C) the total dollar value of proposed penalties to be applied under such Act (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.); and

(D) the total number of oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity related fatalities involved.

(2) A list of oil wells, petrochemical manufacturing plants, or pipeline construction or transportation entities of which the issuer, or a subsidiary of the issuer, is an operator, that receive written notice from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of willful, serious, and repeated violations of mandatory health or safety standards at an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline construction or transportation entity, including safety hazards under section 9 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 658).

(3) Any pending legal action before the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, established under section 12 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 661), involving an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline construction or transportation entity.

(b) REPORTING SHUTDOWNS AND PATTERNS OF VIOLATIONS.—Beginning on the effective date of this section, each issuer that is, or that has a subsidiary that is, an operator of an oil well or an operator of a petrochemical manufacturing plant or pipeline construction or transportation entity shall file a current report with the Securities and Exchange Commission on Form 8-K (or any successor form) disclosing the following with respect to each oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity of which the issuer or subsidiary is an operator:

(1) The receipt of a citation issued under section 9 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 658).

(2) The receipt of a citation from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration that the oil well, petrochemical manufacturing plant, or pipeline construction or transportation entity has—

(A) willfully or repeatedly violated mandatory health or safety standards at an oil well, a petrochemical manufacturing plant, or a pipeline construction or transportation entity under such section; or

(B) the potential to have such a pattern or willful or repeated violations.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any obligation of a person to make a disclosure under any other applicable law in effect before, on, or after the effective date of this section.

(d) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT.—A violation by any person of this section, or any rule or regulation of the Securities and Exchange Commission issued under this section, shall be treated for all purposes in the same manner as a violation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) or the rules and regulations issued thereunder, consistent with the provisions of this section, and any such person shall be subject to the same penalties, and to the same extent, as for a violation of such Act or the rules or regulations issued thereunder.

(2) RULE AND REGULATIONS.—The Securities and Exchange Commission is authorized to issue such rules or regulations as are necessary or appropriate for the protection of investors and to carry out the purposes of this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ISSUER; SECURITIES LAWS.—The terms “issuer” and “securities laws” have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c).

(2) OPERATOR OF AN OIL WELL.—The term “operator of an oil well” means an operator as described in the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 213111.

(3) PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURING PLANT.—The term “petrochemical manufacturing plant” means any entity assigned the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 324, 213112, or 32511.

(4) PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION OR TRANSPORTATION ENTITY.—The term “pipeline construction or transportation entity” means an entity described in the 2012 North American Industry Classification System code 23712 or 486.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the day that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 85. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LOCAL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

Section 610 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) 10 percent of the funds apportioned to the State for each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016 under each of sections 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), and 144; and”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “2005 through 2009” and inserting “2015 and 2016”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “2005 through 2009” and inserting “2015 and 2016”; and

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking “section 133(d)(3)” and inserting “section 133(d)(4)”; and

(2) in subsection (h)(2)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “shall” and inserting “shall not”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “shall” and inserting “shall not”; and

(3) in subsection (k), by striking “2005 through 2009” and inserting “2015 and 2016”.

SA 86. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.

(a) AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the “American Bridge Fund”, consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—There is hereby appropriated to the American Bridge Fund an amount equivalent to the increase in revenue received in the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate).

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the American Bridge Fund shall be made available by the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of making grants to States for the repair or maintenance of any bridges classified as deficient in the National Bridge Inventory, as authorized under section 144(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer’s Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

“(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.”.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN” after “IDEN-

TIFICATION REQUIREMENT” in the heading thereof.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 87. Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”):

(1) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 88. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ENERGY EXPORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) competitive and open markets facilitate lower prices for consumers, increase private investment, and foster economic growth and opportunities for workers in the United States;

(2) technological innovations have made the United States the largest oil and natural gas producer in the world, creating millions of high-paying jobs in the United States and billions in revenues to Federal and State governments; and

(3) leveraging energy resources of the United States in the global marketplace will provide greater energy security to allies of the United States and increase the geopolitical power of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should realize its full potential as an energy superpower, by expanding trade of energy resources to spur economic growth, increase jobs in the United States, and strengthen the national security of the United States.

SA 89. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.

(a) AMERICAN BRIDGE FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the “American Bridge Fund”, consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—There is hereby appropriated to the American Bridge Fund an amount equivalent to the increase in revenue received in the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate).

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the American Bridge Fund shall be made available by the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of making grants to States for the repair or maintenance of any bridges classified as deficient in the National Bridge Inventory, as authorized under section 144(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(e) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no credit shall be allowed under this section to a taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and taxpayer identification number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.

“(2) REFUNDABLE PORTION.—Subsection (d)(1) shall not apply to any taxpayer with respect to any qualifying child unless the taxpayer includes the name and social security number of such qualifying child on the return of tax for the taxable year.”.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(I) an omission of a correct TIN under section 24(e)(1) (relating to child tax credit) or a correct Social Security number required

under section 24(e)(2) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), to be included on a return.”

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 90. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

TITLE II—ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Energy Consumers Relief Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **DIRECT COSTS.**—The term “direct costs” has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the report of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” and dated December 17, 2010.

(3) **ENERGY-RELATED RULE THAT IS ESTIMATED TO COST MORE THAN \$1,000,000,000.**—The term “energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000” means a rule of the Environmental Protection Agency that—

(A) regulates any aspect of the production, supply, distribution, or use of energy or provides for such regulation by States or other governmental entities; and

(B) is estimated by the Administrator or the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to impose direct costs and indirect costs, in the aggregate, of more than \$1,000,000,000.

(4) **INDIRECT COSTS.**—The term “indirect costs” has the meaning given the term in chapter 8 of the report of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses” and dated December 17, 2010.

(5) **RULE.**—The term “rule” has the meaning given to the term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 203. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES THAT WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may not promulgate as final an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000 if the Secretary determines under section 204(b)(3) that the rule will cause significant adverse effects to the economy.

SEC. 204. REPORTS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PROMULGATING AS FINAL CERTAIN ENERGY-RELATED RULES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Before promulgating as final any energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000, the Administrator shall carry out the requirements of subsection (b).

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Administrator shall submit to Congress and the Secretary a report containing—

(A) a copy of the rule;

(B) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(C) an estimate of the total costs of the rule, including the direct costs and indirect costs of the rule;

(D)(i) an estimate of the total benefits of the rule and when such benefits are expected to be realized;

(ii) a description of the modeling, the calculations, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under this subparagraph; and

(iii) a certification that all data and documents relied upon by the Environmental Protection Agency in developing the estimates—

(I) have been preserved; and

(II) are available for review by the public on the Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency, except to the extent to which publication of the data and documents would constitute disclosure of confidential information in violation of applicable Federal law;

(E) an estimate of the increases in energy prices, including potential increases in gasoline or electricity prices for consumers, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule; and

(F) a detailed description of the employment effects, including potential job losses and shifts in employment, that may result from implementation or enforcement of the rule.

(2) **INITIAL DETERMINATION ON INCREASES AND IMPACTS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall prepare an independent analysis to determine whether the rule will cause any—

(A) increase in energy prices for consumers, including low-income households, small businesses, and manufacturers;

(B) impact on fuel diversity of the electricity generation portfolio of the United States or on national, regional, or local electric reliability;

(C) adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use due to the economic or technical infeasibility of implementing the rule; or

(D) other adverse effect on energy supply, distribution, or use, including a shortfall in supply and increased use of foreign supplies.

(3) **SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION ON ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE ECONOMY.**—If the Secretary determines under paragraph (2) that the rule will cause an increase, impact, or effect described in that paragraph, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall—

(A) determine whether the rule will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, taking into consideration—

(i) the costs and benefits of the rule and limitations in calculating the costs and benefits due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information; and

(ii) the positive and negative impacts of the rule on economic indicators, including those related to gross domestic product, unemployment, wages, consumer prices, and business and manufacturing activity; and

(B) publish the results of the determination made under subparagraph (A) in the Federal Register.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON.**—In this section, the term “social cost of carbon” means—

(1) the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled

“Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 (or any successor or substantially related document); or

(2) any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any Executive order, the Administrator may not use the social cost of carbon to incorporate social benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, or for any other reason, in any cost-benefit analysis relating to an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than \$1,000,000,000 unless a Federal law is enacted authorizing the use.

SA 91. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REVIEW OF CERTAIN FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES.

If, by the date that is 45 days after the date on which a State Bureau of Land Management office has submitted a Federal Register notice to the Washington, DC, office of the Bureau of Land Management for Department of the Interior review, the review has not been completed—

(1) the notice shall consider to be approved; and

(2) the State Bureau of Land Management office shall immediately forward the notice to the Federal Register for publication.

SA 92. Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “During the period ending September 30, 2015, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “through September 30, 2015”.

(b) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—Not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditure in any fiscal year under section 200303 shall be used for projects that secure recreational public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.”

SA 93. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN,

Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION—REBUILDING AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Rebuilding America’s Infrastructure Act of 2015”.

TITLE I—REPEAL OF OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

Subtitle A—Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes

SEC. 101. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

“(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

“(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

“(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

“(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

“(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘dual capacity taxpayer’ means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

“(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

“(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

“(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘generally applicable income tax’ means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

“(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

“(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHELD.—The amendments made by this sec-

tion shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 102. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) for the taxable year, the term ‘domestic production gross receipts’ shall not include gross receipts from the production, refining, processing, transportation, or distribution of oil, gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 103. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS; AMORTIZATION OF DISALLOWED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (i), regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary under this subtitle corresponding to the regulations which granted the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and which were recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such regulations shall also grant the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of wells drilled for any geothermal deposit (as defined in section 613(e)(2)) to the same extent and in the same manner as such expenses are deductible in the case of oil and gas wells. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any costs to which any deduction is allowed under section 59(e) or 291.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(B) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred. For purposes of section 1254, any deduction under this subparagraph shall be treated as a deduction under this subsection.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the

meaning of section 167(h)(5)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(2) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of paragraph (1) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 106. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) CERTAIN SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘major integrated oil company’ includes any successor in interest of a company that was described in subparagraph (B) in any taxable year, if such successor controls more than 50 percent of the crude oil production or natural gas production of such company.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “except as provided in subparagraph (C),” after “For purposes of this paragraph.”.

(2) TAXABLE YEARS TESTED.—Clause (iii) of section 167(h)(5)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “does not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d)” and inserting “did not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d) for any taxable year after 2004”, and

(B) by striking “does not apply” in subclause (II) and inserting “did not apply for the taxable year”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Subtitle B—Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Natural Gas

SEC. 111. REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

TITLE II—INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

SEC. 201. INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise

appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an amount equal to the net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this Act and the amendments made by this Act (after any expenditures authorized by this Act and the amendments made by this Act)—

(A) in accordance with subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) in the case of any additional savings after the application of such subsections, into the Highway Trust Fund in the following manner:

(i) 75 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account).

(ii) 25 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Mass Transit Account.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) 2015 INCREASE.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) and the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund amounts equal to the amounts determined under section 201(a)(1)(B) of the Rebuilding America’s Infrastructure Act of 2015.”.

(b) WATER INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATIVE FINANCING PILOT PROJECTS.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency jointly, \$2,000,000,000 to carry out the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) through 2019.

(c) TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANT.—In this section, the term “TIGER discretionary grant” means a grant awarded and administered by the Secretary of Transportation using funds made available for—

(A) supplemental discretionary grants for a national surface transportation system under title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 203);

(B) the national infrastructure investments discretionary grant program under title I of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111-17; 123 Stat. 3035);

(C) national infrastructure investments under section 2202 of division B of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10; 125 Stat. 191);

(D) national infrastructure investments under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 641);

(E) national infrastructure investments under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 432);

(F) national infrastructure investments under title I of division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 574); or

(G) national infrastructure investments under title I of division K of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235).

(2) APPROPRIATION.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Transportation, \$2,000,000,000 to provide TIGER discretionary grants for fiscal year 2016.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under this section shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for the programs and accounts funded under this section.

SEC. 202. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE III—STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 301. STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, \$1,500,000,000 for State water pollution control revolving funds established in accordance with title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.).

SEC. 302. STATE DRINKING WATER TREATMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, \$1,000,000,000 for State drinking water treatment revolving loan funds established in accordance with section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12).

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The Office of Management and Budget shall not include amounts made available under subsections (b) or (c) of section 201 or title III during a fiscal year in determining whether there has been a breach of the discretionary spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) during the fiscal year.

SA 94. (Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING RENEWABLE ENERGY AND CARBON CAPTURE RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the energy policy of the United States is based on an all-of-the-above approach to production sources;

(2) an all-of-the-above approach reduces dependence on foreign oil, increases national security, and creates jobs;

(3) smart research investments are critical to increase the energy independence of the United States, combat climate change, reduce emissions, and create jobs;

(4) Department of Energy funding for research and development for renewable energy is not currently adequate; and

(5) research regarding carbon capture use and sequestration has decreased almost 30 percent since fiscal year 2012.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that research and development and loan and grant program funding for renewable energy and carbon capture systems should be increased in order to reduce United States emissions, combat climate change, provide energy security, and maintain energy diversity.

SA 95. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking “January 1, 2015” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2020”:

- (1) Paragraph (1).
- (2) Paragraph (2)(A).
- (3) Paragraph (3)(A).
- (4) Paragraph (4)(B).
- (5) Paragraph (6).
- (6) Paragraph (7).
- (7) Paragraph (9).
- (8) Paragraph (11)(B).

(b) EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO TREAT QUALIFIED FACILITIES AS ENERGY PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) is amended by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2020”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SA 96. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ STUDY ON RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ENSURE SAFE TRANSPORTATION BY PIPELINE AND RAIL OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Administrator of Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) shall conduct a study on the resources necessary to ensure the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products, including by rail and pipeline. The study shall focus on the following priorities:

(A) Ensuring the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(B) Ensuring PHMSA has the necessary personnel and other resources, including access to new and emerging technologies, to properly monitor and regulate the transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(2) SCOPE.—The study required under this subsection shall include the following elements:

(A) An examination of the current and projected resources and personnel at the Department of Transportation and PHMSA that are or will be dedicated to regulating, monitoring, and ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(B) A determination of the appropriate manpower personnel, resources, and funding requirements for all Department and Administration elements that do or are expected to play a significant role in regulating, monitoring, and ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(C) An assessment and description of the personnel, resources, and funding needs for each State, and a description of the State, local, and tribal resources and personnel that are dedicated to performing the tasks described in subparagraph (B).

(D) The development and use of technology for each of the Department and Administration elements involved in regulating, monitoring, or otherwise ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline, including whether the elements need additional technological assets and how best to acquire needed additional technological assets.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation and the PHMSA Administrator, in conjunction with the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) The findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(B) Input from other Federal agencies that have any significant role in the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(C) A description of any impending changes to regulations or policy that may have an effect on personnel, resources, or funding or that would otherwise impact the ability of the Department and the Administration to meet the basic standards necessary to properly monitor and regulate the transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(D) Recommendations for enhancing safety for the transport of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline, and what resources, personnel, and funding would be required to implement such recommendations.

(E) An explanation of why the Department or the Administration is not already implementing any of such recommendations.

(F) Recommendations for additional legislation necessary to implement recommendations contained in the report.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Natural

Resources, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. ____ RAILROAD AND PIPELINE EMERGENCY SERVICES PREPAREDNESS, OPERATIONAL NEEDS, AND SAFETY EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE.

Section 508 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 318) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) RAILROAD AND PIPELINE EMERGENCY SERVICES PREPAREDNESS, OPERATIONAL NEEDS, AND SAFETY EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, the Administrator shall establish, as a subcommittee of the National Advisory Council, the Railroad and Pipeline Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation Subcommittee (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Subcommittee’).

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Subcommittee shall be composed of the following:

“(A) The Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or designee.

“(B) The Director of the Office of Emergency Communications of the Department of Homeland Security, or designee.

“(C) The Director for the Office of Railroad, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Investigations of the National Transportation Safety Board, or designee, only in an advisory capacity.

“(D) The Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety of the Federal Railroad Administration, or designee.

“(E) The Assistant Administrator for Security Policy and Industry Engagement of the Transportation Security Administration, or designee.

“(F) The Assistant Commandant for Response Policy of the Coast Guard, or designee.

“(G) The Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response of the Environmental Protection Agency, or designee.

“(H) The Associate Administrator for Hazardous Materials Safety of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or designee.

“(I) The Chief Safety Officer and Assistant Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, or designee.

“(J) The Director of the Office of Energy Infrastructure Security of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or designee.

“(K) Such other qualified individuals as the Administrator shall appoint as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act from among the following:

“(i) Members of the National Advisory Council that have the requisite technical knowledge and expertise to address rail and pipeline emergency response issues, including members from the following disciplines:

“(I) Emergency management and emergency response providers, including fire service, law enforcement, hazardous materials response, and emergency medical services.

“(II) State, local, and tribal government officials with expertise in preparedness, protection, response, recovery, and mitigation, including Adjutants General.

“(III) Elected State, local, and tribal government executives.

“(IV) Such other individuals as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

“(ii) Individuals who have the requisite technical knowledge and expertise to serve on the Subcommittee, including representatives of—

“(I) the rail industry;

“(II) the pipeline industry;

“(III) the oil industry;

“(IV) the communications industry;

“(V) emergency response providers, including individuals nominated by national organizations representing local governments and personnel;

“(VI) representatives from national Indian organizations;

“(VII) technical experts; and

“(VIII) vendors, developers, and manufacturers of systems, facilities, equipment, and capabilities for emergency responder services.

“(iii) Representatives of such other stakeholders and interested and affected parties as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness shall serve as the Chairperson of the Subcommittee, or designee.

“(4) MEETINGS.—

“(A) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the Subcommittee shall take place not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

“(B) OTHER MEETINGS.—After the initial meeting, the Subcommittee shall meet at least twice annually, with at least 1 meeting conducted in person during the first year, at the call of the Chairperson.

“(5) CONSULTATION WITH NONMEMBERS.—The Subcommittee and the program offices for emergency responder training and resources shall consult with other relevant agencies and groups, including entities engaged in Federally funded research and academic institutions engaged in relevant work and research, which are not represented on the Subcommittee to consider new and developing technologies and methods that may be beneficial to preparedness and response to rail and pipeline incidents.

“(6) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Subcommittee shall develop recommendations, for improving emergency responder training and resource allocation, including the following:

“(A) Quality and application of training for local emergency first responders related to rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on local emergency responders and small communities near railroads and pipelines, including the following:

“(i) Ease of access to relevant training for local emergency first responders, including an analysis of—

“(I) the number of individuals being trained;

“(II) the number of individuals who are applying;

“(III) whether current demand is being met;

“(IV) current challenges; and

“(V) projected needs.

“(ii) Modernization of course content related to rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on response to the exponential rise in oil shipments by rail.

“(iii) Training content across agencies and the private sector to provide complementary opportunities for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents courses and materials to avoid overlap, including the following:

“(I) Overlap of course content among agencies.

“(II) The need for integrated course content through public-private partnerships.

“(III) Regular and ongoing evaluation of course opportunities, adaptation to emerging trends, agency and private sector outreach, effectiveness and ease of access for local emergency responders.

“(iv) Online training platforms, train-the-trainer and mobile training options.

“(B) Effectiveness of funding levels related to training local emergency responders for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents, with a particular focus on local emergency responders and small communities, including the following:

“(i) Minimizing overlap in resource allocation among agencies.

“(ii) Minimizing overlap in resource allocation among agencies and private sector.

“(iii) Maximizing public-private partnerships where funding gaps exist for specific training or cost-saving measures can be implemented to increase training opportunities.

“(iv) Adaptation of priority settings for agency funding allocations in response to emerging trends.

“(v) Historic levels of funding across agencies and private sector for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents.

“(vi) Current funding resources across agencies for rail and pipeline hazardous materials incidents.

“(C) Strategy for integration of commodity flow studies, mapping, and access platforms for local emergency responders and how to increase the rate of access to the individual responder in existing or emerging communications technology.

“(D) The need for emergency response plans for rail, similar to existing law related to maritime and stationary facility emergency response plans for hazardous materials, including the following:

“(i) The requirements of such emergency plans on each train and the format and availability of such emergency plans to emergency responders in communities through which the materials travel.

“(ii) How the industry would implement such plans.

“(iii) The thresholds that require emergency plans for each train related to hazardous materials in its cargo.

“(iv) Gaps in existing regulations across agencies.

“(E) The need for a rail and pipeline hazardous materials incident database, including the following:

“(i) An assessment of the appropriate entity to host the database.

“(ii) A definition of ‘rail hazardous materials incident’ and ‘pipeline hazardous materials incident’ that would constitute the level of reporting from the industry.

“(iii) The projected cost of such a database and how that database would be maintained and enforced.

“(F) Increasing access to relevant, useful, and timely information for the local emergency responder for training purposes and in the event of a rail or pipeline hazardous materials incident, including the following:

“(i) Existing information that the emergency responder can access, what the current rate of access and usefulness is for the emergency responder, and what current informa-

tion should remain and what should be reassessed.

“(ii) Utilization of existing technology in the hands of the first responder to maximize delivery of useful and timely information for training purposes or in the event of an incident.

“(iii) Assessment of emerging communications technology that could assist the emergency responder in the event of an incident.

“(G) Determination of the most appropriate agencies and offices for the implementation of the recommendations, including—

“(i) recommendations that can be implemented without congressional action and appropriate time frames for such actions; and

“(ii) recommendations that would require congressional action.

“(7) REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, the Subcommittee shall submit a report containing the recommendations developed under paragraph (6) to the National Advisory Council.

“(B) REVIEW.—The National Advisory Council shall take up the Subcommittee’s report within 30 days for review and deliberation. The National Advisory Council may ask for additional clarification, changes, or other information from the Subcommittee to assist in the approval of the recommendations.

“(C) RECOMMENDATION.—Once the National Advisory Council approves the recommendations from the Subcommittee, the National Advisory Council shall submit the report to—

“(i) the Administrator;

“(ii) the head of each agency represented on the Subcommittee;

“(iii) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

“(v) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; and

“(vi) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(8) INTERIM ACTIVITY.—

“(A) UPDATES AND OVERSIGHT.—After the submission of the report by the National Advisory Council under paragraph (7), the Administrator shall—

“(i) provide quarterly updates to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (7) regarding the status of the implementation of the recommendations developed under paragraph (6); and

“(ii) coordinate the implementation of the recommendations described in paragraph (6)(G)(i).

“(B) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—After submitting the report required under paragraph (7), the Subcommittee shall submit additional reports and recommendations in the same manner and to the same entities identified in paragraph (7) if needed or requested from Congress or from the Administrator.

“(9) TERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Subcommittee shall terminate not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

“(B) EXTENSION.—The Administrator may extend the duration of the Subcommittee, in 1-year increments, if the Administrator determines that additional reports and recommendations are needed from the Subcommittee after the termination date set forth in subparagraph (A).”

SA 97. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. — INDIAN ENERGY OFFICE.

Section 2602(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3502(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) INDIAN ENERGY REGULATORY OFFICE.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—To assist the Secretary in carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall establish within the office of the Deputy Secretary an Indian Energy Regulatory Office (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Office’), to be located in Denver, Colorado.

“(B) EXISTING RESOURCES.—The Office shall use the existing resources of the Division of Energy and Mineral Development of the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development.

“(C) DIRECTOR.—The Office shall be led by a Director who shall—

“(i) be compensated at a rate equal to that of level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(ii) report directly to the Deputy Secretary.

“(D) FUNCTIONS.—The Office shall serve as a new Regional Office within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which an energy-producing Indian tribe may select to replace the existing Regional Office of the Indian tribe—

“(i) notwithstanding any other law, to oversee, coordinate, process and approve all Federal leases, easements, rights-of-way, permits, policies, environmental reviews, and any other authorities related to energy development on Indian land;

“(ii) (I) to support review and evaluation by Agency Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian tribes of—

“(aa) energy proposals, permits, mineral leases, and rights-of-way; and

“(bb) Mineral Agreements entered into under section 3 of the Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982 (25 U.S.C. 2102) for final approval; and

“(II) to conduct environmental reviews and surface monitoring for the activities described in items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I);

“(iii) to review and prepare Applications for Permits to Drill, communitization agreements, and well spacing proposals for approval;

“(iv) to provide production monitoring, inspection, and enforcement;

“(v) to oversee drainage issues;

“(vi) to provide energy-related technical assistance and financial management training to Agency Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian tribes;

“(vii) to develop best practices in the area of Indian energy development, including standardizing energy development processes, procedures, and forms among Agency and Regional Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(viii) to minimize delays and obstacles to Indian energy development; and

“(ix) to provide technical assistance to Indian tribes in the areas of energy-related engineering, environmental analysis, management, and oversight of energy development, assessment of energy development resources, proposals and financing, and development of

conventional and renewable energy resources.

“(E) RELATIONSHIP TO BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS REGIONAL AND AGENCY OFFICES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall have the authority to review and approve all energy-related matters for Indian tribes that select to use the Office under subparagraph (D), without subsequent or duplicative review and approval by other Agency or Regional Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or other agencies of the Department of the Interior.

“(ii) NON-ENERGY RELATED MATTERS.—Nothing in this paragraph affects the authority or duty of Regional Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to oversee, support, and provide approvals for non-energy related matters.

“(iii) REGIONAL AND LOCAL SERVICES.—Nothing in this paragraph affects the authority or duty of Agency Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and State and Field Offices of the Bureau of Land Management to provide regional and local services related to Indian energy development, including local realty functions, on-site evaluations and inspections, direct services as requested by Indian tribes and individual Indians, and any other local functions related to energy development on Indian land.

“(iv) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Office shall provide technical assistance and support to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management in all areas related to energy development on Indian land.

“(F) DESIGNATION OF INTERIOR STAFF.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate and transfer to the Office existing staff and resources from—

“(I) the Division of Energy and Mineral Development of the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development and other applicable offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(II) the Bureau of Land Management;

“(III) the Office of Valuation Services;

“(IV) the Office of Natural Resources Revenue;

“(V) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(VI) the Office of Special Trustee;

“(VII) the Office of the Solicitor;

“(VIII) the Office of Surface Mining, including mining engineering and minerals realty specialists; and

“(IX) any other agency or office of the Department of the Interior involved in energy development on Indian land.

“(ii) FUNCTIONS.—Staff and resources transferred under clause (i) shall provide for—

“(I) review, processing, and approval of permits and regulatory matters under—

“(aa) the Act of February 5, 1948 (commonly known as the ‘Indian Right-of-Way Act’) (25 U.S.C. 323 et seq.);

“(bb) the Act of May 11, 1938 (commonly known as the ‘Indian Mineral Leasing Act of 1938’) (25 U.S.C. 396a et seq.);

“(cc) the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415);

“(dd) the Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982 (25 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.);

“(ee) this title;

“(ff) the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.);

“(gg) part 162 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to leases and permits) (or successor regulations); and

“(hh) part 169 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to rights-of-way over Indian lands) (or successor regulations); and

“(II) consultations and preparation of biological opinions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536);

“(III) preparation of environmental impact statements or similar analyses required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

“(IV) technical assistance and training for various forms of energy development on Indian land.

“(G) MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN LAND.—The Director shall ensure that—

“(i) all environmental reviews and permitting decisions—

“(I) comply with the unique legal relationship between the United States and Indian tribal governments (as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, Executive orders, and court decisions); and

“(II) are exercised in a manner that promotes tribal authority over Indian land, consistent with the policy of the Federal Government supporting Indian self-determination; and

“(ii) Indian land shall not be—

“(I) considered to be Federal public land or part of the public domain; or

“(II) be managed in accordance with Federal public land laws and policies.

“(H) INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION.—Programs and services operated by the Office shall be provided pursuant to contracts and grants awarded under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.).

“(I) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—To fund the Office for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary shall transfer such funds as are necessary from the annual budgets of—

“(I) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(II) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(III) the Bureau Land Management;

“(IV) the Office of Surface Mining;

“(V) the Office of Natural Resources Revenue; and

“(VI) the Office of Mineral Valuation.

“(ii) BASE BUDGET.—At the end of the period described in clause (i), the combined total of the funds transferred under that clause shall serve as the base budget for the Office.

“(J) APPROPRIATIONS OFFSET.—All fees generated from Applications for Permits to Drill, inspection, nonproducing acreage, or any other fees related to energy development on Indian land—

“(i) shall, beginning on the date the Office is opened, be transferred to the budget of the Office; and

“(ii) may be used to advance or fulfill any of the stated duties and purposes of the Office.

“(K) REPORT.—The Office shall—

“(i) keep detailed records documenting the activities of the Office; and

“(ii) annually submit to Congress a report detailing—

“(I) the number and type of Federal approvals granted;

“(II) the time taken to process each type of application;

“(III) the need for additional similar offices to be located in other regions; and

“(IV) proposed changes in existing law to facilitate the development of energy resources on Indian land and improve oversight of energy development on Indian land.

“(L) COORDINATION WITH ADDITIONAL FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Not later than 1 year after establishing the Office, the Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to coordinate and streamline energy-related permits with—

“(i) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

“(ii) the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; and

“(iii) the Secretary of Agriculture.”.

SA 98. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment to be proposed by her to the bill S.1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, “Protecting the Internet and Consumers through Congressional Action.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public

Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Iran Nuclear Negotiations: Status of Talks and the Role of Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Fixing No Child Left Behind: Testing and Accountability."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, January 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; I further ask that the Senate then be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. We were able to process several amendments to the Keystone bill today, and there are now seven more in the queue and pending. Senators should expect votes related to amendments to this bill throughout the day tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WHITEHOUSE for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week marks a somewhat dark milestone, which is the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's, in my view, reprehensible decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*. This was some fete of activism by the conservative bloc of the Supreme Court. It overturned the laws of Congress, it overturned the will of the American people, and it gave wildly outside influence over our elections to corporations and big-money interests, creating what one newspaper in Kentucky called a "tsunami of slime."

Well, 5 years on and the evidence is in. The evidence is in our elections, where this dam burst of outside cash that has wiped out previous campaign spending records, and the evidence is in this Chamber, where we once had a thriving bipartisan conversation on climate change, and instead of that we have now been reduced to this Keystone XL Pipeline bill—a show of force from the fossil fuel industry and virtual silence from the other side of the aisle on climate change.

I will say that today marked an unusually bright spot in that darkness when 98 out of 99 Senators voting voted that climate change was real and not a hoax and when we came so close to an amendment that stated that climate change was real and caused by human activity that the sponsor of the amendment had to vote against his own

amendment in order to keep the number under 60 because there were enough votes at one stage in the vote count for that bill to have passed even the filibuster threshold. So that made it an interesting day today. But normally we are in blockade.

The purpose of the effort that we have been on has been to fast-track the Keystone XL Pipeline—a tar sands pipeline that may, at the present oil price, be an economic zombie, basically a dead pipeline walking.

Canadian authorities say that the tar sands can't be extracted profitably at under \$85 a barrel. The report from the State Department said that the break price where they could take it out by train as an alternative to the pipeline was at \$75 per barrel, and the price today is around \$50 per barrel. So we really don't know whether this pipeline has an economic future. What we do know is that if it were to operate, it would pass enough tar sands through it to unleash additional carbon pollution equal to 6 million added cars on the road each year for 50 years.

If we take a look at this conversation here, other than the votes we forced today, the effect of *Citizens United* on our politics is pretty plain to see. *Citizens United* has not expanded debate in the Senate; it has crushed debate in the Senate. Why? Because since the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United*, the big fossil fuel polluters and their network of associated interests have become among the biggest spenders—relying heavily, by the way, on undisclosed, untraceable dark money.

According to the Center for American Progress, oil, gas, and coal companies and electric utilities alone reported spending more than \$84 million on the 2014 elections. And that is just what they reported. The industry's undisclosed spending in that election through groups not required to disclose their donors or on so-called issue ads that don't need to be disclosed—the total is estimated to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Well, money talks, and in politics it talks plenty loud, and \$100 million has a lot to say.

One example is Americans for Prosperity—a Koch brothers' venture—disclosed election spending of \$6.4 million to the FEC for last year's midterm elections, but that group's own officials have boasted that the real number is as much as \$130 million—\$130 million in just one election by just one group. It is that kind of extravagant spending which has bought the Koch brothers a vast political network, with employees in critical States, with voter bases tied into our consumer data, with advertising and media-buying specialists. Indeed, that sophisticated Koch brothers electioneering capacity has now been reported in the general media to rival or exceed that of the Republican National Committee. Think about that. A few very wealthy

individuals in the fossil fuel business—huge polluters—are now such big players in our politics that they rival our national parties. It is small wonder that it is hard to have an honest conversation about carbon pollution in the Senate.

Most of it is hidden. The Washington Post has reported that at least 31 percent of all independent spending in the 2014 elections—which were, by the way, the most expensive midterm elections in American history. At least 31 percent of that was spent by groups not required to disclose their donors. The Washington Post also noted that the 31 percent doesn't even include those issue ads. They are also not disclosed. So we don't know fully how bad the influence of the fossil fuel polluters is, but we sure know it is bad.

Interestingly, the same Supreme Court that decided *Citizens United* as a part of that decision decided by a margin of 8 to 1 that disclosure of outside spending was necessary and appropriate. The majority said this, and I will quote the decision:

Prompt disclosure of expenditures can provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable . . .

These intervening 5 years have seen a concerted effort to prevent and frustrate disclosure. Dark money spending by so-called independent groups with no disclosure requirements has more than doubled since 2010.

Ludicrous factfinding by the Court's five conservative activists concluded that corporate spending could not ever corrupt elections. It is laughable on its face, but that laughable conclusion also overlooks a very clear fact: limitless, untraceable political money doesn't even have to be spent to corrupt our democracy. It can corrupt through the threat of spending or through the promise of spending. What *Citizens United* gave corporations and their political instruments the power to do, it also gave them the power to threaten or promise to do, and we in the public will never see those backroom corporate threats and promises or the deals that result. The candidate will know, the special interests will know, but the public will be the ones left in the dark.

Some lobby groups are a little bolder. The Koch-backed Americans for Prosperity openly promised to wipe out candidates who support curbs on carbon pollution. The group's president said if the Republicans support a car-

bon tax or climate regulations, they would "be at a severe disadvantage in the Republican nomination process. . . . We would absolutely make that a crucial issue."

The threat is plain. Step out of line and here come the attack ads and the primary challengers—all funded by the deep pockets of the fossil fuel industry, enabled by *Citizens United* and largely protected from disclosure, so the public cannot see what is going on.

The effect of *Citizens United* has been particularly clear in the Senate. There once was an active heartbeat of Republican activity on climate change. Senator MCCAIN ran for President on an active, robust program of addressing climate change. Senator COLLINS did a bipartisan bill on climate change. Senator KIRK voted in the House for the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill. Senator FLAKE wrote articles supporting a carbon fee as long as the taxes were reduced elsewhere to offset the increased revenue from the carbon fee and on and on. My first exposure to this was the Warner-Lieberman bill and the Warner was Republican Senator John Warner.

That has been a while. Since 2010, the year *Citizens United* was decided, this honest debate about how we address this problem for the benefit of the American people has flat-lined. Since 2010 the climate evidence has only become stronger. NASA and NOAA just officially declared 2014 the hottest year ever recorded—ever—easily breaking the previous records, the agencies say.

But as the climate alarm bells grow louder, as the Earth sends her signals to us through our scientists' measurements about what has happened to the oceans, measuring the acidification of the oceans, about what is happening in our atmosphere, measuring the carbon concentrations in the atmosphere—as all that information has advanced, there has been just silence in this building since then. Instead of talking about what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and oceans, instead, No. 1, the first agenda of the new majority: We are talking about letting polluters pump more tar sands crude, one of the most toxic fossil fuels on the planet, out onto the global market. *Citizens United* did not enhance speech in our democracy. Instead it allowed wealthy special interests to suppress and silence real debate.

So I have filed an amendment to the Keystone bill to see what corporate influence pervades this effort. My amend-

ment would require any company that stands to make over \$1 billion from the pipeline or from the development of the tar sands to disclose its campaign spending over \$10,000 from the last election cycle and going forward. The public needs to be able to connect the dots.

I am also reintroducing the general disclosure act, called the DISCLOSE Act, to require all groups spending on elections to report their large expenditures and their high-dollar donors. The Supreme Court has said we cannot keep corporate interests from meddling in our popular elections. They are people, too, now. So now that the corporations are people, too, let's at least show the voters who it is who is trying to sway their votes. It is a pretty simple idea. It is what the Supreme Court Justices themselves prescribed, and it is an idea that Republicans over and over and over have supported in the past.

The fact we must face in the Senate is that polluter money has polluted our democracy, just as their carbon pollution has polluted our atmosphere and oceans. So it is time to disclose. On climate change where we have an overwhelming scientific consensus, where we have the American people, majorities of Democrats and Republicans, supporting strong congressional action on climate, where we have American businesses small and large that see the folly of ignoring the looming risk, and where we have the national security community, our Armed Forces actively preparing to face the threat climate change poses to American safety and international stability—here, by the way, just as an example, is the Department of the Army's high-level climate change vulnerability assessment. I don't think they are kidding us and I don't think they are part of a hoax.

Mr. President, I thank you for your patience this evening and I will conclude with the remark that I ordinarily conclude these speeches with: It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:58 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING MS. KATIA STEINBECK FOR BECOMING KRCG 13 AND MISSOURI RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION EXCELLENT EDUCATOR FOR 2014

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Katia Steinbeck for winning the KRCG 13 and Missouri Retired Teachers Association Excellent Educator Award for 2014.

Ms. Steinbeck is a 3rd grade teacher at St. Elizabeth Elementary School, which is located in my hometown of St. Elizabeth, MO. She won the Excellent Educator Award for the month of March earlier in 2014, and then proceeded to receive the Excellent Educator Award Teacher of the Year for 2014 in May of last year.

Providing a quality education for the nation's youth is a top priority of mine, and I commend educators like Ms. Steinbeck who take steps to enhance the classroom experience for their students, and recognize the amount of personal time all teachers spend to create a better learning environment for our nation's schoolchildren. Outside of the home, our teachers have the most impact on our children's development. By supporting our schools, and most importantly our teachers, both at home and in Washington, we come closer to ensuring that our children are prepared for the future.

Ms. Steinbeck's dedication and commitment to the students of the St. Elizabeth community is exemplary, and I applaud Ms. Steinbeck for her outstanding success thus far in the field of teaching.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Katia Steinbeck for a job well done.

HONORING LEMONT POLICE CHIEF KEVIN SHAUGHNESSY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lemont Police Chief Kevin Shaughnessy who is retiring from the force after 11 years as Chief of Police.

Chief Shaughnessy received his Bachelor's Degree in criminal justice from Arizona State University and his Master's Degree in criminal justice from Chicago State University. His first position in law enforcement was with the Illinois State Police and he served with that force for 25 years. During this time Chief

Shaughnessy was selected to be Commander of the South Suburban Major Crimes Task Force. With this position, he worked closely with area police chiefs to establish one of the largest and most successful violent crime task forces in the nation. In 2003, Chief Shaughnessy was selected from over 60 qualified candidates to lead the Lemont Police Department.

As chief, Kevin Shaughnessy has overseen various programs offered to Lemont residents including Neighborhood Watch, 911 Emergency Cell Phones, Prescription and OTC Drug Disposal, and his personal favorite—Kops n Kidz Day. Chief Shaughnessy is committed to the concept of community policing and he considers the citizens served as partners in providing meaningful police service.

Friends and colleagues of Chief Shaughnessy say that he is a great mentor and friend, and someone who can be depended on. I know this also from my experiences with the chief since I have served as Lemont's representative in the House. He is a true example of a leader and has brought stability to the Lemont Police Department. I know that Chief Shaughnessy will truly be missed for he has greatly contributed to the department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Kevin Shaughnessy for his many years of service to his community and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER DANIEL FRIESEN

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Navy veteran Daniel Frieson of New Jersey's Third Congressional District, who passed away this week, and express my deepest condolences to his family and friends.

Chief Warrant Officer Frieson served our country for twenty-two years as a member of the United States Navy, and rose to the rank of Chief Warrant Officer 3 upon his retirement. He was stationed aboard the USS *Pennsylvania* during the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. At the time of his death, CWO Frieson was among the last surviving Pearl Harbor veterans in New Jersey.

CWO Frieson went on to serve aboard the USS *Burke*, and ashore at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst.

After his retirement he settled in Marlton, New Jersey and became an active member of the community. CWO Frieson will be remembered for his involvement in his local church and as a Commander of VFW Medford Post No. 7677.

Mr. Speaker, South Jersey is tremendously grateful for Chief Warrant Officer Daniel Frieson's service to our nation. It is my honor to recognize his service and achievements before the United States House of Representatives.

CRAIG BIGGIO

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of Houston Astros legend Craig Biggio's entrance into the Baseball Hall of Fame is an achievement long in the making. In his franchise record 20 seasons with the Houston Astros organization, Biggio was loved by fans for his work on and off the field.

On the field, Biggio holds Houston Astros franchise records in games played, at-bats, runs scored, hits, doubles, and extra base hits. Biggio has played in seven all-star games, won five Silver Sluggers awards, and four Gold Gloves.

However, off the field is where Biggio has really shined. He's a supporter of the Sunshine Kids Foundation, an organization dedicated to providing positive group activities and emotional support for kids receiving cancer treatment. In 2007, Biggio received the Roberto Clemente award for best exemplifying the game of baseball, sportsmanship, community involvement, and individual contribution to his team. A dedicated family man, Biggio has been married to his wife, Patty, for 22 years. He also has two sons, Conor and Cavan, and a daughter, Quinn. Biggio is currently a baseball coach at St. Thomas High School in Houston and has led the Eagles to back-to-back TAPPS 5A State Championships.

His achievements speak for themselves. I'm proud to have known him and proud to be able to call him a fellow Houstonian.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING ROTARY INTERNATIONAL

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Rotary International, one of the world's largest non-profit humanitarian service organizations, for its 110 years of service. The Rotary motto, "Service Above Self," inspires members to serve their communities, maintain high ethical standards and promote good will and peace. Rotary clubs are active in meeting the needs of their local communities, using funds and volunteer members

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

to provide medical supplies, clean water, food, job training and education to millions in need.

In 1985, Rotary launched PolioPlus in partnership with the World Health Organization, U.S. Center for Disease Control and UNICEF with the goal of immunizing children across the globe against polio. The campaign has been tremendously successful; polio cases have decreased by 99 percent since 1988, and the world stands on the threshold of eradicating the disease.

It is my pleasure to recognize the Rotary clubs of Central Florida as they prepare for "Light Up Rotary to End Polio Now" on March 13-14, 2015, with Rotary International President Gary C. K. Huang. I am grateful to the Rotarians of Central Florida for their service and dedication to strengthening our community.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER ANN KEEFE

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Ann Keefe, who passed away on Sunday, January 18, 2015 after a long and courageous battle against cancer.

In 1982 Sister Ann joined the ministry at St. Michaels Church in Providence and began her life long fight for those who had no voice and those particularly vulnerable and marginalized.

Recognizing the challenges that faced our city and Rhode Island, Sister Ann took action to help the poor, empower workers, advocate non-violence and promote justice for all. Over thirty years of service to our community, she cofounded the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, which is credited with helping to sharply cut the city's murder rate. She started Providence ¡CityArts! to help at-risk youth. And, she was involved in creating nearly two dozen other organizations that continue to create opportunity for so many.

I had the extraordinary honor of working with Sister Ann over many years and treasured our friendship. As Mayor, I was especially proud to work with Sister Ann to support the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence to make Providence safe for kids and future generations of young Rhode Islanders. During this time, I witnessed her leadership skills, dedication and profound commitment to the youth of our city. Last year, even though she was battling cancer, Sister Ann was still fighting for those without a voice and helped my office secure Saint Michaels Church as the location for a comprehensive immigration reform rally and attended the event to show her support. There are so many examples of when she would connect those in need with those that could help.

She was a remarkable and strong woman who served as an inspiration for all of us and she leaves behind a great legacy. Her passing is a tremendous loss for Rhode Island, but her presence will continue to be felt in the community through the many organizations she helped found and run, and the positive impact she has had on so many.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family and loved ones. Rest in peace, Sister Ann.

HONORING COMMISSIONER TOM FREEMAN FOR HIS SERVICE TO OUR NATION, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND RIVERSIDE COUNTY

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Commissioner Tom Freeman as he's retiring after 35 years in service to our nation, state, and the County of Riverside, California. While serving the County of Riverside Tom has served as the Commissioner of Foreign Trade, Commissioner of Defense and Military Services, Commissioner of the Office of Film and Television, Chief of Staff, Board of Supervisors, 4th district, Executive Officer for the Sheriff's Department, Chief Public Information Officer and Emergency Services Coordinator for the CDF-County Fire, and first Chairman of the Workforce Development Board. His extraordinary service with the County of Riverside in key posts has been of great benefit to the county and its 2.3 million residents.

Tom began serving his nation in the United States Air Force in 1979, enlisting during the Iranian Hostage Crisis and later served in the Inaugural Honor Guard of President Ronald Reagan, The Homecoming Honor Guard for the Iranian Hostages, and the Funeral and Repose of General of the Army Omar Bradley. In 1981, Tom was selected for Marine Corps and Naval Parachutist Training, which he completed, earning the prestigious Paratrooper Badge. He went on to complete Instructor School and receive his Air Training Command Instructor Badge. He then served the House and Senate, teaching selected members of the Armed Services Committee escape, evasion, survival, and parachute training at nearby Andrews Air Force Base. Later in 1984, then Staff Sergeant-Select Freeman, was honored by the U.S. Senate, having his enlistment oath administered by the late Senator Quentin S. Burdick in the Senate Chamber, thus becoming the first member of the active duty armed forces to have his enlistment oath administered on the Senate Floor by a seated member of the Senate of the United States.

Tom returned to his native California with assignment to the Undergraduate Navigator Instructor School, United States Air Force, Mather Air Force Base and served as the Non Commissioned Officer In Charge of Training for future Air Force Navigators. He excelled in this assignment and was named Non Commissioned Officer of the Year. Later he was honorably discharged and joined the Military Department, State of California and was called to Active Duty again thru 1990. While serving on active duty with the State of California he was again named Non Commissioned Officer of the Year, this time for the entire state, and he was also honored as Non Commissioned Officer of the Year by the Air Force Association and the Air Force Sergeant's Association. He was also honored by the National Guard Bureau, here in Washington, D.C., two years in a row with the Rookie Recruiter of the Year Award and Recruiter of the Year Award the following year. During this same period of time

Tom received a Commendation Medal for rendering lifesaving first aid to an injured motorist. Other awards received include four more commendation medals, an achievement medal, meritorious service medal, and the Air Force Recognition Ribbon, amongst many others.

On January 10, 1990 Tom began his service with the County of Riverside-CDF, Office of Emergency Services. Over his almost 5 years in this post he responded to major quakes, floods, and fires earning three awards from the Governor of California for his service and Emergency Manager of the Year honors from the City of Indian Wells, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Later he was promoted to the post of Legislative, Information, and Marketing Officer at the Economic Development Agency. After 6 years as Vice President of Government Affairs and Marketing with WML, the world's largest environmental service provider, Tom returned to serve as Chief of Staff for his mentor and friend, the late County Supervisor Roy Wilson. Tom served with distinction as Chief of Staff and accepted a promotion as Executive Officer for Riverside County Sheriff Larry Smith. He excelled in this position and received awards for his work from the Secret Service, FBI, The International Association of Chiefs of Police, State Attorney General, and United States Army. He was the Agency Representative to the Ford Family during the Funeral & Repose of the 38th President of the United States. After serving the Sheriff's Department with distinction he returned to the Economic Development Agency as Commissioner of the Office of Foreign Trade, spokesman, and custodian of records.

Tom has decided to retire at the age of 55 and spend time with his wife, Brenda Salas Freeman, enjoy their grandson Robert III, and enjoy time with sons Joel, Robert II, and daughter in-law Lindsay. His career as the Foreign Trade Commissioner was remarkable, crafting three bilateral trade agreements with Canada, Japan, and Croatia, and helping take Riverside County Exports from 47th in the nation to 24th in the nation. He also served with the National Association of Counties, achieving the post of Vice Chairman of the International Task Force on Economic Development, supporting global trade agreements in South Korea, the EU, and Pacific Rim, and helping businesses create jobs through the Great Recession. Tom was frequently consulted by elected leaders in the state and nation's capital to discuss trade issues and Military & Defense programs and policies. In addition to these accomplishments, Colonel Tom Freeman retired in November 2007, 28 years after enlisting in the United States Air Force, from the Military Department of the State of California and is the recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal-Order of California Medal by the Governor and our Adjutant General. Freeman also chaired numerous charitable boards and organizations including the United Way, Breath of Life, Junior Diabetes Foundation, and served as Treasurer of the John F. Kennedy Foundation 7 Law Enforcement Appreciation Committee in the City of Riverside, raising millions for charity. He is the recipient of the Jefferson Award for Public Service presented by the 38th President of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, Tom's talent and leadership exemplify the very best of Riverside County

and my state. Our nation, state, and county are a better place because of the efforts of Commissioner Freeman and his devotion to duty and commitment to serve the people. I congratulate Commissioner Freeman on his 35 years of service to our nation, state, and County of Riverside and wish him well in retirement and all future endeavors.

PEARLAND LEGACY CONTINUES

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school student Brooke Botkin for being named to the Texas Sports Writers Association (TSWA) first team and the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state volleyball teams. Brooke is a sophomore at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. These honors recognize her hard work and outstanding athletic achievements.

The TSWA and TGCA selected Brooke for her skill and sportsmanship, which have made her a top prospect for collegiate volleyball programs. Her dedication to the sport ensures her place in an elite class of competitors and continues Pearland's legacy of producing some of the nation's best student athletes.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Brooke Botkin for being selected as a first team athlete on the TSWA and TGCA Class 6A all-state volleyball teams. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

CONGRATULATING LOGAN GULEFF ON WINNING "MASTERCHEF JUNIOR"

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Memphian Logan Guleff on winning the second season of "MasterChef Junior." At age 11, Logan was among thousands of children ages 8 through 13 who auditioned for the show. His culinary experience helped him to not only be selected as a show participant but to also triumph over his competitors and take home the grand prize.

When Logan was nine, he traveled to New York to compete in a Jif peanut butter contest as a semifinalist and at age 10, he had lunch at the White House and a meeting with President Barack Obama after winning a state contest. Additionally, Logan has already become a culinary entrepreneur, offering his own line of seasonings called Logan's Rub and providing dining reviews on his blog, orderupwithlogan.blogspot.com.

For Logan's final competitive meal on "MasterChef Junior", he chose to highlight his talents by preparing all seafood dishes, including grilled spot prawn with a smoked saffron

aioli and olive tapenade for his appetizer and a salt crusted branzino with a chimichurri sauce for his entrée. "MasterChef Junior" host Gordon Ramsay commented that Logan's dishes were the most unusual ones the show has ever seen, to which Logan replied, "Go big or go home." His vision, creativity and all-or-nothing spirit certainly paid off.

Logan's accomplishments are significant for a young man of only 12 years of age, and he represents the Memphis culinary community well. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Logan Guleff on winning the title of MasterChef Junior.

HONORING THE MOORPARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Moorpark Chamber of Commerce's 100th anniversary. I commend the Moorpark Chamber for their dedication and leadership in promoting a business friendly community and strengthening the economic environment in Moorpark that contributes to Ventura County's diverse and dynamic economy.

The Moorpark Chamber of Commerce was established in 1915 surrounded by a pastoral community and chartered in 1950. The success of the Chamber is mirrored in the success of the City of Moorpark, a product of determined citizens coming together to accomplish a common goal, and creating a better way of life for residents.

The service that the Moorpark Chamber has provided for the City of Moorpark has been invaluable to the community. Successful ventures included the business directory that began in 1963, and the publication of the Community Link Newspaper in 2009. The Moorpark Chamber supports cooperation, and collaborative relationships among citizens, businesses, and community organizations. Through strong membership, inclusive programs, and special committees, the Moorpark Chamber of Commerce honors the history and diversity of the community.

The Moorpark Chamber of Commerce supports a strong vibrant community, rich in civic engagement, hosting events that facilitate community inclusion, recognizing outstanding residents of Moorpark through the Citizen of the Year recognition event and Annual Community Awards, and continuing to foster new generations of community leaders.

I am honored to recognize the Moorpark Chamber of Commerce's centennial anniversary. I congratulate the Chamber in reaching this historic milestone, and would like to extend my sincere gratitude for their continued success, and service to the City of Moorpark and our community.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES E. CRIDER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of James E. Crider, a great man of faith and the father of my good friend, Indiana State Senator Michael Crider.

Jim was a loving and devoted husband to his wife of 63 years, Janet. Together, they were the proud parents of six children, 13 grandchildren, and 19 great-grandchildren. As traveling song evangelists for many years, Jim and his family valued their faith and were diligent leaders at the Shirley Church of the Nazarene. He spent an impressive 27 years at Chrysler and in retirement enjoyed hunting and spending time with his family.

Jim taught his son Michael the value of hard work and the importance of being a man of integrity. He raised a great son who has become a valued leader in our state.

I am very grateful for the friendship that I share with Michael and his wife Sherri. Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Michael's father, James E. Crider.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,080,794,842,225.47. We've added \$7,453,917,793,312.39 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING FRED T. NOLAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Fred T. Nolan, a native of Dyer, Tennessee, but raised in Paducah, Kentucky, and has lived in Jackson, Mississippi since his graduation from Tougaloo College in the early 1960s. One of his early career choices was teaching in the Jackson Public School District (JPS).

Mr. Nolan taught two years at the then Brinkley High School located on Livingston Road and was a ninth grade teacher of Social Studies and Mathematics. He left JPS to pursue other career options and worked briefly for the Urban League of Jackson as director. The majority of his career spanned 25 years as the executive director of Fair Housing and Equal

Opportunity, a division of Housing Urban Development (HUD).

After fully retiring from HUD in 1996, Mr. Nolan rejoined the JPS family as a substitute and limited service teacher. He worked three years in a limited service capacity at Siwell Middle, Lanier High, and Forest Hill High schools.

Mr. Fred Nolan is married to Mrs. Kisiah Nolan, a former JPS Board member and president. His son, Fredrick Nolan, is coordinator of the JPS WATCH D.O.G.S. program. The Nolan's also have two daughters: Renee Nolan Johnson of Huntsville, Alabama, and Adrienne Nolan Colar of Smyrna, Georgia. All three of their children are graduates of the Jackson Public School District.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Fred T. Nolan for his dedication to serving others.

LEADING THE WAY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jillian Ross for being elected to the Columbia University senate for a two-year term through 2016. Jillian is a 2012 graduate of Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas and a chemical/biomedical engineering junior at Columbia University.

Ms. Ross is the first African-American woman elected to represent Columbia's Fu Foundation School of Engineering in the department's 150-year history. Through her position in the university's senate, Jillian will work with the school's president and faculty to shape policy on issues that affect the student body and greater Columbia University community.

I commend Jillian Ross for her dedication to serving the interests of her fellow students and taking on the responsibilities that leadership brings. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Jillian for winning a seat in the Columbia University Senate.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RECORD PRODUCER JOHN FRY

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of Memphis record producer, John Fry. Fry, a son of Memphis, was an example of the innovation, creativity and daring that is uniquely Memphis, as embodied in such Memphians as Abe Plough, founder of Plough Inc. and creator of St. Joseph's aspirin for children and the Coppertone skin care line; Fred Smith, founder of Federal Express; Kemmons Wilson, founder of Holiday Inn; Clarence Saunders, founder of Piggly Wiggly—the first self service

grocer; and Sam Phillips, the father of rock and roll and founder of Sun Studio and Sun Records—the recording home of Elvis Presley.

Born on New Year's Eve in 1944, Fry became a well-known and respected member of the Memphis music community, having founded the Ardent record label in the late 1950s and early 1960s along with John King and Fred Smith. Ardent was a unique studio for the region that brought high technical standards to recording, which Fry used to father a multitude of music from rock and roll and punk to soul, power pop and gospel. Under his leadership, Fry helped launch the careers of local musicians and guide the works of others from around the country.

John began recording music out of his family's garage in 1959 while he was still in high school. He committed to spending countless hours remodeling the space by building the equipment needed and inter-connecting equipment that could not be built. Out of his self-made recording studio, he recorded and released singles that were favored by locals, including The Ole' Miss Downbeats' Slewfoot and The Hucklebuck. These were the first recordings for the Ardent label. In 1962 after graduating high school, Fry and a friend built a radio station in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and in 1964, he worked with recording artist Jim Dickinson, who had also worked with Elvis and power pop singer Alex Chilton, to begin reviving the Ardent label.

In 1966, Ardent Studios opened on National Street, where it stayed for five years before moving to its current location on Madison in Midtown Memphis. In its first four years, John invested in the studio, furnishing it with four- and sixteen-track equipment, outboard and Dolby noise reduction equipment. The technologically advanced studio soon had a console that was the same make used by Stax Records, which enabled Ardent to become a companion studio for Stax recording artists, including Isaac Hayes, the Staples Singers, the Bar-Kays, Sam and Dave and Albert King. Ardent also recorded albums for The Replacements, The Clits, The Scruffs and Elvis Presley.

One band that was close to John's heart was Big Star. Made up of Memphians Chris Bell, Andy Hummel, Jody Stephens and lead singer/songwriter Alex Chilton, Big Star recorded three albums at Ardent Studios—#1 Record, Radio City and Third—and viewed John largely as a mentor. John showed them ins and outs of the industry and drummer Jody Stephens commented that he was "a person who could help you make your dreams come true." While Big Star received little national recognition at the time, over the next four decades, the group's three albums eventually were listed among Rolling Stone magazine's "500 Greatest Albums of All Time" and a variation of their song In The Street was used as the theme song for the popular Fox-TV sitcom, That 70s Show.

In the late 70s, John began to focus more on the business side of Ardent Studios, but talents including Led Zeppelin, ZZ Top, R.E.M., Bob Dylan, Leon Russell, the Replacements, Freddie King, the Gin Blossoms and many others traveled to and recorded at the Memphis studio throughout the 70s, 80s and 90s. In 1995, John launched a Christian

rock label, releasing 36 albums and receiving seven Grammy nominations from artists including Big Tent Revival, Skillet, Jonah33 and others. He also began operating Ardent as a learning ground for future award winning producers and engineers, including Jim Dickinson, Terry Manning, John Hampton and others.

Today, Ardent Studios continue to attract musicians both local and national from all genres. Memphis rap group and Oscar winner Three 6 Mafia has recorded at the studio as well as Memphis rapper, Al Kapone. Three Doors Down, the North Mississippi Allstars, the White Stripes and the Raconteurs are among the studio's roster of artists. Additionally, filmmakers for Hustle and Flow, Black Snake Moan and 40 Shades of Blue—all movies featuring and filmed in Memphis—went to Ardent Studios for recording their soundtracks. The studio has amassed 70 gold and platinum albums and singles.

John Fry was a recording visionary and helped propel Memphis music and that of others from around the world to a higher level. His contributions to the industry are numerous and will continue to inspire future generations. In 2006, he said, "If you acquire knowledge or skill or even wisdom, and you just keep it, then when you die, that dies with you. But if you share that with other generations—who in turn will share it and share it and share it—you're doing something that lasts."

John Fry passed away on December 18, 2014 in Memphis at 69 years of age, and is survived by his wife, Betty Fry. He and Betty were advocates for laws concerning humane treatment of animals, and they treasured and cared for horses, dogs and cats with the dignity that people who respect all life would. He will be remembered by all who came in contact with him and whose careers and success benefited from his mentorship. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing his life, accomplishments and contributions to American music. His was a life well lived.

COMMENDING DR. WINSLOW SARGEANT, CHIEF COUNSEL OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S OFFICE OF ADVOCACY FOR HIS SERVICE UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to Dr. Winslow Sargeant who is retiring as Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy.

Appointed in August of 2010, I had the pleasure of working with Dr. Sargeant during the last three Congressional Sessions while a member of the House Small Business Committee. He has brought his expertise to bear in helping solve issues facing small businesses and entrepreneurs in my district and across the country as they navigated the most difficult economy our country has experienced in nearly a century.

Dr. Sargeant knows the challenges of starting and building a small firm. He enrolled in a PhD Program at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in 1988 and left in 1992 to work at IBM in Rochester, Minnesota. He received his PhD in electrical engineering in 1995, and worked at ATT/Bell Labs in Allentown, Pennsylvania. In 1997, Dr. Sargeant and partners co-founded Aanetcom, a "fabless" semiconductor integrated circuit design company. The company designed state-of-the-art computer circuits for telecom and broadband applications. In March 2000, Aanetcom was acquired by PMC-Sierra, a publicly traded company.

Prior to becoming chief counsel, Dr. Sargeant served as managing director of Venture Investors, LLC, in Madison, Wisconsin. The firm provided seed and early-stage money to high-potential health care and IT companies. There, he specialized in computer software, hardware, and materials, and worked with technology transfer offices.

As Chief Counsel, he brought years of experience as a federal partner to small firms. From 2001 to 2005, he was program manager in electronics for the National Science Foundation's Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program, while also serving as adjunct professor at the University of Pennsylvania. The NSF is one of the federal agencies with the largest extramural research and development budgets that are required in the SBIR program to dedicate a portion of their awards to small firms.

On behalf of the small business community of the 9th District of Brooklyn, I'd like to thank and congratulate Dr. Sargeant, his wife Ikanyeng and three children, Kgosi, Lorato, and Marang and wish them many blessings in the future.

"BLACK JANUARY" SOVIET INVASION OF AZERBAIJAN

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of the over 130 innocent men, women, and children who were killed by the Red Army in the days following its invasion of Azerbaijan 23 years ago.

On January 20, 1990, the Soviet Union, in a brutal attempt to end the growing independence movement in Azerbaijan, sent in 26,000 troops under the pretext of restoring public order, while actually aiming to forcefully end peaceful demonstrations for independence.

The invasion and subsequent massacre, which resulted in over 130 killed, 611 injured, and 841 arrests, is remembered as "Black January" in the Republic of Azerbaijan today and has left an indelible mark on that nation's memory.

It was the overt oppression of innocent people by the Soviet government that further inspired the Azerbaijani people to regain its independence after 70 years of foreign rule.

Less than two years later, on October 18, 1991, Azerbaijan gained its independence from the Soviet Union and was soon recognized by the international community.

Today, the United States and Azerbaijan enjoy a close and important relationship, built on trust, understanding, and mutual support. It is important on this day that America remembers the trials and tribulations our friends in Azerbaijan have had to endure for the cause of freedom and continue to support their vital role as a beacon of democracy and prosperity in the Caspian Region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to please join me in remembering the tragic events of Black January and honor those who gave their lives in order to give birth to their country.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF TREVOR COLBOURN

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding member of the Central Florida community, Trevor Colbourn. Trevor passed away on January 13, 2015 at the age of 87 and will be deeply missed.

Born in Armindale, New South Wales, Australia on February 24, 1927, Trevor became the second President of, what was then known as, the Florida Technological University in 1978. Recognizing that the University had grown beyond being just "Florida's Space University," Trevor renamed the institution the University of Central Florida. In addition to the high-profile name change, Trevor also established the University's honors program and a football program that went on to earn national rankings. Trevor nurtured Orlando's fledgling research park, and developed a partnership with Orange County that has created thousands of high tech jobs and helped transform the region's economy.

Under Trevor's leadership, the University introduced the state's first stand-alone doctoral program in computer science, and expanded its PhD offerings to include civil, computer, electrical, mechanical, industrial and environmental engineering. Trevor also spearheaded a long effort to create equitable funding for the state's newer universities to put them on the same financial footing as the well-established state universities.

Known as the "Scholar President," Trevor held degrees from the University of London, the College of William and Mary, and the Johns Hopkins University, where he earned his doctorate in American History in 1953. An expert on the American Revolution and Thomas Jefferson, Trevor penned a number of books and articles, including *The Lamp of Experience*, *Fame and the Founding Father*, and *The Americans: A Brief History*.

Trevor was an active member of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission, the Orlando Crime Prevention Association, the Board of Visitors of the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, the United Way, the Greater Orlando Sports Organizing Committee, the Kiwanis Club, the boards of the local opera company and public television station and the Organization of American Historians.

A lifelong Episcopalian, Trevor is survived by Beryl, his wife of 66 years, his daughters, Katherine "Kit" Wrye and Elinor Colbourn, and four grandchildren.

I am saddened by the loss of such a valuable member of the Central Florida community and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family.

2014 BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Vince Finnegan for being named the 2014 Business Person of the Year by the Central Fort Bend Chamber. Finnegan is the owner and operator of Finnegan Auto Group in Rosenberg, Texas. He fills critical workforce needs by financially supporting workforce development courses for high school students in Lamar Consolidated Independent School District. These workforce development courses help prepare students for skilled jobs after they graduate.

Finnegan is also a steward of the local business community, and serves as treasurer and board member of the Central Fort Bend Chamber. I commend him for his community support. He serves as a model businessman in Rosenberg and Fort Bend County.

I thank Vince Finnegan for his dedication to serving the interests of his community and expanding their opportunities for personal growth and prosperity. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Vince for being named the Central Fort Bend Chamber's 2014 Business Person of the Year.

TCU & BAYLOR FOOTBALL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for years, Texas college football has been dominated by Texas and Texas A&M, both of which are large public universities. So how have a couple of small, private, Christian institutions like Baylor and TCU dethroned the kings of Texas football and become the top two programs in the state? It's simple really—their success has been built on good coaching. While the Longhorns and Aggies consistently bring in top ranked recruiting classes, Baylor and TCU typically bring in much less heralded players, yet have had more success. This means that these two programs have coaches who can turn what most consider to be "lesser" talent into better football players.

They each hired relative unknowns to guide their programs. Baylor put its faith in Art Briles while TCU put its in Gary Patterson. Both Briles and Patterson come from similarly humble backgrounds and have developed strong work ethics and good attitudes.

Briles hails from a small town in West Texas called Rule, where his father was the head football coach at the local high school. Briles played for his father and went on to become an all-state quarterback, earning a scholarship to the University of Houston where he played wide receiver for legendary Coach Bill Yeoman. On their way to watch Art play in the 1977 Cotton Bowl, his parents and aunt died in a tragic car crash. Though Coach Yeoman knew about this before the game started, he didn't tell Art until after the game was over. Briles went on to transfer to Texas Tech so that he could be closer to his girlfriend who was a student there at the time. They are now happily married. Prior to his coaching career, Briles earned his master's in education from Abilene Christian University, my alma mater. He would go on to become one of the most successful high school coaches in Texas history, winning four state titles at Stephenville. After coaching at Stephenville, Briles moved on to Texas Tech as an assistant and to Houston as its head coach. Then, in 2008, after a remarkable turnaround at Houston, he was hired by Baylor in hopes that he could do the same for their program. Flash forward to 2015, and Briles has just finished coaching the team to its second straight Big XII conference title, which seemed virtually unimaginable before he arrived.

TCU's Coach Gary Patterson also comes from humble roots. He grew up in a small town in Kansas called Rozel and played football at Dodge City Community College before transferring to Kansas State. After graduating from Kansas State, Patterson became a grad assistant there before moving up the ranks at several small schools around the country. In 1998 he was hired as TCU's defensive coordinator and would be named the head coach just two years later.

Briles and Patterson have each enjoyed huge amounts of success, but got there through different means. Patterson is known as a defensive mastermind and is one of the only coaches in history to win the national Coach of the Year award more than once. Briles, oppositely, is an offensive tactician and has engineered one of the greatest program turnarounds in recent memory. Both Baylor and TCU were low level football programs when Briles and Patterson arrived. Baylor was considered one of the worst football programs in the country, regularly winning only one or two games per season. TCU had just been left out of the Big 12 and were now members of the Western Athletic Conference, which isn't even a football conference anymore. Now, both are considered two of the top coaches in America and have brought back respect to these once forgotten programs.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING PROFESSOR PERRY WALLACE FOR OVERCOMING ADVERSITY IN SPORTS DURING THE CIVIL RIGHTS ERA

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Professor Perry Wallace, a Vander-

bilt University graduate who integrated basketball for the Southeastern Conference (SEC) and current professor at American University, for overcoming the racism and violence he experienced as an African-American collegiate athlete during the Civil Rights era. While Wallace never viewed himself as a pioneer or a change agent for civil rights, he nonetheless helped break the color-barrier in the SEC as the first African-American basketball player in the Conference.

Like many African-American college athletes at the time, Wallace faced tremendous challenges, both physical and emotional, that highlighted the ugly reality of race relations in America. One significant memory Wallace has when his health and life were threatened was during a 1968 game between Vanderbilt and the University of Mississippi that was played in Oxford. During this game, Wallace—who was the only African-American player on the team—was subjected to racial epithets, taunting, threats of lynching, and physical violence when he received a swollen eye due to a thrown elbow just before halftime. Perry eventually returned to the game after tending to his injury, but he was mindful of the fact that after halftime, no members of his team stayed behind to accompany him back to the court. He went on to help his team win 90–72.

Unfortunately, the incident at Oxford was not the only time when he had to endure racism at an away game. Wallace and his teammates have recounted a noose being dangled near the Vanderbilt bench at a game in Knoxville and items being thrown at him, including Cokes, coins, ice and even a dagger. Perhaps adding insult to injury, many of the venues were very small and the sounds of racism could be easily picked up and broadcast over the radio for all to hear, including his mother who listened to the game against Ole Miss from her hospital bed. Despite the intolerance he experienced, Wallace remained steadfast in his resolve to not succumb to those who wished to see him fail. He was fortunate, in this manner, to have such mental strength to survive. Others, including Henry Harris, who also played in the SEC, and Nat Northington, one of the first two African-Americans to play football at the University of Kentucky, found the pressures all too great.

In a stand against the injustices of the Jim Crow laws that made segregation legal and gave protection for acts of violence and death toward African-Americans, in his last game played in Nashville against Mississippi State, Wallace ended his college basketball career with a slam dunk—a play that was deemed illegal at the time. The illegal play was allowed to stand and he finished the game scoring 28 points and 27 rebounds. He dedicated the game to his mother who passed away a year earlier.

Perry Wallace graduated from Vanderbilt and was drafted by the Philadelphia 76ers in 1970. He earned his Juris Doctorate from Columbia University in 1975 and moved to Washington, DC where he worked in the Executive Office of then-mayor Walter E. Washington before becoming an adjunct professor of law at George Washington University. Professor Wallace then served as a trial attorney at the U.S. Department of Justice and later re-joined academia as an associate professor of

law at the University of Baltimore School of Law.

Today, Perry Wallace is a professor at American University Washington College of Law where he specializes in environmental, corporate and international economic law, business and environmental studies, and is the Director of the JD/MBA Joint Degree Program. Perry has received numerous awards for his accomplishments in academia and his list of publications and writings is extensive. In 2003, he was inducted into the Tennessee Sports Hall of Fame and in 2004, his Vanderbilt jersey, number 25, was retired. In 2014, Andrew Maraniss, a Vanderbilt alum and former associate director of media relations at the school's athletic department, published Wallace's biography entitled "Strong Inside: Perry Wallace and the Collision of Race and Sports in the South."

Vanderbilt University has a program called VUcept where freshmen students are paired with upperclassmen to make their transition to the school easier. As a freshman there, I was fortunate to have Wallace as my VUceptor. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Perry Wallace for his tenacity in the face of adversity and for his many professional accomplishments and contributions to academia.

HONORING COLONEL DAVID ARTHUR LERPS, USMC (RET)

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Colonel David Arthur Lerps, USMC (RET), who died on October 21, 2014 after a long and valiant struggle with Parkinson's disease, and his career of service to our nation.

Born in Chicago, Illinois on June 28, 1931, he spent his early years in Eastchester, New York and was an honors graduate of Duke University where he was Commandant of the Naval Battalion and participated in every sport, winning distinction as quarterback of the 1954 Blue Demons Football Team. His flight training at NAS Pensacola prepared him for many years in the Marine Air Wing. During his 30-year military career, he served three tours in Japan and flew 312 missions in Vietnam in 1968, where he was awarded 23 Air Medals and nominated for a Distinguished Flying Cross for valor in an especially dangerous mission to the DMZ.

He later served in strategic planning at the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, DC; was both student and teacher at the Marine Corps Command and Staff College; and attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces while gaining his MBA at George Washington University. He concluded his active duty as Chief of Staff, LFTC Pacific Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado.

Upon retiring from active duty in 1984, he was appointed Chief of Staff at the Academy of the Pacific, a post he held for 18 years. After retiring from AOP, he became a student once again, studying Shakespeare and music at the University of Hawaii.

Col. Lerps was a board member of Hawaii Opera Theater and member of the Hawaii Wagner Society. He was an ardent ocean canoe paddler, a board member of the Lanikai Canoe Club and coordinator of the Duke Kahanamoku Long Distance Canoe Race for four years.

Even with the decline in mobility and speech and the loss of the ability to swallow, he never lost his deep love for opera, sports, for his family, Catholic faith and Marine Corps. As life-long friend John Schwarz wrote, "Dave never really left the Corps . . . 'once a Marine always a Marine.' He was 'SEMPER FI,' a Marine to his final breath!"

Dave is survived by Mary, his wife of 55 years, his children Kathy Lerps, Karen Pittman, Robert Lerps, six grandchildren: Vito and Dylan Higgins, Ashley Snow, Amber Lerps, Kylie and Cassidy Barker; and a sister Ann Falkenberg and brother Kurt Lerps. I learned of Col. Lerps' life of service from his brother-in-law and my good friend Father Robert Oldershaw.

HONORING BISHOP GORDON
ARLESTER HUMPHREY, JR.

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Bishop Gordon Arlester Humphrey, Jr. Bishop Humphrey was a beloved pastor, husband, father, and friend. With his passing on Sunday, December 14, we look to Bishop Humphrey's personal legacy of leadership, service, and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born to Gordon Humphrey, Sr. and Helen Humphrey, in Ohio, Bishop Humphrey was educated in the public schools of Chicago and graduated from Hirsch High School. He went on to attend Morehouse College in Atlanta, and then went on to follow in his father's footsteps, entering the ministry with his wife, First Lady Diane and their two children, Gordon III and Cha'Rena.

Bishop Humphrey was noted for establishing "Sunday Night Live," a service where all are welcome to attend without any condemnation or judgment, aimed at those who otherwise may not have attended a church service. This model proved so successful that it was replicated across the nation. He was also a powerful singer and a talented musician, using his gifts to minister through music and song. He was the executive producer of an acclaimed album entitled, "Olivet Oakland, Sunday Night Live! You're in the Right Place at the Right Time." The album was nationally and internationally recognized for its inspirational message.

After the passing of his father, Bishop Humphrey moved to Chicago, away from his 30-year ministry at Olivet Institutional Missionary Baptist Church in Oakland. Upon his return to Chicago, Bishop Humphrey assumed the position of senior pastor at Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church, the church his father once led for more than 40 years.

Eventually, Bishop Humphrey would become the Senior Pastor at three churches:

Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church in Chicago, Olivet Institutional Missionary Baptist Church in Oakland, and Olivet's sister church of the same name in Stockton, California.

Bishop Humphrey was known as a bridge-builder, and he opened the doors of Olivet to the community for the Oscar Grant Forums, which took place weekly for more than three years. He was noted for his prolific urban message and was in great demand as an evangelist, preaching the Gospel across the nation. For years, he was known to walk the streets and meet with drug addicts and gang members, and was able to bring them together and begin the healing process.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual, Bishop Gordon Arlester Humphrey, Jr. His dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the state of California and the nation. I join all of Bishop Humphrey's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed, but his life, legacy, and spirit will live in our hearts and our community forever.

HONORING LT. COLONEL ALLEN
KIRKSEY

HON. RUBEN GALLEG0

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, as he begins the transition to civilian life, I rise today to salute Lieutenant Colonel Allen Kirksey for his distinguished military career and years of dedicated service to our nation.

Lt. Colonel Kirksey most recently served as the Wing Chief of Staff in Phoenix, Arizona, a position he has held since June of 2013. He began his military career in the United States Air Force from 1979 to 1983, during which time he completed two operational assignments with the 92nd Bomb Wing and the 435th Tactical Air Wing. He enlisted in the Arizona Air National Guard in 1984 as a drill status guardsman Combat Crew Communications Specialist. In 1998, he assumed command of the 161st Security Forces Squadron. Lt. Colonel Kirksey has deployed as the Wing Senior Intelligence Officer in support of Operation Desert Shield, Deny Flight, Phoenix Scorpion, and Southern Watch.

In 2001, as the Security Forces Commander, he was mobilized in support of Operation Noble Eagle and Enduring Freedom and was designated as the 201st Mission Support Squadron Detachment Commander. In 2005, he served as the 161st Deputy Mission Support Commander, and in 2006 he assumed command of the 161st Logistics Readiness Squadron. In 2010, as the Logistics Readiness Squadron Commander, he was mobilized in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn.

Throughout his years of service, Lt. Col. Kirksey has won numerous awards and distinctions, including the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Humanitarian Service Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal, twice. In addition, he was named the Arizona National Guard Diversity Champion in 2008

and the National Guard Diversity Award Winner—Air National Guard Individual Category in 2011.

Incredibly, on top of his outstanding service in uniform, Lt. Colonel Kirksey also volunteers over 100 hours each year at Phoenix-area schools and is a motivational speaker in the community. In 2014, he was awarded the City of Phoenix Calvin Goode Lifetime Achievement award in recognition of his outstanding leadership and dedication to civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Allen Kirksey and thank him for his many years of exceptional service.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Regina Crafter of Missouri City, Texas for being awarded the Ms. Texas America 2015 title by the Ms. America Pageant. Regina is a health teacher at Quail Valley Middle School in Missouri City, Texas. This award recognizes her exceptional contributions to her community as an educator, youth mentor and champion of health initiatives.

Regina has led several successful fundraising drives for the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center and the American Diabetes Association (ADA). She is also a breast cancer survivor who has been an outspoken awareness ambassador for the disease. She is committed to promoting a healthy lifestyle for her students. Regina is the Health Club sponsor and the ADA coordinator at Quail Valley Middle School. She has helped her students raise more than \$10,000 for ADA, the largest donation among secondary schools in Texas. She goes on to compete in the 2015 Ms. America Pageant finals.

I commend Regina Crafter for the outstanding difference she has made in her community as a role model and leader. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Regina for being selected to represent our state as Ms. Texas America 2015. We wish her well as she competes on the national stage. I know she will make Texas proud.

CONGRATULATING DR. BRIAN D.
SMITH OF THE DALLAS CHRISTIAN
COLLEGE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor Dr. Brian D. Smith. On November 1, 2014, Dr. Smith began serving as the eleventh president of Dallas Christian College in Farmers Branch, Texas. He will be formally inaugurated this Saturday, January 24, 2015.

Dallas Christian College was founded in 1950 and maintains a mission to educate and

mentor students to be "People of Influence, Under God's Influence, for a Life of Influence." I have no doubt that the strong work of the College toward this end will continue to excel under Dr. Smith's new leadership.

Dr. Brian D. Smith has a remarkable career in Christian higher education. He received a Bachelor's degree in Biblical Studies and Christian Ministry from Florida Christian College (FCC) in 2003. Two years later he earned his Master's from Lincoln Christian University in Contemporary Christian Theology and Philosophy. Smith received his PhD in Theology from the University of Exeter in England in 2011. He has published several chapters in academic works.

During his initial working years, Smith remained with FCC, which eventually merged with another school to become Johnson University Florida. He quickly advanced from serving as registrar to Associate Dean of Academics and Institutional Effectiveness, then Vice President of Academics and ultimately Assistant Provost. During his time there, Smith led the university through the process of accreditation with the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the Association for Biblical Higher Education.

His strong and faithful professional life made him the top contender when the Board of Trustees for Dallas Christian College took up the task of searching for a replacement for their preceding president, Dusty Ruback. The chair of the search committee, Dr. Keith Keeran, reported that the applicant pool was remarkable and seven well-qualified candidates were interviewed, but only one reached the final interview before the Board. Keeran further commented that "the Lord's hand was on the search process from the beginning."

Dr. Smith has always prayerfully desired to spread the Gospel and loves serving that cause through the work of Christian higher education. He and his wife, Samantha, have four children together. I welcome them to the 24th District of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating and wishing well Dr. Brian D. Smith as he begins to serve as President of Dallas Christian College.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS J. KEENEY FOR HIS DEDICATION AND SERVICE TO THE WILKES-BARRE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Thomas J. Keeney, past Grand Knight of the Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania Knights of Columbus Council 302. Mr. Keeney was born on July 3, 1946. His father, a Major in the army, was stationed in Arkansas, Japan, and New Jersey and took the Keeney family with him as he traveled around the world. In 1964, Thomas graduated from Coughlin High School in Wilkes-Barre and currently resides in Plains with his wife, Karen.

After finishing high school, Thomas Keeney joined the air force in the winter of 1965. He was trained as an aircraft mechanic at Lackland Air Force Base and Sheppard Air Force Base. Upon completing his training, he was stationed at RAF Lakenheath Air Base in England. At Lakenheath, Thomas served as a Crew Chief on F-100D & F aircraft. While in England, Thomas married Irene V. Tucker. In the summer of 1968, they were blessed with their first son Patrick. Thomas finished his service with the Air Force in 1969, leaving with the rank of Sergeant.

When he returned to the United States, Thomas settled back in Wilkes-Barre and had his second child, Maurita. He took a job as a laborer at the Pressed Steel Plant on Penn Avenue. Thomas entered the apprentice program for Plumbers with Pipe Fitters Local 147 of Wilkes-Barre in 1970. He completed his apprenticeship in 1974 with Scranton's Local 90. As a journeyman plumber, he worked with many contractors in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Thomas left the construction industry to work for the City of Wilkes-Barre, as a member of the city's sewer department. In 1985, he returned to the construction industry where he worked for Penn State Mechanical as a plumber, welder, and foreman. While working with Penn State Mechanical, he obtained his Masters Certificate in Plumbing and Heating with the cities of Wilkes-Barre and Scranton. In 1995, as a Plumbing Trade Instructor for the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, Thomas helped prepare inmates for a job in the plumbing trade after rehabilitation. After working for the Department of Corrections, he went on to be a caretaker for Camp Raninu and then took a position with the VA, before he retired in 2011.

Thomas Keeney also served his country with distinction as an army reservist in the 79th Army Regional Command. Starting in 1974, Thomas was a Specialist 4 Welder with the 365th Engineers of Wilkes-Barre. When he left the Engineers, Thomas had attained the rank of Sergeant. Thomas then joined the 300th Field Hospital Unit and was retrained as a combat medic. He was then promoted to Sergeant First Class and reassigned to the NCOIC of the 338th Medical Group Headquarters in Folsom, Pennsylvania. At Folsom, Thomas was responsible for the care and training of the soldiers assigned to the Medical Group Headquarters. After serving at Folsom, Thomas returned to Wilkes-Barre, where he served with the 424th Military Police Liaison Team as the Senior Medic and Instructor. While with the 424th, Thomas was responsible for all medical and environmental issues for setup and operation of military POW camps in the U.S. and overseas. After being promoted to Master Sergeant, he was sent to the Regional Command Headquarters at Willow Grove, Pennsylvania to be a Senior Medic for the 79th ARCOM. Thomas retired from the army reserves when the 79th ARCOM was disbanded in spring 1996.

Additionally, Thomas has served as a member of the Knights of Columbus for a number of years. He has been the Grand Knight twice, first from 1998 to 2000 and recently from 2012 until 2014. He was also a District Deputy for the Pennsylvania Knights of Columbus and Faithful Navigator of the Bishop Hafey Assembly Fourth Degree Knights.

In addition, Thomas has been involved with many organizations. He was the past President of the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick, where he currently holds the position of Secretary. He has also served as the President of Council 302 Home Association and was a former Trustee of the Plumbers Local 90.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Keeney for his service to the Knights of Columbus and all of his achievements. He is a true patriot, and I applaud him for his dedication to his country and the work he has done for his community.

DEDICATION TO CHARACTER AND SERVICE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ruben Ruiz and Shelby Lowe for being named Pearland's 2014 Employees of the Year by Pearland city management. This award is given to the public servants who best exemplify the city's core mission—to provide those who live in Pearland with the best quality of life.

Mr. Ruiz, a utility billing specialist, and Ms. Lowe, a recreation attendant, went above and beyond in performing their duties and improving the systems on which the city runs. Their dedication to service and character provide a shining example of public service and set an example we can all follow. The residents of Pearland, Texas already know what a great place they live, work and raise their families. These dedicated city employees are part of what makes Pearland special.

I thank Ruben Ruiz and Shelby Lowe for their tireless work in ensuring the Pearland community gets the customer service it deserves. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Mr. Ruiz and Ms. Lowe for being named Pearland's 2014 Employees of the Year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 12, 2015, I was unable to be present for a recorded vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on roll call vote No. 17, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 203, "yes" on roll call vote No. 18, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 33, and "yes" on roll call vote No. 19, on approving the Journal.

HONORING THE WORK OF CASCO
BAYKEEPER JOE PAYNE

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, from my District Office in Portland, Maine, I am fortunate to have a beautiful view of Portland Harbor and Casco Bay. On a typical day, one might see cruise ships carrying thousands of visitors to our city, lobster boats setting and pulling their traps, kayakers paddling to Fort Gorges, and harbor seals popping their heads out of the water.

What's remarkable about this scene is that the bay's many uses—as a place for recreation, a source of jobs and economic activity, and habitat for marine life—coexist in a way that is not possible in many other places in the country. The bay is healthy enough to balance the needs of our community with the needs of the environment.

I rise today to recognize and celebrate a man who has worked tirelessly to strike that careful balance and maintain it. Joe Payne is the Casco Baykeeper, placing him in the very difficult job of improving and safeguarding the health of our bay. After nearly 25 years of doing that job remarkably well—as a scientist, advocate, and relationship builder—he is retiring.

Joe's accomplishments during his tenure as Baykeeper are too many to list in full, but here are some highlights. During a 1996 oil tanker spill, he pushed successfully for a quicker and more thorough response than what was initially given, preventing what could have been a disastrous impact on the bay. He launched a groundbreaking water-quality monitoring program that has mobilized 650 volunteers. He helped move 35,000 lobsters that would have been harmed or displaced by a harbor dredge. And he fought for state legislation that has kept cruise ships from dumping their wastewater into the bay.

I have had the pleasure of working with Joe over the years. Most recently, I appeared with him at a press conference where he used dye, a bowl of seawater, and a chunk of dry ice to demonstrate how climate change is making our ocean more acidic and less habitable for shellfish. The dramatic reaction was a great example of Joe's ability to draw attention to critical issues in ways that make people understand and care.

I wish my very best to Joe in retirement, though I will miss him in the role of Baykeeper. If I need any reminder of his leadership and legacy, however, all I have to do is look out the window.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. GAIL
WARREN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal

congratulations and best wishes to a great friend and outstanding public servant, Ms. Gail Warren. Ms. Warren has served as the Congressional Liaison Representative, Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison for the United States Army since March 2000. She will be retiring on Wednesday, January 21, 2015.

Ms. Warren, a native of Bedford, Virginia, has lived and worked in the DC-Maryland-Virginia area for the majority of her career. Indeed, she has built quite an impressive career which began in 1976 when she commenced her civil service serving in the Pentagon as a Department of Defense Telephone Operator. She then moved on to the office of the Army Board for Corrections of Military Records.

In 1982, Ms. Warren began serving in the Congressional Inquiry Division, Office of the Chief, Legislative Liaison, where she served for fifteen years as a Congressional Liaison Assistant. She was promoted to a Congressional Liaison Representative before she left briefly in 1998 to join the Army Inspector General's Office as a FOIA Specialist/Records Manager. In 2000, Ms. Warren returned to the Office of the Chief, Legislative Liaison as a Congressional Liaison Representative working in the Army House Liaison Division, where she has excelled for the last fifteen years.

During her tenure as a Congressional Liaison Representative, Ms. Warren responded to countless telephone inquiries and handled many last-minute coordination requests. She consistently went above and beyond the call of duty to ensure that Congressional offices had the information needed to respond to congressional and constituent inquiries. She provided expert advice on complex and unusual inquiries to the Army Leadership as well as to Members of Congress and their staffs. Her high standard of excellence and attention to detail ensured the trust and confidence of those with whom she worked.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give." We are so grateful that Ms. Warren has given her time and talents to serving as a connection between the Army and the Congress of the greatest nation in the world. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled. Capitol Hill shined a little brighter because of Ms. Gail Warren.

Ms. Warren has accomplished much in her life but none of it would be possible without the love and support of her three children, Crystal, Kevin and Courtney, and her four grandchildren Javon, Derrick, Jabarie, and Diego.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Ms. Gail Warren upon the occasion of her retirement from an outstanding career in civil service.

EXCELLING IN THE CLASSROOM
AND ON THE COURT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate high school student Cassidy

Nussman for being named to the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state and academic all-state volleyball teams. Nussman is a senior at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. These prestigious awards recognize her hard work and exemplary performance as a scholar-athlete.

Nussman earned a spot on the academic all-state team by maintaining a GPA of 3.9 or higher while competing on the court at an elite level throughout her high school career. She was also named an honorable mention selection on the Under Armour Girls High School All-America Team by the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) and competed on the 2014 TGCA Blue All-Star team for Class 5A/6A as one of the division's top 12 college-bound players. She has committed to play volleyball for Northwestern University next year.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Cassidy Nussman for being named to the 2014 Texas Girls Coaches Association (TGCA) Class 6A all-state and academic all-state volleyball teams. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 22, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
JANUARY 27

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine global challenges and U.S. national security strategy.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine perspectives on the strategic necessity of Iran sanctions.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine President Obama's 2015 trade policy agenda.

SD-215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on supporting teachers and school leaders.

SD-430

JANUARY 28

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of the "Budget Control Act of 2011" and sequestration on national security.

SD-106

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine MAP-21 reauthorization, focusing on Federal and state perspectives.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, committee rules of procedure, subcommittee assignments, S. 192, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, an original bill entitled, "Strengthening Education Through Research Act", and any pending nominations.

SD-430

10 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) budg-

et and economic outlook for fiscal years 2015-2025.

SD-608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine freight rail transportation, focusing on enhancing safety, efficiency, and commerce.

SR-253

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine articulating the case for American leadership in the world, focusing on the national interest.

SD-419

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, and committee rules of procedure.

SR-428A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine protecting America from cyber attacks, focusing on the importance of information sharing.

SD-342

Committee on Indian Affairs

Organizational business meeting to consider selection of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, committee rules of procedure, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Con-

gress; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine Indian country priorities for the 114th Congress.

SD-628

4 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, and subcommittee assignments.

SR-328A

JANUARY 29

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act of 2015".

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 33, to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas.

SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine employer wellness programs, focusing on better health outcomes and lower costs.

SD-430

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 22, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Thank You, God, for giving us another day.

Even before the first word is spoken this day, O Lord, guide our minds, thoughts, hearts, and desires. Breathe into the Members of this House a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that all might fulfill Your holy will.

Bless the Members of this assembly with attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas they may sort out what is best for our Nation.

May all speech in this assembly be deliberately free of all prejudice so that others might listen wholeheartedly. Then all dialogue will be mutually respectful, surprising even us with unity and justice.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BONAMICI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FACTS REVEAL PRESIDENT'S JOB FAILURE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's State of the Union speech was a disconnect with the American people who live and feel the failures of his policies. That is why the voters clearly spoke to stop tax increases destroying jobs in favor of the Republican bipartisan legislation to create jobs.

Big Government fails. The real facts threatening the middle class are: \$869.3 billion total taxes in ObamaCare, according to the Congressional Budget Office; 5.5 million Americans who have fallen into poverty since Obama became President, U.S. Census Bureau; 401,000 construction jobs lost since Obama became President, Bureau of Labor Statistics; \$2,484 decline in the median household income since Obama became President, U.S. Census Bureau.

Again, the President should stop, change course, and work with Republicans for legislation that promotes small business jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Welcome, right to life marchers, to Washington today.

CONGRESS SHOULD FOCUS ON AMERICA'S TOP PRIORITIES

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, just the night before last the President addressed this body and laid out an agenda that we all might not agree with certain elements, but there are elements that we could certainly act upon.

We could take up an infrastructure bill. We could take up legislation that would assure every young person the ability to go to community college. We could take up the big questions that the American people expect us to address that are important to growing our economy. But we are not doing that.

Instead, this morning, the leadership will present to this body legislation that will again seek to curtail the health care rights of women, not because you have some expectation that it will become law, but I believe because it is just another attempt to pander to the more extreme voices of the base.

The President and others have called to us to elevate the dialogue in Congress and elevate our aspirations for our country.

We have legislation before us that would put limitations on the choices that women have and even deny access to abortion services to save the life of a mother. This is the wrong direction. We need to reject it.

LAVONIA POLICE OFFICERS OF THE YEAR

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to rise in recognition of three police officers from the Lavonia, Georgia, Police Department.

Officers Harold McCroskey, Brandon Brown, and Blake Andrews are selfless public servants who have committed their lives to protect ours. The Lavonia Police Department named Officers McCroskey, Andrews, and Brown their 2014 Officers of the Year.

Our corner of northeast Georgia is safe and peaceful thanks in part to the service of these three brave officers. On behalf of my family, Franklin County, and the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia, I offer my gratitude and respect.

The entire department deserves recognition in Congress because Chief Bruce Carlisle and his squad are proud, patriotic Americans. Not only do they keep their local community safe, but they give to charity. This month, they started a scholarship fund in honor of their friend Deputy Steven LaCruz, who died in pursuit of a traffic violator.

As the son of a Georgia State trooper, I am honored by their sacrifice, inspired by their courage, and remain committed to working on their behalf here in Congress.

CONGRESS SHOULD HELP WOMEN AND FAMILIES

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, in 1973, 42 years ago, the Supreme Court ruled in *Roe v. Wade* that women have the right to safe and legal abortion.

I remember the days before that landmark decision. Mr. Speaker, over the centuries it has been clear, when abortion is illegal, it does not go away but is very unsafe.

On this anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we should commit to reducing unwanted pregnancies. We should commit

to making family planning services more available.

To help women and families, we should be passing the Paycheck Fairness Act for equal pay and a robust infrastructure plan for jobs across this country.

To help women and families, let's stop trying to take away women's rights. Let's protect their health care. Let's pass the Women's Health Protection Act and say "no" to unconstitutional attempts to restrict the right of women to safe and legal abortion.

I AM DISAPPOINTED BUT HOPEFUL

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today sad and disappointed.

I am sad and disappointed that in a nation as great as this, lives of so many of our unborn children are ended through abortion.

I am disappointed that we have not moved past this blot on our Nation's history and forward into respecting the dignity of all humans, born and unborn.

I am disappointed that so many of my colleagues here continue to ignore the science that shows over and over the self-evident life in the womb.

Even so, I am more hopeful than ever before there is good news to celebrate. Abortion numbers are down, as are teen pregnancies. States have passed record numbers of laws to protect women's health and the lives of the unborn.

Today on The National Mall, I look forward to seeing the thousands of teenagers and young adults marching hand in hand to the Supreme Court. Their generation is our hope to bring about a culture of life.

LET'S KEEP OUR MARITIME INDUSTRY STRONG

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress to oppose efforts that would undermine our domestic maritime industry and workforce.

Ninety-five years ago, Congress recognized the critical importance of maintaining a strong domestic maritime fleet by passing the Merchant Marine Act, also known as the Jones Act.

Congress is now considering unraveling a law that has played a key role in ensuring the development of a robust shipyard industrial base that supports our national economy, our military, and our homeland security.

The Jones Act has also guaranteed that the United States has highly trained and skilled mariners who can

be called into service during times of national emergency so America can build ships for America.

We saw how commercial vessels flying the American flag played a major role in providing the mariners needed to operate sealift vessels activated from reserve status in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

This is about American jobs. In 2012, the maritime industry employed more than 57,000 workers and supported \$15.2 billion in gross business income in Washington State alone. In the Pacific Northwest, we understand the importance of the Jones Act.

Why would Congress kill good American jobs?

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Congress will reject efforts to undermine the Jones Act and I will continue working with my colleagues to show our strong support for our country's domestic maritime industry and its workers.

MAKING LNG EXPORTS EASIER BY CUTTING RED TAPE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, too often good ideas get lost in bureaucratic red tape. Today we have the opportunity to start cutting that tape away.

H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, requires a timely decision to be made on liquefied natural gas projects around the country, projects that have been held back by unnecessary regulations.

This bill streamlines the review process, getting these projects off of paper and in place, and once these projects start, countless economic opportunities will begin as well.

More jobs, decreased dependency on foreign oil, and a modernized energy sector are waiting. All we need to do is cut the tape and let these opportunities flourish.

This is a commonsense economic step towards a healthier economy. I am proud to support H.R. 161 and the energizing opportunities that come with its passage.

POLITICIANS SHOULDN'T MAKE MEDICAL DECISIONS FOR WOMEN

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, if you thought the 114th Congress would be different, think again. If you thought Republicans were ready to put partisan politics behind them, think again. If you thought they had finally ended their war on women, think again.

Last night, thanks to Republican women and their supporters, the Republicans abandoned their effort to pass a 20-week abortion ban even for

women who were victims of rape or incest.

But instead of respecting women this morning, the Republicans are coming back to the floor again, this time attempting to deny women access to their constitutionally protected right to safe and legal abortions by restricting coverage to abortions—including in private plans purchased with women's private dollars.

This is harmful to women and continues to ignore the American people, who believe that women and their doctors should make important medical decisions, not politicians.

Roe v. Wade wasn't the beginning of women having abortions. It was the end of women dying from abortions.

REMEMBERING STEVE J. BRATKA

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the loss of a dear friend, Steve Bratka, past president of the Tarrant County Stonewall Democrats.

Mr. Bratka was studying at the University of Nebraska, where he developed a passion to work in the railroad industry.

Over 40 years, Mr. Bratka held several leadership positions and was promoted into the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in 1975.

In 1991, Steve relocated to Fort Worth, where he served as vice chairman until he retired.

He was very engaged in the community. As one of the founding members of the Texas Stonewall Democrats, Mr. Bratka inspired colleagues to run for local positions to improve our community.

Mr. Bratka left his mark on Fort Worth by standing up for those who had no voice and mentoring dozens of local chairmen to help them become qualified representatives.

Mr. Bratka is survived by his husband, Tim; sister, Connie Benjamin; brother, Lex Bratka, and his wife, Patty Burwell; four nieces; and eight great-nieces and -nephews.

Mr. Bratka's leadership and legacy in the Fort Worth community will be celebrated this Saturday at the Southside Preservation Hall.

Mr. Bratka was a great guy to everyone who knew him, and everyone is sad for his loss but remember him fondly for just being a great person.

□ 0915

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 42 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 42 provides for a closed rule allowing consideration of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Since 1973, at least 52 million children's lives have been tragically taken by abortion in the United States. It is unconscionable that in America, where we fight for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we tolerate this systematic extermination of an entire generation of the most vulnerable among us.

In the midst of that darkness, there has been one area of consensus, Mr. Speaker: protecting taxpayers from paying for a practice they sincerely oppose. Since 1976, the Hyde amendment, which prohibits the Federal funding of abortions, has been included in relevant appropriations bills. Each year it has been consistently renewed and supported by congressional majorities and Presidents of both parties.

NARAL, an abortion advocacy group, has suggested that prohibiting public funds for abortion reduces abortion rates by roughly 50 percent. That means that half of the women who would have otherwise had a publicly funded abortion end up carrying their baby to term.

In 1993, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Hyde amendment prevented as many as 675,000 abortions every single year. That

means that millions of Americans are alive today because of the Hyde amendment. After 38 years, it is time for this lifesaving amendment to become permanent law.

When Barack Obama was elected in 2008, a myriad of long-established laws, including the Hyde amendment, created a mostly uniform policy that Federal programs did not pay for abortion or subsidize health plans that included coverage of abortion, with only narrow exceptions.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare destroyed that longstanding policy, bypassing the Hyde amendment restriction and paving the way for publicly funded abortions. The President's health care law authorized massive Federal subsidies to assist millions of Americans to purchase private health plans that will cover abortions on demand. In other words, Mr. Speaker, hard-earned taxpayer dollars are now being used to pay for elective abortions. This is simply unacceptable.

H.R. 7 will codify the principles of the Hyde amendment on a permanent, governmentwide basis, which means that it will apply to longstanding Federal health programs such as Medicaid, SCHIP, and Federal employees' health benefits, as well as to new programs created by ObamaCare.

H.R. 7 prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions. It does so by, one, prohibiting all Federal funding for abortions; two, prohibiting Federal subsidies for ACA health care plans that include coverage for abortion; three, prohibiting the use of Federal facilities for abortion; and four, prohibiting Federal employees from performing abortions.

This commonsense measure, which restores a longstanding bipartisan agreement, protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to fund thousands of abortions.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to respect our Nation's consensus on abortion funding and affirm life by voting in favor of this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, down the hall in the old House Chamber stands Clio, Muse of History. Perched atop the room, she is riding the Chariot of Time. She has watched silently over the proceedings of this House since 1807. And in the folio that rests in the crook of her arm, she records every move, large and small, for the benefit of all generations, past, present, and future. What she is recording today is, I am certain, a disappointment.

The proceedings playing out before us today show a blatant, overt disrespect for the time-honored rules of this House, first written by Thomas Jefferson in 1801.

The bill that was supposed to come to the floor today, a bill that would have stripped women of their right to constitutionally protected medical care, was so odious and destructive that some of the women of the Republican Conference rebelled against it. It was based on unsound and fictitious science and caused such a meltdown in the Republican Conference that the House majority pulled it from the floor for fear that it wouldn't pass. But something had to be done because visitors were coming to town for the 42nd anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*.

On this day, there are floods of visitors here in the Nation's Capital to fight against that ruling, to protest that decision, and to raise their clarion call against a woman's right to choose.

In this current Congress, this bill was not brought to us under regular order—as not many are. It had no committee action. It had no hearings, no markup, no witnesses testified in favor or against it, and it came out of the Rules Committee and to the floor today under a closed rule.

One of the ever-ready alternatives came to us late last night, and it is even worse than the one it replaced. It seems that the majority has an endless supply of bills attacking women's health. Can't pass this one? Grab another. Can't pass that one? Just take the next one. Their insistence on attacking women's health seemingly knows no bounds.

Because this bill has not seen any committee action in the current Congress, no one has been able to read it or to weigh in on it or amend it, and some of us would like a clarification on the sordid history of this bill.

In the earliest version of this bill, which was in the 112th Congress, there was a phrase that lit a firestorm across the Nation. It was "forcible rape." The bill was, indeed, the one that would have required women to prove that their rape was "forcible" so it could be categorized as "legitimate." Has nothing been learned here?

The next iteration of the bill, in the 113th Congress, included a provision—and listen to this, America—that would have required the IRS to audit women who had had abortions to ensure that the pregnancy that they terminated had been the result of rape or incest.

This extreme legislation, which is a dust-covered holdover from the last Congress, was originally sponsored by a man, originated from a subcommittee composed of 13 men, and was passed out of the Judiciary Committee with the votes of 21 Republican men. Remember those pictures, America, all of those men sitting there deciding what women's health would be about? It is a perfect illustration of a problem we have had for a long time, that men in blue suits and red ties determine what women can and should do when it comes to their own health or bodies.

This bill is absolutely a solution in search of a problem. As Ms. FOXX pointed out, all this is taken care of. There is no tax money for abortions. The bill in its current form would permanently prohibit low-income women, civil servants, District of Columbia residents, and military women from accessing a full range of reproductive services by codifying the Hyde amendment, which unfortunately already requires no taxpayer funds be spent on abortions except in very limited services. It has been this way for decades. Congress should be repealing these unfair and discriminatory bans, not doubling down on them.

Are these provisions still in the current bill text before us? We have had no chance to check, and it has been awhile since we have seen this bill.

This display is a messaging opportunity and another attempt to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. This bill not only threatens women who buy their insurance on public exchanges with Federal tax credits but also threatens women who use their own private money to pay for their health insurance on the exchanges. Experts tell us this would jeopardize the availability of abortion coverage for all women, no matter where they buy their insurance.

When the House considered this bill in the previous Congress, it was attempt number 49. Today, it is attempt number 55. That is right, ladies and gentlemen, 55 votes the majority has held in this Chamber to take health care away from their own constituents. The House majority has wasted nearly \$80 million of taxpayer money to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

Infrastructure money, anyone?

Time and again, we see the House majority turn their backs on the people they represent and force an extreme agenda, one filled with poison pills that would take our country backward, backward to a time when women died from back-alley abortions; backward to a time of women in desperate circumstances seeking illegal procedures performed by strangers with dirty hands in unspeakable conditions; backward to a time when medical choices were not the choice of the woman, but of the public; backward to a time when women who "got themselves into trouble" by getting pregnant could not work and could not go to school.

These choices are personal. They are not public. A woman's actions regarding her own reproductive health should include anyone she deems appropriate, not politicians in Washington or State capitals scoring political points off her health care.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, as my colleague knows, this legislation is identical to H.R. 7, which passed the

House last Congress after moving through regular order, including a full committee markup.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the strongest champions of life in this House.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her leadership, and for reminding us that this bill passed the House last year in identical form. The only thing changed are the dates, because obviously they had to be updated. It is a 12-page bill which can be very quickly read by any Member. And the only reason we have to be here is because the Senate wouldn't provide a vote on it. So the Senate just shelved it, and we are now bringing it back up on the floor.

Madam Speaker, because abortion dismembers, decapitates, or chemically poisons unborn children to death—the part of abortion that my friends on the other side of this issue have a keen reluctance to not look at and to avoid, abortion methods—we know we will soon have the pain-capable legislation on the floor, and it will come to the floor. We know that children suffer excruciating pain from dismemberment. Piece by piece, a child is literally pulled apart—arms, legs, torso, and decapitation. That is the reality of abortion, Madam Speaker.

Because of all of this, Americans have consistently demanded—and now in ever-growing numbers—that public funds not pay for abortion. I would point out to my colleagues that yesterday the Marist Poll found that 68 percent of Americans oppose taxpayer funding for abortions, and that includes 69 percent of women; 71 percent of the next generation, the millennials, oppose taxpayer funding for abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 will save lives. We know the Hyde amendment has probably saved at least 1 million lives, children who are on soccer fields today or in school, perhaps even getting married, people who live because the Hyde amendment has been in effect since the 1970s. Over a million children are alive because of that restriction of abortion from Medicaid funding.

□ 0930

H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals. It makes the Hyde amendment and other current funding prohibitions permanent, so they don't have to be included in the annual appropriations bills. It ensures that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President.

It provides full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display of the extent to which any health insurance plan on the exchange funds abortion. Now, that is all being done stealthily, hidden from the consumer. They have no idea when they are buying a plan

that the plan is paying for abortion on demand.

Let me remind my colleagues that in the runup to passage of the Affordable Care Act, Americans were assured by President Obama himself, right there at the podium, and he said in September of 2009 that "under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion." That is the President's word.

He also said on March 24, 2010, in order to get a number of pro-life Democrats, he gave them his word and wrote that the Affordable Care Act "maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges." Nothing, Madam Speaker, could be further from the truth.

We asked the General Accountability Office last year to look into how many of these plans were paying for abortion. They came back and said well over 1,000 insurance plans on the exchange were funding abortion on demand, completely contrary to what our President told us would be the case in a speech to all of us in 2009 and then in an executive order that he issued.

Agree or disagree on the abortion issue, but let's always be truthful. President Obama told us funding wouldn't be in there, yet it is.

There is also problems with transparency. Senator Ben Nelson, in order to procure his vote, said there has to be two payments for abortion if it is included when the bill is on the Senate side.

He said: "If you are receiving Federal assistance to buy insurance and if that plan has any abortion coverage, the insurance company must bill you separately, and you must pay separately from your own personal funds—perhaps a credit card transaction, your separate personal check, or automatic withdrawal from your bank account—for that abortion coverage. Now, let me say that again. You have to write two checks: one for the basic policy and one for the additional coverage for abortion."

That is not being implemented either, so the premium is all rolled into one. Again, conscientious pro-life Americans who do not want to be complicit in the wounding of women and the killing of babies are paying for abortion, and many of them don't even know it.

I hope that Members will vote for the rule, and to those who think that there will be no debate and vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, that will come to the floor; and, again, you defend dismemberment abortions at 20 weeks, 21 weeks, 23 weeks, where the child suffers excruciating pain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say there is

no scientific evidence at all. As a matter of fact, gynecologists have all written to us—and we have their statements—that there is no way of fetal pain at 20 weeks.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD, as a woman and as a Member of Congress and a citizen of the United States, that the House should vote for bigger paychecks, and they should vote for better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend for a moment.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Chair is correct, and we will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.

ADAMS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my

statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) to speak as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

H.R. 7 is yet another direct attack on women and their families. It creates sweeping new restrictions on abortion coverage for women who purchase insurance under the Affordable Care Act, with no meaningful exception to protect a woman's health, and experts predict that it could cause many insurers to limit women's health options in their plans altogether.

This bill injects ideology into personal medical decisions and puts politicians, rather than doctors, in charge of women's health care. Instead of this extreme legislation, Congress should address the real challenges facing women and families today.

At a time when 42 million women are either living in poverty or on the brink of it, Congress must do more to help. We should be focused on expanding access to child care, providing workers with paid sick leave, and ensuring women equal pay for equal work. This bill does none of these. It fails women and their families.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on both the rule and H.R. 7.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Dr. BABIN.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. It is plain wrong to use America's hard-earned tax dollars to pay for abortions.

On September 9, 2009, President Obama told the joint session of Congress:

One more misunderstanding I want to clear up—under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions, and Federal conscience laws will remain in place.

Those of us in the pro-life community knew that this was simply not the

case, and last September, the Government Accountability Office confirmed that, under ObamaCare, abortions are being paid for with taxpayer funds by more than 1,000 ObamaCare exchange plans across the country.

Our bill ends taxpayer funding for abortion, fulfilling one of the promises that this President has broken. Let's pass this bill and end the largest expansion of taxpayer-funded abortion in American history.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

I, too, rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

Today, on the 42nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we should be celebrating it, not dismantling it. I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about pain.

Well, do you want to know about pain? Think back in horror to the perils for our mothers, our daughters, and our sisters in the days before the Supreme Court ruled that women have a constitutional right to make our own personal health care decisions.

Back then, our country faced a public health crisis as women were maimed, made sterile, and lost their lives as a result of self-inflicted or illegal abortions. I remember finding a friend who was near death as a result of a back alley procedure.

Since *Roe v. Wade*, State after State, including Florida, my home State, has passed onerous laws criminalizing doctors, requiring unnecessary tests, and other insidious obstructions to prevent access to abortion.

Today, Congress again piles on to the damage hurting the poorest of our citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Here is a much better way to make lives better for our children, and that is to allow their mothers to live full, productive lives; and instead of this bill, pass the Women's Health Protection Act to ensure that no matter where a woman lives, she has access to the resources needed to make her own health care decisions.

We cannot and will not go back.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. BENISHEK.

Mr. BENISHEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rights of the unborn and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule.

I, along with many in northern Michigan, believe that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb and must be protected. Both

unborn and born children have a right to life.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act will ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used to subsidize a practice that so many of my constituents cannot condone. Your hard-earned tax dollars should not be used to pay for abortions.

I served as a doctor for 30 years in northern Michigan, and I have had the awesome gift of witnessing the miracle of new life in the delivery room. I have also been blessed with the experience as a father and a grandfather, and I know how life-changing this event can be.

I want to commend the pro-life grassroots efforts led by passionate advocates in our local communities. Thank you for the hard work that you do to educate our communities on the value of life.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 0945

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, despite the misleading title of this bill, the fact is that there is no Federal taxpayer funding of abortion right now except in very limited circumstances.

H.R. 7 would for the first time place restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health care. It would also likely result in the loss of access to comprehensive health care for millions of women who work for small businesses or who will be purchasing insurance in the Health Insurance Marketplaces. Politicians are not medical experts and should not be dictating health care decisions for women.

House Republicans are scrambling this morning to consider the rule for H.R. 7 at the last minute because it became clear that the overly restrictive and unconstitutional 20-week abortion ban would fail a floor vote. Why? Because Americans support comprehensive health care for all women. House Republicans should be bringing up bills to strengthen the economy, to guarantee women equal pay for equal work, to raise the minimum wage, to make child care affordable, and not limit a woman's access to health services in a desperate attempt to relitigate a very divisive issue.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, codifies many longstanding pro-life protections that have been passed under both Republican- and Democrat-controlled Congresses. The majority of taxpayers oppose Fed-

eral funding for abortion, as demonstrated in poll after poll.

A recent Marist poll showed that 58 percent of respondents oppose or strongly oppose using any tax dollars for abortions;

During the ObamaCare debate, a 2010 Zogby/O'Leary poll found that 76 percent of Americans said that Federal funds should never pay for an abortion or should pay only to save the life of the mother;

A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed the Federal funding of abortion;

An April 2011 CNN poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed public funding for abortion;

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed that 61 percent of respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that include abortion;

A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed any measure that would "require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes."

In other words, Madam Speaker, the American people do not want the government spending their hard-earned tax dollars to destroy innocent human life—period.

Like most taxpayers, employers also prefer plans that preclude abortion coverage. According to the insurance industry's trade association, "Most insurers offer plans that include abortion coverage, but most employers choose not to offer it as part of their benefits packages."

Even Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI has voted numerous times to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion in the District of Columbia. President Obama voted against the taxpayer funding of abortion in the District of Columbia twice when he was in the Senate, and since being elected, he has signed appropriations legislation into law that prohibits this funding.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, opposition to taxpayer funding for abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and is supported by the majority of the American people. It is time to restore the status quo on the government funding of abortion and make this widely supported policy permanent across the Federal Government. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I will comment on the demerits of this terrible bill in the debate on the bill. I want to comment now on how this bill got before us.

This is, I think, the fifth bill we have considered in this Congress. Not one of

those bills went through committee. Not one of those bills had a markup, a hearing, an opportunity for people to amend the bills in committee, and now the bills come to the floor for an hour of debate with no opportunity to offer amendments. This is hardly the transparency and the due process that the GOP leaders promised us.

This bill is even worse because this bill was not on the calendar until late last night. Yesterday, when the Republican anti-choice women rebelled at the terrible rape provisions of the bill we were supposed to debate today and when they found they couldn't pass a bill today on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, they brought another off-the-shelf bill, which is a terrible bill, with no hearing in committee, no debate in committee, no markup, no opportunity to offer amendments, no vote in committee, no opportunity to offer amendments on the floor.

This is not the way you run or should run the House of Representatives of the United States. It is a shameful procedure for a shameful bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues that H.R. 7 passed last year. It passed with an overwhelming majority. It is the same bill. It went through regular order. Hearings and a markup were held, and the legislation came through regular order in the House of Representatives. The problem has been the Senate, which has refused to take up this bill for well over a year, so we are back to take up a bill that has already been approved by the House in regular order.

Let me remind my colleagues as well that, next week, we will be taking up a number of bills that will combat human trafficking. Madam Speaker, I am the prime sponsor of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, Americans' landmark law to combat the hideous crime of sex trafficking and labor trafficking.

We have a number of important antihuman trafficking bills that passed the House but sat over on the Senate side for a year or more—some of them—including two of mine, and we are talking about bringing those bills up next week. Regular order was followed last year on those bills—just like H.R. 7. Those bills languished on the Senate side. Surely, we can come together to combat human trafficking. The flaw in the process was the Senate and its former leadership unwillingness to vote on House-passed legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, I am going to state this as simply as I can. There is no public funding for abortion. Whether you like it or not, the Hyde amendment, which has been the law of this land for decades now, says there is no public funding for abortion. That has not changed. There is no public funding for abortion under the Affordable Care Act or any other government program.

This bill would vastly expand the current restrictions on a woman's right to get her own health care through her insurance, with her own private money, that she, her family, and her doctor think she needs. Let me say how this would work. Under H.R. 7, people who buy their insurance in exchanges—and their employers—now would not be able to spend their own private dollars to buy insurance that they need for themselves and their families.

This not only would be a radical expansion over current law, it would be a terrible wedge between patients and their doctors. I do not care how many polls there are that you might cite, because the vast majority of Americans think that a woman's private health care decisions should be made between herself, her family, and her doctor—certainly, not by politicians in Washington, D.C.

H.R. 7 is an idea that has been proposed time and again. It is not going anywhere. I am sure it will probably pass this House today, and it will go over to the other body, and it will die. If not, the President will veto it.

Here are my questions to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Why aren't we spending this week talking about how the women of America can get better paychecks? Why aren't we spending our time talking this week about how the women and men of America can get tax credits so that the children they do have can go to child care that is quality child care? Why aren't we spending our time this week talking about how women and men should be able to get paid the same amount for doing the very same job?

That is what I think this Congress should be spending its time doing, not passing these bills which are false statements about a woman's private decisions about her health care. I urge the body to defeat this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say as forcefully as I can that there is nothing in H.R. 7 that restricts the private sale of plans that include abortion. There is nothing in H.R. 7 that restricts the private sale of plans that include abortion. Consistent with the Hyde amendment, the bill ensures that Federal dollars—wherever those Federal dollars come from—do not subsidize plans that cover abortion.

What is important to explain is that the Hyde amendment has only in the past applied to annual appropriations bills. As we have done our best to ex-

plain to the American people, ObamaCare is not subject to annual appropriations bills but is funded under mandatory spending. Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is important that we codify that no Federal funds can be used for abortions. That is what this bill does.

If our colleagues believe it is unnecessary, then they should have no problem voting for it because, then, it is not doing anything that violates what has been done in the past. However, this bill is necessary. Let me say again, Madam Speaker, that H.R. 7 simply codifies the longstanding bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funding should not be used to destroy innocent life.

H.R. 7 does so by establishing a permanent, governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage, including cutting off taxpayer funding for plans that include abortion under ObamaCare;

It prevents funding for abortion in government programs like Medicaid, the Federal Health Benefits Program, and the Children's Health Insurance Program;

The bill also ensures that subsidies made available in the form of refundable tax credits under the ACA are prevented from flowing to plans that include abortion;

H.R. 7 also explicitly states that private individuals may purchase separate abortion coverage or plans that include abortion as long as no Federal subsidies are used to pay for the abortion coverage. Similarly, H.R. 7 explicitly states that insurance companies may offer abortion coverage as long as the coverage is not paid for by using taxpayer dollars.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my colleague from North Carolina for, once again, being such a strong defender of life.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 7. I believe in the sanctity of human life and that life begins at conception and ends at death. My life's experiences as a mom, as a nurse, and as a Christian have helped me to form these core beliefs.

I have held the hands of newborn infants, and I have held the hands of elderly patients in the last moments of their lives. I have been blessed to have had such special moments, and because of them, I know that every life is precious and is a gift from God and that it is not for us to judge its worth.

Madam Speaker, the unborn need us to stand up for them and to be the voice that they do not have. I support this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

□ 1000

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that we

have heard what is in this bill, but this bill was taken out of the used-bill freezer last night at 9 o'clock, against all the rules, and put on the floor today. We really don't know what is in this bill.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend from Rochester for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try again. That is clearly what my Republican colleagues are doing this morning.

The bill Republicans initially attempted to bring to the floor today would have required women to go to the police before they could even address their own health care needs. They abandoned that first line of attack on women's health because it was too extreme, even for members of their own party. But they weren't going to let something like that stop them from pandering to the rightwing flank. Fortunately for the Republicans, they have a long list of bills that attack health care and women's access to care. So it is easy for them to just swap it out for another extremist effort. Their partisan base will be happy—but at the expense of the health of many women and families in our country.

This bill will have a serious impact on families' ability to make their own health care decisions. It will raise taxes on hardworking Americans just if they happen to choose a health care plan that this majority doesn't like. And for what? So my Republican colleagues can score cheap political points.

This is not what the American people want. They want an agenda that lifts people up. They want us to be working on legislation that creates jobs, boosts paychecks in this country, and strengthens our economy. This bill will do none of these things. It is nothing but a cynical attempt to put politics where it doesn't belong.

Vote "no" on this rule and vote "no" on this blatant political gambit.

I understand how embarrassing this may be to the Republicans because of the little snafu within their own caucus, but please put aside this petty politics. Let's get on to the real business of creating more jobs in this country and boosting a person's pay in this land. That is what the American people want and need.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her diligence and efforts on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I think we all are pleased to have so many of our con-

stituents in town today who are supporting life and supporting that concept of life, liberty, and freedom.

It is such an honor today to come to the floor and talk about an issue that 68 percent of the American people agree on. Listening to my colleagues talking about how this is partisan and just for our base, I am glad that they think 68 percent of the American people are our base—because they do agree with us. Seventy-one percent of millennials agree with us on this issue. And the issue is simply this: there should not be taxpayer dollars used to pay for abortions.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has done a tremendous amount of work on this bill. I thank him for his diligence, his attention, and for working to get H.R. 7 in the right form, ready to move forward and to bring this issue into the light.

We have got three things we want to focus on in this bill. Number one, there is enormous bipartisan support—I would say near unanimous bipartisan support—for the Hyde amendment language. Title I of this bill is going to make that permanent.

Madam Speaker, what that means is no longer do we have to revote this over and over and over. The Hyde amendment language will be the applied standard.

Title II of this bill will apply that to ObamaCare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, what it will do is apply that to ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act.

Now the reason it is imperative, the President promised on numerous occasions, Madam Speaker, that there would be no taxpayer dollars, which become Federal funds, used for abortion. This was a big debate as we went through the Affordable Care Act.

What we have learned from not us but from the GAO is that we have in the marketplace 1,036 plans. We have over 1,000 plans that allow those dollars into those plans. What this bill will also do is bring transparency not only to the plans but to the money flow, so that hardworking American taxpayers who do not want their money used to pay for abortion—68 percent agree with us—will have clarity and certainty on the issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Madam Speaker, I am totally puzzled. I came to the floor thinking that we were going to be focused on creating jobs, putting people to work, helping our young people go to college, and re-

ducing student loan debts. Where is the regular procedure that my friends on the other side of the aisle were going to bring to the House? Where did this bill come from? Did it come from the committee process? No.

Let me make this very, very clear. I knew Henry Hyde. I worked with Henry Hyde. The Hyde amendment is the law of the land. There is no public money for abortion.

This is a radical bill that restricts women paying for private insurance with their own dollars. Millions of women would lose comprehensive health care. I just don't understand it.

As an appropriator, we still have not brought the Homeland Security bill to the floor. As a resident of New York, I am concerned by possible attacks.

Let's do our work. Let's move on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. To my friends on the other side of the aisle, this bill just came to the floor without serious discussion and when there is no public money for abortion today as a result of the Hyde amendment.

I look forward to bringing a Homeland Security bill to the floor. As I began to say, as a New Yorker, I am concerned about potential threats to our country.

Let's get to work. Let's create jobs. Let's do the work that our citizens—our constituents—brought us here to do. I don't understand this bill. And in closing, there is no public money for abortion.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The passage of H.R. 7 will be welcome news for the majority of Americans who do not want their tax dollars paying for the grisly business of abortion. This bill will make existing policies like the Hyde amendment permanent and will rid ObamaCare of its massive expansion of public funding for abortion insurance plans.

The President repeatedly assured Americans that ObamaCare would "maintain current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extend those restrictions to newly created health insurance exchanges." Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that promise didn't pan out. It now joins "if you like your plan, you can keep it" in President Obama's panoply of broken promises.

Madam Speaker, today, hundreds of thousands of Americans are coming to Washington, D.C., to brave the cold and march for life. Participants hail from all 50 States, have various religions, and are from all different walks of life and ages. But the one thing they have in common is the shared dedication to protecting the unborn.

The March for Life gives a voice to the voiceless and sends a powerful message to the Representatives of the people assembled here in Congress. It is

heartening that so many Americans of different backgrounds are willing to take a stand for life.

Madam Speaker, this is not a partisan issue and this is not a partisan bill. H.R. 7 reflects the bipartisan, bicameral agreement that our government should not be in the business of subsidizing abortions. This is not a radical idea. It is a commonsense proposal that codifies a longstanding compromise. Therefore, I again urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman from the great State of New York for her extraordinary leadership on the Rules Committee and in so many areas for this country and our State.

I rise today in strong opposition to yet another closed rule. Despite all the lectures from Republicans about how creating jobs and growing the economy should be the number one top priority for this Congress, here we are instead once again hammering away at a woman's right to make her own choices, control her own body, and make choices about her own health care.

It is insulting to women, and it does not create one single job. But what it does do is put government between a physician and its patient. That is what it does. The other side says they want freedom and they want the government off their back. Yet on the most personal health care decisions for women, they are putting government between a woman and her doctor.

This bill will not grow our economy, but it will make permanent such discriminatory bans that target women in both the public and private health insurance market.

Republicans claim on their Web site—you can look it up and see it on their Web site—that they want to “do something for the 8.7 million people in America who are still unemployed.” It is time to focus on creating jobs and improving the economy for Americans, yet the first bill the Republican majority puts on the floor does not create one single job but discriminates, hurts, and insults women.

I urge a strong, strong “no” vote on this rule and on the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also for being very vigilant in protecting women, women's right to privacy, and alerting us as to the dangers in this very terrible rule and terrible bill.

Madam Speaker, first of all, once again, as I said yesterday, this is just downright wrong. This is a horrible bill. This takes away a woman's right to privacy. Again, I thought in our country we prided ourselves on the right to privacy.

Women have a right to determine their own health care decisions. They can make these decisions with whom-ever they deem appropriate. There is no way that Members of Congress should intervene, direct, or super-impose views and government policies on women's health care and women's right to privacy.

□ 1015

Once again, the Hyde amendment was passed, I believe it was—what—in the seventies. We should be providing access to women's health care so low-income women would have the same opportunities to determine their own health care decisions as other women who have the access, but Federal funds haven't been allowed for many, many years now.

I don't know why these bogus arguments are being made on this bill because we don't have Federal funding of abortions, and I think women know that and see this as a real sinister move to, once again, deny women their right to health care and their right to privacy.

Also, once again, we are seeing how another bill further undermines D.C.'s home rule. This bill prohibits the District of Columbia from using its own funds to provide abortions. Why would we do this?

D.C. has a right to determine how they want to provide health care for women and have their own ability to determine their own destiny; but, once again, for low-income women in Washington, D.C., they are under assault with this bill.

It is really a shame and disgrace that, once again, we have to get up here and debunk the argument that Federal funds are being used for abortions because they are not. Today, the 42nd anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we should really be talking about expanding access to a full range of reproductive health services for everyone, including low-income women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Ms. LEE. We should be talking about expanding reproductive health services for all women, including low-income women. We should be talking about pay equity. We should be talking about child care. We should be talking about paid family medical leave. We should be talking about creating jobs.

But rather than that, here we go, once again, trying to get in the middle of a woman's decision to move forward

with her own life based on the decisions that she and her physician and her family members make.

The right to privacy, once again, is being undermined by this bill. You can't have a right to privacy and keep government out of your private life on one hand and, on the other hand, say government has got to interfere with your personal and private business.

Health care is too important for women. Women need to be able to make their own health care decisions, and this bill would do the exact opposite. It would move our country backwards. It would move women's health care backwards.

I hope that Members will vote “no” on this rule and “no” on the bill. We need to be expanding access to women's health care.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While it is true that the Hyde amendment and its companion amendments have been renewed every year, recent implementation of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, has ignored these restrictions. Rather than renewing various amendments each year, we should make the prohibition on Federal abortion funding permanent and governmentwide.

Additionally, provisions contained in the Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act have been included in H.R. 7. These provisions require the exchanges to prominently display, one, whether a plan provides for abortion coverage; and, two, if it does, the amount of the abortion surcharge that the consumer is required to pay.

Unfortunately, for most consumers, finding out if the plans on their State's exchange or the Federal marketplace covers abortion is nearly impossible because the information is not consistently available.

Knowing whether these plans cover abortion is absolutely critical to many consumers because plans that cover elective abortion are required by law to impose a mandatory monthly abortion surcharge.

These surcharges are not optional. Once you sign up for a plan with abortion coverage, you must pay the surcharge. This means that, potentially, many Americans who strongly oppose elective abortion could be unknowingly contributing to the practice financially.

Madam Speaker, that simply isn't right. H.R. 7 will stop funding for plans that cover elective abortion under ObamaCare and ensure that abortion coverage and the accompanying surcharge are made transparent to the American people.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and H.R. 7, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me first say something about the process that we are engaged in. We have heard just in the last few weeks—and even as we opened this Congress—the Speaker and others in the majority talk about how we will adhere to regular order and we will get back to the process of legislating the way it was intended to be conducted.

What happened to that? Why did we set that aside? What is the emergency that requires us to bring this highly ideological piece of legislation to the floor in just a few hours after it had been brought to the Rules Committee? What happened to the previous legislation that we were supposed to debate?

I mean, to me, this is a big problem, and it is one that I think begs the question of whether or not those offers of returning to the regular legislative process are sincere.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule for that reason, but also because this is yet just another ideological attack on the health care rights of women in this country who want—in some cases, we know that abortion services are already prohibited from being funded through Federal sources.

This is simply going so far as to say that women, with their own money, who seek to procure insurance coverage, can’t seek that coverage if it includes these services. To me, it goes just far too far. It does not allow even exceptions for abortions that would be required to protect the health of the woman or serious medical concerns.

We can’t continue to make this a political question and a political football. Forty-two years ago, this question was decided at the Supreme Court. It is a right that is protected.

Rather than continuing to just sort of pander to the base and satisfy the ideological extremists in our country, we ought to be thinking about the questions that people actually want us to take this precious time on the floor of the House to debate: How are we going to put America back to work? How are we going to rebuild our infrastructure? How are we going to make sure that kids who want to get a good college education the way the President outlined the other night are going to be able to afford that?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that it is clear some of our colleagues have not read the bill or have not listened to the debate. This bill does not prohibit women from purchasing abortion coverage with their own money.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I also want to thank Mr. SMITH and my colleagues and all who are in Washington, D.C., participating in the

March for Life for their unwavering commitment and support to fight on behalf of those who have no voice.

Throughout my years in Congress, Madam Speaker, and as a devoted human rights advocate, I have fought tirelessly for the fundamental rights of the innocent unborn.

As pro-life Members of Congress, we have a commitment to stand up for life and to take the necessary steps to advance legislation to the floor, and that is exactly what the U.S. House of Representatives will be doing today.

While the vast majority of Americans can agree that we have a lot of work in front of us to reduce the number of abortions, few legislators have taken any meaningful action. In fact, pro-abortion Members of Congress have sought to eliminate Federal protections on the use of taxpayer funds for abortions, both here and abroad.

Federal funds should not be used to pay for abortions, Madam Speaker, and Congressman SMITH’s bill would do exactly that by establishing a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage. This will help save lives.

In addition, this bill also protects the conscience and religious views of millions of Americans. The vast majority of Americans also do not want their tax dollars to be used to pay for abortions. This bill would establish a permanent prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion.

For many years, the Hyde amendment and other Federal prohibitions on public funding for abortion have been enacted as appropriation riders, but they are not permanent, Madam Speaker. We need to get rid of this patchwork approach and enact H.R. 7 to ensure that Federal funds are not used to pay for abortions.

I look forward to working with Mr. SMITH and Ms. FOXX and others in favor of this bill and to continue working with my fellow pro-life colleagues in the House and the Senate to promote legislation that upholds the sanctity of innocent human life.

We have a responsibility to protect the unborn, and we must remain vigilant and continue to do what is right for all Americans.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we just heard that apparently none of us have read the bill. That is absolutely true. The bill, as I said, was dragged out of the “used bill freezer” at 9 last night.

If it is the same bill that we were talking about that has been through for several terms, it still has the idea of forcible rape being the only legitimate rape and that the IRS can audit to see if you were really raped when you had an abortion and to prove

that—again, taking women back to the days when everybody said that they could not make decisions and that they had to be made for them.

If this is the same bill that was brought to us, as we pointed out, by a subcommittee of 13 men and voted through the House by a committee of 21 men, then we don’t need to read it again, and my understanding is that this is the same bill. It was repugnant then, and it certainly is repugnant now.

On behalf of the men and women of the United States who feel that they have the right to make their own health decisions, I beg the House of Representatives to turn down all of this.

Now, we know that what they are doing, literally, is dismissive of not only 51 percent of the women population—we are the majority population, we women in the United States—but this is certainly, by any account, a misuse of the Chamber’s attention, and we are talking taxpayer funds. Believe me, this is a misuse of taxpayer funds.

Now, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow us to strike the 3-day layover waiver, the waiver that was given by the Rules Committee to not do the 3-day layover, but to have something to do on the floor today.

With 23 months left of the 114th Congress, we should be able to run the House in the thoughtful manner that the rules of the House provide for.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Now, I am going to urge again for all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no” on the previous question, vote “no” on the rule and, by all means, “no” on the intrusive, deceptive bill that has been talked about here for 40 years.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, life is the most fundamental of all rights. It is sacred and God-given, but millions of babies have been robbed of that right in this, the freest country in the world. That is a tragedy beyond words and a betrayal of what we, as a nation, stand for.

One day, we hope it will be different. We hope life will cease to be valued on a sliding scale. We hope the era of elective abortions, ushered in by an unelected court, will be closed and collectively deemed one of the darkest chapters in American history, but until that day, it remains a solemn duty to stand up for life.

□ 1030

Regardless of the length of this journey, we will continue to speak for those who cannot, and we will continue to pray to the One who can change the hearts of those in desperation and those in power, who equally hold the lives of the innocent in their hands.

Madam Speaker, the commonsense measure before us restores an important, longstanding, bipartisan agreement that protects the unborn and prevents taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions. It reflects the will of the American people and is the product of what has historically been a bipartisan, bicameral consensus in Congress. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and H.R. 7.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 42 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

On page 1, line 4 of the resolution, insert the following after the word "waived": "except those arising under clause 11 of rule XXI".

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the pre-

vious question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—239

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Coffman	Fox
Allen	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Babin	Comstock	Gibbs
Barletta	Conaway	Gibson
Barr	Cook	Gohmert
Barton	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Benishek	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Boustany	DeSantis	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bridenstine	Dold	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hartzer
Buck	Ellmers	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Emmer	Hensarling
Burgess	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Fincher	Hice (GA)
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hill
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Holding
Chabot	Fleming	Hudson
Chaffetz	Flores	Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)	Scalise
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Schock
Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert
Hurd (TX)	Mullin	Scott, Austin
Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Jenkins (KS)	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Shuster
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Simpson
Jolly	Nugent	Smith (MO)
Jones	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Jordan	Olson	Smith (NJ)
Joyce	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Katko	Palmer	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Stewart
King (IA)	Pearce	Stivers
King (NY)	Perry	Stutzman
Kinzinger (IL)	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Pitts	Thornberry
Knight	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Labrador	Poliquin	Tipton
LaMalfa	Pompeo	Trott
Lamborn	Posey	Turner
Lance	Price (GA)	Upton
Latta	Ratcliffe	Valadao
LoBiondo	Reed	Wagner
Long	Reichert	Walberg
Loudermilk	Renacci	Walden
Love	Ribble	Walker
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Walorski
Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Walters, Mimi
Lummi	Roby	Weber (TX)
MacArthur	Roe (TN)	Webster (FL)
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup
Massie	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
McCaul	Rokita	Whitfield
McClintock	Rooney (FL)	Williams
McHenry	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Roskam	Wittman
McMorris	Ross	Womack
Rodgers	Rothfus	Woodall
McSally	Rouzer	Yoder
Meadows	Royce	Yoho
Meehan	Russell	Young (IA)
Messer	Ryan (WI)	Young (IN)
Mica	Salmon	Zeldin
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Zinke

NAYS—183

Adams	Delaney	Kind
Aguilar	DeLauro	Kirkpatrick
Ashford	DelBene	Kuster
Bass	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Beatty	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Becerra	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bera	Doggett	Lawrence
Beyer	Doyle (PA)	Lee
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Levin
Blumenauer	Ellison	Lewis
Bonamici	Engel	Lieu (CA)
Boyle (PA)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Esty	Loeb
Brown (FL)	Farr	Loeb
Brownley (CA)	Fattah	Lowenthal
Bustos	Foster	Lowe
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Capps	Fudge	(NM)
Capuano	Gabbard	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cardenas	Galleo	(NM)
Carney	Garamendi	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Graham	Maloney,
Cartwright	Grayson	Carolyn
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Matsui
Chu (CA)	Grijalva	McCollum
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	McDermott
Clark (MA)	Hahn	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Clay	Higgins	Meeks
Cleaver	Himes	Meng
Clyburn	Honda	Moore
Cohen	Hoyer	Moulton
Connolly	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Conyers	Israel	Nadler
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Costa	Jeffries	Neal
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Norcross
Cuellar	Kaptur	O'Rourke
Cummings	Keating	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pascarelli
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Payne
DeFazio	Kildee	Pelosi
DeGette	Kilmer	Peters

Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Weber
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings

Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Marchant
Nunnelee

Perlmutter
Smith (WA)
Young (AK)

□ 1056

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the
Speaker pro tempore announced that
the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker,
on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a
5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 242, nays
179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo

NAYS—179

Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Loebback
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum

McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—12

Carter (TX)
Duckworth
Forbes
Hastings

Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Lowenthal
Marchant

Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Smith (WA)
Speier

□ 1104

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

Stated against:

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall
No. 43, had I been present, I would have
voted "nay."

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, pursu-
ant to House Resolution 42, I call up
the bill (H.R. 7) to prohibit taxpayer
funded abortions, and ask for its imme-
diate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms.
FOX). Pursuant to House Resolution
42, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep-
resentatives of the United States of America in
Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as
the "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and
Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of
2015".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of con-
tents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY
FUNDED ABORTIONS**

Sec. 101. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abor-
tions.

Sec. 102. Amendment to table of chapters.

**TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE
AFFORDABLE CARE ACT**

Sec. 201. Clarifying application of prohibi-
tion to premium credits and
cost-sharing reductions under
ACA.

Sec. 202. Revision of notice requirements re-
garding disclosure of extent of
health plan coverage of abor-
tion and abortion premium sur-
charges.

**TITLE I—PROHIBITING FEDERALLY
FUNDED ABORTIONS****SEC. 101. PROHIBITING TAXPAYER FUNDED
ABORTIONS.**

Title 1, United States Code is amended by
adding at the end the following new chapter:

**"CHAPTER 4—PROHIBITING TAXPAYER
FUNDED ABORTIONS**

"301. Prohibition on funding for abortions.

"302. Prohibition on funding for health bene-
fits plans that cover abortion.

"303. Limitation on Federal facilities and
employees.

"304. Construction relating to separate cov-
erage.

"305. Construction relating to the use of
non-Federal funds for health
coverage.

"306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws.

"307. Construction relating to complications
arising from abortion.

“308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother.

“309. Application to District of Columbia.

“§ 301. Prohibition on funding for abortions

“No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for any abortion.

“§ 302. Prohibition on funding for health benefits plans that cover abortion

“None of the funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are authorized or appropriated by Federal law, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

“§ 303. Limitation on Federal facilities and employees

“No health care service furnished—

“(1) by or in a health care facility owned or operated by the Federal Government; or

“(2) by any physician or other individual employed by the Federal Government to provide health care services within the scope of the physician's or individual's employment, may include abortion.

“§ 304. Construction relating to separate coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting any individual, entity, or State or locality from purchasing separate abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion so long as such coverage is paid for entirely using only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§ 305. Construction relating to the use of non-Federal funds for health coverage

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as restricting the ability of any non-Federal health benefits coverage provider from offering abortion coverage, or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage, so long as only funds not authorized or appropriated by Federal law are used and such coverage shall not be purchased using matching funds required for a federally subsidized program, including a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds.

“§ 306. Non-preemption of other Federal laws

“Nothing in this chapter shall repeal, amend, or have any effect on any other Federal law to the extent such law imposes any limitation on the use of funds for abortion or for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion, beyond the limitations set forth in this chapter.

“§ 307. Construction relating to complications arising from abortion

“Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply to the treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused by or exacerbated by the performance of an abortion. This rule of construction shall be applicable without regard to whether the abortion was performed in accord with Federal or State law, and without regard to whether funding for the abortion is permissible under section 308.

“§ 308. Treatment of abortions related to rape, incest, or preserving the life of the mother

“The limitations established in sections 301, 302, and 303 shall not apply to an abortion—

“(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

“(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

“§ 309. Application to District of Columbia

“In this chapter:

“(1) Any reference to funds appropriated by Federal law shall be treated as including any amounts within the budget of the District of Columbia that have been approved by Act of Congress pursuant to section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (or any applicable successor Federal law).

“(2) The term ‘Federal Government’ includes the government of the District of Columbia.”

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CHAPTERS.

The table of chapters for title 1, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4. Prohibiting taxpayer funded abortions 301”.

TITLE II—APPLICATION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

SEC. 201. CLARIFYING APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION TO PREMIUM CREDITS AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS UNDER ACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DISALLOWANCE OF REFUNDABLE CREDIT AND COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS FOR COVERAGE UNDER QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN WHICH PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 36B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code)”.

(B) OPTION TO PURCHASE OR OFFER SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Paragraph (3) of section 36B(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from purchasing separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the premiums for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as premiums for such separate coverage or plan are not paid for with any amount attributable to the credit allowed under this section (or the amount of any advance payment of the credit under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”

(2) DISALLOWANCE OF SMALL EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE CREDIT FOR PLAN WHICH INCLUDES COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—Subsection (h) of section 45R of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking “Any term” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF HEALTH PLANS INCLUDING COVERAGE FOR ABORTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified health plan’ does not include any health plan that includes coverage for abortions (other than any abortion or treatment described in section 307 or 308 of title 1, United States Code).

“(B) SEPARATE ABORTION COVERAGE OR PLAN ALLOWED.—

“(i) OPTION TO PURCHASE SEPARATE COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as prohibiting any employer from purchasing for its employees separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a health plan that includes such abortions, so long as no credit is allowed under this section with respect to the employer contributions for such coverage or plan.

“(ii) OPTION TO OFFER COVERAGE OR PLAN.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall restrict any non-Federal health insurance issuer offering a health plan from offering separate coverage for abortions described in such subparagraph, or a plan that includes such abortions, so long as such separate coverage or plan is not paid for with any employer contribution eligible for the credit allowed under this section.”

(3) CONFORMING ACA AMENDMENTS.—Section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking paragraph (3), as amended by section 202(a); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(b) APPLICATION TO MULTI-STATE PLANS.—Paragraph (6) of section 1334(a) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(6) COVERAGE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL ABORTION POLICY.—In entering into contracts under this subsection, the Director shall ensure that no multi-State qualified health plan offered in an Exchange provides health benefits coverage for which the expenditure of Federal funds is prohibited under chapter 4 of title 1, United States Code.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2015, but only with respect to plan years beginning after such date, and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to plan years beginning after such date.

SEC. 202. REVISION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING DISCLOSURE OF EXTENT OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE OF ABORTION AND ABORTION PREMIUM SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 1303(b) of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18023(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) RULES RELATING TO NOTICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The extent of coverage (if any) of services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) or (1)(B)(ii) by a qualified health plan shall be disclosed to enrollees at the time of enrollment in the plan and shall be prominently displayed in any marketing or advertising materials, comparison tools, or summary of benefits and coverage explanation made available with respect to such plan by the issuer of the plan, by an Exchange, or by the Secretary, including information made available through an Internet portal or Exchange under sections 1311(c)(5) and 1311(d)(4)(C).

“(B) SEPARATE DISCLOSURE OF ABORTION SURCHARGES.—In the case of a qualified

health plan that includes the services described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) and where the premium for the plan is disclosed, including in any marketing or advertising materials or any other information referred to in subparagraph (A), the surcharge described in paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II) that is attributable to such services shall also be disclosed and identified separately.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to materials, tools, or other information made available more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in strong support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act, legislation that passed the House almost 1 year ago with bipartisan support.

This bill affirms what a majority of Americans believe, that no taxpayer dollars should be spent on abortions and abortion coverage.

H.R. 7 establishes a permanent governmentwide prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion. This bill is all the more necessary because of the President's health care law and its attack on this longstanding protection of taxpayer dollars.

The bill before us would simply codify the Hyde amendment, a longstanding provision that has ensured Federal dollars do not subsidize abortion over the past decade.

H.R. 7 also requires that information regarding abortion coverage as well as the amount of the abortion surcharge be displayed where consumers can easily identify which plans cover abortion. Consumers should have the right to know whether the plan they are selecting on an exchange includes abortion coverage.

While the Affordable Care Act included some notification provisions, many of our constituents are simply unable to find out whether a plan is paying for abortions. In fact, this inability to find out whether exchange plans provide abortion coverage seems to extend to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as former Secretary Sebelius failed to uphold her commitment after testifying twice be-

fore the Energy and Commerce Committee, promising to provide the Congress and the American people a full list of exchange plans providing abortion coverage.

Today, over a year has passed and this commitment is still left unfulfilled. The self-appointed “most transparent administration” in history is simply unwilling or unable to comply with this request. In fact, it took the Government Accountability Office months to find out that taxpayer dollars went to pay for over 1,000 health insurance plans that included abortion.

Even though the Affordable Care Act required, through law, that separate payments be made to pay for the abortion surcharge, the GAO also found that none of the insurers they interviewed actually collected a separate payment.

In fact, the report reveals that the administration informed insurance issuers that they didn't need two separate payments. This bill is about protecting taxpayer dollars and protecting life. It also ensures we have at least some transparency under the President's health care law.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I have good news for my friends on the other side of the aisle. There is no taxpayer funding for abortion. Let me say that again. There is no taxpayer funding for abortions. There hasn't been for many decades because of the Hyde amendment.

Under the Affordable Care Act, that prohibition did not change. Now, some of us might disagree with the Hyde amendment, but that is the law of the land, and it was a carefully constructed compromise under the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1115

This bill would be a vast expansion of the restriction of a woman's right to choose what type of insurance she can purchase with the consultation of her doctor and her husband because it would prevent women from purchasing insurance with their own money on the exchanges, and that would be a restriction on their rights. So I am going to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this ill-conceived piece of legislation, and let's talk about some things that really matter, like jobs, child care, and pay equity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today as a supporter and cosponsor of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. I was a cosponsor of this legislation in the pre-

vious two Congresses, and I continue to support it after hearing from my constituents time and time again that they do not want their tax dollars funding abortions. In fact, the majority of Americans and the vast majority of Kansans oppose their tax dollars being used towards abortion.

The specter of taxpayer-funded abortion has been exacerbated by the President's health care law, which offers subsidies to taxpayers in order to offset its high cost. These subsidized plans, bought through the health care exchanges, could allow for taxpayer-funded abortions to occur.

Without this crucial legislation, we will continue to have a patchwork of provisions regarding Federal funding. This creates confusion, blocks transparency, and opens up additional loopholes. Longstanding provisions are reestablished under H.R. 7, which would apply uniformly across Federal programs, including the President's destructive health care law.

I urge passage of this bipartisan bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPs. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my statement inserted in the RECORD of the House of Representatives that we should be considering bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD of the House of Representatives that we should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to all health care.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for the

purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking my daughter's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should be voting on proposals that create jobs and accelerate economic growth. Instead, the only thing the Republicans have accelerated around here is their attacks on a woman's constitutional rights and health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House, instead of attacking women's access to health care, should be voting on bigger paychecks and better infrastructure for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House, instead of attacking women's access to health care, we should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of constantly attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that instead of attacking women's access to health care, this House should vote for bigger paychecks for women and better infrastructure for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD

that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of constantly attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that this House should be voting for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of these relentless attacks on women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the Democratic Caucus chairman, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that this House should start to concentrate finally on bigger paychecks for our people who are working and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to decent health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of yet another attack on women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my

statement in the RECORD that the House should vote for bigger paychecks and better infrastructure instead of attacking women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Today, on the 42nd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the majority is launching yet another attack on women's health and constitutionally protected right to choose whether to carry a pregnancy to term.

Most importantly, this bill will make it virtually impossible for a woman to obtain abortion services even when paid for with purely private, non-Federal funds. Through its novel tax penalty provisions, H.R. 7 departs radically from existing law, taking away women's existing health care and placing their health and lives at risk.

And despite the claims of its sponsors, H.R. 7 does not codify current law, and it is not about the regulation of Federal funds. There is no Federal funding of abortion due to the Hyde amendment, and the Affordable Care Act maintains that policy and law.

For more than 30 years, Congress has prohibited Federal funding of abortion except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother, through provisions like the Hyde amendment in annual appropriations bills. Nothing in the Affordable Care Act changes this.

Finally, H.R. 7 also eradicates the authority of the District of Columbia to make decisions about how appropriated funds are used for the health care of the District's citizens.

So what is H.R. 7 really about? Plain and simple, it is an assault on women's health and freedom. It permanently blocks abortion coverage for low-income women, civil servants, D.C. residents, and the military. No committee has considered this legislation. Text was not even available until last night, when the Rules Committee met in a so-called emergency meeting. But the only emergency was the majority didn't have the votes to pass another mean-spirited, anti-choice bill so they are rushing to the floor with this bill in time for the anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Isn't it time to stop playing politics with women's lives and start governing? Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I believe all human

life is worth protecting. Each one is worth saving and deserves respect and protection.

For years now, pro-life Americans have been forced to watch as their tax dollars subsidize abortion procedures that they are morally opposed to. The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion legislation prohibits taxpayer funding of elective abortions no matter where in the Federal system these may occur. This principle is supported by a majority of Americans. In fact, 56 percent of Americans are opposed to taxpayer funding of abortions.

Later today, I will join half a million people who believe that life is a gift at the annual March for Life rally, the largest ongoing march in American history. We have a responsibility, as the elected body representing our constituents, to protect the most vulnerable among us and ensure that women facing unwanted pregnancies do not face judgment or condemnation but have positive support structures and access to health care to help them through their pregnancies. This bill is an important step in the right direction to protecting life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I would just ask my colleagues on the other side to please give me an example where Federal taxpayer dollars have been used to pay for an abortion, except with the Hyde amendment exceptions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking Democrat on the Constitution Subcommittee.

□ 1130

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I, too, am against this bill for I am for a woman's right to choice. This bill is the second bill that has been brought in the last few days to show the Republican side's intent to repeal Roe v. Wade. That is what they would like to do: repeal Roe v. Wade.

What is most important is to understand the theater that this bill has shown that the majority party has made this historic hallowed hall of Congress today.

Today is the March for Life, lots of pro-lifers here. They wanted to give them something, so they scheduled a bill—we could be legislating on jobs, on minimum wage, on infrastructure. They wanted to give them something, so they came with a bill called “fetal pain” to get around the viability requirements of the Supreme Court.

Their caucus found that bill too extreme to get the votes—even their caucus. Now, the leadership wouldn't listen to the Democrats of the Rules Committee, and it wouldn't listen to the Democrats on the floor, and they didn't have the good sense to realize it would make them look as they are: antiwoman and out-of-step with reality.

It took some women and maybe a few men—but mostly women—in their caucus to finally go “no,” so they brought up a retread of a bill. That was a retread too, but they brought up another one, a substitute bill, because they had to have something to give as a gift for the March for Life pro-life caucus.

This is theater. This is drama. That is what this has become. A woman's right should not be theater; it shouldn't be drama. A woman's right should be preserved. If any case, if there is any question about them, it should go through regular process, go through committees.

Let the Members know about the bill with notice, not have, within 72 hours, a bill brought to this floor. Regular order has been destroyed because of theater and messaging, and that is what you are going to see for the next 2 years.

The American people will be very disappointed in this Congress because it has become the theater of the absurd.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, however stark Americans' difference of opinion can be on the matter of abortion generally, there has been long, bipartisan agreement that Federal taxpayer funds should not be used to destroy innocent life.

The Hyde amendment, named for its chief sponsor, former House Judiciary Committee chairman Henry Hyde, has prohibited the Federal funding of abortions since 1976 when it passed a House and Senate that were composed overwhelmingly of Democrat Members.

It has been renewed each appropriations cycle with few changes for over 37 years, supported by Congresses, supported by both parties and Presidents from both parties. It is probably the most bipartisan pro-life proposal sustained over a longer period of time than any other. It is time the Hyde amendment was codified in the United States Code.

H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, sponsored by Representative CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, would do just that. It would codify the two core principles of the Hyde amendment throughout the operations of the Federal Government: namely, a ban on Federal funding for abortions and a ban on the use of Federal funds for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

As hundreds of thousands of people from across the country come to Washington to express their love of unborn children at the annual March for Life, it is a marvelous time to reflect on what could be accomplished if the bill we consider today were enacted into law.

During the time the Hyde amendment has been in place, probably millions and millions of innocent children

and their mothers have been spared the horrors of abortion. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Hyde amendment has led to as many as 675,000 fewer abortions each year. Let that sink in for a few precious moments.

The policy we will be discussing today has likely given America the gift of millions more children and, consequently, millions more mothers, millions more fathers, millions more lifetimes, and trillions more loving gestures and other human gifts in all their diverse forms—what a stunningly wondrous legacy and the bill before us today would continue that legacy permanently.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this vitally important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, today is a sad day for this institution. Late last night, when Republicans failed to garner the votes for one extreme antiwomen bill, they flipped a switch and turned to another antiwomen bill.

This attempt to restrict women's access to abortion care is an unprecedented, radical assault on women's health care. Tens of thousands of women and their families will be harmed by this policy.

The bill's sponsors claim that this bill simply codifies the Hyde amendment, and that is inaccurate. This bill takes unprecedented steps far beyond the Hyde amendment.

This bill places restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health insurance, but the bill doesn't stop there. It also prohibits Washington, D.C., from using its own Medicaid funds to make health care coverage decisions.

The goal behind this bill is to effectively get rid of all comprehensive health care coverage in this country. Anti-choice Republicans want to turn back the clock on women's rights.

It is critical that we protect the right of every woman to make her own personal and private health care decisions. Women, in consultation with their doctors, should remain in control of these choices and not Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 7.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the pro-life leader in the House of Representatives for many years.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PITTS so very much.

Madam Speaker, on September 9, 2009, President Obama stood 6 feet from where I stand now, right at that po-

dium, and told lawmakers and the American public in a specially called joint session of Congress on health care reform that "under our plan, no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortion."

In an eleventh hour ploy to garner a remnant of pro-life congressional Democrats—and they were convinced, and they were deceived—needed for passage of ObamaCare legislation, the President issued an executive order on March 24, 2010, and it said, in pertinent part: "The act maintains current Hyde amendment restrictions governing abortion policy and extends those restrictions to newly-created health insurance exchanges." That is absolutely, I say to my friends, untrue.

Despite an appalling degree of non-transparency, we finally asked the Government Accountability Office to look into it. Last September, they came back and said 1,036 ObamaCare exchange plans covered abortion on demand. GAO also found that a separate billing of the abortion surcharge required by the act is not being enforced by the administration, and the abortion funding premium, again, in 2015 is being illegally rolled into the total plan costs.

Health care consumers are, therefore, unaware when they buy their health insurance whether or not they are paying for abortion on demand. If the Hyde amendment had been applied to ObamaCare, the number of ObamaCare plans covering abortion on demand would be zero.

At its core—I believe my colleagues should know this by now, some don't on this side of the aisle and some on that do—the Hyde amendment has two indisputable parts. It prohibits direct funding for abortion and funding for any insurance plan that includes abortion, except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

ObamaCare violates the Hyde amendment by funding insurance plans that pay for abortion on demand. H.R. 7 seeks to accomplish three goals: make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions current—and that includes the D.C. rider permanent; ensure that the Affordable Care Act faithfully conforms with the Hyde amendment, as promised by the President of the United States; and provide full disclosure, transparency, and prominent display of the extent to which any health insurance plan funds abortion on the exchanges.

Last January, the House passed H.R. 7 by a vote of 227–188. It languished in the Senate for a year—never took it up. This is the same bill. It has been through regular order. Hearings have been held, as well as markup.

The American people, Madam Speaker, strongly oppose taxpayer funding for abortion. The Marist poll that was just released yesterday found that 68 percent of all respondents oppose using

taxpayer funding for abortion, and a whopping 69 percent of women are against taxpayer funding for abortion, and 71 percent of the millennials are against taxpayer funding for abortion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend.

We live in an age of ultrasound imaging, the ultimate window to the womb and the child, that precious child, who resides there. We are in the midst of a fetal health care revolution, an explosion of benign interventions designed to diagnose, treat, and cure the precious lives of these children.

Abortion is antithetical to that. It dismembers, chemically poisons, shots to the heart, to stop the heart from beating. As you know—and I know my friend from New York is next to speak—at testimony before your committee, Dr. Levantino said—and he is an abortionist—he said the baby can be in any position in the uterus.

You just reach in with a Sopher clamp and grasp whatever you can. You pull out an arm, he went on to say. You pull out and reach in again and again, and you tear out the spine, intestine, heart, and lungs.

These are gruesome procedures. That is what abortion is all about: the dismemberment and chemical poisoning of children.

H.R. 7 will save lives. There is no doubt about that. The Hyde amendment—I remember when Henry Hyde was told that 1 million, maybe even more than 1 million children have survived because of the Hyde amendment.

Tears came down his face, knowing that those kids are now in the world, going to school, having their own families, playing soccer, and doing other great things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they should direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

The name of the bill is a lie. There is now no taxpayer funding for abortions. I wish there were. The right of a woman to decide whether to become pregnant, to decide to continue her pregnancy, or even to make the difficult decision to terminate her pregnancy is protected by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has determined that neither Congress nor a State may place an undue burden on that right. Denial of Medicaid or other government funding that would be available

for other medical procedures should be considered an undue burden, but that is not the law, unfortunately. Taxpayer funding of abortion is prohibited by the Hyde amendment.

This bill goes far beyond that. This bill for the first time ever denies tax deductions and credits for women who use their own money to pay for abortions or to purchase insurance that covers abortions. In so doing, the Republican majority increases taxes for women and families.

This bill for the first time denies the itemized medical tax deduction that is otherwise available for medical expenses if the medical expense is for an abortion.

This bill for the first time treats as taxable income any distribution from a flexible spending account or health savings account that is used to pay for abortion expenses.

This bill for the first time denies small employers the ability to use tax credits to help them to provide health coverage for their employees if that coverage includes abortion.

This bill also denies income-eligible women the use of premium tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act if the insurance coverage they select includes abortion coverage.

In first opposing and then voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act 50 times, my Republican colleagues have complained that government should not meddle in the private insurance market or in private health care choices, but this legislation obviously is designed to do just that.

It seems that many Republicans believe in freedom, provided no one uses that freedom in the way they do not approve. That is a strange understanding of freedom.

Even more stunning, this bill increases taxes on families, businesses, and the self-employed if they spend their own money—let me repeat that—their own money on abortion coverage or services, and this tax increase is being championed by Republicans, all of whom have taken a pledge not to raise taxes on individuals or businesses.

The intent of the bill is clear. It is to end insurance coverage for abortions for all women, whether or not they obtain their insurance on an exchange, and even if they use their own money to purchase the insurance.

□ 1145

My colleagues in the majority believe that, if you like your insurance coverage, you should get to keep it unless it is for choices that they don't like. Then they have no qualms about taking your insurance coverage away. That is the intended and likely result of this bill.

Currently, the vast majority of insurance policies cover abortion services, but insurance companies will likely re-

spond to the tax penalties this bill imposes by dropping the coverage of abortions from all of their plans. This will have a significant effect on all women, not just on lower income women, who have long felt the brunt of Federal restrictions on their health care choices.

H.R. 7 is a radical departure from the current tax treatment of medical expenses and insurance coverage, and it is neither justifiable nor necessary to prevent the Federal funding of abortion. It is a frontal assault on the liberty and dignity of all American women. It should be roundly rejected.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the Hyde language does not apply to ObamaCare. There is not one sentence in this 2,700-page bill. Read the bill. It applies to Medicaid and to annually appropriated programs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTS. I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, one of the things that people seem to forget here is that ObamaCare both authorizes and appropriates the money so that it is outside the purview of the HHS appropriations bill. That is why this legislation is needed. The President promised he would apply the Hyde amendment, but he has not.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), another champion of life.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I rise in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Madam Speaker, we know from science that everyone's life begins at conception. The right to life is God-given and is described in our Declaration of Independence as "unalienable," which means something that cannot be taken away. I defend, Madam Speaker, the right to life of everyone in this country and of everyone in this Chamber, even of those opposed to this legislation.

This bill helps promote a culture of life. It reflects the overwhelming opinion held by Americans that taxpayer dollars should not be used to pay for abortion. It also holds President Obama accountable for another one of his broken promises, when he assured us that his health care law would not allow taxpayer funds to be used for abortion.

We know, Madam Speaker, from a September 15, 2014, GAO report on health insurance exchanges that tax dollars are paying for more than 1,000 ObamaCare plans that cover elective abortions. This bill stops that. I insert the GAO report into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the U.S. Government Accountability Office, Sept. 15, 2014]

CONGRESSIONAL REQUESTERS—HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGES: COVERAGE OF NON-EXCEPTED ABORTION SERVICES BY QUALIFIED HEALTH PLANS

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) requires the establishment in all states of health insurance exchanges—marketplaces where eligible individuals may compare and select among insurance plans offered by participating private issuers of health coverage. PPACA requires the insurance plans offered under an exchange, known as qualified health plans (QHP), to provide a package of essential health benefits—including coverage for specific service categories, such as ambulatory care, prescription drugs, and hospitalization. In addition to these categories states may require or restrict coverage of other benefits by QHPs. Consistent with federal and state law, QHPs may cover other benefits, such as abortion services.

PPACA prohibits the use of federal funds made available to offset the cost of QHP coverage—that is, income-based tax credits and subsidies—to pay for "non-excepted abortion services," which, based on the law applicable to the 2014 benefit year, are abortion services performed except where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest, or the life of the pregnant woman would be endangered unless an abortion is performed. While QHPs may cover non-excepted abortion services, PPACA places requirements on the provision of such coverage. These include the requirement to estimate the cost of coverage of such services, at an amount of no less than \$1 per enrollee, per month, and to collect from each enrollee an amount equal to the actuarial value of the coverage—segregated from any other premium amounts collected by the QHP—to be used to pay for the costs associated with providing non-excepted abortion services. In addition, PPACA directed the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to contract with issuers to offer at least two multi-state QHPs in each state, at least one of which does not cover non-excepted abortion services.

There are 23 states with laws restricting the circumstances under which QHPs may provide non-excepted abortion services as a covered benefit in 2014, and 28 states with no such laws. Among the 23 states with restrictions, 17 have laws that do not permit the coverage of non-excepted abortion services by QHPs, and 6 states permit the coverage of non-excepted abortion services only in limited circumstances, such as to prevent substantial and irreversible impairment of a pregnant woman's major bodily function.

You asked that we provide a list of QHPs that do and that do not cover abortion services and for additional information on issues related to that coverage. This report describes whether non-excepted abortion services are covered by QHPs within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage for the 2014 benefit year, and provides additional information—such as the scope and the cost of non-excepted abortion services coverage—for selected QHPs that cover such services.

To obtain the information we present here, we contacted every state to determine whether states had laws restricting the circumstances under which abortion services may be provided as a covered benefit by QHPs in 2014. Based on our review of those laws and relevant federal laws and regulations, we determined that 23 states have laws restricting the circumstances under which non-excepted abortion services may be provided as a covered benefit by QHPs for the

2014 benefit year. In order to report on whether non-excepted abortion services are covered by QHPs within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage in 2014, we obtained data on QHPs' coverage of non-excepted abortion services from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the agency responsible for overseeing the establishment of health insurance exchanges; private issuers of QHPs; state departments of insurance and state exchange organizations; and from officials at OPM. While these data sources have different characteristics and limitations, we have determined that, when taken together, they are reliable for the purpose of identifying which QHPs do and which do not provide non-excepted abortion services coverage in 2014 within the 28 states with no laws restricting such coverage. To provide additional information regarding non-excepted abortion services for selected QHPs that cover such services, we interviewed and collected documentation from a non-probability sample of 18 issuers about the QHPs they offer in 10 states. Our criteria for selecting these issuers included states with no laws restricting non-excepted abortion services coverage organized by CMS region, state uninsured population, and number of issuers covering non-excepted abortion services. These 18 issuers accounted for nearly one-quarter of QHPs that covered non-excepted abortion services and were offered within the 28 states.

We conducted our work from February 2014 to September 2014 in accordance with all sections of GAO's Quality Assurance Framework that are relevant to our objectives. The framework requires that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence to meet our stated objectives and to discuss any limitations in our work. We believe that the information and data obtained, and the analysis conducted, provide a reasonable basis for any findings and conclusions in this product.

RESULTS

1. Which QHPs participating in health insurance exchanges provide non-excepted abortion services as a covered benefit, and which do not?

Within the 28 states with no laws restricting the circumstances under which QHPs may provide non-excepted abortion services as a covered benefit in 2014:

—in 5 states (Connecticut, Hawaii, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont), all QHPs cover non-excepted abortion services;

—in 15 states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, and Washington), some QHPs cover non-excepted abortion services; and

—in 8 states (Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, West Virginia, and Wyoming), no QHPs cover non-excepted abortion services.

Nationally, 1,036 QHPs in these 28 states cover non-excepted abortion services and 1,062 QHPs do not.

2. For selected QHPs, what is the scope of the non-excepted abortion services benefits that are provided?

Of the 18 issuers offering QHPs that cover non-excepted abortion services from which we obtained information, all but three issuers indicated that the benefit is not subject to any restrictions, limitations, or exclusions. One issuer told us that it only covers services for a "therapeutic abortion," which a health care provider determines to

be medically necessary. Two issuers that offered QHPs in New York indicated that, consistent with requirements set by the state-based exchange, they impose a limit of one non-excepted abortion treatment per year. However, one of these two issuers indicated they also offer QHPs that were not subject to this restriction. All 18 issuers also indicated that their abortion services benefit is subject to the same requirements as other benefits, such as enrollee out-of-pocket costs—including deductibles, copayments, and coinsurance—and prior authorization, all of which can vary depending on the location where the service is provided. For example, issuers indicated that if this service is provided in an outpatient setting—which one issuer noted is the typical location—enrollees are not required to request prior authorization, similar to any other service performed in an outpatient setting. Additionally, if performed in an inpatient setting, the service would require prior authorization, similar to any other service performed in such a setting. Issuers indicated that this benefit is described in member materials where other covered benefits are listed.

3. For selected QHPs, how do issuers estimate the cost of non-excepted abortion services coverage, what is this cost, and how are enrollees billed for this coverage?

To estimate the cost of covering non-excepted abortion services, issuers we contacted indicated that they generally reviewed historical costs for these procedures, similar to the approach used to estimate the actuarial value of the premium attributable to the cost of other covered benefits. All but one of the issuers from which we obtained information estimated the cost of the coverage of non-excepted abortion services to be less than \$1 per enrollee, per month. For example, officials from one issuer told us that their actuaries estimated that the cost for non-excepted abortion services ranged between 10 cents and 20 cents per enrollee, per month, calculated across multiple states, while officials with another issuer said that the cost for these services ranged from 10 cents to 70 cents per enrollee, per month. All but two of the issuers that estimated the cost to be less than \$1 indicated they rounded the amount up to comply with PPACA's requirement that the cost of such coverage be estimated at no less than \$1 per enrollee, per month. The other two issuers noted that they did not round up the amount to the statutory minimum of \$1 and, therefore, were not using this statutory minimum as a basis for determining premium amounts to collect from enrollees for non-excepted abortion services. The highest cost estimated by the issuers we interviewed was \$1.10 per enrollee, per month. For several of the issuers we contacted, the premium amount associated with non-excepted abortion services coverage was reported to also be \$1; however, for other issuers the premium amount varied from the cost issuers estimated for this coverage. For example, the issuer that estimated the cost of coverage of non-excepted abortion services at \$1.10 per enrollee, per month, indicated that when adjusted to a paid cost based upon plan design and administrative expenses, the premium amount collected from enrollees ranged from 51 cents to \$1.46, depending on the specific QHP.

Fifteen issuers and the Washington Health Benefit Exchange—which bills enrollees on behalf of issuers offering QHPs in the state-based exchange, including for 2 of the 18 issuers from which we obtained information—did not itemize the premium amount associated with non-excepted abortion serv-

ices coverage on enrollees' bills nor indicate that they send a separate bill for that premium amount. Officials from the remaining issuer from which we obtained information told us that their bills indicate that there is a \$1 charge "for coverage of services for which member subsidies may not be used."

4. For selected QHPs, how are consumers shopping for QHPs able to determine whether non-excepted abortion services are covered?

PPACA does not establish any requirements on whether or how information about non-excepted abortion services should be made available to consumers before they enroll in QHPs, though six of the issuers we contacted indicated that they made available such information about coverage for abortion services—which they stated includes both excepted and non-excepted abortion services—to consumers shopping for QHPs. These issuers indicated that there are various ways consumers may determine if their QHPs provide coverage for abortion services before they enroll. For example, issuers said that QHP materials—such as their summary of benefits and coverage or member policies, such as the Evidence of Coverage document—indicate that abortion services are covered, and these materials are available to consumers shopping for QHPs through the issuer's website or through the exchange's website. Specifically, officials with one issuer informed us that their Evidence of Coverage document, which provides details about the features of their QHPs, was available through the state-based exchange and the benefit—"voluntary termination of pregnancy"—is identified in that document under "Family Planning Services." Eleven issuers indicated that consumers shopping for QHPs do not have access to such information; some of these issuers indicated that consumers would need to call the issuer directly before enrolling to determine whether a QHP provides coverage for abortion services.

PPACA requires that QHP issuers providing non-excepted abortion services coverage notify enrollees at the time of enrollment that those services are covered. While most issuers from which we collected information indicated they were notifying enrollees that abortion services were provided as a covered benefit, four issuers indicated they were not disclosing this information to enrollees. Officials with two of these four issuers told us they had only recently become aware of this requirement, and were in the process of updating their enrollee materials to come into compliance with the notification requirement. Officials with the other two issuers, both of which offered QHPs in the same state, told us that they are not providing enrollees with notification of the coverage of non-excepted abortion services at the time of enrollment. These officials said that they use model plan materials developed by the state that do not specifically indicate that non-excepted abortion services are a covered benefit, and that such information would only be provided upon enrollee request.

Mr. ROTHFUS. As hundreds of thousands march today on the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision, I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to defend the sanctity of life and vote "yes" on this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman for her courage.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, refusing to surrender on behalf of millions of women of all economic backgrounds, races, ethnicities, and religions who rely upon the Supreme Court of the United States, which, under the Ninth Amendment, has indicated that *Roe v. Wade*—the right to choose—is a viable and important law of the land. How can we undermine the Constitution in its premise and its articulation?

Today, very quickly, let me say that I know there are millions who are here to disagree with me. I respect that disagreement, but I am saddened that we would take advantage of this day to misrepresent the law and pass a law that will do damage to millions of Americans.

This is the face of Republican women, who, in essence, decided that H.R. 36 was too extreme. Even Republican men said that they could not vote on a bill that caused or asked women to report a rape before they would be able to benefit from an abortion. How sad, in the trauma of rape, that you must require someone to go to the police department before she could get assistance. That bill was pulled. That extreme bill was pulled.

In order not to leave us without dramatics, we come again to do what is hurting millions of women in Texas—where they cannot even get health services because of the laws passed in Texas, which completely shut down good health care clinics that deal in abortion and other women's services for health care—with this dastardly law about requiring those clinics to be within a certain mileage of hospitals, with their never having any problem before.

Now we come with another masquerade in H.R. 7, which prohibits Federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage which includes the coverage of abortion, making permanent already existing Federal policies, prohibiting the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by Federal or the District of Columbia health care—again, interfering with the women in the District of Columbia—and prohibiting individuals from receiving refundable Federal tax credits—individuals interfering with private health insurance.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad bill, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it. It undermines the Constitution and the Ninth Amendment.

Madam Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 7, the so-called “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act,” and the underlying bill.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, puts the lives of women at risk, interferes with women's constitutionally guaranteed right of privacy, and diverts our attention from the real problems facing the American people.

A more accurate short title for this bill would be the “Violating the Rights of Women Act of 2015”!

Instead of resuming their annual War on Women, our colleagues across the aisle should be working with Democrats to build upon the “Middle-Class Economics” championed by the Obama Administration that have succeeded in ending the economic meltdown it inherited in 2009 and revived the economy to the point where today we have the highest rate of growth and lowest rate of unemployment since the boom years of the Clinton Administration.

We could and should instead be voting to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour so that people who work hard and play by the rules do not have raise their families in poverty.

A far better use of our time would be to provide help to unemployed job-hunters by making access to community college affordable to every person looking to make a new start in life.

Instead of voting to abridge the constitutional rights of women for the umpteenth time, we should bring to the floor for a first vote comprehensive immigration reform legislation or legislations repairing the harm to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

Madam Speaker, the one thing we should not be doing is debating irresponsible “messaging bills” that abridge the rights of women and have absolutely no chance of overriding a presidential veto.

The version of H.R. 7 before us now is as bad today as it was when the House Republican leadership insisted on bringing it to a vote a year ago.

The other draconian provisions of that terrible bill are retained in H.R. 7, which would:

1. Prohibit federal funds from being used for any health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion. (Thus making permanent existing federal policies.)
2. Prohibit the inclusion of abortion in any health care service furnished by a federal or District of Columbia health care facility or by any physician or other individual employed by the federal government or the District.
3. Apply such prohibitions to District of Columbia funds.
4. Prohibit individuals from receiving a refundable federal tax credit, or any cost-sharing reductions, for purchasing a qualified health plan that includes coverage for abortions.
5. Prohibit small employers from receiving the small-employer health insurance credit provided by the health care law if the health plans or benefits that are purchased provide abortion coverage.

If H.R. 7 were enacted, millions of families and small businesses with private health insurance plans that offer abortion coverage would be faced with tax increases, making the cost of health care insurance even more expensive.

Under the Affordable Care Act, insurers are able to offer abortion coverage and receive federal offsets for premiums as long as enrollees pay for the abortion coverage from separate, private funds.

If enacted, H.R. 7 would deny federal subsidies or credits to private health insurance

plans that offer abortion coverage even if that coverage is paid for from private funds.

This would inevitably lead to private health insurance companies dropping abortion coverage leaving millions of women without access to affordable, comprehensive health care.

Currently, 87% of private insurance health care plans offered through employers cover abortion.

If H.R. 7 were to become law, consumer options for private health insurance plans would be unnecessarily restricted and the tax burden on these policy holders would increase significantly.

H.R. 7 would also deny tax credits to small businesses that offer their employees insurance plans that cover abortion, which would have a significant impact on millions of families across the nation who would no longer be able to take advantage of existing tax credits and deductions for the cost of their health care.

For example, small businesses that offer health plans that cover abortions would no longer be eligible for the Small Business Health Tax Credit—potentially worth 35%–50% of the cost of their premiums—threatening 4 million small businesses.

Self-employed Americans who are able to deduct the cost of their comprehensive health insurance from their taxable income will also be denied similar tax credits and face higher taxes.

H.R. 7 would also undermine the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting its use of funds for abortion care to low-income women.

The Hyde Amendment stipulates that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care, and has narrow exceptions for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which put the mother's life in danger.

H.R. 7 would restrict women's access to reproductive health care even further by narrowing the already stringent requirements set forth in the Hyde Amendment.

When the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, the President issued an Executive Order to “ensure that Federal funds are not used for abortion services.”

This version of H.R. 7 goes far beyond the safeguards established under the Affordable Care Act, and sets a dangerous precedent for the future of women's reproductive health in this country because it includes two new provisions that were added at the nth hour but have never received a hearing or a mark-up.

These new provisions would (1) ban abortion coverage in multi-state health plans available under the ACA; and (2) mandate that health plans mislead consumers about abortion coverage by requiring all plans in the health-insurance exchanges that include abortion coverage to display that fact prominently in all advertising, marketing materials, or information from the insurer but interestingly, does not require the same disclosure from plans that do not cover abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 would also force health plans to mislead consumers about the law's treatment of abortion.

As a concession to anti-choice lawmakers, the ACA requires insurance plans participating in the new health system to segregate monies used for abortion services from all other funds.

In order to aid in identifying these funds and simplify the process of segregating general premium dollars from those used to cover abortion services, the ACA requires that health plans estimate the cost of abortion coverage at no less than \$1 per enrollee per month.

H.R. 7 would require plans covering abortion to misrepresent this practice as an "abortion surcharge," which is to be disclosed and identified as a portion of the consumer's premium.

By describing abortion coverage in this way, H.R. 7 makes it look as though it is an added, extra cost, available only at an additional fee, when in fact it is not.

Taken together, the provisions in H.R. 7 have the effect, and possibly the intent, of arbitrarily infringing women's reproductive freedoms and pose a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability.

This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs. In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point.

There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its own.

H.R. 7 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion.

Every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family.

These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

H.R. 7 lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother.

H.R. 7 is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could not prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability.

While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of

gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979).

The constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

The bill before us threatens this hard won right for women and must be defeated.

I urge all members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill. H.R. 7 should be pulled off of this floor!

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 36, the "Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act." In the last Congress, I opposed this irresponsible and reckless legislation.

I opposed the bill, which arbitrarily bans a woman from exercising her constitutionally protected right to choose to terminate a pregnancy after 20 weeks, last year for the same reasons I do now. This purely partisan and divisive legislation:

1. Unduly burdens a woman's right to terminate a pregnancy and thus puts their lives at risk;
2. Does not contain exceptions for the health of the mother;
3. As introduced and considered in the Judiciary Committee, unfairly targeted the District of Columbia; and
4. Infringes upon women's right to privacy, which is guaranteed and protected by the U.S. Constitution.

Madam Speaker, in 2010, Nebraska passed a law banning abortion care after 20 weeks. Since then 10 more red states—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Oklahoma—have enacted similar bans. None of these laws has an adequate health exception. Only one provides an exception for cases of rape or incest.

H.R. 36 seeks to take the misguided and mean-spirited policy of these states and make it the law of the land. In so doing, the bill poses a nationwide threat to the health and wellbeing of American women and a direct challenge to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roe v. Wade*.

Madam Speaker, one of the most detestable aspects of this bill is that it would curb access to care for women in the most desperate of circumstances. It is these women who receive the 1.5 percent of abortions that occur after 20 weeks.

Women like Danielle Deaver, who was 22 weeks pregnant when her water broke. Tests showed that Danielle had suffered anhydramnios, a premature rupture of the membranes before the fetus has achieved viability. This condition meant that the fetus likely would be born with a shortening of muscle tissue that results in the inability to move limbs.

In addition, Danielle's fetus likely would suffer deformities to the face and head, and the lungs were unlikely to develop beyond the 22-week point. There was less than a 10% chance that, if born, Danielle's baby would be able to breathe on its own and only a 2% chance the baby would be able to eat on its

own. Danielle and her husband decided to terminate the pregnancy but could not because of the Nebraska ban. Danielle had no recourse but to endure the pain and suffering that followed. Eight days later, Danielle gave birth to a daughter, Elizabeth, who died 15 minutes later.

H.R. 36 hurts women like Vikki Stella, a diabetic, who discovered months into her pregnancy that the fetus she was carrying suffered from several major anomalies and had no chance of survival. Because of Vikki's diabetes, her doctor determined that induced labor and Caesarian section were both riskier procedures for Vikki than an abortion. Because Vikki was able to terminate the pregnancy, she was protected from the immediate and serious medical risks to her health and her ability to have children in the future was preserved.

Madam Speaker, every pregnancy is different. No politician knows, or has the right to assume he knows, what is best for a woman and her family. These are decisions that properly must be left to women to make, in consultation with their partners, doctors, and their God.

That is why the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the nation's leading medical experts on women's health, strongly opposes 20-week bans, citing the threat these laws pose to women's health.

Madam Speaker, I also strongly oppose H.R. 36 because it lacks the necessary exceptions to protect the health and life of the mother. In fact, the majority Republicans rejected an amendment offered by our colleague, Congressman NADLER, which would have added a "health of the mother" exception to the bill.

Madam Speaker, this may come as news to some in this body, but each year approximately 25,000 women in the United States become pregnant as a result of rape. And about a third (30%) of these rapes involved women under age 18!

Madam Speaker, last and most important, I oppose H.R. 36 because it is an unconstitutional infringement on the right to privacy, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in a long line of cases going back to *Griswold v. Connecticut* in 1965 and *Roe v. Wade* decided in 1973. In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court held that a state could prohibit a woman from exercising her right to terminate a pregnancy in order to protect her health prior to viability. While many factors go into determining fetal viability, the consensus of the medical community is that viability is acknowledged as not occurring prior to 24 weeks gestation.

Late Wednesday night because of how absurd H.R. 36 was—it was pulled from the floor.

By prohibiting nearly all abortions beginning at "the probable post-fertilization age" of 20 weeks, H.R. 36 violates this clear and long standing constitutional rule.

In striking down Texas's pre-viability abortion prohibitions, the Supreme Court stated in *Roe v. Wade*:

With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the 'compelling' point is at viability. This is so because the fetus then presumably has the capability of meaningful life outside the mother's womb. State regulation protective of fetal life after viability thus has both logical and biological justification. If the State

is interested in protecting fetal life after viability, it may go as far as to proscribe abortion during that period, except when it is necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother.

Supreme Court precedents make it clear that neither Congress nor a state legislature can declare any one element—"be it weeks of gestation or fetal weight or any other single factor—as the determinant" of viability. *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. 379, 388–89 (1979). NOT can the government restrict a woman's autonomy by arbitrarily setting the number of weeks gestation so low as to effectively prohibit access to abortion services as is the case with the bill before us.

If this bill ever were to become law, it would not survive a constitutional challenge even to its facial validity. A similar 20-week provision enacted by the Utah legislature was struck down years ago as unconstitutional by the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit because it "unduly burden[ed] a woman's right to choose to abort a nonviable fetus." *Jane L. v. Bangerter*, 102 F.3d 1112, 1118 (10th Cir. 1996). And just last month, the Ninth Circuit struck down a 20 week ban on the ground that the U.S. Supreme Court has been "unalterably clear" that "a woman has a constitutional right to choose to terminate her pregnancy before the fetus is viable." *Isaacson v. Horne*, F.3d, No. 12–16670, 2013 WL 2160171, at *1 (9th Cir. May 21, 2013).

Madam Speaker, the constitutionally protected right to privacy encompasses the right of women to choose to terminate a pregnancy before viability, and even later where continuing to term poses a threat to her health and safety.

This right of privacy was hard won and must be preserved inviolate.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, STEVE CHABOT, another pro-life champion and the principal sponsor of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, a little while ago, a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle came down and made, I believe, the ludicrous allegation that this bill is somehow an attack on women's health care, and, therefore, we ought to be spending time on the infrastructure and on a whole range of issues.

If you want to talk about an attack on women's health care, it is called "ObamaCare." It is an attack on the health care of women and men and children in this country—deductibles up, premiums up, the quality of health care down. Most of the folks who came down to the mike—I can't say all of them. I think probably all of them if they were here—voted for ObamaCare, and the American people are having to live with the results of that. Now, that is an attack on the health care of American women.

This legislation simply says that there ought not to be taxpayer dollars going to pay for abortions in this coun-

try, that one person shouldn't have to pay for the abortion of another person whether it is on moral grounds, conscience, or one's religion. You shouldn't make one person pay for another person's abortion. It is pretty simple, and the American people overwhelmingly agree with that point of view. That is what this legislation is about. It is in ObamaCare as well. It is the same thing. Through insurance or otherwise, you shouldn't force one person to pay for another person's abortion because one is opposed to it.

Today happens to be a day that is important to me. It is the day I was born. It is my birthday. It also happens to be the date that, I would say, the infamous decision of *Roe v. Wade* came down. My birthday was in 1953, and this was in 1973 that *Roe* came down. On this day, I can't help but think of those millions and millions and millions of Americans who do not exist today because of that decision.

This, obviously, is related to that, but it is mostly about the choice that a person has to make; and if she makes that choice, should somebody else have to pay for it? The law says "no." I agree with the law. Support this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, once again, women's rights are being attacked on the floor of the House. A decision about health that should be made by a woman and her doctor is, instead, being made by politicians with an agenda. Despite their claims of acting for the sake of women's health, this draconian bill would deny women access to medical care and drive out abortion coverage from private health plans once and for all.

What would be the effect?

Women would be denied access to abortion, especially low-income and minority women who are buying health insurance through the marketplace. For some, they will be sent back to the days before *Roe v. Wade*, when women who were desperate for help were driven to unlicensed doctors and unsanitary conditions, often suffering infections, hemorrhages, and, at times, death.

We should not be in the business of endangering women's health and safety. This is why, yesterday, I introduced the Women's Health Protection Act. It would prevent States from restricting access to abortion if they cannot demonstrate an actual benefit to women's health. Personal medical decisions belong solely to the people they impact and to the medical professionals they trust. We must oppose this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK, another pro-life spokesperson.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, today is a somber occasion. On this 42nd an-

niversary of the Supreme Court's tragic decision in *Roe v. Wade*, our hearts ache for the 56 million unborn lives that have been lost due to this shameful practice of abortion.

But, today, there is hope because we have an opportunity to make a difference by passing the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This commonsense, compassionate legislation will protect Americans' conscience rights by ensuring that their hard-earned tax dollars are not used to fund the destruction of a human life.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a nurse for over 40 years, this measure is especially meaningful to me. During my years in the health care industry, I saw the joy in young parents' eyes when they met their newborn children for the very first time; I held the hands of grieving spouses and children as they said their final good-byes to loved ones; and, sadly, I witnessed a young woman lose her life due to the effects of a botched abortion.

These experiences informed my view that all life is a precious gift from God, and I pray that, in time, this truth will be reflected in our Nation's laws; but, until then, can't we at least do this much?

I urge a "yes" vote on the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion, and I thank the sponsor for his work on this deeply important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, a bill falsely advertised as pro-family and supporting American values.

If they actually care about defending the values of our Nation and of the well-being of American families, I ask my colleagues across the aisle to offer legislation that reflects the priorities of American families instead of debating a bill that the Republican leadership just threw on the calendar at the last minute because their original abortion bill was too extreme, even for them.

Today, we should be discussing ways to ensure every woman can put food on the table by raising the minimum wage, like 29 States have done, and by passing equal pay for women. We should be discussing how to ensure that every person who dreams of a higher education has access to it by working with President Obama on his community college proposal. We should be discussing legislation to allow 43 million workers to take time off when they are sick and to make sure parents can take time off with their new babies.

These are the family-centered priorities that reflect our values as a nation, and these are, certainly, the challenges that my constituents in south

Florida sent me here to tackle. Instead, we are debating a bill with an underlying principle that has already been codified.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that a regressive policy of banning taxpayer funding for abortion, which only serves to punish our Nation's poor and most vulnerable women, already exists. As the President said Tuesday night, while we may not agree on choice, we can at least agree that the best people to make these decisions for women are not politicians. Building on the zeal to interfere in the health decisions of women, this bill goes even further by tying a woman's health options to her income.

A strong majority of Americans agree, including 62 percent who identify as Republicans, that abortion is the wrong issue for Congress to be spending its time on. I agree with them. When my colleagues are prepared to work on legislation that truly addresses the concerns of the American people, we stand ready to work with them.

Listen to your Members who sounded the alarm bell on the original bill that was pulled off this floor, and get your priorities straight.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Mr. KEVIN MCCARTHY, our distinguished majority leader in this Congress.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we are here today, taking a step forward towards a simple goal—to save innocent lives from abortion and to make sure no woman ever has to make that decision to end the life of her child. We all know that this is more than just some debate or social disagreement. These are human beings we are talking about.

□ 1200

This is about pregnant mothers facing hardship and tough choices. It is about a culture of telling people that human life is expendable. But most importantly, this is about human beings—more than 56 million children since *Roe v. Wade*—who have been denied a chance to live. We are here today for them, to make sure every person has the most fundamental right of all: the right to life.

Today, on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* and during the March for Life, the House will vote on a bill to stop all Federal funding from being used to pay for abortion. At the very least, the American people should never be forced to pay for abortions or abortion coverage with their tax dollars.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the hundreds of thousands of people out on The Mall right now by voting for this bill. Stand up and commit to creating an America that values every life, especially the lives of innocents who cannot stand up for themselves.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for yielding and for her advocacy and work on this issue.

Today, on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, which changed history for women in America by allowing them to control their own bodies, I rise against the effort to roll back these rights.

Though we have come a long way in the last 42 years, some politicians want to undo this progress and restrict access to critical medical procedures women may need. Why have we been debating whether the government should seize control over women's health decisions when the American people want us to work together to create good-paying jobs, balance the budget, and raise the minimum wage? Instead, this Chamber is wasting time with a divisive argument about whether the government should jeopardize a woman's access to medically necessary procedures.

Politicians are not medical experts, and we should not deny a woman the ability to make her own decisions with those she trusts the most. I ask my colleagues to focus on the economy instead of spending time on bills that divide this House and this country.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of life. Today is a very joyous and hopeful day on what is a very sad anniversary. Today is the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*. Hundreds of thousands of pro-life advocates from across the country, and many from my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, will be on The Mall as we march in honor of the over 56 million precious angels we have lost over the last 42 years.

Madam Speaker, I believe in the sanctity of life, I believe that life begins at conception, and that every life is a gift.

There is an area where most Americans agree and where elected officials should all come together, and that is on the Federal funding of abortion. The majority of Americans do not want their hard-earned tax dollars going to pay for abortions, and Congress has consistently worked together over the years by attaching the Hyde amendment to appropriations bills to prevent taxpayer funds from going towards abortions.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor and support H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act. There is

no more appropriate day than today to consider such important legislation.

This bill does exactly what the name implies. It permanently ensures that no taxpayer dollars go to pay for abortion or abortion coverage. This bill codifies the Hyde amendment and also addresses taxpayer funding for abortion that, unfortunately, the Hyde amendment does not cover.

For example, ObamaCare expressly allows funding for plans that include abortion through taxpayer subsidies. During the health care debate, the President assured the American people that no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions under ObamaCare. It was yet again another broken promise.

However, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act not only prevents taxpayer funding for abortion under ObamaCare, it also requires transparency to ensure the consumers are fully informed about which plans on the exchanges contain abortion coverage and surcharges.

Madam Speaker, throughout my life I have worked to draw attention to the pro-life movement—to change hearts and minds and to approach this issue with love and compassion. I will continue to work throughout my time in Congress towards the day when abortion is not only illegal but abortion is unthinkable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, I want to first say to the other side of the aisle that I am grateful that some members of your caucus recognized that indeed extremism on this issue has got to come to an end and that you took steps to roll back the ridiculous bill that you had intended to bring up today but didn't have the votes for because they spoke up. And I am grateful to them.

In some respects, you look around this room and you think, Is this a Chamber of Congress or is this a doctor's office? We might as well have stethoscopes, stirrups, and speculums here because that is what you are doing. You are trying to come between a woman and her physician.

There is a lot of hoopla today because this is the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, and this is a messaging bill, so we are here messaging. *Roe v. Wade* was a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and when each of us became Members of this body this month, we swore that we would uphold the Constitution of the United States. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle spend hours and hours wringing hands, trying to somehow find ways to undo constitutional decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court.

So we are here having yet another debate when American women in this country are far more interested in equal pay for equal work, paid sick leave, a child care tax credit that has some resemblance to what reality is in this country. But rather, we will continue to act like doctors here.

And I might add there are even some hypocrites on the other side of the aisle who have counseled their own girlfriends to have abortions. It is legal, Members. We have a right to maintain this legality.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), another eloquent pro-life force.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, I am glad to be a Californian who is in favor of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Indeed, we have heard some interesting debate on this today, deflecting issues like higher pay or building more infrastructure, which we desperately need in California, as well as the water supply, and even entering the word “child care” in when we are talking about paying for abortions. Interesting. Even words like “access.” Well, abortion has been certainly accessible for 42 years, millions of times.

The central point is, Are the taxpayers going to be compelled to pay for it? Are the American people out there—those 68 percent, in the latest poll—going to be compelled to pay for something?

Jefferson said:

To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

People who are pro-life, as well as many that are pro-choice, might agree with the idea that abortion should be available—on the pro-choice side. But many, many disagree, a supermajority. The number of people who disagree with this would override a veto in these two Houses in the Capitol.

Yet what we are finding in my own State of California is an interpretation of ObamaCare—which is one of those job-killing, non-infrastructure building items that is hurting our economy in California and in this country—where we are being compelled, whether you are a church or religious charity, employer or individual, to have included in your insurance plans these provisions paying for abortions.

Where is the freedom in that? Where is the conscientious objection to that? Where is the freedom of expression that I hear a lot from the other side of the aisle—until recent years? Our First Amendment?

This bureaucratic mandate, which includes their opinion on what it would be under ObamaCare, largely done quietly, in the middle of the night, out

of the public eye, is now being put on Californians. We need to send the message back that Californians should not be compelled to have to provide this in their coverage.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I feel compelled to point out, after listening to the debate and the hyperbole, the passionate thoughts of what a high priority this is for the Republican leadership to bring this bill to the floor—such a high priority that they didn't think about it until late last night. They didn't bring it to committee. They rushed it to the floor without having even thought of this legislation until late last night. Such a high priority. We know, the American people know, this is political theater.

In listening to the debate, it is also quite revealing in listening to some of the comments made that this is not about taxpayer funding for the health care choices that American women legally have and the Constitution supports and that the Supreme Court clarified 42 years ago, but it is about preventing women from making that choice in the first place. That is a choice that ought to be made by women, by themselves, in consultation with their health care provider, and not by Members of Congress.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, might I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELLEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Is there any way to make an anti-women, anti-health, anti-choice bill worse? Sure there is. Add a provision that keeps a local jurisdiction—the District of Columbia—from spending its own local funds on abortion services for poor women, exactly as 17 States of the Union do. Americans will ask: How on Earth can you do that in this country? Laughably—by declaring the District of Columbia government to be a virtual Federal agency.

This bill hurts millions of women across the country who have a constitutional right to make choices about their own health. It compounds that discrimination by violating the oldest American principle—local control of local funds.

The Senate has repeatedly rejected this bill, and I expect them to have the good sense to repeat that rejection.

□ 1215

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the 42nd anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* in support of H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This vital bill establishes that no taxpayer funds be used for abortion, including plans that cover abortion under the President's health care law.

These restrictions will save lives. According to the research by the Guttmacher Institute, policies that cut taxpayer funds towards abortion will actually prevent 25 percent or more of the abortions that would otherwise take place.

Furthermore, recent polling has demonstrated that the American public is widely opposed to taxpayer funds for abortion. According to a Marist poll released in January of this year, 68 percent of the respondents opposed taxpayer funds for abortion. A CNN poll from last year shows that 56 percent of respondents oppose public funding for abortion.

As a mother of four, I know personally how precious the gift of human life is and how important it is to honor that gift. As legislators, it is both our job and responsibility to protect the innocent lives of the unborn and to serve as a voice for those who do not yet have one.

Today, the U.S. House has a historic opportunity to put an end to the use of taxpayer funding for abortion. In drafting the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, Thomas Jefferson so wisely penned: “To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions in which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical.”

Madam Speaker, I emphatically agree.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), one of our distinguished new Members.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, absolutely outrageous, that is what Republicans' attempt to repeal *Roe v. Wade* on its 42nd anniversary is, absolutely outrageous.

A blatant attack on women and their families, their first attempt, H.R. 36, failed because women of both parties spoke out to let our male Republican colleagues know they have gone too far.

The women of this House know that a woman cannot call herself free who does not own or control her own body. We are free, Madam Speaker.

Here we go again, H.R. 7, another attempt to attack women's rights. It especially impacts women of color—not on my watch.

Women of the House, let's do it again. Let's prevent this legislation from moving forward, and let's vote "no."

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, abortion is not health care. It is a brutal procedure that ends the lives of unborn children through suction, dismemberment, decapitation, or chemical poison. It is the most violent form of death known to mankind.

As Frederica Mathewes-Green, former chair of the Feminists for Life, said:

Abortion breaks a mother's heart.

She said:

There are always two victims in an abortion. One is the baby, and one is the mother; one is dead, one is wounded.

Madam Speaker, this human rights abuse should not be paid for or encouraged by government taxpayer money. The women in the Silent No More Awareness Campaign and the women in Operation Outcry point out that abortion not only takes the lives of the unborn child, it wounds all the mothers. We should keep this in mind.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank my good friend, DIANA, for her leadership on this issue and for so many other important issues and for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, despite the rhetoric we have heard from our Republican colleagues about their commitment to focusing, laserlike, on what the American people care about most—creating jobs and accelerating economic growth—the only thing that they have accelerated in this new Congress is their attacks on a woman's constitutional rights.

In just their first 7 days in office, our Republican colleagues have introduced six anti-choice bills and brought two of them to the floor for debate; so rather than focus on jobs, we have a bill that is not only an assault on women, it is pure political posturing that is guaranteed to be vetoed, even if it makes it through the Senate. The President has made that clear.

We need to focus on what the vast majority of the American people have asked us to do: create greater economic opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlelady said what the American people care about. Well, a Marist poll released this month found that 68 percent of the respondents oppose taxpayer funding for abortion. A February 2014 CNN poll showed that 56 percent of the respondents opposed public funding of abortion. A January 2010 Quinnipiac University poll showed 67 percent of

the respondents opposed Federal funding of abortions.

A November 2009 Washington Post poll showed 61 percent of the respondents opposed government subsidies for health insurance that includes abortion. A September 2009 International Communications Research poll showed that 67 percent of respondents opposed measures that would require people to pay for abortion coverage with their Federal taxes.

We know what the American people care about.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just have to end with what I started with. There is no Federal taxpayer funding for abortion. There has not been for many decades.

Some people, like me, think that this is an ill-conceived public policy, but it is the law of the land, it is the law of the land every year in the appropriations bill, and it is part of the compromise that was negotiated with the Affordable Care Act, so we need to keep that in mind as we talk about what this legislation does.

What this legislation will do is it will take away the ability of women in the exchanges to buy comprehensive health care insurance with their own money.

Now, I heard many speakers on the other side of the aisle today talk about their deep concerns about abortion and unwanted pregnancies. Well, I will tell you something: if you want to reduce unwanted pregnancies—which all of us in this room do—what you need to do is give women quality health insurance with robust family planning and a full range of health care services.

The Guttmacher Institute, in a 2010 study, showed, happily, that teen pregnancy in this country was at the lowest rate in over 30 years. Do you know why? Two reasons: number one, birth control for these teenagers; and, number two, comprehensive health insurance.

This Congress which has passed, over and over again, restrictions on birth control access—not just for teens, but for all women—and restrictions on comprehensive family planning is actually passing legislation that is going to stop this decrease in unwanted teen pregnancies.

It is an ill-conceived policy. It is a wrongheaded policy. If we want to stop unwanted pregnancies, the way to do it is to have comprehensive health insurance for all American women.

Now, the majority, at the last minute, pulled the bill with the egregious provisions on rape that would have required rape victims to affirmatively go to the police before they could raise the exception, but don't make any mistake about it, this bill is just as egregious as that bill.

The reason it is is because, in an unprecedented move, it stops American women and their families from being able to get comprehensive health insurance with their own money.

What would happen is it would open up a significant divide between the coverage that large employers would give to families and small employers and individuals.

Now, the other thing this does is it reopens the debate and the compromise that we had in the Affordable Care Act. The compromise we made in that bill was that there would be no public funding for abortion under the Affordable Care Act.

It was negotiated, it was agreed upon, and as the other side admitted, the President issued an executive order saying he would enforce the current law on that, and, in fact, that is what happened.

The act required two separate premium payments for women and their families who receive premium tax credits and choose coverage that includes abortion services. The act is clear in its language. No portion of premium tax credits may be used to pay for the portion of comprehensive health coverage that is purchased in the marketplaces that relates to abortion services.

The compromise was agreed upon by pro-life groups like the Catholic Health Association and everybody else, and now, this compromise is being thrown out the window.

Well, our opponents say there was a GAO report last September that said that insurance companies were not segregating the funds, so they say that that means, somehow, Federal dollars are being used to pay for abortions.

Well, after that GAO study came out, Madam Speaker, the HHS promulgated a new rule clarifying the agreement under the Affordable Care Act that the funds had to be segregated, and they promulgated this rule on Wednesday, November 26.

Madam Speaker, I will insert that proposed rule into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

So this compromise is being honored by the administration.

Now, early in this debate, I asked my opponents to please give me one example where Federal taxpayer dollars have been used to pay for abortions. I haven't heard that example, and it is because it is not happening. This is a false issue that is being raised.

I would submit to everybody here: let's stop talking about this false issue just because there are a whole bunch of people in town who want us to pass some legislation; let's talk about some real issues.

We just received a Statement of Administration Policy from the White House. Not surprisingly, the administration has said that the President would veto this bill. The bill is likely dead on arrival in the Senate, but even if it did pass, it would be vetoed.

I have a suggestion for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's take up some issues that the women and families of America care about; let's take up the issue of how we are going to give women good jobs with comprehensive health insurance, so they can make their own decisions, along with their family and their doctor.

Let's talk about legislation that will allow women of America to get jobs that have equal pay for equal work to the men. Let's talk about a bill that will give tax credits for families who have to struggle every month to pay for child care for their little kids. Let's talk about that.

□ 1230

And finally, let's talk about parental leave, which virtually every other country in the world has, so that when families have children whom they love so much and want to take care of, they won't have to go back to work because their employer doesn't pay them for family leave. Let's talk about that because, Madam Speaker, that is what the women and families of America want us to talk about.

I urge us to reject this legislation. I urge a "no" vote.

g. Segregation of Funds for Abortion Services (§156.280)

Section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act and §156.280 specify accounting and other standards for issuers of QHPs through the Exchange in the individual market that cover abortion services for which public funding is prohibited (also referred to as non-excepted abortion services). The statute and regulations establish that unless otherwise prohibited by State law, a QHP issuer may elect to cover such services. If an issuer elects to cover such services under a QHP sold through the individual market Exchange, the issuer must take certain steps to ensure that no premium tax credit or cost-sharing reduction funds are used to pay claims for abortion services for which public funding may not be used.

We are providing guidance on an individual market Exchange issuer's responsibilities with respect to requirements related to QHP coverage of abortion services for which public funding is prohibited. HHS works with stakeholders, including States and issuers, to help them fully understand and follow the statutes and regulations governing the provision of health insurance coverage under a QHP through the Exchange. As is the case with many provisions in the Affordable Care Act, States and State insurance commissioners are the entities primarily responsible for implementing and enforcing the provisions in section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act related to individual market QHP coverage of nonexcepted abortion services. OPM may issue guidance related to these provisions for multi-State plan issuers.

Under section 1303(b)(2)(B) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(2)(i), individual market Exchange issuers must collect a separate payment from each enrollee, for an amount equal to the AV of the coverage for abortions for which public funding is prohibited. However, section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act and §156.280 do not specify the method an issuer must use to comply with the separate pay-

ment requirement. This provision may be satisfied in a number of ways. Several such ways include, but are not limited to: sending the enrollee a single monthly invoice or bill that separately itemizes the premium amount for nonexcepted abortion services; sending a separate monthly bill for these services; or sending the enrollee a notice at or soon after the time of enrollment that the monthly invoice or bill will include a separate charge for such services and specify the charge. Section 1303 of the Affordable Care Act permits, but does not require a QHP issuer to separately identify the premium for non-excepted abortion services on the monthly premium bill in order to comply with the separate payment requirement. A consumer may pay the premium for non-excepted abortion services and for all other services in a single transaction, with the issuer depositing the funds into the issuer's separate allocation accounts as required by section 1301(b)(2)(C) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(2)(ii) and §156.280(e)(3).

Section 1303(b)(2)(D) of the Affordable Care Act, as implemented in §156.280(e)(4), establishes requirements for individual market Exchange issuers with respect to how much they must charge each QHP enrollee for coverage of abortions for which public funding is prohibited. A QHP issuer must estimate the basic per enrollee, per month cost, determined on an average actuarial basis, for including coverage of non-excepted abortion services. In making this estimate, a QHP issuer may not estimate the basic cost of coverage for non-excepted abortion services to be less than one dollar per enrollee, per month. This means that an issuer must charge each QHP enrollee a minimum premium of one dollar per month for coverage of non-excepted abortion services.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 7—NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Rep. Smith, R-New Jersey, and 20 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 7. The legislation would intrude on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care; increase the financial burden on many Americans; unnecessarily restrict the private insurance choices that consumers have today; and restrict the District of Columbia's use of local funds, which undermines home rule. Longstanding Federal policy prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman would be endangered. This prohibition is maintained in the Affordable Care Act and reinforced through the President's Executive Order 13535. H.R. 7 would go well beyond these safeguards by interfering with consumers' private health care choices. The Administration strongly opposes legislation that unnecessarily restricts women's reproductive freedoms and consumers' private insurance options.

If the President were presented with H.R. 7 his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, on the so-called compromise, I offered the Hyde language in the committee, and we won in a bipartisan vote. Chairman Waxman recessed, changed the votes, stripped it out, and brought it to the floor without Hyde. I was involved in the negotiation.

I wrote the Stupak-Pitts amendment. I know what the compromise is with the so-called executive order. It is full of loopholes. The Hyde amendment does not apply to the Affordable Care Act.

I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), another pro-life champion.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake about what this debate is about. H.R. 7 codifies that no taxpayer money would be given for abortions.

But the real debate on the floor today is about life. We are talking about life in the people's House, on the floor of the people's House. We are talking about a gift from God. We are talking about something that was so well put into our Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the first of those being life. I understand that there is a serious debate about that.

There are times that people say: Listen, we are not really ready right now for this child. But expectant mothers and unborn children have got to be protected. My goodness, in a nation that recoils at the news around the world, at the loss of life, and says this is horrible what is happening in Syria, this is horrible what is happening in the Middle East, this is horrible that this is happening, then we want to go there, and we want to rush to help people because there is a loss of life, and then in our own country we have turned a blind eye and a deaf ear to the loss of 56 million unborn children. These are lives that were lost that did not have to be lost.

I know there is a law that says they have the right to make that decision. It may be legal, but I don't think it is right.

As far as giving a gift to the 500,000 or so people that are in Washington today in the pro-life march, this is not a gift from the Republican Party to these people. This is a gift from our Creator, Himself, on reproduction. How we have demeaned this and reduced it down to a political discussion is absolutely abhorrent.

Never, never has this country ever turned its back on the most vulnerable.

I have been there for the birth of my four children. I have 10 grandchildren now. I have also held the hands of my mother, my father, and my sister as they died. There is nothing more precious than life. There is just nothing more precious than that.

I ask all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 7 to answer the American people who say we do not want to fund abortion, to end this debate, and let's move forward.

Mr. PITTS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, this bill is simply outrageous. It was bad enough that the

Majority brought to the floor H.R. 36 outside the regular order. But the Majority had to pull that bill when the women in their Conference informed their Leadership just how bad the bill was and that they could not vote for it. Undeterred at its 'war on women' the Majority pulled H.R. 36 and rushed to the floor an equally offensive bill, H.R. 7. This new bill, H.R. 7, the so-called No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2015 is simply an attempt to substitute one anti-family bill for another. Timed to coincide with the annual pro-life march in Washington, this is a blatant attempt at pandering to their base.

During the last elections, the Republicans made quite a show of how they would run the Congress by regular order and make Congress work for the American people. However, we have had mere hours notice that this bill would even be brought to the floor. The bill was introduced yesterday and has already been fast tracked by the leadership to be on the floor this morning! Needless to say, there was NO committee debate and NO opportunity to amend the bill in any way. No one has even had a chance to read the bill. Who says those in Congress can't get things done quickly when they want to?

Supporters of the bill argue that it will simply codify the Hyde amendment and permanently prohibit taxpayer funding of abortion. However, we all know that is false. H.R. 7 is actually much more nefarious than that. It seeks to restrict women's reproductive rights and access to health care; increase healthcare premiums for many Americans and small businesses; and, limit the private insurance choices of consumers. It will almost certainly guarantee that insurance companies will no longer offer abortion coverage to consumers.

The Republicans in the House are continuing the mission to completely eliminate women's reproductive rights and their access to healthcare. As with the previous version of this bill, H.R. 7 is nothing more than a statement bill.

In addition, this bill also undermines the D.C. home rule. H.R. 7 prohibits D.C. from using its own Medicaid funds to provide abortion, language that is already included in the annual appropriations bill. This is despite the fact that 17 states currently use their own state funds to provide abortion.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 7 is the antithesis of Republicans stated goal of "small government." How can the Majority be so hypocritical? The Republican Majority is using this bill to reach into the lives of millions of Americans and make their health care decisions for them.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, our Great Nation was founded upon the idea that ALL men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights." And the first right mentioned in our Declaration of Independence is that of Life. We must do all we can to uphold this most fundamental value.

Today is the anniversary of the tragic Roe v. Wade ruling. In response, thousands of people have come to Washington, DC to participate in the annual March for Life so that those who cannot speak for themselves do have a voice.

In solidarity, the House is also taking action to uphold our founding principles and protect

our unborn by voting to reaffirm that no federal funding—including Obamacare subsidies—shall be used to pay for or subsidize abortions. At a time when our national debt is over \$18 trillion, to allow any federal funding for abortions would be a breach in the trust that the American public has placed in us to be good stewards of taxpayers' dollars—but more importantly, to protect our unborn.

I have consistently cosponsored and voted for legislation that continues the prohibition on federal funding for abortions, and I fully support H.R. 7. I am dedicated to protecting the sanctity of human life, which begins at conception. While today's vote is crucial to protecting the unborn, we cannot rest. Therefore I look forward to joining millions of Americans as we continue the important work of fully protecting our God-given right to Life for ALL, including our most innocent.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, Groundhog Day isn't for a couple more weeks, but you wouldn't know that from looking at the Republican majority's agenda these past few weeks. They've brought up one partisan bill after another that already proved unsuccessful in previous years.

Today, we are revisiting the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, which is misleading and redundant to say the least and represents yet another attempt by Republicans to restrict a woman's reproductive rights and access to lifesaving health services. In fact, it's their second attempt this week after they had to pull a controversial and unconstitutional 20-week (abortion) ban due to lack of support on their side of the aisle.

The contradiction between this narrow, ideological agenda and the message Republicans attempted to convey in their response to the President's State of the Union address this week—in which they claimed they would be "working to change the direction in Washington" and passing "serious job-creation ideas"—is stark.

Aside from denying care to women in the most desperate of circumstances, this bill would go beyond the current Hyde Amendment to place restrictions on how women with private insurance can spend private dollars in purchasing health insurance. It is a prima facie infringement of women's constitutional rights.

Madam Speaker, as polarizing as these debates continue to be, I believe we should make decisions based on this country's founding principles of personal liberty that should always guide this body on the subject of women's reproductive health.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I join with women's rights advocates, health care stakeholders, and religious groups in opposing H.R. 7, the Unprecedented, Radical Assault on Women's Health Care Act. This piece of legislation is another attempt by politicians to control women's private health care choices.

As we emerge from one of the worst economic crises in our nation's history, Congressional leaders should focus on bills to increase Americans' paychecks, create jobs, improve education, and incentivize investment in America rather than jeopardize the health of American women and undermine longstanding Supreme Court precedence regarding women's reproductive health.

Politicians are not medical experts, yet this bill today allows politicians to control women's private health care decisions. Politics should not drive medical decisions.

I firmly believe that the American people wish to see their representatives focus on proactive policies that strengthen our economy and address their health care needs, such as by increasing access to affordable health care and reducing health disparities. Rather than imposing national restrictions on private medical decisions, policymakers should focus on keeping Americans healthy via comprehensive health care, healthy pregnancies, and healthy children. Rather than allowing the federal government to violate the basic constitutional rights of women, we should increase our investment in research and development, help students afford and succeed in college, raise the minimum wage, strengthen our roads and bridges, and invest in our communities.

America needs policymakers who support our citizens, not who subordinate them. I cannot support this bill that allows politics to control women's medical choices, and I urge my colleagues to oppose.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Longstanding federal policy explicitly prohibits the use of federal funds for abortions, except for certain narrow circumstances of rape, incest, or severe health complications that threaten the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) maintains this ban and a federal appeals court confirmed that no federal dollars may be used to pay for abortion services under the law.

Far more sweeping in scope than the title implies, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act goes well beyond codifying the Hyde Amendment and protecting public funds. This bill intrudes on women's reproductive autonomy and access to health care, manipulates the tax code to put additional financial burdens on many women and small businesses, and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices available to consumers today.

The House of Representatives should be spending our time working to improve access to health care for all Americans, instead of deceptive legislation that interferes with a woman's ability to make personal, private medical decisions.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the misleadingly titled "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act."

This deceptively-titled bill does nothing more than dramatically restrict the ability of women to purchase affordable health insurance without forfeiting their constitutionally protected right to buy health coverage that includes reproductive services. Federal policy, including explicit language in the Affordable Care Act (ACA), already prohibits the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. Existing law in the ACA states that any individual who joins a plan that covers abortions will pay an additional fee that goes into a separate account; this was specifically designed to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not spent on abortions. The fee is only paid by people who knowingly joined a health plan that covers abortions, and any abortion (except in cases of rape, incest,

or to save the mother's life) coverage is paid out of those accounts—not by taxpayer dollars.

The ACA also provides that individuals purchasing their health care from the recently established exchanges can, depending on their income, access tax credits and ensure that their health care plan is affordable. This bill would deny women access to the tax credits on their health plans even though the tax credit does not cover any of the cost of plans that include abortion coverage. In other words, women will be denied access to affordable health care if they exercise their right to use their own funds for abortion coverage. This is unacceptable and violates the careful balance established in the ACA. Whether women purchase their insurance through the marketplace exchanges or receive it through their employers, millions of American women would be denied their choice of affordable health care coverage.

A woman's right to choose her own health care is a fundamental one, and the Congress should not tell women how to manage their private health or reproductive care. Sadly, this legislation will do just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this assault on women. This bill was a mistake the first two times it was proposed, and it remains a mistake today. Instead of attacking a woman's access to health care, we should be focused on accelerating job growth and increasing the paychecks of working Americans.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, once more, Republicans are seeking to limit women's access to safe reproductive health care through H.R. 7, the "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act." This is a sweeping ban on abortion coverage and another callous attempt to insert Congress into the most personal of conversations between a woman and her physician and I did not vote for it.

Last week marked the 42nd anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision, *Roe v. Wade*. It is exasperating that we still have to go through this annual charade as Republican leadership tries to force those of us who support women and their reproductive choices to take a "hard vote."

It is not hard for me to stand with the millions of women who depend on access to safe, legal abortion. It is not hard for me to vote against any bill that imposes the will of an intolerant, albeit vocal, minority on our mothers, sisters, and daughters. It is not hard for me to protect freedom of choice, because it is right and it is just.

Instead of bringing up legislation to strengthen our economy or improve our infrastructure, Republican leadership is choosing to focus its efforts on legislation that will trump women's health, override family decisions, and compromise the ability of women and their doctors to deal with reproductive issues. It's a blatant attack on women and it's not hard for me to say that it is wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 42, the previous question is ordered on the bill. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, Madam Speaker. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE III—RULE OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 301. PROTECTING THE MEDICAL PRIVACY OF WOMEN, INCLUDING VICTIMS OF RAPE AND INCEST.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any party to violate, directly or indirectly, the medical privacy of any woman, including the victims of rape or incest, with respect to her choice or use of comprehensive health insurance coverage.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, and it will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If this amendment is adopted, the bill, as amended, will immediately proceed to final passage.

As the Clerk has indicated, Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit would merely protect the medical privacy of millions of women, including those women who are victims of rape and incest. It would ensure that nothing in H.R. 7, the underlying legislation, could be construed to allow any entity to violate the medical privacy of any woman, including these victims, when it comes to her choice of comprehensive health care services.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a great debate here today, and we have heard, Madam Speaker, the majority party insist that we need to codify the 1976 Hyde amendment prohibiting poor women from having abortions.

I can assure you that, as we have looked over the past 42 years here on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we have seen that low-income women—particularly women of color—have been disproportionately impacted by the very successful implementation of the Hyde amendment. Women have been forced to choose between food and shelter. They have been forced to choose between the best interests of

their health, and they have given birth, on many occasions, even despite their poor health status, their poor economic status, or their poor emotional status to children who are poor.

We have heard data and statistics about the number of unborn persons as a result of abortion. We have not heard one single statistic about the number of children who are born in dire poverty only, Madam Speaker, to be humiliated in this Chamber over and over again, being called "products of the culture of dependency," who are killed by cuts, death by 1,000 cuts—cuts to food stamps, cuts to WIC, cuts to Head Start, cuts to educational opportunity. Death by 1,000 cuts. We have not heard anyone on the other side speak about that misalignment.

But with this legislation, it is not enough to stop low-income women, poor women, particularly women of color—African Americans, Asians, Native American women, Latinas—it is not enough to prevent them from abortions. Some of them have become pregnant because of rape and incest and forced trafficking who have diabetes and other underlying health problems. That is not enough.

This legislation is so nefarious as to try to prevent the women who have been lucky enough to get a job in a small business, lucky enough to be able to afford to buy insurance and use their own money to buy insurance—they have been lucky enough to do that—to prevent them, by some extraneous nexus—supposedly health care-funded payments through the Affordable Care Act—from seeking this health care. This is really, really a backdoor approach to really trying to undermine the law of the land, *Roe v. Wade*.

Many women, Madam Speaker, know on a personal level the history of shame and stigma that come forward when they are trying to seek the best remedy for their life at that time, for whatever reason that they need to have an abortion.

I know personally, Madam Speaker, of young women who have been 13 years old and who have become victims of statutory rape, and the best solution for their lives at that time and for their health is an abortion because their life is truly in danger. This is the kind of bill that would prevent them from having that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I hope that you will accept this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot of charges and accusations that were made by some of

my colleagues as they have chosen to describe the bill before us today, H.R. 7, so I want to be clear about what the bill before us does do and does accomplish.

This bill follows a longstanding principle, as my colleague said, going back to 1976, the principle that the American people and Members from both sides of the aisle in both Chambers of Congress have supported for decades, and that is taxpayer dollars should not be spent on abortions and abortion coverage. The vast majority of my colleagues voted for this exact same principle in countless appropriations bills, including a bill that we passed out of this Chamber last month. Yet today, some Members are fighting the widely shared belief that taxpayer dollars should not be used to take an innocent life.

The bill before us today also provides much-needed transparency regarding which health plans on the exchange pay for abortions. The Obama administration promised to provide Congress and the American people a list of plans in ObamaCare that covered abortion, yet they refused to live up to that promise. They forced Congress to act. And, indeed, the GAO has informed us that 1,036 plans include abortion coverage. There is no excuse—no excuse—to hide information about abortion coverage from the American people.

Madam Speaker, 68 percent, a vast majority of the American people believe there should be no taxpayer money used for abortion and abortion coverage.

HHS has forced Congress to act on this issue. The commonsense transparency requirement that is in H.R. 7 is needed, and it is supported by all Members. So that is what this bill is about, following an established bipartisan principle and providing transparency.

I urge my colleagues, each and every one, to vote to protect life, to vote to protect taxpayer dollars, and to promote transparency by rejecting the motion to recommit and supporting the underlying bill. I urge a “no” vote on the recommitment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 240, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—177

Adams	Fudge	Nolan
Aguilar	Gabbard	Norcross
Ashford	Gallego	O'Rourke
Bass	Garamendi	Pallone
Beatty	Graham	Pascarell
Becerra	Grayson	Payne
Bera	Green, Al	Pelosi
Beyer	Grijalva	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pingree
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Polis
Brady (PA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rangel
Bustos	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Israel	Richmond
Capps	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	T.
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Chu (CA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Ciulline	Kind	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Clay	Langevin	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Lawrence	Sherman
Connolly	Lee	Sinema
Conyers	Levin	Sires
Cooper	Lewis	Slaughter
Costa	Lieu (CA)	Speier
Courtney	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Crowley	Loebbeck	Takai
Cuellar	Lofgren	Takano
Cummings	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DeFazio	(NM)	Tonko
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Delaney	(NM)	Tsongas
DeLauro	Lynch	Van Hollen
DelBene	Maloney,	Vargas
DeSaulnier	Carolyn	Veasey
Dingell	Matsui	Vela
Doggett	McCollum	Velázquez
Doyle (PA)	McDermott	Visclosky
Edwards	McGovern	Walz
Ellison	McNerney	Wasserman
Engel	Meng	Schultz
Eshoo	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Farr	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Fattah	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Neal	

NAYS—240

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Fincher
Aderholt	Chabot	Fitzpatrick
Allen	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Amash	Clawson (FL)	Fleming
Amodei	Coffman	Flores
Babin	Cole	Fortenberry
Barletta	Collins (GA)	Fox
Barr	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Barton	Comstock	Frelinghuysen
Benishek	Conaway	Garrett
Bilirakis	Cook	Gibbs
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Gibson
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gohmert
Black	Crawford	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Gosar
Blum	Culberson	Gowdy
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Granger
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brat	Dent	Graves (MO)
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Griffith
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Grothman
Brooks (IN)	Dold	Guinta
Buchanan	Duffy	Guthrie
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Hardy
Burgess	Ellmers	Harper
Byrne	Emmer	Harris
Calvert	Farenthold	Hartzler

Heck (NV)	Meadows	Sanford
Hensarling	Meehan	Scalise
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Schock
Hice (GA)	Mica	Schweikert
Hill	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin
Holding	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner
Hudson	Moolenaar	Sessions
Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus
Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Shuster
Hultgren	Mulvaney	Simpson
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)
Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Hurt (VA)	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Issa	Noem	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (KS)	Nugent	Stefanik
Jenkins (WV)	Nunes	Stewart
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Stivers
Jolly	Palazzo	Stutzman
Jones	Palmer	Thompson (PA)
Jordan	Paulsen	Thornberry
Joyce	Pearce	Tiberi
Kaptur	Perry	Tipton
Katko	Pittenger	Trott
Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Turner
King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Upton
King (NY)	Poliquin	Valadao
Kinzing (IL)	Pompeo	Wagner
Kline	Posey	Walberg
Knight	Price (GA)	Walden
Labrador	Ratcliffe	Walker
LaMalfa	Reed	Walorski
Lamborn	Reichert	Walters, Mimi
Lance	Renacci	Webster (TX)
Latta	Ribble	Webster (FL)
LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup
Long	Rigell	Westerman
Loudermilk	Roby	Westmoreland
Love	Roe (TN)	Whitfield
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lummis	Rohrabacher	Wittman
MacArthur	Rokita	Womack
Marino	Rooney (FL)	Woodall
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder
McCarthy	Roskam	Yoho
McCaul	Ross	Young (AK)
McClintock	Rothfus	Young (IA)
McHenry	Rouzer	Young (IN)
McKinley	Royce	Zeldin
McMorris	Russell	Zinke
Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	
McSally	Salmon	

NOT VOTING—16

Carter (TX)	Hastings	Nunnelee
Deutch	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Forbes	Marchant	
Green, Gene	Meeks	

□ 1307

Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. GARRETT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FARR, KIND, BECERRA, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

AYES—242

Abraham	Grothman	Peterson
Aderholt	Guinta	Pittenger
Allen	Guthrie	Pitts
Amash	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Harper	Poliquin
Babin	Harris	Pompeo
Barletta	Hartzler	Possey
Barr	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Barton	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Benishkek	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Ribble
Black	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Rigell
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Bost	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Buck	Jolly	Ross
Bucshon	Jones	Rothfus
Burgess	Jordan	Rouzer
Byrne	Joyce	Royce
Calvert	Katko	Russell
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	King (IA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kline	Schock
Cole	Knight	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	Lamborn	Sessions
Conaway	Lance	Shimkus
Cook	Latta	Shuster
Costello (PA)	Lipinski	Simpson
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Love	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lucas	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	MacArthur	Stutzman
Dent	Marino	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Massie	Thornberry
DesJarlais	McCarthy	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Tipton
Dold	McClintock	Trott
Duffy	McHenry	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Valadao
Ellmers	Rodgers	Wagner
Emmer	McSally	Walberg
Farenthold	Meadows	Walden
Fincher	Meehan	Walker
Fitzpatrick	Messer	Walorski
Fleischmann	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Flores	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Moolenaar	Webstrup
Foxx	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Newhouse	Wittman
Gohmert	Noem	Womack
Goodlatte	Nugent	Woodall
Gosar	Nunes	Yoder
Gowdy	Olson	Yoho
Granger	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Palmer	Young (IA)
Graves (LA)	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Graves (MO)	Pearce	Zeldin
Griffith	Perry	Zinke

NOES—179

Adams	Becerra	Bonamici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle (PA)
Ashford	Beyer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)

Bustos	Higgins	Payne
Butterfield	Himes	Pelosi
Capps	Honda	Peters
Capuano	Hoyer	Pingree
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pocan
Carney	Israel	Polis
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Chu (CA)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cicilline	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kildee	Rush
Cleaver	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	T.
Connolly	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Costa	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Lawrence	Lee	Schrader
Levin	Levin	Scott (VA)
Lewis	Lewis	Scott, David
Lieu (CA)	Lieu (CA)	Serrano
Loebbeck	Loebbeck	Sewell (AL)
Lofgren	Lofgren	Sherman
Lowenthal	Lowenthal	Sinema
Lowe	Lowe	Sires
Lujan Grisham	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
(NM)	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
(NM)	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Lynch	Lynch	Takai
Maloney,	Maloney,	Takano
Carolyn	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Maloney, Sean	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Matsui	Matsui	Tonko
McCollum	McCollum	Torres
McDermott	McDermott	Tsongas
McGovern	McGovern	Van Hollen
McNerney	McNerney	Vargas
Meeks	Meeks	Veasey
Meng	Meng	Vela
Moore	Moore	Velázquez
Moulton	Moulton	Visclosky
Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Nadler	Nadler	Wasserman
Napolitano	Napolitano	Schultz
Neal	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Nolan	Nolan	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Norcross	Welch
O'Rourke	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Pallone	Yarmuth
Pascrell	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—12

Carter (TX)	Green, Gene	Marchant
Deutch	Hastings	Nunnelee
Duckworth	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Forbes	Johnson, Sam	Thompson (MS)

□ 1315

Mr. KATKO changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, I regrettably missed the vote, but I fully support this crucial legislation to protect the unborn. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, January 22, 2015 I was not present to vote on H.R. 7, legislation intruding on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote. Had I been present for roll call No. 45, I would have voted “no.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected around noon. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected.

The House will consider a number of bipartisan suspensions next week to combat human trafficking. A complete list will be announced at close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 351, authored by Representative BILL JOHNSON. This bipartisan bill will expedite liquefied natural gas exports to our allies. In order to boost our economy here at home and encourage global energy security, we must help clear the backlog of export applications currently pending at the Department of Energy, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for sponsoring this important bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 399, the Secure Our Borders First Act, authored by Chairman MCCAUL, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to achieve operational control of our border. The bill also ensures that we are using the latest technologies to assist with border enforcement and takes the commonsense step of allowing greater access to the border region—specifically, Federal lands—to Customs and Border Patrol officers.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. The last bill he says will be on the floor, I presume that it will be on the floor on Wednesday. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

As the gentleman knows, in the last Congress the Homeland Security Committee, chaired by Mr. MCCAUL, passed out of the committee a bipartisan bill that was supported—as a matter of fact, I think it was reported out by voice vote, and it was supported by Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as Republicans and Democrats from the committee.

As you know, so far this month in January we have spent time, frankly,

recycling what we perceive to be partisan bills from the last Congress. Unfortunately, it appears that we are going to do the same thing next week, and I ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan bill that just months ago was supported by Democrats and Republicans, reported out of committee, not brought to the floor, unfortunately, but reported out of committee I think unanimously, or at least without voiced opposition, and now instead of taking that bill up, which we know has broad bipartisan support, we have a bill that is now going to be reported to the floor without going to committee, without being marked up—excuse me, it was marked up yesterday. I am corrected. It was filed and marked up within hours of one another, no considered judgment, no hearings. It may have been marked up, but no hearings, no notice to the public that the bill was pending, no opportunity for the public or Members to look at it. As I understand it, the committee was organized yesterday at 10 a.m., and this bill was considered at 2 p.m. or some time in that timeframe.

But my concern, Mr. Leader, is that we continue to go down the path of having bipartisan agreements worked out in committee, and now at the beginning of this Congress we are simply seeing partisan bill after partisan bill.

I understand that your side had a victory in the election and expanded your membership. However, the President, as he pointed out, is still in office, and in order to get something done—we are all for border security. That is why the committee reported out the bill in the last Congress. We had agreement on it. I lament the fact that we didn't bring the bipartisan bill, which would have gotten overwhelming support, in my opinion. Substituting that on Wednesday, where we are going to come in at 9 and go out at 12, we will have a rule on that, maybe the rule the day before. There will be a very short time to consider this.

We are bringing a partisan bill that is going to engender a lot of opposition on our side. It is going to be opposed by Mr. THOMPSON. It is so unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that having achieved bipartisan agreement on a priority item, that is, border security, that within hours yesterday we turned that into a partisan bill on which there is neither consensus nor widespread agreement.

I am sure the gentleman had the opportunity to hear a quote about the first 3 weeks of this session from one of his Republican Members, Mr. DENT, who talked about week one being, of course, the Speakership election.

Then week two, we got into a big fight over deporting children under DREAMers, which I thought we had a consensus on, but we got into a big fight about that.

And week three, we talked about rape and incest and, frankly, a partisan

bill on a very, very important subject which did not have significant consideration and was substituted at 9 p.m. last night, no committee hearing, no committee input, no testimony available for that bill.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we understand there are going to be differences between the Republican side and the Democratic side on issues, but repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Speaker and the majority leader and others talk about a transparent Congress. I hear them talk about regular order and how they are going to return to that, and how they are going to have consideration of bills. The majority leader himself was quoted a number of times saying we are going to have 72 hours.

The bill that we just considered on this floor had less, frankly, than 12 hours before it was brought to this floor out of the Rules Committee. I would hope, Mr. Leader, that if you are going to go through with this border security bill—we will have an argument about it, and it will be largely a partisan vote on it. That is unfortunate, because we ought to be coming together, working together, creating consensus on making sure our borders are secure, as happened in the last Congress but is not repeated here.

□ 1330

I will be glad to yield to my friend.

I don't know whether this is going to be a closed rule or not. If I were betting, though, based upon the first 3 weeks of this session, I would bet it is going to be a closed rule or a structured rule with very, very few amendments, given the timeframe available to us.

I would say that we are very concerned on this side of the aisle, Mr. Leader, I will tell the Speaker that we are concerned about the closed processes that we are going through, the partisan processes that we are going through, and the lack of transparency and consideration that is being given to the bills that are coming to this floor.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I listened very closely to you, but I think we have two different experiences. I watched on the day of swearing in we had Hire More Heroes. Every single Member on both sides of the aisle voted for it. That was bipartisan.

I watched, Mr. Speaker, bringing up a bill from Mr. FITZPATRICK, where we had a bipartisan vote just a few months before, and the reason we brought it back—committees were not organized yet, we were just in—so we grabbed a bipartisan bill, but many Members on the other side of the aisle—and we had it on suspension—changed their vote just in a month before, but we were able to pass that, again, bipartisan.

Earlier, in asking me what would come to the floor next week, you heard

me say 12 bipartisan bills on suspension that deal with human trafficking.

You bring up the border bill. It has been noticed for a week—remember, we have been here for 2 weeks—it has been marked up in committee where both sides late into the night got to debate, where Members on both sides of the aisle got to express their opinions and their amendments the way the system should work.

We have noticed that today, more than 72 hours of why it will go up on Wednesday and not Friday, both sides have their retreats. We already had ours. We left that Wednesday, yours going through there. So there has been more notice. There has been clear debate. There has been bipartisan bills here.

I have no problem or qualm with a difference of philosophical opinion. The problem I have is when we misstate what history has shown.

You asked me about the rule. Bringing up the bill, I will leave the type of the rule that will accompany the bill up to the Rules Committee and Chairman SESSIONS. I do expect, though, a robust debate and look forward to considerable participation on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure I heard. Do you think it is going to come up on a closed rule or a structured rule? I am sorry. Did you mention that?

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I expect the type of rule—and I leave that up to the Rules Committee and Chairman SESSIONS—but I do expect to have debate from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would find it shocking if a bill ever came to this floor that precluded all debate. The gentleman is telling me it is going to come up and there will be time for debate. I don't know that I have ever been here where a bill came up that had no time for debate, so I assume that, Mr. Speaker, to be the case.

The question is: Will there be an opportunity for Members to offer amendments so that perhaps we can get back to the bipartisan bill that was reported out of the committee and leave the partisan parts of that bill for further discussion, debate, and amendment? We would like to have the opportunity to vote on such an amendment.

I ask my friend again, there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that I believe there will be time for debate. It won't be very much time, I presume, but I presume there will be time for debate.

But will there be time to offer alternative views and provisions to that bill as it is debated?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, committees have jurisdiction. The Rules Committee is where you decide what rules comes forward. Chairman SESSIONS and those in the Rules Committee will take that up. As soon as a decision is made, we will notify every Member of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman—I don't know the answer, but I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would observe, though, he mentioned a heroes bill. That was obviously overwhelmingly a bipartisan bill. You didn't hear me complain about that or anybody else complain about it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman will yield, I didn't even hear you bring it up when you say we weren't bipartisan.

Mr. HOYER. Right.

The Keystone bill, however, which I think is a very important issue, was made partisan. The 30- to 40-hour work-week was made partisan.

The Regulatory Accountability Act, as the gentleman mentioned—excuse me, the Financial Services—that bill was changed. It was changed without a hearing. It was changed without public testimony, as I had a personal discussion, Mr. Speaker, with the majority leader about the change that occurred from the House bill that was passed.

So that bill was made, again, a partisan piece of legislation. Unfortunately, it could have passed on suspension, I think, as it did the year before, had it not been changed.

On the pipeline permitting legislation, again, not a bipartisan bill. This bill that we just considered, obviously very partisan, but no hearings and a closed rule.

Again, very important issues brought up and, I would suggest to the gentleman, nontransparent. He mentioned the bill that was filed last Friday, the border security bill, which is coming up Wednesday. The committee organized at 10. This bill was passed sometime shortly after 2—or thereafter. Debate started at 2.

When we talk about transparency, when we talk about regular order, very frankly, on pieces of substantive legislation, regular order, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the majority leader, is not introducing a bill, then we are off for 3 days, coming back, and the day after organizing the committee without hearings, without any testimony, then passing the bill, and bringing it to the floor, when clearly it is a partisan difference.

We will move on, Mr. Leader. I know you are happy about that.

As the gentleman knows, after next week, we have two 4-day weeks scheduled in February prior to the President's Day recess.

Can the gentleman give me a sense of what legislation will be on the floor in February, again, Mr. Speaker, so that Members can have some knowledge of

what might be brought to the floor, so that they can prepare and the public knows what legislation is going to be considered?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have made no decisions on February and notification yet, but as soon as we do, we will give ample time for all to know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman and, again, would emphasize that the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has made it clear in his statements, both in a book that he and two others coauthored prior to their taking the majority, but he has said numerous times since then about his commitment to transparency, openness, 72-hour rule, which has been 3-day rule—it used to be 72 hours, now 3 days.

Three days, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, can be 26 hours. That is the last hour of the third day and the first hour of the third day. I understand that, but that is not regular order. We have all breached that. We all understand that.

Having said that, this Congress has started with closed rules, no hearings, and anything but regular order. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the majority leader try to adhere to that.

As he has observed in the past, if we do that, I think we will have better legislation, greater participation by Members, and reflect better the voice of the American people.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I want to thank the gentleman. If you quoted my book, I hope you bought it, so I thank you for that. Proceeds went to help the veterans.

I listened to what the gentleman said. As the gentleman knows, any new Congress, when you start, the committees are just beginning to organize. That is why, when we look to legislation, we look to those that the American public wanted.

You had brought up Keystone. Twenty-eight Members on your side of the aisle voted for it. I would consider that bipartisan. You have a large majority of Americans who want it and waited 5 years.

I know you bring up that we had a debate on the border, but we just now organized, and we were just now sworn in, but they have been debating this issue for quite some time.

It is our intention to run this House in a very open manner. I have been here when it has not been, and just as we said in our book, I think the American public wins when we go through regular order and we have greater transparency. I look forward to working with the gentleman as we progress throughout the term.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I don't want to be very cynical, but talk is fine. Performance—as Ronald

Reagan said: "Trust, but verify." We can read the talk, we can read the assertions, we can read the promises, but if it is not carried out, the American people are going to be—and continue to be, as they were when the gentleman appealed to them in his book—they are going to be cynical about our actions.

I think Mr. DENT observed it correctly. For the first 3 weeks, we have gone through a partisan practice. Hopefully, we can, Mr. Speaker, skew that in the future, give notice, make sure everybody has the opportunity to participate, make sure that we have the ideas from both parties and the American people, given opportunity to be expressed and, yes, to be included.

Next week, we will bring to the floor, as we have in the past, a bill that skews and abandons bipartisanship, which was achieved in the last Congress through the same committee for a partisan bill on which there will not be agreement. That is unfortunate for the security of our country. It is unfortunate for the due process of this institution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 26, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and thank the thousands—tens of thousands—of Americans who traveled to Washington, D.C., to participate in today's March for Life.

They came here today to remember a somber occasion, the anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision. It has been 42 years since that fateful decision, and while years have worn on, its impact on this country have not diminished.

Those who participated in the march today came from across the Nation, from every State—despite the cold and the weather—for one reason: the next generation of Americans depends on it.

Millions of Americans have been unable to pursue their dreams and defend their inalienable rights because of abortion. This is not justice. This is

not freedom. I stand with those who march for life. I honor those who march for life.

This is my seventh March for Life since coming to Congress. Knowing that, I can promise that as long as the lives of innocent unborn children are at risk, there will be those who will make a stand against it.

HONORING WILLIAM KORTUM

(Mr. HUFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and memory of Bill Kortum, regarded by many as the father of the environmental movement in Sonoma County.

Bill grew up in a Sonoma County that was much more rural and undeveloped than today. By the early 1960s, he foresaw that a growing population could threaten the county's natural landscape, so he fought to protect the home he loved.

He was singularly responsible for instituting lasting environmental protections throughout Sonoma County and California, though he would never claim credit for them.

One of Bill's first victories was to prevent the development of PG&E's nuclear power plant at Bodega Head. He helped create the California Coastal Commission, which continues to guarantee public access to the coast today.

He established Sonoma County Conservation Action, helped create the Sonoma County Open Space District, and championed the Sonoma Land Trust and the SMART train.

Bill illustrates the incredible impact one person can have in making the world a better place. His legacy in Sonoma County and beyond will not soon be forgotten.

I extend my deepest condolences to his partner in much of this work, his dear wife Lucy, as well as his three children and grandchildren.

HONORING WINSTON CHURCHILL

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 24, marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Winston Churchill. Over the past half century, he has passed from memory into history, yet stands unchallenged as one of the greatest figures of modern times.

Born of an American mother and a British father, his life and career symbolized the fellowship of the English-speaking peoples.

Just outside this very Chamber, Mr. Speaker, stands an enduring tribute to the "British Bulldog" in the Freedom Foyer. The placement of Churchill's

bust inside the U.S. Capitol serves as a testament to our special relationship with the United Kingdom and to the values our two nations have fought so dearly to defend: democracy and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD a touching account of Mr. Churchill's passing written by Celia Sandys, his granddaughter, and the only surviving member of the Churchill family present at his death.

MY GRANDFATHER'S FINAL DAYS

The Personal Account of Hon. Celia Sandys

His birthdays were always a big family occasion. The first one that I can remember clearly was his eightieth birthday in 1954 when there was a huge event in Westminster Hall. The purpose was for both Houses of Parliament to mark the day with tributes and the presentation of the portrait by Graham Sutherland, which had been commissioned as a gift for him.

The rumour was out that the image was less than flattering. I remember my parents discussing how he had disliked it when he had seen it two weeks earlier. He did, however, rise to the occasion and accepted it saying: "It is a remarkable example of modern art." As usual he had chosen the perfect words. The portrait was never seen again!

Ten years later we celebrated his ninetieth birthday at Hyde Park Gate. He had left his beloved Chartwell for the last time the month before. As we raised our glasses of Pol Roger to toast him, the unspoken thought in everyone's mind was that the final meeting could not be long delayed.

Six weeks later, on 10 January 1965 he suffered a stroke, the effects of which worsened over the next few days.

On the evening of the 15th, I received a call from his personal secretary, Anthony Montague Browne, to tell me that my aunt Sarah was on her way from Rome. He said she would be arriving at Heathrow in the early hours of the morning and had asked if she could stay with me.

I remember driving like the wind to get to Heathrow in time and then having to run the gauntlet of a huge crowd of journalists before we could get out of the airport. The press had only heard of my grandfather's condition a few hours before and so were hungry for information.

We went straight to Hyde Park Gate and found Grandpapa sleeping peacefully with his cat Jock curled up beside him. I don't know if Jock ever left the bed, but every time I was there the cat lay curled up by his master.

It was clear that the inevitable was about to happen. We were all sad; for ourselves not for him. Anyone who had spent time with him during the last few years knew that he was ready to go.

During the next nine days we had two urgent calls to go to Hyde Park Gate when it seemed the end was near, but each time he rallied. Otherwise during this period we visited once or twice a day, as much for my grandmother as for him.

Initially we had to struggle to get through the crowds of press and concerned onlookers who filled the little cul-de-sac day and night. After a few days, in response to a request from my grandmother, the bystanders moved to the main road and our visits became much easier.

Early on the morning of the 24th of January we received what was clearly the final call from my aunt Mary. Sarah and I raced

to Hyde Park Gate. There we joined my grandmother, Mary, my uncle Randolph and my cousin Winston.

Clementine sat holding Grandpapa's hand with his doctor, Lord Moran, sitting beside her; Randolph and Winston stood on the other side, while Sarah, Mary and I knelt at the foot of the bed. Also in the room were two nurses, whose work had finished, and Anthony Montague Browne.

No one made a sound except Grandpapa who breathed heavily and sighed. Then there was silence.

It seemed as though time stood still until Clementine asked Lord Moran, "Has he gone?" He nodded.

Seventy years to the day and almost to the minute since his father, Lord Randolph, had died, Winston Churchill had slipped imperceptibly away to meet his Maker.

We all sat down to a subdued breakfast and listened to the radio as the announcement of his death was broadcast to the world.

Some years earlier the Queen had decided that her first Prime Minister was to have a Lying-in-State and a State Funeral. The was the first time such an honour had been granted to a commoner since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington more than a century before.

Preparations for the ceremony had been given the code name "Operation Hope Not" and, in true British tradition, had been worked out to the last detail some years before.

More than 300,000 people queued in the freezing cold along the Embankment, across Lambeth Bridge, back along the Thames and across Westminster Bridge to file past the catafalque in Westminster Hall, the oldest surviving part of the Palace of Westminster, where my grandfather had spent so much of his working life.

The family were allowed to slip in by a side door and watch the extraordinary sight of so many who had come from near and far to bid farewell to the man for whom they felt love, respect and gratitude.

On the day of the funeral we gathered in Westminster Hall for the journey to St Paul's Cathedral.

The men of the family together with Anthony Montague Browne, who had served his master faithfully and lovingly to the end, walked behind the coffin, which was borne on a gun carriage.

The women rode in the Queen's carriages. My grandmother, Sarah and Mary were in the first carriage. My sister Edwina and I rode in the second. We had rugs and hot water bottles to keep us warm on a very cold day. We were so close to the crowds lining the streets that we could have touched them. The emotion in their faces I will never forget.

When we arrived at St Paul's, we all lined up for the procession up the aisle. The women of the family looked as though we were in uniform. Quite independently we were all wearing more or less identical black fox fur hats.

As the bearers struggled to carry the coffin up the steps and into the cathedral, it seemed they might be going to drop it. Apparently they had rehearsed but not with a lead-lined coffin! They made it and we all followed up the long aisle where the Queen and her family were waiting.

We were told that the Queen had said we should not curtsy to her so we filed into our seats opposite the Royal Family.

After the service we processed out and watched anxiously as the bearers carried the coffin down the steps, probably an even more difficult task.

As we got back into our carriages, the Queen and her family joined on the cathedral steps with monarchs, presidents, wartime colleagues and political allies to say goodbye to the man they had come to honour.

The carriages took us to Tower Pier where, after Grandpapa had been piped aboard, there was a seventeen-gun salute. We boarded the Port of London Authority's survey vessel, MV Havengore, for the journey to Waterloo Station. As we sailed off we could hear the band playing Rule Britannia.

The crane drivers on the quayside dipped the heads of their cranes in salute. This was the only unscripted part of the day and one of the most moving. The RAF flew overhead.

At Waterloo the coffin was placed in the guard's van with a military escort of the 4th Hussars on constant watch.

We sat down to have lunch and a glass of champagne, which we certainly needed, as the train moved off, pulled by the engine, which my then seven-year-old brother Julian had named "Winston Churchill" during the war.

Along the entire route from Waterloo to Long Hanborough, the railway was lined with people of all ages, some waving, some crying, some saluting, all of them silently saying goodbye to the man they admired. Finally we reached the small churchyard at Bladon, the burial place of Winston's parents and his brother Jack and within sight of Blenheim Palace where he had been born ninety years before.

The day immediately turned into a family affair, and we could say goodbye in private to the husband, father and grandfather who we all loved so much.

After the service we stood by the graveside as the bearers lowered the coffin into the grave. The silence was broken by a metallic clatter. Lying on the coffin were the shiny medals that had fallen off the coat of one of the bearers.

We were a sombre party on the train going back to London. When I got home I realized how strange the past weeks had been. It was as though I had been in a state of suspension but had now come down to earth.

Aunt Sarah and I watched the rerun of the day on television and wondered at all the events in which we had played a part.

□ 1345

SHADOWS OF CRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a week. There have been tragedies, and there have been wonderful events.

In having been to Nigeria this past year and in having met with family members of girls who were kidnapped because they went to Christian schools, there were three girls I met who had escaped after they had been kidnapped. The kidnapped girls, it was known, were being sexually abused and may have now been sold into sex trafficking, given as wives, and have been ordered to convert from Christianity to Islam or be killed. I know there are

some in this town who think they are being asked to convert to an Islam that doesn't exist as a religion, but to those girls who are being told they must convert to the religion of Islam or be killed, it does seem to be a religion.

In having grieved with others around the world who have been harmed or who have had family killed or harmed by radical Islam, it is tragic this week.

I will read a story from Breitbart:

According to the United Nations, ISIS—the Islamic State—is killing educated women following shari'a court sentences.

That is a problem. There is nothing wrong with religious people participating in government. Most of our Founders were very strong Christians. Around a third or so of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were actually ordained Christian servants. So that is a good thing, but when a religion also becomes the state, then this is the kind of thing you get, and it is tragic.

In an article by Edwin Mora, it says:

The U.N. warned on Tuesday that the Islamic State, known as ISIS, ISIL, or IS, is showing a "monstrous disregard for human life" in the areas it has conquered, which include swaths of Iraq and Syria.

This article points out:

Nevertheless, President Obama, during his State of the Union Address delivered Tuesday night, proclaimed that the United States "is stopping ISIL's advance" in Iraq and Syria. Just last week, The Daily Beast, citing an unnamed Pentagon official, reported that, despite U.S.-led airstrikes, ISIS is gaining ground in Syria.

The U.N. warned that the jihadist group is meting out "cruel and inhuman punishments against men, women, and children" through "unlawful" shari'a courts it has established in territory under its control.

The civilians falling victim to ISIS' wrath are accused of "violating the group's extremist interpretations of Islamic shari'a law or for suspected disloyalty," said Ravina Shamdasani, spokesperson for the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

ISIS has killed fellow jihadists and local residents for violating the harsh version of Islamic law imposed on the areas it now controls.

"Educated, professional women, particularly women who had run as candidates in elections for public office, seem to be particularly at risk. In just the first 2 weeks of the year, reports indicated that three female lawyers were executed."

It goes on:

"The ruthless murder of two men who were thrown off the top of a building after having been accused of homosexual acts by a so-called 'court' in Mosul is another terrible example of the kind of monstrous disregard for human life that characterized ISIL's reign of terror over areas of Iraq that were under the group's control."

Look. I know, Mr. Speaker, that our President stood right here at the second level and told us "the shadow of crisis has passed." Apparently, he is not getting the briefings, or maybe the briefings don't include just how bad the situation is around the world. Chris-

tians are being persecuted and are being killed in greater numbers than at any time in history since Jesus came. Jews are being subjected to anti-Semitic hate in many places, we are told, which has not been seen since before and during World War II.

Now, in growing up reading and studying history, I couldn't imagine that there would ever come another day that we would see hate growing against Jewish people that could inspire another Holocaust. I just didn't think it would happen. So, when I had read about General Eisenhower's having soldiers bring people from the surrounding communities to help clean up the death camps, I thought: These are civilians in the community, and that may have been a little harsh if they had nothing to do with the death camps.

I had read that his reasoning was—and this was many years ago—that he wanted to make sure that nobody could ever proclaim that the death camps did not exist and that they were a figment of someone's imagination. He wanted to make sure that could not happen, so they were brought out to clean up. Yet, mere decades later, here we are at a time when there are radical Islamists calling for a new, greater Holocaust to kill Jewish people, calling for the complete wiping off the map of Israel, calling for the complete destruction of what they call the "Great Satan"—the United States.

The shadow of crisis may have passed, but the mental image I got when I heard the President say "the shadow of crisis has passed" took me back to fifth grade. I was very small in elementary school, and there was one guy who could have been two grades ahead, but he had been held back. He was about two heads taller than I was. I was on the playground one day, and as a little kid, I saw Ray's shadow pass me. I turned around, and I got smashed in the face, and it made my nose bleed. That was the image I had when the President invoked the shadow of the crisis' passing. If the shadow of this crisis has passed, then we may be just about to get smacked in the face by these radical Islamists, and it will be a lot more than a bloody nose that ends up occurring.

This is a very desperate time in the world for millions of people. Since they, perhaps, weren't journalists—the nearly 2,000 or so Nigerians who were killed by radical Islamists—Boko Haram, in Nigeria, didn't quite get the attention I thought it should have as did the horrendous killings in Paris get the attention, as they absolutely should have.

Under Western civilization law—and it was true in the early days of this country, and it has been true, as far as I know, under every State's law. I know, absolutely, it is true under State

law—when it comes to a physical assault, the law has been clear: provoking words are never a defense to a physical assault. In this country, under our law and under the law of every State, no matter what you say, it does not justify a physical attack. We have even had the President of the United States basically stand up before the U.N., stand up in front of media, stand up in front of crowds, and say that we need to be more careful.

But he goes beyond that.

He appears to attribute blame for an attack on the people being attacked to the point that he and those who work for him were asked to go out and tell the country before the 2012 election that a video was responsible for the deaths of four Americans who were serving their country in Benghazi, Libya. It turns out that that was not true at all. It turns out people knew that before that was trotted out.

According to the book written about the blood feud between the Clintons and the Obamas, there was a phone call from Hillary Clinton to her husband in which she was upset that the President was asking her to go out and say that the Benghazi attack was the result of a video. According to the book, she was advised that America wouldn't buy a lie like that. Ultimately, they decided, at least, not to have her go on the Sunday shows—again, according to the book—and that, gee, if she resigns, that might cost him the election, and Democrats would be upset about it, so they would never want to nominate her for President if she resigned and cost Obama the election in 2012.

That was according to the book as to why she didn't resign, but she didn't go on the Sunday shows. Susan Rice was sent out with that task to blame a video when it was very clear, when Chris Stevens called, saying that he was under attack, there was nothing about a video mentioned. When the warnings were being given by those who were aware of a buildup of radicals—and of potential problems even across the street—nothing was mentioned about a video because it wasn't about a video; but that would have been an inconvenient truth so close to the election.

Our heartbreaks collectively for these killings, and it is my hope and prayer—liberal women's groups here in the United States prefer the easy task of attacking conservatives and of creating allegations that, gee, there is some war on women when, actually, as I speak, there is a war on women going on in radical Islamist-held countries. There is a war on baby women going on around the world, and there are people who actually choose to abort babies because they are baby women.

□ 1400

There is a war on women, but it is not by conservatives in the country,

who want them to have the best health care they can get, who want young girls to have the best care they can get, both in the womb and outside the womb. This isn't where the war on women is occurring.

Although there are still some vestiges of prejudice against women, we are very hopeful that since the President has made such a big issue about treating women equally, it won't be too long before the White House will start treating women equally and giving them equal pay for equal work. So I am encouraged the President keeps bringing that up, hoping that will inure to the benefit of people working at the White House so they will eventually be paid what men in the White House are paid.

I really do hope that liberal women's groups that take the easy path—taking potshots at conservatives—will stand with us against radical Islam.

I asked mothers of girls who were kidnapped by Boko Haram in Nigeria: Did they attack this school because it was a school for girls? They said that apparently they didn't realize that it was only girls at the school because they did ask: Where are the boys? Because they wanted to bring them out and shoot them, as they did at other places. When they realized it was only girls, they took them to become slaves, sexually and otherwise, and to force them to convert. But the school wasn't attacked because it was a girls school, because they didn't know it was only for girls. They knew it was Christian.

There was also an attack on Christian women. And I would hope that even the most atheist of women in the United States and in Western civilized countries around the world would start standing up for the mistreatment of Christian women who are particularly being brutalized because of their faith and because of their sex, combined.

So, of the Presidents we have had since 9/11, the President failed to mention al Qaeda. And I can understand that, and I have to be a little defensive for the President here. He and the Vice President had been saying before the 2012 election that al Qaeda was on the run. In some cases, Osama bin Laden is dead, al Qaeda is on the run, and General Motors is alive.

Well, it turns out if al Qaeda is on the run, it is a run directly at us and our allies, our friends. And that is particularly true of Israel. They consider Israel the little Satan and us the great Satan, but we have no better friend in the Middle East than Israel.

Our President has been overheard on a microphone that picked him up basically casting aspersions on the character of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Fair people that I have known, if they ever got caught maligning someone inappropriately, they would go out of their way to show that it was inappropriate—I want to make it up, and I

want to show that we are friends. We may have disagreements, but we are friends.

Of course, people have read about him treating Prime Minister Netanyahu so poorly when he came to the White House in prior years, having him sit around. One account said he was told: Just wait here. And when you have a change of position, let me know. I'm going to eat with my family.

The Prime Minister ended up leaving rather than sitting in his corner for a timeout, as the President wanted.

We haven't seen this President make clear to the world that Israel is our friend, as well as to its leader, the people, and the legislature they have elected. We haven't seen those kind of outreaches.

And then, we find out the President is upset that the Speaker of the House invited Prime Minister Netanyahu to come speak here on February 11. And perhaps that is yet another indication of the ignorance. And, Mr. Speaker and our Parliamentarian, it doesn't cast aspersions to be ignorant of something—we are all ignorant of things—but apparently there is a blind spot in the Constitution for the President on a number of things, and apparently one is how the legislature works, even though he has been in the Senate, because under the Constitution, we can't have anybody in the people's House come speak here who is not a Member of Congress, with one exception. Under the Constitution and Thomas Jefferson's Rules of the House, under which we have been operating since 1789—with modifications, but it has still been the rule, you can't come speak in the House Chamber officially unless you are invited by the House. You can't come speak to a joint session of Congress, both the House and Senate, unless both the House and the Senate invite you.

Now how do we know that the President doesn't really grasp that concept and is not aware of the constitutional and the rule ramifications in Congress? It has been a few years back, but the President decided, as I recall, that he was going to come lecture Congress on a jobs bill and tell us—I think it was 16 or so times—that we had to pass it right now, right away, failing to mention he didn't even have a bill.

Nevertheless, the President went out publicly and the statement was released that he was going to come to Congress and speak to Congress on a specific day at a specific time, and he had not even spoken to the Speaker of the House. Maybe he had talked to Majority Leader REID, but he hadn't talked to the Speaker of the House, and this is the House Chamber where the House actually has to vote to invite him. He didn't even bother to see what was convenient.

And as I recall, not only was there ignorance of the rules and the constitutional requirements, but there was also

ignorance about the NFL, what is known as football here in the United States, and I believe it was the beginning of the season. The President had just announced he wanted to come to Congress. He demanded to come speak to us, in conflict with the beginning of the first football game of the season. I believe it was the first. It was a big night. After that was pointed out, he ended up coming and speaking earlier. But the point being, no President has ever picked a date, said, Here's when I'm coming to speak to the House, without understanding you can't come unless you are invited.

You are not even allowed to come give an oral State of the Union Address unless the House and Senate vote to invite you to speak to a joint session. That has been the rule since we began. Under the Constitution, it is not required that a State of the Union Address be orally given in a speech. There is a constitutional requirement for a State of the Union report to be given. But in the early years of our country, there were times when the President just sent a report. Here's my report on the state of the Union.

So the President has snubbed Congress, the rules, and the Constitution repeatedly, and then our Speaker is condemned by the White House for inviting a world leader to come speak here. Again, the President doesn't realize there is no requirement to check with the President. If it hasn't already occurred, we will have to have a unanimous consent or a vote to have the House approve the invitation of Prime Minister Netanyahu to come speak here. That has to happen, if it hasn't already.

So there is no requirement to check with the President. We don't even have to invite him over here to speak to do his State of the Union. And when the unanimous consent request is made, anybody here could object to the President coming. I am not aware of that ever happening. I don't anticipate that ever happening.

Interestingly, we have been reading—when I have been in Israel and talked to leaders over there, they talk about the massive pressure by the Obama administration to try to push Israel into getting rid of Prime Minister Netanyahu. Now we know what our President did to help support the removal of President Mubarak. We know that he went even further in Libya, after Qadhafi—after the 2003 invasion of Iraq—threw all of his weapons systems open to the United States and said, You tell me what I can keep, basically. And as some in Israel have advised, after Qadhafi's conversion experience in fear that the U.S. would invade Libya in 2003, he became more of a help in going after radical Islamic terrorists than almost anybody, except in Israel.

We have got friends around the world that are trying to help us with radical

Islam, and even our friends in Egypt, a neighbor of Israel. As many of us feared, they had an election too quick after the so-called Arab Spring, which was more of an Arab nightmare for the Egyptian people. They had an election too soon. The most organized group was the radical Islamic Muslim Brotherhood.

It was not really a military coup, and that has offended the Egyptian people, as they have indicated, when news media or the White House have said it was a coup because you had the largest uprising in the history of the world occur in Egypt. It was demonstration after demonstration for the ages. It was 20 million, 30 million, 33 million, came the reports of the uprising, of the around 90 million people in Egypt—massive. That would be like over 100 million people in America going to the streets and demanding the President be removed. It is hard to get a third of the United States just to go out and vote. They did more than that. They put themselves at risk and came to the streets and said, Enough is enough.

And the Coptic Christian Pope has told me of how touched he was to have moderate Muslims, secularists, and people of different faiths come and literally and figuratively join arms and march together to stop the brutality against Christianity and against Jews in Egypt.

That was extraordinary. And so much of our media missed it. I think our President never really understood that. Briefings must not have been adequate—or he missed them—but that was extraordinary. That was an event for the ages, the Egyptian people uprising in millions like no country had ever experienced in our entire history of mankind. Extraordinary. They are to be commended.

□ 1415

What happened?

Yeah, there were even a couple of Republican Senators, but you had the President, the White House, the State Department, people condemning Egypt for saying: We don't want radical Islam running our country.

I didn't realize, but the constitution—that as I understand this administration helped with—did not include a provision for impeachment. We didn't give them a peaceable way within the constitution to remove a leader once he acted outside the constitution, as Morsi was doing.

Now, because I have been told by a former CIA operative—I asked General al-Sisi while he was still general, before Morsi was elected: Did you have evidence that he was trying to have you killed? I was told by a former CIA operative that he did.

He was reluctant to respond, but he eventually responded: Yes, we did. He didn't even really need that because of the unconstitutional actions of Presi-

dent Morsi. Now, I have had friends of Israel that were saying: We want to give Morsi a chance because he is really working to bring peace to the Sinai.

Well, as we found out after the people arose and a peaceful revolution occurred—I thought about the Egyptian peaceable revolution as I watched the movie "Selma." It is tragic that that ever came about and circumstances ever came to the point that we were treating, especially as a Christian, treating brothers and sisters like that.

Thank God for Martin Luther King, Jr. We honor him this week. What an example. People in Egypt know about Dr. King. The Pope, Coptic Christian Pope knows of Dr. King. He wanted a peaceful demonstration, and they were part of peaceful demonstration.

Unfortunately, radical Islam did not like being removed. They burned churches. They went after Christians. They went after Jews. It was so offensive to the moderate Muslims that make up most all of Egypt that they even voted, overwhelmingly, for a constitution that required the government to build back the churches that the Muslim Brotherhood burned down. That is historic for the ages.

We have this one country, 90 million, most Muslim. At one time, there may have been, as I understand, maybe 10 percent or more Christians, but radical Islam took over after the alleged Arab Spring that was anything but a spring. It is a place of hope with a very, very difficult road in front of them.

Some of the military leaders were asking Members of Congress that were visiting over there about the Apache helicopters and the tanks that have been frozen by President Obama's administration and the refusal, for so long, to provide them.

The military leaders are saying: Does your President not understand that we use those Apache helicopters to keep the Suez Canal open? Does he want a tragedy at the Suez Canal? Is that why he is not allowing us to have new Apaches that we need in order to keep the Suez Canal properly open and safe?

We use the Apache helicopters to go after the massive weapon buildup that occurred in the Sinai under Morsi, and the Sinai is an area with rapid, huge weapon buildup under Morsi that is a threat and was a threat to Israel, our ally.

Somebody in the administration needs to get out a memo to everyone else saying: Look, Israel really is our friend. Netanyahu has more in common in his government and what his government believes than any other government in the entire Middle East with us here in America. Maybe we ought to go easy on pushing for a new leader.

Well, it hasn't happened today. Here is an article. Not only, apparently, is the White House furious with our Speaker—heck, I have been mad with our Speaker. I am telling you, this is a

good thing, Mr. Speaker, that has been done here in inviting the Prime Minister of Israel.

Here is an article, since the leader of our closest ally and friend in the Middle East, Israel, is coming, this article from NBCNews.com, Kristen Welker and Carrie Dann:

President Barack Obama will not meet with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu when he visits the United Nations in March, his administration announced Thursday, citing a “longstanding practice” of avoiding appearances with heads of states in close proximity to their elections.

I guess he is glad that countries around the world don't have that same policy because he was sure running around before the election wanting to make appearances with them. I guess it would only be natural that foreign leaders would assume, since he did it before his election, that he would certainly not want to appear less than consistent.

They didn't use that excuse when the President gave Prime Minister Netanyahu a timeout. You wait here, I am going to go eat. Let me know when you have a change of mind.

I mean, that is what parents used to say to us. That is what some of us, as parents, have said: Until you are willing to act right, you go to your room.

For a President of the United States to do that to the leader of the country that is our best ally in the Middle East is really extraordinary, so I guess it shouldn't be a surprise that he wants him snubbed before his reelection; but I also think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we have him here to hear his side about what Iran is doing.

Some of us, in December, met with leading investigators at the IAEA in Vienna to talk about Iran's current status, as best they can figure out. I think it was the most candid meeting that we have had with representatives of the IAEA. I appreciate their honesty and forthrightness.

But Iran's centrifuges are still spinning. They are still enriching uranium. They are increasing the amount of uranium that they are enriching. Even though they are assuring the IAEA that they are not taking it any more—they are not taking it past 5 percent enrichment, people that know about the enrichment process know it is not that much of a step to go from 5 percent to 90 percent, have weapons-grade uranium that can be used for bombs.

I think my friend, Joel Rosenberg, in his all-too-realistic novel, previously depicted Iran as developing enough nuclear material to use—not just in one bomb, they wanted enough to use in several bombs, so that when they got to that point, in a secret facility that even the IAEA, U.S., others didn't know about, according to the novel, they were able to prepare nuclear weapons, multiple nuclear weapons at the same time and immediately ship

them out in different directions, so that anyone trying to stop their nukes, once developed, would have to worry that if they attacked Iran to stop their nuclear weapons—they had several—that it would be unlikely they would get them all, and that would mean that nukes would probably show up in Israel and the United States.

It seems pretty realistic. That seems like a realistic consideration for Iran. They seem to be following that procedure, developing as much 5 percent enriched uranium, that we know of; but as even the experts can tell you, it is possible they have got a facility we didn't know about. They have surprised us before.

This is a tragic time in so many places in the world. The shadow of the crisis may have passed us, but too often, that means, now, the shadow is passed and the crisis is upon us.

It is time to stand up to radical Islam and to stand in Erbil and talk to Kurdish leaders—or outside Erbil, at the headquarters where they are able to watch things that are going on; hear a Commander say: You have no idea how heartbreaking it is to see a vehicle, an American vehicle, up-armored vehicle that the United States produced that is in the Islamic State hands, that has now been made into a massive suicide bomb, comes at our Kurdish fighters, fighting heroically, but not having a single weapon that will stop an American up-armored vehicle as the vehicle comes, as they know it is going to explode, and it gets nearer and nearer, and they are frantic.

Everybody watching the video feed, everybody on the ground there knows they are not going to stop it because the United States has not provided the weapons to our friends that will stop the weapons, the U.S. weapons that are in the hands of our enemies. Then, ultimately, the suicide bomb of a U.S. up-armored vehicle takes out those valiant, heroic Kurdish fighters.

These are not people that threw down their weapons and ran, like so much of the Iraqi Army did. There are Iraqi officials that say: This is why we really needed a small American presence here, to give us the backbone, to tell us, “Here is what you do. Yes, they are coming, but don't throw down your weapons. Go here. Go there.”

We needed that help, that coordination, the same kind of help and direction, coordination that our embedded Special Forces, Special Ops people gave to the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan in late 2001 and early 2002, when the Taliban was initially decimated, defeated before we added tens of thousands of troops and became occupiers.

It has worked. It worked in Afghanistan before we became occupiers. It has worked when we help people that want to defend themselves to defend themselves.

We have seen over and over these reports that, in Syria, this so-called vet-

ted, moderate Free Syrian Army is joining forces with al Qaeda affiliates. This administration still thinks it is a good idea to send them weapons that they can use, ultimately, to go after our friends, the Kurds.

□ 1430

Turkey, our ally and friend, NATO partner, says we can't use their bases to fight the Islamic State. I have got friends in Turkey, leaders there I have met with. They don't like the idea of the Kurds being armed.

Well, I think it is time the administration should announce that we are not sending weapons to Baghdad so that they can send what can't stop the Islamic State to the Kurds. We are sending weapons directly to Erbil. We are sending them directly to the Kurds.

Okay. Turkey, we understand you don't like that idea. If you don't like it enough, you have a powerful enough military to stop and destroy the Islamic State by yourself if you want to. So we would much prefer Turkey take out the Islamic State by themselves. But as it appears, Turkey is becoming more radical in their legislation and activities. It explains, perhaps, why they will not allow us to use our bases and will not directly, themselves, fight the Islamic State.

Well, the Kurds are willing. They are doing it. They are fighting valiantly. Let's help them out directly, not through Baghdad, but directly.

Let's try to be friends with Israel. Let's try not to snub their leaders. I mean, since I have been in Congress, I have tried to be encouraging when I have met with other Israeli leaders. Before Netanyahu became the Prime Minister, we met with others. We encouraged them. I wasn't crazy about some of the things they were doing, but they were leaders of our friend Israel, and I wanted to be their friend. I wish that it were so with this administration.

Now, we had what was purported to be the State of the Union Address in here. We were told “the shadow of crisis has passed.” I don't know. I am finding that maybe the President, a few years ago when he came and told us, “Pass my bill right away, right away, right away,” maybe he didn't really know he didn't have a bill. But we kept trying for days to get a copy of his bill, and finally, after a week, there was no President's American Jobs Act.

Well, I went ahead and created one, and what it did was eliminate the biggest tariff that any country in the world puts on their own manufactured goods. It is called a corporate tax. It has to be passed on to consumers, which makes the price of the product or their services more expensive. Imagine the manufacturing jobs that would come flooding back to America if we even just reduced the corporate tax, this tariff that we are putting on our own goods.

And I have had reporters around Washington who don't really get it say: Well, how would you make up for the lost corporate taxes?

Those corporate taxes are paid by Americans. They are paid by the consumers. Any corporation that doesn't pass on that tax is not going to stay in business. So the consumers pay it. The American taxpayers pay it anyway.

But what would happen when you lower the corporate tax rate? Some of those massive manufacturing businesses—like the President's dear friends own that have moved over to China and other places—some of them have told a group of us that went over there: Well, the biggest reason we had to move is America had such a massive and now the highest corporate tax in the world. If you lower that like to China levels, 17 percent, we would be able to be back there.

Now, I loved hearing from leaders of industry in China that the best workers they have were American workers in the United States of America. Their best quality control is right here. Well, if we would lower the corporate tax, those jobs would come flooding back.

I loved hearing the President so pleased that we are becoming energy independent. Unfortunately, it is not due to anything the Federal Government is doing. His administration is doing whatever it can to slow down energy production of oil and gas that we are so reliant on, and production from Federal lands, under his watch, is down significantly.

So it is all the private sector that has done this, Sarah Palin and others saying, "Drill, baby, drill." That has actually happened, and now we have got an abundance. It has brought down gasoline prices.

And what is the Democrat reaction to prices of gasoline going down? Well, that means we need to add some taxes to gasoline. Really?

I loved hearing the President say we need to do infrastructure, except, dadgummit, I remember him talking about that repeatedly when he first became President. That is why he said we had to have this massive \$900 billion, because we are going to build infrastructure.

And what did he do? He got the \$900 billion from a Democratic House and Senate, and only a fraction of it went to infrastructure. We were told it was going to go to shovel-ready jobs, and then we find out some years later, well, actually there was no such thing as the shovel-ready jobs. They did send it to companies like Solyndra and others that lived high off the hog for a while and then went broke. I am sure they are getting some other grant somewhere else.

Which brings us to another story, which was reported as a bombshell, a story by Richard Pollock, "Bombshell: IRS Has Active Contract for Millions

With Company HHS Fired Over Botched Healthcare.gov" Web site.

Wow. Well, no wonder the President wants more money. He is still doing deals for millions of dollars with people they paid massive millions of dollars to do a Web site that didn't work. We have had people come to the Hill and say: We could have done that for about one-twentieth of the cost of what was paid and actually had it working.

But things are a little better in Texas. I loved hearing the President take credit for jobs that have been created in Texas. Unfortunately, when you look at the jobs that his policies have helped create around the country, the biggest thing he has helped create is part-time jobs in numbers like we have never had before.

I love when he brings people in here to hold them up as good examples. I wish he had brought some of my constituents, some of whom are broken-hearted because their part-time job went from 39 hours to 29. They had to get a second one. And they have also lost what benefits they did have at their first employment. Now they are spending more time away from their children, making less.

I know he has the image that \$15,000 a year is supposed to support a family of four, but what most people in business can tell you—especially small business that employs about 70 percent of American workers—the minimum wage is entry level. And when I talk to people at places like McDonald's, they are not even paying the minimum wage. They are paying more than that. And places where oil is being drilled and gas is being drilled, they are paying a lot more than minimum wage. Some of them are paying bonuses because that is what happens when the Federal Government does not impede the ability of industry and of American entrepreneurialism.

But here, also, the President wants to provide net neutrality. I want neutrality. I want Internet neutrality. But I don't want the government taking over because I know his friends end up doing well and his enemies don't do well.

I would like to make sure that the market is able to play. I would love it if he had come in here and said: You know what? We have wasted a lot of money trying to prop up solar energy and wind energy. We have squandered massive amounts of money, of taxpayer dollars, money we have had to borrow from China that won't be paid back in my lifetime. But here is a tax notion. Let's eliminate the subsidies for every energy form, whatever it is, eliminate them. Nobody is going to get subsidies. Nobody gets grants. Good luck.

What would that mean? It would mean the free market would take over.

And when I hear the commercials, oh, buy a solar energy whatever, air conditioner or whatever it is, heater,

buy it now because the subsidies may be running out before long, well, let's run them all out. Let's let energy be determined by the free market without government intervention, without using the Tax Code.

I am pleased that perhaps the President has heard some of us. As we have said, the President keeps talking about Warren Buffett paying a lower tax rate than his secretary, but he has never offered any solutions to fix that, as some of us here have. What would be the best solution? Well, bring down the secretary's income tax rate to the capital gains rate that Warren Buffett is paying. That is how you do it.

I just love Arthur Laffer, Ronald Reagan's former economic adviser, such a brilliant guy. He explained to a group of us a few years ago here—and I am paraphrasing Arthur—he said: I hear people talking about we are going to tax the rich. The rich, he says, are the ones you are not going to tax.

Now, if you say we are going to tax this activity of the rich, they will change the activity. They can do that because they are ultrarich. If you say we are going to tax you in this location, this State, this city, this country, they are ultrarich; they can move. That is what rich people do.

So if one State where Secretary Kerry has his yacht has a really high tax, well, what is he going to do? He is going to do what he has done. He is going to move the yacht to a State that has a lower tax. That is what rich people do. So you may say: I am going to go after the rich and tax them, really put it to them, and then spread that wealth.

The ultrarich are the ones you are not going to tax. They will move. The rest of us, we can't just say: You know what? I am going to go be a lawyer in another country, another place.

You can't just do that. You have got to go through all kinds of training. You just can't do that. You can't go be a Member of Congress somewhere else. You can't just pick up your job and take it when you are middle class or you are poor.

So what happens when somebody says we are going to increase taxes on the rich, well, they move. They change their activity. They avoid the tax because they can do that. That is why Warren Buffett can say he is not worried about the inheritance tax. He takes actions to make sure he is not going to get hit with it. The poor can't do that. Of course, you have to have over a minimum amount now, so the poor don't get hit with it, but the middle class does.

My great-aunt was middle class through and through—as they say, land rich, cash poor. Land prices dropped within 6 months of her death. The IRS took every acre of her 2,500-acre farm. Every acre. They sold her home at an auction because land prices dropped.

The FDIC had dumped land around there. Prices dropped. Under the inheritance tax, it is the value of that land at the time of the death. They took every acre, took the home place. The people she had specified in her will that would get specific things didn't get them. The IRS got them.

That is why I went when the call went out to family members to please show up and buy whatever you can so that we can keep it in the family. Yes, that lady was middle class. She lived middle class. I had been to her home numerous times. You wouldn't find anything that you would say was even upper middle class. They took every acre of her land, her home for taxes.

But if you are ultrarich, you don't run into that situation. You buy insurance policies. You convert the way you get income. You move cash here, there, to other countries. You can do that. But not when you are middle class.

So the policies of this President have caused, for the first time in American history, 95 percent of America's income to go to the top 1 percent.

□ 1445

The President admitted it a couple years ago, yeah, he was aware that happened. Well, how about working with the rest of us who have some good ideas that would increase the number of middle class, moving people up from poor; increase the people moving from lower middle class up to upper middle class; and moving people from middle class to wealthy? We want that. That is what we hope for. We don't want to bring down people from where they have done well, even if they are one of the few that were born on third base and have gone through life thinking they hit a triple. We want everybody to do well. And if you get jealous of them, your life is going to be ruined.

I loved the quotes from Martin Luther King, so many of them brought out in the movie "Selma": If you get eaten up with anger, revenge—and in the cases around here—jealousy, you are the one that is going to be miserable. Let's encourage people to get wealthy not by taking from the wealthy and bringing people down. Let's have a flat tax: if you make more, then you are going to pay more; if you make less, then you are going to pay less.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that in 40 years over 57 million babies have been killed here in America. As a father who held a premature daughter in my hand and had her grasp the end of my finger with her tiny little hand, it wrenches my heart to think there are people that will want to kill a baby girl of that same age. Let's stop. God bless the March for Life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THEODORE EMILE "BO" DOLLIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, before we left after this workweek, I wanted to make sure that I came to the floor and took the time to recognize the loss of a cultural icon in New Orleans and a family friend.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Theodore Emile "Bo" Dollis, the Big Chief of the Wild Magnolias Mardi Gras Indians and a cultural icon in New Orleans for decades. Bo Dollis died this week at the age of 71.

Though his family did not want him to join the Mardi Gras Indians as a child, Bo secretly sewed his own suit at his friend's home. He joined the Wild Magnolias as a Flag Boy and quickly rose in their ranks, becoming Big Chief in 1964, a position he held until his health no longer allowed it.

As Big Chief, just as his mentor, Big Chief Allison "Tootie" Montana, did, Bo encouraged the Indians to shun violence and instead hold prettiness contests when one group would meet another. Bo was also instrumental in bringing the music of the Mardi Gras Indians to an audience beyond New Orleans. With Bo Dollis on lead vocals, the Wild Magnolias recorded their first single in 1970 and their first album in 1974. Under Bo's leadership, the group toured all over the world, opened for Aretha Franklin, and played at Carnegie Hall. This week, the New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival announced that Bo Dollis would appear on the festival's official poster. Bo has received numerous honors and awards, including Offbeat Magazine's Lifetime Achievement Award and the National Endowment for the Arts' National Heritage Fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, Bo Dollis embodied the happiness, the passion, and love of music that define the culture of New Orleans. His soaring voice brought joy to countless listeners, and his colorful personality brightened every room he entered. The city of New Orleans will not be the same without Bo Dollis, but his legacy will live on in the lives of all that he inspired. And this Mardi Gras will not be the same without Big Chief "Bo" Dollis' presence there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, another legislative day has come to

an end, and sunset approaches fast in Washington, DC. And as I have so many years, I stand before you in this House with what I call a Sunset Memorial, because, you see, Mr. Speaker, before the sun sets today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children will be killed by abortion on demand in the land of the free and the home of the brave. That is more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country by a multitude of thousands. And it happens every day.

It has now been 42 years since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 56 million of its own unborn children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common, Mr. Speaker. First, they were just little babies who had never done anything wrong to anyone. Each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never quite be the same. All the gifts that these children might have brought for humanity and to humanity are now lost forever.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to this blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself over and over again, and our silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims—those yet unborn.

We should remember the quotes of President Abraham Lincoln when he said:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God, cannot long retain it.

Mr. Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers when he said:

Their enlightened belief was that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows.

He reminded those he called posterity—and that is us, Mr. Speaker:

When in the distant future some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that their posterity—again, Mr. Speaker, that is us—might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began.

Mr. Speaker, when authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report:

Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. Now, he didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." And the way he ensured fetal

demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it snipping. Over the years there were hundreds of snippings.

Mr. Speaker, Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise. She said: "It sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, is this who we really are?

Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent, pain-capable children like the one I just described. Yet if he had killed them only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in many of the United States of America, including here in the District of Columbia.

If there is one thing we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly. He is just the visible face of this lucrative enterprise of murdering pain-capable unborn children in America. Mr. Speaker, more than 18,000 very late-term abortions are occurring in America every year, placing the mothers at exponentially greater risk and subjecting their pain-capable unborn babies to torture and death without anesthesia. It is the worst atrocity in America today, and this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Throughout history there has often been great intensity surrounding the debates of protecting the innocent lives of those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves obscured in the shadows of humanity. It encourages me greatly that in nearly all of those cases the collective conscience was finally moved in favor of the victims.

The same thing is beginning to happen in this debate related to innocent, unborn children, Mr. Speaker, especially those that are pain capable. We are beginning to ask ourselves the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child? We are especially asking the question recently: Does very late-term abortion torture and take the life of a pain-capable baby? And we are finally beginning to realize as human beings that it does.

Ultrasound technology now demonstrates to all reasonable observers both the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what is being done to them. And we are beginning to realize as Americans that taking brutally the lives of the innocent unborn does not liberate anyone and that 56 million children, Mr. Speaker, is enough.

Ironically I have heard Barack Obama speak such poignant words that, whether he knows it or not, apply so profoundly to the tragedy of abortion on demand in America. Let me quote excerpted portions of his comments. He said:

This is our first task—caring for our children. It is our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That is how, as a society, we will be judged.

He went on to say:

And by that measure, can we truly say, as a nation, that we are meeting our obligations? Can we honestly say that we are doing enough to keep our children—all of them—safe from harm? Can we say that we are truly doing enough to give all the children of this country the chance they deserve to live out their lives with happiness and purpose?

The President went on to say:

I have been reflecting on this the last few days, and if we are honest with ourselves, the answer is no. We are not doing enough. And we will have to change.

Oh, how true the President's words are, Mr. Speaker.

The President also said:

We can't tolerate this anymore. These tragedies must end. And to end them, we must change.

And then the President asked:

Are we really prepared to say that we are powerless in the face of such carnage, that the politics are too hard? Are we prepared to say that such violence visited on our children year after year after year is somehow the price of freedom?

Mr. Speaker, is this not the most relevant of questions we should all be asking in the midst of this genocidal murder of thousands of unborn babies in America every day?

□ 1500

The President has said: "Our journey is not complete until all our children" . . . are "cared for and cherished and always safe from harm."

Finally, he said: "That is our generation's task—to make these words, these rights, these values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness real for every American."

Mr. Speaker, never have I so deeply agreed with any words ever spoken by President Barack Obama as those I have just quoted, and yet this President in the most merciless distortion of logic and reason and humanity itself refuses to apply these majestic words to helpless unborn babies.

Oh, how I wish somehow that Mr. Obama and all of us could open our hearts and our ears to his words and ask ourselves in the core of our own soul why his words that should apply to all children cannot apply to the most helpless of all children.

Mr. Speaker, we honor Abraham Lincoln most because he found the courage as President of the United States in the days of slavery, and he found the humanity within himself to recognize the image of God stamped on the soul of slaves that the Supreme Court said were not human and that the tide of public opinion didn't recognize as protectable under the law.

Could it still be that President Barack Obama might consider that perspective as well as his own legacy, and even eternity itself, and recognize

that those little unborn children look so desperately to him now for help?

Could it be that the President might finally remember that on the pages of the Bible on which he laid his hands were the words written in red: "Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, you have done it unto Me"?

Whether he does or not, it is time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said:

The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.

The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says:

No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without the due process of law.

The 14th Amendment tells us that we should have equal protection of the laws for all. Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of all Americans and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, the rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is truly who we are.

Yet today another day has passed. As so many sunset memorials that I have given, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent, unborn babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this sunset memorial in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard it will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that it is time we stood up together again and looked up to the Declaration of Independence, and that we remember that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust, and we are still the courageous and compassionate Nation that can find a better way for mothers and their unborn children than abortion on demand.

It is still not too late for us to make a better world and for America to be the one that leads the rest of the planet, just as we did in the days of slavery, from this tragic genocide of murdering nearly 4,000 of our own children every day.

So now, Mr. Speaker, as we consider the thousands, the hundreds of thousands out on The Mall marching to protect these little babies, as we consider the plight of the unborn for 42 years under *Roe v. Wade*, maybe we can each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are all numbered and that we, too, each one, shall walk from these Chambers one day for the very last time.

If it should be that Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries, when we finally hear the cries of innocent, unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity and the constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny little American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 42 years to the day since *Roe v. Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children—this, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT OFFICE MANAGER, THE HONORABLE CHAKA FATTAH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Dolores Ridley, District Office Manager, the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for grand jury testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DOLORES RIDLEY,
District Office Manager.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. AMASH, Michigan
Mr. PAULSEN, Minnesota
Mr. HANNA, New York
Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Arizona
Mr. GROTHMAN, Wisconsin

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House rule XI, I am submitting the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 114th Congress. The rules were adopted earlier today during our Committee's organizational meeting.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

(a) Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

MEETINGS

RULE 2—REGULAR MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session, if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c) and paragraph (g)(3) of clause 2 of rule XI of House Rules.

(b) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

(c) The Chair shall give written notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 3—ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The Chair may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of House Rules.

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chair shall provide public electronic notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

RULE 4—OPEN BUSINESS MEETINGS

(a) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the Ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(b) Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI of the House Rules.

(c) No person, other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(d) Not later than 24 hours after commencing a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the Chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such measure or matter and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 5—QUORUMS

(a) A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

RULE 6—RECOGNITION

Any member, when recognized by the Chair, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

RULE 7—CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chair or by a majority vote of the Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 8—AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all Committee members at least 24 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for Committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chair and Ranking Minority Member.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 9—PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget

incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

RULE 10—ROLL CALL VOTES

(a) A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

(b) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a quorum is present for such purpose.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(d) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI of the House Rules, a record of the vote of each Committee member on each recorded vote shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote, and, with respect to any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

HEARINGS

RULE 11—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Such announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 12—OPEN HEARINGS

(a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of House Rules, the task forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

RULE 13—QUORUMS

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 14—QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the 5-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to clause 2(j) of rule XI of the House Rules.

(b) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the Committee members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, the Committee members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

(c) In recognizing Committee members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the Chair and Ranking Minority Member may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or may designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes.

RULE 15—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(a) In accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House Rules, subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee or by the Chair (pursuant to such rules and limitations as the Committee may prescribe) may be issued over the signature of the Chair or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(b) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

RULE 16—WITNESSES' STATEMENTS

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(c) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

RULE 17—COMMITTEE PRINTS

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

RULE 18—COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

(a) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

RULE 19—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to Committee business, and shall be selected

without regard to race, creed, gender, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraphs a, b, and c, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

RULE 20—STAFF SUPERVISION

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule X, clause 9(c)) and job titles, and, at his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

RULE 21—PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(c) Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chair may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

RULE 22—ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) The Chair shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with clause 2(e) of rule XI of the House Rules).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe, and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(b) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in

accordance with rule VII of the House Rules. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

OVERSIGHT

RULE 23—GENERAL OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(d) of rule X of the House Rules, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X of the House Rules, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of rule X of the House Rules.

REPORTS

RULE 24—AVAILABILITY BEFORE FILING

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the Committee shall be available to all Committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or by a majority vote of the Committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chair or with a majority vote by the Committee.

RULE 25—REPORT ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The report of the Committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

RULE 26—PARLIAMENTARIAN'S STATUS REPORT AND SECTION 302 STATUS REPORT

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Par-

liamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of Committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate Committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

RULE 27—ACTIVITY REPORT

(a) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, the chair of the Committee may file any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the House Rules without the approval of the Committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(b) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee; a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made; a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and a delineation of any hearings held.

MISCELLANEOUS

RULE 28—BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in clause 4 of rule XI of the House Rules.

(b) Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with clause 4 of rule XI of the House Rules.

RULE 29—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chair subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee.

(b) The Chair shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

RULE 30—WAIVERS

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chair may, if practical, consult with the Committee members on whether the Chair should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points

of order during the consideration of such measure.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule XI clause 2, I am submitting the Ways and Means Committee rules for the 114th Congress. The rules were adopted during our Committee's organizational meeting, which was held January 21, 2015.

A. GENERAL

RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Ways and Means and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of high privilege in the Committee.

Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

The provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2. MEETING DATE AND QUORUMS

The regular meeting day of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be on the second Wednesday of each month while the House is in session. However, the Committee shall not meet on the regularly scheduled meeting day if there is no business to be considered.

A majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for business; provided however, that two Members shall constitute a quorum at any regularly scheduled hearing called for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence. In establishing a quorum for purposes of a public hearing, every effort shall be made to secure the presence of at least one Member each from the majority and the minority.

The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet pursuant to the call of the Chair.

RULE 3. COMMITTEE BUDGET

For each Congress, the Chairman, in consultation with the Majority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. After consultation with the Minority Members, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted by Minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision.

RULE 4. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS

Any Committee or Subcommittee print, document, or similar material prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the Committee or Subcommittee prior to distribution and opportunity afforded for the inclusion of supplemental, minority or additional views, or such document shall prominently display near the top of its cover the

following: “Majority [or Minority] Staff Report,” as appropriate.

The requirements of this rule shall apply only to the publication of policy-oriented, analytical documents, and not to the publication of public hearings, legislative documents, documents which are administrative in nature or reports which are required to be submitted to the Committee under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the Minority.

RULE 5. OFFICIAL TRAVEL

Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff. Official travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full Committee for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee, its Subcommittees, or any other Committee or Subcommittee of the Congress on matters relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee, and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the official travel;
- (2) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and
- (4) The names of the Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the full Committee Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated above.

Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the full Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

RULE 6. AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE RECORDS AND PUBLICATIONS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of Rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE 7. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members and other members of the House.

B. SUBCOMMITTEES

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE RATIOS AND JURISDICTION

All matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means involving revenue measures, except those revenue measures referred to Subcommittees under paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6 shall be considered by the full Committee and not in Subcommittee. There shall be six standing Subcommittees as follows: a Subcommittee on Trade; a Subcommittee on Oversight; a Subcommittee on Health; a Subcommittee on Social Security; a Subcommittee on Human Resources; and a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures. The ratio of Republicans to Democrats on any Subcommittee of the Committee shall be consistent with the ratio of Republicans to Democrats on the full Committee.

1. The Subcommittee on Trade shall consist of 16 Members, 10 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Trade shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to customs and customs administration including tariff and import fee structure, classification, valuation of and special rules applying to imports, and special tariff provisions and procedures which relate to customs operation affecting exports and imports; import trade matters, including import impact, industry relief from injurious imports, adjustment assistance and programs to encourage competitive responses to imports, unfair import practices including antidumping and countervailing duty provisions, and import policy which relates to dependence on foreign sources of supply; commodity agreements and reciprocal trade agreements involving multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and implementation of agreements involving tariff and non-tariff trade barriers to and distortions of international trade; international rules, organizations and institutional aspects of international trade agreements; budget authorizations for the customs revenue functions of the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Trade Representative; and special trade-related problems involving market access, competitive conditions of specific industries, export policy and promotion, access to materials in short supply, bilateral trade relations including trade with developing countries, operations of multinational corporations, and trade with non-market economies.

2. The Subcommittee on Oversight shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall include all matters within the scope of the full Committee's jurisdiction but shall be limited to existing law. Said oversight jurisdiction shall not be exclusive but shall be concurrent with that of the other Subcommittees. With respect to matters involving the Internal Revenue Code

and other revenue issues, said concurrent jurisdiction shall be shared with the full Committee. Before undertaking any investigation or hearing, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall confer with the Chairman of the full Committee and the Chairman of any other Subcommittee having jurisdiction.

3. The Subcommittee on Health shall consist of 16 Members, 10 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to programs providing payments (from any source) for health care, health delivery systems, or health research. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters that relate to the health care programs of the Social Security Act (including titles V, XI (Part B), XVIII, and XIX thereof) and, concurrent with the full Committee, tax credit and deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with health insurance premiums and health care costs.

4. The Subcommittee on Social Security shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System, the Railroad Retirement System, and employment taxes and trust fund operations relating to those systems. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters involving title II of the Social Security Act and Chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (the Railroad Retirement Tax Act), as well as provisions in title VII and title XI of the Act relating to procedure and administration involving the Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System.

5. The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act, including temporary assistance for needy families, child care, child and family services, child support, foster care, adoption, supplemental security income, social services, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps, and low-income energy assistance. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters relating to titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX and related provisions of titles VII and XI of the Social Security Act.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation, and the financing thereof, including the programs for extended and emergency benefits. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include all bills and matters pertaining to the programs of unemployment compensation under titles III, IX and XII of the Social Security Act, Chapters 23 and 23A of the Internal Revenue Code, and the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, and provisions relating thereto.

6. The Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of those revenue measures that, from time to time, shall be referred to it specifically by the Chairman of the full Committee.

RULE 9. EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may sit as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees. They may be counted for purposes of assisting in the establishment of a quorum for a Subcommittee. However, their absence shall not count against the establishment of a quorum by the regular Members of the Subcommittee. Ex-officio Members shall neither vote in the Subcommittee nor be taken into consideration for the purposes of determining the ratio of the Subcommittee.

RULE 10. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Insofar as practicable, meetings of the full Committee and its Subcommittees shall not conflict. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view towards avoiding, wherever possible, simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 11. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Except for bills or measures retained by the Chairman of the full Committee for full Committee consideration, every bill or other measure referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate Subcommittee in a timely manner. A Subcommittee shall, within three legislative days of the referral, acknowledge same to the full Committee.

After a measure has been pending in a Subcommittee for a reasonable period of time, the Chairman of the full Committee may make a request in writing to the Subcommittee that the Subcommittee forthwith report the measure to the full Committee with its recommendations. If within seven legislative days after the Chairman's written request, the Subcommittee has not so reported the measure, then there shall be in order in the full Committee a motion to discharge the Subcommittee from further consideration of the measure. If such motion is approved by a majority vote of the full Committee, the measure may thereafter be considered only by the full Committee.

No measure reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been presented to all Members of the full Committee at least two legislative days prior to the full Committee's meeting, together with a comparison with present law, a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, a section-by-section justification, and a draft statement of the budget effects of the measure that is consistent with the requirements for reported measures under clause 3(d)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman of the full Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those Committee Members as the Chairman may designate. In making recommendations of Minority Members as con-

ferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

C. HEARINGS

RULE 13. WITNESSES

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited time available to question hearing witnesses, a witness who is scheduled to appear before the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of their proposed testimony. In addition, all witnesses shall comply with formatting requirements as specified by the Committee and the Rules of the House. Failure to comply with the 48-hour rule may result in a witness being denied the opportunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a witness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. In addition to the requirements of clause 2(g)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House regarding information required of public witnesses, a witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of their position and shall provide sufficient copies of their written statement to the Clerk for distribution to Members, staff and news media.

A witness appearing at a public hearing, or submitting a statement for the record of a public hearing, or submitting written comments in response to a published request for comments by the Committee must include in their statement or submission, a list of all clients, persons or organizations on whose behalf the witness appears. Oral testimony and statements for the record, or written comments in response to a request for comments by the Committee, will be accepted only from citizens of the United States or corporations or associations organized under the laws of one of the 50 States of the United States or the District of Columbia, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the full Committee or Subcommittee involved. Written statements from non-citizens may be considered for acceptance in the record if transmitted to the Committee in writing by Members of Congress.

RULE 14. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

Committee Members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. All Members shall be limited to five minutes on the initial round of questioning. In questioning witnesses under the five minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized first, after which Members who are in attendance at the beginning of a hearing will be recognized in the order of their seniority on the Committee. Other Members shall be recognized in the order of their appearance at the hearing. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members and the number of Majority and Minority Members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage Members of the majority.

RULE 15. SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 16. RECORDS OF HEARINGS

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at a public hear-

ing. The staff shall transmit to a witness the transcript of his or her testimony for correction and immediate return to the Committee offices. Only changes in the interest of clarity, accuracy and corrections in transcribing errors will be permitted. Changes that substantially alter the actual testimony will not be permitted. Members shall have the opportunity to correct their own remarks before publication. The Chairman of the full Committee may order the printing of a hearing without the corrections of a witness or Member if he determines that a reasonable time has been afforded to make corrections and that further delay would impede the consideration of the legislation or other measure that is the subject of the hearing.

RULE 17. BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

The provisions of clause 4(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are specifically made a part of these rules by reference. In addition, the following policy shall apply to media coverage of any meeting of the full Committee or a Subcommittee:

(1) An appropriate area of the Committee's hearing room will be designated for members of the media and their equipment.

(2) No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

(3) Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through an appropriate designee.

(4) Still photography during a Committee meeting will not be permitted to disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee Members or witnesses.

(5) Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

D. MARKUPS

RULE 18. PREVIOUS QUESTION

The Chairman shall not recognize a Member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the Member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

RULE 19. POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment.

The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. In exercising postponement authority the Chairman shall take reasonable steps to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 20. MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE 21. OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTS OF MARKUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEE MEETINGS

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other official meetings of the full Committee and the Subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as "uncorrected," shall

be available for inspection by the public (except for meetings closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House), by Members of the House, or by Members of the Committee together with their staffs, during normal business hours in the full Committee or Subcommittee office under such controls as the Chairman of the full Committee deems necessary. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or Subcommittee office.

If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or Subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup, such transcript may be released upon the signature and to the custody of an appropriate committee staff person. Such transcript shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting session.

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or distributed to the public in any way except by a majority vote of the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, Members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule shall likewise be observed.

RULE 22. PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a Subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each Member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each Member of the Committee.

E. STAFF

RULE 23. SUPERVISION OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 9 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning Committee expenses and staff.

Pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the full Committee, from the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions, shall ensure that each Subcommittee receives sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

'I AB do solemnly swear (or Affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

Has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

- 1 Bradley Byrne
- 2 Martha Roby
- 3 Mike Rogers
- 4 Robert B. Aderholt
- 5 Mo Brooks
- 6 Gary J. Palmer
- 7 Terri A. Sewell

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

ARIZONA

- 1 Ann Kirkpatrick
- 2 Martha McSally
- 3 Raúl M. Grijalva
- 4 Paul A. Gosar
- 5 Matt Salmon
- 6 David Schweikert
- 7 Ruben Gallego
- 8 Trent Franks
- 9 Kyrsten Sinema

ARKANSAS

- 1 Eric A. "Rick" Crawford
- 2 J. French Hill
- 3 Steve Womack
- 4 Bruce Westerman

CALIFORNIA

- 1 Doug LaMalfa
- 2 Jared Huffman
- 3 John Garamendi
- 4 Tom McClintock
- 5 Mike Thompson
- 6 Doris O. Matsui
- 7 Ami Bera
- 8 Paul Cook
- 9 Jerry McNerney
- 10 Jeff Denham
- 11 Mark DeSaulnier
- 12 Nancy Pelosi
- 13 Barbara Lee
- 14 Jackie Speier
- 15 Eric Swalwell
- 16 Jim Costa
- 17 Michael M. Honda
- 18 Anna G. Eshoo
- 19 Zoe Lofgren
- 20 Sam Farr
- 21 David G. Valadao
- 22 Devin Nunes

- 23 Kevin McCarthy
- 24 Lois Capps
- 25 Stephen Knight
- 26 Julia Brownley
- 27 Judy Chu
- 28 Adam B. Schiff
- 29 Tony Cardenas
- 30 Brad Sherman
- 31 Pete Aguilar
- 32 Grace F. Napolitano
- 33 Ted Lieu
- 34 Xavier Becerra
- 35 Norma J. Torres
- 36 Raul Ruiz
- 37 Karen Bass
- 38 Linda T. Sánchez
- 39 Edward R. Royce
- 40 Lucille Roybal-Allard
- 41 Mark Takano
- 42 Ken Calvert
- 43 Maxine Waters
- 44 Janice Hahn
- 45 Mimi Walters
- 46 Loretta Sanchez
- 47 Alan S. Lowenthal
- 48 Dana Rohrabacher
- 49 Darrell E. Issa
- 50 Duncan Hunter
- 51 Juan Vargas
- 52 Scott H. Peters
- 53 Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

- 1 Diana DeGette
- 2 Jared Polis
- 3 Scott R. Tipton
- 4 Ken Buck
- 5 Doug Lamborn
- 6 Mike Coffman
- 7 Ed Perlmutter

CONNECTICUT

- 1 John B. Larson
- 2 Joe Courtney
- 3 Rosa L. DeLauro
- 4 James A. Himes
- 5 Elizabeth H. Esty

DELAWARE

At Large, John C. Carney, Jr.

FLORIDA

- 1 Jeff Miller
- 2 Gwen Graham
- 3 Ted S. Yoho
- 4 Ander Crenshaw
- 5 Corrine Brown
- 6 Ron DeSantis
- 7 John L. Mica
- 8 Bill Posey
- 9 Alan Grayson
- 10 Daniel Webster
- 11 Richard B. Nugent
- 12 Gus M. Bilirakis
- 13 David W. Jolly
- 14 Kathy Castor
- 15 Dennis A. Ross
- 16 Vern Buchanan
- 17 Thomas J. Rooney
- 18 Patrick Murphy
- 19 Curt Clawson
- 20 Alcee L. Hastings
- 21 Theodore E. Deutch
- 22 Lois Frankel
- 23 Debbie Wasserman Schultz
- 24 Frederica S. Wilson
- 25 Mario Diaz-Balart
- 26 Carlos Curbelo
- 27 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen

GEORGIA

- 1 Earl L. "Buddy" Carter
- 2 Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
- 3 Lynn A. Westmoreland
- 4 Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.
- 5 John Lewis
- 6 Tom Price

7 Rob Woodall
8 Austin Scott
9 Doug Collins
10 Jody B. Hice
11 Barry Loudermilk
12 Rick W. Allen
13 David Scott
14 Tom Graves

HAWAII

1 Mark Takai
2 Tulsi Gabbard

IDAHO

1 Raúl R. Labrador
2 Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1 Bobby L. Rush
2 Robin L. Kelly
3 Daniel Lipinski
4 Luis V. Gutiérrez
5 Mike Quigley
6 Peter J. Roskam
7 Danny K. Davis
8 Tammy Duckworth
9 Janice D. Schakowsky
10 Robert J. Dold
11 Bill Foster
12 Mike Bost
13 Rodney Davis
14 Randy Hultgren
15 John Shimkus
16 Adam Kinzinger
17 Cheri Bustos
18 Aaron Schock

INDIANA

1 Peter J. Visclosky
2 Jackie Walorski
3 Marlin A. Stutzman
4 Todd Rokita
5 Susan W. Brooks
6 Luke Messer
7 André Carson
8 Larry Bucshon
9 Todd C. Young

IOWA

1 Rod Blum
2 David Loebsack
3 David Young
4 Steve King

KANSAS

1 Tim Huelskamp
2 Lynn Jenkins
3 Kevin Yoder
4 Mike Pompeo

KENTUCKY

1 Ed Whitfield
2 Brett Guthrie
3 John A. Yarmuth
4 Thomas Massie
5 Harold Rogers
6 Andy Barr

LOUISIANA

1 Steve Scalise
2 Cedric L. Richmond
3 Charles W. Boustany, Jr.
4 John Fleming
5 Ralph Lee Abraham
6 Garret Graves

MAINE

1 Chellie Pingree
2 Bruce Poliquin

MARYLAND

1 Andy Harris
2 C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger
3 John P. Sarbanes
4 Donna F. Edwards
5 Steny H. Hoyer
6 John K. Delaney
7 Elijah E. Cummings
8 Chris Van Hollen

MASSACHUSETTS

1 Richard E. Neal
2 James P. McGovern
3 Niki Tsongas
4 Joseph P. Kennedy, III
5 Katherine M. Clark
6 Seth Moulton
7 Michael E. Capuano
8 Stephen F. Lynch
9 William R. Keating

MICHIGAN

1 Dan Benishek
2 Bill Huizenga
3 Justin Amash
4 John R. Moolenaar
5 Daniel T. Kildee
6 Fred Upton
7 Tim Walberg
8 Mike Bishop
9 Sander M. Levin
10 Candice S. Miller
11 David A. Trott
12 Debbie Dingell
13 John Conyers, Jr.
14 Brenda L. Lawrence

MINNESOTA

1 Timothy J. Walz
2 John Kline
3 Erik Paulsen
4 Betty McCollum
5 Keith Ellison
6 Tom Emmer
7 Collin C. Peterson
8 Richard M. Nolan

MISSISSIPPI

1 Alan Nunnelee
2 Bennie G. Thompson
3 Gregg Harper
4 Steven M. Palazzo

MISSOURI

1 Wm. Lacy Clay
2 Ann Wagner
3 Blaine Luetkemeyer
4 Vicky Hartzler
5 Emanuel Cleaver
6 Sam Graves
7 Billy Long
8 Jason Smith

MONTANA

At Large, Ryan K. Zinke

NEBRASKA

1 Jeff Fortenberry
2 Brad Ashford
3 Adrian Smith

NEVADA

1 Dina Titus
2 Mark E. Amodei
3 Joseph J. Heck
4 Crescent Hardy

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1 Frank C. Guinta
2 Ann M. Kuster

NEW JERSEY

1 Donald Norcross
2 Frank A. LoBiondo
3 Thomas MacArthur
4 Christopher H. Smith
5 Scott Garrett
6 Frank Pallone, Jr.
7 Leonard Lance
8 Albio Sires
9 Bill Pascarella, Jr.
10 Donald M. Payne, Jr.
11 Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12 Bonnie Watson Coleman

NEW MEXICO

1 Michelle Lujan Grisham
2 Stevan Pearce
3 Ben Ray Lujan

NEW YORK

1 Lee M. Zeldin
2 Peter T. King
3 Steve Israel
4 Kathleen M. Rice
5 Gregory W. Meeks
6 Grace Meng
7 Nydia M. Velázquez
8 Hakeem S. Jeffries
9 Yvette D. Clarke
10 Jerrold Nadler
11 [VACANT]
12 Carolyn B. Maloney
13 Charles B. Rangel
14 Joseph Crowley
15 José E. Serrano
16 Eliot L. Engel
17 Nita M. Lowey
18 Sean Patrick Maloney
19 Christopher P. Gibson
20 Paul Tonko
21 Elise M. Stefanik
22 Richard L. Hanna
23 Tom Reed
24 John Katko
25 Louise McIntosh Slaughter
26 Brian Higgins
27 Chris Collins

NORTH CAROLINA

1 G. K. Butterfield
2 Renee L. Ellmers
3 Walter B. Jones
4 David E. Price
5 Virginia Foxx
6 Mark Walker
7 David Rouzer
8 Richard Hudson
9 Robert Pittenger
10 Patrick T. McHenry
11 Mark Meadows
12 Alma S. Adams
13 George Holding

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kevin Cramer

OHIO

1 Steve Chabot
2 Brad R. Wenstrup
3 Joyce Beatty
4 Jim Jordan
5 Robert E. Latta
6 Bill Johnson
7 Bob Gibbs
8 John A. Boehner
9 Marcy Kaptur
10 Michael R. Turner
11 Marcia L. Fudge
12 Patrick J. Tiberi
13 Tim Ryan
14 David P. Joyce
15 Steve Stivers
16 James B. Renacci

OKLAHOMA

1 Jim Bridenstine
2 Markwayne Mullin
3 Frank D. Lucas
4 Tom Cole
5 Steve Russell

OREGON

1 Suzanne Bonamici
2 Greg Walden
3 Earl Blumenauer
4 Peter A. DeFazio
5 Kurt Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA

1 Robert A. Brady
2 Chaka Fattah
3 Mike Kelly
4 Scott Perry
5 Glenn Thompson
6 Ryan A. Costello
7 Patrick Meehan

8 Michael G. Fitzpatrick
9 Bill Shuster
10 Tom Marino
11 Lou Barletta
12 Keith J. Rothfus
13 Brendan F. Boyle
14 Michael F. Doyle
15 Charles W. Dent
16 Joseph R. Pitts
17 Matt Cartwright
18 Tim Murphy

RHODE ISLAND

1 David N. Cicilline
2 James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1 Mark Sanford
2 Joe Wilson
3 Jeff Duncan
4 Trey Gowdy
5 Mick Mulvaney
6 James E. Clyburn
7 Tom Rice

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kristi L. Noem

TENNESSEE

1 David P. Roe
2 John J. Duncan, Jr.
3 Charles J. “Chuck” Fleischmann
4 Scott DesJarlais
5 Jim Cooper
6 Diane Black
7 Marsha Blackburn
8 Stephen Lee Fincher
9 Steve Cohen

TEXAS

1 Louie Gohmert
2 Ted Poe
3 Sam Johnson
4 John Ratcliffe
5 Jeb Hensarling
6 Joe Barton
7 John Abney Culberson
8 Kevin Brady
9 Al Green
10 Michael T. McCaul
11 K. Michael Conaway
12 Kay Granger
13 Mac Thornberry
14 Randy K. Weber, Sr.
15 Rubén Hinojosa
16 Beto O'Rourke
17 Bill Flores
18 Sheila Jackson Lee
19 Randy Neugebauer
20 Joaquin Castro
21 Lamar Smith
22 Pete Olson
23 Will Hurd
24 Kenny Marchant
25 Roger Williams
26 Michael C. Burgess
27 Blake Farenthold
28 Henry Cuellar
29 Gene Green
30 Eddie Bernice Johnson
31 John R. Carter
32 Pete Sessions
33 Marc A. Veasey
34 Filemon Vela
35 Lloyd Doggett
36 Brian Babin

UTAH

1 Rob Bishop
2 Chris Stewart
3 Jason Chaffetz
4 Mia B. Love

VERMONT

At Large, Peter Welch

VIRGINIA

1 Robert J. Wittman

2 E. Scott Rigell
3 Robert C. “Bobby” Scott
4 J. Randy Forbes
5 Robert Hurt
6 Bob Goodlatte
7 Dave Brat
8 Donald S. Beyer, Jr.
9 H. Morgan Griffith
10 Barbara Comstock
11 Gerald E. Connolly

WASHINGTON

1 Suzan K. DelBene
2 Rick Larsen
3 Jaime Herrera Beutler
4 Dan Newhouse
5 Cathy McMorris Rodgers
6 Derek Kilmer
7 Jim McDermott
8 David G. Reichert
9 Adam Smith
10 Denny Heck

WEST VIRGINIA

1 David B. McKinley
2 Alexander X. Mooney
3 Evan H. Jenkins

WISCONSIN

1 Paul Ryan
2 Mark Pocan
3 Ron Kind
4 Gwen Moore
5 F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.
6 Glenn Grothman
7 Sean P. Duffy
8 Reid J. Ribble

WYOMING

At Large, Cynthia M. Lummis

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner, Pedro R. Pierluisi

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Amata Coleman Radewagen

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

GUAM

Delegate, Madeleine Z. Bordallo

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Delegate, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate, Stacey E. Plaskett

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information.

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. “Buddy” Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy

Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. “Rick” Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. “Chuck” Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Rubén Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X.

Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trotter, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

100. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Youth Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 509(k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

101. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on

the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2094; to the Committee on Financial Services.

102. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to Public Law 105-261, section 1512; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

103. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on United States Participation in the United Nations in 2013, pursuant to Public Law 79-264, section 4(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the August 15, 2014 – October 14, 2014, reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

105. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Certification Related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

106. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

107. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), the Department's 2012 and 2013 Inventories of Inherently Governmental Activities and of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

108. A letter from the Vice President, Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

109. A letter from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's interim rule — Veterans' Preference (RIN: 3206-AM79) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

110. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Patent Term Adjustment in View of the Federal Circuit Decision in *Novartis v. Lee* [Docket No.: PTO-P-2014-0023] (RIN: 0651-AC96) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. A letter from the FMCSA Division Chief, Regulatory Development, Department

of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection, Repair, and Maintenance; Driver-Vehicle Inspection Report (DVIR) [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0336] (RIN: 2126-AB46) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

112. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule; correction — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0072; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-18017; AD 2014-23-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

113. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0981; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-18036; AD 2014-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

114. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0366; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-18038; AD 2014-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

115. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0771; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-18056; AD 2014-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

116. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0848; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18055; AD 2014-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

117. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0460; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-18054; AD 2014-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

118. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's immediately adopted final rule — Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Simferopol (UKFV) and Dnipropetrovsk (UKDV) Flight Information Regions (FIRs) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0225; Amdt. No.: 91-331A] (RIN: 2120-AK56) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

119. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat, PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with International Standards (RRR) [Docket Nos.: PHMSA-2013-0260 (HM-215M)] (RIN: 2137-AF05) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 463. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal education funding for elementary schools and secondary schools that provide on-campus access to abortion providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 464. A bill to authorize Members of Congress to bring an action for declaratory and injunctive relief in response to a written statement by the President or any other official in the executive branch directing officials of the executive branch to not enforce a provision of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROBY (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MICA, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BLUM, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HILL, Mr. PALMER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 465. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 466. A bill to prohibit the Central Intelligence Agency from using an unmanned aerial vehicle to carry out a weapons strike or other deliberately lethal action and to transfer the authority to conduct such strikes or lethal action to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the

Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 467. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 469. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 470. A bill to authorize the sale of certain National Forest System land in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 471. A bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 472. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 473. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 474. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a five-year extension to the homeless veterans reintegration programs and to provide clarification regard-

ing eligibility for services under such programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 475. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 476. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the process of approving courses of education pursued using educational benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 477. A bill to extend the authority to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion and his service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 478. A bill to prohibit the marketing of electronic cigarettes to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 479. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal defense contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for employer-provided employee housing assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit for hiring the long-term unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 482. A bill to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 483. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 484. A bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 485. A bill to ensure that the percentage increase in rates of basic pay for prevailing wage employees shall be equal to the percentage increase received by other Federal employees in the same pay locality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 486. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to ensure that on-duty time does not include waiting time at a natural gas or oil well site for certain commercial motor vehicle operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 487. A bill to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 488. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 489. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 490. A bill to provide for a strategic plan to reform and improve the security clearance and background investigation processes of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 491. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LATTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 492. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BUCHSHON, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 493. A bill to update avian protection laws in order to support an all-of-the-above domestic energy strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 494. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. MENG, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 495. A bill to strengthen student achievement and graduation rates and prepare young people for college, careers, and citizenship through innovative partnerships that meet the comprehensive needs of children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 496. A bill to establish the Alabama Hills National Scenic Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 497. A bill to require training for teachers in social and emotional learning programming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 498. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to jointly ensure that the Vet Centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs have access to the Defense Personnel Record Image Retrieval system and the Veterans Affairs/Department of Defense Identity Repository system; to the Committee on Veterans'

Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 500. A bill to establish the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to review Federal Government policy on human trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 501. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 502. A bill to establish a pilot program to improve the management and accountability within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to provide oversight of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 503. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 504. A bill to clarify that no express or implied warranty is provided by reason of a disclosure relating to voluntary participation in the Energy Star program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 505. A bill to establish a Hazardous Materials Information Advisory Committee to develop standards for the use of electronic shipping papers for the transportation of hazardous materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 507. A bill to allow Members of Congress to decline certain retirement benefits and contributions by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 508. A bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote, and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 510. A bill to establish a uniform and more efficient Federal process for protecting property owners' rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 511. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 512. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of DISARM antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce,

for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 513. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 514. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SIREs, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. YOH0):

H.R. 515. A bill to protect children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 516. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to save the American taxpayers money by immediately altering the metallic composition of the one-cent, five-cent, dime, and quarter dollar coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 517. A bill to establish a task force to evaluate the backlog of appeals to claims submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain emergency medical devices from the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MICA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of

Alaska, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. McCLIN-TOCK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual and employer health insurance mandates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 44. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to the Congress to cast votes in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. JOLLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 45. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution to include an analysis of whether the bill or joint resolution creates a program, office, or initiative that would duplicate or overlap with an existing program, office, or initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H. Res. 46. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the recent terrorist attacks in Nigeria that resulted in the deaths of over 2,000 innocent persons and offering condolences to those personally affected by this cowardly act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 47. A resolution supporting women's reproductive health care decisions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 2, Section 1, Clause 8

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section VIII, Clause 1, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States . . ." In addition, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 14 provides, "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Lastly, Article I, Section VIII, Clause 16 states "The Congress shall have Power To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 1.

Article. I.
Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution, and Section 1 of Article 3 of the Constitution to create and regulate Federal Courts.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. TAKAI:

H.R. 483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 4th and 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment V, Section 1—the "Due Process" clause protects any life from being taken without due process of law; this legislation provides unborn citizens a modicum of due process.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the rules and regulations for property owned by the United States pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

Authority to stay misapplied regulations from the executive Branch stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. (commerce clause)

“The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec 8, cl. 3 (commerce clause), & cl. 18 (necessary and proper clause); section 1 of the 14th Amendment (due process and equal protection clauses), and section 5 of the 14th Amendment (enforcement). In addition, Article 1, sec 8, & cl. 16.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 which states: “The Congress shall have the Power To . . . establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . .”

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US constitution gives Congress the authority “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of the Constitution as amended by the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. This section of the Constitution allows Congress to set their own compensation so long as new representatives have been elected.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

5th Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”; and

(c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.”

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18, as this bill better equips the Executive Branch to properly carry out the powers vested in it by the Constitution, as well as ensures that Congress is accurately informed of a foreign

nations’ trafficking record and tier ranking when Congress considers regulation of commerce with foreign nations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, as sex offenders are traveling in foreign commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—“To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures”

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, as the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the imposition of the burdensome mandate on hardworking American taxpayers is an action Congress may take under its power to tax, and that this bill seeks to repeal sections of title 26 U.S.C., the Internal Revenue Code.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 24: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 27: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 91: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 129: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 159: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 181: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 187: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 199: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 217: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 223: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 228: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 231: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 232: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 238: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 243: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 246: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 248: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 249: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 258: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 264: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 271: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 281: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 284: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 285: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 287: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 289: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 290: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 296: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 303: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 304: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 310: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 317: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 321: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 344: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 346: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 349: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 350: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 351: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 357: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 362: Mr. WELCH and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 363: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 366: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 373: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 399: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 402: Mr. LONG, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 416: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 420: Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 429: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 431: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VELA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 438: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 448: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 451: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 452: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 456: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BLUM.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. JONES and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.J. Res. 22: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HIMES.

H. Res. 11: Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 12: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. DEFazio.

H. Res. 21: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 24: Mr. FORBES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LONG, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 25: Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 28: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 32: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 35: Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 43: Mr. SERRANO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Ways and Means in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 7 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

SENATE—Thursday, January 22, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the leader's heart is in Your hand and You turn destinies as You desire. Give our lawmakers wisdom to labor so that justice will abound and the righteousness will flow like a mighty stream.

Lord, may our Senators develop a clear vision of the light that leads to truth. Enable them to make the differing approaches expressed by both parties contribute to better solutions to the world's problems. Infuse our legislators with a reverential awe that will empower them to be aware of Your presence and to accept and obey Your plans. Use them as extensions of Your power in our Nation and world.

And, Lord, please place Your healing hands on Senator HARRY REID.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour before resuming consideration of the Keystone bill. Senators should expect votes on pending amendments to the bill after lunch today. Votes are possible into the evening tonight as well as during tomorrow morning's session of the Senate. We need to make progress on this bill and all Members should expect a busy day.

REAL DEBATE IN THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate, as I indicated, will continue its work on the Keystone jobs bill today.

It is great to see a real debate on the floor of the Senate again. We saw some action in the Chamber yesterday and even some unpredictability. We saw how democracy in the Senate has looked many times in the past. It is great to see both sides able to offer amendments once more.

I know many of our Democratic friends have been ready to give more of a voice to their constituents too. I know they have been waiting for this moment for some time. The assistant Democratic leader said he welcomes our vision of the Senate where Members "bring amendments to the floor, debate them, vote on them, and ultimately pass legislation," and that is what we are doing.

Another Democratic colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, said he was "very excited" about the prospect of an open amendment process. He also noted that it gave Members of his party a valuable opportunity to pursue some of their own priorities through the legislative process.

The Senator makes an important point about the more open Senate we are working toward. A more open Senate presents more opportunities for legislators with serious ideas to make a mark on the legislative process. It can give Members of both parties a real stake in the ultimate outcome of the bill on the floor. And because it does, it represents one of our best avenues to secure passage of sensible legislation centered on jobs and the middle class. That is something we should all want.

So I hope Members in both parties will help us continue our efforts to make the Senate function better. That would be a good thing for our country. It would represent a change from the kind of Senate we have seen in recent years. And it would represent a positive step forward, not just for Congress but for the people we represent.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me join the majority leader in saying that I think we are in a healthy environment on the floor of the Senate where we are pursuing amendments and active debate, and it is great to see that happening. The only way that happens in the U.S. Senate is when the majority and the minority both work for it

to happen. The rules of the Senate are constructed, as we both know well, so that literally any one Senator can stop the process. But the good-will and good-faith efforts of Senators on both sides of the aisle have really brought us to a good moment here.

I wish to commend especially the leaders on the floor for this legislation, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska on the Republican side, and on our side Senator MARIA CANTWELL and Senator BARBARA BOXER. The two of them, in an extraordinary show of cooperation, have been able to work together to process amendments.

The fact is we voted on nine amendments so far on this Keystone Pipeline measure. We have eight amendments pending today. So there is a good-faith effort on both sides to call up these important amendments with fairness to both sides of the aisle. I want to see that continue.

I hope no one believes we are finished with eight amendments. We are not. There are other important amendments to be considered. Members have brought them to the attention of both sides, and I hope as quickly as we can that we will schedule them for consideration and a vote and move forward.

Yesterday, what was fascinating was the fact that we branched off from this conversation about the Keystone Pipeline itself and the jobs—35 permanent jobs—that will be created for this Canadian corporation and started talking about some underlying, critically important issues. We spent a great deal of time on the floor discussing the environmental impact not just of the pipeline but of the Canadian tar sands which will be brought by the pipeline, if it is approved, into the United States for processing.

It is interesting what we have learned so far during the course of this debate. When the Democrats insisted that this pipeline's product—the oil that is refined and used for consumption—be sold in the United States, the Republicans voted no. The Republicans voted no. I have a lengthy memo on my desk of all of the Republican Senators who have come to the floor insisting that the Keystone Pipeline was going to create more gasoline, more diesel fuel, and help the American economy. Yet, when Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts offered an amendment to say keep the products coming from the Keystone Pipeline in the United States, the Republicans, to a person, voted no.

Then Senator FRANKEN came forward and said, Well, let's agree that if this is about jobs in America that the Keystone Pipeline will use American steel.

That seems reasonable to me, and I voted for it. The Republicans voted no. They defeated the notion that we would use American steel to build this pipeline.

This pipeline is Senate Bill 1 for the Senate Republicans. It is their highest priority. One would think that if it truly is a jobs bill, they would want American steel to be used to build the pipeline; let our steel mills build this pipeline in the future, create the jobs in America, and they voted no.

Yesterday I offered an amendment as well. We know at the end of this pipeline, if tar sands reach the United States through this means or otherwise, it is a pretty nasty process taking the tar and sand out of the oil, and what is left over is a nasty product known as petcoke.

Petcoke is now being stored in three-story-high piles in the city of Chicago. I have seen it. And the city is trying to get to the point where it is at least contained and covered. Yet, the company that owns it, which incidentally is a company owned by the Koch brothers—what an irony—this company has resisted the idea of covering these petcoke piles, so this nasty black substance blows through the community in southeast Chicago. The city of Chicago is in a battle.

I tried to put in an effort yesterday so that we would establish standards for transportation and storage of petcoke, and the Republicans insisted it was a benign substance, it isn't hazardous, not dangerous, don't worry about it. If some of the Senators who voted against my amendment, tomorrow, God forbid, face this issue in their community, I think they will have a little different view of petcoke and what it can do to people, the impact it has on respiratory disease and asthma.

Yesterday I didn't prevail. But I can tell my colleagues how over the years, as I fought the tobacco companies and they insisted there was nothing dangerous about tobacco, I heard those arguments from industry just as we are hearing the petcoke arguments from the petcoke industry. Ultimately, good sense prevailed, public health prevailed, and we moved toward regulation of tobacco products. We should do the same—basic regulation—to protect the public from any negative impact on their health relative to petcoke.

The amendments continue today. Some of them are extraordinarily important. I hope we will continue to move toward the completion of this task in an orderly manner. I commend not only the leadership on the majority side, but I commend my colleagues too. We found over the past many years that the process of amendment would break down when one Republican Senator would stand up and say, I won't let any amendment be considered until my amendment is considered, No. 1. It even reached a point where Republican

Senators would say, I won't let any amendment be considered unless I am guaranteed my amendment will pass. Well, when people take unreasonable positions and threaten filibusters, we break down the amendment process.

We have tried, now being in the minority, to be more constructive, and we have reached that goal so far this week. I hope we continue to aspire to it and I hope we can wrap this bill up next week in an orderly manner.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks around the world—particularly in Paris—the American people know that terrorism, sadly, is a threat to us even to this day. We count on one department of government as much if not more than any other to protect us—the Department of Homeland Security.

This is the Department which monitors the terrorist threats to our country on a minute-by-minute basis. This is the agency that provides the inspectors at airports and in many other places to try to thwart terrorism before it strikes. It is a critically important part of our government—one of the most important departments.

That is why it is curious to me that House Republicans insisted that the budget—the regular budget for the Department of Homeland Security—be held up until the end of February. They need their Department budget. They need to invest it to keep America safe. Yet, the House Republicans said no. They gave a continuing resolution to the Department, which basically lets them operate on a day-to-day basis with no certainty for the future. That is no way to run an agency, particularly one that is supposed to keep America safe.

Then, last week, the U.S. House of Representatives took another step and really revealed what was behind this strategy. They added five negative riders to this Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Their riders are the subject of immigration. Of course, the Department of Homeland Security has a responsibility when it comes to immigration. These riders were onerous and they threatened the very passage of this important legislation, so much so that the President of the United States has issued a veto threat if the Republican riders from the U.S. House of Representatives are included in the bill when it passes the Senate.

The right thing to do, the smart thing to do, the thing to do to protect America is for us to pass the homeland security appropriation now so this agency has its money. We should remove the onerous and unfair riders that were attached by the House of Representatives. If we are to debate

the negative aspects of immigration, let's save it for another day and not put this Department of Homeland Security at risk and the safety of America at risk over this political effort by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

One aspect of the House measure, an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriation, I find particularly troublesome. It was 14 years ago when I introduced the DREAM Act. It is hard to imagine it has been that long. But the notion behind the DREAM Act was if a child is brought to America by a family and is undocumented in this country and that child grows up in America, completes high school, and has no serious criminal problems in their background, they ought to be given a chance to either enlist in our military, to go to college, to get on a path toward legalization. That is the DREAM Act.

Originally the DREAM Act had some Republican sponsorship, but over the years that support melted away. Yet, many Republicans have said from time to time: I think the DREAM Act is fair; we just haven't enacted it into law. Because of that, 2½ years ago many of us appealed to President Obama to protect these DREAMers, these young people. Many of them completed school and had nowhere to go. Being undocumented, they didn't qualify for a penny of assistance in going to college and, many times, if they completed college, they couldn't get a job because of their immigration status.

Back in 2012 President Obama created a program called DACA. The DACA Program said that if these DREAMers—these young people who might be eligible under the law I described—would come forward and register with the government and submit to a background check and pay a filing fee, they would be given temporary status to live in the United States without being deported, to go to school, to work.

We estimate that some 2 million young people could qualify for this program, and 600,000 have signed up—so far, 600,000. In the State of Illinois, 30,000 have signed up. They have come forward.

I have met some of these young people who have qualified under DACA. They are extraordinary young people. I went to Loyola Medical School in Chicago. At the medical school I believe there are 10, perhaps 12 students who are DACA-protected who are now going to medical school. There are two things to be said. First, they are extraordinary students. They had no chance to go to medical school before DACA, and now they do. They are well qualified to go to medical school. Secondly, they have only come to Loyola with the promise that after they receive their medical license, they will practice in underserved areas in Illinois and across

America, whether it is rural areas or inner city. They are prepared to dedicate their professional lives to serving people who otherwise might not have access to medical care.

That is just one example. Let me tell you about some others. I would like to update the Senate on two people whom I have come to the floor and talked about in the past—Carlos and Rafael Robles. They were brought to the United States when they were small children. They grew up in suburban Chicago in my home State of Illinois. They were both honor students at Palatine High School and Harper Community College.

In high school Carlos was the captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team. He volunteered for Palatine's physically challenged program, where every day he helped to feed lunch to special needs students. Carlos graduated from Harper Community College and went on to attend Loyola University in Chicago, majoring in education. This is what one of his teachers said about him:

Carlos is the kind of person we want among us because he wants to make the community better. This is the kind of person you want as a student, the kind of kid you want as a neighbor and friend to your child, and most germane to his present circumstance, the kind of person you want as an American.

After he received DACA protection—President Obama's Executive order—Carlos was able to work as a tennis coach at his high school and help pay his tuition.

After he graduated from Loyola with a major in education, Carlos worked as a teacher in a public high school in Chicago. I ran into him at a meeting last year, and he told me about his ambition to be a teacher. He is now attending graduate school at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan, where he is studying education policy. He is a bright and engaging young man who wants to make our schools more effective.

In high school, his brother Rafael was captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team and soccer team. He graduated from Harper Community College and now attends the University of Illinois, where he is majoring in architecture. One of Rafael's teachers said:

Rafael is the kind of person I have taught about in my Social Studies classes—the American who comes to this country and commits to his community and makes it better for others. Raffi Robles is a young man who makes us better. During my 28-year career as a high school teacher, coach, and administrator, I would place Raffi in the top 5 percent of all the kids with whom I have ever had contact.

Since receiving DACA, Rafael has been a full-time student while also working at Studio Gang Architects, an award-winning architectural firm in

Chicago. Rafael will graduate this spring with a 3.8 GPA.

In a letter to Congress, the Robles brothers shared their thoughts about efforts to overturn DACA. Here is what they said:

We ask you today to see it in your heart to do the right thing, to listen, and to reward the values of hard work and diligence, values that made America the most beautiful and prosperous country in the world and that we're sure got you, as members of Congress, to where you are today in life. These are values we have come to admire and respect in the American people. We will continue to uphold these values until the last days of our lives. We hope eventually as citizens of the United States we will become part of a country we now see as home.

These two individuals, Carlos and Rafael Robles—extraordinary DREAMers—were brought to this country as children by their parents, undocumented with no future in America, and look what they have done with their lives. One has dedicated his life to education and has overcome the odds and graduated from Loyola University without any government assistance. Because he is undocumented, he doesn't qualify. Now he is going for a master's degree, again at his own expense. His brother is pursuing a degree in architecture.

Do you know what House Republicans say? Deport the Robles brothers. That is what their amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations says. Deport these two young men. Send them out of this country despite the fact that they have worked so hard and succeeded in what they have set out to achieve.

The House Republicans want to deport the 600,000 just like them who have qualified under the President's DACA Program. And they have gone further—not a penny, they have said, for any additional young people to apply for the DACA Program. Two million young people, many of whom, like the Robles brothers, just want to make America a better place—the House Republicans say: Deport them. Further, they say: We won't pass the Department of Homeland Security appropriations to protect Americans from terrorism until you deport the Robles brothers and young people just like them.

What is wrong with this picture? Have the Members of the House of Representatives forgotten who we are as a nation? It is a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country. Her naturalization certificate is sitting right behind my desk upstairs. I am proud of it. She came to this country at the age of 2 from Lithuania and raised a family—a proud American citizen. Her son is honored to represent the State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate. That is my story. That is my family's story. That is America's story. That is the Robles' story.

Why do the House Republicans have such a vengeance against these young

men and women who through no fault of their own found themselves in America and made the best of it and only want to make this a better Nation? It drives the House Republicans into a rage to think that the Robles brothers might stay in the United States and make this a better country. I don't get it. I don't understand their thinking.

I really would encourage the House Republicans to meet some of the DREAMers and get to know them. When they do, the images which perhaps they have in their minds would be dispelled quickly.

We have a job ahead of us. The Senate needs to pass the Department of Homeland Security appropriations and the sooner, the better. God forbid we face another terrorist attack. Let's not let it happen with this important Department facing the restrictions they have been facing because of this Republican strategy. Let's give them a full appropriation and tell them to do their best every single day to keep us safe. Let's not embroil their work in a political debate about immigration, which is what the House Republicans insist on. Let's do something different here in the Senate. Let's pass a clean Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Take out the immigration riders. Save them for another day. Save them for amendments on another bill. Let's fund this Department, and let's get it done now. For the safety and security of this Nation, we need to come together on a bipartisan basis and put this political tactic by the House Republicans behind us.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, many have now heard the sad news that one of the giants of Kentucky politics passed away last night. Wendell Ford first came to the Senate in the 1970s, calling himself just "a dumb country boy with dirt between his toes." But over a distinguished two-decade career, this workhorse of the Senate would prove he was anything but.

I had the opportunity to watch my Senate colleague up close as he ascended to leadership in his party and established himself as a leader on issues of importance to my State. A proud Kentuckian who rose from page in the statehouse to Governor of the State, Ford shaped the history of the Commonwealth in ways few others had before him.

He never forgot the lessons about hard work he learned while milking cows or tending to chores on the family farm. This World War II veteran never backed down from a fight either.

We imagine he approached his final battle with the same spirit. Elaine and I, and I am certain I speak for the entire Senate, send our condolences to his wife Jean—Mrs. Ford, as Wendell often called her—and the rest of the Ford family at this difficult time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Senator ENZI was going to be here, so I am hoping his schedule will allow him to use his time this afternoon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday we had an interesting debate on climate change in the Senate, and there were three separate votes. The first one I and virtually all the Republicans supported, the Whitehouse amendment No. 29, said climate change is real and not a hoax.

This is true. Climate has always changed, and I think there is an effort by those on the other side who are trying to promote the big Obama program that would cost \$479 billion and not accomplish anything in terms of setting up a new bureaucracy of trying to say we are denying that climate changes.

As I said on the floor yesterday, climate has always changed. If we go

back and read history, look at archeological findings, and read the Scriptures, it has changed since the very beginning of time. We know it is real.

The hoax is that somehow there are people so arrogant who are going to go along with the President's program to say: Yes, if we spend enough money we, the human beings, can stop the climate from changing. I think people do understand that is not going to happen. So I am very happy we were able to get it out so it cannot be used in a way that would be deceptive to the public—because the climate has been changing since the beginning of time.

The hoax I have referred to since 2002 is that man is going to be in the position to change climate. That is not going to happen.

What is interesting is these votes could have taken place any time over the last year. I hope I am not divulging something someone else is going to use, but we are on pace now to have more amendments and votes on this one bill—a popular bill—than we had on amendments in the entire year last year.

We were very critical of the majority and the fact that we were not doing anything here. I would go home this last year and people would say: What did you accomplish?

Nothing. We didn't have any votes. We didn't do anything.

We had 15 votes on amendments in the entire year last year. By the end of today we will have that many votes on amendments just in 1 week. So it is very significant that we are actually getting things done.

Why did the Democrats not have a vote on the Keystone Pipeline or on climate? Because voters don't care or because people have lost interest in that. They have caught on. They know that, despite the money that has been put in this thing by Tom Steyer—we have already talked about that on this floor—that went into midterm elections, the proglobal warming votes would be seen negatively by voters.

This wasn't true back in the 1990s. At that time they had everyone scared that global warming was coming and the world was going to come to an end. There was polling by the Gallup polls, and that was the No. 1 and No. 2 concern in America. Environmental concerns are now No. 14 out of 15 in America.

So that is where it is. That is why Tom Steyer has spent, by his own admission, some \$70 million on the elections. He stated he was going to get involved in eight senatorial elections—and I say to the Presiding Officer, he knows which ones they would be—and they lost them all. But Tom Steyer is not out of money, and they are going to do what they can to try to resurrect this global warming as an issue.

So the Gallup polls—and not just the polls. The Pew Research Center said 53

percent of Americans either don't believe global warming exists or believe it is caused by natural variation. I don't have it here, but I do know there was a university that put together a poll of all of the television weather people and it came out to the same thing: It was 63 percent said either it doesn't exist or, if it does exist, it exists because of natural causes.

What do the American people care about? They are concerned about the deficit and they are concerned about jobs.

Yesterday on the floor we talked about the deficit. Under this President—not a believable figure but an accurate figure—he has increased the debt in America more than all Presidents in the history of America, from George Washington to George Bush.

So that is what people care about.

As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, one of my top priorities in this Congress is to conduct vigorous oversight of EPA regulations and getting into President Obama's excessive regulation regime through numerous hearings. We are going to have hearings on these regulations. We actually have dates set already to have hearings so people will understand what the cost is of these regulations.

The Presiding Officer is from a rural State, as I am. I am from Oklahoma. When I talk to farmers—in fact, Tom Buchanan, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, said I can use his quote: Our farmers in Oklahoma—and I suggest all throughout America—are more concerned about the EPA regulations than they are all the other problems that are out there or anything that you will see in the Farm Bill.

He talks about the endangered species, that they can't plow their fields anymore in certain places because there might be some kind of a bug down there. He talks about containment of fuel on their farms. He talks about the water of the United States. That bill is probably the No. 1 concern of farmers.

The western part of my State is arid. I was out in Boise City, in the panhandle, and it is one of the most arid parts of the United States. It could actually be declared a wetland if we were to pass this and allow the Federal Government to replace the States and come in and regulate water on the land.

These are the things they are concerned about.

We should look closely at this, and this is quite a breakthrough. Our friends in Australia already tried regulating their emissions. I think we all know the IPCC is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and that bureaucracy is supposedly the scientific community. Yet we find out now—and I talked about this yesterday. All the scientists were not believers in this, but a lot did believe and

Australia did believe. So they joined in a Kyoto-type treaty and started stopping their emissions. They imposed a carbon tax on the economy a few years ago, and it caused horrendous damage—\$9 billion in lost economic activity per year, and destroyed tens of thousands of jobs. It was so bad that their government recently voted to repeal the carbon tax they imposed just a couple years ago, and their economy is now better for it. In fact, it was announced just following the repeal that Australia experienced record job growth of 120,000 jobs—far more than the 10,000 to 15,000 jobs economists had expected.

We also looked closely at this because scientists are having a difficult time explaining the 15-year hiatus we have seen in temperature increases. This isn't me. The IPCC agrees with this, *Nature* magazine agrees with this, the *Economist* magazine agrees. They are reputable publications.

Reviewing the science is one thing they have to do in the EPW Committee, the committee I chair, because it is on this disputed science the EPA is building its significant greenhouse gas regulation package scheduled for this summer, which all together would be the costliest regulation in history. The component regulating CO₂ emissions from existing sources is the cause of a great concern in particular.

We heard in the President's message on Tuesday night that as proposed right now, the EPA's regulation will raise energy prices, destroy jobs, and impose billions of dollars in costs on the U.S. economy without achieving any kind of an effect.

It is interesting, and I have quoted her many times. The first EPA Administrator appointed by Barack Obama was Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson came before our committee many times. I always appreciated her because she would get a message from the White House and come and repeat it in our committee.

I asked her a question: If we were to pass any of these regulations or the legislation to have cap and trade in America—which is what the President proposed on Tuesday night—would this have the effect of reducing CO₂ emissions worldwide.

Her answer, live on TV, in our meeting was, no, it wouldn't because this isn't where the problem is. The problem is in China, the problem is in India, the problem is in Mexico.

So what we do in the United States isn't going to affect what they do. In fact, the opposite is true. Because if we control emissions to the point where our manufacturing base runs out of energy in America, where do they go? They go to places such as China. China is sitting back hoping we pass something so they can benefit from our lost jobs in America.

The Wall Street Journal on June 3 called the proposal that the President

suggested on Tuesday “a huge indirect tax and wealth redistribution scheme that the EPA is imposing by fiat [that] will profoundly touch every American.”

Further quoting the Wall Street Journal: “It is impossible to raise the price of carbon energy without also raising costs across the economy.”

This is clearly worthy of intense congressional oversight, and that is what we intend to do. EPA has gone beyond the plain reading of the Clean Air Act in an attempt to grossly expand its authority. It is forcing States to achieve dubious emission reduction targets from a limited menu of economically damaging and legally questionable options.

One of the foremost authorities in America is Richard Lindzen of MIT. Richard Lindzen some time ago made the statement, “Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream.”

That is what they want to do, try to control carbon emissions.

Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.

The scientific community has been divided on this. We are in a position to try to make sure this doesn't happen to America, and so we are going to be very busy on that.

I wish to also mention we have seen Europe go down the road of imposing these mandates—the cap and trade and regimes they are proposing for America and in the green energy subsidies—and we have seen where that has gotten them. Electricity prices are up to 2½ times higher than those in the United States. In Germany, in 2012, CO₂ emissions actually rose by 1.3 percent over the 2011 levels, while the U.S. emissions fell by 3.9 percent—and they were imposing these new restrictions, we were not.

As a matter of fact, things got so bad in Germany that they backed off of their disastrous renewable fuels program and now plan to build 10 new coal-fired powerplants in Germany.

Make sure we heard that, 10 new coal-fired powerplants. This is what they are trying to do away with altogether in America—as if we could run the “machine” called America without fossil fuels and without nuclear. We can't do it.

A look closer to home: California has adopted similar carbon reduction policies, and its cap-and-trade scheme alone will increase electricity rates by 8 percent, according to the California Public Utilities Commission.

That is in California today. If we pass this, I don't have a figure as to how much that is going to increase out in California. Do we want our entire economy following the path of the State of California? It has one of the country's highest electricity rates. The rates in California are 65 percent higher than our rates in the State of Oklahoma,

and it has one of the worst unemployment rates, one of the worst insolvent fiscal positions of any State, not to mention some of the worst air quality in the country.

Predictions of this rule's devastating impacts are prevalent. In Oklahoma, residential rates are projected to increase by 15 to 19 percent and industrial rates by 24 percent; that is, in the event they are successful in this program.

I notice the other side has not arrived. I ask unanimous consent to go an additional 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. The Kansas Corporation Commission calculates that compliance with the rule as proposed would cost the State \$5 to \$15 billion, the equivalent of a 10- to 30-percent increase in electric rates. The loss of cheaper and more reliable coal units will increase the power prices by as much as 25 percent on grids that serve about a third of the Nation's population, according to the Brattle Group in Massachusetts.

Now, I have gone on and talked about how much more this would cost State by State. There isn't time to go over all of it now. But let's stop and realize the cost of this. NERA's analysis of the increased cost if we were to adopt these programs projects that the cost to comply with the EPA's plan could be a total of \$479 billion or more, with 43 States having double-digit electricity increases and 14 States potentially facing peak-year electricity price increases exceeding 20 percent.

I say this because—who is having to pay this? Everybody pays it, and they have to pay it equally. It has to be the most regressive type of increase in taxation that we could have. If you have a pilot program, with a family that is in poverty they have to spend the same amount of money for their electricity. That is a must, not a luxury. It is something they have to have. So they could easily spend half of their expendable income on electricity price increases, while wealthy people might only face a 1-percent increase of their income. That is why it is important and why we need to pay attention to it—to make sure we know the public is aware of this.

NERA also estimates that atmospheric CO₂ concentrations would be reduced by less than one-half of 1 percent—that is if they are successful in doing this—equating to reductions in global average temperatures of less than two one-hundredths of a degree. So all these things they say they might be able to accomplish, they have studied it and say it is just not true.

I have already talked about the fact that within the President's own administration, Lisa Jackson, the former head of the EPA, said even if they are successful, even if they are right about

this, it is not going to reduce CO₂ emissions because this isn't where the problem is.

So this is going on right now. We have a committee that is clearly going to be working on this so the American people will be aware of what is happening. The Energy Information Administration determined that the China agreement would result in a 34-percent increase in electricity prices.

I bring this up because we heard in the President's speech on Tuesday that they were negotiating with China and some very successful negotiations took place. The Presiding Officer remembers that this was back when our Secretary of State went over and met with President Xi of China and came back and said it was a successful meeting. What came out of that negotiation? China said: Well, we will keep increasing our emissions until 2020, and then we will look at it and decide whether we want to lower it. That is not much of a negotiation, and it was not very comforting to us.

A comprehensive survey conducted by a Harvard political scientist shows that people who are worried about climate change are only willing to pay energy bills up to 5 percent higher. Whether it is global warming or climate change, the American people understand this proposal is in no way about protecting the environment or improving public health. This rule is an executive and bureaucratic power grab unlike anything this country has ever seen, and it is merely the tip of the spear in a radical war against affordable energy and fossil fuels.

At a time when domestic oil and gas prices through hydraulic fracturing continue to be one of the only bright spots in our economy, a lot of people are trying to stop this from taking place. I kind of wind up with this because I think it is important. I come from an oil State, so I have to buy it. I understand that. The process of hydraulic fracturing started in my State of Oklahoma—in Duncan, OK—in 1948. Did you know that by their own admission the EPA said there has never been a documented case of groundwater contamination since they started using hydraulic fracturing?

When the President made the statement in the State of the Union Message that the United States has dramatically increased in the last 5 years our production of oil and gas, that is correct, but that is in spite of the President. We have enjoyed a 61-percent increase in the production of oil and gas in America in the last 5 years—61 percent. However, all of that is either on State or private land. On Federal land we have had a reduction of 6 percent. So I look at that, and I believe it when people say that if we had been able to increase production on Federal land such as we have done in the last 5 years on private land and State land,

we could be totally—100 percent—dependent from any other country in developing our resources.

So I am committed to using our committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, not only to conduct a rigorous oversight of the Obama EPA policies which are running roughshod over our economy, operating outside the scope of the law, and directly ignoring the intent of Congress but also to rein in this out-of-control agency through any and all means at our disposal.

This has been a problem. People used to say that it was just big business that wanted to reduce these regulations. That isn't true. As I mentioned before, the farmers of America—just in my State of Oklahoma—say the over-regulation of EPA is the most difficult issue they have to deal with.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Fischer amendment No. 18 (to amendment No. 2), to provide limits on the designation of new federally protected land.

Sanders amendment No. 24 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Menendez/Cantwell amendment No. 72 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure private property cannot be seized through condemnation or eminent domain for the private gain of a foreign-owned business entity.

Wyden amendment No. 27 (to amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

Lee amendment No. 71 (to amendment No. 2), to require a procedure for issuing permits to drill.

Murkowski (for Blunt/Inhofe) amendment No. 78 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions

for the President entering into bilateral or other international agreements regarding greenhouse gas emissions without proper study of any adverse economic effects, including job losses and harm to the industrial sector, and without the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are back to continue debate and voting on amendments to this bipartisan Keystone XL bill.

I will focus on two main subjects today. The first is to speak to what I think is the good progress we have made on this bill, moving us toward ultimately a final vote and final passage. I believe we probably surprised a few people yesterday by adopting an amendment on climate change that few thought would be adopted. We have now processed a total of nine amendments. Some would say, well, nine is not much, but just to put it into context, last year, the Senate held just 15 rollcall votes on amendments. That was in all of 2014. Over just a couple of days here in this new Congress, we are already at 60 percent of last year's total, and it is still January. We have eight amendments that are pending at this moment and set to be voted on today. We will work out the timing and order of those votes. My hope is that we will exceed last year's total today.

I believe our productivity has been good. I appreciate the cooperation of the ranking member on the committee. What we have been able to do with this measure is important because I think it stands in pretty stark contrast to what we have seen in recent years and, quite honestly, to the delays the Keystone XL Pipeline has faced over those years.

The second part of my comments this morning—I wish to provide a little bit of perspective about how long this cross-border permit has been pending, awaiting a final decision by the President.

Sometimes when we talk in terms of the raw numbers, some ask: What does that really mean? What does it mean to be on the 2,316th day that has passed since the company seeking to build this pipeline first filed its first permit with the State Department?

It has been more than 6 years, more than 76 months, and more than 330 weeks.

The President noted in his State of the Union Address this week that Keystone XL was just a single oil pipeline. And he is right—it is just a single oil pipeline. We have multiple pipelines that cross the border. We have hundreds of pipelines that cross the country. So it begs the question: How and why has it taken so long to get action on just one single pipeline? Why has it taken so long?

There have been a lot of examples we have heard on floor. I mentioned yesterday that President Obama was still

a sitting Senator when the permit application was filed. Others have said the iPad was not even out on the market when the first permit was filed. We heard that 2,300 days is longer than it took the United States to win World War II, longer than Lewis and Clark's expedition to explore the West, and longer than Project Mercury, which put the first American into space. There have been a lot of comparisons in terms of what it really means to be longer than 2,300 days.

I mentioned on the floor many times that in Alaska we are seeking to try to advance our natural gas resource, and in order to do so we need a big pipeline to move from the North Slope down to tidewater, and so we are working to train welders because we know that when that day comes and we have the opportunity to build that line, we are going to want Alaskans to have those jobs. They may be temporary in that you don't weld a pipeline forever, you do it until the job is complete, but those are good jobs for those Alaskans and for people who come up to our State.

The Fairbanks Pipeline Training Center in Alaska does a fabulous job. In my opinion, it is the best pipeline training facility we have in the country. Every year, graduates from the training center are sent out, ready to go to work on projects such as Keystone XL. We are probably talking about seven sets of welders who have graduated at this point, and we need to keep approving projects that can help these young people or those who have been retrained as welders to get jobs. That is what they are waiting for.

We can even think about this length of time which has ensued since the first permit application has been pending in terms of flying to Mars and back. We could probably complete about three roundtrips from here to Mars and back, depending, of course, on the distance between the planets, but I am just putting it in context.

If we wanted to stay closer to home, we could describe those 2,300 days in terms of how many times we could hike the Appalachian Trail—probably 10 or 12 depending on the weather. One of these days I would like to hike the Appalachian Trail. I don't know that I have the time, it is one of those issues when you think about how long this has been pending before this administration.

Today I will add one more example to show the comparison. At this time in the football season, we are all focused on what is going on with Super Bowl XLIX, which is coming up in 10 days now. We will see Super Bowl XLIX pit the reigning NFL champions, the Seattle Seahawks—in Alaska we don't have our own professional football team, so we kind of adopted the Seahawks. I will let my colleagues know that I will be standing with the

ranking member in rooting for the Seahawks on the big day next week. A lot of folks are excited about it, and we will be watching it. The game will be played next Sunday.

For the moment, let's look back to September 19, 2008, when the first cross-border permit for the Keystone XL Pipeline was first submitted to the State Department. Let's specifically focus on the Seahawks because they provide a pretty good example of how much has changed over the past 6 years. Back in September of 2008, the Seahawks were about to start a season in which they would have a record of just 4 and 12—winning 4 games and losing 12. At that point they were still a good team and we were still rooting for them, but they were a pretty different team. For starters, the Seahawks had a head coach. Their current coach, Pete Carroll, was still at the University of Southern California coaching the Trojans. Their star running back, Marshawn Lynch, was about to start his second year in the NFL as a member of the Buffalo Bills. It would be another 2 years before Lynch joined the Seahawks and just over 3 years before the Nation discovered his love of Skittles during the game against the Philadelphia Eagles.

The most famous members of the Seahawks secondary—the Legion of Boom—are Richard Sherman and Earl Thomas. Back in September of 2008, both were still in college, respectively playing for Stanford and the University of Texas.

Of course, we cannot forget Russell Wilson. A lot of Alaskans are rooting for him to get a second consecutive Super Bowl as the starting quarterback for the Seahawks. Back in September of 2008—he played just a handful of college games at that time. He was a red-shirt freshman at North Carolina State.

My point here is not necessarily about football—although that is what a lot of us are talking about—it is to demonstrate that a lot can happen over the course of 2,300 days, and it does, whether we are talking about what goes on in politics, in world events, or the world of sports. My point is that it should probably take the Federal Government less time to approve an important infrastructure project—what the President himself has called just a single oil pipeline—than it takes to build an NFL championship team.

I would like us to get to the point where we are done discussing the merits of this important project and be done in the sense that we can move forward not only with Keystone XL but move forward as a nation when it comes to North American energy independence and providing jobs and greater economic benefit to this country.

I am pleased with the process we have had on the floor over the past couple of days. I look forward to the se-

ries of amendments on which we will have votes this afternoon—likely after lunch—and the opportunity to be in further discussion about these issues that I think have been pent-up for a period of time.

With that, I acknowledge my colleague on the energy committee and co-fan of the Seattle Seahawks.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska. I am certainly tired of hearing about deflate-gate. I don't know if our bantering on the floor can keep the focus on the real talent of the football team and the individuals, but I certainly want to say that she has proven she is a true 12, and that is important to us in the Northwest. I thank the Senator for her comments.

We are here today to continue the debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline, and I see my colleague from Vermont is here, and he probably wishes to give comments about his amendments. Hopefully we will be voting later today on the various amendment proposals we discussed yesterday. We will be talking to Members about other amendments they would like to see on this legislation.

Before I turn it over to Senator SANDERS, I wish to draw focus for a few minutes to the fact that this process, debate, and discussion about the protection of environmental issues, property rights, and environmental laws is incredibly important in the United States of America. I say that because I want to submit for the RECORD two news articles that just came out today. One is entitled "Montana oil spill renews worries over safety of old pipelines," and the other story is headlined "Cleanup Underway for Nearly 3M-Gallon Saltwater Spill In ND."

The reason I bring that up is that as we are sitting here today discussing whether we are going to override current environmental law and give special carve-out exceptions to a foreign company to basically build a pipeline through the United States of America, the fundamental question in my mind is, What is the hurry in giving them exemptions to these various laws as a way to get the pipeline built? These are things U.S. businesses don't get. They don't get these exemptions and they certainly don't get the U.S. Senate voting to basically override the President's authority—I should say to pass a bill that would basically prohibit the President from using his authority on what is in the national interest.

To me, the Montana spill in the Yellowstone River is similar to our current pipeline debate on Keystone XL and whether we have the right safety provisions in place. So, if anything, we should be discussing what we can do to further pipeline safety in the United States of America and not let a foreign company roll back existing U.S. laws on environmental issues that they should be complying with.

This is such a beautiful part of our country, and this article talks about how oil is floating 28 miles downstream from the Poplar Pipeline spill. This is an issue we should be really thinking about.

I get that there has been an explosion of both tar sands and Bakken oil. The question is not are we going to rush to try to help these companies override rules; the question is whether they comply with rules and whether the United States of America has enough protections in place to make sure the safety and security of our citizens as this new opportunity and explosion of product is occurring.

I can say from my perspective in my State, I have worked with practically every city council in the State about how they want new safety regulations for crude oil transported by rail—something they are very concerned about, given the explosions that have happened on oil railcars.

Again, regarding this particular issue, I know my colleague from North Dakota thinks that somehow this alleviates the Northwest from having trains go through there, but I assure him it doesn't. So we will still have concerns about the safety of our citizens as more crude oil is being transported by rail.

But we shouldn't now be trying to exempt a foreign company from complying with U.S. laws; we should be saying they should follow the rules. In the meantime, we should be asking the NTSB—we should be asking our agencies—whether there are enough safety protections in place, given the large amount of crude that is now moving and the issues we have seen as a result. There is nothing more important to me than protecting farmers and landowners to make sure they are actually treated fairly, and to make sure that resources such as clean water are protected.

Just because the discussion has been going on for a long time doesn't mean we should overrule existing environmental laws and exempt a foreign company from complying with it. I would rather them follow the rules all the way through the process.

So, with that, I yield the floor. I see my colleague from Vermont is here to discuss his amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Associated Press, Jan. 22, 2015]
MONTANA OIL SPILL RENEWS WORRY OVER
SAFETY OF OLD PIPELINES

(By Matthew Brown)

BILLINGS, MT.—A second large oil spill into Montana's Yellowstone River in less than four years is reviving questions about oversight of the nation's aging pipeline network.

Investigators and company officials on Wednesday were trying to determine the cause of the 40,000-gallon spill that contaminated downstream water supplies in the city of Glendive.

Sen. Jon Tester said Saturday's spill from the decades-old Poplar Pipeline was avoidable, but "we just didn't have the folks on the ground" to prevent it.

The Montana Democrat told The Associated Press that more frequent inspections by regulators are needed, and older pipelines should face stricter safety standards.

"We need to take a look at some of these pipelines that have been in the ground for half a century and say, 'Are they still doing a good job?'" Tester said.

The latest spill comes as Republicans and some Democrats, including Tester, want the Obama administration to approve TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline from Canada to the Gulf.

Keystone would cross the Yellowstone roughly 20 miles upstream of the Poplar Pipeline spill.

In 2011, an ExxonMobil pipeline break spilled 63,000 gallons of oil during flooding on the Yellowstone near Billings. The break was blamed on scouring of the river bottom that exposed the company's Silvertip line to floodwaters.

Officials involved in the Poplar Pipeline spill have said it's too soon to say if that line also was exposed.

Poplar, owned by Wyoming-based Bridger Pipeline, was constructed in the 1950s. The breached section beneath the Yellowstone was replaced at least four decades ago, in the late 1960s or early 1970s, according to the company.

Based on the number of miles of pipelines in the U.S. that carry oil, gasoline and other hazardous liquids, just over half were installed prior to 1970, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation.

The agency's Office of Pipeline Safety has roughly 150 inspectors overseeing 2.6 million miles of gas, oil and other pipelines.

That number is slated to increase by another 100 inspectors under a \$27 million budget increase approved last year. That would still leave inspectors stretched thin given the mileage of pipelines.

Dena Hoff, a farmer and rancher whose land borders the site of the Poplar accident, said she's had a good working relationship with Bridger Pipeline, and she commended the company for taking responsibility for the spill.

But Hoff said the spill should spur second thoughts about Keystone and whether it's a good idea to have pipelines that cross beneath surface waters.

"It's the nature of the beast. Pipelines leak and pipelines break. We're never going to get around that," she said. "We have to decide if water is more valuable than oil."

Authorities continue work to clean up Glendive's public water supply after cancer-causing benzene was detected in water coming from the city's treatment plant. The plant draws directly from the Yellowstone.

Bridger Pipeline has committed to providing bottled water for Glendive's roughly 6,000 residents until the water-treatment plant is running again.

Late Wednesday night, Dawson County Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator Mary Jo Gehmert said in an email that the plant has been decontaminated. If tests conducted Thursday show that the plant's water is safe to use, county workers will give information to the public on how to flush the water in homes and businesses, Gehmert said.

Workers late Tuesday recovered about 10,000 gallons of oil that was still in the Poplar line after it was shut down because of the breach.

Bridger Pipeline Co. spokesman Bill Salvin said Wednesday only a "very small" amount of oil has been siphoned from the river itself.

Company officials and government regulators say most of the oil is thought to be within the first 6 miles of the spill site. That includes the stretch of the river through Glendive.

"What we're working on is identifying places where we can collect more oil," Salvin said. "The cleanup could extend for a while."

Oil sheens have been reported as far away as Williston, North Dakota, below the Yellowstone's confluence with the Missouri River, officials said.

The farthest downstream that free-floating oil has been seen was at an intake dam about 28 miles from the spill site, officials said.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality Director Tom Livers said he was concerned that when the ice breaks up in the spring, oil will spread farther downstream.

[From the Associated Press, Jan. 22, 2015]
CLEANUP UNDERWAY FOR NEARLY 3M-GALLON
SALTWATER SPILL IN ND
(By Regina Garcia Cano)

Cleanup is underway after nearly 3 million gallons of brine, a salty, toxic byproduct of oil and natural gas production, leaked from a pipeline in western North Dakota, the largest spill of its kind in the state since the current energy boom began.

The full environmental impact of the spill, which contaminated two creeks, might not be clear for months. Some previous saltwater spills have taken years to clean up. A contractor hired by the pipeline operator will be on site Thursday, assessing the damage.

Operator Summit Midstream Partners LLC detected the pipeline spill on Jan. 6, about 15 miles north of Williston and informed North Dakota officials then. State health officials on Wednesday said they weren't given a full account of the size until Tuesday.

Inspectors have been monitoring the area near Williston, in the heart of North Dakota's oil country, but it will be difficult to assess the effects of the spill until the ice melts, said Dave Glatt, chief of the North Dakota Department of Health's environmental health section.

"This is not something we want to happen in North Dakota," Glatt said.

The spill presently doesn't threaten public drinking water or human health, Glatt said. He said a handful of farmers have been asked to keep their livestock away from the two creeks, the smaller of which will be drained.

Brine, also referred to as saltwater, is an unwanted byproduct of drilling that is much saltier than sea water and may also contain petroleum and residue from hydraulic fracturing operations.

The new spill is almost three times larger than one that fouled a portion of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in July. Another million-gallon saltwater spill in 2006, near Alexander, is still being cleaned up nearly a decade later.

Summit Midstream said in a statement Wednesday that about 65,000 barrels of a mix of freshwater and brine have been pumped out from Blacktail Creek. Brine also reached the bigger Little Muddy Creek and potentially the Missouri River.

Glatt said the Blacktail Creek will be completely drained as part of the initial cleanup, but the water and soil will have to be continuously tested until after the spring thaw because some of the contaminated water has frozen. The Little Muddy Creek will not be drained because it is bigger than the Blacktail Creek and the saltwater is being diluted.

"We will be monitoring to see how quickly it gets back to natural background water

quality conditions, and we are already starting to see that," Glatt said of the Little Muddy Creek. "It's getting back pretty quickly."

Summit Midstream's chief operating officer, Rene Casadaban, said in a statement that the company's "full and undivided attention" is focused on cleaning up the spill and repairing any environmental damage.

Spokesman Jonathan Morgan did not immediately confirm exactly when the spill began. It also was not clear what caused the pipeline to rupture. Glatt said the company has found the damaged portion of pipeline and it was sent to a laboratory to determine what caused the hole.

North Dakota has suffered scores of saltwater spills since the state's oil boom began in earnest in 2006.

A network of saltwater pipelines extends to hundreds of disposal wells in the western part of the state, where the briny water is pumped underground for permanent storage. Legislation to mandate flow meters and cutoff switches on saltwater pipelines was overwhelmingly rejected in the Legislature in 2013.

Wayde Schafer, a North Dakota spokesman for the Sierra Club, called the brine "a real toxic mix" and "an extreme threat to the environment and people's health."

"Technology exists to prevent these spills and nothing is being done," said Schafer. "Better pipelines, flow meters, cutoff switches, more inspectors—something has got to be done."

Daryl Peterson, a grain farmer from Mohall who has had spills on his property, said the latest incident underscores the need for tougher regulation and enforcement.

"Until we start holding companies fully accountable with penalties, I don't think we're going to change this whole situation we have in North Dakota," said Peterson, a board member of the Northwest Landowners Association.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

MR. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington for their work on this legislation.

I rise today to say a few words about my amendment to the proposed Keystone Pipeline bill, an amendment that will be coming up for a vote in a few minutes. I wish to thank Senators BENNET, CARPER, LEAHY, MENENDEZ, MURPHY, WARREN, and WHITEHOUSE for co-sponsoring this amendment.

This amendment is extremely simple. It is about 1 page and I will read it in a moment. It raises a very profound question as to how we implement public policy, not just on issues related to climate but on issues in general. The question is: As we go forward, tackling the very difficult problems facing our country and the world, to whom do we listen? Whose advice do we take as we proceed?

I would argue that historically and appropriately, what we do as a nation is we listen to the experts. That is what we do. I think in this debate, when we deal with the Keystone Pipeline and when we deal with the issue of climate change, it is absolutely appropriate that we listen to what the over-

whelming percentage of scientists are telling us.

I hear some of my colleagues say, This is complicated and I am not a scientist; I don't know. Let me be very frank. I am not a scientist and I did not do terribly well in biology and in physics in college, but I can read. And I can listen and understand what the scientific community is saying on this issue.

As the Senate moves forward, when we deal with complicated medical issues and search for solutions in terms of cancer or heart disease or diabetes, to whom do we go? Who do we listen to for advice as to how we should proceed and allocate public funding? We listen to the doctors and the scientists and the researchers who know a lot more than virtually all of us do in terms of cancer or heart disease.

We spend a lot of money in this country on infrastructure, on roads and bridges and wastewater plants and water systems. That is complicated stuff. To whom do we look for advice? Who do we have at our hearings on these issues? We look to the engineers and the scientists who tell us the best way to proceed in terms of how we build roads and bridges in a cost-effective way.

We are dealing right now with the issue of cyber security—a huge issue—a threat to the Nation. To whom do we look for advice? We look to those experts in technology who can tell us the best way to prevent cyber security attacks against the United States. On and on it goes. Whether it is education or whatever it is, good public policy is dependent upon listening to the scientific community, listening to the people who know the best about this issue.

In terms of the issue of climate change, the fact is that the scientific community is virtually unanimous in telling us that climate change is real. It is caused by human activity. It has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world. The scientific community tells us there is just a brief window of opportunity before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm. They tell us it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is not the opinion of BERNIE SANDERS; that is the opinion of the scientific community.

So to those of my colleagues who say, This is complicated stuff, I am not a scientist, I don't know, let me tell my colleagues who does know. Thirty-seven major American scientific organizations—people who study this issue—do know. And what they say is that climate change is real. It is caused by human activities. It is already causing devastating problems in the United

States and around the world, and we need to transform our energy system.

That is what the Sanders amendment says. That is all it says. It is a modest amendment. It simply tells us what the scientific community has told us year after year after year.

For those of us who are not scientists, let me tell my colleagues the scientific organizations that hold that point of view. They are, among others, the American Anthropological Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Society, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Meteorological Society, the American Physical Society, the National Academy of Engineering, the National Academy of Sciences—37 separate scientific organizations, including those I mentioned.

That is not all. There are 135 international scientific organizations that say the same thing.

I refer my colleagues to the list of 135 international scientific organizations, 37 American scientific organizations, and 21 medical associations that all agree with the basic premises that are in the Sanders amendment that is printed with my remarks in yesterday's RECORD, Wednesday, January 21.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is the leading international scientific body that deals with climate change. Let me quote to my colleagues what they said last fall:

Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea level.

More than 97 percent of the scientific community in the United States and across the globe agrees with these findings.

I am going to conclude my remarks by simply reading my amendment to make sure every Member of the Senate understands how simple and straightforward and noncontroversial this amendment is. This is what it says:

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community that

- (1) climate change is real;
- (2) climate change is caused by human activities;
- (3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;
- (4) a brief window of opportunity exists before the United States and the entire planet suffer irreparable harm; and
- (5) it is imperative that the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency and sustainable energy as rapidly as possible.

That is it. That is the entire amendment. And every provision in this amendment is supported by virtually the entire scientific community, the people who best understand this issue.

Clearly we are a nation divided politically and clearly we are a Congress divided politically. We have different views on almost every issue. But I hope very much the U.S. Senate does not reject science, because in doing so, it would not only lead to bad public policy but it would be an embarrassment before the entire world, that the U.S. Senate is rejecting what the overwhelming majority of scientists are telling us about what they consider to be one of the great crises facing our planet.

So I hope very much for strong bipartisan support for this amendment in the Senate and will say, as a Senator, that we are going to listen to what the scientific community tells us and that we are going to develop public policy based on their knowledge and that information.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I had some concluding thoughts about the President's State of the Union speech on Tuesday night. Much of it we have heard before. In fact, what the President laid out was largely what his agenda has been for the last 6 years. In other words, we have been there and we have done that, and it hasn't worked very well. We have had tired big government proposals. In fact, the President seems as though he has doubled down in a lot of ways on higher taxes, more redistribution, and more regulations that are out of step with what the American people, I believe, want and need.

I think what they want more than anything else, from a strictly economic point of view, is to get the economy growing again. Let's create jobs. Let the private sector actually create jobs—not government. We know government is pretty incompetent when it comes to job creation. And we now have this nagging little minor detail called the national debt where we keep borrowing money and pushing that down the road to the next generation and beyond.

It is ironic in a lot of ways because the President came to the people's House to give his State of the Union speech, which is the House of Representatives, but his speech was anything but for the people. He claimed that really his focus was on middle-class economics. I think he had been listening to the senior Senator from New York who, after this last election, gave a speech at the National Press Club and said that Democrats had made a terrible mistake leading off with the President's new term in 2009 with ObamaCare and other big government programs and they had neglected stagnant wages and the middle class. So I think the President, in a tipping of his hat to Senator SCHUMER and his

comments post election, has essentially acknowledged that his first 6 years have failed to address the needs of the middle class. That is why he kept using the phrase "middle-class economics" during his speech. But it wasn't really about the middle class. It wasn't about hard-working American taxpayers. Time and again, it seemed his most urgent priority was himself. His speech was really about him and his agenda, his pet projects, his vision for bigger government.

I would just point out that the President quite candidly admitted it was his agenda and his policies that were on the ballot on November 4. I think that sent a shudder through every incumbent who was running for reelection who happened to have voted for his big government agenda. But the point is that it was soundly rejected on November 4. You couldn't tell that from the President's tone and his cheerleading last Tuesday night. But my point is we have been there, we have done that, and it didn't work. So let's try something different.

We have felt the experience of this experiment in big government for the last 6 years. If anything, what the voters said on November 4 is enough is enough. I can't remember who originally said it, but someone said famously that the definition of insanity is trying the same thing over and over and expecting different results. You can't try the same old tired policies over and over and actually expect a different outcome. At least to my mind, reality wasn't what was driving the President's remarks. If it was, he would have focused on the biggest concerns Americans have right now. I mentioned jobs, stagnant wages, rising costs, and issues such as health care costs.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare really backfired on a lot of middle-class workers, and it actually raised their health care costs rather than lowered them. Then there are the stagnant wages I mentioned a moment ago. But if he really cared about those issues as he should and as we do, he would be working with Congress to address those issues, and he would have given some attention to one of the first major pieces of legislation that we have taken up in the 114th Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Of course I am referring to the Keystone XL Pipeline that we are debating now, where 11 Democrats joined all of the Republicans who are present to proceed to this bill. So when I say it is bipartisan, I am not just saying it. It actually is.

Sometimes you can tell a lot from what a person doesn't say. In this case, the President spoke more than 6,000 words, and he didn't mention the word Keystone in one of them. Instead of using this opportunity when millions of Americans and people around the

world were listening to the President to lay out sound reasons why he continues to oppose this jobs and infrastructure project year after year, the President merely said we should look beyond a single pipeline to meet America's infrastructure needs. We need to start somewhere, and the President won't even start by taking the first step of approving this infrastructure and job-creating project known as the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I think there is a Chinese proverb that says a trip of a thousand miles has to start with the first step. That is true here as well. It may be a single pipeline, but it is a single pipeline that his own State Department has said has the potential to support more than 40,000 jobs.

Here is what I don't get. There are 2.5 million miles of oil and gas pipelines in America today—2.5 million. What is this fixation with this roughly thousand-mile pipeline that comes from Canada down to southeast Texas where it is refined, turned into gasoline, and other refined products? Why has this become such a political football?

It is because the President and, unfortunately, some of his own party who are wed to a political base that won't allow them to do the rational, realistic, practical thing, which would be to approve this pipeline. The President tried to minimize this.

We have heard people say these are temporary jobs. My job here is temporary. The President's job is temporary. It is going to run out in a couple of years. Every job is temporary in that sense. To try to denigrate these well-paying construction jobs from welders and others—people who make \$125,000, \$140,000 a year in my State—and to denigrate them, to minimize them, and to say it is just a temporary job and is really not all that important is a slap in the face to the people who are hungry to find work, people who are working part time who want to work full time, people who are working for minimum wage but want to improve their standard of living and their ability to provide for their family.

Then there is this. We need to remember the percentage of Americans participating in the workforce is at a 30-year low—a 30-year low. What that means to me is that some people just simply have given up looking for work, and so they have dropped out. They have retired. They have gone on to do other things. But it is a symptom of a disease in our economy. It is not something we should be proud of. If we are actually interested in getting more Americans back in the workforce, the President would approve this pipeline.

Let me tell you about one person with whom I met last Friday in Beaumont, TX. We call it the golden triangle. It is a place where refineries are seemingly almost everywhere. It is a blue-collar community but one that is

proud and contributes a lot to the Texas economy. I was in Beaumont, as I said, and we were there to mark the 1-year anniversary of the southern leg of the Keystone XL Pipeline's coming online. This is a little confusing. But this is the portion of pipeline that is already in place, and it doesn't require a transit with Presidential approval to cross from Canada into the United States.

Believe it or not, there are already 4,800 jobs that have been created and an average of 400,000 barrels of Canadian crude pumped into southeast Texas already. We are not talking about doing something that is new. We are talking about adding to what already exists by completion of this pipeline.

My point is this. If the President wants to see what the potential economic impact and the impact on jobs and on the standard of living would be for the entire Keystone XL Pipeline, all he needs to do is to look to southeast Texas—to Beaumont, TX—where the impact has been nothing but positive.

I met with the mayor of Beaumont, the county judge, other local businesses, officials, and stakeholders. The mayor and the county judge pointed out that it is the taxes they get from the economic activity caused by this pipeline—which exists and which would do nothing but be enhanced by the Keystone XL Pipeline—that helps pay the taxes that pave roads, provide health care to people who don't have access to it—who can't afford health care. It provides to pay the law enforcement. It provides all of the governmental functions, including education. This is what adds to the tax base which allows local governments, including school districts, to provide for the education of our children.

Then there is this. There is the multiplier effect of the investment in the private investment on this pipeline. It is the multiplier effect because people who earn these good wages spend the money at restaurants, buy homes, rent apartments. They buy things at retail outlets. That is the multiplier effect from this pipeline.

One person in particular I want to close with is a gentleman I met by the name of Kenneth Edwards who is a vice president with the United Association, the union of plumbers, fitters, welders, and service techs. I think Mr. Edwards would agree with me that we wouldn't necessarily see eye to eye on everything. But after being married 35 years, I don't know many married couples that agree on everything. So that is not all that unusual. It isn't a surprise that Republicans and unions haven't been on the same page on every issue. But there is an issue where we agree 100 percent, and that is the need for the President to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline after 6 long years.

Mr. Edwards speaks on behalf of many union workers nationwide who, as he put it, earn their living from a series of temporary jobs that happen to add up to a lifelong career. He told me last week he wants the President to put his famous veto pen away, to take out his approval pen, and to sign his approval of this project right away.

Speaking of temporary jobs, the President is ending his time in office. He has 2 more years left. His State of the Union Address leads me to believe he is not open to changing course and making much of a departure from the partisanship and gridlock that marked his first term and a half. But there is still time to change his mind.

With the Keystone XL Pipeline bill that a bipartisan majority of Congress will soon send his way, we are presenting him an opportunity to say that he heard the message that voters delivered on November 4. I heard the American people say we are tired of the dysfunction in Washington, DC. We actually want to see Congress and the White House work together to get things done on behalf of the American people.

It is not too late. I hope he will listen not only to people such as Kenneth Edwards and union workers across the country but to the vast majority of Americans who support this important project.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER).

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, we are working now to set up votes on several pending amendments to the bill. These votes should be after lunch today. Right now, we are looking at 60-vote thresholds on the Fischer amendment, along with the Boxer side-by-side, the Sanders amendment, and the Lee amendment.

I do understand that the Boxer amendment is now filed at the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 18, AS MODIFIED

I ask unanimous consent that the Fischer amendment, No. 18, be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF NEW FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.—In this section, the term “federally protected land” means any area designated or acquired by the Secretary of the Interior

for the purpose of conserving historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, developmental, or biological resources.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary, prior to the designation or acquisition of new federally protected land, shall consider—

(1) whether the addition of the new federally protected land would have a negative impact on the administration of existing federally protected land; and

(2) whether sufficient resources are available to effectively implement management plans for existing units of federally protected land.

(c) This section shall not apply to

(1) congressionally designated federally protected land, or

(2) acquisitions of federally protected land authorized by Congress.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we have a number of Members who have asked to come to the floor to speak over the course of these next couple of hours. Many will be speaking to their specific amendment on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Again, we encourage folks to use this time, while we have a little bit of time before we move to the votes this afternoon.

I see that my colleague from North Carolina is here to speak. I would welcome his remarks at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, long before I was actually sworn into the Senate, I traveled across the State of North Carolina. I promised the citizens of North Carolina that I would work toward commonsense solutions to provide opportunities for economic growth and opportunity.

Today I hope to send forth amendment No. 102 with the support of my good friend Senator BURR from North Carolina on the approval of the Keystone Pipeline, to take a look at things that we can do to do our part in North Carolina to contribute to the ultimate goal of energy independence in this Nation.

The amendment, the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015, will expand domestic offshore production, natural gas exploration and production, which, in turn, will create jobs and set our Nation on that track to energy independence.

Families across the country are too familiar with the impact energy prices play in our day-to-day lives, making decisions that are very difficult for them in these difficult economic situations.

When utility bills and gas prices increase, hard-working Americans face

hardship and struggle to make ends meet. We need to make that easier and lift the burden on those hard-working taxpayers.

We also cannot underestimate the great impact energy plays in America's foreign policy decisions. We are in many ways dependent on oil from the Middle Eastern States that do not share our democratic values.

The predicament does not certainly place America in a position of strength. America has more energy potential than any other nation. It is time that we start realizing its full potential.

What the amendment does is fairly straightforward. It instructs the Secretary of the Interior to finalize the 5-year program for 2017 to 2022. That includes annual lease sales in both the Mid-Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf and the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf region. It grants to States in both of these regions a 37.5-percent share of all revenues collected from the Outer Continental Shelf leasing activities.

Each State in the region gets a minimum of a 10-percent share of that allocation. It directs 12.5 percent of the revenues collected for the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf activities to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The 37.5 percent for the States and the 12.5 percent for other regions mirrors the revenue split given to the Gulf Coast States—Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama—under current law.

North Carolina has received approximately \$209 million in funding over the past 5 decades, protecting places such as the Cape Lookout National Seashore, the Great Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests. The Department of Interior is currently developing a 5-year leasing program for 2017 to 2022. The language of the amendment merely instructs the Department to include the Mid-Atlantic and the South Atlantic regions as part of that plan.

Current law requires that the Department of Interior give deference to the preferences of States when developing a leasing plan for areas within 50 miles of the shore. Keep in mind, the drilling that we are talking about in North Carolina, off our coast, is greater than 30 miles off the coast, far beyond the site horizon of our beautiful beaches in North Carolina.

I want to close by saying why we are moving this amendment now. First, it is the fulfillment of a promise I made to the citizens of North Carolina. It also does enormous progress for creating jobs and helping our economy get back on track in the State and the region.

It is estimated that more than 55,000 jobs can be created by 2035; more than \$4 billion annually in economic con-

tributions to the State of North Carolina. Almost \$4 billion in government revenue for the State of North Carolina—\$4 billion. As someone who served as Speaker of the House of North Carolina, I cannot tell you what an enormous impact that will have in terms of reducing the burden on taxpayers and businesses in North Carolina, creating more opportunities for economic expansion and job growth. There will be up to \$577 million annually in revenue share payments according to a report published by the Southeast Energy Alliance in 2009.

These numbers increase opportunities in North Carolina unlike anything I saw in my 8 years in the State legislature. It is an opportunity for North Carolina to do its part to make the Nation energy independent and to help me fulfill my promises to the citizens of North Carolina, which is to create jobs and provide great opportunities for this generation and future generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss an amendment that I filed to the pending legislation. It is an amendment to modify the Jones Act. The Jones Act is an archaic 1920s-era law that hinders free trade, stifles the economy, and hurts consumers, largely for the benefit of labor unions.

Specifically, this amendment would effectively repeal a law that prevents U.S. shippers from purchasing or otherwise supportively procuring the services of vessels that are built outside the United States for use in American waters. From time to time here in Congress, we find that legislation still remains on the books many decades after it has served its original stated purpose. If ever we had one, I think one of the best examples of this is a law called the Jones Act.

As many of you know, the Jones Act is simply a continuation of laws passed through U.S. history addressing cabotage—or port-to-port coastal shipping. Those laws have been used to protect U.S. domestic shipping dating back to the very first session of Congress.

The Jones Act may have had some rationale back in the 1920s when it was enacted, but today it serves only to raise shipping costs, making U.S. farmers and businesses less competitive in the global marketplace and increasing costs for American consumers.

According to the 2002 U.S. International Trade Commission economic study—by the way, the U.S. International Trade Commission is not a group of special interests, they are an international trade commission which is appointed to study issues affecting international trade, obviously, as the name implies.

Their study reached the conclusion that repealing the Jones Act would lower shipping costs by about 22 per-

cent. The Commission also found that repealing the Jones Act would have an annual positive welfare effect of \$656 million on the U.S. economy.

Since these decade-old studies are the most recent statistics available, imagine the impact the Jones Act repeal would have today—far more than a \$656 million annual positive impact—likely closer to \$1 billion, stimulating our economy in the midst of an anemic recovery.

The requirement that U.S. shippers must purchase vessels in the United States comes at a tremendous cost that is passed on to U.S. consumers. For example, just recently the U.S. container line Matson placed a \$418 million order for two 3,600 20-foot equivalent unit container ships in a U.S. shipyard. The high price of \$209 million per vessel reflects that the ships will be carrying goods within the United States and therefore governed by the protectionist Jones Act.

The fact is that Matson's order at \$209 million per ship is more than five times more expensive than if those same ships were procured outside of the United States. Ships of that size built outside the United States would cost closer to \$40 million each. For comparison, even Maersk Line's far larger ships cost millions less at an average of \$185 million each.

The U.S. Maritime Administration, MARAD, has found that the cost to operate U.S. flag vessels at \$22,000 per day is about 2.7 times higher than foreign flag vessels—just \$6,000 a day.

There is no doubt that these inflated costs are eventually passed on to shipping customers. In the energy sector, for example, the price for moving crude oil from the gulf coast to the Northeastern United States on Jones Act tankers is \$5 to \$6 more per barrel, while moving it to eastern Canada on foreign flag tankers is about \$2.

That can mean an additional \$1 million per tanker in shipping costs for oil producers.

This increased cost is why, according to the Congressional Research Service, more than twice as much gulf coast crude oil was shipped by water to Canada as shipped to Northeastern U.S. refineries last year—all in an effort to avoid paying Jones Act shipping rates.

The implications of this fact touches just about every American who buys gasoline. It is American consumers who pay exorbitantly higher prices because of a law that protects the shipbuilding industry and domestically manufactured ships that transport crude and other refined products.

But it is not only the energy sector that deals with the distorted effects of the Jones Act. Cattlemen in Hawaii who want to bring their cattle to the U.S. mainland market, for example, have actually resorted to flying the cattle on 747 jumbo jets to work around the restrictions of the Jones Act. Their

only alternative is to ship the cattle to Canada because all livestock carriers in the world are foreign owned.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of any barrier to free trade. I believe the U.S. trade barriers invite other countries to put up or retain their own barriers and that at the end of the day the U.S. consumer and the economy at large pays the price.

Throughout my career I have always been a strong supporter of free trade. Opening markets to the free flow of goods and services benefits America and benefits our trading partners. Trade liberalization creates jobs, expands economic growth, and provides consumers with access to lower cost goods and services.

Yet as clear as the benefits of free trade are, actually taking action to remove trade barriers and open markets can be almost impossible in Congress. Special interests that have long and richly benefited from protectionism flex their muscles and issue doomsday warnings about the consequences of moving forward on free trade. Judging from the hysterical reaction by some of the special interests to my simple filing of this amendment, the debate over the Jones Act will be no different.

The domestic shipbuilding requirement of the Jones Act is outdated and should be abolished.

U.S. consumers are free to buy a foreign-built car. U.S. trucking companies are free to buy a foreign-built truck. U.S. railroads are free to buy a foreign-built locomotive. U.S. airlines are free to buy a foreign-built airplane.

Why can't U.S. maritime special interests more affordably ship foreign goods on foreign-made vessels? Why do U.S. consumers, particularly those in Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, need to pay for ships that are five times more expensive?

If there was a law that long ago outlived its usefulness—if it ever had any—it is the Jones Act. On the Jones Act, it is time to change course today.

I have a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation which states:

Farm Bureau believes that there should be no restrictions as to the quantities or vessels on which a commodity is shipped between U.S. ports. Repealing The Jones Act would allow more competition for the movement of goods between U.S. ports, thus driving down transportation costs.

Continuing to read from the letter "TO ALL MEMBERS OF SENATE" from the Farm Bureau:

Repeal of The Jones Act accomplishes the same purpose: a reduction in energy costs, increased competition to lower costs of U.S. goods and more opportunities to transport agricultural commodities at competitive prices.

Due to this importance, Farm Bureau policy, developed by our grassroots members consisting of working farmers and ranchers, explicitly supports the repeal of The Jones Act. Farm Bureau urges you to vote in support of Sen. McCain's amendment repealing sections of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

Then there is an article: "McCain under fire."

A growing number of politicians are taking aim at a prominent US Senator's crusade against the Jones Act

Oh my God. I am deeply concerned. All the special interests on this issue are weighing in. By the way, one of them would have effects on the U.S. shipbuilding and repair base. We all know the U.S. shipbuilding industry, because of the Jones Act, is moribund. In fact, I have an article from the Daily Signal which says: "Shipbuilding industry stuck on ground."

U.S. shipbuilding exports are tiny compared to exports of semis and trailers. Shipbuilding is subject to the protectionist Jones Act which hinders competition, while the semi industry is not.

According to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, "The coastwise laws [like the Jones Act] are highly protectionist provisions that are intended to create a 'coastwise monopoly' in order to protect and develop the American merchant marine, shipbuilding, etc."

But protecting U.S. industries from competition may actually have the opposite effect. Consider U.S. production of vessels designed to transport goods via water compared to U.S. production of semi-trailer trucks and trailers designed to transport goods via land. In 2013, U.S. manufacturers exported \$4.1 billion in semi-trailer trucks and trailers, but they exported just \$0.1 billion in commercial ships.

Americans in most states would benefit from the freedom to ship goods on the best-built, most affordable vessels, wherever they are made. The Alaska governor is actually required to "use best efforts and all appropriate means to persuade the United States Congress to repeal those provisions of the Jones Act formally codified at 46 U.S.C. 861, et seq."

The Jones Act drives up the price of gas, hinders U.S. infrastructure improvements, inflicts high costs on people in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and makes it difficult to transport goods between U.S. ports.

The facts are clear. What we have is an old-time 1920s law that may have been, I emphasize the word "may," have had some utility in the past.

I am aware that all of the special interests have been mobilized and how this can be damaging, frankly, to certain special interests. It would not be damaging to the average citizen who would pay less for the goods that are transported much more cheaply as a result of the Jones Act repeal.

I say to those critics of this amendment, as has been my habit over the years, I will not quit on this issue. There will be other opportunities to put the Senate and Congress on record.

Sooner or later the Farm Bureau will be heard. Sooner or later the people of Hawaii and Puerto Rico who are paying exorbitant prices that they shouldn't have to pay will be heard. Sooner or later this protectionist—an anachronism—ancient protectionist act will be repealed and average American consumers will benefit from it and unfortunately the special interests will not.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the January 20,

2015, Farm Bureau letter, the Heritage Foundation piece called the Daily Signal, entitled "Senator McCain's Jones Act Amendment: Good for America," and another article: "If You Like Higher Prices, Enriched Cronies, And Weak National Security, Then You'll Love The Jones Act." It is one of my favorite pieces.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, January 20, 2015.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR: The Senate will soon begin consideration of amendments to S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's largest general farm organization, I am writing to convey our strong support for adoption of an amendment by Sen. John McCain that would repeal provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, known as The Jones Act. The Jones Act mandates that any goods shipped by water between two points in the United States or its territories must be transported by a vessel that is U.S. built, U.S. flagged, and at least 75 percent U.S. crewed.

Given the ability of ships to move large amounts of cargo, and the bulk nature of most agriculture commodities, shipping via water is a strategic and economic resource that should not be limited by antiquated provisions of U.S. law. Farm Bureau believes that there should be no restrictions as to the quantities or vessels on which a commodity is shipped between U.S. ports. Repealing The Jones Act would allow more competition for the movement of goods between U.S. ports, thus driving down transportation costs.

Farm Bureau supports the construction of pipelines in general and the Keystone XL pipeline in particular. We support projects of this nature for their ability to decrease energy and input costs, lower prices for consumers and diversify our transportation infrastructure. Repeal of The Jones Act accomplishes the same purpose: a reduction in energy costs, increased competition to lower costs of U.S. goods and more opportunities to transport agricultural commodities at competitive prices.

Due to this importance, Farm Bureau policy, developed by our grassroots members consisting of working farmers and ranchers, explicitly supports the repeal of The Jones Act. Farm Bureau urges you to vote in support of Sen. McCain's amendment repealing sections of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

[From the Daily Signal, Jan. 16, 2015]
SENATOR MCCAIN'S JONES ACT AMENDMENT:
GOOD FOR AMERICA

(By Bryan Riley and Brian Slattery)

Senator John McCain (R-AZ) recently introduced an amendment to repeal harmful aspects of the Jones Act, a 1920 law that restricts the use of foreign-built or foreign-owned ships for transporting goods within the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, "The coastwise laws [like the Jones Act] are highly protectionist provisions that are intended to create a 'coastwise monopoly' in order to protect and develop the American merchant marine, shipbuilding, etc."

But protecting U.S. industries from competition may actually have the opposite effect.

Consider U.S. production of vessels designed to transport goods via water compared to U.S. production of semi-trailer trucks and trailers designed to transport goods via land. In 2013, U.S. manufacturers exported \$4.1 billion in semi-trailer trucks and trailers, but they exported just \$0.1 billion in commercial ships.

U.S. commercial shipbuilding accounts for just 21.7 percent of total shipbuilding. Most of the industry produces vessels for the military and will continue to do so with or without the Jones Act. The notion that U.S. defense needs require a ban on the use of foreign-built ships for commercial purposes (but not foreign-built aircraft or foreign-built cars and trucks) seems bizarre. In fact, by artificially inflating prices, protectionist measures such as the Jones Act may have given foreign competitors a competitive edge in international shipping.

The Persian Gulf conflict in the early 1990s proved that the Jones Act was not a necessary element in supplying and sustaining a military operation. For example, during the Persian Gulf War, Military Sealift Command shipped millions of tons of cargo to the operation. Of the 191 chartered dry cargo ships involved in this operation, 162 (or 85 percent) were foreign-flagged.

Additionally, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has frequently leased foreign vessels to execute missions that required additional sealift capacity. This further obviates the need for the Jones Act. One could argue that such long-term leasing agreements are not cost-effective, but if that is the case then the military should purchase such vessels outright. The Jones Act doesn't solve this issue.

Americans in most states would benefit from the freedom to ship goods on the best-built, most affordable vessels, wherever they are made. The Alaska governor is actually required to "use best efforts and all appropriate means to persuade the United States Congress to repeal those provisions of the Jones Act formerly codified at 46 U.S.C. 861, et seq."

The Jones Act drives up the price of gas, hinders U.S. infrastructure improvements, inflicts high costs on people in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and makes it difficult to transship goods between U.S. ports. Senator McCain's Jones Act amendment would promote competition, strengthen the economy, and benefit American consumers.

[From the federalist.com, Jan. 22, 2015]

IF YOU LIKE HIGHER PRICES, ENRICHED CRO-
NIES, AND WEAK NATIONAL SECURITY, THEN
YOU'LL LOVE THE JONES ACT

(By Scott Lincicome)

Sen. John McCain has found an archaic, protectionist boondoggle whose time for death is long past. It's called the Jones Act.

Lost in the never-ending debate about the KeystoneXL pipeline is great news for anyone who opposes cronyism and supports free markets and lower prices for essential goods like food and energy. Sen. John McCain has offered an amendment to repeal the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, also known as the Jones Act, which requires, among other things, that all goods shipped between U.S. ports be transported by American-built, owned, flagged, and crewed vessels.

By restricting the supply of qualified interstate ships and crews, this protectionist 94-year-old law has dramatically inflated the cost of shipping goods, particularly essen-

tials like food and energy, between U.S. ports—costs ultimately born by U.S. consumers. Thus, the Jones Act is a subsidy American businesses and families pay to the powerful, well-connected U.S. shipping industry and a few related unions. For this reason alone, the law should die, but it turns out that the Jones Act also harms the very industry it's designed to protect and, in the process, U.S. national security.

THE JONES ACT INFLATES SHIPPING COSTS FOR AMERICANS

There is no question that the Jones Act inflates U.S. shipping costs. A 2011 Maritime Administration (MARAD) report, with input from the U.S. maritime industry, compared the costs of U.S.-flagged versus foreign cargo carriers, and found that the former far outweighed the latter due to the Jones Act and other U.S. Carriers noted that the U.S.-flag fleet experiences higher operating costs than foreign-flag vessels due to regulatory requirements on vessel labor, insurance and liability costs, maintenance and repair costs, taxes and costs associated with compliance with environmental law . . . [T]he operating cost differential between U.S.-flag vessels and foreign flag vessels has increased over the past five years, further reducing the capacity of the U.S.-flag fleet to compete with foreign-flag vessels for commercial cargo . . .

Higher costs are precisely what you'd expect from an industry that has a "coastwise monopoly" on shipping, due almost entirely to the Jones Act. As a result, U.S. vessel operating costs are 2.7 times more expensive than their foreign counterparts.

Domestic unions and shipbuilders, with a bipartisan coalition of their congressional benefactors, vehemently deny that these outrageous shipping costs differences have any effect on the ultimate cost of U.S. goods that are transported on Jones Act vessels, but several examples belie such claims (and prove that, once again, basic economics still works).

First, there is ample evidence that the Jones Act distorts the U.S. energy market and raises domestic gasoline prices. As I noted last year:

According to Bloomberg, there are only 13 ships that can legally move oil between U.S. ports, and these ships are 'booked solid.' As a result, abundant oil supplies in the Gulf Coast region cannot be shipped to other U.S. states with spare refinery capacity. And, even when such vessels are available, the Jones Act makes intrastate crude shipping artificially expensive. According to a 2012 report by the Financial Times, shipping U.S. crude from Texas to Philadelphia cost more than three times as much as shipping the same product on a foreign-flagged vessel to a Canadian refinery, even though the latter route is longer.

It doesn't take an energy economist to see how the Jones Act's byzantine protectionism leads to higher prices at the pump for American drivers. According to one recent estimate, revoking the Jones Act would reduce U.S. gasoline prices by as much as 15 cents per gallon 'by increasing the supply of ships able to shuttle the fuel between U.S. ports.'

For these and other reasons, the Heritage Foundation just recently called for the complete repeal of the Jones Act as part of its new energy policy agenda.

Second, the Jones Act has particularly deleterious effects on water-bound U.S. markets like Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. A 2012 report by the New York Fed highlighted the issue for Puerto Rico:

Available data show that shipping is more costly to Puerto Rico than to regional peers

and that Puerto Rican ports have lagged other regional ports in activity in recent years. While causality from the Jones Act has not been established, it stands to reason that the act is an important contributor insofar as it reduces competition (shipments between the Island and the U.S. mainland are handled by just four carriers). It costs an estimated \$3,063 to ship a twenty-foot container of household and commercial goods from the East Coast of the United States to Puerto Rico; the same shipment costs \$1,504 to nearby Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) and \$1,687 to Kingston (Jamaica)—destinations that are not subject to Jones Act restrictions . . . Furthermore, over the past decade, the port of Kingston in Jamaica has overtaken the port of San Juan in total container volume, despite the fact that Puerto Rico's population is roughly a third larger and its economy more than triple the size of Jamaica's. The trends are stark: between 2000 and 2010, the volume of twenty-foot containers more than doubled in Jamaica, while it fell more than 20 percent in Puerto Rico.

A 1988 study by the U.S. Government Accountability Office found similar harms for Alaska and the U.S. economy. Thus, the idea that the Jones Act doesn't line the pockets of a few U.S. companies and unions at the expense of American families and businesses simply defies reality.

REGULATING INDUSTRIES CUTS THEM DOWN

Supporters of the Jones Act often rebut these economic criticisms by explaining that the law is absolutely essential for U.S. national security, but these claims also fail the smell test. Consider first the enervation of the U.S. shipping industry itself. The above-referenced MARAD report shows a U.S. industry that has declined nearly to the point of extinction under the weight of the Jones Act and other regulations—a shameful outcome when you consider the history and importance of the U.S. Merchant Marine, which is a component not just of the United States economy, but also our national defense. Mariners in World War II faced the highest casualty rate of any other service: 1 in 26 men went to their deaths on the sea. In 1950, ships waving the United States flag comprised 43 percent of the global shipping trade. Yet by 2009 the U.S. fleet had withered to 1 percent of the global fleet—while global demand for international shipping surged.

As of 2010, the picture was clear: there were 110 U.S.-flagged ships engaged in foreign commerce. Sixty in of these ships were part of the Maritime Security Program. Notably, as of 2012 these ships receive a subsidy (naturally) to the tune of \$3.1 million per ship, per year, to offset their higher costs. Compare this to the 540 ships owned by American interests which flew a "flag of convenience"—typically that of the Marshall Islands, Singapore, or Liberia. Why such a dramatic difference?

While it is certainly not the only factor at play, this precipitous decline in the U.S. fleet's standing is due in no small part to burdensome regulations which make American ships more costly and less competitive. The Jones Act requires ships engaged in the U.S. trade to be built in the country, but building a ship in the United States is exorbitantly expensive—three times the cost of a new ship built in Japan or South Korea. In nearly all cases it is far less burdensome to purchase an existing ship and reflag it rather than build new. And these burdens are before factoring the requirement to crew these ships with U.S. mariners, union men who unsurprisingly average more than five times the expense of a foreign crew. Indeed, the

MARAD report identified labor costs as the single largest driver of the difference between U.S. and foreign carrier costs.

The Jones Act isn't the only harmful regulation, not by a mile. One of the unfortunate realities of operating a massive ocean-going vessel full of complex machinery is that things inevitably require maintenance. These inconveniences often arise overseas and necessitate repairs in foreign countries. Lest you worry the government would be left with beak unwetted in this instance, fear not: 19 USC §1466 to the rescue (link included if you're having trouble falling asleep). This outgrowth of the Tariff Act of 1930 requires the master, or owner of a vessel, upon the ship's return to a United States port, to declare to U.S. Customs any parts and services received onboard while in foreign waters. The ship owner is then required to pay an ad valorem duty of 50 percent on the dutiable vessel repair costs.

A few exceptions written into the law help mitigate this figure, at the further cost of man hours or maritime attorney fees. Free trade agreements between the United States and nations like Oman, South Korea, Singapore, and others help to alleviate these costs by allowing for almost total remission of duty for work performed in those countries. However, it's hardly practical for U.S.-flagged vessels to perform the entirety of their maintenance in these countries when stays in port can be measured in hours. Vessel repair duties are situated to remain a significant, punitive cost of doing business as a U.S. cargo vessel. Even with this 50 percent duty, in the majority of cases it is still less expensive to make the repairs overseas and pay up rather than to perform the work in the United States. This also holds true for the acquisition of new ships.

Thus, under the Jones Act, shipping prices (as well as those for the goods shipped) rise and the U.S. fleet degrades. (For more on how the Jones Act imperils U.S. maritime security, see this helpful Heritage Foundation report.) It's quite the double-whammy, and precisely what you'd expect from a protectionist law that thwarts the benefits of foreign competition. In short, the Jones Act has turned the U.S. merchant marine into a fleet of Ford Pintos and Chrysler K-Cars, all in desperate need of the kind of motivation only free market competition can bring.

TO TOP IT OFF, THE JONES ACT WORSENS EMERGENCIES

Moreover, the Act has proven to be a significant and costly obstacle in times of real emergency. Most recently, the deep freeze of 2014 saw New Jersey exhaust its supply of road salt, imperiling the lives of local travelers. Such salt was available in Maine, but it was delayed for days because of the requirement that only U.S. ships could engage in coastwise trade to carry the shipment—even though an empty foreign ship was available and headed to Newark. The government denied a request to waive the Jones Act and use the foreign ship to supply the much-needed road salt. By the time a Jones Act barge was found to carry the salt, the cost of the operation had grown by \$700,000. Sorry about those icy roads, New Jersey, but the shipping industry and unions gotta get paid.

During the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, the government similarly refused to issue Jones Act waivers so foreign vessels could aid in the cleanup and containment. Despite several offers for foreign assistance during an ongoing ecological disaster, the government cited the Jones Act to justify turning them away. Many suspect that the Obama administration was reluctant to go against the

pro-Jones Act labor unions (tr. every labor union) he needed to cement his re-election. It's not a leap to say that such cronyism may have delayed the eventual resolution of the spill.

The Jones Act and its related statutes raise the cost of essential goods for American families and businesses; strangle the life from the industries they were designed to protect; jeopardizes U.S. maritime security; and exacerbates the pain of major national emergencies. (They also are major irritant in foreign trade relations.) So why hasn't Congress repealed these laws? Maybe we should ask the politicians and well-connected cronies who benefit from the current arrangement. I'm sure they'd be happy to explain.

McCain's amendment to repeal the Jones Act is a common-sense solution to the problems facing a key American industry and the pain of the U.S. economy. The amendment, as well as any broader proposal to kill off the Act, deserves widespread support from conservatives and liberals alike. Efforts to dispense with this archaic protectionist boondoggle will no doubt meet fierce resistance from entrenched interests, labor unions, and opponents of free trade. However, those same groups stand only to benefit from efforts to make the U.S. fleet more competitive and less costly. American mariners have what it takes to compete on a global scale, and they should be given the chance. More competition translates to more opportunity, and perhaps the expansion and revitalization of a crucial sector of our economy. Where artificial monopolies and ancient restrictions can be removed, American labor, American business, and American consumers will have a chance to thrive.

Mr. McCain. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would like to talk about an amendment I filed along with my colleague SUSAN COLLINS of Maine to support the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the LIHEAP program.

As the Senate continues to debate whether to bypass a longstanding Presidential permitting process and essentially rubberstamp the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline—which, to be clear, would likely benefit major oil companies and could have a harmful consequence on our environment—I wish to take the opportunity to highlight a Federal program that helps our country's most vulnerable citizens, including seniors, meet their home energy needs.

The bipartisan amendment led by Senator COLLINS and me, along with several of our colleagues, expresses the sense of the Senate that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—better known as LIHEAP—

should be funded at no less than \$4.7 billion annually to ensure that more low-income households—those with children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans—are able to access this critical assistance.

I must commend Senator COLLINS. She and I have taken the lead on this effort over many sessions of Congress. Her efforts are extraordinarily critical for the continued support of this program, and it is no surprise that once again we are both together urging our colleagues to support this program.

LIHEAP is the main Federal program that helps low-income families, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and a growing number of veterans across the country pay their energy bills. It provides vital assistance during the cold winter months often seen in the Northeast, the Northern Plains, and across the northern part of the country, and also during the summer months in areas of the Southeast and Southwest where air-conditioning is absolutely critical to the health and welfare of seniors. Unfortunately, we often read very disturbing reports of individuals, particularly seniors, with serious medical conditions that can become fatal because they simply can't afford the cost of air-conditioning or home heating.

This is not a program that is regionally specific; this is a program that has a national impact and, as such, has to be supported. It is an indispensable lifeline that ensures recipients do not have to choose between paying their energy bills and affording other necessities such as food and medicine.

The funding also supports many small businesses, such as oil heating companies. They see the benefits of LIHEAP as well. It goes to pay utility bills, which indirectly affects small businesses and individual ratepayers across a broad spectrum. So the benefits of this legislation are not just for the specific recipients but also for the overall economy of our States and for small businesses, and that has to be noted.

We also recognize that there are many more households eligible than receive the benefits simply because the funding levels are insufficient.

Despite bipartisan efforts over many years—again, with Senator COLLINS being right there—funding reductions in 2011 and 2012, along with sequester cuts, mean LIHEAP funding has declined more than 30 percent since fiscal year 2010, from \$5.1 billion down to about \$3.4 billion. This raises another bigger issue.

We have seen our deficit decline significantly, from 9.8 percent of gross domestic product now to about 2.8 percent. In fact, that is a little bit below the 40-year average of deficits in the United States. This hasn't been just because of magic; it is because we have been cutting programs. This is an example of one of the programs we have

cut very significantly, and it is a program that aids so many people in our communities—particularly seniors and people with disabilities. This deficit reduction has been hard won, and one of the costs has been supporting these people. The money has shrunk, so obviously the number of people serviced has shrunk. The number of households LIHEAP funds has declined by 17 percent, from about 8.1 million households to 6.7 million households, and they have seen this impact directly. Those receiving assistance have also seen their average LIHEAP grant reduced by about \$100, down to about \$400. This is estimated to cover less than half of the average home heating costs for a household this winter, meaning that many low-income families and seniors will have fewer resources available to meet other basic needs.

I must point out that we are seeing a temporary reprieve from very high energy prices—particularly oil prices in the Northeast—because of geopolitical developments that have impacted the price of oil. But that is not the solution. The bills these people face, even in this economic climate as well as meteorological climate, are still significant and challenging to people of very limited means. For many people, this is an issue of safety, it is an issue of their health, and it is an issue of just being able to get by and make ends meet.

So the need is clear, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of LIHEAP and in support of this amendment.

In this context, we need to be proactive in terms of recognizing something we can do on a bipartisan basis that works.

I do believe I should also comment at this moment on the underlying proposal, the Keystone XL Pipeline.

We understand this TransCanada pipeline would move crude oil from the Canadian tar sands—one of the dirtiest sources of fuel on the planet—to refineries on our gulf coast. There are many ways to extract hydrocarbons, and this is one of the most environmentally challenging ways. Constructing this pipeline runs counter to what we should be doing on a much broader basis, which is addressing climate change and protecting the environment.

I was struck yesterday at a meeting of the Senate Armed Services Committee—and the Presiding Officer is a distinguished and very valuable member of that committee—where we listened to Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft and Zbigniew Brzezinski, two of the foremost experts on national security policy. General Scowcroft was National Security Adviser for President George Herbert Walker Bush, and Dr. Brzezinski was National Security Adviser for President Carter and was integral in negotiating the Camp David Ac-

cords between Israel and Egypt. I was struck, when asked about the big issues we face, that General Scowcroft said: Well, there are two big issues—cyber security and climate change. When you have these very authoritative individuals—again on a bipartisan basis—essentially saying climate change is a big national security issue, that is the context in which we have to view so many things, in particular this issue of the Keystone Pipeline.

The second issue is the obvious need in this country to create jobs. In fact—no pun intended—that is job number 1 for us. Now, there are jobs associated with the pipeline. Even if they are of short duration, they are still pretty good jobs. But the point has to be made that we have to do much more—particularly for our construction workers—than one single pipeline. I have been told that long-term employment of the pipeline, once it is built—will be very small.

We have to do much more. That is why I think we have to be very serious about an infrastructure program that goes way beyond Keystone and includes roads, bridges, sewers—all these things we have let decline. If we look at the spending levels—once again, a victim of our deficit reduction, a victim of the cuts we have made—we are at a level now where we are not doing what our fathers, grandfathers, grandmothers, and mothers did, which is invest a lot of money in building infrastructure for a productive America. We have been missing in action for the last several years as far as doing those things we used to do routinely—building new highways, building new sewer systems, improving our pollution control systems, all of those things. We have to do that.

We also have to do those things in the context of climate change—in other words, look at alternative energy and not just replicate what we did 20 or 30 years ago because this is a different planet.

According to the BlueGreen Alliance, a coalition of labor unions and environmental groups, repairing America's crumbling infrastructure could create 2.7 million jobs across the economy, increase GDP by \$377 billion, while reducing carbon pollution and other greenhouse gas emissions. So it is not thousands of jobs; it is millions of jobs. It is not one project; it is a commitment to improving, advancing, and rehabilitating our infrastructure in every part of the country, while at the same time dealing with climate change, which is so central.

So, I would like to see us, as we move past this debate, move vigorously into a debate about infrastructure.

There is another issue too, and that is this debate about where the oil is going. Well, given the global market for petroleum products, it could go to parts of the United States, but it could

easily go overseas. A lot of that is a factor of the price and the demand. We have seen a lot of oil going into Asia in particular. I think that trend will continue for several reasons. One reason is that they have done less, relatively speaking, than many other parts of the world in terms of lowering their dependence on oil and moving to alternative fuels. So the potential is that a significant amount, if not all, of this product—even though it reaches the gulf coast—will not be used in the United States. That is another factor we have to consider.

Bypassing the administration's traditional legislative review process with respect to Keystone is not the way to proceed. We have to get our energy policies right. I think we have to recognize climate change. We have to be sensitive to a whole host of issues. We also have to recognize that an energy policy is not just producing and getting these products into the marketplace, it is also making sure that very vulnerable Americans can afford these products, whatever their prices may be. That is where LIHEAP comes in.

I am very pleased, once again, that this is a continuation of a bipartisan effort Senator COLLINS and many others have pursued for the benefit of families all across this country. When we are doing that, I think we are doing the best possible work we can for our constituents and our Nation.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. MIKULSKI pertaining to the submission of S. Res. No. 35 is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 71

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand today to encourage my colleagues to support my amendment No. 71. This amendment would solve a problem that has severely hamstrung oil and gas development on Federal lands, a problem that is particularly severe in the Western United States and that involves excessive delays in the issuing of permits

by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management.

Federal law requires the BLM to approve or deny these permits within 30 days. They have 30 days to go one way or the other. But according to a report issued last year by the inspector general within the U.S. Department of Interior, BLM took an average of 228 days to approve each drilling permit in 2012–228 days. That is 7½ months. That is a lot longer than the 30 days under Federal law. In Moab and in Salt Lake City, UT, the average processing delay is 220 days. In Price, UT, the backlog is around 250 days. It doesn't have to take this long. In fact, to explain why, let's look at how States handle it.

State governments, by comparison, process these same permits in 80 days or less.

Approval of these permits is further complicated by endless environmental reviews, reviews that sometimes can take years upon years. The result of all this redtape is a serious backlog of about 3,500 permits.

My amendment would address this problem in a few ways. First, it would require BLM to issue a permit within 60 days of receiving an application. If the permit is denied, the BLM would be required to specify the reasons for its decision to deny the permit and to allow the applicant thereafter to address any issues.

The amendment would also address delays stemming from reviews under the Endangered Species Act and under the National Environmental Policy Act. Reviews under these statutes are required to be completed within 180 days. To provide companies with certainty and to hold BLM accountable, if either of these deadlines is not met, the applications would be deemed approved.

Significantly, there are currently 113 million acres of Federal land open and accessible for oil and gas development. Much of this Federal land contains abundant domestic energy resources. In Utah alone we have hundreds of acres available for drilling, acres that are currently being held up by bureaucratic delays. My amendment would ensure that Utah and other States in the West that are dominated by Federal land can access the energy, the vast wealth that lies within their borders, and provide the United States with a reliable source of domestic energy production.

Look, our security—our energy security and our national security, more broadly—depends ultimately on our ability to produce energy. I understand that fuel prices right now are down relative to what they have been. We cannot get too secure in this. We cannot assume it is always going to be the case. Certainly, when the Federal Government insists on owning this much land—roughly one-third of the land in the United States as a whole, roughly

two-thirds of the land in my State of Utah—if we are going to own this much land within the Federal Government, we should be using the resources within it.

We need to make sure we are using that land to shore up our energy independence. The less energy independent we are in this country, the more dependent we become on other countries that are producing their energy, that are using their natural resources—countries such as Saudi Arabia and Venezuela and other countries where there are a lot of people growing wealthy off of our petrodollars and where many of those same people are using our own petrodollars to fund acts of terrorism against us, countries that are often hostile to our interests.

We need to do this because it makes sense economically and we need to do this because it makes sense from a national security standpoint as well. But in order for any of this to work, we have to have procedures in place to make sure that those people who choose to go out and want to develop land—want to develop Federal land that has already been identified as suitable for oil and gas production within Federal lands—that they have some modicum of due process, that they have some ability to predict what the procedural outcome is going to be, what set of procedures they will have to follow and what kind of timeline they will be facing as they approach this often lengthy process.

We do need to be careful. We do need to be sensitive and we need to make sure we are developing our natural resources in a way that respects our environment and doesn't endanger our health or that of our Federal land, but this can be done in a way that doesn't have to result in open-ended and completely unforeseeable delays.

For this reason I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, amendment No. 71, with the understanding that as they do so, they will be shoring up America's energy independence, and with it, America's national security.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. I also ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you very much for recognizing me to take the opportunity to address some-

thing I hope can readily and easily be solved. If common sense prevails—and we know it doesn't often enough here in our Nation's Capital—one, the Department of Veterans Affairs certainly, in my view, can solve this problem. If common sense doesn't prevail there, then surely the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President could agree upon a legislative fix that is really nothing more than common sense. I am talking about a veterans issue—one that is certainly prevalent in a rural State such as mine. My guess is it is a problem that occurs in a State such as the Presiding Officer's as well.

I was very pleased. I came to the Senate floor and talked about the importance of passing and approving the CHOICE Act. We remember the scandal of last year in which it became clear the Department of Veterans Affairs had significant problems across the country. The VA hospital in Phoenix was a poster child for bad behavior that resulted in potentially the death of veterans. One of the things we did to try to help the Department of Veterans Affairs better take care of America's veterans was to pass the CHOICE Act. We did that in August of last year. It was signed into law, and it is now being implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There are many issues that are associated with the implementation of this bill, but let me raise one. The crux of that legislation is this. If you are a veteran and you live more than 40 miles from a VA facility or if you can't get the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide the services within 30 days or the timeframe in which you need those services, then the Department of Veterans Affairs is required by law to provide those services, if you choose, at a place of your choice, presumably your hometown.

This is about service to our veterans in their hometowns across Kansas and across States around the country. The theory is that the Department of Veterans Affairs is incapable of providing those services perhaps for a number of reasons, including lack of the necessary professionals. Therefore, let's take advantage of the professionals we have at home in our hometowns. Let the veterans see his or her hometown physician. Let the veteran be admitted to his or her hometown hospital. It is a pretty commonsense kind of reaction to the inability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to meet the needs of veterans across our country—provide another option. If that is the choice of the veteran, that veteran wants to have care at home, give them that option.

As a Senator from a State such as Kansas, this makes sense to me even in the circumstance in which the Department of Veterans Affairs can provide the service. For 14 years I represented a congressional district in Kansas, the

western three-fourths of our State. The congressional district is larger than the State of Illinois and has no VA hospital.

We pushed for a number of years and were successful in opening outpatient clinics so veterans could get that care closer to home than the VA hospital, and those outpatient clinics provide—or at least intended to provide—routine care.

Here is the problem today. The law says if you live more than 40 miles from a VA facility, then the VA must provide the services at home if you choose. The Department of Veterans Affairs is defining facility as any facility, including the hospital or the outpatient clinic. That doesn't seem too troublesome to me until you take it to the next step, which is, even if the VA hospital or the outpatient clinic doesn't provide the service that the veteran needs, they still consider it a facility within 40 miles.

In my hometown, where I grew up, we have had an ongoing dialogue with one of our honored veterans. He needs a colonoscopy. My hometown is nearly 300 miles—250 miles from the VA hospital in Wichita. There is an outpatient clinic, a CBOC, in Hays, 25 miles away. But guess what. The outpatient clinic in Hays doesn't provide the service of colonoscopies.

One would think the veteran in my hometown could go to the local physician or the local hospital and have the colonoscopy performed and the Department of Veterans Affairs provide and pay for the services. But no, because there is an outpatient clinic within 40 miles, even though it doesn't provide the colonoscopy, our veteran is directed to drive to Wichita. Incidentally, we have calculated the mileage expense of the veteran doing it. It does not make sense economically, either. But regardless of that, it certainly doesn't make sense for that veteran.

I have said this many times over the years as we have tried to bring services closer to home to veterans. If you are a 92-year-old World War II veteran and you live in Atwood, KS, up on the Nebraska border, how do you get to the VA hospital in Wichita or in Denver?

Our initial attempt was to put an outpatient clinic closer. The problem with that—we now have an outpatient clinic in Burlington, CO, and an outpatient clinic in Hays, KS. But that is still 2½ hours from Atwood, KS. If you are a 92-year-old World War II veteran in Atwood, KS, how do you get to Hays or Burlington, CO? The answer is you probably don't.

Our veterans are not being served. We attempted to address this issue. Let me say it differently. We addressed this issue in the CHOICE Act and said that if you are 40 miles from a facility, then the VA provides the services at home. The VA is interpreting that facility—the word facility—just to mean any fa-

cility there regardless of what service it provides.

In many instances—take Liberal, KS, where there is a CBOC. They haven't had a permanent physician in their CBOC in almost 4 years. But yet Liberal—the CBOC in Liberal—counts as a facility even though there is no physician who is regularly in attendance at the clinic. These issues ought to be resolved in favor of whom? The veteran. Whom, of all people, would we expect to provide the best service to? In any capable way we can, whom would we expect to get the best health care in our Nation? I would put at the top of the list those who served our country.

The committee that passed this legislation, the CHOICE Act—it says in the language—the conferees recognized the issues I just described and added report language that allows veterans to secure health care services that are either unavailable or not cost-effective to provide at a VA facility, which was intentionally included to give the VA flexibility to provide veterans access to non-VA care when a VA facility, no matter what size or location, cannot provide the care the veteran is seeking.

Yesterday I introduced S. 207. I would ask my colleagues to join me. Again, I guess my first request is, Could the Department of Veterans Affairs fix this problem on their own? If not, I would ask that my colleagues join me in fixing this legislatively with one more directive to the Department of Veterans Affairs saying, if they cannot provide the service at the CBOC, then it does not count as a facility within the 40 miles.

This is a problem across our States. I had my staff at a meeting in the VISN in which they were describing how they were going to implement the CHOICE Act. They put up a chart in which they show how they are going to have a mobile van work its way through the area of our State and Missouri and talked about how that will then satisfy the 40-mile requirement.

Why is the VA bending over backward to avoid—let me say it differently. Why is the VA not bending over backward to take care of the veteran, instead of bending over backward to make sure it is the most difficult circumstance for a veteran to get the health care they need at home?

We ought to always err on the side of what is best for veterans, not what is best for the Department of Veterans Affairs—if you could ever make the case that providing services someplace far away from the veteran is good for the VA.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak to this issue. It is an important one. I have mentioned it to a number of my colleagues. They have described similar circumstances in their State. I have met with the Department of Veterans Affairs personnel. I serve on the veterans' com-

mittee, have since I came to Congress. We will work in every way with the veterans' committee, Republicans and Democrats, to make certain there is a fix to this issue.

But I want to highlight the manner in which the Department is implementing the CHOICE Act is not the way Congress intended, and it is not the way that benefits the veteran. Finally, let me say that even if there was some circumstance in which the Department does not have the authority to do what we are asking them to do in the CHOICE Act, they have the ability today to provide non-VA care whenever they deem it necessary.

There is also the opportunity for them to use a pilot program that many of us have in our States. I see the Senator from Maine is on the floor. They have a pilot program, the ARCH Program, in which we are trying to provide services to veterans at home. There are a variety of ways the Department can solve this problem. I ask them to do that.

In the absence of their solution, I ask my colleagues to join me in sponsoring, in debating, in potentially amending but most importantly in passing and sending this bill to the President so we can resolve once and for all that the Department of Veterans Affairs is created for the benefit of the veteran, not the Department.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, first, as an original cosponsor of the good Senator's bill, I compliment him for taking the leadership position he has on this issue, for bringing it forward and so eloquently expressing his support for it.

This is an important bill. I think it is one we all can agree on, on a bipartisan basis. Let's get it through and to the President.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. President, I start with a question, a basic question: Why are we here? Why do we have those jobs? What is it we are supposed to do? The clearest expression of the answer to that question comes from the preamble to the Constitution, which lays out exactly what our responsibilities are.

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

This is the purpose of the Constitution. It is the purpose of the government. The most solemn responsibility of any government, I would submit—any government, anywhere, any time—is to provide for the security of its citizens, to provide for the common defense. That is our most solemn and fundamental responsibility.

We are not doing that right now. We are avoiding, missing, obfuscating, and not dealing with one of the most serious threats facing our country. I refer to the threat of cyber attack. Every intelligence official I have talked to in the last 2 years, every military official, everybody with any knowledge of the defense and the security, the national security of this country, has emphasized that the most serious threat we face right now is cyber.

What does that mean? Cyber attacks. The disabling of critical infrastructure, attacks on our businesses, financial systems. This is a direct threat that is heading at us like a freight train on a track. The problem is we see it coming, but we are not doing what we should to deal with it.

To say it is coming is kind of an understatement. This is an unusual chart, but it goes in time from 2004 until today. It is basically the frequency and size of cyber attacks in our country. The bigger bubbles are bigger attacks. The smaller bubbles are smaller attacks. From 2004 to 2006, a few but not many. It is bubbling up and it is about to boil over. Each year we have seen more attacks, larger attacks, more serious attacks. The evidence is overwhelming that this is a threat we are facing. Sony was a wake-up call if ever there was one. What if the Sony attack had been the New York Stock Exchange or the railroad system, where cars bearing toxic materials are derailed, or the natural gas pipeline system or any other of the critical infrastructure of this country, financial or physical, would have disabled us?

I was at a hearing yesterday in the Armed Services Committee. We had the testimony of two of the wisest men in America—Brent Scowcroft, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, who was the National Security Adviser to President Ford and President George H.W. Bush, and Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was the National Security Adviser to Jimmy Carter—talking about threats.

Brent Scowcroft said he believes the cyber threat was analogous to the nuclear threat: People would not be killed, but our country could be destroyed. He saw this as one of the two fundamental threats we face. Yet what are we doing in Congress? Not much. It is as if we got a telegram from Admiral Yamamoto in 1941 saying, I am steaming toward Pearl Harbor and we are going to wipe you out, and we did nothing, or a telegram or a text message from Osama bin Ladin saying, We are heading for the World Trade Center, what are you going to do, and we did nothing.

We have the notice. It is right in front of us. Yet we are not acting. What are the risks? The biggest risk is in the nature of our society. The good news is we are the most technologically advanced society on Earth. The bad news is we are the most tech-

nologically advanced society on Earth—because it makes us vulnerable.

It is what they call an asymmetric vulnerability. We are the most vulnerable because we are the most wired. We are in the most danger because of our technical advancement. What can they do to us? This gives you an idea of how this risk is accelerating and how it fits. This is the number of devices in the world connected to the Internet. Back in 2003 it was very few. By 2010 we were up to 10 billion devices connected to the Internet. The projection is, by the end of this year, we will be at 25 billion devices connected to the Internet. By 2020, not that long from now, 50 billion devices will be connected to the Internet and therefore vulnerable to cyber attacks.

Critical infrastructure, I have mentioned. The financial system, what would it do to the country if all of a sudden everybody's bank account disappeared? Most of us, many workers in America, have their—we do not see cash money or a paycheck. It goes electronically into our bank account. What if all of that just disappeared? Chaos would ensue.

The same thing with transactions on the New York Stock Exchange or the great transactions of our banks. It would be chaos that would tumble through the economy and then into people's daily lives. Transportation could be paralyzed. The simply act of messing around with how red and green lights work in a major city could paralyze a major city for hours, if not days.

The transportation of toxic or volatile compounds could be compromised. Of course, the energy system, the electrical grid, we do not realize how dependent we are on these modern facilities until they go down. Periodically in Maine, when I was Governor, we had an ice storm where three-quarters of our people lost electricity for sometimes 2 weeks at a time. We learned what a disaster that was. One of the things we learned was that home furnaces, heating oil furnaces, need electricity to fire. People got cold. It was not just: Gee, I cannot watch TV tonight. It became life threatening.

The second area of vulnerability is financial. Data breaches, that is something that is happening all of the time. Then, finally, property ideas, theft of ideas. Where are these threats coming from? All over the place. North Korea, Russia, China, Iran. Terrorist organizations are now looking into the cyber field—hackers for hire, somebody in some country or somebody's basement somewhere in the world who hires out to take advantage of the vulnerability, particularly of the Western countries and particularly the United States.

We are already incurring huge costs, the cost of these data breaches, the cost of protection against these data breaches. Our financial system is spending a huge amount of money to

protect itself from these breaches. We have to act. We have to act. It is beyond time to act.

My favorite quote from Mark Twain—and there are many. But my favorite is: History doesn't always repeat itself, but it usually rhymes.

History doesn't always repeat itself, but it usually rhymes.

Nothing new ever happens. This would not be the first time in history a great nation ignored threats to its existence. In August of 1939, Winston Churchill, in talking about the House of Commons, but he could have been talking about the U.S. Congress:

At this moment in its long history, it would be disastrous, it would be pathetic, it would be shameful for the House of Commons to write itself off as an effective and potent factor in the situation, or reduce whatever strength it can offer to the firm front which the nation will make against aggression.

Earlier in the thirties he said—and this is a perfect analogy of where we are today:

When the situation was manageable it was neglected, and now that it is thoroughly out of hand we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure.

We are at the line between manageable and too late. I would argue it is almost over that line. Now is the time that we have to act, but we aren't acting because of a variety of reasons: the complexity of our process—four committees have to consider cyber legislation; the differences with the House; the differences with the White House. There are all kinds of complications in our system which seem to be preventing us from acting.

Again, Churchill is appropriate:

There is nothing new in the story. It is as old as the Sibylline Books. It falls into that long, dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind.

Boy, that is a dark judgment. Continuing:

Want of foresight, unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective, lack of clear thinking, confusion of counsel until the emergency comes, until self-preservation strikes its jarring gong—these are the features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

Let's act before the crisis starts. Let's act while we still have time.

There are at least three bills that I know of that are available. One is a bipartisan bill that was heavily negotiated in the Intelligence Committee, came out of the committee I think 12 to 3 last summer. That is available. It is a new Congress, but the ink is barely dry. There is a bill that came out of the Judiciary Committee. A bill that came out of the homeland security committee in December of 2012—and lost in this body by a couple of votes—from my friends Senator COLLINS and Senator Lieberman also dealt with this problem. In other words, we don't have to start from zero. We don't have to invent these solutions; we just have to

have the will to put them in place. Yet we don't act.

People say: Well, we have national security, Senator. What are you talking about? We are spending almost \$600 billion a year on the defense of this Nation.

And the answer is yes, but in some ways it reminds me of the famous Maginot Line of France in the thirties. The Maginot Line has come to symbolize a faulty defense premise, which really isn't true. The Maginot Line worked. The problem was that the Maginot Line stopped. It went from Switzerland to the Belgian border. It stopped at the Belgian border, and the Germans came around it and behind it and overwhelmed France in 6 days. So the problem wasn't that the Maginot Line was not an effective defense—and our defense budget certainly is not ineffective; it is absolutely essential. But we are not defending the whole frontier. There is a piece of it, like Belgium, that is undefended, and that is our failure.

So what are we going to say when the crisis strikes? What are we going to say when we go home to our citizens in our home States when the financial system goes down and people can't get their money? There are threats of violence and violence across our country when toxic waste is spilled in our waterways. What are we going to say? "Well, we would have done something about it, but that was in four committees, and that was really hard" or "You know, we just got in this argument with the White House and couldn't work it out" or "Gee, we would have solved it and your paycheck wouldn't have disappeared except the House—you know how they are." Can you imagine trying to defend yourself with that kind of argument? You would be laughed out of the place.

Come on. Let's do this. I don't know exactly how to proceed, except maybe those four committees should get together, talk to each other, and say: Let's bring a bill to the floor.

I would like to see this body decide that we are going to pass cyber protection legislation between now and May 1. There is no reason we can't do it. The bills are drafted. We just have to pull ourselves together and take collective responsibility for defending our country.

If we don't do this—a friend and colleague on this floor yesterday—we were talking about it, and he said: It is political malpractice if we don't get this done.

This is a threat we know about. It is important. It is serious. We know at least some of the important things we have to do to coordinate better between the government and the private sector. We know how we can help to solve this; we just have to summon the political will to do it. And it isn't even that controversial. There are dif-

ferences here and there, but this isn't one of the big fights in the Senate where we have great ideological differences, this is one where we should be able to come together. It is a lack of coordination and a lack of political will.

I don't know how I can say this more strongly. I think this is one of our most fundamental responsibilities. I go back to the preamble to the Constitution—the primary reason that governments are established and that our government was established, one of the basic reasons is to provide for the common defense. If we don't do that in the face of this threat, shame on us. This is one of the most solemn responsibilities we have as Senators, as Members of the Congress, and as members of the Federal Government of the United States.

I deeply hope that the next several weeks and months will be a time of productive discussions and a commitment to at least an attempted solution, the beginning of a solution to this grave threat facing the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Wyoming.

THE BUDGET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss several issues that I hope Congress will consider in this Congress.

First, I intend to work this year to address our Nation's spending problems because I sit up nights worrying about our Nation's debt and how it will affect our children and grandchildren. As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will have a hand in handling that, so I have more responsibility.

We have a spending problem in this country, and we cannot spend our way to prosperity; rather, we have to stop spending more than we take in and find a way to start paying down \$18 trillion. The debt is growing. In fact, last fiscal year we spent \$469 billion more than we took in. This fiscal year we are projected to spend \$550 billion more than we will take in.

The money on which we actually get to make decisions is about \$1,000 billion. I could say \$1 trillion, but \$1,000 billion seems to me like a lot more. When we talk about one, we don't pay much attention, whether it is a penny or a dollar or a million or a billion or a trillion, but if we put it out in real terms, we are talking about \$1,000 billion that we could actually make decisions on, and we go ahead and spend half more than that, half more than we take in. How long do you think we can do that?

Well, it is affected by interest. We have to pay interest on the money we spend that is in addition to the money we take in. Right now we are able to borrow that money at only 1.9 percent. Only? That amounts to \$251 billion that we are paying in interest. It doesn't do a single program, just pays interest.

How many people think the interest rate is going to stay at 1.9 percent? Well, nobody does. In fact, the projections for this year for that interest rate, as we sell our bonds, is for 2.1 percent and going up. The average would be 5 percent. Let's see—\$250 billion. If that doubled, that would be \$500 billion. That could happen in 1 year. That would be an extra \$250 billion that we couldn't spend out of that \$1,000 billion that we now get to make decisions on, which is only two-thirds of what we actually spend. We have a spending problem, and it is catastrophic in the long run.

People would like us to balance the budget, and I have noticed that 24 States have already passed a constitutional convention balanced budget amendment. There is a provision—article V of the Constitution says you can have a constitutional convention, and there are ways of having it happen, and that is by two-thirds of the States saying they want to have one. The way all those are being phrased is as though it would be limited to a constitutional convention on the balanced budget amendment only, but there is no provision to keep it at that. The only real provision in article V is one that says that no matter what you do in a constitutional convention, the thing that cannot be violated is that all States have equal representation in the U.S. Senate. Since we are the least populated State, that is one of my favorite parts of that article, and that is my favorite article. But everything else could be tapped. There are 10 more States that are considering that resolution. If all 34 of them pass it, we will have a constitutional convention.

If we had to balance that budget in 1 year, that would mean we would have to cut \$550 billion out of \$1,000 billion. In other words, we would have to make a 50-percent cut to balance the budget.

The real tragedy of this—I am not even talking about paying down the national debt; I am just talking about what we would be able to spend after we pay interest because we overspend.

So we are trying to get it on a track where we can at least see the end of the tunnel and hope that is not the light of a train coming our way. So far it is. That is one of the things that keep me up. Several Members of the Senate have ideas on how we can do that, and I intend to work with them in an effort to find real solutions, eliminate some of the budget gimmicks we have had in the past, and I have some ideas I hope my colleagues will consider. One of them is my penny plan. That cuts the overall spending by 1 percent for 3 years to balance the budget. It is a little pain for virtually everybody. Everybody gives up one penny out every dollar they get from the Federal Government. The plan doesn't mandate any specific cuts. Congress would have the authority to make targeted cuts and

focus on the worst first. That is what we ought to do—focus on the worst first, and there is plenty of worst-first out there. If we focus on identifying and eliminating all of the wasteful spending that occurs in Washington, we might not have to cut important programs and services. Let's not make the cuts hurt. Let's be smart about the spending cuts and prioritize how we spend taxpayers' money.

My biennial appropriations bill would allow for each of the appropriations bills to be taken up for a 2-year period. That means agencies would know what they are doing for 2 years. What happens right now is we don't meet the spending deadline—which is October 1—until sometime into the next year. So they not only don't know what they are going to do for 2 years, they don't even know what they are going to do for the year they are in. We need to solve that problem.

My biennial budgeting bill actually breaks up the spending into two pieces. We do 12 of the bills, so we do the six tough ones right after the election and then we do the six easy ones before an election to make that a little easier to get done. But each of them would allow the agencies to know what they are going to do for a 2-year period, and it would allow the appropriators to scrutinize the details of those budgets. When you are looking at \$1,000 billion, how much detail do you think you can look at when you have to do that each and every year? So I am suggesting that we only have to do it once every 2 years for half of the budget, and I think that would get us into a position where we would be cutting that worst first.

Of course, the Defense appropriations bill would be taken up each year, just as we take up the authorization bill. Some people have mentioned that we are funding some things that aren't authorized right now. They were authorized before, but the authorization date has passed, so technically they are not authorized to happen. I was curious as to how many of those there were. I found out there were over 250 authorizations. So how many of those are current? Well, 150 of them are out of date. We are still spending the money, but we haven't looked at the program to see if that is what we intended for them to do and if that is how they are using the money and if it is getting done. It is about time we did that.

Eliminating duplication and waste as well as improper payments could be a real part of the solution this year because those are avoidable wastes of taxpayer dollars. The Government Accountability Office has reported that 31 areas of the Federal Government are in need of reform to eliminate duplicative and unnecessary programs. Consolidating programs and agency functions that overlap could save \$95 billion.

Additionally, in fiscal year 2012 there were nearly \$100 billion in improper

payments. That is the last time we have an accurate record—or inaccurate record of inaccuracies. These are payments that shouldn't be going out the door to people who are no longer eligible for benefits or overpayments of benefits or, in the worst cases, payments to people who are deceased. Ending waste and duplication could not only help out our fiscal house and get it back in order, but it could restore some confidence in the ability of government to operate effectively.

Additionally, I believe that now is the time to deal with the problems we have seen each day since ObamaCare was implemented. Premiums are skyrocketing for many people this year, while small businesses continue to hold off on hiring new workers or are keeping people on a part-time schedule so they do not have to go out of business.

We should repeal this law because it is bad for consumers and bad for businesses. We need real health care reform that gets health care costs under control and ensures that rural health care providers can afford to continue to provide vital services. We can redo that so we provide what the President promised but hasn't provided.

I am also hopeful this Congress can take up tax reform legislation. This will be a challenge since the President said he wants \$1 trillion more in revenue from the Tax Code. I disagree with that premise because I don't think Washington needs to spend more. Tax reform shouldn't raise any more money for the Federal Government than the current system does, but if done correctly tax reform may generate additional revenue through economic growth. That revenue can be used to reduce the deficits and pay down the debt. I hope we can work on a bipartisan basis to take our Tax Code off of autopilot and make it more simple and more fair for everyone—families, small businesses, corporations, and particularly individuals. As the only accountant on the Finance Committee, I am ready to roll up my sleeves and get to work on tax reform.

I also hope Congress will work to improve our economy and make energy more affordable by approving the Keystone Pipeline that we are debating now and fighting against the President's war on coal—the only stockpileable energy source we have. The Keystone Pipeline application has been pending for more than 5 years, and the State Department has had five reviews of the project and wants more. Every one of those reviews has determined the pipeline would cause no significant environmental impacts and that the pipeline would create thousands of jobs. Let's get it built.

Similarly, we need to encourage coal production and prevent the administration from restricting this low-cost, reliable, stockpileable energy source. The coal industry provided—directly

and indirectly—over 700,000 good-paying jobs in 2010, but since being sworn into office, President Obama's rule-making machine has released rule after rule designed to make it difficult and more expensive to use coal. Instead of running from coal, America should run on coal, and I hope this Congress will embrace its abundance and its power and its potential. With the ingenuity of the American people, there isn't any problem I have seen where we couldn't solve it. So let's just go to work on having cleaner energy and putting some of that incentive into using coal.

We need to challenge the President's other regulatory overreach as well. President Obama has issued more Executive orders, more regulations and other Executive actions than either Presidents Bush, Clinton or Reagan. In fact, last month USA Today reported this President is on track to take more high-level Executive actions than any President since Truman, with 195 Executive orders and 198 Presidential memoranda under his belt. This year we need to fight the abuse of Executive power, whether it is used to grant illegal Executive amnesty to illegal immigrants or to regulate all bodies of water on public and private land or to make unconstitutional political appointments. I will be reintroducing my constitutional amendment to allow States to repeal Federal regulations and hope to work with my colleagues on other efforts to fight regulatory overreach.

I am confident we can make real progress for America this year on these and other issues because I believe the Republican leader has established regular order. I expect we will use the committee process so Senators can offer constructive amendments and debate bills in that forum, where they are intensely interested in that legislation. I am hopeful we will also have an amendment process on the Senate floor so all 100 Members of the Senate have an opportunity to improve the bills we consider. Each of us has a different background and each of us looks at every proposal from a different point of view. Working together we can make things better for the American people, and I hope we will do it this year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I wish to take a couple of minutes to talk about the pending business—the Trans-Canada tar sands pipeline. I think it is helpful to start out by recognizing that we actually haven't had a global energy bill in the Senate going back to 2005. So it has been about 10 years since we have truly looked at our entire energy policy in this country and set a new course for what we should be doing in the future.

Despite the fact I think bumper stickers are a little dangerous, I

thought it would be helpful to at least try to encapsulate the general direction we should be going—the short and sweet of what lens we should be viewing our national energy policy through. I think if I had to boil that down to a simple and concise statement, what I would say is simply fewer imports and cleaner fuels. So as we look at different proposals over the course of this upcoming Congress, I think it will be very helpful, particularly on the energy committee and on the floor, to view these projects through that lens.

Oddly enough, we are not dealing with a major energy policy as the very first thing the Senate considers as its pending business. We are dealing with one single project put forward by TransCanada, an international corporation, that has spent millions and millions of dollars over the last few years lobbying Washington for this particular project.

A lot has been said about the tar sands and about oil sands, but one of the things I think would be helpful to talk about is the fundamental difference between the oil that is produced around the United States and tar sands production. At the end of the line we are talking about the energy that is produced, but at the front end there is an enormous difference between oil that is drilled in Southeast New Mexico, Northwest New Mexico, in West Texas, in North Dakota or Colorado and in the tar sands. If we look through that same lens of fewer imports and cleaner fuels, tar sands development fails on both of those fronts.

We talk about more dependency in the United States on importing energy, and here we are talking about a substantially dirtier fuel source. In fact, we aren't allowed props on the floor, but when having this conversation in caucus, I brought some tar sands with me so I could show people the difference between oil and tar sands and how just toxic and sticky it is and how it represents a step backward in our overall energy policy in this country.

When thinking of oil production, most people think of putting a well in place, you case the well, and there is a well pad. It has an impact, certainly, but it is substantially limited compared to what we are seeing going on in the boreal forest in northern Alberta right now.

This is a picture of northern Canada. For those of us in arid Southwestern States, I can't tell you how envious we are of the kind of water one finds in this part of Canada. Also, the fish and wildlife and the forest resources are substantial. If we look at this picture, some people would say: That is the kind of place one might want to see as a national wildlife refuge or a national park. This is what the boreal forest looks like before tar sands production.

The thing to remember is that tar sands are not drilled for. They are not

produced the way oil and natural gas is produced. Tar sands are mined, and they are strip mined. Let us see a picture that exemplifies the boreal forest and then the tar sands production area in the back. This in the front is how it started out and the back is what you have once you are producing the tar sands.

We heard from our colleague from Wyoming in his statement recently on the floor that there is no significant environmental impact from this project. But when we look at tar sands production, I don't know how we can look at a photo such as this and say there is no significant environmental impact.

Let's look at the next picture, and we can take an even closer look at what the tar sands look like when it is in production. We are talking about an enormous area across northern Canada impacted in this way. As we can see, the tar sands is not oil, it is sand and bitumen together.

To be able to process tar sands, to send it through this tar sands pipeline—the Keystone or any other pipeline—to be able to produce it and refine it is a very complicated process. You start by removing the forest cover, then you scrape off the topsoil, and after that you dig up the remaining tar sands and then you have to heat those up and process it to get the energy-bearing oil portion out. Just to be able to move it through a pipeline you have to heat it up, you have to pressurize it and you have to add caustic solvents.

One of the reasons it has been so incredibly difficult to clean up the existing tar sands spills in places such as Michigan and Arkansas is because—unlike oil, where we have a fair amount of experience, though it is not easy to clean up—there are additional solvents and because the very sticky nature of this substance makes it almost impossible to clean up. We have had very little luck cleaning up tar sands spills to date.

We see in the front of this picture the boreal forest—or what is left of it—and then we see acres and acres and acres, thousands upon thousands of acres of tar sands production. So I think the first thing that is important for people to know is that this simply is not traditional oil and gas development. It is not clear a well pad, drill a hole, and produce oil. It is the kind of impact that if it were proposed for New Mexico or New York or California or even Texas we would have enormous outcry. We don't have the kind of open-pit mining and strip mining we once had in this country, but that is what it is most analogous to.

That said, another one of the claims that has been made repeatedly about this particular project is that the emissions it would create are inconsequential. So it is helpful to look at the emissions to understand that, because

tar sands are fundamentally not only harder to handle but fundamentally dirtier from a pollution point of view than traditional oil resources. It is instructive to look at the difference between if we created the same amount of energy from domestic New Mexico, Texas, Colorado or North Dakota crude oil versus if we produced that energy from tar sands.

Once again, we get an idea of the emissions just at the source of the tar sands development here, but if we were to build this tar sands pipeline and we burned all of that produced tar sands that will move through it, the incremental pollution impact of that, the incremental carbon pollution—not the base pollution of whether we created the same amount of energy from oil sources or from some other sources of energy, if we used oil from the United States to create this energy—not looking at that but just the increment of burning tar sands oil instead of conventional crude oil, it is the equivalent of putting 285 million cars on the road for 1 year.

So the addition of carbon pollution to the atmosphere is anything but inconsequential if we look at it from the point of view that it is the equivalent of doubling Pennsylvania's cars—putting another Pennsylvania's worth of auto traffic on the road every year for 50 years.

What that doesn't take into account is the additional carbon released simply because we are cutting down all the forests, eliminating the peat bogs, and fundamentally industrializing an enormous portion of Alberta and Canada. That increment is another 6 million cars' worth of carbon pollution on the road for 1 year.

So that brings me to: What difference does this make?

We may have seen in the news a few days ago how 2014 was the hottest year on record. I wish I could say that was an anomaly. Unfortunately, it is not. Fourteen of the last 15 years have been record-setting years. And if there is something we know from our geologic records—from ice cores, from the science that has been done at NASA and NOAA and analyzed by our national labs and our university scientists—it is that over time the amount of carbon pollution in the atmosphere—the parts per million of carbon dioxide at any given time—tends to correlate with temperature. It doesn't matter if it comes from a volcano, it doesn't matter if it comes from the exhaust of a car. But because we have added such an enormous increment in recent years, since 1880 and the Industrial Revolution, we can see that as the parts per million of particles go up over time—this is the CO₂ concentration over that time period from the Industrial Revolution to today. It is actually not quite up to date because, unfortunately, we are now up

here above 400 parts per million. Over that same time period, the average temperature has gone up year in and year out, with fluctuations, but the trendline continues to go up to a very dangerous level.

Adding an additional increment of carbon pollution is simply not something we can afford at a time when we need to be showing real leadership in terms of cleaning up our energy sources, moving forward to a clean energy future, and putting Americans to work here, domestically, with that approach.

The temporary jobs this tar sands pipeline will create are not inconsequential. But since this has been sold as a jobs program, it is worth stepping back and talking about how much of a permanent impact this is going to make. I would make the argument that if we were truly serious here in the U.S. Senate about the type of temporary construction jobs this pipeline would create, we would get serious about passing a transportation bill—and not only passing a transportation bill, but financing transportation in this country, financing infrastructure in this country the way we have historically.

We have a deficit of trillions of dollars worth of infrastructure at this point in this country because we won't pay to maintain it. In fact, our parents' generation built an infrastructure that is the envy of the world. With the current approach in the Congress, we haven't even had the decency to maintain the infrastructure they built and pass it on to our children unimpaired, much less create additional infrastructure of the type we saw from previous generations.

So if we look at the permanent jobs, as articulated in the environmental impact statement, we are talking about 30 to 50 permanent jobs from Keystone. That is slightly less than a single McDonald's, although I would argue that construction jobs are usually higher paying than McDonald's. But it gives us a sense of the kind of scale we are talking about in terms of permanent jobs. If we compare that to just regional projects in individual States—a transmission line in the Southwest, three times as many jobs as that; an electric vehicle plant in the West in Nevada, substantially many, many increments of permanent jobs more, which once again brings us to the fact that in this recovery, just in the third quarter of 2014, we saw 18,000 in clean energy jobs created in this country.

We need jobs in this country. We need energy in this country. And I would argue that the sooner we commit ourselves to a clean energy job-intensive future, the sooner we will address the real challenges that are in front of us.

I continue to urge the President to exercise his discretion and his veto of

this. I suspect it will pass the U.S. Senate. But the sooner we get through this process, my hope is that we can return to a real debate about how we address the science that all the scientists have said is out there. We did make a big step forward yesterday in that the Senate for the first time—and the Republicans in the Senate in particular for the first time—accepted the reality of climate change. Unfortunately, right now the policy prescription is to make that climate change worse.

It is time we had an Apollo project for clean energy in this country. That will take transition. That means we are going to continue to produce fossil fuels as a part of that transition. But the sooner we get serious about investing in research and development, the sooner we get serious in terms of scaling the very real and economically competitive technologies we already have, the sooner we get serious about building infrastructure, such as transmission lines to carry renewable energy from parts of the country where it can be produced today to parts of the country where it will be consumed, the sooner we will lead the world and put this country back on track to be the world leader in not only energy but in clean energy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROE V. WADE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of a tragedy. Forty-two years ago today, the Supreme Court announced its creation of a right to abortions for virtually any reason at all virtually at any time. The result of that decision is a tragedy for our society, for our culture, and for our precious life lost.

Since even before America's founding, the law was on a steady march toward protecting human beings before birth. In the 19th century, medical professionals and civil rights activists led a movement that succeeded in prohibiting abortion in every State except to save the mother's life. America had reached a consensus on the importance of protecting the most vulnerable. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court swept all of that aside, imposing upon the country a permissive abortion regime that the American people to this day have never chosen or accepted.

The debate over the morality and legality or policy of abortion begins with one inescapable fact—every abortion kills a living human being. Many have tried mightily to avoid, obscure, dis-

tract from, or ignore that fact, but it will not go away. Every abortion kills a living human being. That fact informed President Ronald Reagan when he wrote a moving essay titled "Abortion and the Conscience of the Nation" in 1983.

He wrote, "We cannot diminish the value of one category of human life—the unborn—without diminishing the value of all human life." The real question, President Reagan said, is not about when human life begins, but about the value of human life. I believe that remains the real question today.

Today the United States is one of only seven nations in the world to allow abortion into the sixth month of pregnancy and beyond. That list of nations includes such champions of human rights as China and North Korea. Yet, in 1948, the United States voted in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes in its preamble the inherent dignity and inalienable rights of "all members of the human family."

Article 3 of the declaration states that "everyone has a right to life." Words such as "universal" and "inherent" and "all" are unambiguous and clear.

Our embrace of the inherent dignity and worth of all human beings in 1948 stands in jarring contrast to the Supreme Court's decision in Roe just 25 years later, that the life of any human being may be ended before birth.

The Supreme Court might have thought in 1973 that it was settling the abortion issue. By 1992, however, the Court conceded that the rules it created in Roe simply did not work and issued revised regulations in a case titled *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. The Court said then that the contending sides in the abortion controversy should "end their national division by accepting a common mandate rooted in the Constitution."

National division on any issue, let alone one so profound as the taking and the value of human life, will not end simply because the Court says so. The division over abortion not only continues, but has remained largely unchanged even after dozens of Supreme Court decisions and four decades of insisting that abortion is a constitutional right.

The Supreme Court can render opinions on constitutionality, but it is limited in its ability to forge lasting consensus. That is the provenance of our great deliberative bodies where the people are truly represented.

More than 70 percent of Americans believe abortion should be illegal in most or all circumstances. That figure has not changed in 40 years. What has changed is that more Americans today identify themselves as pro-life than pro-choice. Large majorities favor a range of limitations on abortion and last November elected scores of new

pro-life Senators at both the State and Federal level.

We must not avoid the fundamental question of the value of human life, for no question is more important. Do we still, as we once did, believe that every human being has inherent dignity and worth?

Two nights ago, in his State of the Union Address, President Obama spoke about the values that are at stake in the public policy choices we must make. Is there any value more important than life itself? He spoke about expanding opportunities for individuals, but the first opportunity that must be secured is the opportunity for life itself.

For many, the right to abortion is a symbol of progress. However, the idea that an act resulting in killing a living human being should be held up as a step forward, as a light to guide our way, strikes me as deeply misguided. We should instead be deepening the conviction that all human beings have inherent dignity and worth. That has been and should remain the foundation of our culture, society, and even our politics.

In his 1983 essay, President Reagan wrote that “we cannot survive as a free nation when some men decide that others are not fit to live and should be abandoned to abortion.”

Today’s tragic anniversary is a reminder of how our Nation’s survival depends on respecting the essential dignity and worth of every human individual. Resting in the balance is how we ultimately define who we are as a people and what we strive to be as a nation.

This is an important issue. It is not one that should be slighted over. It is an issue that should strike at the heart of every person in this body. It is an issue that we all should stand up to strengthen and fight against in the case of this issue of abortion.

I am so grateful that so many people feel the same way, and that more and more people in this country are starting to realize every human life is important and that this society has sometimes gotten off track and not respected the rights of human beings. I think *Roe v. Wade* led us there, and we should be let out of *Roe v. Wade* by those who know there is a better way to have the sensitivity that society deserves to have, should have, and I believe will have in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer. I heard the words of my friend, and he was eloquent in his remarks, but I don’t think he would be surprised to know that I see this issue very differently.

Before *Roe v. Wade* was decided in the 1970s, women died because they could not end a pregnancy even if they were raped. There are bodies buried in

America, and we don’t know the cause of death because if a woman tried to end an unwanted pregnancy—sometimes as a result of rape or even incest—she would be considered a criminal. And that is what you hear from my colleagues on the other side. They say, let’s go back to the last century—let’s undo *Roe v. Wade*.

It is hard for me to believe that here I stand in this century arguing that women should be respected, that families should be respected, and that everyone’s religion should be respected. I support a woman’s right to choose, and that means if your religion says you will never end an unwanted pregnancy, I support you.

I believe this decision should be between a woman, her doctor, her family, and her God. I don’t think any Senator should get in the middle of a woman’s private life. It is dangerous to do so, it is wrong to do so, and to do so in the name of doing something that is going to help the family—it doesn’t make sense to me.

The Republican Party used to be the party of individual freedom and individual rights. When I was on the board of Planned Parenthood so many years ago, before *Roe v. Wade*, do you know who was very active and on their board? George Herbert Walker Bush. This was an issue that was embraced by Republicans and Democrats—individual respect and rights for women and caring about a woman’s health. It was not a partisan issue.

I don’t see how interfering with a woman’s health, or her right to choose, in any way is helpful to her in a time of need. It should be her decision within the law. We don’t want to go back to the last century.

I was glad to see that the Republicans in the House pulled a bill off the floor because it was so nasty to women. It didn’t even allow women the right to terminate a pregnancy at a certain date if the woman was a victim of rape. They pulled it, but then they replaced it with another terrible bill that also limits a woman’s right to choose.

My Republican friends would make doctors criminals and put them in jail for years and years. They would make women criminals. They have even had a bill that said that a grandmother should be put in jail if she helps her granddaughter. As a grandmother, that was too much for me. How dare some Senator come down here and tell a grandma what to do for her granddaughter? This is the party of individual freedom that always decries too much government? Come on. This is putting the government right in the middle of our most personal decisions. It never used to be that way, but that is the way it is now.

Everyone deserves respect for their views. They should not be taunted for their views, and that is why the right to choose makes so much sense. You

don’t tell someone that the government says you must do A, B, or C. You tell the person within the law—within *Roe*, which was a modest decision at the time—you make a decision, we respect that decision, and we don’t need to know about it.

Putting Senators in the middle of our private lives is not why I came to the Senate. We have a lot of work to do. We have to work on good jobs. We have to pass a highway bill. We have to make sure this planet is habitable for people. Talk about kindness. Think about future generations who have to live on a planet that is increasingly inhospitable. Scientists tell us if we don’t do anything about climate, at the end of the day it may be an uninhabitable planet.

We have a lot of work to do. We all do. It seems to me we should start off by doing what government should do, not putting ourselves in the middle of private lives.

Again, I greatly respect my colleagues whose views are different than mine. All I ask them to think about is this: If we embrace the right to choose, then we are saying to women all over America that this is a tough decision and we understand that. Make it with your God. Make it with your loved ones. But we are not going to be right there in the middle of people’s living rooms telling them what we think is right, because that is not why we were elected.

I am glad I happened to be on the floor to follow the remarks of Senator HATCH. I feel very strongly about this. As many of my colleagues know, the Democratic women of the Senate and several of our Republican women colleagues will continue to fight against saying to a woman that she has no right to make a most private, most personal decision without satisfying U.S. Senators, most of whom are men, by the way. It is just not right.

Speaking of polls, because I think Senator HATCH mentioned one, people want us to have a moderate approach on this. They don’t want abortion on demand and neither does any pro-choice Senator. *Roe v. Wade* spelled it out. In the early stages we know a woman has that right; later, only if her health or her life is threatened. It is pretty modest. It makes sense. Leave it alone. That decision was made in 1973. Don’t turn the clock back in this century.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:50 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Boxer No. 113, which is a side-by-side to Senator FISCHER's amendment; then Fischer No. 18, as modified; Manchin No. 99; Sanders No. 24; Lee No. 71; Murkowski No. 123, which is a side-by-side to Senator WYDEN's amendment; Wyden No. 27; Blunt No. 78, as modified; Cornyn No. 126, as modified; and Menendez No. 72, as modified; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption except for Cornyn No. 126 and Menendez No. 72, which are germane, and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote, and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment No. 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 123 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that all forms of unrefined and unprocessed petroleum should be subject to the nominal per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a "blue slip" from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 78, AS MODIFIED

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the Blunt amendment, No. 78, with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BILATERAL OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) On November 11, 2014, President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of the People's Republic of China announced the "U.S.-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change and Clean Energy Cooperation" (in this section referred to as the "Agreement") reflecting "the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances".

(2) The Agreement stated the United States intention to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by one-quarter by 2025 while allowing the People's Republic of China to double its greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2030.

(3) Analyses have shown that policies limiting greenhouse gas emissions lead to a material increase in electricity prices.

(4) The people of China will not see similar electricity price increases as they continue to emit without limit for the foreseeable future, at least until 2030.

(5) Increases in the price of electricity can cause job losses in the United States industrial sector, which includes manufacturing, agriculture, and construction.

(6) The price of electricity is a top consideration for job creators when locating manufacturing facilities, especially in energy-intensive manufacturing such as steel and aluminum production.

(7) Requiring mandatory cuts in greenhouse gas emissions in the United States while allowing nations such as China and India to increase their greenhouse gas emissions results in jobs moving from the United States to other countries, especially to China and India, and is economically unfair.

(8) Imposing disparate greenhouse gas emissions commitments for the United States and countries such as China and India is environmentally irresponsible because it results in greater emissions as businesses move to countries with less stringent standards.

(9) Union members, families, consumers, communities, and local institutions like schools, hospitals, and churches are hurt by the resulting job losses.

(10) The poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes are hurt the most by increased electricity rates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Agreement negotiated between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China has no force and effect in the United States;

(2) the Agreement between the President and the President of the People's Republic of China is a bad deal for United States consumers, workers, families, and communities, and is economically unfair and environmentally irresponsible;

(3) the Agreement, as well as any other bilateral or international agreement regarding greenhouse gas emissions such as the United Nation's Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris in December 2015, requires the advice and consent of the Senate and must be accompanied by a detailed explanation of any legislation or regulatory actions that may be required to implement the Agreement and an analysis of the detailed financial costs and other impacts on the economy of the United States which would be incurred by the implementation of the Agreement;

(4) the United States should not agree to any bilateral or other international agreement on greenhouse gases that imposes disproportionate and economically harmful commitments on the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 126, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the Cornyn amendment, No. 126, as modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. CORNYN, proposes an amendment numbered 126, as modified, to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure private property is protected as guaranteed by the United States Constitution)

At the end add the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 72, AS MODIFIED

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Menendez amendment, No. 72, be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired from willing sellers and consistently with the Constitution.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. On behalf of Senator MANCHIN, I call up his amendment, No. 99.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for Mr. MANCHIN, proposes an amendment numbered 99 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community and a growing number of top national security experts, economists, and others that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) climate change is caused by human activities;

(3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;

(4) the Energy Information Administration projects that fossil fuels will continue to produce 68 percent of the electricity in the United States through 2040; and

(5) it is imperative that the United States invest in research and development for clean fossil fuel technology.

Ms. CANTWELL. I yield to Senator BOXER so she can call up her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mrs. BOXER. I call up amendment No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 113 to amendment No. 2.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding federally protected land)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Presidents of both parties have designated public land to preserve the land for current and future generations and to honor the national heritage of the United States, and that designated public land includes—

(A) the Statue of Liberty;

(B) the Grand Canyon;

(C) Acadia National Park;

(D) African Burial Ground National Monument;

(E) the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park;

(F) Muir Woods National Monument;

(G) Arches National Park; and

(H) Devils Tower National Monument;

(2) outdoor recreation, including recreation within Federal land, adds over \$600,000,000,000 into the economy of the United States and supports more than 6,000,000 jobs;

(3) Federal land, such as National Parks, National Monuments, or other federally designated land, conserves historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, and biological resources, and positive impacts include—

(A) economic opportunities and small business creation;

(B) local tourism in gateway communities;

(C) new direct and indirect employment opportunities;

(D) recreational opportunities; and

(E) environmental, historic, and educational opportunities; and

(4) regions surrounding National Monuments have seen continued growth or improvement in employment and person income.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should acknowledge the benefit that public land designations provide to local and regional communities and economies; and

(2) designations of federally protected land should continue where appropriate and with consultation by local communities, bipartisan elected leaders, and interested stakeholders.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes just before the vote starts to explain this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, reversing the right to object, I want to make sure we understand the vote was scheduled to begin 3 minutes ago. As part of the unanimous consent agreement, there was not a time allowed for Senator BOXER to speak. I don't have a problem in giving—

Mrs. BOXER. Excuse me for interrupting. I assume we have at least a minute to talk about our amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I am happy to make sure that is allowed. It wasn't included in the consent, but I am certainly happy to allow for the minute as Senator BOXER has asked.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. I have a minute. I actually asked for three, but as I understand, I have a minute. Is that where we are?

I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you so much. I know what a hard job it is to get this bill moving, and I am trying to be very helpful. I am offering an amendment I didn't expect to offer because basically my amendment says that we should acknowledge the benefit that parks provide to our local and regional communities and their economies for small

business and enhanced local tourism and how much they contribute to employment and provide opportunities to our families. Can my colleagues imagine America without Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, the Statue of Liberty, Natural Bridges in Utah, Scottsbluff in Nebraska, Muir Woods in California, Glacier Bay in Alaska?

These were all protected by Republican and Democratic Presidents, and in many cases, by Congress. Why do I offer this? It seems to me we shouldn't have to argue about this. It is because my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER, has an amendment that I think is very dangerous. I know she modified it, and I appreciate that, but at the end of the day, it is so vague that I think it is going to lead us right to the courthouse door.

For example, if a President now or in the future, Democratic or Republican, decided in California—because the community really wanted it—to declare a national monument as we just had recently, in many cases, I would tell you this: Under this Fischer amendment, what would happen is there would have to be under consideration what does this do to other monuments, to other parks, to the budget deficit.

If someone who did not like this said, I am taking this to court because the President didn't consider this, you would not have any more national monuments, and you would not have all the beautiful iconic things we have such as the Grand Canyon and Scottsbluff. I think it is a bad amendment. I know my friend is trying to make a point, but I think we should defeat it and pass the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a vote in relation to amendment No. 113, offered by the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Brown	Corker
Ayotte	Cantwell	Cruz
Baldwin	Cardin	Donnelly
Bennet	Carper	Durbin
Blumenthal	Casey	Feinstein
Booker	Collins	Franken
Boxer	Coons	Gillibrand

Graham	Menendez	Schatz
Heinrich	Merkley	Schumer
Heitkamp	Mikulski	Shaheen
Heller	Murphy	Stabenow
Hirono	Murray	Tester
Kaine	Nelson	Udall
King	Paul	Warner
Klobuchar	Peters	Warren
Leahy	Portman	Whitehouse
Manchin	Reed	Wyden
Markey	Rubio	
McCaskill	Sanders	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 18, as modified, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, our national parks are facing \$13 billion in maintenance needs. The entire Federal land of States is looking at \$22 billion in needs. We want to keep these resources and parks open for our children and grandchildren to marvel at and enjoy.

All of us have unique and special areas within our States, but we in Congress have the responsibility to care for the natural resources of our country.

This amendment has been softened so that the limitations are now just considerations. Let's vote yes on this amendment to take care of the resources we have so that future generations can enjoy them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would open the courthouse door over disputes of whether to place worthy lands under protection because of challenges that there are not enough resources or certain issues were not considered ahead of time.

Let me give one concrete example. A little over 1 year ago the President des-

ignated the Harriet Tubman Park as a national historic monument. It was a prerequisite to becoming a national park. That could have been challenged in the courts and it could have prevented the protection of that land. That could have been done.

What this amendment does—and it was not intended to do that—is add additional bureaucracy to the protection of worthy lands. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. I think it will do harm to the protection of necessary lands in our country.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Perdue
Boozman	Heitkamp	Portman
Capito	Heller	Risch
Cassidy	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rounds
Cochran	Isakson	Rubio
Corker	Johnson	Sasse
Cornyn	Kaine	Scott
Cotton	King	Sessions
Crapo	Kirk	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Sullivan
Daines	Lee	Thune
Enzi	Manchin	Tillis
Ernst	McCain	Toomey
Fischer	McConnell	Vitter
Flake	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—45

Ayotte	Durbin	Murray
Baldwin	Feinstein	Nelson
Bennet	Franken	Peters
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Graham	Sanders
Boxer	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Burr	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McCaskill	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Warner
Collins	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 99

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 99, offered by the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, for the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, we can all agree climate change is real and that 7 billion people have had an impact on the climate. We have a responsibility. We can all agree we need to act to address the potentially devastating impact of climate change. The Energy Information Administration predicts the United States will continue to rely on fossil fuels for almost 68 percent of our energy through 2040. That is right, the Department of Energy.

My amendment basically says that right now the only baseload fuels we have are coal and nuclear and that is going to expand to natural gas.

What we are asking for is we need a Federal commitment from the President to Congress to invest in the research and development of fossil energy so we can use the cleanest and most environmentally responsible way possible and find that technology to do it so we are responsible.

My amendment does recognize these facts. I ask for a "yea" vote and appreciate your support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the Manchin amendment is a side-by-side to my amendment, which will follow.

The first three provisions are exactly the same: Climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and it is already causing devastating problems.

We agree on that. But what my amendment says, importantly, is that according to the scientific community, it is imperative the United States transform its energy system away from fossil fuel to energy efficiency and sustainable energy as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we had a robust discussion yesterday on two amendments that dealt with the issue of climate change. I think we had a very clear and resounding vote on the one that had a perfectly reasonable statement that climate change is real; climate change is not a hoax.

I also supported the amendment of my colleague from North Dakota on this same topic. I think it was important that we had that debate.

What I am hoping we can do now is get beyond the discussion as to whether climate change is real and talk about: What do we do? How do we move forward to those technologies? How do we make a difference with reasonable steps such as greater efficiency, a no-

regrets energy policy that makes our energy supply even cleaner.

I want to move on to that. But I think at this point in time, with what we have had in front of us, we could have a whole series of amendments that basically restate the same thing.

I would like to move us beyond that conversation, and I look forward to that. But at this time I move to table, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a motion to table is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am asking for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is asking for unanimous consent.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the original agreement said that, further, that all these amendments be limited to 60-vote affirmative threshold adoption, except for Cornyn and Menendez, and that no second-degrees be in order. So the original agreement we entered into allowed for this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent agreement was for a vote in relation to each amendment, and the motion to table is in order.

QUORUM CALL

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 2 Leg.]

PRESENT

Alexander	Coons	Hatch
Ayotte	Corker	Heinrich
Barrasso	Cornyn	Heitkamp
Bennet	Cotton	Hirono
Blumenthal	Cruz	Hoeven
Blunt	Daines	Inhofe
Boozman	Donnelly	Isakson
Boxer	Durbin	King
Burr	Enzi	Kirk
Cantwell	Ernst	Klobuchar
Capito	Feinstein	Lankford
Cardin	Fischer	Manchin
Cassidy	Flake	Markey
Coats	Franken	McCain
Cochran	Graham	McCaskill
Collins	Grassley	McConnell

Menendez	Rubio	Tester
Merkley	Sanders	Thune
Murkowski	Sasse	Tillis
Nelson	Schumer	Vitter
Perdue	Scott	Warner
Peters	Shelby	Warren
Portman	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Rounds	Sullivan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 99

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murphy	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Reid

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 24, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we are walking down a very dangerous road as a nation when we reject the findings of

the vast majority of scientists on one of the most important issues facing humanity, which is climate change.

A vote to table this amendment is a vote to reject science, and that is a very bad idea for the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for the same reasons that I just expressed in the previous amendment that was before us, I would suggest that we move to table this amendment.

I will make that motion now to table the Sanders amendment, and I would ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is still 30 seconds remaining for the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. This is a vote that our kids and grandchildren who will have to live with the consequences of climate change will remember.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Cardin	Franken
Bennet	Carper	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Casey	Heinrich
Booker	Coons	Hirono
Boxer	Donnelly	Kaine
Brown	Durbin	King
Cantwell	Feinstein	Klobuchar

Leahy	Murray	Shaheen
Manchin	Nelson	Stabenow
Markey	Peters	Tester
Menendez	Reed	Udall
Merkley	Sanders	Warren
Mikulski	Schatz	Whitehouse
Murphy	Schumer	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Graham Reid

The motion was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 71

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 71, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand to urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to expedite the process by which the Bureau of Land Management processes applications for a permit for drilling on Federal land. We all know that drilling and the production of oil and natural gas in our country on Federal lands is an essential activity for our energy security and therefore for our national security.

The fact is that although these applications are supposed to be handled in an expedited manner, they are not. The average right now for them to be processed is about 7½ months. That is too long. We need a simple up-or-down ruling by the Bureau of Land Management, especially given the fact that these lands, once they get to this stage, have already been deemed by the Bureau of Land Management as suitable for oil and gas leasing. I therefore urge each of my colleagues to support this amendment and thereby secure our energy security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, speaking against the Lee amendment, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this because it is an amendment relating to oil and gas permits on Federal land. I guess if colleagues want to keep trying to loosen environmental regulations, then maybe they should support this amendment.

This amendment would impose new limitations on the Secretary of the Interior and their ability to process permits for drilling and provides a waiver for the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act if necessary reviews have not been completed by an arbitrary deadline, and it waives judicial review of these actions.

So I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to remind Members that we are

trying to keep a schedule here. We have six more amendments to go in this stack, and we are supposedly at 10 minutes per amendment. We have not been following that. I urge Members to stick close so we can move more expeditiously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 17 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker

NAYS—47

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Lankford	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Collins	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham Reid

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. LEE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 123

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to

amendment No. 123, offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have the sense of the Senate that would express that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude should be subject to the 8-cent-per-barrel excise tax associated with the oilspill liability trust fund. This is important because right now we have a legitimate but unintended loophole on the books, and it is also a matter of fairness because conventional oil pays into the trust fund. We need to address this, and I commend my colleague Senator WYDEN for the effort he has done. But the problem that we have is that as we work to enact legislation to update our laws, we have to make sure it is consistent with the Constitution, which requires revenue-raising measures to originate in the House.

If we agree that we want to close this loophole, which we should do, we need to allow for the House to address this. Otherwise, we face a blue slip issue, and quite honestly, it would act as a poison pill to the Keystone XL bill. The sense of the Senate expresses to do it legitimately through the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am glad Senator MURKOWSKI has now agreed that the outlandish tar sands loophole, which rips off taxpayers and communities, must be closed. The difference between our amendments is that Senator MURKOWSKI's amendment is a nonbinding resolution to close the loophole sometime down the road. My amendment, in contrast, closes the loophole now.

The argument Senator MURKOWSKI makes against my amendment is that it is a revenue measure that should start in the House. The fact is that there is a House revenue measure at the Senate desk right now that I would be happy to call up and amend as a substitute to my amendment to close the loophole that ends the tar sands double standard harming our communities and taxpayers. That way we will be acting in a constitutional fashion and the Senate makes clear we want to close the loophole today.

I will close by saying that until I can propound the unanimous consent request to do just that, I intend to go along with the Murkowski amendment. After its consideration, I hope my colleagues will vote for my amendment because closing this flagrant tax loophole is too important to wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 18 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Ernst	Murphy
Baldwin	Feinstein	Murray
Barrasso	Fischer	Nelson
Bennet	Flake	Peters
Blumenthal	Franken	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Reed
Booker	Gillibrand	Rounds
Boxer	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Burr	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sessions
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Stabenow
Carper	King	Sullivan
Casey	Kirk	Tester
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Thune
Coats	Leahy	Tillis
Cochran	Manchin	Udall
Collins	Markey	Vitter
Coons	McCain	Warner
Corker	McCaskill	Warren
Daines	Menendez	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Merkley	Wicker
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—23

Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Isakson	Roberts
Cotton	Lankford	Rubio
Crapo	Lee	Sasse
Cruz	McConnell	Scott
Grassley	Moran	Shelby
Hatch	Paul	Toomey
Heller	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Reid
--------	------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to remind everybody these are supposed to be 10-minute rollcall votes. To the extent that you do not make it in the 10 minutes, you inconvenience everybody else. I would hope people would be respectful of their colleagues and stay close to the floor and vote during the 10 minutes.

We have actually reached a milestone here that I think is noteworthy for the Senate. We just cast our 15th rollcall vote on an amendment on this bill, which is more votes—more rollcall votes on amendments than the entire Senate in all of 2014.

I particularly want to commend Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL for their fair and open process that has been engaged in. This is the way the Senate ought to work.

Now the question I know on everyone's mind is: What do we do next? Right? It is Thursday night. We have a current tranche of amendments. We are having a little difficulty getting our friends on the other side of the aisle to offer their amendments so they can be considered.

In order to consider amendments, they need to be offered. So here is where we are for the evening: We are going to finish this tranche. Chairman MURKOWSKI is interested in setting up an additional tranche of amendments tonight. Once she has been able to set up an additional tranche of amendments for tonight, we will be able to announce the way forward for later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the majority leader for the compliment which he has placed to the constructive minority in the Senate. We know that under the rules of the Senate, this procedure could have been stopped at any moment by any Senator. Yet we have worked in good faith with the good leadership of Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator CANTWELL, and Senator BOXER. We want to continue to.

We have had a number of amendments considered here. Many of them had Republican responses which we have accommodated. Many of your amendments had Democratic responses which you have accommodated. I think we have done that in good faith. We have not threatened any filibusters. We have not tried to stop the process, and we do not want to. We think we have constructive amendments. We want to bring them forward. We would like to have a vote.

I agree with the Senator completely, this is a constructive use of the Senate floor and the Senate procedure on a critical issue relative to our environment and energy policy in this country.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Illinois. He is entirely correct. We are open for business. When we finish this tranche, I hope Senators on both sides who have additional amendments to be considered will come and offer them.

After we get an additional tranche of amendments that are pending, then I think we will be in a better position to announce the way forward.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 27, offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it is very significant that more than 70 Senators just voted for a nonbinding resolution to close an outlandish tax loophole that favors Canadian tar sand producers over American oil and American taxpayers. That vote was for a nonbinding resolution. The next amendment that I offer allows the Senate to actually eliminate the flagrant loophole now.

As for the blue-slip question, this amendment is an amendment that we ought to pass now and then add to an appropriate House revenue measure. This amendment, colleagues, ends the double standard today. To say to your communities, to your taxpayers, and to your producers that Canada should essentially get a free ride is not right. Let's actually do the job now.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, again, let me remind my colleagues that while we may agree we need to address this legal—but there is a loophole in the law. As many of us have just voted, 75 I believe, we say we need to address this oilspill liability trust fund issue.

Doing so in the manner that the Senator from Oregon has suggested does create a blue-slip problem. It would cause this bill to fail. It is not constructive to do so. The sense of this Senate that we just passed, I think, sends clearly the message that we want to address it, but we need to do it in a constitutional way. I would ask Members to vote no.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there is a constitutional point of order that lies against the pending amendment.

It was filed and offered by my friend, the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Oregon.

A constitutional point of order lies against the amendment, numbered 27 because it violates article 1, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, commonly referred to as the origination clause. The origination clause states that "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

In addition, the pending amendment is not germane to the bill we are debating, and is not expected to pass. I reserve the right to raise this constitutional point of order against amendment No. 27 in the unlikely event that it passes. I will hold off for now on raising this point of order to spare the Senate an unnecessary vote.

However, I want to put everybody in the Senate on notice that, in the future, I reserve the right to raise this constitutional point of order regarding any proposal that violates the origination clause. In the Senate, revenue proposals should first be processed in the committee of jurisdiction in the Senate, which is the Senate Finance Committee.

I will vote “no” on the pending amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gardner	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Kirk	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	McCain	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Vitter
Enzi	Paul	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid
--------	-----	------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 78, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate in relation to amendment No. 78 offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, for the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment, cosponsored by Senator INHOFE, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee; by Senator CAPITO, the new chair of the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety.

This amendment simply says the United States should not be bound by commitments where we are the only party that has a commitment made in the agreement with China. We agree to reduce emissions by 27 percent between now and a point in the future; the Chinese agree to increase emissions between now and 2030.

The amendment also says the President should have these kinds of agreements approved by the Senate. It also says the United States should not enter any international agreements that are disproportionately a disadvantage to us.

I urge support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I will speak for the Senator from New Jersey, although this is a foreign policy question in general.

Let me say this: In the next 10 years, 50 percent of the new buildings that are going to be built in the world are going to be built in China. They are the most energy-inefficient buildings on the planet. So when we reached an agreement through the President of the United States to work together as a way to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gases, guess what is going to win. American business, American product, and we are selling it to them because we have an agreement to work together to be more energy efficient.

So I don't want to slow down this President or any President in cutting deals to get U.S. products into markets because they agree we need to deal with this issue. Please don't slow down the ability to get U.S. product into foreign markets. Oppose the Blunt amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Blunt amendment, as modified.

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 20 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Sessions
Cornyn	Kirk	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Vitter
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker

NAYS—46

Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	McCaskill	Warner
Collins	Menendez	Warren
Coons	Merkley	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Mikulski	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid
--------	-----	------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 126, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 126, offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI, for the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the next amendment following the Cornyn amendment seeks to prohibit the use of eminent domain in the building of the Keystone XL Pipeline, but eminent domain is actually irrelevant to this bill. This is actually designed to confuse things and ultimately end up being a poison pill. I think it is accurate to say that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is no fan of the Keystone XL Pipeline, so he wants to add this provision to the bill to make it impossible, basically, to implement.

The bill doesn't authorize or mandate the use of eminent domain to take any property; it simply approves a cross-border permit. The decision on how the property should be taken should be and will be made by the individual States in a process overseen by State courts and subject to the U.S. Constitution. My amendment simply reiterates that the standard in the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution applies.

I ask all Senators to vote for the Cornyn amendment and to vote against the Menendez amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, what I am not a fan of is a foreign company coming to the United States and taking the property of U.S. citizens. This amendment seems innocuous, but it embraces the seizure of private property for private gain to the full extent of the Constitution.

Ten years ago my dear friend from Texas decried the Kelo decision and advocated for severely restricting the use of eminent domain for private gain. Now, with this amendment, he endorses it.

The Founders of our country and its Constitution never envisioned having a company from another country come to the United States and use eminent domain to take the property of U.S. citizens for private purposes. That is what we are trying to avoid with the Menendez amendment.

If you vote for the amendment by the Senator from Texas, you in essence will continue to allow the opportunity for any foreign company to come into the United States and take private property of U.S. citizens for private purposes. That is not what we want to see.

Vote no on the Cornyn amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Cornyn	Heller
Ayotte	Cotton	Hoeven
Barrasso	Crapo	Inhofe
Blumenthal	Cruz	Isakson
Blunt	Daines	Johnson
Boozman	Donnelly	Kaine
Burr	Enzi	Kirk
Capito	Ernst	Klobuchar
Carper	Fischer	Lankford
Casey	Flake	Manchin
Cassidy	Gardner	McCain
Coats	Grassley	McCaskill
Cochran	Hatch	McConnell
Collins	Heinrich	Moran
Corker	Heitkamp	Murkowski

Nelson	Rubio	Tillis
Paul	Sasse	Toomey
Perdue	Scott	Vitter
Portman	Sessions	Warner
Risch	Shelby	Wicker
Roberts	Sullivan	
Rounds	Thune	

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Leahy	Schumer
Brown	Markey	Shaheen
Cantwell	Menendez	Stabenow
Cardin	Merkley	Tester
Coons	Mikulski	Udall
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Franken	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid
--------	-----	------

The amendment (No. 126), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 72, as modified, offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. This amendment protects private property from unjust seizure by foreign corporations using eminent domain proceedings against the will of those who are not willing sellers.

Let me read a letter from the Nebraska landowners to the majority leader.

Dear Senator McConnell, our farms and ranches are definitely at risk of tar sands and benzene spills. We ask, even knowing that you support the Keystone Pipeline, that you vote for Senator Menendez's amendment that makes it clear TransCanada cannot take land from unwilling sellers. We ask you to stand up for our property rights and not permit eminent domain be used for private gain.

I wish to yield the remainder of my time to Senator TESTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I support the pipeline. I think it has a lot of good benefits, but make no mistake about it, if you do not support the Menendez amendment—and there are a lot of Aggies on the other side of the aisle. If you do not support this amendment, you will allow a foreign corporation—a foreign corporation—to come in and use eminent domain to take the property. We don't want to go down this line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the Senate has spoken on the preceding amendment and overwhelmingly affirmed the Constitution as the only standard that should apply under these circumstances.

The standard being proposed by the Senator from New Jersey is an anti-States rights amendment, and it is de-

signed to be a poison pill on this Keystone XL Pipeline, which he obviously does not support and wants to use every means to kill.

I would ask for a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 22 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Ayotte	Heinrich	Peters
Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	King	Schatz
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Boxer	Leahy	Shaheen
Brown	Markey	Stabenow
Cantwell	McCaskill	Tester
Cardin	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warner
Coons	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NAYS—54

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Barrasso	Ernst	Murkowski
Blunt	Fischer	Perdue
Boozman	Flake	Portman
Burr	Gardner	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Carper	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Graham	Lee	Reid
--------	-----	------

The amendment (No. 72), as modified, was rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MORAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have just gone through a considerable period processing some votes. I appreciate the patience of colleagues as we

have gone through it. As the majority leader mentioned, we want to figure out what the next tranche—the next grouping of amendments—will be, and then we will be able to figure out the path forward.

It is the hope of myself and the ranking member of the committee that we be able to get through a few more votes this evening, at a minimum, but also to set up a more clearly defined path for the coming days ahead, for tomorrow and Monday.

So I ask for the indulgence of Members as we call up a few amendments now to get them pending, and then we will work together to figure out what those votes will actually look like—which votes we will actually take up this evening.

Again, I think the opportunity to get amendments pending on both sides is good. It gives everybody an idea of the lay of the land and gives them a chance to look at the amendments we will bring up.

So at this point in time I wish to call up an amendment. When I have concluded, I will turn it over to the ranking member and an amendment will be called up on the Democratic side, and then we will come back to this side. We will alternate back and forth to get these amendments pending so Members can know what it is we have in this universe out there.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

With that, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Sullivan amendment No. 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. SULLIVAN, proposes an amendment numbered 67 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . POWERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

Section 3063(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and
(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I turn to my colleague, Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I know our colleagues have been working throughout the day on these amendments, and I

applaud them for their cooperation. As the Senator from Alaska said, oftentimes these needed side-by-sides—people need to see these. We have various committees that have been involved in these amendments, so I appreciate the patience of our colleagues.

I think going back and forth tonight on getting another set of amendments pending is a good idea because we have many Members on our side who have amendments they are very interested in having votes on. I appreciate them being here tonight. So I call on Senator CARDIN to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 75 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are 2,537 wells within 1 mile of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, including 39 public water supply wells and 20 private wells within 100 feet of the pipeline right of way;

(2) 254 miles of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would traverse over the shallow Ogallala Aquifer, the largest underground fresh water source in the United States, underlying 8 States and 2,000,000 people, including 10.5 miles where the groundwater lies at depths between 5 and 10 feet and another 12.4 miles where the water table is at a depth of 10 to 15 feet;

(3) on July 26, 2010, a pipeline ruptured near Marshall, Michigan, releasing 843,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen into Talmadge Creek, flowing into the Kalamazoo River;

(4) the Talmadge Creek tar sands spill is the costliest inland oil spill cleanup in United States history, and the Kalamazoo River continues to be contaminated from the spill;

(5) on March 29, 2013, the first pipeline of the United States to transport Canadian tar sands to the Gulf Coast, the ExxonMobil Pegasus Pipeline, ruptured, spilling 210,000 gallons of tar sands diluted bitumen in Mayflower, Arkansas; and

(6) following the Pegasus Pipeline tar sands spill, individuals in the Mayflower community experienced severe headaches, nausea, and respiratory infections.

(b) PETITION TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNORS.—The President shall provide a copy of the analysis described in paragraph (1) to the Governor of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under paragraph (2), a petition to the President requesting that the pipeline not be located in the affected municipality or county.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—A Governor may withdraw a petition submitted under paragraph (3) at any time.

(5) RIGHT OF ACTION.—A property owner with a private water well drilled into any portion of an aquifer that is below the proposed pipeline described in section 2(a) may sue the owner of the pipeline for damages if—

(A) the well water of the property owner becomes contaminated as a result of—

(i) construction activities associated with the pipeline; or

(ii) a rupture in the pipeline; and

(B) the property owner demonstrates that the well water was safe prior to construction and operation of the pipeline.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

This is an important amendment, as it deals with the rights of property owners to clean water. The Ogallala Aquifer is the largest aquifer in the western part of the United States, and the Keystone Pipeline would bisect that. At some point the aquifer is only 5 feet from the surface. Private owners drill wells to get their drinking water, and there is no protection in the event there is a spill. A spill is a real possibility. We have seen in prior cases in Michigan and Arkansas the impact of spills from this tar sands oil and the damage it can cause.

My amendment is pretty straightforward. It allows our Governors to be able to challenge the safety of their drinking water. It is a States rights issue. It gives the property owners whose wells could be contaminated by this the right of action. I ask my colleagues to favorably consider this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up Murkowski amendment No. 98.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 98 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I wish to recognize the Senator from Rhode Island to call up his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr.

WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 74 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program should be funded at not less than \$4,700,000,000 annually)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (referred to in this section as “LIHEAP”) is the main Federal program that helps low-income households and senior citizens with their energy bills, providing vital assistance during both the cold winter and hot summer months.

(2) Recipients of LIHEAP assistance are among the most vulnerable individuals in the country, with more than 90 percent of LIHEAP households having at least one member who is a child, a senior citizen, or disabled, and 20 percent of LIHEAP households including at least one veteran.

(3) The number of households eligible for LIHEAP assistance continues to exceed available funding, with current funding reaching just 20 percent of the eligible population.

(4) The average LIHEAP grant covers just a fraction of home energy costs, leaving many low-income families and senior citizens struggling to pay their energy bills and with fewer resources available to meet other essential needs.

(5) Access to affordable home energy is a matter of health and safety for many low-income households, children, senior citizens, and veterans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that LIHEAP should be funded at not less than \$4,700,000,000 annually, to ensure that more low-income households and children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans can meet basic home energy needs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is a bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to sponsor with Senator COLLINS of Maine. It would express the sense of the Senate that we should fund LIHEAP, the Low Income Heating Assistance Program, at \$4.7 billion. We have seen a significant diminution of the LIHEAP funding over the years.

This amendment helps every aspect of the country. It helps low-income households, particularly seniors. It would help immensely families throughout this country. In the winter it is about heating oil in New England and Alaska and all through the north and central plains. In the summer it is about cooling in the southwest and the southeast. If families and households can't get access to these resources, they have to make a hard choice between literally paying for their energy or sometimes their rent or sometimes their food. This program has been long supported on a bipartisan basis. We should aim for this figure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I turn to my colleague from Arizona at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE] proposes an amendment numbered 103 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs)

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 4 ____ . EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE GREEN BUILDING PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term “administrative expenses” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85), except that the term shall include, for purposes of that section and this section, with respect to an agency—

(A) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(2) APPLICABLE PROGRAMS.—The term “applicable programs” means the programs listed in Table 9 (pages 348–350) of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(3) APPROPRIATE SECRETARIES.—The term “appropriate Secretaries” means—

- (A) the Secretary;
- (B) the Secretary of Agriculture;
- (C) the Secretary of Defense;
- (D) the Secretary of Education;
- (E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;
- (F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;
- (G) the Secretary of Transportation;
- (H) the Secretary of the Treasury;
- (I) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (J) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(K) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(4) SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term “services” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The term “services” shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as—

- (i) the provision of medical care;
- (ii) assistance for housing or tuition; or
- (iii) financial support (including grants and loans).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet websites of the agencies of the appropriate Secretaries a report on the outcomes of the applicable programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In reporting on the outcomes of each applicable program, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the applicable program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the applicable program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the applicable program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the applicable program (if applicable);

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the applicable program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the applicable program;

(E) describe the type of assistance the applicable program provides, such as grants, technical assistance, loans, tax credits, or tax deductions;

(F) describe the type of recipient who benefits from the assistance provided, such as individual property owners or renters, local governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, or State governments; and

(G) identify and report on whether written program goals are available for the applicable program.

(c) PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an analysis of whether any of the applicable programs should be eliminated or consolidated, including any legislative changes that would be necessary to eliminate or consolidate the applicable programs; and

(2) ways to improve the applicable programs by establishing program goals or increasing collaboration so as to reduce the overlap and duplication identified in—

(A) the 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “Federal Initiatives for the NonFederal Sector Could Benefit from More Interagency Collaboration”; and

(B) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(d) PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(1) identify—

(A) which applicable programs are specifically required by law; and

(B) which applicable programs are carried out under the discretionary authority of the appropriate Secretaries;

(2) eliminate those applicable programs that are not required by law; and

(3) transfer any remaining applicable projects and nonduplicative functions into another green building program within the same agency.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, in its 2012 annual report on opportunities to reduce duplication and achieve savings, the GAO noted that in 2011 there were 94 Federal initiatives to foster green buildings in the non-Federal sector. This report highlighted many initiatives that provided similar types of assistance, grants, technical assistance, tax credits, and so forth. This obviously doesn't sound like a recipe for proper oversight if this is still going on 5 years later.

This amendment would help tackle the problem simply by requiring agencies to evaluate and eliminate duplicative green building programs consistent with GAO's recommendations.

We ask GAO to study these things, and we often don't follow through and make sure the agencies follow up on the recommendations. This is simply ensuring that happens.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I call on the Senator from Vermont to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 30 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike a provision relating to judicial review)

Beginning on page 2, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 3, line 10, and insert the following:

(d) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this will be set aside in a moment. First, I wish to note that my amendment is simply to make sure that if people have appeals on actions under this law, they be able to appeal in the courts within their jurisdictions and not have to trundle their way to Washington, DC.

Too many people think Washington has the answers to everything.

My amendment simply says it is a States rights issue. It says the appeals will be in courts within their districts. That is a simple explanation. I spoke earlier on the floor, and I will speak more when the amendment comes up.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I turn to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CRUZ. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CRUZ] proposes an amendment numbered 15 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CRUZ. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c) For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(c) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEMBER COUNTRY.—In this subsection, the term ‘World Trade Organization member country’ has the meaning given the term ‘WTO member country’ in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

“(2) EXPEDITED APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS.—For purposes”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (as so designated), by inserting “or to a World Trade Organization member country” after “trade in natural gas”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to applications for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) that are pending on, or filed on or after, the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this is an amendment to allow expedited export of liquid natural gas to WTO member countries. It would have benefits to our country in terms of jobs and economic growth as well as substantial geopolitical benefits to our allies. I expect to debate this further in the coming days.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I call on the Senator from Rhode Island to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE] proposes an amendment numbered 28 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefitting from tar sands development)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) INITIAL DISCLOSURE.—Every covered entity which has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during the period beginning on January 1, 2013, and ending on the date that is 165 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT DISCLOSURES.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements (other than covered disbursement reported under subparagraph (A)) and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

“(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

“(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

“(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

“(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than \$200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

“(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

“(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to that account during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

“(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

“(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered entity’ means—

“(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

“(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person—

“(i) holds one or more tar sands leases, or

“(ii) has received revenues or stands to receive revenues of \$1,000,000 or greater from tar sands production, including revenues received in connection with—

“(I) exploration of tar sands;

“(II) extraction of tar sands;

“(III) processing of tar sands;

“(IV) building, maintaining, and upgrading the Keystone XL pipeline and other related pipelines used in connection with tar sands;

“(V) expanding refinery capacity or building, expanding, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

“(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

“(VII) refinement of tar sands;

“(VIII) importing crude, refined oil, or byproducts derived from tar sands crude;

“(IX) exporting crude, byproducts, or refined oil derived from tar sands crude; and

“(X) use of production byproducts from tar sands, such as petroleum coke for energy generation.

“(C) TAR SANDS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘tar sands’ means bitumen from the West Canadian Sedimentary Basin.

“(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered disbursement’ means a disbursement for any of the following:

“(A) An independent expenditure.

“(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

“(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

“(ii) is made—

“(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

“(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and

“(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

“(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

“(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000; and

“(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

“(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this is a measure that will allow a needed beam of daylight to be shown on the politics behind this bill we are on. As everybody knows, it is a little bit unusual to some that the opening measure of the new Republican majority would be a project that advantages a foreign oil company.

This measure would require the disclosure of political donations made by companies that stand to earn more than \$1 million from this project. This is the kind of information the U.S. Supreme Court has clearly said citizens are entitled to know in order to make appropriate decisions, and in our democracy we should put our citizens first.

I will speak further about this amendment on a later occasion, and I yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I turn to my very patient colleague from Kansas, Mr. MORAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 73.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MORAN], for himself and Mr. CRUZ, proposes an amendment numbered 73 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973)

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. ____ . DELISTING OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN AS THREATENED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the Lesser Prairie-Chicken" (79 Fed. Reg. 19974 (April 10, 2014)), the lesser prairie-chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*) shall not be listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment that sets aside the endangered threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken. It is an important issue to the citizens of Kansas but also to Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Colorado.

I look forward to having this conversation and debate on the Senate floor at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I call on the Senator from Delaware to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment to the Murkowski substitute, amendment No. 121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] proposes an amendment numbered 121 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To impose a fee of 8 cents per barrel on oil transported through the pipeline)

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A fee of 8 cents shall be imposed on each barrel of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in subsection (a).

(2) USE OF FEE REVENUE.—Revenue from the fee imposed under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the land and water conservation fund established under section 200302 of title 54, United States Code.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President and colleagues, you will recall from our debate earlier this evening concerns raised about the equity of—most oil that is consumed and transported through this country or into this country pays a fee. It is an 8-cent-per-barrel fee that goes into the oilspill liability fund. One source of oil that does not pay that 8-cent-per-barrel fee is derived from the oil sands. There has been some discussion of whether—I think there is a fair amount of agreement that that does not seem right, it doesn't seem equitable, and it is not fair to assess an 8-cent-per-barrel fee on all these other sources of oil but not apply that to oil derived from tar sands.

What I seek to suggest with my amendment is that an 8-cent-per-barrel fee be assessed on the oil derived from tar sands and the revenues derived therefrom would be deposited not in the oilspill liability fund but rather in the land and water conservation fund which has been in existence for many years.

I believe the balance in the oilspill liability fund is measured in the billions of dollars. The balance in the land and water conservation fund is not. The moneys are much smaller, much more modest, and that money provides funding in all 50 States. Many of us know the need far outweighs the money appropriated every year for this program.

The land and water conservation fund is also established not just to provide the revenues for national parks—and we are always looking for moneys for national parks. We just expanded our national parks system. How are we going to pay for that? The amendment I hope to offer would help to address that.

The land and water conservation fund was also established to help protect rivers, lakes, and critical habitat for wildlife, areas that may be impacted by the construction of this pipeline or a possible spill from this pipeline or from another spill.

Again, that is what I am asking. I will be concise. No fee is now paid on tar sands oil. I believe it should be the same as that which is assessed against other sources of oil.

What I would suggest is rather than put the moneys derived from that 8 cents on the tar sands oil—rather than that money going into the oilspill liability fund, which is quite robust, to instead deposit that in the land and water conservation fund where we could use it in all 50 States for a variety of good purposes. That is the nature of my amendment. I hope I have the opportunity to offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to turn to my colleague from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 132.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 132 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the designation of National Monuments should be subject to—

(1) consultation with each unit of local government within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located; and

(2) the approval by the Governor and legislature of each State within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located.

Mr. DAINES. In Montana we understand our resource use must be done responsibly. We also know that Montanans who live and use the land every day understand how to best protect these resources.

Unfortunately, the current administration, as well as past administrations, both Republican and Democratic—their efforts to stretch the intent of the Antiquities Act threatens Montanans' ability to manage our State's resources. It is a trend we are seeing in other States as well.

Too often these unilateral designations ignore the needs of the local communities, of sportsmen, of farmers and ranchers, small business owners who are directly impacted by these new designations.

The amendment I am offering simply expresses the sense of Congress that all future national monument designations should be subject to consultation with local governance and the approval of the Governor of that State and the legislature of that State in which the designation would occur.

This amendment ensures the people affected most by these designations have a seat at the table and their voices are heard.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I would like to call on the Senator from Massachusetts to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], for himself and Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. BALDWIN, proposes an amendment numbered 25 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INCLUSION OF OIL DERIVED FROM TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of section 4612(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may be established either by an Act of Congress or any regulations, rules, or guidance issued by the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service or the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate).

Mr. MARKEY. I ask that the amendment be put in order for debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we now have in front of us six amendments that are pending on the Republican side, six amendments that are pending on the other side of the aisle. We indicated we wanted to try to get these up, alternating back and forth. I think we have a pretty good range in front of us. Recognizing that it is important Members have an opportunity

to take a look at the now 12 amendments that are pending, I think it is our hope that we would be able to, as the chairman and the ranking member, sit down and figure out how many of these we might be able to move to a vote this evening and dispense with some of them.

I think it is pretty clear we will have a difficult time perhaps advancing such a plan with everything tonight. So if we could have a little bit of time to work through an agreement to present to Members—I think right now people are taking a little bit of a break from the floor activity, and that is appreciated, but I want to give them notice as to where we are.

It is my hope we will be able to come to an agreement relatively shortly in terms of how many amendments we might be able to take up and vote on this evening, thus giving Members a better chance as to whether we are staying in for the long haul tonight or perhaps just for a shorter period, but we need a little bit of time to take a look at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, we did go back and forth on these amendments, but I heard Senator MCCONNELL say he wanted Members to offer amendments. We have several Members who want to offer amendments. I hope there will be a time that those Members will be allowed to get their amendments pending before this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Washington stating that. This is by no means saying this is it for the night. I am just saying give the floor managers an opportunity now, with a dozen amendments that we have in front of us, to figure out what it is that we have. This would probably be a great time for people to speak on either their amendments or other amendments that they might wish to bring pending, but I am not suggesting this is our finite list of amendments. This is what we have for this moment in time, having gone back and forth. That is all I am suggesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I have a pending amendment. Does the Senator object to my bringing that up? I would like to bring that up; can I do that?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think it was the intention of the ranking member and myself that we go back and forth. We have done that, six each time now. I don't have other Members on our side who are either present, which we have asked them to be, or have asked me to offer on their behalf. I am certainly not suggesting to the Senator from Vermont that he

should not be allowed to get his amendment pending. I am just trying to keep with the agreement we have that we go back and forth.

Mr. SANDERS. Would it be OK if I brought mine up and the Senator could catch up to it later? I am sure there will be another one.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Through the Chair, I am sure we will have other amendments. Again, I want to defer to the Senator's ranking member on that as far as whether we bring it pending at this moment in time. It might be possible after we reach our agreement that we have another set of back-and-forths to get these pending agreements put forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 73

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, earlier this evening an amendment of mine was made pending to the legislation that we now have before us, amendment No. 73.

I thank my colleagues for allowing that amendment to become pending, and I look forward to the opportunity now, while we are determining the remainder of the evening's schedule, to describe the nature of amendment No. 73.

I have a copy of the amendment in front of me. It is a short paragraph, but it is one that has significant consequences to the people of Kansas. But in addition to the people of Kansas, it has significant consequence to the people of Colorado, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The story we are talking about is the lesser prairie-chicken. In March of 2014, the lesser prairie-chicken was listed not as an endangered species but a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

It is true the numbers of birds declined in 2012 and 2013. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had their explanation for why there was the decline in the population of those birds, both those who live on the land but as well a number of wildlife experts—people who are very interested in conservation practices in our State—believe and agree that the primary reason behind the bird's decline in population was the historic and prolonged drought that our area of the country has experienced in the past several years.

There is less habitat for birds generally in our State and across this region of the country, but the reality is that it is because we have had so little rainfall. We have been in a drought in

a significant part of the Nation, in our part of the country, for a number of years, and as a result there is less habitat and a decline in the bird population. What many believe is that with the return of rainfall, with the return of snow this winter and the moisture it will provide, we will have increasing wildlife habitat for the lesser prairie-chicken and a large number of birds and other wildlife in our State and in the surrounding States where this is a significant issue.

There are some exceptions that have been written into the designation, but the reality is that there are huge, ongoing, significant economic consequences to the listing as a threatened species of the lesser prairie-chicken in Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas. Front and center of that, of course, are the consequences to agriculture. It is how we earn a significant portion of our living in our State. Land values, for example, have dropped as a result of this issue. Oil and gas exploration has been disrupted. Wind energy projects that have been an important component of our State economy and particularly a benefit to the economy of rural Kansas have been harmed as a result of this listing. These disruptions have driven down county tax revenues that are used for essential services in some of the most challenging and difficult parts economically of our State, from damage to Main Street, and certainly harmed a portion of Kansas that always struggles to be economically viable.

The listing, in my view, was based on an artificially low population estimate due to the drought I described. I guess I failed to mention that 1 year ago this was a bird which could be hunted in Kansas. So, again, it was prevalent enough to be able to be pursued by those who hunt, but because of the drought the population declined. In fact, every Kansas county that is included in the habitat area was experiencing a D3-Extreme or a D4-Exceptional drought, according to the U.S. Drought Monitor, again highlighting that what we need here is rainfall and moisture that comes from snow and rain and that listing this as a threatened species doesn't create the moisture necessary to create the habitat for the return of the population of the bird.

What we really have asked for is an opportunity which has been offered and suggested by conservation groups in Kansas, by the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, and by the Kansas Farm Bureau and others to work together to find a solution short of this listing to increase bird population in Kansas. And I assume that is true in the other States as well. We are looking for a cooperative effort to improve habitat, and the fact is that the listing as a threatened species has been so disruptive that we have been unable to

get what we would say is a more commonsense, less broad-brush approach to solving this problem in place as compared to the heavy hand of this listing. We stand ready, willing, and able to provide that kind of local effort to improve habitat and bird population.

This amendment would not mean the lesser prairie-chicken would never be listed again, but it gives Kansans and others the opportunity to go back and make certain that efforts at the local level are given a chance to work before the very dramatic and devastating implementation of this decision to list the bird as threatened.

So this is a relatively straightforward and simple amendment that will take the lesser prairie-chicken off the list as a threatened species, give Kansans and others the opportunity to improve the habitat, reduce the economic damage that is being done in our State and the States that surround us as a result of this listing, and then give us the opportunity to again work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to find a better solution and one that, I might add, may be more easily found once the rainfalls return to the State of Kansas.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to describe this amendment, and it is certainly my request and I look forward to it being an amendment that would be considered tonight, later this evening.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn today of the death of Senator Wendell Ford of Kentucky. Wendell Ford was a skilled political mind and as warm a human being as any U.S. Senator has ever been.

During my first 2 years in the U.S. Senate, Senator Ford was the assistant Democratic leader, the same job I have today. I was fortunate, able to learn by example from one of the best. And how fortunate the people of Kentucky and all Americans were to have had the benefit of Wendell Ford's public service.

Senator Ford served in the Senate for nearly a quarter of a century. Before that, he served the Bluegrass State as a State senator, Governor, and lieutenant governor. He defended America in uniform during World War II.

Maybe because he had already accomplished so much before he came to the Senate, he never worried about headlines. Instead, he was content to work quietly, diligently, effectively—often with colleagues from across the aisle—to solve problems.

The last desk Senator Ford occupied in the Senate was once occupied by another great Kentucky Senator, "the great compromiser" Henry Clay. Like Henry Clay, Wendell Ford believed that compromise was honorable and necessary in a democracy. But Wendell Ford also understood that compromise is, in Henry Clay's words, "negotiated hurt." So Wendell Ford tried, whenever possible, to work out disagreements between the scenes, away from the cameras, where Senators could bend and still keep their dignity.

In 1991 Wendell's quiet bipartisan style convinced a Senator from across the aisle, Mark Hatfield of Oregon, to join him in sponsoring the motor voter bill. Working together, this Democrat and this Republican Senator convinced the entire Senate it was time to pass this landmark bill. To this day the motor voter bill remains the most ambitious effort Congress has made since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to open up the voting booth to more Americans.

Wendell Ford distinguished himself in the Senate as a determined foe of government waste and duplication and a champion of campaign finance reform.

His raspy voice was unmistakable. His good humor and wise counsel were indispensable in some of the most important debates. He will be missed.

I know our entire Senate sends their condolences to Senator Ford's wife Jean and to all of Senator Ford's family and friends.

I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from Illinois for what he said about my dear friend Senator Wendell Ford.

I was fortunate to come here to the Senate the same year that Senator Ford did. We were different in age, and I must say, different in experience. He had a lot more experience than I did, and I relied on his experience and his help. We traveled together, and we talked together so often. He had the unfailing characteristic of the best of the Senators—both Republicans and Democrats. He always kept his word. He was always very honest and direct with you. If he made a commitment, you could go to the bank with it.

I remember the night we had a dinner for his retirement. There was a dozen of us that came in that year. There were only four left and three were retiring that night—Wendell Ford, John Glen, and Dale Bumpers. It was wonderful to listen to the three of them reminisce about the Senate.

I said to Wendell Ford at that time: Save me a seat on that lifeboat as you are leaving. I thought how lonely it would be without him. Fortunately, I have a good friend like the senior Senator from Illinois to fill the void.

But Wendell Ford had probably more knowledge and sense of politics—not just knowledge but sense—of how to work things out, how to get liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats together, than most people ever have.

He had a raspy voice, but he was good natured, with a sense of humor. And when I go back through the people I have met, the 300 or more Senators I have had the opportunity to serve with, I think of Wendell Ford as one who epitomizes what a Senator should be.

I had talked to him just a few months ago. I will speak more about him later on, but I think the Senator from Illinois has given probably as good a description of this wonderful man as any of the rest of us might, and I thank him for that.

I yield the floor.

QUORUM CALL

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3 Leg.]

Boozman	Hirono	Perdue
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Collins	Leahy	Sasse
Corker	Markey	Schumer
Cornyn	McConnell	Tillis
Durbin	Murkowski	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator

from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 23 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Feinstein	Perdue
Baldwin	Fischer	Peters
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Bennet	Gardner	Reed
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Risch
Booker	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Boxer	Heitkamp	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Capito	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Lankford	Sullivan
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Thune
Corker	McCaskill	Tillis
Cornyn	McConnell	Toomey
Cotton	Merkley	Udall
Crapo	Mikulski	Vitter
Cruz	Moran	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Warren
Donnelly	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Enzi	Nelson	

NAYS—5

Blunt	Heller	Wicker
Grassley	McCain	

NOT VOTING—6

Franken	Lee	Menendez
Graham	Manchin	Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the addition of Senators who did not answer the quorum call, a quorum is now present.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Can we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCONNELL. The Senate is not yet in order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCONNELL. My colleagues, here is the situation. Earlier today we cast our 15th rollcall vote on this bill. That is more votes than we had on all amendments on the floor—rollcall votes—throughout all of 2014. We have now voted on 19 rollcall amendments, and here is the situation in which we find ourselves at 10 o'clock on Thursday night. There are 12 amendments pending—6 Democratic amendments and 6 Republican amendments—but our good friends on the other side will not agree to vote on their own amendments.

So we find ourselves in a unique situation. We have opened up the Senate for amendments for both sides. Our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, have had more rollcall votes on amendments than all of last year com-

bined. Yet our Democratic friends don't even want to agree to vote on the amendments they have pending.

We are left with only one way to avoid having to invoke cloture on each amendment, which would tie up the Senate for weeks, in order to provide our colleagues on the other side an opportunity to vote on the amendments they said they wanted to vote on. So there is really only one way to go forward, and so what I am going to do is ask unanimous consent that starting at 10 o'clock the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Sullivan No. 67, Cardin No. 75, Murkowski No. 98, Reed No. 74, Flake No. 103, Leahy No. 30; Cruz No. 15, Whitehouse No. 28, Moran No. 73, Carper No. 121, Daines No. 132, and Markey No. 25; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the majority leader came to the floor this evening and commended the Senate for the work we have done. He pointed out the constructive, bipartisan, good-faith efforts that have been made on both sides. Earlier today we disposed of 10 separate amendments, 5 on each side. Those amendments were given to us yesterday. During the last 24 hours there has been active negotiation back and forth on side-by-side amendments. In fact, the Republican Senator from Missouri and the Republican Senator from Nebraska asked to modify their amendments while they were still pending. There was a good-faith effort to make these amendments ready for floor consideration, and they were. They were brought before the Senate, and they were voted on in an orderly way. We all know that in the rules of the Senate you can stop the train. No one did on this side of the aisle. We moved forward in an orderly way.

Now at 8 o'clock this evening, 12 more amendments have come forward, 6 on each side. The majority leader is correct. What we are trying to do, as we did with the previous 10 amendments, is to work through these in an orderly fashion, and we propose that we start considering them tomorrow morning.

Those who are interested in—the staff who are interested, the Members who are interested can work to put these 12 amendments in order. We will start working on them as early as the majority leader wants to work tomorrow morning and start working through the amendments and those

others that may be offered. But I would say, if we are going to continue in the spirit of good faith, bipartisan cooperation, then let us work together as we have leading up to today to come to the point where we can have a vote on those amendments.

There are others that may be offered on both sides. But for these pending amendments, we are ready to commit to you that we will be here first thing in the morning, and let's start considering them.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me just say one more time, I think everybody understands. What we have here are at least six Democratic amendments that presumably they understand because they offered them. I assume they know what is in them because they wrote them and offered them. Yet they do not want to vote on them.

We have been on this bill for a while. We have already had more rollcall votes on this bill than the entire Senate had on every bill through the whole year of 2014. I think it is time that we start moving forward.

So since there is an objection to setting votes on the pending amendments, there is really only one way to ensure a vote on these amendments absent a cloture motion, which I was explaining earlier. If we had to file cloture on each of these amendments, we would be on them for weeks trying to help our friends on the other side get votes on amendments they offered.

So given the fact that they are reluctant to vote on their own amendments, which presumably they understand, the only way to go forward is to table their amendments. So I, therefore, intend to begin tabling the pending amendments, ensuring a vote on the proposals they have offered, which presumably they understand, but moving the process along tonight.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MCCONNELL. For a question only, without losing the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Did the majority leader not notify the entire Senate that we would be working on Fridays?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am not suggesting we are not working on Friday. I am suggesting we are working tonight.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the majority leader, we are prepared to start working in an orderly fashion on Friday, as we did earlier today.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Well, I have not said anything about Friday. Did anybody hear me say anything about Friday? We are talking about right now.

AMENDMENT NO. 25

Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 25, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the pending amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 1 minute to speak on my amendment before it is voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. DURBIN, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 4 Leg.]

Alexander	Ernst	Nelson
Baldwin	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Gardner	Risch
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Rounds
Boozman	Hatch	Sasse
Boxer	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Heitkamp	Schumer
Cantwell	Heller	Sessions
Capito	Hirono	Shaheen
Cassidy	Hoeven	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Stabenow
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Collins	King	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Manchin	Tillis
Cornyn	Markey	Toomey
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Crapo	McCaskill	Warner
Cruz	McConnell	Warren
Daines	Merkley	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 25

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Boozman	Coats
Ayotte	Burr	Cochran
Barrasso	Capito	Collins
Blunt	Cassidy	Corker

Cornyn	Isakson	Rounds
Cotton	Johnson	Rubio
Crapo	Kirk	Sasse
Cruz	Lankford	Scott
Daines	McCain	Sessions
Enzi	McCaskill	Shelby
Ernst	McConnell	Sullivan
Fischer	Moran	Tester
Flake	Murkowski	Thune
Gardner	Paul	Tillis
Grassley	Perdue	Toomey
Heller	Portman	Vitter
Hoeven	Risch	Wicker
Inhofe	Roberts	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Franken	Hatch	Reid
Graham	Lee	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 121

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call for the regular order with respect to Carper amendment No. 121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the Carper amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for 1 minute, please.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Capito	Cotton
Ayotte	Cassidy	Crapo
Barrasso	Coats	Cruz
Bennet	Cochran	Daines
Blunt	Collins	Donnelly
Boozman	Corker	Enzi
Burr	Cornyn	Ernst

Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kirk
Klobuchar

Lankford
McCain
McCaskill
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds

Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—38

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Heinrich

Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—5

Coons
Franken

Graham
Lee

Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 28

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I call for regular order with respect to the Whitehouse amendment No. 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent for just 1 minute to defend my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I ask unanimous consent for just 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Enzi

Ernst
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kirk
Lankford
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul

Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—43

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Heinrich

Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Coons
Franken

Graham
Lee

Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 30

Mr. MCCONNELL. I call for regular order with respect to Leahy amendment No. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute to explain the States rights amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request from the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PERDUE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Enzi

Ernst
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Grassley
Hatch
Heitkamp
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Lankford
Manchin
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski

Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—41

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand

Heinrich
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Coons
Franken

Graham
Kirk

Lee
Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 74

Mr. MCCONNELL. I call for regular order with respect to Reed amendment No. 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 1 minute on the Reed-Collins amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Gardner	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Vitter
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

NAYS—45

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McCaskill	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Coons	Graham	Lee
Franken	Kirk	Reid

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion on the pending substitute to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Murkowski amendment No. 2: the Keystone XL pipeline approval act.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion on the underlying bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m. Friday, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Sullivan No. 67, Cardin No. 75, Murkowski No. 98, Flake No. 103, Cruz No. 15, Moran No. 73, and Daines No. 132; further, that all amendments on the list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and no second degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, now that we have purged the calendar of five of the six Democratic amendments, the majority leader tells us it is time to vote.

It doesn't strike me that this is in the best interest of what we are trying to achieve. We are going back and forth in a bipartisan, constructive fashion. I would like to ask the majority leader if he is prepared to be in session tomorrow and to consider Democratic and Republican amendments and work through the list, including the ones he just tabled?

Mr. McCONNELL. Does the Senator from Illinois intend to object to my consent?

Mr. DURBIN. What I am asking is to try to amend this so it does have some balance. The majority leader mentioned one Democratic amendment and at least five or six Republican amendments to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. McCONNELL. We just had votes on Democratic amendments that the Senator's Members offered and he didn't want to agree to have a vote.

Mr. DURBIN. The RECORD will reflect the spirited debate on those amendments when the majority leader wouldn't even give the authors 60 seconds to describe what was in the amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Am I correct the Senator from Illinois is going to object?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the next vote will be Monday, at 5:30 p.m. The assistant Democratic leader and I have agreed to announce no more votes tonight.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SCOTT). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BEN RICHMOND

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great Kentuckian and a man who has dedicated his entire career to promoting civil rights and helping people. My good friend Ben Richmond, the longtime president and CEO of the Louisville Urban League, recently announced his impending retirement from that position. Mr. Richmond has served as president and CEO of the Louisville Urban League for nearly 30 years—since 1987.

Mr. Richmond is a civil rights champion who has led a venerable civil rights institution such as the Louisville Urban League to new heights. Under his tenure, the Louisville Urban League has promoted job training and education for many in Louisville's African-American community. His body of work is so outstanding that in 2007 he received from the city the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Award, a recognition for a local activist who is dedicated to King's principles and who has promoted peace, equality, and justice.

Since Mr. Richmond took over the Louisville Urban League, the staff has grown from around 20 to 30 and the annual budget grown from under \$1 million to around \$3.3 million. Mr. Richmond is the driving force for fundraising for the budget.

The Louisville Urban League placed more than 200 people in jobs last year with a combined annual income of

nearly \$5 million. It helped about 1,000 prepare for finding employment through career expos, job training, referrals, and career counseling. It also has many programs to help youth and seniors.

The Louisville Urban League is nearly halfway towards realizing their goal of seeing 15,000 local African Americans earn college degrees between 2012 and 2020. Mr. Richmond oversaw the Louisville Urban League's move to a new headquarters in 1990. And under Mr. Richmond's tenure, the Louisville Urban League was just one of 13 Urban League affiliates nationwide to receive a top score in a self-audit required by the National Urban League.

I should add my interest in the Urban League is personal—my father once served on the board of the Louisville Urban League. I believe he knew Ben Richmond. We are lucky, that after his retirement, Mr. Richmond plans on staying in Louisville. Our city can continue to benefit from his wisdom and experience.

I want to wish my good friend Mr. Ben Richmond all the best in retirement, and I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating Ben for his successful tenure at the helm of the Louisville Urban League. The city of Louisville and the State of Kentucky have certainly benefitted immeasurably by his many efforts over the decades.

The Louisville Courier-Journal newspaper recently published an article extolling Mr. Ben Richmond's many accomplishments. I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-Journal, Jan. 21, 2015]

URBAN LEAGUE CEO RICHMOND RETIRING
(By Sheldon S. Shafer)

Ben Richmond, a cornerstone of local social activism for more than a quarter century and a major advocate of economic equality, is retiring as president and CEO of the Louisville Urban League.

Richmond announced his impending retirement at an Urban League board meeting Tuesday, after serving as head of the civil-rights organization since 1987.

Under the leadership of Richmond, a mainstay in the push to improve economic development in western Louisville, the Urban League has long been dedicated to promoting job training and education, primarily for Louisville's poorer citizens.

Richmond "has been one of the anchors for diversity and for stability in not only the African-American community but the overall Louisville community," said Raoul Cunningham, Louisville NAACP president. "I am going to miss Ben, his counsel and his cooperative spirit."

Richmond "has become known around the country for innovative and groundbreaking approaches to helping residents improve their quality of life," said Dan Hall, a University of Louisville vice president and the Urban League board chairman. "He is intensely passionate about helping individuals find a pathway to success."

Richmond received Louisville Metro's Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Award in 2007, an annual recognition given by the city to a local activist dedicated to King's principles and who has promoted peace, equality and justice.

Then-Mayor Jerry Abramson said at the time that "over his decades of leadership, countless lives have been improved through Ben's tireless efforts in workforce development, housing and youth programs."

The national Urban League was founded in 1910, and the Louisville agency in 1921. The local league was set up chiefly to help rural black Southerners who had moved to Louisville after World War I.

The Louisville Urban League under Richmond has greatly expanded its reach. It placed about 250 people in jobs last year and helped around 1,000 more prepare for finding employment. The league's career-development efforts range from helping job seekers draft resumes to mock job interviews.

In recent times the league has sponsored Saturday morning enrichment classes for children. And it has found buyers for dozens of new single-family homes built on vacant or abandoned property under its Project Rebound program in Russell, helping to transform the surrounding neighborhood.

League efforts annually include career expos; job training, referrals and career counseling; a variety of services for employers; homeownership training and counseling; a health and wellness program called Get Fit Louisville; a walk to defeat childhood obesity; and a long list of programs to help both youths and seniors in many ways.

Benjamin K. Richmond, 71 and single, was born in Durham, N.C., and raised in Jackson, Miss.

Richmond came to the Louisville Urban League as president and CEO in 1987, after top jobs with league affiliates in Wisconsin and Michigan. Richmond here replaced the league's longtime leader, the late Art Walters. Walters, who died in 2010 at age 91, directed the Louisville Urban League from 1970 to 1987.

Since Richmond took over, the league's staff has grown from around 20 to 30—also aided by dozens of volunteers—and its annual budget has grown from under \$1 million to around \$3.3 million this year. The funds have been cobbled together largely by Richmond—from Metro United Way and numerous public and private sources.

The current budget, for instance, includes about \$340,000 from United Way, less than \$100,000 from Metro Government and a \$1.2 million federal grant earmarked primarily for programs for seniors.

The league has several departments, including the Center for Workforce Development, the Center for Housing and Financial Empowerment and the Center for Youth Development and Education.

Richmond said in an interview Monday that he expects to remain on the job until around June 30, or until a replacement is named by the agency's board, after a planned national search. He said he may then stay on under a contract for a while longer.

Richmond intends to stay in Louisville, while traveling some to visit relatives in Mississippi and Arizona.

But he pledges to remain active, noting that "there are many opportunities in both the public and private sectors here. I will see what emerges. But I want to have fun."

Among many achievements during his tenure, Richmond cited:

Opening the league headquarters in 1990 at 1535 W. Broadway, a 19,000-square-foot office,

community meeting site, classroom and job-training facility. The league invested \$1.6 million in the headquarters, which was paid off long ago. Richmond said the league headquarters has spurred significant nearby development along Broadway.

The economic impact of the league in terms of finding jobs for more than 200 people last year. Their combined annual income should be nearly \$5 million.

Richmond noted that in recent years the league helped find jobs for dozens of minorities in construction of the KFC Yum! Center, and he said the league was instrumental in getting the PGA of America to establish an urban youth golf program and also hire top staff minorities.

That a halfway point has nearly been reached toward a goal—shared with partner organizations such as Simmons College and Jefferson Community and Technical College—to have 15,000 local African-Americans earn college degrees between 2012 and 2020. The minority effort is part of the community's 55,000 Degrees effort.

That the league last year received a top score in a self-audit—a review of its staff, policies, finances and procedures—required every three years by the National Urban League. The Louisville agency was just one of 13 affiliates of the national organization to achieve that status, Richmond said.

Richmond said he is proud that under his oversight the local league has attained financial stability, adding that he believes his organized is widely respected.

Under Richmond, the league has become more diversified. About half of its 36-member board and about half the staff are white. Richmond said he has strived to "practice what we preach—racial diversity."

Richmond "has been a tremendous leader," said Metro Councilman David Tandy, D-4th District. "There is still work to do, but he has been at the forefront of the second, or third, wave of the civil-rights movement, focusing on economic opportunity. . . . He has played a pivotal role in the community."

Richmond "has tried to create opportunities and meet challenges our community has faced," said longtime ally Sam Watkins, president of the Louisville Central Community Center, another West End-based, pro-development group.

"He's been a champion for west Louisville and has been proactive in trying to garner desperately needed attention for the area's issues and problems."

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today the United States Senate family lost one of its Members. Early this morning, our friend and colleague, Senator Wendell Ford, passed away at his home in Owensboro, KY.

Senator Wendell Ford's service to his State and country spanned seven decades. A veteran of World War II and longtime member of the Kentucky Army National Guard, Wendell Ford's first elected position was that of State senator. In 1967 he ran successfully for Lieutenant Governor. Four years later he was elected Governor.

Following his term as Governor, the people of Kentucky sent him to the U.S. Senate, where he enjoyed a distinguished 24-year career. He was my predecessor as Democratic whip, a position that he held from 1995 to 1999.

When Senator Ford retired, he was the longest serving U.S. Senator in Kentucky history, a record that my friend, the majority leader, eclipsed in 2009.

Senator Wendell Ford loved Kentucky. His loyalty to his home State was never in question. During his time here in the Senate, he unabashedly and unapologetically fought for anything that would give Kentucky families a helping hand. Similarly, anyone or anything that threatened Kentucky and its people was met with Senator Ford's fierce opposition.

My thoughts today are with his family. I express my condolences to his wife of 71 years, Jean Neel, their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Senator Wendell Ford will be greatly missed by his loved ones, the people of Kentucky and the United States of America.

FIVE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF CITIZENS UNITED DECISION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday marked the 5-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*. In this sweeping opinion, on a divided 5 to 4 vote, the Court held that the First Amendment permitted corporations to spend freely from their treasuries to influence elections. As a result of *Citizens United* and the series of decisions that followed in its wake, we have witnessed wealthy, well-connected campaign donors and special interests unleash a deluge of cash in an effort to sway Federal, State, and local elections across our Nation.

Let me be clear: I firmly believe that every voice should be heard in our country, and every perspective should have a seat at the Nation's policymaking table. However, *Citizens United* has led to a system that allows a privileged group of deep-pocketed donors and corporations to drown out the voices of ordinary citizens in an effort to buy and control every seat at the table.

The numbers speak for themselves. During the last Presidential election, outside groups poured more than one billion dollars into Federal races, over three times the \$338 million that outside groups spent in 2008. More than 93 percent of all super PAC donations in 2012 came in contributions of at least \$10,000 from 3,318 donors, who make up 0.0011 percent of the U.S. population. Of that group, an elite class of 159 people each contributed at least \$1 million—funding nearly 60 percent of all super PAC donations that year.

We saw this trend continue during the recent midterm elections. Outside groups spent more than \$560 million to influence 2014 Federal races—8 times the approximately \$70 million spent in 2006, the last midterm election cycle before *Citizens United*. In 2014, we also saw a significant increase in political

activity by tax-exempt “dark money” groups that do not publicly disclose their donors. *Citizens United* and its progeny have created a campaign finance system flush with secret cash and sorely lacking in transparency.

The impact stretches from Congress to state capitols to city halls throughout the country. As in Federal campaigns, *Citizens United* has led to an explosion of outside spending at the State and local levels, with corporations and wealthy single spenders looking to play kingmaker, pouring cash into races for positions ranging from district attorney to city commissioner. One of the most startling examples last fall occurred in Richmond, CA, a city with a population of 107,000. Chevron—an energy company with more than \$200 billion in annual revenue—spent approximately \$3 million through campaign committees aimed at influencing the mayoral and city council races. That means Chevron spent at least \$33 per voting-age resident in Richmond.

While the influx of spending is well documented, I believe that the long-term damage to our political process from *Citizens United* is just beginning to reveal itself. Some scandals have already emerged, and there will doubtlessly be more stories of corruption and corrosive influence ahead. As a result, the public confidence in our government will continue to erode.

I have worked with my colleagues on a number of solutions to address these concerns. Yesterday, several of these proposals were introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives. I strongly support my colleagues in their efforts to improve disclosure and create a more transparent campaign finance system, and I will continue my efforts to establish a public financing system for Congressional elections through the Fair Elections Now Act, which I plan to reintroduce soon.

We also must continue to push for a constitutional amendment that would protect and restore the First Amendment by overturning *Citizens United* and empowering Congress and State legislatures to set reasonable, content neutral limitations on campaign spending. Last year, as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, I was proud to preside over a hearing and a vote on Senator UDALL's Democracy for All amendment. A majority of the Senate voted in favor of the bill, but not enough to defeat a Republican filibuster. We will continue to pursue this amendment and work toward its ultimate ratification.

As I said last year, supporting a constitutional amendment to reform our campaign finance system was not a decision I came to lightly. There is a very high bar for amending the Constitution and that is exactly the way it should be. In fact, Senator UDALL's amendment was the only constitutional

amendment that the Constitution Subcommittee approved during my time as chairman. But I believe it is necessary to clean up our campaign finance system once and for all. Only a constitutional amendment can fully undo the damage of *Citizens United* and ensure that elections are a contest of the best ideas—not just the ideas of multimillionaires and corporate titans.

In the 5 years since *Citizens United* was decided, we have watched the corrosive influence of special interest money grow. It crosses the political spectrum, with wealthy donors vying for influence and streams of secret cash emerging from both the right and the left. Meanwhile, everyday Americans struggle for their voices to be heard amidst the endless ads blanketing the airwaves, so often financed by corporate interests.

As Justice Rehnquist once noted, corporations are granted the advantages of perpetual life, property ownership, and limited liability “to enhance [their] efficiency as an economic entity.” But he went on to say that “those properties, so beneficial in the economic sphere, pose special dangers in the political sphere.” While some First Amendment protections have rightfully been extended beyond everyday Americans to corporations, *Citizens United* went too far. Living, breathing Americans face challenges and have concerns that are very different than those faced by corporations—and their resources pale in comparison.

The special dangers of corporate influence in elections have never been more evident. The Supreme Court should fully examine the impact and effects of *Citizens United* and consider its damaging consequences as future cases involving campaign finance come before the Court. In the meantime, I will work with my colleagues to continue our legislative efforts to fix America's campaign finance system and overturn *Citizens United* so that elected officials listen to the everyday Americans who elected them—not just the wealthy donors and special interests that bankrolled their success.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying rules for the Senate Committee on Finance be printed in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

I. RULES OF PROCEDURE (ADOPTED JANUARY ??, 2015)

Rule 1. *Regular Meeting Days*.—The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the

second and fourth Tuesday of each month, except that if there be no business before the committee the regular meeting shall be omitted.

Rule 2. Committee Meetings.—(a) Except as provided by paragraph 3 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to special meetings called by a majority of the committee) and subsection (b) of this rule, committee meetings, for the conduct of business, for the purpose of holding hearings, or for any other purpose, shall be called by the chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member. Members will be notified of committee meetings at least 48 hours in advance, unless the chairman determines that an emergency situation requires a meeting on shorter notice. The notification will include a written agenda together with materials prepared by the staff relating to that agenda. After the agenda for a committee meeting is published and distributed, no nongermane items may be brought up during that meeting unless at least two-thirds of the members present agree to consider those items.

(b) In the absence of the chairman, meetings of the committee may be called by the ranking majority member of the committee who is present, provided authority to call meetings has been delegated to such member by the chairman.

Rule 3. Presiding Officer.—(a) The chairman shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the committee except that in his absence the ranking majority member who is present at the meeting shall preside.

(b) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsection (a) any member of the committee may preside over the conduct of a hearing.

Rule 4. Quorums.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) one-third of the membership of the committee, including not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party, shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business.

(b) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsection (a), one member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

Rule 5. Reporting of Measures or Recommendations.—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee is actually present and a majority of those present concur.

Rule 6. Proxy Voting; Polling.—(a) Except as provided by paragraph 7(a)(3) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to limitation on use of proxy voting to report a measure or matter), members who are unable to be present may have their vote recorded by proxy.

(b) At the discretion of the committee, members who are unable to be present and whose vote has not been cast by proxy may be polled for the purpose of recording their vote on any rollcall taken by the committee.

Rule 7. Order of Motions.—When several motions are before the committee dealing with related or overlapping matters, the chairman may specify the order in which the motions shall be voted upon.

Rule 8. Bringing a Matter to a Vote.—If the chairman determines that a motion or amendment has been adequately debated, he may call for a vote on such motion or amendment, and the vote shall then be taken, unless the committee votes to continue debate on such motion or amendment, as the case may be. The vote on a motion to continue debate on any motion or amendment shall be taken without debate.

Rule 9. Public Announcement of Committee Votes.—Pursuant to paragraph 7(b) of Rule

XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to public announcement of votes), the results of rollcall votes taken by the committee on any measure (or amendment thereto) or matter shall be announced publicly not later than the day on which such measure or matter is ordered reported from the committee.

Rule 10. Subpoenas.—Witnesses and memoranda, documents, and records may be subpoenaed by the chairman of the committee with the agreement of the ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the committee. Subpoenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of memoranda, documents, and records shall be issued by the chairman, or by any other member of the committee designated by him.

Rule 11. Nominations.—In considering a nomination, the committee may conduct an investigation or review of the nominee's experience, qualifications, and suitability, to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. To aid in such investigation or review, each nominee may be required to submit a sworn detailed statement including biographical, financial, policy, and other information which the committee may request. The committee may specify which items in such statement are to be received on a confidential basis. Witnesses called to testify on the nomination may be required to testify under oath.

Rule 12. Open Committee Hearings.—To the extent required by paragraph 5 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to limitations on open hearings), each hearing conducted by the committee shall be open to the public.

Rule 13. Announcement of Hearings.—The committee shall undertake consistent with the provisions of paragraph 4(a) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to public notice of committee hearings) to issue public announcements of hearings it intends to hold at least one week prior to the commencement of such hearings.

Rule 14. Witnesses at Hearings.—(a) Each witness who is scheduled to testify at any hearing must submit his written testimony to the staff director not later than noon of the business day immediately before the last business day preceding the day on which he is scheduled to appear. Such written testimony shall be accompanied by a brief summary of the principal points covered in the written testimony. Having submitted his written testimony, the witness shall be allowed not more than ten minutes for oral presentation of his statement.

(b) Witnesses may not read their entire written testimony, but must confine their oral presentation to a summarization of their arguments.

(c) Witnesses shall observe proper standards of dignity, decorum, and propriety while presenting their views to the committee. Any witness who violates this rule shall be dismissed, and his testimony (both oral and written) shall not appear in the record of the hearing.

(d) In scheduling witnesses for hearings, the staff shall attempt to schedule witnesses so as to attain a balance of views early in the hearings. Every member of the committee may designate witnesses who will appear before the committee to testify. To the extent that a witness designated by a member cannot be scheduled to testify during the time set aside for the hearing, a special time will be set aside for the witness to testify if the member designating that witness is available at that time to chair the hearing.

Rule 15. Audiences.—Persons admitted into the audience for open hearings of the com-

mittee shall conduct themselves with the dignity, decorum, courtesy, and propriety traditionally observed by the Senate. Demonstrations of approval or disapproval of any statement or act by any member or witness are not allowed. Persons creating confusion or distractions or otherwise disrupting the orderly proceeding of the hearing shall be expelled from the hearing.

Rule 16. Broadcasting of Hearings.—(a) Broadcasting of open hearings by television or radio coverage shall be allowed upon approval by the chairman of a request filed with the staff director not later than noon of the day before the day on which such coverage is desired.

(b) If such approval is granted, broadcasting coverage of the hearing shall be conducted unobtrusively and in accordance with the standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the Senate.

(c) Equipment necessary for coverage by television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing room while the committee is in session.

(d) Additional lighting may be installed in the hearing room by the media in order to raise the ambient lighting level to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(e) The additional lighting authorized by subsection (d) of this rule shall not be directed into the eyes of any members of the committee or of any witness, and at the request of any such member or witness, offending lighting shall be extinguished.

Rule 17. Subcommittees.—(a) The chairman, subject to the approval of the committee, shall appoint legislative subcommittees. The ranking minority member shall recommend to the chairman appointment of minority members to the subcommittees. All legislation shall be kept on the full committee calendar unless a majority of the members present and voting agree to refer specific legislation to an appropriate subcommittee.

(b) The chairman may limit the period during which House-passed legislation referred to a subcommittee under paragraph (a) will remain in that subcommittee. At the end of that period, the legislation will be restored to the full committee calendar. The period referred to in the preceding sentences should be 6 weeks, but may be extended in the event that adjournment or a long recess is imminent.

(c) All decisions of the chairman are subject to approval or modification by a majority vote of the committee.

(d) The full committee may at any time by majority vote of those members present discharge a subcommittee from further consideration of a specific piece of legislation.

(e) The chairman and ranking minority members shall serve as nonvoting ex officio members of the subcommittees on which they do not serve as voting members.

(f) Any member of the committee may attend hearings held by any subcommittee and question witnesses testifying before that subcommittee.

(g) Subcommittee meeting times shall be coordinated by the staff director to ensure that—

(1) no subcommittee meeting will be held when the committee is in executive session, except by unanimous consent;

(2) no more than one subcommittee will meet when the full committee is holding hearings; and

(3) not more than two subcommittees will meet at the same time.

Notwithstanding paragraphs (2) and (3), a subcommittee may meet when the full committee is holding hearings and two subcommittees may meet at the same time only upon the approval of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee and subcommittees involved.

(h) All nominations shall be considered by the full committee.

(i) The chairman will attempt to schedule reasonably frequent meetings of the full committee to permit consideration of legislation reported favorably to the committee by the subcommittees.

Rule 18. *Transcripts of Committee Meetings.*—An accurate record shall be kept of all mark-ups of the committee, whether they be open or closed to the public. A transcript, marked as “uncorrected,” shall be available for inspection by Members of the Senate, or members of the committee together with their staffs, at any time. Not later than 21 business days after the meeting occurs, the committee shall make publicly available through the Internet—

(a) a video recording;

(b) an audio recording; or

(c) after all members of the committee have had a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks for grammatical errors or to accurately reflect statements, a corrected transcript.

Notwithstanding the above, in the case of the record of an executive session of the committee that is closed to the public pursuant to Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the record shall not be published or made public in any way except by majority vote of the committee after all members of the committee have had a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks for grammatical errors or to accurately reflect statements made.

Rule 19. *Amendment of Rules.*—The foregoing rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended at any time.

II. EXCERPTS FROM THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

RULE XXV

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * *

(i) Committee on Finance, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Bonded debt of the United States, except as provided in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

2. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

3. Deposit of public moneys.

4. General revenue sharing.

5. Health programs under the Social Security Act and health programs financed by a specific tax or trust fund.

6. National social security.

7. Reciprocal trade agreements.

8. Revenue measures generally, except as provided in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

9. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

10. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.

11. Transportation of dutiable goods.

* * *

RULE XXVI

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

* * *

2. Each committee shall adopt rules (not inconsistent with the Rules of the Senate) governing the procedure of such committee. The rules of each committee shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress, except that if any such committee is established on or after February 1 of a year, the rules of that committee during the year of establishment shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than sixty days after such establishment. Any amendment to the rules of a committee shall not take effect until the amendment is published in the Congressional Record.

* * *

5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the rules, when the Senate is in session, no committee of the Senate or any subcommittee thereof may meet, without special leave, after the conclusion of the first two hours after the meeting of the Senate commenced and in no case after two o'clock post meridian unless consent therefor has been obtained from the majority leader and the minority leader (or in the event of the absence of either of such leaders, from his designee). The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on the Budget. The majority leader or his designee shall announce to the Senate whenever consent has been given under this subparagraph and shall state the time and place of such meeting. The right to make such announcement of consent shall have the same priority as the filing of a cloture motion.

(b) Each meeting of a committee, or any subcommittee thereof, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by a committee or a subcommittee thereof on the same subject for a period of no more than fourteen calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

(c) Whenever any hearing conducted by any such committee or subcommittee is open to the public, that hearing may be broadcast by radio or television, or both, under such rules as the committee or subcommittee may adopt.

(d) Whenever disorder arises during a committee meeting that is open to the public, or any demonstration of approval or disapproval is indulged in by any person in attendance at any such meeting, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator. When the Chair finds it necessary to maintain order, he shall have the power to clear the room, and the committee may act in closed session for so long as there is doubt of the assurance of order.

(e) Each committee shall prepare and keep a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceeding of each meeting or conference whether or not such meeting or any part thereof is closed under this paragraph, unless a majority of its members vote to forgo such a record.

* * *

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—114TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary on three days' notice of the date, time, place and subject matter of the meeting, or in the alternative with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member, or pursuant to the provision of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended.

2. Unless a different date and time are set by the Chairman pursuant to (1) of this section, Committee meetings shall be held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursdays the Senate is in session, which shall be the regular meeting day for the transaction of business.

3. At the request of any member, or by action of the Chairman, a bill, matter, or nomination on the agenda of the Committee may be held over until the next meeting of the Committee or for one week, whichever occurs later.

II. HEARINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The Committee shall provide a public announcement of the date, time, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee at least seven calendar days prior to the commencement of that hearing, unless the Chairman with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member determines that good cause exists to begin such hearing at an earlier date. Witnesses shall provide a written statement of their testimony and curriculum vitae to the Committee at least 24 hours preceding the hearings in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee prescribes.

2. In the event 14 calendar days' notice of a hearing has been made, witnesses appearing before the Committee, including any witness representing a Government agency, must file with the Committee at least 48 hours preceding appearance written statements of their testimony and curriculum vitae in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee prescribes.

3. In the event a witness fails timely to file the written statement in accordance with this rule, the Chairman may permit the witness to testify, or deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee, or permit the witness to testify in response to questions from Senators without the benefit of giving an opening statement.

III. QUORUMS

1. Seven Members of the Committee, actually present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of discussing business. Nine Members of the Committee, including at least two Members of the minority, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. No bill, matter, or nomination shall be ordered reported from the Committee, however, unless a majority of the Committee is actually present at the time such action is taken and a majority of those present support the action taken.

2. For the purpose of the taking down sworn testimony, a quorum of the Committee and each Subcommittee thereof, now or hereafter appointed, shall consist of one Senator.

IV. BRINGING A MATTER TO A VOTE

The Chairman shall entertain a non-debatable motion to bring a matter before the Committee to a vote. If there is objection to bring the matter to a vote without further debate, a roll call vote of the Committee shall be taken, and debate shall be terminated if the motion to bring the matter to a vote without further debate passes with eleven votes in the affirmative, one of which must be cast by the minority.

V. AMENDMENTS

1. Provided at least seven calendars days' notice of the agenda is given, and the text of the proposed bill or resolution has been made available at least seven calendar days in advance, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless such amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee and circulated via e-mail to each of the offices by at least 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting.

2. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

3. The time limit imposed on the filing of amendments shall apply to no more than three bills identified by the Chairman and included on the Committee's legislative agenda.

4. This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

VI. PROXY VOTING

When a recorded vote is taken in the Committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, a quorum being present, Members who are unable to attend the meeting may submit votes by proxy, in writing or by telephone, or through personal instructions. A proxy must be specific with respect to the matters it addresses.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Any Member of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during its hearings or any other meeting, but shall not have the authority to vote on any matter before the Subcommittee unless a Member of such Subcommittee.

2. Subcommittees shall be considered de novo whenever there is a change in the Subcommittee chairmanship and seniority on the particular Subcommittee shall not necessarily apply.

3. Except for matters retained at the full Committee, matters shall be referred to the appropriate Subcommittee or Subcommittees by the Chairman, except as agreed by a majority vote of the Committee or by the agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

4. Provided all members of the Subcommittee consent, a bill or other matter may be polled out of the Subcommittee. In order to be polled out of a Subcommittee, a majority of the members of the Subcommittee who vote must vote in favor of reporting the bill or matter to the Committee.

VIII. ATTENDANCE RULES

1. Official attendance at all Committee business meetings of the Committee shall be kept by the Committee Clerk. Official attendance at all Subcommittee business meetings shall be kept by the Subcommittee Clerk.

2. Official attendance at all hearings shall be kept, provided that Senators are notified by the Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Committee hearings, and by the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Subcommittee Hearings, 48 hours in advance of the hearing that attendance will be taken; otherwise, no attendance will be taken. Attendance at all hearings is encouraged.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. Today, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs adopted Committee Rules of Procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

PURSUANT TO RULE XXVI, SEC. 2, STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE 1. MEETINGS AND MEETING PROCEDURES OTHER THAN HEARINGS

A. Meeting dates. The Committee shall hold its regular meetings on the first Wednesday of each month, when the Congress is in session, or at such other times as the Chairman shall determine. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he/she deems necessary to expedite Committee business. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 3, Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Calling special Committee meetings. If at least three Members of the Committee desire the Chairman to call a special meeting, they may file in the offices of the Committee a written request therefor, addressed to the Chairman. Immediately thereafter, the clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of such request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chairman fails to call the requested special meeting, which is to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special Committee meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of such notice, the Committee chief clerk shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 3, Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Meeting notices and agenda. Written notices of Committee meetings, accompanied by an agenda, enumerating the items of business to be considered, shall be sent to all Committee Members at least 5 days in advance of such meetings, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session. The written notices required by this Rule may be provided by electronic mail. In the event that unforeseen requirements or Committee business prevent a 5-day notice of either the meeting or agenda, the Committee staff shall communicate such notice and agenda, or any revisions to the agenda, as soon as practicable by telephone or otherwise to Members or appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

D. Open business meetings. Meetings for the transaction of Committee or Subcommittee business shall be conducted in open session, except that a meeting or series of meetings on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) below would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee Members when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of Committee or Subcommittee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure

the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of an informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.) Notwithstanding the foregoing, whenever disorder arises during a Committee or Subcommittee meeting that is open to the public, or any demonstration of approval or disapproval is indulged in by any person in attendance at any such meeting, it shall be the duty of the Chairman to enforce order on his or her own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Member of the Committee or Subcommittee; provided, further, that when the Chairman finds it necessary to maintain order, he/she shall have the power to clear the room, and the Committee or Subcommittee may act in closed session for so long as there is doubt of the assurance of order. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(d), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

E. Prior notice of first degree amendments. It shall not be in order for the Committee, or a Subcommittee thereof, to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee unless a written copy of such amendment has been delivered to each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, and to the office of the Committee or Subcommittee, by no later than 5:00 p.m. two days before the meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee at which the amendment is to be proposed. The written copy of amendments in the first degree required by this Rule may be provided by electronic mail. This subsection may be waived by a majority of the Members present, or by consent of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee. This subsection shall apply only when at least 72 hours written notice of a session to mark-up a measure is provided to the Committee or Subcommittee.

F. Meeting transcript. The Committee or Subcommittee shall prepare and keep a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceeding of each meeting whether or not such meeting or any part thereof is closed to the public, unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee Members vote to forgo such a record. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(e), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

RULE 2. QUORUMS

A. Reporting measures and matters. A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting to

the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(1), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term "routine business" includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Committee other than reporting to the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(1), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Taking testimony. One Member of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(2) and 7(c)(2), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

D. Subcommittee quorums. Subject to the provisions of sections 7(a)(1) and (2) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Subcommittees of this Committee are authorized to establish their own quorums for the transaction of business and the taking of sworn testimony.

E. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

RULE 3. VOTING

A. Quorum required. Subject to the provisions of subsection (E), no vote may be taken by the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, on any measure or matter unless a quorum, as prescribed in the preceding section, is actually present.

B. Reporting measures and matters. No measure, matter or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee Members are actually present, and the vote of the Committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of those Members who are actually present at the time the vote is taken. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(1) and (3), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Proxy voting. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, except that, when the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, is voting to report a measure or matter, proxy votes shall be allowed solely for the purposes of recording a Member's position on the pending question. Proxy voting shall be allowed only if the absent Committee or Subcommittee Member has been informed of the matter on which he or she is being recorded and has affirmatively requested that he or she be so recorded. All proxies shall be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee or Subcommittee thereof, as the case may be. All proxies shall be in writing and shall contain sufficient reference to the pending matter as is necessary to identify it and to inform the Committee or Subcommittee as to how the Member establishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(a)(3) and 7(c)(1), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

D. Announcement of vote. (1) Whenever the Committee by roll call vote reports any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such a measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or matter by each Member of the Committee. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

(2) Whenever the Committee by roll call vote acts upon any measure or amendment thereto, other than reporting a measure or matter, the results thereof shall be announced in the Committee report on that

measure unless previously announced by the Committee, and such announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment thereto by each Member of the Committee who was present at the meeting. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

(3) In any case in which a roll call vote is announced, the tabulation of votes shall state separately the proxy vote recorded in favor of and in opposition to that measure, amendment thereto, or matter. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 7(b) and (c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

E. Polling. (1) The Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, may poll (a) internal Committee or Subcommittee matters including the Committee's or Subcommittee's staff, records and budget; (b) steps in an investigation, including issuance of subpoenas, applications for immunity orders, and requests for documents from agencies; and (c) other Committee or Subcommittee business other than a vote on reporting to the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations or a vote on closing a meeting or hearing to the public.

(2) Only the Chairman, or a Committee Member or staff officer designated by him/her, may undertake any poll of the Members of the Committee. If any Member requests, any matter to be polled shall be held for meeting rather than being polled. The chief clerk of the Committee shall keep a record of polls; if a majority of the Members of the Committee determine that the polled matter is in one of the areas enumerated in subsection (D) of Rule 1, the record of the poll shall be confidential. Any Committee Member may move at the Committee meeting following the poll for a vote on the polled decision, such motion and vote to be subject to the provisions of subsection (D) of Rule 1, where applicable.

F. Naming postal facilities. The Committee will not consider any legislation that would name a postal facility for a living person with the exception of bills naming facilities after former Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former State or local elected officials over 70 years of age, former judges over 70 years of age, or wounded veterans.

RULE 4. CHAIRMANSHIP OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

The Chairman shall preside at all Committee meetings and hearings except that he or she shall designate a temporary Chairman to act in his or her place if he or she is unable to be present at a scheduled meeting or hearing. If the Chairman (or his or her designee) is absent 10 minutes after the scheduled time set for a meeting or hearing, the Ranking Majority Member present shall preside until the Chairman's arrival. If there is no Member of the Majority present, the Ranking Minority Member present, with the prior approval of the Chairman, may open and conduct the meeting or hearing until such time as a Member of the Majority arrives.

RULE 5. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

A. Announcement of hearings. The Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, shall make public announcement of the date, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week in advance of such hearing, unless the Committee, or Subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 4(a), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Open hearings. Each hearing conducted by the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, shall be open to the public, except that a hearing or series of hearings on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) below would require the hearing to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee Members when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such hearing or hearings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of Committee or Subcommittee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of an informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

Notwithstanding the foregoing, whenever disorder arises during a Committee or Subcommittee meeting that is open to the public, or any demonstration of approval or disapproval is indulged in by any person in attendance at any such meeting, it shall be the duty of the Chairman to enforce order on his or her own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Member of the Committee or Subcommittee; provided, further, that when the Chairman finds it necessary to maintain order, he or she shall have the power to clear the room, and the Committee or Subcommittee may act in closed session for so long as there is doubt of the assurance of order. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(d), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Full Committee subpoenas. The Chairman, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses at a hearing or deposition or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials. The Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman has not received a letter of disapproval signed by the Ranking Minority Member within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays in which

the Senate is not in session, of the Ranking Minority Member's receipt of a letter signed by the Chairman providing notice of the Chairman's intent to issue a subpoena, including an identification of all individuals and items sought to be subpoenaed. Delivery and receipt of the signed notice and signed disapproval letters and any additional communications related to the subpoena may be carried out by staff officers of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, and may occur through electronic mail. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided in this subsection, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Committee. When the Committee or Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman.

D. Witness counsel. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness at any public or executive hearing or deposition to advise such witness while he or she is testifying, of his or her legal rights; provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the Government, or of a corporation or association, the Committee Chairman may rule that representation by counsel from the Government, corporation, or association or by counsel representing other witnesses, creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness may only be represented during interrogation by staff or during testimony before the Committee by personal counsel not from the Government, corporation, or association or by personal counsel not representing other witnesses. This subsection shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event his or her counsel is ejected for conducting himself or herself in such manner so as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct or interfere with the orderly administration of the hearings; nor shall this subsection be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness or answer for the witness. The failure of any witness to secure counsel shall not excuse such witness from complying with a subpoena or deposition notice.

E. Witness transcripts. An accurate electronic or stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. The record of his or her testimony whether in public or executive session shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his or her counsel under Committee supervision; a copy of any testimony given in public session or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in a public session shall be provided to any witness at his or her expense if he or she so requests. Upon inspecting his or her transcript, within a time limit set by the chief clerk of the Committee, a witness may request changes in the transcript to correct errors of transcription and grammatical errors; the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her shall rule on such requests.

F. Impugned persons. Any person whose name is mentioned or is specifically identified, and who believes that evidence presented, or comment made by a Member of the Committee or staff officer, at a public hearing or at a closed hearing concerning which there have been public reports, tends to impugn his or her character or adversely affect his or her reputation may:

(a) File a sworn statement of facts relevant to the evidence or comment, which state-

ment shall be considered for placement in the hearing record by the Committee;

(b) Request the opportunity to appear personally before the Committee to testify in his or her own behalf, which request shall be considered by the Committee; and

(c) Submit questions in writing which he or she requests be used for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the Committee, which questions shall be considered for use by the Committee.

G. Radio, television, and photography. The Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, may permit the proceedings of hearings which are open to the public to be photographed and broadcast by radio, television or both, subject to such conditions as the Committee, or Subcommittee, may impose. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

H. Advance statements of witnesses. A witness appearing before the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, shall provide electronically a written statement of his or her proposed testimony at least 48 hours prior to his or her appearance. This requirement may be waived by the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member following their determination that there is good cause for failure of compliance. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 4(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

I. Minority witnesses. In any hearings conducted by the Committee, or any Subcommittee thereof, the Minority Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of the Minority Members, to call witnesses of their selection during at least 1 day of such hearings. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 4(d), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

J. Swearing in witnesses. In any hearings conducted by the Committee, the Chairman or his or her designee may swear in each witness prior to their testimony.

K. Full Committee depositions. Depositions may be taken prior to or after a hearing as provided in this subsection.

(1) Notices for the taking of depositions shall be authorized and issued by the Chairman, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman may initiate depositions without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman has not received a letter of disapproval of the deposition signed by the Ranking Minority Member within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session, of the Ranking Minority Member's receipt of a letter signed by the Chairman providing notice of the Chairman's intent to issue a deposition notice, including identification of all individuals sought to be deposed. Delivery and receipt of the signed notice and signed disapproval letter and any additional communications related to the deposition may be carried out by staff officers of the Chairman and Ranking Member, and may occur through electronic mail. If a deposition notice is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided in this subsection, the deposition notice may be authorized by a vote of the Members of the Committee. Committee deposition notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the Committee Member or Members or staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private. The Committee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness' failure to appear or produce unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a Committee subpoena.

(2) Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their legal rights, subject to the provisions of Rule 5D.

(3) Oaths at depositions may be administered by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. Questions shall be propounded orally by a Committee Member or Members or staff. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify, the objection shall be noted for the record and the Committee Member or Members or staff may proceed with the remainder of the deposition.

(4) The Committee shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded (which may include audio or audio/video recordings). If it is transcribed, the transcript shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his or her counsel under Committee supervision. The witness shall sign a copy of the transcript and may request changes to it, which shall be handled in accordance with the procedure set forth in subsection (E). If the witness fails to sign a copy, the staff shall note that fact on the transcript. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his or her presence, the transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee. The Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her may stipulate with the witness to changes in the procedure; deviations from this procedure which do not substantially impair the reliability of the record shall not relieve the witness from his or her obligation to testify truthfully.

RULE 6. COMMITTEE REPORTING PROCEDURES

A. Timely filing. When the Committee has ordered a measure or matter reported, following final action, the report thereon shall be filed in the Senate at the earliest practicable time. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 10(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

B. Supplemental, Minority, and additional views. A Member of the Committee who gives notice of his or her intention to file supplemental, Minority, or additional views at the time of final Committee approval of a measure or matter shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days in which to file such views, in writing, with the chief clerk of the Committee. Such views shall then be included in the Committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the Committee report may be filed and printed immediately without such views. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 10(c), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

C. Notice by Subcommittee Chairmen. The Chairman of each Subcommittee shall notify the Chairman in writing whenever any measure has been ordered reported by such Subcommittee and is ready for consideration by the full Committee.

D. Draft reports of Subcommittees. All draft reports prepared by Subcommittees of this Committee on any measure or matter referred to it by the Chairman shall be in the form, style, and arrangement required to conform to the applicable provisions of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and shall be in accordance with the established practices followed by the Committee. Upon completion of such draft reports, copies thereof shall be filed with the chief clerk of the Committee at the earliest practicable time.

E. Impact statements in reports. All Committee reports, accompanying a bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by

the Committee, shall contain (1) an estimate, made by the Committee, of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out the legislation for the then current fiscal year and for each of the next 5 years thereafter (or for the authorized duration of the proposed legislation, if less than 5 years); and (2) a comparison of such cost estimates with any made by a Federal agency; or (3) in lieu of such estimate or comparison, or both, a statement of the reasons for failure by the Committee to comply with these requirements as impracticable, in the event of inability to comply therewith. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 11(a), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

Each such report shall also contain an evaluation, made by the Committee, of the regulatory impact which would be incurred in carrying out the bill or joint resolution. The evaluation shall include (a) an estimate of the numbers of individuals and businesses who would be regulated and a determination of the groups and classes of such individuals and businesses, (b) a determination of the economic impact of such regulation on the individuals, consumers, and businesses affected, (c) a determination of the impact on the personal privacy of the individuals affected, and (d) a determination of the amount of paperwork that will result from the regulations to be promulgated pursuant to the bill or joint resolution, which determination may include, but need not be limited to, estimates of the amount of time and financial costs required of affected parties, showing whether the effects of the bill or joint resolution could be substantial, as well as reasonable estimates of the recordkeeping requirements that may be associated with the bill or joint resolution. Or, in lieu of the foregoing evaluation, the report shall include a statement of the reasons for failure by the Committee to comply with these requirements as impracticable, in the event of inability to comply therewith. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 11(b), Standing Rules of the Senate.)

RULE 7. SUBCOMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURES

A. Regularly established Subcommittees. The Committee shall have three regularly established Subcommittees. The Subcommittees are as follows:

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

B. Ad hoc Subcommittees. Following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall, from time to time, establish such ad hoc Subcommittees as he/she deems necessary to expedite Committee business.

C. Subcommittee membership. Following consultation with the Majority Members, and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, the Chairman shall announce selections for membership on the Subcommittees referred to in paragraphs A and B, above.

(1) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall serve as nonvoting *ex officio* members of the subcommittees on which they do not serve as voting members.

(2) Any Member of the Committee may attend hearings held by any subcommittee and question witnesses testifying before that Subcommittee, subject to the approval of the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member.

D. Subcommittee meetings and hearings. Each Subcommittee of this Committee is au-

thorized to establish meeting dates and adopt rules not inconsistent with the rules of the Committee except as provided in Rules 2(D) and 7(E).

E. Subcommittee subpoenas. Each Subcommittee is authorized to adopt rules concerning subpoenas which need not be consistent with the rules of the Committee; provided, however, that in the event the Subcommittee authorizes the issuance of a subpoena pursuant to its own rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

F. Subcommittee budgets. During the first year of a new Congress, each Subcommittee that requires authorization for the expenditure of funds for the conduct of inquiries and investigations, shall file with the chief clerk of the Committee, by a date and time prescribed by the Chairman, its request for funds for the two (2) 12-month periods beginning on March 1 and extending through and including the last day of February of the 2 following years, which years comprise that Congress. Each such request shall be submitted on the budget form prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and shall be accompanied by a written justification addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, which shall include (1) a statement of the Subcommittee's area of activities, (2) its accomplishments during the preceding Congress detailed year by year, and (3) a table showing a comparison between (a) the funds authorized for expenditure during the preceding Congress detailed year by year, (b) the funds actually expended during that Congress detailed year by year, (c) the amount requested for each year of the Congress, and (d) the number of professional and clerical staff members and consultants employed by the Subcommittee during the preceding Congress detailed year by year and the number of such personnel requested for each year of the Congress. The Chairman may request additional reports from the Subcommittees regarding their activities and budgets at any time during a Congress. (Rule XXVI, Sec. 9, Standing Rules of the Senate.)

RULE 8. CONFIRMATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

A. Standards. In considering a nomination, the Committee shall inquire into the nominee's experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. The Committee shall recommend confirmation, upon finding that the nominee has the necessary integrity and is affirmatively qualified by reason of training, education, or experience to carry out the functions of the office to which he or she was nominated.

B. Information concerning the Nominee. Each nominee shall submit the following information to the Committee:

(1) A detailed biographical resume which contains information relating to education, employment, and achievements;

(2) Financial information, in such specificity as the Committee deems necessary, including a list of assets and liabilities of the

nominee and tax returns for the 3 years preceding the time of his or her nomination, and copies of other relevant documents requested by the Committee, such as a proposed blind trust agreement, necessary for the Committee's consideration; and,

(3) Copies of other relevant documents the Committee may request, such as responses to questions concerning the policies and programs the nominee intends to pursue upon taking office. At the request of the Chairman or the Ranking Minority Member, a nominee shall be required to submit a certified financial statement compiled by an independent auditor. Information received pursuant to this subsection shall be made available for public inspection; provided, however, that tax returns shall, after review by persons designated in subsection (C) of this rule, be placed under seal to ensure confidentiality.

C. Procedures for Committee inquiry. The Committee shall conduct an inquiry into the experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity of nominees, and shall give particular attention to the following matters:

(1) A review of the biographical information provided by the nominee, including, but not limited to, any professional activities related to the duties of the office to which he or she is nominated;

(2) A review of the financial information provided by the nominee, including tax returns for the 3 years preceding the time of his or her nomination;

(3) A review of any actions, taken or proposed by the nominee, to remedy conflicts of interest; and

(4) A review of any personal or legal matter which may bear upon the nominee's qualifications for the office to which he or she is nominated. For the purpose of assisting the Committee in the conduct of this inquiry, a Majority investigator or investigators shall be designated by the Chairman and a Minority investigator or investigators shall be designated by the Ranking Minority Member. The Chairman, Ranking Minority Member, other Members of the Committee, and designated investigators shall have access to all investigative reports on nominees prepared by any Federal agency, except that only the Chairman, the Ranking Minority Member, or other Members of the Committee, upon request, shall have access to the report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Committee may request the assistance of the U.S. Government Accountability Office and any other such expert opinion as may be necessary in conducting its review of information provided by nominees.

D. Report on the Nominee. After a review of all information pertinent to the nomination, a confidential report on the nominee shall be made in the case of judicial nominees and may be made in the case of non-judicial nominees by the designated investigators to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member and, upon request, to any other Member of the Committee. The report shall summarize the steps taken by the Committee during its investigation of the nominee and the results of the Committee inquiry, including any unresolved matters that have been raised during the course of the inquiry.

E. Hearings. The Committee shall conduct a public hearing during which the nominee shall be called to testify under oath on all matters relating to his or her suitability for office, including the policies and programs which he or she will pursue while in that position. No hearing shall be held until at least 72 hours after the following events have oc-

curred: The nominee has responded to pre-hearing questions submitted by the Committee; and, if applicable, the report described in subsection (D) has been made to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, and is available to other Members of the Committee, upon request.

F. Action on confirmation. A mark-up on a nomination shall not occur on the same day that the hearing on the nominee is held. In order to assist the Committee in reaching a recommendation on confirmation, the staff may make an oral presentation to the Committee at the mark-up, factually summarizing the nominee's background and the steps taken during the pre-hearing inquiry.

G. Application. The procedures contained in subsections (C), (D), (E), and (F) of this rule shall apply to persons nominated by the President to positions requiring their full-time service. At the discretion of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, those procedures may apply to persons nominated by the President to serve on a part-time basis.

RULE 9. PERSONNEL ACTIONS AFFECTING COMMITTEE STAFF

I. accordance with Rule XLII of the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-1), all personnel actions affecting the staff of the Committee shall be made free from any discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, state of physical handicap, or disability.

RULE 10. APPRAISAL OF COMMITTEE BUSINESS

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall keep each other apprised of hearings, investigations, and other Committee business.

IT'S TIME TO FIX NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at yesterday's Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO FIX NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Since this is the first hearing of the committee in this 114th Congress, I have some preliminary remarks.

This committee touches almost every American.

No committee is more ideologically diverse and none is more productive. In the last Congress, 25 bills passed out of this committee became laws.

That's because we worked with Chairman Harkin on areas of agreement.

I look forward to working in the same way with Ranking Member Murray in this Congress. She is direct, well-respected, she cares about people and is results-oriented.

We are going to have an open process, which means we're going to have a full opportunity for discussion and for amendments. Not just in the committee, but on the floor. In the last two congresses, we reported a bill, but it didn't make it to the floor.

This congress, we hope to have a bipartisan bill coming out of committee—but even if we don't, the bill will go to the floor and it will have to get 60 votes on the floor, 60 votes to go to conference, 60 votes to get out of conference, and then the president will have his

say. We hope to get his signature and get a result.

Next, the schedule:

Let me start with some unfinished business:

Fixing NCLB: This is way overdue, it expired more than 7 years ago. We posted a working draft on the website last week, already feedback is coming in—not just from Congress but from around the country. We have several more weeks of hearings and meetings. We hope to have a bill ready for floor by end of February. The House expects to have its bill on the floor by the end of February.

Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: This is, for me, about deregulating higher education making rules simpler and more effective. Also, finishing the work we did on student loans in the last congress. Our first hearing on the deregulation task force formed by Senators Mikulski, Burr, and Ben-net and me is on Tuesday, February 24.

As rapidly and responsibly as we can, we want to repair the damage of Obamacare and provide more Americans with health insurance that fits their budgets. Our first hearing is tomorrow on the 30 to 40 hour work-week—the bill introduced by Senators Collins, Donnelly, Murkowski and Manchin. We will report our opinions to the Finance committee.

Then, some new business:

Let's call it 21st Century Cures—that's what the House calls it, as it finishes its work this spring. The president is also interested. What we're talking about is getting to market more rapidly, while still safe, medicines, treatments and medical devices. There is a lot of interest in this and we'll start staff working groups soon.

There will be more in labor, pensions, education, health but those are major priorities and that is how we start.

The president has also made major proposals on early childhood education and community college. These are certainly relevant to K-12, but we've always dealt with them separately. It's difficult for me to see how we make these issues part of this reauthorization.

Now to today's hearing: Last week Secretary Duncan called for law to be fixed. Almost everyone seems to agree with that—it's more than 7 years overdue.

We've been working on it for more than 6 years. When we started, former Rep. George Miller said, Pass a lean bill to fix No Child Left Behind, and we identified a small number of problems.

Since then, we've had 24 hearings, and in each of the last two Congresses we've reported bills out of committee.

Senators should know issues by now, 20 of 22 were here in the last congress, 16 of 22 were here in the previous congress.

One reason it needs to be fixed is that NCLB has become unworkable.

Under its original provisions, almost all of America's 100,000 public schools would be labeled a "failing school."

To avoid this unintended result, the U. S. Secretary of Education has granted waivers from the law's provisions to 43 states—including Washington, which has since had its waiver revoked—as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

This has created a second unintended result, at least unintended by Congress, which stated in law that no federal official should "exercise any direction, supervision or control over curriculum, program or instruction or administration of any educational institution."

Nevertheless, in exchange for the waivers, the Secretary has told states what their academic standards should be, how states should measure the progress of students toward those standards, what constitutes failure for schools and what the consequences of failure are, how to fix low-performing schools, and how to evaluate teachers. The Department has become, in effect, a national school board. Or, as one teacher told me, it has become a national Human Resources Department for 100,000 public schools.

At the center of the debate about how to fix No Child Left Behind is what to do about the federal requirement that states annually administer 17 standardized tests with high-stakes consequences. Educators call this an accountability system.

Are there too many tests? Are they the right tests? Are the stakes for failing them too high? What should Washington, D.C. have to do with all this?

Many states and school districts require schools to administer additional tests.

This is called a hearing for a reason. I have come to listen.

The Chairman's staff discussion draft I have circulated includes two options on testing:

Option 1 gives flexibility to the states to decide what to do on testing.

Option 2 maintains current law testing requirements.

Both options would continue to require annual reporting of student achievement, disaggregated by subgroups of children.

Washington sometimes forgets—but governors never do—that the federal government has limited involvement in elementary and secondary education, contributing only 10 percent of the money that public schools receive.

For 30 years the real action has been in the states.

I have seen this first hand.

I was Governor in 1983 when President Reagan's Education Secretary, Terrell Bell, issued a report called: "A Nation at Risk," which said that: "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war."

The next year Tennessee became the first state to pay teachers more for teaching well.

In 1985 and 1986, every Governor spent an entire year focused on improving schools the first time in the history of the National Governors Association that it happened. I was chairman of the association that year and the Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton, was the vice chairman.

In 1989, the first President Bush held a national meeting of Governors in Charlottesville, Virginia, and established national education goals.

Then in 1991-1992, President Bush announced America 2000 to help move the nation voluntarily toward those goals, state by state, community by community. I was the Education Secretary at that time.

Since then states have worked together voluntarily to develop academic standards, develop tests, to create their own accountability systems, find fair ways to evaluate teacher performance—and then adopted those that fit their states.

I know members of this committee must be tired of hearing me talk until I am blue in the face about a "national school board." I know it is tempting to try to fix classrooms from Washington. I also hear from governors and school superintendents who say that if "Washington doesn't make us do it, the

teachers unions and opponents from the right will make it impossible to have higher standards and better teachers."

And I understand that there can be short term gains from Washington's orders—but my experience is that long term success can't come that way. In fact, today Washington's involvement, in effect mandating Common Core and teacher evaluation, is creating a backlash, making it harder for states to set higher standards and evaluate teaching.

As one former Democratic governor told me recently, "We were doing pretty well until Washington got involved. If they will get out of the way we can get back on track."

So rather than turn blue in the face one more time about the national school board let me conclude with the remarks of Carol Burris, New York's High School principal of the Year. She responded last week to our committee working draft this way:

... I ask that your committee remember that the American public school system was built on the belief that local communities cherish their children and have the right and responsibility, within sensible limits, to determine how they are schooled.

While the federal government has a very special role in ensuring that our students do not experience discrimination based on who they are or what their disability might be, Congress is not a National School Board.

Although our locally elected school boards may not be perfect, they represent one of the purest forms of democracy that we have. Bad ideas in the small do damage in the small and are easily corrected. Bad ideas at the federal level result in massive failure and are harder to fix.

Please understand that I do not dismiss the need to hold schools accountable. The use and disaggregation of data has been an important tool that I use regularly as a principal to improve my own school. However, the unintended, negative consequences that have arisen from mandated, annual testing and its high stakes uses have proven testing not only to be an ineffective tool, but a destructive one as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP CHAD W. ZIELINSKI

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. In November, Father Chad Zielinski, the deputy wing chaplain at Eielson Air Force Base near Fairbanks, received what he regarded as an odd early morning telephone call. The call came from the Apostolic Nuncio, the Vatican's ambassador to the United States. The Nuncio informed Father Zielinski that he had been selected by Pope Francis to serve as the Catholic bishop of Fairbanks.

His immediate reaction: This makes no sense; how can this be? There must be some mistake. But there was no mistake. In December, Bishop Zielinski was ordained and installed to lead the Diocese of Fairbanks. The Catholic Anchorage newspaper reports that Bishop Zielinski is the first active duty military chaplain in recent history to shepherd a diocese. At age 50 he is also the 11th youngest of the 267 active U.S. Catholic bishops.

The selection was met with great enthusiasm throughout interior Alaska

and especially in our military community. Before being called to the priesthood, Bishop Zielinski served on active duty in the Air Force. He was ordained a priest for the Catholic Diocese of Gaylord, MI, in 1996. But after the events of September 11 he saw a need for Catholic chaplains in the military and rejoined the Air Force.

His Air Force career was varied. Bishop Zielinski served as Roman Catholic cadet chaplain at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and as a chaplain recruiter assigned to the Air Force Recruiting Service. He also served at Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota and at RAF Mildenhall in Suffolk, England.

And he served three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan—his first in Baghdad in 2003 and his last in Afghanistan where he served 18 forward combat positions, where religious services were punctuated by the sound of live gun fire. On one sad day, the convoy in which he was traveling was hit by a rocket, killing one of the drivers, who also happened to be a parishioner. That day ended with the bishop conducting a funeral. Needless to say, Bishop Zielinski was regarded as an exemplary chaplain and I have no doubt that he will be an exemplary bishop.

The Diocese of Fairbanks, the most northern and geographically diverse in the United States, covers some 410,000 square miles. It holds 46 parishes, most of which are in the Alaska Native villages. I am excited about Bishop Zielinski's elevation and I look forward to working closely with him in his new and important role as a leader in our faith community.●

TRIBUTE TO FATHER FERNANDO "FRED" BUGARIN

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. On January 25, 1975, Father Fred Bugarin was ordained as a priest in the Archdiocese of Anchorage by Archbishop Joseph T. Ryan. This week marks the 40th anniversary of Father Fred's ordination. On Saturday evening, friends of Father Fred will gather in St. Anthony's parish hall to celebrate his 40 years of faith and service. I join with the Anchorage community in expressing my appreciation to Father Fred for his good works.

Father Fred was born in the Philippines and migrated to Anchorage with his family in 1963. He was age 14 at the time. He graduated from West High School in 1967 and went on to study humanities and theology at the University of Dallas/Holy Trinity Seminary. Following his ordination, Father Fred was assigned to St. Benedict's parish as an assistant pastor. In 1978 he was selected as the first resident pastor of Sacred Heart parish in Wasilla and served there until 1981. He was subsequently promoted to direct the permanent diaconate and ministries program for the archdiocese.

Five years later, while on sabbatical, Father Fred set out on a new direction—to reconnect with his roots in the Philippines and enrolled at the East Asian Pastoral Institute in Manila where he became immersed in East Asian thought and culture. Father Fred signed up for the Maryknoll Associate Priests Program and upon completion of the training he was sent off to Mindanao in the southern Philippines. Father Fred had much to learn. He grew up in the northern Philippines and the language and culture of the southern Philippines was much different. Yet he was determined to connect with the people he served no matter how steep the learning curve. It was the right fit—a 5-year contract turned into an 8-year experience. What was to have been a short sabbatical turned into a life changing event.

Upon his return to the United States, the Archdiocese of Anchorage assigned Father Fred to Kodiak Island, a diverse community with an economy revolving around the fishing industry. Blue collar workers, mainly from the canneries, made up the bulk of the parish. During fishing season the population includes Filipinos, Salvadorans, Mexicans, Vietnamese, Samoans and Laotians among others. Father Fred regarded Kodiak as a laboratory for incorporating what he learned through his work in the Philippines.

After 5 years in Kodiak, Father Fred was reassigned to St. Anthony's parish where he remains today. He is known throughout Alaska for his work in building inclusive parishes and is active in interreligious activities in Anchorage. Since 2003, Father Fred has been involved with Alaska Faith and Action Congregations Together, has taught foundations of Christianity at Alaska Pacific University and has facilitated fatherhood workshops for the Alaska native community. In 2011, Father Fred was awarded the doctor of ministry degree from the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, CA.

Father Fred has left a very powerful impression on every community he has served. He is an inspiration to his fellow pastors. I am honored to recognize Father Fred for his good works and wish him many long years of continued service to his faith and to his community.●

RECOGNIZING BOYETT PRINTING & GRAPHICS, INC.

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, the expansion of a small business can refer to the size of the building, customers, as well as inventory, but sometimes expansion can lead a small business toward a much more extensive track than its original direction. For this week's Small Business of the Week, I would like to recognize a Louisiana business that has broadened its scope and impact far beyond the size of its

storefront. Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. of Shreveport, LA, is well-known for its printing and also offers an immense variety of services and products to the customers of northwest Louisiana.

In March 1994, John and Janet Boyett founded their printing business right in their home office. Their first official project was to print the church bulletins for the local Broadmoor Baptist Church. Five years later, the Boyetts' flourishing business outgrew their home, and they moved to the heart of Shreveport, hiring seven full-time employees in the process. The Boyetts' commitment to extraordinary service and quality products has buoyed their success for over 20 years.

These days, Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. provides printing on items such as brochures, business cards, newsletters, and stationery. Printing is also available on over 30,000 promotional products, which includes a vast variety of items from apparel to party favors to first aid kits. Their services, however, go far beyond what their printing label might suggest. Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. supplies creative graphic design services, as well as mailing services, booklet binding, letterpress, as well as bindery and finishing services. This broad array of operations truly allows this small business to be a "one stop shop."

Another way the Boyetts have set themselves apart is through their efforts to have a low impact on the environment. They prioritize recycling, using biodegradable inks and water soluble chemicals, and purchasing their paper from decades-old tree farms—even when it is more expensive. That is why their website is innovative and user friendly. Customers can submit an order or request price estimates. They can also sift through helpful ideas, business news, constructive tips, printing terms, as well as the latest versions of graphic art software. It is no wonder they were awarded an A-plus rating with the Better Business Bureau.

Their philosophy is founded on trust, reasonable prices, quality work, and friendliness, and clearly, it works. I am honored to recognize a business that anticipates its customer's needs, works with urgency and enthusiasm, and provides necessary services to the community with such dedication and convenience. Congratulations to Boyett Printing & Graphics, Inc. for being selected as this week's Small Business of the Week, and thank you for all of your service to the northwest region of Louisiana.●

TRIBUTE TO VINCENT PETRARCA

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am honored to congratulate Mr. Vincent Petrarca of West Warwick, RI, a proud American veteran and beloved family man, on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

Vin enlisted in the U.S. Navy at age 18 and served in the Pacific Fleet. He was a crewmember of the destroyer USS *Newcomb* when, in April 1945, that ship encountered heavy air bombardment from Japanese forces off the west coast of Okinawa. Although struck multiple times by kamikaze attackers and sustaining heavy casualties, the *Newcomb* drove off or shot down several aircraft. "Nelson's accolade to his sailors, 'They fought as one man, and that man a hero,'" wrote historian Samuel Eliot Morison, "could well be applied to her crew," which earned the Navy Unit Commendation.

Vin married Jeanne Lesniak, and their union, now in its 62nd year, has been blessed with 7 children, 12 grandchildren, and 4 great grandchildren. Vin remains active, continuing a formidable amateur golf career. His tournament victories span a half-century, from the 1962 West Warwick Country Club Championship to the 2012 Rhode Island Father/Daughter State Championship.

On behalf of the State of Rhode Island and the Senate of the United States, I congratulate Vincent Petrarca on 90 remarkable years, and wish him health and happiness in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:26 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 161. An act to provide for the timely consideration of all licenses, permits, and approvals required under Federal law with respect to the siting, construction, expansion, or operation of any natural gas pipeline projects.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-362. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flupyradifurone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9914-77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-363. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fosetyl-Al; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9920-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-364. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9921-69-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-365. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates" (FRL No. 9921-83-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-366. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9920-52-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-367. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan Approved by EPA through Letter Notice Actions" (FRL No. 9921-71-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-368. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Steamboat Springs." (FRL No. 9921-54-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-369. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9921-90-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-370. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; General Definitions" (FRL No. 9921-79-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 33. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. Res. 34. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 36. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

*Earl L. Gay, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Michael Greco, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York for the term of four years.

Ronald Lee Miller, of Kansas, to be United States Marshal for the District of Kansas for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 231. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 523 East Railroad Street in Knox, Pennsylvania, as the "Specialist Ross A. McGinnis Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 232. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr.

RISCH, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 233. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 234. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 235. A bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 236. A bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 237. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 239. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to apportionments under the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 240. A bill to promote competition, to preserve the ability of local governments to provide broadband capability and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 241. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of temporary compensation to a surviving spouse of a veteran upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 242. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limit for Coverdell education savings accounts from \$2,000 to \$5,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 244. A bill to require an independent comprehensive review of the process by which the Department of Veterans Affairs assesses cognitive impairments that result from traumatic brain injury for purposes of awarding disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand personal saving and retirement savings coverage by enabling employees not covered by qualifying retirement plans to save for retirement through automatic IRA arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. THUNE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 246. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 247. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 248. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 249. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing hazardous humanitarian services in West Africa to combat the spread of the 2014 Ebola virus outbreak shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. Res. 33. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. Res. 34. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance; from the Committee on Finance; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 35. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. Res. 36. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Judiciary; from the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 37. A resolution supporting women's reproductive health care decisions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 38. A resolution relative to the death of Wendell H. Ford, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 48, a bill to prohibit dis-

crimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, *supra*.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. 201

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 201, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 207, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care

sought by the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 214, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 229

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 229, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 27 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 28

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 28 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 49

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 49 intended to be pro-

posed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 74

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 74 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 78

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 78 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 87

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 87 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 92

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 92 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 96

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 96 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 235. A bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2015 with a bipartisan group of my colleagues, to ensure that Federal agencies have the resources and funding they need to not only fight the wildfires that erupt yearly in our Nation's forests, but to effectively manage forests to prevent future infernos.

For decades, our country has experienced tragic and costly wildfire seasons. Year after year, communities are displaced, natural treasures are destroyed, and the brave men and women who fight these fires risk their lives, and some don't come home. Due to climate change, drought, and overstocked and under-managed forests, the risks from these infernos continues to grow.

As the Forest Service needs to direct more and more resources to fighting fires, and less to managing the forests, it is transforming itself into the "Fire Service." Over the past 20 years, substantial spending on Federal wildfire suppression activities has grown. In 2013, the Forest Service devoted 41 percent of its total budget to wildfire management, compared to just 13 percent of its total budget in 1991. In 8 of the past 10 years, the Forest Service has exceeded its budget for wildfire suppression, requiring the Agency to conduct what's known as "fire borrowing" to cover wildfire suppression costs. The funds being borrowed come from accounts that should be used for hazardous fuels treatment and other forest management activities, and are unfortunately rarely, if ever, paid back.

This "fire robbery" is disruptive, unproductive, and undermines the core mission of the Forest Service, particularly as forest management program budgets continue to get slashed. Hazardous fuels treatments have been proven to reduce fire risk, yet Federal agencies don't even have the opportunity or the funding to conduct these treatments when fires are breaking out and threatening lives and property for months on end.

Today I am reintroducing the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, to help our Nation find a better way to manage our forests, prevent future wildfires, and fund wildfire fighting activities, both small and catastrophic. Major wildfire events should be treated as the natural disasters that they are, and should be funded as such. This bill establishes parity for wildfire funding, putting it on equal footing with other natural disasters like floods and hurricanes. Whether it's water, wind, earth, or fire, the earth's natural disasters can all cause devastation and should be addressed equally.

A Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture analysis shows that 1 percent of wildfires represent 30 percent of agency costs. To ensure that fighting the largest infernos doesn't cripple agency budgets, the bill would fund the largest fire even under disaster programs, leaving funds available for routine wildfire fighting and forest management activities. It does this by moving any spending above 70 percent of the 10-year rolling average for fire suppression outside of the agencies' baseline budget and makes these additional costs eligible to be funded under

a separate disaster account. This should free up discretionary funds that can now go toward hazardous fuels projects that will improve the health of our forests and ultimately prevent future wildfires.

I am pleased to be joined again by Senator CRAPO in introducing the bill today, as well as Senators CANTWELL, RISCH, BENNET, GARDNER, BALDWIN, and DAINES. I look forward to working with my colleagues toward enactment of the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act in the 114th Congress.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. THUNE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 246. A bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, for those of us who are parents, we should want to make sure all of our children have the same opportunities as other children. This starts with a quality education, a safe and secure home, access to quality health care, and a community free of violence. These are deeply important issues. But too often, talk about protecting our Native children is left out of the conversation. Native children are too often considered “them” and not part of “us.” That needs to change—in fact, it must change. Unfortunately, for children in our nation’s tribal communities, opportunities for success are often out of reach. As a result, Native children are sadly the most at-risk population in the country and face serious disparities.

The Federal Government has a trust responsibility to provide for the education, health, and safety of Native children. But for far too long, we have failed to live up to this promise. We are failing by not keeping them safe, healthy, or providing them with educational opportunities necessary to reach their full potential.

Native children have the third highest rate of being abused. They are overrepresented in foster care, more than 2.1 times the general population. Child mortality has increased 15 percent among Native children, while the rate among all American children has decreased by 9 percent since 2000. Suicide is the second leading cause of death among Native young adults ages 15 to 24 years old, 2.5 times the national average. The graduation rate for Native

high school students hovers around 50 percent compared to 75 percent for white students. These numbers are simply staggering and they are the direct result of growing up in communities that face significant challenges, high rates of poverty, staggering unemployment, child abuse and domestic violence, crime, substance abuse, and few economic opportunities.

I have spent a great deal of time on Indian reservations in North Dakota. I am humbled to always be welcomed with open arms and treated like family. The tribes have a cultural sense about the need to defend their children. But because of the lack of resources, the stories are still incredibly jarring. I have seen firsthand the obstacles tribal governments confront in responding to the needs of Native children. Existing program rules and the volume of resources required to access current grant opportunities stymie efforts of tribes to tackle the underlying issues impacting our Native children. At the same time, federal agencies lack clear guidance about the direction that should be taken to best address the needs of Native children to fulfill our nation’s treaty and trust responsibility to tribal nations. It is clear that Native children are suffering as a result.

Too many times I have heard stories about Native children in North Dakota placed in juvenile detention centers for offenses that would likely not result in incarceration, except for the fact that they are Native American. I heard a story about a teenage girl in detention because of substance addiction. She wants to get the health counseling she needs, but hasn’t been given enough support, as too often there aren’t enough resources available. She wants to go to school and get to the correct grade level, but is now already two grades behind and is continuing to fall further back while in detention. Without anyone looking to help, she will likely fall further back. This is just one story. But there are too many like it. Unless we act, we are turning our backs on Native children throughout the country.

I am determined to work to reverse these trends and end these terrible stories. We need to strive for a day when Native children no longer live in third-world conditions; where they don’t face the threat of abuse on a daily basis; where they receive the good health care and education that help them grow and succeed. I will pledge to work to give these to today’s Native children and future generations.

To begin this effort, I am proud to introduce the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children. Since joining the Senate, I have talked about the importance of working across the aisle to get things done. That’s why this is a bipartisan bill, as Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska has joined me in this effort, along

with 20 of our colleagues. Our bill aims to address the sweeping challenges that Native Americans face by creating a Federal Commission on Native Children. It would begin a national conversation about the state of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children. It is a conversation that is long overdue.

The commission will be directed to complete a comprehensive study on the programs, grants, and support available for Native children, both at the federal level and on the ground in Native communities. Right now, so many of these details are lacking, which makes it more difficult for the Federal Government to determine what kind of support is needed. Then, the 11 member Commission will issue a report on how to address the series of challenges currently facing Native children. It is my hope that the recommendations will lead to the development of a sustainable system to provide wrap-around services and support our Native children, and also reverse the troubling statistics that have become all too familiar.

I believe it is telling that this bill has received a great deal of support. I want to thank the National Congress of American Indians, the National Indian Health Board, the National Indian Child Welfare Association, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, and the National Indian Education Association, which have endorsed the bill, as has the Great Plains Tribal Chairman’s Association, and the five tribes in my state of North Dakota.

Additionally, this Commission is named in part after my dear friend, the late Dr. Alyce Spotted Bear, who passed away in 2013 after a hard fought battle with cancer—and Walter Soboleff from the Tlingit tribe in Alaska. Alyce was a member of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Ankara Nation in North Dakota and served as Chairwoman from November 1982 to March 1987. She was an inspiration to all who knew her and a great leader—in North Dakota and throughout the country. She was an educator dedicated to enabling Native students to succeed academically and making sure Native American cultures thrive. She was a mother, to her children, as well as her students and her community. In recognition of her expertise in the field, President Obama appointed her as a member to the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. And at the time of her passing, Alyce served as Vice President of Native American Studies and Tribal Relations at the Fort Berthold Community College in New Town, North Dakota. I hope this Commission will be able to live up to the great legacy she left behind, and also help complete some of her work for Native children.

As Sitting Bull once said “Let us put our minds together to see what we can

build for our children.” That is exactly what this Commission will do, and I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this important effort.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 33—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 33

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules and S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

- (1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
- (2) employ personnel; and
- (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,591,653, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

- (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$9,585,691, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

- (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February

28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$3,994,038, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

- (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

- (1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

- (A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

- (B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

- (C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

- (D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

- (E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

- (F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

- (G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

- (1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

- (2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

- (3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SEC. 5. INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, is authorized to study or investigate—

- (1) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption, or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;

- (2) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have

been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities;

(3) organized criminal activity which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions and the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activity have infiltrated lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against such practices or activities;

(4) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety, including but not limited to investment fraud schemes, commodity and security fraud, computer fraud, and the use of offshore banking and corporate facilities to carry out criminal objectives;

(5) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(A) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(B) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation’s resources of knowledge and talents;

(C) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relations between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and

(D) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;

(6) the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of energy shortages including, but not limited to, their performance with respect to—

(A) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;

(B) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;

(C) the pricing of energy in all forms;

(D) coordination of energy programs with State and local government;

(E) control of exports of scarce fuels;

(F) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;

(G) maintenance of the independent sector of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force;

(H) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(I) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;

(J) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries;

(K) the monitoring of compliance by governments, corporations, or individuals with

the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and

(L) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and

(7) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of Government with particular references to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs.

(b) **EXTENT OF INQUIRIES.**—In carrying out the duties provided in subsection (a), the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee of the committee shall not be construed to be limited to the records, functions, and operations of any particular branch of the Government and may extend to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(c) **SPECIAL COMMITTEE AUTHORITY.**—For the purposes of this subsection, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman is authorized, in its, his, her, or their discretion—

(1) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(2) to hold hearings;

(3) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recess, and adjournment periods of the Senate;

(4) to administer oaths; and

(5) to take testimony, either orally or by sworn statement, or, in the case of staff members of the Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by deposition in accordance with the Committee Rules of Procedure.

(d) **AUTHORITY OF OTHER COMMITTEES.**—Nothing contained in this section shall affect or impair the exercise of any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(e) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—All subpoenas and related legal processes of the committee and any duly authorized subcommittee of the committee authorized under S. Res. 253, agreed to October 3, 2013 (113th Congress) are authorized to continue.

SENATE RESOLUTION 34—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Finance; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 34

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015; October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on

Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2a. The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, under this resolution shall not exceed \$4,710,670, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$17,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$5,833 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$8,075,434, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,364,764, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$12,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$4,166 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015; October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, to be paid from the Appropriations account for Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 35—COMMEMORATING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF THE AUSCHWITZ EXTERMINATION CAMP IN NAZI-OCCUPIED POLAND

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 35

Whereas on January 27, 1945, the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland was liberated by Allied Forces during World War II after almost 5 years of murder, rape, and torture at the camp;

Whereas 1,100,000 innocent civilians were murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas nearly 1,300,000 innocent civilians were deported to Auschwitz from their homes across Eastern and Western Europe, particularly from Hungary, Poland, and France;

Whereas 1,000,000 of the civilians who perished at the camp were Jews, along with 100,000 non-Jewish Poles, Roma and Sinti individuals, Soviet prisoners of war, Jehovah's Witnesses, gay men and women, and other ethnic minorities;

Whereas these civilians included farmers, tailors, seamstresses, factory hands, accountants, doctors, teachers, small-business owners, clergy, intellectuals, government officials, and political activists;

Whereas these civilians were subjected to torture, forced labor, starvation, rape, medical experiments, and being separated from loved ones;

Whereas the names of many of these civilians who perished have been lost forever;

Whereas the Auschwitz extermination camp symbolizes the extraordinary brutality of the Holocaust;

Whereas the people of the United States must never forget the terrible crimes against humanity committed at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas the people of the United States must educate future generations to promote understanding of the dangers of intolerance in order to prevent similar injustices from happening again; and

Whereas commemoration of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp will instill in all people of the United States a greater awareness of the Holocaust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates January 27, 2015, as the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp by Allied Forces during World War II;

(2) calls on all people of the United States to remember the 1,100,000 innocent victims murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp as part of the Holocaust;

(3) honors the legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust and of the Auschwitz extermination camp; and

(4) calls on the people of the United States to continue to work toward tolerance, peace, and justice and to end all genocide and persecution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to my Senate colleagues' attention the most momentous day that will occur next week.

Next week, on January 27, it will be the 70th anniversary of the liberation

of the Auschwitz concentration camp—70 years since the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp. It was a triumph for the allies, but a melancholy day as the world began to see the films and photographs coming out of this hellhole.

I stand here today to remember and remind us all that, more than any other word, Auschwitz is synonymous with evil.

As someone who is very proud of her Polish-American heritage, I visited Auschwitz. I wanted to see it when I had the chance to learn more about my own heritage, and I wanted to see what happened there so that I would remember. I rise today so that the world remembers what happened there, and then the heroic effort of the allied forces, joined together, to be able to save Europe and save Western civilization.

I have submitted a resolution honoring those who survive even today, and those who were lost, that would remind us that we need to work always for tolerance, peace, and justice, and, always, to end genocide.

The harms of Auschwitz are incomprehensible and indescribable. The numbers are grim and even ghoulish. Over 1 million people—men, women, and children—lost their lives at Auschwitz. Ninety percent were Jews, hundreds of thousands were children, and it was the largest of any of the death camps.

Auschwitz was first created as an internment camp for Polish dissidents, for hundreds of thousands of Poles who were not Jewish but were murdered alongside the Jews of Auschwitz.

In occupied Poland, a Nazi governor named Hans Frank proclaimed that, “Poles will become slaves of the Third Reich.”

But Auschwitz went far beyond the Poles, because the German authorities brought in people from throughout Europe. Who were the people who came? They were teachers, they were politicians, they were professors, they were artists—they were even Catholic priests. They were executed or barely survived. These are the stories of heroism that arise from the horrors.

Many Poles risked their lives to save Jews. I am reminded of the story of Irena Sendler, who was a young social worker in Warsaw. She smuggled 200 Jewish children out of the ghetto into a safe house. The Gestapo arrested her in 1943. They first tortured her and then condemned her to death.

Jan Karski, working for the Polish Government, went on to be a leader of solidarity in the founding of the new Polish democratic government. In working, he visited the Warsaw ghetto and did much to liberate people.

But this is not a story of numbers or statistics or naming of heroes. It is a story I am going to tell about myself.

In the late 1970s, as a brandnew Congresswoman, I traveled to Poland. I

wanted to see my heritage, and I visited the small—really small—village that my family came from, where my great-grandmother left Poland as a 16-year-old girl to come to the United States to meet up with her brother and begin a new life, with little money in her pocket but big dreams in her heart. The story of America is the story of our family. Landing in Baltimore when women didn't even have the right to vote, she came in 1886—exactly 100 years to the year I became a U.S. Senator. So I wanted to go back to see where we came from to really know our story even better. But I also wanted to see the dark side of the history of Poland, and I went to Auschwitz.

Touring the concentration camp was an experience for me that was searing. Even today I carry it not only in my mind's eye, but I carry it in my heart. I could not believe the experience. The Presiding Officer knows me. I am a fairly strong, resilient person. I think we have even shared stories that I was a child abuse worker. I have seen tough things. But I wasn't prepared for what I saw that day.

As I walked through the gate of Auschwitz, to see the sign—that despicable sign—of welcome there. And then we toured—well, you don't tour. It is not a tourist site, it is a memorial. It is sacred ground. It is not a tourist site. But as we walked through, we saw the chambers where people had died.

I even went to a particular cell of a Father Kolbe, a Catholic priest who in the death camp gave his life to protect a Jewish member there. When they were ready to shoot him, Father Kolbe stepped forward to offer his life instead. Father Kolbe, in my faith tradition, has been canonized a saint for his heroic effort to show that he was willing to martyr himself for another human being, and in the belief that God was there in what he wanted to do.

But as I walked through there—and I saw hard things, tough things, wrenching things, repulsive, repugnant things. But then I got to the part that really broke my heart. I got to the part about the children. Pictures of children—little children. Not that any child's age is there. And then I saw the bins—the bins of the children's shoes: bins piled up with little shoes size 2, size 3, size 4, lace-up shoes, because they were the shoes they had in the 1930s and 1940s. And then I saw their suitcases. Then over in another corner I saw the eyeglasses that were taken from them and broken into pieces. Then I saw the pictures of the mothers.

I will tell you, I became unglued. I had to step away. Even today, when I tell this story, my voice chokes up because it shook my very soul.

So as we move into this commemoration—because it is both a celebration and a commemoration—a celebration of the liberation but a commemoration of what went on. I knew when I left

Auschwitz—I knew and I understood why, first of all, we should never have genocide in the world again.

The second thing, and also so crucial to my views, is that there always needed to be a homeland for the Jewish people—why we always need an Israel, why it has to be there, survivable for the ages, and for all who will seek a home there and seek refuge there. This is why I worked so hard on these issues in terms of the support for Israel, the end of genocide, and also the gratitude for all the people who fought—for the people who fought in the underground, for people who fought in the resistance, for people who tried to participate in the famous uprisings; to thank God also for the other fighters—the ones who in the camp gave whatever they could to keep other camp members going; and then, for the allied troops, led by the United States of America—there, where we stood together, we stood and stared evil down; and then, when we opened up the doors of Auschwitz, for freedom and the ability to come out, though barely alive—that it was indeed an historic moment.

We don't want that history ever to repeat itself, where there has to be a liberation of a death camp.

I would also take this opportunity to salute the allies and all the American people who made us victorious in World War II.

Let's say God bless the United States of America. And let's work together for a safe and secure Middle East.

SENATE RESOLUTION 36—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on the Judiciary; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 36

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through

September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,461,388, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$9,362,379, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,900,991, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 37—SUPPORTING WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE DECISIONS

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 37

Whereas access to comprehensive reproductive health care is critical to improving the health and well-being of women and their families and is an essential part of their economic security;

Whereas access to affordable contraceptives, including emergency contraceptives, and medically accurate information prevents unintended pregnancies, thereby improving the health of women, children, families, and society as a whole;

Whereas Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), was decided 42 years ago and clarifies that women have a constitutional right to plan their families and futures;

Whereas private reproductive health care decisions should be decided by women and their health care providers;

Whereas the requirement under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) that all insurance plans cover contraception without cost sharing has saved women at least \$483,000,000, and more than 30,000,000 women are eligible for this benefit;

Whereas research suggests that increasing the rate of contraceptive use may be associated with the decline in teen pregnancy by 50 percent since 1990;

Whereas elected officials in many States and Congress have attempted to block or curtail women's access to medical care and information in order to fulfill a political agenda, and they have often succeeded in such attempts;

Whereas there have been numerous attempts, both legal and legislative, to allow insurance companies and employers to deny women coverage for all contraceptive methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration, even though the law requires such coverage, and such methods are based on a foundation of scientific evidence;

Whereas since the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, States have enacted hundreds of laws restricting access to women's reproductive health care and 24 States have enacted laws that reduce abortion coverage in plans that are offered through the Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and

Whereas 24 States have laws or policies that interfere with women's health care pro-

viders in a way that undermines, instead of strengthens, patient safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports efforts to—

(1) ensure that all women have access to the best available, scientifically-based health care and information;

(2) ensure that women can make their own private health care decisions with access to comprehensive, unbiased information and confidentiality;

(3) ensure that women and families, not their employers, make their own decisions about their health care;

(4) prohibit employers or government entities from interfering with or denying reproductive health care services guaranteed by law, including access to contraception without cost;

(5) promote preventive health care services and wellness for women;

(6) guarantee the constitutionally protected right to safe, legal abortion services;

(7) ensure that women have access to health care that fosters safe childbearing, with resources available to reduce maternal and infant morbidity and mortality;

(8) ensure that all women have access to comprehensive, affordable insurance coverage that includes pregnancy-related care, such as prenatal care, miscarriage management, family planning services, abortions, labor and delivery services, and postnatal care; and

(9) enact legislation that improves and expands women's access to reproductive health care regardless of the State within which they reside.

SENATE RESOLUTION 38—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WENDELL H. FORD, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISC, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr.

THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was:

S. RES. 38

Whereas Wendell H. Ford was born in Daviess County, Kentucky in 1924, and attended the University of Kentucky;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served in the United States Army during World War II, earning the rank of Technical Sergeant, the American Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, and the Expert Infantryman Badge;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served in the Kentucky Army National Guard from 1949 to 1962, earning the rank of First Lieutenant;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served as the Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky from 1967 to 1971 and the Governor of Kentucky from 1971 to 1974;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford was first elected to the United States Senate in 1974 and served four terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky with honor and distinction;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford, when he was elected to his fourth term in the Senate on November 3, 1992, received the largest number of votes for elected office ever recorded in the Commonwealth of Kentucky up to that time;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford served the Senate as the Majority Whip from 1991 to 1995 and as the Democratic Whip from 1995 to 1999;

Whereas Wendell H. Ford was the only Kentuckian to ever win election to consecutive terms as Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and Senator;

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Wendell H. Ford, former member of the United States Senate;

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Wendell H. Ford.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 99. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

SA 100. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 101. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 102. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 103. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 104. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 105. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 106. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 107. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 108. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 109. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 110. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 111. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 112. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 113. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 114. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN,

Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 115. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 116. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 117. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 118. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 119. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 120. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 121. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 122. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 123. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 124. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 125. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 126. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 127. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 128. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 129. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 130. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 131. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 132. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 133. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 134. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 135. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 136. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 137. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 138. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 139. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 140. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 141. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 142. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 143. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 99. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community and a growing number of top national security experts, economists, and others that—

- (1) climate change is real;
- (2) climate change is caused by human activities;
- (3) climate change has already caused devastating problems in the United States and around the world;
- (4) the Energy Information Administration projects that fossil fuels will continue to produce 68 percent of the electricity in the United States through 2040; and

(5) it is imperative that the United States invest in research and development for clean fossil fuel technology.

SA 100. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title the following definitions apply:

(1) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “economic development”—

(i) means taking private property, without the consent of the owner, and conveying or leasing such property from one private person or entity to another private person or entity for commercial enterprise carried on for profit, or to increase tax revenue, tax base, employment, or general economic health; and

(ii) does not include—

(I) conveying private property—

(aa) to public ownership, such as for a road, hospital, airport, or military base;

(bb) to an entity, such as a common carrier, that makes the property available to the general public as of right, such as a railroad or public facility;

(cc) for use as a road or other right of way or means, open to the public for transportation, whether free or by toll; or

(dd) for use as an aqueduct, flood control facility, pipeline, or similar use;

(II) removing blighted property;

(III) leasing property to a private person or entity that occupies an incidental part of public property or a public facility, such as a retail establishment on the ground floor of a public building;

(IV) acquiring abandoned property;

(V) clearing defective chains of title;

(VI) taking private property for use by a utility, including a utility providing electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water and wastewater services, either directly to the public or indirectly through provision of such services at the wholesale level for resale to the public; or

(VII) redeveloping of a brownfield site, as defined in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(B) BLIGHTED PROPERTY.—In subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), the term “blighted property” means a structure—

(i) that was inspected by the appropriate local government and cited for one or more enforceable housing, maintenance, or building code violations that—

(I) affect the safety of the occupants or the public; and

(II) involve one or more of the following:

(aa) a roof or roof framing element;

(bb) support walls, beams, or headers;

(cc) foundation, footings, or subgrade conditions;

(dd) light or ventilation;

(ee) fire protection, including egress;
(ff) internal utilities, including electricity,
gas, and water;

(gg) flooring or flooring elements; or
(hh) walls, insulation, or exterior envelope;
(ii) in which the cited housing, maintenance, or building code violations have not been remedied within a reasonable time after 2 notices to cure the noncompliance; and

(iii) that the satisfaction of those enforceable, cited and uncured housing, maintenance, and building code violations cost more than 50 percent of the assessor's taxable market value for the building, excluding land value, for property taxes payable in the year in which the condemnation is commenced.

(C) **ABANDONED PROPERTY.**—In subparagraph (A)(ii)(IV), the term “abandoned property” means property—

(i) that has been substantially unoccupied or unused for any commercial or residential purpose for at least 1 year by a person with a legal or equitable right to occupy the property;

(ii) that has not been maintained; and

(iii) for which property taxes have not been paid for at least 2 years.

(2) **FEDERAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.**—The term “Federal economic development funds” means any Federal funds distributed to or through States or political subdivisions of States under Federal laws designed to improve or increase the size of the economies of States or political subdivisions of States.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 203. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No State or political subdivision of a State shall delegate its power of eminent domain to a foreign corporation over property—

(1) that is—

(A) to be used for economic development; or

(B) used for economic development within 7 years after that exercise; and

(2) if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which the property is so used or intended to be used.

(b) **INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), a violation of subsection (a) by a State or political subdivision of a State shall render such State or political subdivision ineligible for any Federal economic development funds for a period of 2 fiscal years following a final judgment on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction that such subsection has been violated.

(2) **AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.**—An agency charged with distributing Federal economic development funds to a State or political subdivision of a State that violates subsection (a) shall withhold such funds for such 2-year period and any such funds distributed to such State or political subdivision shall be returned or reimbursed by such State or political subdivision to the appropriate agency or authority of the Federal Government, or component thereof.

(c) **OPPORTUNITY TO CURE VIOLATION.**—A State or political subdivision shall not be ineligible for Federal economic development funds under subsection (b) if such State or political subdivision—

(1) returns all real property the taking of which was found by a court of competent jurisdiction

to have constituted a violation of subsection (a);

(2) replaces any other property destroyed and repairs any other property damaged as a result of such violation; and

(3) pays applicable penalties and interest.

SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY STATES.

No State or political subdivision of a State shall exercise its power of eminent domain, or allow the exercise of such power by any person or entity to which such power has been delegated, over property—

(1) that is—

(A) to be used for economic development; or

(B) used for economic development within 7 years after that exercise; and

(2) if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which the property is so used or intended to be used.

SEC. 205. PROHIBITION ON EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The Federal Government, including any authority of the Federal Government, shall not exercise its power of eminent domain over property that is to be used for economic development.

SEC. 206. RELIGIOUS AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON STATES.**—No State or political subdivision of a State shall exercise its power of eminent domain, or allow the exercise of such power by any person or entity to which such power has been delegated, over property of a religious or other nonprofit organization by reason of the nonprofit or tax-exempt status of such organization, or any quality related thereto, if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during any fiscal year in which it does so.

(b) **INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A violation of subsection (a) by a State or political subdivision of a State shall render such State or political subdivision ineligible for any Federal economic development funds for a period of 2 fiscal years following a final judgment on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction that such subsection has been violated.

(2) **AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.**—An agency charged with distributing Federal economic development funds to a State or political subdivision of a State that violates subsection (a) shall withhold such funds for such 2-year period and any such funds distributed to such State or political subdivision shall be returned or reimbursed by such State or political subdivision to the appropriate agency or authority of the Federal Government, or component thereof.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—The Federal Government or any authority of the Federal Government shall not exercise its power of eminent domain over property of a religious or other nonprofit organization by reason of the nonprofit or tax-exempt status of such organization, or any quality related thereto.

SEC. 207. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) **CAUSE OF ACTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An owner of private property whose property is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, or tenant of property that is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, may bring a civil action to enforce any provision of this title in the appropriate

Federal or State court, which may include seeking appropriate relief through a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order.

(2) **NO IMMUNITY.**—A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States from a civil action brought under paragraph (1) in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) **BURDEN OF PROOF.**—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the defendant has the burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the taking is not for economic development.

(b) **LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.**—A civil action brought by a property owner or tenant under this section may be brought if the property is used for economic development following the conclusion of any condemnation proceedings condemning the property of such property owner or tenant, but shall not be brought later than 7 years following the conclusion of any such proceedings.

(c) **ATTORNEYS' FEE AND OTHER COSTS.**—In any action or proceeding under this section, the court shall award a prevailing plaintiff costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expert fees.

SEC. 208. REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—An owner of private property whose property is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, or tenant of property that is subject to eminent domain who suffers injury as a result of a violation of any provision of this title with respect to that property, may report the violation to the Attorney General.

(b) **INVESTIGATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Upon receiving a report of an alleged violation of a provision of this title, the Attorney General shall conduct an investigation to determine whether a violation exists.

(c) **NOTIFICATION OF VIOLATION.**—If the Attorney General concludes that a violation of this title does exist, the Attorney General shall notify the applicable authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State that—

(1) the Attorney General has determined there is a violation of this title;

(2) the authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State has 90 days from the date of the notification to demonstrate to the Attorney General that—

(A) it is not in violation of this title; or

(B) it has cured the violation by returning all real property the taking of which the Attorney General finds to have constituted a violation of this title and replacing any other property destroyed and repairing any other property damaged as a result of such violation.

(d) **ATTORNEY GENERAL'S BRINGING OF ACTION TO ENFORCE ACT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If, at the end of the 90-day period described in subsection (c), the Attorney General determines that the applicable authority of the Federal Government, State, or political subdivision of a State is still in violation of this title or has not cured its violation as described in subsection (c)(2)(B), the Attorney General shall bring a civil action in an appropriate Federal or State court to enforce this title, which may include seeking appropriate relief through a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order, unless the property owner or tenant

who reported the violation has already brought a civil action to enforce this title.

(2) **INTERVENTION.**—If a property owner or tenant has brought a civil action as described in paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall seek to intervene if the Attorney General determines that intervention is necessary in order to enforce this title.

(3) **NO IMMUNITY.**—A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States from a civil action brought under paragraph (1) in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction.

(4) **BURDEN OF PROOF.**—In a civil action brought under paragraph (1), the defendant has the burden to show by clear and convincing evidence that the taking is not for economic development.

(e) **LIMITATION ON BRINGING ACTION.**—An action brought by the Attorney General under this section may be brought if the property is used for economic development following the conclusion of any condemnation proceedings condemning the property of an owner or tenant who reports a violation of this title to the Attorney General, but shall not be brought later than 7 years following the conclusion of any such proceedings.

(f) **ATTORNEYS' FEE AND OTHER COSTS.**—In any action or proceeding under this section, if the Attorney General is a prevailing plaintiff, the court shall award the Attorney General costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expert fees.

SEC. 209. NOTIFICATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) **NOTIFICATION TO STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.**—

(1) **STATUTE.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall provide to the chief executive officer of each State the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

(2) **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall compile a list of the Federal laws under which Federal economic development funds are distributed.

(B) **NOTIFICATION.**—The Attorney General shall—

(i) provide each list compiled under subparagraph (A) to—

(I) the chief executive officer of each State; and

(II) the authorities in each State and political subdivisions of each State empowered to take private property and convert it to public use subject to just compensation for the taking; and

(ii) make each such list available on the Internet website maintained by the Department of Justice for use by the public.

(b) **NOTIFICATION TO PROPERTY OWNERS AND TENANTS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish in the Federal Register and make available on the Internet website maintained by the Department of Justice a notice containing the text of this title and a description of the rights of property owners and tenants under this title.

SEC. 210. REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report

identifying States and political subdivisions of States that have used eminent domain in violation of this title, which shall—

(1) identify each private civil action brought as a result of a State's or political subdivision's violation of this title;

(2) identify all violations reported by property owners and tenants under section 208(a);

(3) identify the percentage of minority residents compared to the surrounding non-minority residents and the median incomes of those impacted by a violation of this title;

(4) identify each civil action brought by the Attorney General under section 208(d);

(5) identify all States or political subdivisions that have lost Federal economic development funds as a result of a violation of this title, and describe the type and amount of Federal economic development funds lost in each State or political subdivision and the agency that is responsible for withholding such funds; and

(6) discuss all instances in which a State or political subdivision has cured a violation as described in section 203(c) or section 208(c)(2)(B).

(b) **DUTY OF STATES.**—Each State or political subdivision of a State that is a defendant in a private civil action brought under this title shall have the duty to report to the Attorney General such information with respect to such State and local authorities as the Attorney General needs to make the report required under subsection (a).

(c) **REPORT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES ON REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO EMINENT DOMAIN.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall review all rules, regulations, and procedures of the agency and submit to the Attorney General a report on the activities of that agency to bring its rules, regulations, and procedures into compliance with this title.

SEC. 211. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING RURAL AMERICA.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The founders realized the fundamental importance of property rights when they codified the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which requires that private property shall not be taken "for public use, without just compensation".

(2) Rural lands are unique in that they are not traditionally considered high tax revenue-generating properties for State and local governments. In addition, farmland and forest land owners need to have long-term certainty regarding their property rights in order to make the investment decisions to commit land to these uses.

(3) Ownership rights in rural land are fundamental building blocks for our Nation's agriculture industry, which continues to be one of the most important economic sectors of our economy.

(4) In the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in *Kelo v. City of New London*, abuse of eminent domain is a threat to the property rights of all private property owners, including rural land owners.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The use of eminent domain for the purpose of economic development is a threat to agricultural and other property in rural America and that Congress should protect the property rights of the people of the United States, including those who reside in rural areas.

(2) Property rights are central to liberty in this country and to its economy.

(3) The use of eminent domain to take farmland and other rural property for economic development threatens liberty, rural economies, and the economy of the United States.

(4) The taking of farmland and rural property will have a direct impact on existing irrigation and reclamation projects.

(5) The use of eminent domain to take rural private property for private commercial uses will force increasing numbers of activities from private property onto this Nation's public lands, including its National forests, National parks, and wildlife refuges, which can overburden the infrastructure of these lands, reducing the enjoyment of such lands by the people of the United States.

(6) The people of the United States should not have to fear the taking their homes, farms, or businesses by the government to give to other persons.

(7) Governments should not abuse the power of eminent domain to force rural property owners from their land in order to develop rural land into industrial and commercial property.

(8) Congress has a duty to protect the property rights of rural Americans in the face of eminent domain abuse.

SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the policy of the United States to encourage, support, and promote the private ownership of property and to ensure that the constitutional and other legal rights of private property owners are protected by the Federal Government.

SEC. 213. BROAD CONSTRUCTION.

This title shall be construed in favor of a broad protection of private property rights, to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of this title and the Constitution.

SEC. 214. LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title may be construed to supersede, limit, or otherwise affect any provision of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

SEC. 215. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that any and all precautions shall be taken by the Federal Government, States, and political subdivisions of States to avoid the unfair or unreasonable taking of property away from survivors of Hurricane Katrina who own, were bequeathed, or assigned such property, for economic development purposes or for the private use of others.

SEC. 216. DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ON MINORITIES.

If a court determines that a violation of this title has occurred, and that the violation has a disproportionately high impact on the poor or minorities, the Attorney General shall use reasonable efforts to locate and inform former owners and tenants of the violation and any remedies they may have.

SEC. 217. SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **SEVERABILITY.**—If any provision of this title, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this title, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This title—

(1) shall take effect upon the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall not apply to any project for which condemnation proceedings have been initiated before the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 101. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.

Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State shall use up to 8 percent of any grant made by the Secretary under this part to track applicants for and recipients of weatherization assistance under this part to determine the impact of the assistance and eliminate or reduce reliance on the low-income home energy assistance program established under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), over a period of not more than 3 years.

“(2) USE OF SAVINGS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of any savings obtained by the Secretary of Health and Human Services due to eliminated or reduced reliance on the low-income home energy assistance program established under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) as a result of the weatherization assistance provided under this part, as determined under paragraph (1)—

“(A) 50 percent shall be transferred to the Secretary to provide assistance to States under this part; and

“(B) 50 percent shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury for purposes of reducing the annual Federal budget deficit.

“(3) ANNUAL STATE PLANS.—A State may submit to the Secretary for approval within 90 days an annual plan for the administration of assistance under this part in the State that includes, at the option of the State—

“(A) local income eligibility standards for the assistance that are not based on the formula that are used to allocate assistance under this part; and

“(B) the establishment of revolving loan funds for multifamily affordable housing units.”.

SA 102. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—ATLANTIC OCS ACCESS AND REVENUE SHARE ACT OF 2015

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Atlantic OCS Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015”.

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term “Mid-Atlantic Producing State” means each of the States of—

- (A) Delaware;
- (B) Maryland;
- (C) North Carolina; and
- (D) Virginia.

(2) MID-ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term “Mid-Atlantic Planning Area” means the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled “Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–17” and dated June 2012.

(3) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues” means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues” does not include—

(i) revenues from the forfeiture of a bond or other surety securing obligations other than royalties, civil penalties, or royalties taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold; or

(ii) revenues generated from leases subject to section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term “South Atlantic Producing State” means each of the States of—

- (A) Florida;
- (B) Georgia; and
- (C) South Carolina.

(6) SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term “South Atlantic Planning Area” means the South Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled “Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–17” and dated June 2012.

SEC. 03. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING IN MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) not later than July 15, 2016, publish and submit to Congress a new proposed oil and gas leasing program prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) for the 5-year period beginning on July 15, 2017 and ending July 15, 2022; and

(2) not later than July 15, 2017, approve a final oil and gas leasing program under that section for that period.

(b) INCLUSION OF MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.—The Secretary shall include in the program described in subsection (a) annual lease sales in both the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area and the South Atlantic Planning Area.

(c) PROHIBITION ON LEASING CERTAIN AREAS.—

(1) PETITION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the leasing of areas within the administrative boundaries of a Mid-Atlantic Producing State or South Atlantic Producing State that are 30 miles or less off the coast of the State shall be prohibited.

SEC. 04. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM MID-ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area

in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to Mid-Atlantic Producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each Mid-Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each Mid-Atlantic producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a Mid-Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

- (1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;
- (2) remain available until expended; and
- (3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area.

SEC. 05. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM SOUTH ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to South Atlantic producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection

(a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the South Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each South Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each South Atlantic producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a South Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under paragraph subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the South Atlantic Planning Area.

SA 103. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

On page 3, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

SEC. 4. EVALUATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE GREEN BUILDING PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term “administrative expenses” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note; Public Law 111–85), except that the term shall include, for purposes of that section and this section, with respect to an agency—

(A) costs incurred by the agency and costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the agency; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the agency.

(2) APPLICABLE PROGRAMS.—The term “applicable programs” means the programs list-

ed in Table 9 (pages 348–350) of the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(3) APPROPRIATE SECRETARIES.—The term “appropriate Secretaries” means—

(A) the Secretary;

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(C) the Secretary of Defense;

(D) the Secretary of Education;

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(F) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(G) the Secretary of Transportation;

(H) the Secretary of Education;

(I) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(J) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(K) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(4) SERVICES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term “services” has the meaning given the term by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The term “services” shall be limited to activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as—

(i) the provision of medical care;

(ii) assistance for housing or tuition; or

(iii) financial support (including grants and loans).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the appropriate Secretaries shall submit to Congress and post on the public Internet websites of the agencies of the appropriate Secretaries a report on the outcomes of the applicable programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In reporting on the outcomes of each applicable program, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the applicable program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the applicable program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the applicable program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the applicable program (if applicable);

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the applicable program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the applicable program;

(E) describe the type of assistance the applicable program provides, such as grants, technical assistance, loans, tax credits, or tax deductions;

(F) describe the type of recipient who benefits from the assistance provided, such as individual property owners or renters, local governments, businesses, nonprofit organizations, or State governments; and

(G) identify and report on whether written program goals are available for the applicable program.

(c) PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall jointly submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) an analysis of whether any of the applicable programs should be eliminated or consolidated, including any legislative changes

that would be necessary to eliminate or consolidate the applicable programs; and

(2) ways to improve the applicable programs by establishing program goals or increasing collaboration so as to reduce the overlap and duplication identified in—

(A) the 2011 report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “Federal Initiatives for the NonFederal Sector Could Benefit from More Interagency Collaboration”; and

(B) the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue”.

(d) PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the appropriate Secretaries shall—

(1) identify—

(A) which applicable programs are specifically required by law; and

(B) which applicable programs are carried out under the discretionary authority of the appropriate Secretaries;

(2) eliminate those applicable programs that are not required by law; and

(3) transfer any remaining applicable projects and nonduplicative functions into another green building program within the same agency.

SA 104. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ GAO STUDY AND REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on requests for proposals by Federal agencies for rebranding, including requests for proposals by Federal agencies to achieve strategic organizational transformation, identity clarification, and social purpose branding and branding management.

SA 105. Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ MODIFICATION OF EXTENSION OF WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, is amended by striking “begins before January 1, 2015” and inserting “begins before January 1, 2014, or during the period beginning on December 19, 2014, and ending on December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 155 of the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014.

SA 106. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a searchable database to uniformly report information regarding installation renewable energy projects undertaken since 2010.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The database established under subsection (a) shall include, for each installation energy project—

- (1) the estimated project costs;
- (2) estimated power generation;
- (3) estimated total cost savings;
- (4) estimated payback period;
- (5) total project costs;
- (6) actual power generation;
- (7) actual cost savings to date;
- (8) current operational status; and
- (9) access to relevant business case documents, including the economic viability assessment.

(c) **NON-DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, withhold from inclusion in the database established under subsection (a) information pertaining to individual projects if the Secretary determines that the disclosure of such information would jeopardize operational security.

(2) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.**—In the event the Secretary withholds information related to one or more renewable energy projects under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include in the database—

(A) a statement that information has been withheld; and

(B) an aggregate amount for each of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (b) that includes amounts for all renewable energy projects described under subsection (a), including those with respect to which information has been withheld under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) **UPDATES.**—The database established under subsection (a) shall be updated not less than quarterly.

SA 107. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPEAL OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) is repealed.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) takes effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—Any amounts made available to carry out section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013) (as in effect before the

amendment made by subsection (a)) that are not obligated as of the date of enactment of this Act are rescinded.

SA 108. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL REQUIREMENT BASED ON ACTUAL PRODUCTION.

(a) **PROVISION OF ESTIMATE OF VOLUMES OF CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL.**—Section 211(o)(3)(A) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **ESTIMATION METHOD.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—In determining any estimate under clause (i), with respect to the following calendar year, of the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production (as described in paragraph (7)(D)(i)), the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall—

“(aa) for each cellulosic biofuel production facility that is producing (and continues to produce) cellulosic biofuel during the period of January 1 through October 31 of the calendar year in which the estimate is made (in this clause referred to as the ‘current calendar year’)—

“(AA) determine the average monthly volume of cellulosic biofuel produced by such facility, based on the actual volume produced by such facility during such period; and

“(BB) based on such average monthly volume of production, determine the estimated annualized volume of cellulosic biofuel production for such facility for the current calendar year; and

“(bb) for each cellulosic biofuel production facility that begins initial production of (and continues to produce) cellulosic biofuel after January 1 of the current calendar year—

“(AA) determine the average monthly volume of cellulosic biofuel produced by such facility, based on the actual volume produced by such facility during the period beginning on the date of initial production of cellulosic biofuel by the facility and ending on October 31 of the current calendar year; and

“(BB) based on such average monthly volume of production, determine the estimated annualized volume of cellulosic biofuel production for such facility for the current calendar year.

“(II) **TOTAL PRODUCTION.**—An estimate under clause (i) with respect to the following calendar year of the projected volume of cellulosic biofuel production (as described in paragraph (7)(D)(i)), shall be equal to the total of the estimated annual volumes of cellulosic biofuel production for all cellulosic biofuel production facilities described in subsection (I) for the current calendar year.”.

(b) **REDUCTION IN APPLICABLE VOLUME.**—Section 211(o)(7)(D)(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(7)(D)(i)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “based on the” and inserting “using the exact”; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by striking “same or a lesser volume” and inserting “same volume”.

SA 109. Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. RESIDENTIAL ENERGY-EFFICIENT PROPERTY CREDIT FOR BIOMASS FUEL PROPERTY EXPENDITURES.

(a) **ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.**—Subsection (a) of section 25D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “, and”, and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) 30 percent of the qualified biomass fuel property expenditures made by the taxpayer during such year.”.

(b) **QUALIFIED BIOMASS FUEL PROPERTY EXPENDITURES.**—Subsection (d) of section 25D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) **QUALIFIED BIOMASS FUEL PROPERTY EXPENDITURE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘qualified biomass fuel property expenditure’ means an expenditure for property—

“(i) which uses the burning of biomass fuel to heat a dwelling unit located in the United States and used as a residence by the taxpayer, or to heat water for use in such a dwelling unit, and

“(ii) which has a thermal efficiency rating of at least 75 percent (measured by the higher heating value of the fuel).

“(B) **BIOMASS FUEL.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘biomass fuel’ means any plant-derived fuel available on a renewable or recurring basis, including agricultural crops and trees, wood and wood waste and residues, plants (including aquatic plants), grasses, residues, and fibers. Such term includes densified biomass fuels such as wood pellets.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 4. INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT FOR BIOMASS HEATING PROPERTY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or” at the end of clause (vi), by inserting “or” at the end of clause (vii), and by inserting after clause (vii) the following new clause:

“(viii) open-loop biomass (within the meaning of section 45(c)(3)) heating property, including boilers or furnaces which operate at thermal output efficiencies of not less than 65 percent (measured by the higher heating value of the fuel) and which provide thermal energy in the form of heat, hot water, or steam for space heating, air conditioning, domestic hot water, or industrial process heat, but only with respect to periods ending before January 1, 2017.”.

(b) **30 PERCENT AND 15 PERCENT CREDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii),

(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) except as provided in clause (i)(V), 15 percent in the case of energy property described in paragraph (3)(A)(viii), and”, and

(C) by inserting “or (ii)” after “clause (i)” in clause (iii), as so redesignated.

(2) INCREASED CREDIT FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY.—Clause (i) of section 48(a)(2)(A) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subclause (III) and by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclause:

“(V) energy property described in paragraph (3)(A)(viii) which operates at a thermal output efficiency of not less than 80 percent (measured by the higher heating value of the fuel).”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after December 31, 2015, in taxable years ending after such date, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SA 110. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE —OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES

SEC. 01. QUALIFYING OFFSHORE WIND FACILITY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 46 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (5),

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting “, and”, and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) the qualifying offshore wind facility credit.”

(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—Subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 48D the following new section:

“SEC. 48E. CREDIT FOR OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the qualifying offshore wind facility credit for any taxable year is an amount equal to 30 percent of the qualified investment for such taxable year with respect to any qualifying offshore wind facility of the taxpayer.

“(b) QUALIFIED INVESTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the qualified investment for any taxable year is the basis of eligible property placed in service by the taxpayer during such taxable year which is part of a qualifying offshore wind facility.

“(2) CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROGRESS EXPENDITURES RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 46 (as in effect on the day before the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this section.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) QUALIFYING OFFSHORE WIND FACILITY.—“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualifying offshore wind facility’ means any facility located in the inland navigable waters of the United States, including the Great Lakes, or in the coastal waters of the United States, including the territorial seas of the United States, the exclusive economic zone of United States, and the outer Continental Shelf of the United States.

“(B) OFFSHORE FACILITY.—The term ‘offshore facility’ means any facility located in the inland navigable waters of the United States, including the Great Lakes, or in the coastal waters of the United States, including the territorial seas of the United States, the exclusive economic zone of United States, and the outer Continental Shelf of the United States.

“(2) ELIGIBLE PROPERTY.—The term ‘eligible property’ means any property—

“(A) which is—

“(i) tangible personal property, or

“(ii) other tangible property (not including a building or its structural components), but only if such property is used as an integral part of the qualifying offshore wind facility, and

“(B) with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable.

“(d) QUALIFYING CREDIT FOR OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior, shall establish a qualifying credit for offshore wind facilities program to consider and award certifications for qualified investments eligible for credits under this section to qualifying offshore wind facility sponsors.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount of megawatt capacity for offshore facilities with respect to which credits may be allocated under the program shall not exceed 3,000 megawatts.

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) APPLICATION PERIOD.—Each applicant for certification under this paragraph shall submit an application containing such information as the Secretary may require beginning on the date the Secretary establishes the program under paragraph (1).

“(B) PERIOD OF ISSUANCE.—An applicant which receives a certification shall have 5 years from the date of issuance of the certification in order to place the facility in service and if such facility is not placed in service by that time period, then the certification shall no longer be valid.

“(3) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In determining which qualifying offshore wind facilities to certify under this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) take into consideration which facilities will be placed in service at the earliest date, and

“(B) take into account the technology of the facility that may lead to reduced industry and consumer costs or expand access to offshore wind.

“(4) REVIEW, ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS, AND REALLOCATIONS.—

“(A) REVIEW.—Periodically, but not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall review the credits allocated under this section as of the date of such review.

“(B) ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS AND REALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary may make additional allocations and reallocations of credits under this section if the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the limitation under paragraph (1)(B) has not been attained at the time of the review, or

“(ii) scheduled placed-in-service dates of previously certified facilities have been sig-

nificantly delayed and the Secretary determines the applicant will not meet the timeline pursuant to paragraph (2)(B).

“(C) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALLOCATIONS AND REALLOCATIONS.—If the Secretary determines that credits under this section are available for further allocation or reallocation, but there is an insufficient quantity of qualifying applications for certification pending at the time of the review, the Secretary is authorized to conduct an additional program for applications for certification.

“(5) DISCLOSURE OF ALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall, upon making a certification under this subsection, publicly disclose the identity of the applicant and the amount of the credit with respect to such applicant.

“(e) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—A credit shall not be allowed under this section with respect to any facility if—

“(1) a credit has been allowed to such facility under section 45 for such taxable year or any prior taxable year,

“(2) a credit has been allowed with respect to such facility under section 46 by reason of section 48(a) or 48C(a) for such taxable or any preceding taxable year, or

“(3) a grant has been made with respect to such facility under section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 49(a)(1)(C) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of clause (v),

(B) by striking the period at the end of clause (vi) and inserting “, and”, and

(C) by adding after clause (vi) the following new clause:

“(vii) the basis of any property which is part of a qualifying offshore wind facility under section 48E.”

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 50(a)(2) is amended by striking “or 48D(b)(4)” and inserting “48D(b)(4), or 48E(b)(2)”.

(3) The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 48D the following new item:

“48E. Credit for offshore wind facilities.”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after the date of the enactment of this Act, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

SA 111. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 01. FUEL SWITCHING UNDER WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 415(c)(1) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865(c)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and inserting the following:

“(E) the cost of making heating and cooling modifications, including replacement (including, at the option of the State, non-renewable fuel switching when replacing furnaces or appliances if the new unit is more efficient than the replaced unit).”

SA 112. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. TAX ON OIL TRANSPORTED THROUGH THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 4611 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) INCREASE IN THE CASE OF OIL TRANSPORTED THROUGH THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any crude oil received at a United States refinery that, at any point before reaching the refinery, travels through any portion of the Keystone XL pipeline, the rate of tax determined under paragraph (1) shall be increased by 8 cents a barrel.

“(B) KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘Keystone XL pipeline’ means the pipeline described in section 2(a) of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

“(C) AMOUNTS NOT ATTRIBUTABLE TO ‘TRUST FUNDS.’—For purposes of any other provision of law, the increase under subparagraph (A) shall not be treated as attributable to the Hazardous Substance Superfund financing rate or the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund financing rate.”.

(b) TRANSFERS FROM GENERAL FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time transfer to the Secretary of Energy from the general fund of the Treasury amounts equal to the taxes collected under section 4611(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be available without further appropriation only for the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.).

(B) PRIORITIZATION.—In carrying out the program described in subparagraph (A) using the amounts described in that subparagraph, the Secretary of Energy shall prioritize funding projects focused on fuel switching.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to crude oil received at a United States refinery after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 113. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERALLY PROTECTED LAND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Presidents of both parties have designated public land to preserve the land for current and future generations and to honor the national heritage of the United States, and that designated public land includes—

(A) the Statue of Liberty;

(B) the Grand Canyon;

(C) Acadia National Park;

(D) African Burial Ground National Monument;

(E) the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park;

(F) Muir Woods National Monument;

(G) Arches National Park; and

(H) Devils Tower National Monument;

(2) outdoor recreation, including recreation within Federal land, adds over \$600,000,000,000 into the economy of the United States and supports more than 6,000,000 jobs;

(3) Federal land, such as National Parks, National Monuments, or other federally designated land, conserves historic, cultural, environmental, scenic, recreational, and biological resources, and positive impacts include—

(A) economic opportunities and small business creation;

(B) local tourism in gateway communities;

(C) new direct and indirect employment opportunities;

(D) recreational opportunities; and

(E) environmental, historic, and educational opportunities; and

(4) regions surrounding National Monuments have seen continued growth or improvement in employment and person income.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should acknowledge the benefit that public land designations provide to local and regional communities and economies; and

(2) designations of federally protected land should continue where appropriate and with consultation by local communities, bipartisan elected leaders, and interested stakeholders.

SA 114. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real and is caused by human activities;

(2) climate change is already impacting the United States with sea level rise, ocean acidification, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(3) climate change poses risks to multiple sectors of the economy of the United States, including national defense, agricultural systems, energy, and transportation, as well as human health and the environment;

(4) the impacts of climate change have significant economic costs that will occur year after year and increase with further delays in global action;

(5) the extent of future climate change is largely determined by the choices the United States and other nations make in the immediate future;

(6) the Federal Government, tribal nations, States, local communities, and the private sector must continue to take action to prepare and adapt communities to climate change;

(7) the United States has a responsibility to children and future generations of the United States to mitigate the harmful effects of climate change;

(8) the actions of the United States taken to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of cli-

mate change cannot come at the expense of the prosperity of the United States;

(9) the actions of a single nation cannot solve the climate crisis, so solutions that address both mitigation and adaption must involve developed and developing nations around the world;

(10) investing in the development of innovative clean and renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies will—

(A) enhance the global leadership and competitiveness of the United States; and

(B) create and sustain short and long term job growth; and

(11) the United States should act immediately to address climate change because the longer the United States waits, the more severe and costly the impacts of climate change will be, and the harder it will be for future generations to address the crisis.

SA 115. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is already impacting the safety and reliability of the critical infrastructure systems of the United States, including buildings, roads, bridges, tunnels, rail, ports, airports, levees, dams, and military installations through sea level rise, rising temperatures, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(2) significant energy, industrial and transportation infrastructure in the United States is located near the coast, in floodplains, or in other areas vulnerable to sea level rise;

(3) the impacts to infrastructure described in paragraph (1) have caused tangible economic costs that are likely to increase over time;

(4) it is fiscally prudent to prepare for and seek to mitigate the impacts described in paragraph (1), as it is estimated that every dollar spent on mitigation saves \$4 in disaster relief;

(5) the Federal Government self-insures, offers insurance programs such as crop insurance and the national flood insurance program, and, in the case of extreme weather events, also serves as the insurer of last resort for public and private infrastructure;

(6) the Federal Government has a crucial role to play as a partner in working with State, local, tribal, and territorial jurisdictions to help ensure coordinated efforts to keep communities resilient;

(7) the role of the Federal Government should include prioritizing climate resilient projects when administering Federal grants, providing technical support, and sharing of data and information in user-friendly and accessible formats, among other actions;

(8) Federal agency climate change adaptation plans that assess the risk to physical assets and missions of the Federal agencies can help create savings for taxpayers; and

(9) Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, should quantify the economic value of the physical risks of the agencies from climate change.

SA 116. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ENERGY POLICIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) energy is central to a strong, diverse, and vibrant economy;

(2) the United States has benefitted greatly from abundant supplies of a range of energy resources throughout the history of the United States;

(3) the United States will continue to prosper by ensuring that balanced pathways are in place to develop energy resources that are clean, reliable, affordable, and secure;

(4) the United States must continue to transition to a lower carbon energy future;

(5) the United States should address that climate change is real and caused by human activities;

(6) climate change is already impacting the United States with sea level rise, ocean acidification, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(7) the United States has a responsibility to children and future generations of the United States to mitigate the harmful effects of climate change while producing and using ever-cleaner forms of energy from all sources;

(8) solutions that address the energy and climate challenges of the United States and the world must involve developed and developing nations around the world;

(9) there is no 1 pathway to address the challenges of climate change, but rather, different approaches must be employed to meet these challenges;

(10) energy policy approaches must take into account the reductions of greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, methane and superpollutants, such as hydrofluorocarbons;

(11) a first beneficial step toward an improved energy policy is the establishment and implementation of a national Quadrennial Energy Review;

(12) investing in the development of innovative clean and renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies will enhance global leadership and competitiveness of the United States and can create and sustain short and long term job growth;

(13) breakthrough technology development requires more than simply investing in research and development, it requires bridging the lab-to-market gap with a variety of public private partnerships ranging from STEM education through workforce training to support for innovative business investment;

(14) effective clean energy innovation policy requires support throughout the entire innovation pipeline from basic research to early market transformation;

(15) economy-wide, regional and sectorial approaches have been demonstrated and are proving that reductions in emissions can be

made while still growing the economy and providing high-paying jobs;

(16) the energy challenges of the United States can be addressed with smart responses which include—

(A) curbing emissions from the transportation sector;

(B) reducing carbon dioxide emissions from power plants;

(C) strengthening the infrastructure of the United States to be more resilient to climate change;

(D) encouraging the use of clean energy through tax cuts, credits, and deductions;

(E) reducing emissions of short-lived climate forcers;

(F) significantly improving energy efficiency solutions;

(G) investing in research, development, and demonstration;

(H) making the electric grid smarter and more reliable;

(I) improving land management planning;

(J) ensuring that a smart regulatory system is in place; and

(K) addressing the energy-water nexus challenges;

(17) responsible action requires putting a price on carbon and both mobilizing action domestically and negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements to strengthen and spur international action; and

(18) the longer the United States waits, the more severe and costly the impacts of climate change will be, and the harder it will be for children of the United States to address this crisis.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should act responsibly to develop bipartisan energy policies that lead to a lower carbon future.

SA 117. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts were first authorized by Congress in 1986 and 1992 respectively and reduce energy costs and consumption at Federal buildings and facilities without relying on additional appropriations;

(2) the contracts described in paragraph (1) are financed by a third-party and realize sufficient energy savings to cover the cost of the financed improvements over the contract term;

(3) the contractor provides a guarantee of energy savings for the Energy Savings Performance Contract and the utility provides energy savings performance assurances or guarantees of the savings for the Utility Energy Service Contract;

(4) performance-based contracting is an opportunity for significant savings so much so that the Oak Ridge National Laboratory has determined that under an Energy Savings Performance Contract the total cost savings delivered to the Government is nearly twice the guaranteed amount;

(5) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 required a Government-wide audit of facilities and, although to date only ½ of those buildings have been surveyed, it has been established that at least \$9,000,000,000 worth of energy savings that could be achieved within a decade;

(6) the Office of Management and Budget first recognized savings from Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts on an annual basis throughout the term of the contract as far back as 1998;

(7) the Congressional Budget Office instead has determined that the full cost of the authority to enter into the long-term contracts for capital investments be scored upfront as new mandatory spending while the savings in energy costs that flow from these investments be realized over time as part of the annual appropriations process;

(8) the process described in paragraph (7) has continued to hinder the ability of Congress to pass legislation ensuring additional energy and cost savings to the Federal Government through utilization of these contracts despite the proven savings; and

(9) there is broad bipartisan and bicameral recognition in Congress of the value of these energy saving contracts.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that legislation regarding Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, and legislation which may lead to the use of those contracts by the Federal Government, should receive Congressional scoring treatment that allows future year guaranteed discretionary savings to be counted against the mandatory spending attributed to undertaking such contracts.

SA 118. Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____ WEATHERIZATION ENHANCEMENT AND LOCAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY INVESTMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. ____ 01. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the State energy program established under part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) (referred to in this section as “SEP”) and the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons established under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.) (referred to in this section as “WAP”) have proven to be beneficial, long-term partnerships among Federal, State, and local partners;

(2) the SEP and the WAP have been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis over many years to address changing national, regional, and State circumstances and needs, especially through—

(A) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(B) the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.);

(C) the State Energy Efficiency Programs Improvement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-440; 104 Stat. 1006);

(D) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(E) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.); and

(F) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(3) the SEP, also known as the “State energy conservation program” —

(A) was first created in 1975 to implement a State-based, national program in support of energy efficiency, renewable energy, economic development, energy emergency preparedness, and energy policy; and

(B) has come to operate in every sector of the economy in support of the private sector to improve productivity and has dramatically reduced the cost of government through energy savings at the State and local levels;

(4) Federal laboratory studies have concluded that, for every Federal dollar invested through the SEP, more than \$7 is saved in energy costs and almost \$11 in non-Federal funds is leveraged;

(5) the WAP —

(A) was first created in 1976 to assist low-income families in response to the first oil embargo;

(B) has become the largest residential energy conservation program in the United States, with more than 7,100,000 homes weatherized since the WAP was created;

(C) saves an estimated 35 percent of consumption in the typical weatherized home, yielding average annual savings of \$437 per year in home energy costs;

(D) has created thousands of jobs in both the construction sector and in the supply chain of materials suppliers, vendors, and manufacturers who supply the WAP;

(E) returns \$2.51 in energy savings for every Federal dollar spent in energy and nonenergy benefits over the life of weatherized homes;

(F) serves as a foundation for residential energy efficiency retrofit standards, technical skills, and workforce training for the emerging broader market and reduces residential and power plant emissions of carbon dioxide by 2.65 metric tons each year per home; and

(G) has decreased national energy consumption by the equivalent of 24,100,000 barrels of oil annually;

(6) the WAP can be enhanced with the addition of a targeted portion of the Federal funds through an innovative program that supports projects performed by qualified nonprofit organizations that have a demonstrated capacity to build, renovate, repair, or improve the energy efficiency of a significant number of low-income homes, building on the success of the existing program without replacing the existing WAP network or creating a separate delivery mechanism for basic WAP services;

(7) the WAP has increased energy efficiency opportunities by promoting new, competitive public-private sector models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships;

(8) improved monitoring and reporting of the work product of the WAP has yielded benefits, and expanding independent verification of efficiency work will support the long-term goals of the WAP;

(9) reports of the Government Accountability Office in 2011, the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, and State auditors have identified State-level deficiencies in monitoring efforts that can be ad-

ressed in a manner that will ensure that WAP funds are used more effectively;

(10) through the history of the WAP, the WAP has evolved with improvements in efficiency technology, including, in the 1990s, many States adopting advanced home energy audits, which has led to great returns on investment; and

(11) as the home energy efficiency industry has become more performance-based, the WAP should continue to use those advances in technology and the professional workforce

SEC. 402. WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking “appropriated—” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “appropriated \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”

(b) GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—The Energy Conservation and Production Act is amended by inserting after section 414B (42 U.S.C. 6864b) the following:

“SEC. 414C. GRANTS FOR NEW, SELF-SUSTAINING LOW-INCOME, SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTIFAMILY HOUSING ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS TO ELIGIBLE MULTISTATE HOUSING AND ENERGY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

“(1) to expand the number of low-income, single-family and multifamily homes that receive energy efficiency retrofits;

“(2) to promote innovation and new models of retrofitting low-income homes through new Federal partnerships with covered organizations that leverage substantial donations, donated materials, volunteer labor, homeowner labor equity, and other private sector resources;

“(3) to assist the covered organizations in demonstrating, evaluating, improving, and replicating widely the model low-income energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations; and

“(4) to ensure that the covered organizations make the energy retrofit programs of the covered organizations self-sustaining by the time grant funds have been expended.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘covered organization’ means an organization that—

“(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under 501(a) of that Code; and

“(B) has an established record of constructing, renovating, repairing, or making energy efficient a total of not less than 250 owner-occupied, single-family or multifamily homes per year for low-income households, either directly or through affiliates, chapters, or other direct partners (using the most recent year for which data are available).

“(2) LOW-INCOME.—The term ‘low-income’ means an income level that is not more than 200 percent of the poverty level (as determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) applicable to a family of the size involved, except that the Secretary may establish a higher or lower level if the Secretary determines that a higher or lower level is necessary to carry out this section.

“(3) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS.—The term ‘Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons’ means the program established under this part (including part 440 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations).

“(c) COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall make grants to covered organizations through a national competitive process for use in accordance with this section.

“(d) AWARD FACTORS.—In making grants under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

“(1) the number of low-income homes the applicant—

“(A) has built, renovated, repaired, or made more energy efficient as of the date of the application; and

“(B) can reasonably be projected to build, renovate, repair, or make energy efficient during the 10-year period beginning on the date of the application;

“(2) the qualifications, experience, and past performance of the applicant, including experience successfully managing and administering Federal funds;

“(3) the number and diversity of States and climates in which the applicant works as of the date of the application;

“(4) the amount of non-Federal funds, donated or discounted materials, discounted or volunteer skilled labor, volunteer unskilled labor, homeowner labor equity, and other resources the applicant will provide;

“(5) the extent to which the applicant could successfully replicate the energy retrofit program of the applicant and sustain the program after the grant funds have been expended;

“(6) regional diversity;

“(7) urban, suburban, and rural localities; and

“(8) such other factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(e) APPLICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall request proposals from covered organizations.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(3) AWARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of a request for proposals, the Secretary shall award grants under this section.

“(f) ELIGIBLE USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—A grant under this section may be used for—

“(1) energy efficiency audits, cost-effective retrofit, and related activities in different climatic regions of the United States;

“(2) energy efficiency materials and supplies;

“(3) organizational capacity—

“(A) to significantly increase the number of energy retrofits;

“(B) to replicate an energy retrofit program in other States; and

“(C) to ensure that the program is self-sustaining after the Federal grant funds are expended;

“(4) energy efficiency, audit and retrofit training, and ongoing technical assistance;

“(5) information to homeowners on proper maintenance and energy savings behaviors;

“(6) quality control and improvement;

“(7) data collection, measurement, and verification;

“(8) program monitoring, oversight, evaluation, and reporting;

“(9) management and administration (up to a maximum of 10 percent of the total grant);

“(10) labor and training activities; and

“(11) such other activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(g) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant provided under this section shall not exceed—

“(1) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is \$225,000,000 or more, \$5,000,000; and

“(2) if the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year is less than \$225,000,000, \$1,500,000.

“(h) GUIDELINES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidelines to implement the grant program established under this section.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The guidelines—

“(A) shall not apply to the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, in whole or major part; but

“(B) may rely on applicable provisions of law governing the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons to establish—

“(i) standards for allowable expenditures;

“(ii) a minimum savings-to-investment ratio;

“(iii) standards—

“(I) to carry out training programs;

“(II) to conduct energy audits and program activities;

“(III) to provide technical assistance;

“(IV) to monitor program activities; and

“(V) to verify energy and cost savings;

“(iv) liability insurance requirements; and

“(v) recordkeeping requirements, which shall include reporting to the Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Energy applicable data on each home retrofitted.

“(i) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall review and evaluate the performance of any covered organization that receives a grant under this section (which may include an audit), as determined by the Secretary.

“(j) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND LOCAL LAW.—Nothing in this section or any program carried out using a grant provided under this section supersedes or otherwise affects any State or local law, to the extent that the State or local law contains a requirement that is more stringent than the applicable requirement of this section.

“(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress annual reports that provide—

“(1) findings;

“(2) a description of energy and cost savings achieved and actions taken under this section; and

“(3) any recommendations for further action.

“(l) FUNDING.—Of the amount of funds that are made available to carry out the Weatherization Assistance Program for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 under section 422, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020—

“(1) 2 percent of the amount if the amount is less than \$225,000,000;

“(2) 5 percent of the amount if the amount is \$225,000,000 or more but less than \$260,000,000;

“(3) 10 percent of the amount if the amount is \$260,000,000 or more but less than \$400,000,000; and

“(4) 20 percent of the amount if the amount is \$400,000,000 or more.”.

(c) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—Section 415 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6865) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) STANDARDS PROGRAM.—

“(1) CONTRACTOR QUALIFICATION.—Effective beginning January 1, 2016, to be eligible to carry out weatherization using funds made available under this part, a contractor shall be selected through a competitive bidding process and be—

“(A) accredited by the Building Performance Institute;

“(B) an Energy Smart Home Performance Team accredited under the Residential Energy Services Network; or

“(C) accredited by an equivalent accreditation or program accreditation-based State certification program approved by the Secretary.

“(2) GRANTS FOR ENERGY RETROFIT MODEL PROGRAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 414C, a covered organization (as defined in section 414C(b)) shall use a crew chief who—

“(i) is certified or accredited in accordance with paragraph (1); and

“(ii) supervises the work performed with grant funds.

“(B) VOLUNTEER LABOR.—A volunteer who performs work for a covered organization that receives a grant under section 414C shall not be required to be certified under this subsection if the volunteer is not directly installing or repairing mechanical equipment or other items that require skilled labor.

“(C) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall use training and technical assistance funds available to the Secretary to assist covered organizations under section 414C in providing training to obtain certification required under this subsection, including provisional or temporary certification.

“(3) MINIMUM EFFICIENCY STANDARDS.—Effective beginning October 1, 2016, the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(A) each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided under this part meets minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established by the Secretary after weatherization of a dwelling unit; and

“(B) at least 10 percent of the dwelling units are randomly inspected by a third party accredited under this subsection to ensure compliance with the minimum efficiency and quality of work standards established under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) the standards established under this subsection meet or exceed the industry standards for home performance work that are in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 303. STATE ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended by striking “\$125,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012” and inserting “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020”.

SA 119. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . EXTENSION OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIP OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE TO ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND RELATED ENERGY ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (E) of section 7704(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “income and gains derived from the exploration” and inserting “income and gains derived from the following:

“(i) MINERALS, NATURAL RESOURCES, ETC.—The exploration”;

(2) by inserting “or” before “industrial source”;

(3) by inserting a period after “carbon dioxide”, and

(4) by striking “, or the transportation or storage” and all that follows and inserting the following:

“(ii) RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The generation of electric power exclusively utilizing any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in section 48 (determined without regard to any termination date), or in the case of a facility described in paragraph (3) or (7) of section 45(d) (determined without regard to any placed in service date or date by which construction of the facility is required to begin), the accepting or processing of such resource.

“(iii) ELECTRICITY STORAGE DEVICES.—The receipt and sale of electric power that has been stored in a device directly connected to the grid.

“(iv) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively utilizing property described in section 48(c)(3) (determined without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (D) thereof and without regard to any placed in service date).

“(v) RENEWABLE THERMAL ENERGY.—The generation, storage, or distribution of thermal energy exclusively using any resource described in section 45(c)(1) or energy property described in clause (i) or (iii) of section 48(a)(3)(A).

“(vi) WASTE HEAT TO POWER.—The use of recoverable waste energy, as defined in section 371(5) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341(5)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this clause).

“(vii) RENEWABLE FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The storage or transportation of any fuel described in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 6426.

“(viii) RENEWABLE FUELS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable fuel described in section 211(o)(1)(J) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(J)) (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this clause) or section 40A(d)(1).

“(ix) RENEWABLE CHEMICALS.—The production, storage, or transportation of any renewable chemical (as defined in paragraph (6)).

“(x) ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS.—The audit and installation through contract or other agreement of any energy efficient building property described in section 179D(c)(1).

“(xi) GASIFICATION WITH SEQUESTRATION.—The production of any product from a project that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 48B(c)(1) and that separates and sequesters in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)) at least 75 percent of such project's total qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)).

“(xii) CARBON CAPTURE AND SEQUESTRATION.—The generation or storage of electric

power produced from any facility which is a qualified facility described in section 45Q(c) and which disposes of any captured qualified carbon dioxide (as defined in section 45Q(b)) in secure geological storage (as determined under section 45Q(d)(2)).”.

(b) **RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.**—Section 7704(d) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) **RENEWABLE CHEMICAL.**—The term ‘renewable chemical’ means a monomer, polymer, plastic, formulated product, or chemical substance produced from renewable biomass (as defined in section 9001(12) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101(12)), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this paragraph).”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SA 120. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR NEW QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 30B(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property purchased after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (g) of section 30C, as amended by the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 5. OFFSET.

(a) **100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.**—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made on or after the date which is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 121. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) **FEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A fee of 8 cents shall be imposed on each barrel of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **USE OF FEE REVENUE.**—Revenue from the fee imposed under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the land and water conservation fund established under section 200302 of title 54, United States Code.

SA 122. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is real;

(2) worldwide scientific opinion is not settled on the extent to which human activities may be causing climate change;

(3) projections by models of catastrophic increases in global temperatures have not been validated by measured temperature data;

(4) fossil fuels are critical to the health of the world economy and low-cost electricity and other energy forms have dramatically improved the health and quality of life of millions the world over; and

(5) the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Project issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, found that construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline will not significantly impact global greenhouse gas emissions.

SA 123. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a “blue slip” from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer

to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SA 124. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization, including the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, without consultation with, and the informed and express consent of, the applicable Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

SA 125. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rebuilding America’s Infrastructure Act of 2015”.

TITLE I—REPEAL OF OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

Subtitle A—Close Big Oil Tax Loopholes

SEC. 101. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) **SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.**—

“(1) **GENERAL RULE.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer which is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

“(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

“(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

“(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

“(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

“(2) **DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘dual capacity taxpayer’ means, with respect to any

foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

“(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

“(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

“(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘generally applicable income tax’ means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

“(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

“(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHOLD.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 102. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)) for the taxable year, the term ‘domestic production gross receipts’ shall not include gross receipts from the production, refining, processing, transportation, or distribution of oil, gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 103. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS; AMORTIZATION OF DISALLOWED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS AND GEOTHERMAL WELLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (i), regulations shall be prescribed by the Secretary under this subtitle corresponding to the regulations which granted the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells and which were recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, Seventy-ninth Congress. Such regulations shall also grant the option to deduct as expenses intangible drilling and development costs in the case of wells drilled for any geothermal deposit (as defined in section 613(e)(2)) to the same extent and in the same manner as such expenses are deductible in the case of oil and gas wells. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any costs to which any deduction is allowed under section 59(e) or 291.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(B) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (A) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred. For purposes of section 1254, any deduction under this subparagraph shall be treated as a deduction under this subsection.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS WELLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—In the case of any taxable year in which the taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)), the allowance for percentage depletion shall be zero.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR TERTIARY INJECTANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 193 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) APPLICATION WITH RESPECT TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred by a taxpayer in any taxable year in which such taxpayer is a major integrated oil company (within the meaning of section 167(h)(5)).

“(2) AMORTIZATION OF AMOUNTS NOT ALLOWABLE AS DEDUCTIONS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).—The amount not allowable as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of paragraph (1) shall be allowable as a deduction ratably over the 60-month period beginning with the month in which the costs are paid or incurred.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 106. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 167(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) CERTAIN SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘major integrated oil company’ includes any successor in interest of a company that was described in subparagraph (B) in any taxable year, if such successor controls more than 50 percent of the crude oil production or natural gas production of such company.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 167(h)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “except as provided in subparagraph (C),” after “For purposes of this paragraph,”.

(2) TAXABLE YEARS TESTED.—Clause (iii) of section 167(h)(5)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “does not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d)” and in-

serting “did not apply by reason of paragraph (4) of section 613A(d) for any taxable year after 2004”, and

(B) by striking “does not apply” in subsection (II) and inserting “did not apply for the taxable year”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

Subtitle B—Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Natural Gas

SEC. 111. REPEAL OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF DEEP WATER AND DEEP GAS ROYALTY RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 344 and 345 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15904, 15905) are repealed.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall not be required to provide for royalty relief in the lease sale terms beginning with the first lease sale held on or after the date of enactment of this Act for which a final notice of sale has not been published.

TITLE II—INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

SEC. 201. INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an amount equal to the net amount of any savings realized as a result of the enactment of this Act and the amendments made by this Act (after any expenditures authorized by this Act and the amendments made by this Act)—

(A) in accordance with subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) in the case of any additional savings after the application of such subsections, into the Highway Trust Fund in the following manner:

(i) 75 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account).

(ii) 25 percent of such additional savings shall be transferred into the Mass Transit Account.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) 2015 INCREASE.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) and the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund amounts equal to the amounts determined under section 201(a)(1)(B) of the Rebuilding America's Infrastructure Act of 2015.”.

(b) WATER INFRASTRUCTURE INNOVATIVE FINANCING PILOT PROJECTS.—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency jointly, \$2,000,000,000 to carry out the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3901 et seq.) through 2019.

(c) TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANT.—In this section, the term “TIGER discretionary grant” means a grant awarded and administered by the Secretary of Transportation using funds made available for—

(A) supplemental discretionary grants for a national surface transportation system under title XII of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5; 123 Stat. 203);

(B) the national infrastructure investments discretionary grant program under title I of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111-17; 123 Stat. 3035);

(C) national infrastructure investments under section 2202 of division B of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10; 125 Stat. 191);

(D) national infrastructure investments under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 641);

(E) national infrastructure investments under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 432);

(F) national infrastructure investments under title I of division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 574); or

(G) national infrastructure investments under title I of division K of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235).

(2) **APPROPRIATION.**—Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary of Transportation, \$2,000,000,000 to provide TIGER discretionary grants for fiscal year 2016.

(d) **MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.**—The funding provided under this section shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for the programs and accounts funded under this section.

SEC. 202. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE III—STATE REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 301. STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REVOLVING FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, \$1,500,000,000 for State water pollution control revolving funds established in accordance with title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.).

SEC. 302. STATE DRINKING WATER TREATMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS.

Out of any funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, \$1,000,000,000 for State drinking water treatment revolving loan funds established in accordance with section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12).

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

The Office of Management and Budget shall not include amounts made available under subsections (b) or (c) of section 201 or title III during a fiscal year in determining whether there has been a breach of the discretionary spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) during the fiscal year.

SA 126. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (e) and insert the following:

(e) **PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.**—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

SA 127. Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—LEASE SALES

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

(2) **QUALIFIED REVENUES.**—The term “qualified revenues” means all bonus bids, rentals, royalties, and other sums due and payable to the United States from all leases entered into after the date of enactment of this Act that cover an area in the South Atlantic planning area.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) **SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.**—The term “South Atlantic planning area” means the area of the outer Continental Shelf (as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331)) that is located between the northern lateral seaward administrative boundary of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the southernmost lateral seaward administrative boundary of the State of Georgia.

(5) **STATE.**—The term “State” means any of the following States:

- (A) Georgia.
- (B) North Carolina.
- (C) South Carolina.
- (D) Virginia.

SEC. 202. ENHANCING STATE RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that establish management of the surface occupancy of each portion of the South Atlantic planning area for the applicable coastline of a State for any lease sale authorized under this Act to the effect that—

(1) the applicable State shall have sole authority to restrict or allow surface facilities above the waterline for the purpose of production of oil or gas resources in any area that is within 12 nautical miles seaward from the coastline of the State;

(2) unless permanent surface occupancy is authorized by a State, only sub-surface production facilities may be installed in areas that are located between the point that is 12 nautical miles from seaward from the coastline of the State and the point that is 20 nautical miles seaward from the coastline of the State;

(3) new offshore production facilities are encouraged and the impacts on coastal vistas are minimized, to the maximum extent practical; and

(4) onshore facilities that facilitate the development and production of the oil and gas

resources of the South Atlantic planning area within 12 nautical miles seaward of the coastline of a State are allowed.

(b) **TEMPORARY ACTIVITIES NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in the regulations described in subsection (a) shall restrict, or give the States authority to restrict, temporary surface activities related to operations associated with outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases.

SEC. 203. REINSTATEMENT OF VIRGINIA LEASE SALE 220.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct Lease Sale 220 (as described in the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement dated November 13, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 67201)).

SEC. 204. SOUTH CAROLINA LEASE SALE.

Notwithstanding the exclusion of the South Atlantic planning area in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2012-2017 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344), the Secretary shall conduct a lease sale not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act in areas off the coast of the State of South Carolina—

(1) determined by the Secretary to have the most geologically promising hydrocarbon resources; and

(2) that constitute not less than 25 percent of the leasable area located within the offshore administrative boundaries of the State of South Carolina depicted in the notice entitled “Federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Administrative Boundaries Extending from the Submerged Lands Act Boundary seaward to the Limit of the United States Outer Continental Shelf”, published January 3, 2006 (71 Fed. Reg. 127).

SEC. 205. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

The Secretary shall complete a multisale environmental impact statement for each lease sale conducted under this title.

SEC. 206. SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA LEASE SALES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct 3 lease sales in the South Atlantic planning area before June 30, 2017, in areas—

(1) to be determined by the Secretary based on—

(A) analysis by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; and

(B) industry nomination; and

(2) determined by the Secretary to contain the most hydrocarbon resource potential.

(b) **2017-2022 LEASING PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) include the South Atlantic planning area in the outer Continental Shelf leasing program for fiscal years 2017-2022 prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344); and

(2) conduct 1 lease sale in the South Atlantic planning area during each year of the program, for a total of 5 lease sales.

SEC. 207. BALANCING OF MILITARY AND ENERGY PRODUCTION GOALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In recognition that the outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program and the domestic energy resources produced under the program are integral to national security, the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall work jointly in implementing lease sales under this Act—

(1) to preserve the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to maintain an optimum state of readiness through the continued use of the outer Continental Shelf; and

(2) to allow effective exploration, development, and production of the oil, gas, and renewable energy resources of the United States.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON CONFLICTS WITH MILITARY OPERATIONS.**—No person may engage in any exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas on the outer Continental Shelf under a lease issued under this Act that would conflict with any military operation, as determined in accordance with—

(1) the agreement entitled “Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior on Mutual Concerns on the Outer Continental Shelf” signed July 20, 1983; and

(2) any revision or replacement of the agreement described in paragraph (1) that is agreed to by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary after that date but before the date of issuance of the lease under which the exploration, development, or production is conducted.

SEC. 208. REVENUE SHARING AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338), each fiscal year the Secretary shall deposit—

(1) 37.5 percent of the qualified revenues in a special account in the Treasury, from which the Secretary shall allocate amounts in accordance with section 209;

(2) 12.5 percent of the qualified revenues dedicated towards deficit reduction; and

(3) 50 percent of the qualified revenues in the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 209. ALLOCATION TO STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the qualified revenues deposited in the account under section 208(1), 37.5 percent shall be distributed to each State—

(1) using the formula established under subsection (b); and

(2) in amounts that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(b) **FORMULA.**—The formula used to make the calculation under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) established by the Secretary by regulation; and

(2) modeled after the final rule entitled “Allocation and Disbursement of Royalties, Rentals, and Bonuses—Oil and Gas, Offshore”, dated December 23, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 78622).

(c) **MINIMUM ALLOCATION.**—Each State shall be entitled to an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the qualified revenues allocated under subsection (a).

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—A State receiving amounts under this section may use the amounts in accordance with State law.

SA 128. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the President determines that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, has completed a comprehensive study analyzing the human health impacts of the pipeline described in section 2(a), including—

(1) increased air pollution in communities near refineries that will process the up to 830,000 barrels per day of tar sands crude that

will be transported through the pipeline, including assessment of the cumulative air pollution impacts on the communities;

(2) increased exposure of communities to particulate matter and heavy metals from the disposal, storage, and use of petroleum coke that results from the refining of the tar sands crude that will be transported through the pipeline; and

(3) increased exposures in communities to benzene, volatile organic compounds, hydrogen sulfide, and other toxic substances that may result from spills or the contamination of water supplies from tar sands crude transported through the pipeline.

SA 129. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(A) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(2) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) relieves any Federal agency of the obligation of the Federal agency to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the obligation of the Federal agency to prepare a supplement to the final supplemental environmental impact statement described in paragraph (1) in connection with the issuance of any permit or authorization needed to construct, connect, operate, or maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the environmental impacts resulting from the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline and cross-border facilities, including from greenhouse gas emissions associated with the crude oil being transported by the pipeline.

SA 130. Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

(c) **PERMIT SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this Act shall affect the status of any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a).

SA 131. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2(a), strike the period at the end and insert the following:

, subject to—

(1) all applicable laws (including regulations);

(2) all mitigation measures that are required in permits issued by permitting agencies; and

(3) all project-specific special conditions listed in Appendix Z of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014.

SA 132. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that the designation of National Monuments should be subject to—

(1) consultation with each unit of local government within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located; and

(2) the approval by the Governor and legislature of each State within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located.

SA 133. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the energy policy of the United States is based on an all-of-the-above approach to production sources;

(2) an all-of-the-above approach reduces dependence on foreign oil, increases national security and creates jobs;

(3) smart investments in renewable resources are critical to increase the energy independence of the United States, reduce emissions, and create jobs;

(4) wind energy is a critical component of an all-of-the-above energy policy and has a proven track record of creating jobs, reducing emissions, and provides an alternative and compatible energy resource to the existing generation infrastructure of the United States;

(5) the wind energy industry and utilities require long-term certainty regarding the Production Tax Credit for project planning in order to continue build out of this valuable natural resource; and

(6) the stop-start unpredictability of short-term Production Tax Credit extensions should be avoided, as short-term extensions have disrupted the wind industry, slowing the ability of the wind industry to cut costs, as compared to what would have occurred with a long-term, predictable policy in place.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended by striking “January 1, 2015” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2020” in—

- (A) paragraph (1);
- (B) paragraph (2)(A);
- (C) paragraph (3)(A);
- (D) paragraph (4)(B);
- (E) paragraph (6);
- (F) paragraph (7);
- (G) paragraph (9); and
- (H) paragraph (11)(B);

(2) clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) should be amended by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2020”; and

(3) the amendments that would be made by paragraphs (1) and (2) should take effect on January 1, 2015.

SA 134. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXTENSION OF THE WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the credit allowed under section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is extended for a period of not less than 5 years for facilities described in subsection (d)(1) of such section.

SA 135. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXTENSION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITION OF FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—Section 3(11) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2012 and 2013”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount that is equal to the full funding amount for fiscal year 2013.”

(b) SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended by striking “2013” each place it appears and inserting “2014”.

(2) ELECTIONS.—Section 102(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “by August 1, 2013 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable), and August 1 of each second fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “by August 1 of each applicable fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “2013” each place it appears and inserting “2014”.

(3) ELECTION AS TO USE OF BALANCE.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “not more than 7 percent of the total share for the eligible county of the State payment or the county payment” and inserting “any portion of the balance”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) COUNTIES WITH MAJOR DISTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of each eligible county to which \$350,000 or more is distributed for any fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) of subsection (a), the eligible county shall elect to do 1 or more of the following with the balance of any funds not expended pursuant to subparagraph (A):

“(i) Reserve any portion of the balance for projects in accordance with title II.

“(ii) Reserve not more than 7 percent of the total share for the eligible county of the State payment or the county payment for projects in accordance with title III.

“(iii) Return the portion of the balance not reserved under clauses (i) and (ii) to the Treasury of the United States.”

(4) NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION.—Section 102(d)(3)(A) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “2012,” and inserting “2014 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)”.

(5) FAILURE TO ELECT.—Section 102(d)(3)(B)(ii) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “purpose described in section 202(b), 203(c), or 204(a)(5)”.

(6) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(c) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—Section 203(a)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7123(a)(1)) is amended by striking “September 30 for fiscal year 2008 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable), and each September 30 thereafter for each succeeding fis-

cal year through fiscal year 2013” and inserting “September 30 of each applicable fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)”.

(2) EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—Section 204(e) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7124(e)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(3) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 205(a)(4) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125(a)(4)) is amended by striking “2012” each place it appears and inserting “2015”.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF PROJECT FUNDS.—Section 207(a) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7127(a)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2008 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable), and each September 30 thereafter for each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2013” and inserting “September 30 of each applicable fiscal year (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)”.

(5) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “2013” and inserting “2014 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “2014” and inserting “2016”.

(d) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO RESERVE AND USE COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2013” and inserting “2014 (or as soon thereafter as the Secretary concerned determines is practicable)”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “September 30, 2014, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States” and inserting “September 30, 2015, may be retained by the counties for the purposes identified in section 302(a)(2)”.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 402 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7152) is amended by inserting “and fiscal year 2015 for payments to States and counties for fiscal year 2014” before the period at the end.

(f) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) TITLE II FUNDS.—Any funds that were not obligated as required by section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) shall be available for use in accordance with title II of that Act (16 U.S.C. 7121 et seq.).

(2) TITLE III FUNDS.—Any funds that were not obligated as required by section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) shall be available for use in accordance with title III of that Act (16 U.S.C. 7141 et seq.).

SA 136. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ RESTORING MANDATORY FUNDING STATUS TO PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES.

(a) PERMANENT PAYMENT.—Section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “of fiscal years 2008 through 2014” and inserting “fiscal year”.

SA 137. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the limit on liability with respect to offshore oil spills is modified to be unlimited.

SA 138. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the following tax breaks are repealed for major integrated oil companies (as that term is defined in section 167(h)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986):

(1) Percentage depletion allowances under sections 613 and 613A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) The domestic production activities deduction under section 199 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SA 139. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation

from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to any of the following:

- (1) Increased water temperatures.
- (2) Significant migration of economically important species from United States waters.
- (3) A decrease in the productivity of United States fisheries and ecosystems.
- (4) An increase in diseases affecting United States fisheries and humans.

SA 140. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to higher sea levels.

SA 141. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to an increase in more extreme weather events.

SA 142. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr.

FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. ____

This Act shall not take effect prior to the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, an adaptation fund is established for State and Indian tribes that funds projects to build resilience to the impacts of climate change, including—

- (A) extreme weather events such as flooding and tropical cyclones;
- (B) more frequent heavy precipitation events;
- (C) loss of snowpack and Arctic land and sea ice;
- (D) water scarcity and adverse impacts on water quality;
- (E) stronger and longer heat waves;
- (F) more frequent and severe droughts;
- (G) rises in sea level;
- (H) ecosystem disruption;
- (I) increased air pollution; and
- (J) effects on public health.

SA 143. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ QUARTERLY JOBS REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 90 days thereafter during the period described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Labor shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that describes, for the period covered by the report, the quantity of construction, operations, and maintenance jobs—

(1) directly associated with the Keystone XL Pipeline described in section 1, in accordance with section ES4.3.1 of the final environmental impact statement issued by the Secretary of State referred to in section 1(c); or

(2) in the renewable energy development and production sectors (including wind energy, solar energy, geothermal energy, biomass and biofuels, and hydropower) of the United States.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PERIOD.—The period referred to in subsection (a) is the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Jobs and a Healthy Economy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining Job-Based Health Insurance and Defining Full-Time Work."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 22, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 22, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to William Treadwell and Samin Peirovi effective today through June 1, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Paulina Rippere, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for this session of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF
WENDELL H. FORD, FORMER
UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR
THE COMMONWEALTH OF KEN-
TUCKY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 38, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 38) relative to the death of Wendell H. Ford, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY
26, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4:30 p.m., Monday, January 26; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1. I further ask that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, the filing deadline for first-degree amendments be at 3 p.m. on Monday, with second degrees at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the next vote will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday. If Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL can reach an agreement for additional votes on amendments, those could be scheduled for Monday night as well.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JANUARY 26, 2015, AT 4:30 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 38 as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator Wendell H. Ford of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:21 a.m., adjourned until Monday, January 26, 2015, at 4:30 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT
AND CAREER OF JAMES "JIM"
NISSEN

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the career and retirement of James "Jim" Nissen. After twenty-six years as La Crosse District Manager of the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge and nearly 39 years with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. Nissen announced his retirement on January second 2015.

Nissen held seasonal positions with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Nebraska, Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, and South Dakota. He also held permanent positions in Indiana, Vermont, Utah, and Wisconsin. Each station offered new opportunities and challenges and developed his career from a student trainee to Refuge Manager.

Mr. Nissen is not a native of the La Crosse, WI area, but according to his colleagues, "no one knows this refuge better than he does." Nissen grew up in a duck hunting family in northeastern Nebraska, not far from the Platte River and among the prairie pothole country that produces much of the continent's canvas-back ducks. Jim's career followed this regal bird across the country and in 1989, Nissen came to the La Crosse District after two years of overseeing the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge on the eastern side of Wisconsin. The Horicon position marked his return to Wisconsin; Nissen had been there in 1976 for the Canada goose dispersal program, where he not only helped manage the goose population, but also met his wife Ruth.

The La Crosse position offered Nissen the chance to get back to a river-based assignment—his true passion. Nissen fell in love with the abundance of canvasbacks, also referred to as "the king of ducks," that the Upper Mississippi River and La Crosse area boast during fall migration. "I like rivers and canvasbacks and people," Nissen said, "so it was a good fit."

Each fall, the Upper Mississippi River allows Nissen to see nearly half of the world's canvasback population pass by his window during migration. "It really is a world-class spectacle," Nissen said.

During his tenure at LaCrosse, Jim received numerous awards and accolades including the Meritorious Service Award of the Department of the Interior in 2007. He has overseen multi-million dollar habitat enhancement projects funded through the Environmental Management Program; he has acquired over 2,500 acres of lands for inclusion in the National Wildlife Refuge; he has overseen the construction of a LEED certified Visitor Center and office; and he is regarded as a leader in

wetland and waterfowl ecology and management.

Jim's departure will create a profound void in the Upper Miss' institutional knowledge. His energy, wisdom, humor, innate ability to remember dates, and his many discussions will be missed terribly by all who worked alongside him. I wish both Jim, Ruth, and their son Travis all the best in the years to come.

MARGO NIELSEN—EMBODIMENT
OF SERVICE

HON. JOHN RATCLIFFE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding parts of my job is seeing the extraordinary work that constituents do giving back to their communities every single day.

They don't do it for fame, and they don't do it for glory. They do it because they want to make a difference. No one person embodies this spirit of service better than Margo Nielsen.

During her 25 years at the helm of Helping Hands, the organization has seen tremendous growth and helped tens of thousands of people by ensuring that essential health and emergency services are available to everyone in Rockwall County.

Margo—congratulations on your remarkable career. Your leadership will be missed, but your legacy not soon forgotten. Thank you all for joining me in honoring Margo and supporting Helping Hands. God Bless.

CELEBRATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY
OF CHILDREN ON THE
GREEN

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Children on the Green located in Morristown, New Jersey as it celebrates its 20th Anniversary.

In 1994, twenty years ago, a special organization opened its doors with the goal of serving others. Not just serving others, but serving others who were not as fortunate as themselves, specifically children. Since its opening, Children on the Green of Morristown has met the childcare needs of nearly 400 families from area shelters. This was possible through the organizations longstanding partnerships with Homeless Solutions, the Jersey Battered Women's Services and Family Promise of Morris County.

Children on the Green, located behind the United Methodist Church, works to provide

safe and nurturing care to children whose parents are struggling to provide for them because they are in need of housing, education, and/or employment. While the parents work to better their families' situation, Children on the Green is a safe place for the children to go where they're taken care of by people who truly care. Their mission is to support the developmental needs of each child and create an interdependent partnership between home, work, community, and the center.

Early childhood education has a value that cannot be measured. Research has shown significant gaps in early development between children of the lowest socioeconomic status and those in the highest, which have been shown to start as early as nine months of age. The main contribution to this problem is access to good quality early childhood education.

Children on the Green has a philosophy that states, "Every child deserves access to a quality early education program like Children on the Green, irrespective of their means." This organization strives every day to lower the achievement gap by providing quality early childhood education to those children in need.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing 20 years of outstanding service by Children on the Green, their directors, board of trustees and staff. Organizations like this are bettering the lives of the children not just in Morristown, New Jersey, but across the country.

CONGRATULATING HARPER COLLEGE ON ITS NEW CAREER AND
TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am excited to recognize Harper Community College in Palatine, IL, which will be opening its new Career and Technical Education Center on January 23. This new building, with state-of-the-art classrooms and labs, will house some of Harper's fastest-growing technical programs such as manufacturing, welding, architectural technology, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), maintenance technology, law enforcement, and fire science.

Programs in this building will help provide students with the skills they will need in the future. These programs will help put people to work and support local employers who are seeking a highly-skilled workforce to compete in the 21st Century global economy.

The building will also house Harper's innovative Advanced Manufacturing Program. The program partners with 75 area manufacturing companies which offer paid internships to manufacturing students attending Harper College.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I applaud the Harper College community on the opening of its new Career and Technical Education Center, and I look forward to its continued leadership in bringing educational opportunities to students in the 10th District.

AGGIES IN WWI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the trenches of the Argonne Forrest in north-eastern France, sat thousands of allied troops. It was the fall of 1918, it was World War I. The battle was muddy, rainy and most of all it was bloody. It was one of the largest and deadliest battles in U.S. military history, involving over a million American soldiers. Among the masses, in the front line trenches, sat James Vernon "Pinky" Wilson, a marine from Texas, who amidst chaos felt called to write what would become one of the most famous songs in college history, the Aggie War Hymn.

Pinky Wilson grew up in the small Texas town of Florence, about 30 miles north of Austin. In 1917, he was a junior enrolled at Texas A&M University when he volunteered to serve our country in World War I.

Wilson fought with the 6th Marine Regiment and by choice he became buck private in the Marine Corps, turning down two commissions, remaining a buck private throughout his military career. Not long after joining his Marine outfit as a replacement, Wilson saw firsthand the rigorous and relentless fighting in the Champagne area of France.

In November of 1918, Wilson found himself right in the middle of the Battle of the Argonne Forrest. By the time Wilson took his first muddy spot in the trenches, the battle had been waging on for 37 days. For the remaining days, the Germans gave everything they had, fighting to the death. Knowing that the end was near, the Germans were desperate to try and steer the war in their favor.

They bombarded and pelted the Marines with infantry, artillery, and machine gun fire. While sitting in the foxhole watching this bloodbath unfold before him, Wilson was struck with an idea. In an interview with the San Antonio Express-News in 1975, Wilson recalled that it was during the Champagne battle he had a running idea of writing a song. A fight song that a quartet would sing for Texas A&M. He took out a pencil and some letters from home and began scribbling the lines of the song that would become one of the most recognizable songs in Texas history.

Wilson sat with his lyrics in the trenches until the war was over. Since he wrote the song and knew it perfectly in his head, melody, lyrics and all, he never bothered to keep the original copy he wrote. The tenor of the War Hymn as it was officially named, takes digs at the arch rival of Texas A&M, the University of Texas Longhorns.

By the time the Battle of the Argonne Forrest was over, it had been a 47 day nightmare that the allies were able to wake up from. And they woke up victorious, the war was over. The bloody battle that began on September

26, 1918, concluded World War I. It lasted until the Armistice, on November 11, 1918.

What is remarkable about the class of 1917 at Texas A&M University is that they all volunteered to serve our country. Some as officers and some as enlisted men. These men went on to fight in World War I to serve and protect America and her freedoms. They were the fathers of the Greatest Generation.

They came back and had families, instilling the same sense of selfless service in their sons and younger generation. When World War II started, the entire graduating classes of 1941 and 1942 at Texas A&M University did the exact same thing; they all volunteered to serve our country.

The Aggies at A&M have a long tradition of service to the military. A&M commissions so many officers into our military that the number rivals our service academies.

Much like the writing of our Star Spangled Banner, the Aggie War Hymn was born from a place of true patriotism during a time of pure terror and a fight for freedom. While the original version that Wilson wrote had a first verse, the second verse makes up the war hymn. And still, almost 100 years later, this second verse marks one of the most notable and famous A&M traditions. After the war, Wilson eventually returned to A&M to earn a degree and graduate with the class of 1920. He went on to become a successful Texas Rancher.

His alma mater will be forever grateful for his contribution to not only his school, but to the State of Texas and his country.

To quote the Aggie War Hymn, "Rough tough, real stuff, Texas A&M,"—those Aggies who fought in WWI, WWII and those who have served and are currently serving our country embody this line to the fullest extent.

James Vernon "Pinky" Wilson is one of the remarkable men who answered the call of his country. There truly are none quite like the Texas A&M Aggies.

The Aggie spirit is engrained and rooted deep into Texas A&M. They are hard core patriots, committed cadets and forever rivals of the University of Texas. They are and will always be the pulse of Texas A&M. Gig 'em.

And that's just the way it is.

THE AGGIE WAR HYMN

(By Pinky Wilson)

Hullabaloo, Caneck! Caneck!
Hullabaloo, Caneck! Caneck!

FIRST VERSE

All hail to dear old Texas A&M
Rally around Maroon and White
Good luck to dear old Texas Aggies
They are the boys who show the real old fight

That good old Aggie spirit thrills us
And makes us yell and yell and yell
So let's fight for dear old Texas A&M
We're going to beat you all to
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Rough Tough! Real Stuff! Texas A&M!

SECOND VERSE

Good-bye to Texas university
So long to the orange and the white
Good luck to dear old Texas Aggies
They are the boys that show the real old fight

"The eyes of Texas are upon you . . ."
That is the song they sing so well
So good-bye to Texas university

We're going to beat you all to
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Chig-gar-roo-gar-rem
Rough Tough! Real Stuff! Texas A&M!

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF BERNARD "BERNY" BALKONIS

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the retirement of Bernard "Berny" Frank Balkonis, Jr. Mr. Balkonis was Vice President of Sales for Prairie Estates Genetics of Middleton, Wisconsin. Mr. Balkonis' retirement at the end of 2014 marked the conclusion of a 40 year career in the seed corn industry. The President of Prairie Estates Genetics, Ron Rogers, affirmed that Balkonis leaves a robust legacy as a fantastic mentor to forage managers and a valued member of the Prairie Estates Genetics team.

Mr. Balkonis graduated from University of Wisconsin-River Falls in 1975, working on dairy farms in the summer and during holiday breaks to make his way through school. After graduation and marriage to his high school sweetheart, Mr. Balkonis was recruited by Farm Supply (Growmark), and managed a store location in northern Illinois for five years. After his time with Farm Supply, he then joined PAG Seeds, a division of Cargill. During his time with PAG Seeds, Mr. Balkonis worked as a territory manager in southwest Michigan. After PAG Seeds, Paymaster, and Cargill combined to create Cargill Hybrid Seeds, Balkonis was moved to northern Michigan, where he became both territory manager and assistant district manager. While located throughout Michigan, Mr. Balkonis and his wife welcomed three sons into the world.

In 1992, Mr. Balkonis was promoted within Cargill Hybrid Seeds to area manager for the eastern United States. Then, in 1996, Mr. Balkonis assumed the position of area manager for the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Illinois and moved his family to Holmen, Wisconsin. In 2000, when Cargill Hybrid Seeds sold to Dow (becoming the entity Mycogen), Mr. Balkonis remained on as area manager. After his time as area manager with Mycogen, Mr. Balkonis took on the responsibilities of VP of Sales for Prairie Estates Genetics, where he would spend the rest of his career and begin the transition to the new role of grandparent with the birth of his first grandson Efram.

Mr. Balkonis will retire with his wife of 40 years, Claudia, in Trempealeau, Wisconsin, just 10 miles north of Holmen where they raised their three sons, Adam, Scott and Wade. I wish to extend the best of wishes to Berny as he steps into retirement and that next great adventure.

IN HONOR OF MAJOR CHAD ERIN
LAMPHERE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Major Chad Erin Lamphere, an American hero who valiantly served his country while serving in the United States Army.

Chad was born on August 24, 1973 on a small family farm in Arkansaw, WI. Displaying a warm heart at a young age, Chad helped his family raise dogs, cats, pigs, and goats, while also contributing and giving back to his community through partaking in 4-H. Chad quickly rose to the top of his academic classes, graduating with two degrees and as Valedictorian from Hartnell College, and later attending UCLA for pre-medical courses, in which he graduated Summa Cum Laude.

Chad joined the U.S. Army in 2006 in pursuit of a degree in medicine. In 2009, Chad joined the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), and as a doctor, provided much needed care and services to his fellow comrades who he valiantly served next to. Additionally Chad's selflessness and can-do attitude shined while serving in the U.S. Army, receiving multiple awards during his Active Duty assignments: the Bronze Star Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, Army Service Ribbon, and Overseas Service Ribbon.

In addition, to serving his country, Chad was a caring friend, loving father, and husband, and dedicated family man. Chad leaves behind his wife, Lindsay Della Valla, daughter, Emma Lamphere and son, Chad Erin Lamphere Jr., three siblings: Kirk, Jarrod, and Nicole, and his loving parents: Suzanne and Brad du Verrier.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of an accomplished American hero and loving husband, Major Chad Erin Lamphere. His life, legacy, and service to the United States of America will never be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF THE SAN FRAN-
CISCO COUNTY TRANSPOR-
TATION AUTHORITY

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI and I rise to congratulate the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, commonly referred to as the Transportation Authority, on its 25th anniversary and its many accomplishments.

Established in 1989, the Transportation Authority administers and oversees the delivery of the county's half-cent local transportation sales tax program and New Expenditure Plan. The agency was founded by the people of

San Francisco to administer Proposition B, a half-cent transportation sales tax program, which began in 1990 and was reauthorized in 2003 when voters approved Proposition K.

For the last quarter-century, the Transportation Authority has been responsible for long-range transportation planning in San Francisco and has analyzed, designed, and funded vital improvements for San Francisco's roadways and public transportation networks. It has significantly increased the region's mobility.

Since 1990, the Transportation Authority has also been the designated Congestion Management Agency for San Francisco, and has served as the San Francisco Program Manager for grants from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air. When passed by voters in 2010, the agency also began serving as the administrator of Proposition AA, a \$10 annual fee on motor vehicles registered in San Francisco.

In these capacities the Transportation Authority has embodied its mission of providing prudent financial management, planning expertise, and project delivery oversight to create a better city for residents, workers and visitors. Through innovation, the Transportation Authority continues to study, plan, and invest in transportation infrastructure that supports San Francisco's thriving economy and meets the needs of its diverse community. The agency serves as a steward to help fund major capital projects such as the Presidio Parkway, Central Subway and Transbay Transit Center, as well as neighborhood-scale improvements that impact everyday San Franciscans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize and honor the leaders of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority on its 25th anniversary. This agency, its Board, Community Advisory Committee members and staff deserve to be congratulated for their leadership during the last 25 years and we wish them continued success for the next 25 years.

HONORING MAINE'S OLDEST
LIVING PEARL HARBOR VETERAN

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent with a story that should be heard. At 95 years old, James Watson of South Portland, Maine, is our state's oldest living veteran who was present during the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

The morning of December 7, 1941, began like many others for Mr. Watson. At the time, he was a gunner's mate first class aboard the U.S.S. *Phoenix*, which was anchored across the harbor from Battleship Row. He was reading the Sunday paper below deck when he felt a vibration rock the ship, then heard a call over the loudspeaker to report to battle stations.

Once topside, he saw anti-aircraft explosions in the air and smelled thick clouds of burning fuel. He knew instantly that the country was at war. What followed after was a blur.

"You're too busy to be scared. You're just mad. You're angry," Mr. Watson recently recounted to a local newspaper.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt called December 7, 1941, "a date which will live in infamy." And, indeed, from books, films, and photos, we can still get a sense of that day's incredible devastation and terrible loss of the life. But as the days go by, there are fewer and fewer living veterans who saw it through their own eyes and can recall what it was like to go through such an experience. Their stories are critical to ensuring that we never forget what happened there.

I appreciate that Mr. Watson has shared his memories so we can better understand and remember one of the most pivotal moments in our nation's history. And I thank him for his brave service that day, and the rest that followed.

CELEBRATING THE MORRIS HABITAT FOR HUMANITY'S 10TH ANNUAL HEARTS & HAMMERS GALA

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morris Habitat for Humanity, located in Randolph, New Jersey as it celebrates 30 years of building homes and changing lives.

Habitat for Humanity, a nonprofit housing organization founded in 1976, implements Christian principles in the pursuit of building homes, communities, and hope. This organization wholeheartedly believes that every man, woman, and child should have a home that is safe and dignified. The members of Habitat for Humanity strive to achieve this goal every day, and are important members of every community.

For 30 years, members of the Morris Habitat for Humanity have selflessly worked toward ensuring that those people in need of housing assistance receive help. Officially created in October 1985, Habitat for Humanity's Morris County branch operated in the center of Morristown with a single computer and a phone. Its several founding members began to investigate the housing situation of Morristown, and learned the processes of selecting families for assistance. Since then, Morris Habitat for Humanity has successfully completed building over 60 houses in New Jersey and more than 140 houses in other countries. The members of this group voluntarily offer their time and efforts to ensure that any person seeking help, regardless of religious affiliation, may realize the American dream of homeownership.

This organization's most current project, in collaboration with the Morris County Affordable Housing Corporation, aims to construct a fiveplex containing two 3-bedroom and three 2-bedroom townhomes on Carlton Street in Morris Township, New Jersey. These townhomes will be sold to low- and moderate-incomes households, and will feature the latest ENERGY STAR technology. In order to select families for this housing project, the Morris

Habitat for Humanity uses a lottery system. Currently, the project is set for completion in December, 2015.

To celebrate 30 successful years of improving the housing situation for many members of the local community, the Morris Habitat for Humanity will host its 10th Annual Hearts & Hammers Gala on Saturday, February 28th, 2015 at the Meadow Wood Manor in Randolph, New Jersey. The Gala will feature dinner, a silent auction, wine pull, awards, and live music. All proceeds will be used to further the Morris Habitat for Humanity's mission of building affordable housing for those families in need.

At this year's Gala, the Morris Habitat for Humanity will honor Richard A. Sleece, President of Richard A. Sleece Associates, with the Founders Award, Ruth Ryan, Vice President of Chubb Insurance, with the Beth Everett Award, and Rick Ostberg, former ReStore Director, with the ReStore Pioneer Award.

I commend the members of the Morris Habitat for Humanity, especially Executive Director Blair Schleicher Bravo, for their dedication to improving the lives of many Morris County residents. Habitat for Humanity has consistently demonstrated a dedication and commitment to advancing our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Morris Habitat for Humanity as it celebrates its 30th Anniversary.

IN HONOR OF JOHN COLLINS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable public service career of Mr. John Collins, who is retiring from a 28 year career with Goodwill Industries as the Senior Vice President of Workforce Development Programs to Goodwill Industries for Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties. In that time John build a stellar reputation for compassionate service and insightful leadership. He is so well networked in the community that it seems that John can claim almost everybody in the Central Coast, including me, as a friend.

A native of Santa Cruz, California, John earned his Master of Public Health Degree from San Jose State University, and his Bachelor of Science Degree in Health and Human Services Administration from Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. John has held positions in both the private and non-profit sectors. Prior to joining Goodwill, John provided consultant services to companies regarding troubled employees and health issues; Program Director for Dominican Hospital's EAP; and Director of Human Organ Recovery at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

As Senior Vice President, Mr. Collins has been very active in the support and implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, The Workforce Investment Act, and many educational strategies. As a CARF Surveyor, he has ensured that organizations around the world follow the standards for quality employment and training programs. John's work has

also included extensive outreach in the Central Coast community. He serves on the Workforce Investment Board as well as having served on The Monterey County Tourist and Travel Alliance, the Board of the Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce and Monterey County Hospitality Boards of Directors. He served as an elected Trustee and president of the board of Santa Cruz City Schools.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our gratitude to John for a job well done and extend our best wishes to John and his family in this next chapter of life. I know that even in retirement, he will still find himself involved in the community and helping people in need and will continue to stand as an example for others.

HONORING ST. DANIEL THE
PROPHET SCHOOL ON ITS 65TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. Daniel the Prophet School, an exemplary Catholic school in Chicago, Illinois, which is celebrating its 65th anniversary.

Part of the Archdiocese of Chicago school system, St. Daniel offers a quality education to its students and teaches them the core pillars of the Catholic faith. The school's administration believes that parents, students, and teachers share in the process and responsibility of education. Parents and teachers are co-learners with the students and are encouraged to teach through example to provide an environment that encourages growth, communication, and Christian acceptance of all individuals. The collaborative effort of the parents and teachers provides for a supportive and nurturing environment in which students have unlimited growth potential.

The school offers many extracurricular activities as well as community-building events. Students can participate in chess club, choir, band, or sports among various other activities. St. Daniel promotes an environmentally friendly lifestyle by offering a recycling program. I commend St. Daniel the Prophet for going above and beyond by expanding their teachings outside the classroom.

The hard work of Pastor John Noga and Principal Mary Frances Porod has not gone unnoticed. They are well deserving of praise along with the outstanding teachers and administrative staff who work tirelessly for the benefit of their students.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing St. Daniel the Prophet School and congratulate them as they celebrate their 65th anniversary. May St. Daniel continue to exhibit excellence and create an outstanding learning environment for our future leaders.

CONGRATULATING BERNARD
"BARNEY" YOUNG FOR BEING
AWARDED THE ARMY AIR CORPS
DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bernard "Barney" Young of Rock Island, Illinois, who has been awarded the Army Air Corps Distinguished Flying Cross.

During World War II, Barney served as a Flight Officer where he flew the treacherous route from India to China over the Himalayas, or the Hump, as Allied pilots called it. Shortly after the war, the Army Air Corps decided that flying the Hump qualified pilots for the Distinguished Flying Cross. However, by 1945, Barney had been reassigned to fly Merrill's Marauders from India to Africa. Because of this, Barney didn't learn of his eligibility for the award until years later.

When he went to apply, it was discovered his flight records had been destroyed in a fire at Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri. Barney believed he would never receive the award. Then about a year ago, Tim Goodbrake of Edwardsville, Illinois, approached Barney about this award. Tim was researching his father's service in the Army Air Corps. He sought out Barney who had served with his father in India and the two discovered Barney's flight records buried in a trunk.

Now, sixty-nine years after returning home from the war, Flight Officer Bernard Young is finally receiving this overdue honor for his service to our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Bernard Young for his outstanding service to the United States and congratulate him on this noteworthy achievement.

RECOGNIZING DR. MANUEL
TZAGOURNIS

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Manuel Tzagournis for his distinguished service and commitment to the State of Ohio and congratulate him on his retirement.

Dr. Tzagournis held a long, devoted career in the healthcare field. He became particularly focused on diabetes mellitus which led him to practice endocrinology and hold numerous positions at The Ohio State University. He became a prominent representative of OSU's College of Medicine by acting as the National Institute of Health's principal investigator for the General Clinical Research Center and serving as the Dean during his tenure. He also worked for the National Regulatory Research Institute in support of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners for 16 years.

Dr. Tzagournis served as the chief medical advisor for the Ohio Police and Fire Pension

Fund since its inception. Dr. Tzagournis contributed significantly to the creation and continued development of the Disability Program at the OP&F, and has spent the end of his career devoted to the safety, health and welfare of Ohio's first responders, testifying on their behalf in the Ohio legislature on bills affecting specific occupational injuries.

On behalf of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I thank Dr. Manuel Tzagournis for his dedication and impeccable service to our community in the field of medicine and wish him happiness in his retirement.

IN SUPPORT OF H. RES. 44, TO RESTORE VOTING RIGHTS TO THE DELEGATES AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER DURING COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE PROCEEDINGS

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 44, offered by my good friend and colleague, Democratic Whip STENY HOYER of Maryland, to restore the voting rights for the Delegates and Resident Commissioner during Committee of the Whole proceedings.

The ability to cast a vote is the most basic of rights in our representative democracy. In the people's House, votes cast by members of Congress make us accountable to our constituents and allow them to understand where we stand on important issues. The rules that have been adopted by the 114th Congress once again deny voting rights for members from the territories and the District of Columbia, and continue to make this body less transparent and less responsive to the more than four million Americans who live in our districts.

Under the resolution, extending voting rights to the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner during Committee of the Whole proceedings would be wholly symbolic—our votes cannot change the outcome of legislation or amendments considered on the floor of this House. However these votes allow us to ensure that the needs of our constituents are addressed in legislation considered by this body.

Further, many of our nation's men and women in uniform are residents of the territories and the District of Columbia. These dedicated servicemembers sacrifice much for our country, and many have paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to our nation. In fact, the per capita death rate for servicemembers from the territories is higher than most states. Unfortunately the majority has decided that our constituents will be less represented in this House despite the sacrifices that servicemembers from our districts make to defend the basic rights and freedoms enjoyed by all Americans. Additionally beyond high levels of military service, residents from the territories and the District of Columbia contribute to and serve our nation in a wide range of areas. The inability to vote in the Committee of the Whole is unfortunate, but I appreciate

that this resolution seeks to remedy this matter.

Mr. Speaker, giving the Delegates and Resident Commissioner the ability to vote during Committee of the Whole proceedings will allow our voices to be heard during legislation considered by the full House. It will give us parity with other members and strengthen the long-cherished values of this body. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

IN MEMORY OF KELLY WALTERS

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember an exceptional young lady taken from us far too soon.

20-year-old Kelly Walters was killed in a tragic hit and run accident on January 16, 2015 as she crossed the street in her hometown of Arlington, Texas. While her death made headlines back home—today I want to focus on the way Kelly lived.

I met Kelly several years ago at one of my town hall meetings. When I asked the crowd if they had any questions, hers was the first hand that shot up. She couldn't vote yet, but her love of our community and interest in government was already on full display.

A few months later, I was proud to sponsor her for the prestigious House Page program. While in Washington, her love of the civic process and politics only grew.

She came by my office regularly to chat with me and my staff. She was too young at the time, but was already expressing interest in serving as an intern in my office.

I understand she wasn't shy about sharing her future political aspirations telling people she was going to run for my seat as soon as I retired. I do appreciate her waiting for my career in Congress to end before hers began. I have since learned she was aiming even higher. She wrote a letter to President Clinton in December of 2000, at the ripe old age of six, saying she wanted his job. Kelly said, "I think I would be a good President because I care about people and how they treat others . . . Please let me know when I need to come to Washington to begin my new assignment. I will need to let people know I will be out of school and have my work mailed to me."

Kelly possessed a rare understanding of the importance of American politics and the impact that it has on everyday life. She had a keen interest and genuine curiosity about the legislative process.

After her semester in the Nation's Capitol, she returned home where she continued to cultivate her deep dedication to civic duty. She volunteered in our community, worked on campaigns, interned for a state representative and excelled in the classroom.

Kelly was a junior at the University of Texas at Arlington and was days from leaving to study abroad in Morocco. She wanted to promote women's rights in the Arabic world.

So what drove this exceptional young woman? Kelly says it best in her own words. This is an excerpt from an essay she wrote a

few years ago: "America is based on many beliefs, but they all boil down to one simple word: Freedom. Life in America is free, it is one most people take for granted, but it was not cheap. Freedom is bought on the back of soldiers who were willing to risk their lives to fight for their country and America's right to be free. Thus Freedom is built on service, on a willingness to give back for what has been given. I don't pretend to know or understand why others volunteer, but for me it is a need to give back for all the opportunities that are standing open for me simply because I am an American."

Profound words that everyone in this body should take to heart. It is rare to see someone so young so engaged. Kelly will be missed, but her love of our community and of our nation will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING KATHY NICKEL AS THE NOVATO CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Kathy Nickel on the occasion of her recognition as the Novato Citizen of the Year.

Ms. Nickel has been a longtime resident of Novato and is well known for her community involvement. She was an active public school supporter, serving as PTA President, chairman of Safe Grad Night at San Marin High School and member of curriculum planning teams, and she continued to support Novato public schools in an advisory capacity after her children had graduated. Ms. Nickel also served as a Troop Leader for Marin Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts and was a team parent for Novato Youth Soccer during this time.

Ms. Nickel's civic involvement has been a constant and positive force for the community, including her roles as Chair of the Novato Fourth of July Committee, member of the City of Novato's Birthday Steering Committee, and as a volunteer coordinator for the Art and Wine Festival for the Novato Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Nickel has been an exemplary citizen of Novato, striving to improve the city for all its residents. Her inspiring commitment and dedication will have a lasting impact on her community for many years to come.

Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Kathy Nickel for her long and impressive record of public service.

WORLD WAR I HISTORY LESSONS FOR TODAY'S RETURNING IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, with my colleagues SANFORD BISHOP and CHARLES

RANGEL, rise to submit a report, written by Ron Armstead, of the 26th Annual Veterans Braintrust at the 44th Annual Congressional Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference.

2014 is the beginning of the worldwide celebration of the centennial of World War I, known as the "war to end all wars." Although, the U.S. didn't join the war until 1917, we would like to point out one American Eugene Jacques Bullard, born in Columbus, GA, who enlisted on October 19, 1914 to fight for France. He later became the first African American combat aviator in history with the motto: "All Blood Runs Red." Also note, 33 years after his death and 77 years after being denied entry into the U.S. Army Air Corps—Bullard was posthumously commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force.

Nearly 5 million Americans served during the war, and 116,516 Americans died in defense of democracy overseas. World War I also marked the first time in the nation's history that American soldiers went abroad to defend foreign soil against aggression. During the war to end all wars, the U.S. enlisted 367,710 African American men as soldiers—most from the south—into the Armed Forces. About 200,000 were sent to France and about 50,000 of those saw combat. The vast majority served in the Service of Supply (SOS) units in Europe with the American Expeditionary Force (AEF) on the Western Front, while also encountering French civilians and colonial African troops alike.

U.S. World War I veterans have moved from memory to history. We are reminded that the last American soldier to die in World War I was Private Wayne Miner of Kansas City, and he was but one of the many African Americans, who participated in Black Regiments during the war. This included the celebrated 369th, formerly New York 15th National Guard "Harlem Hellfighters," made up of volunteers, who served more days under continuous fire (181 days) than any other regiment in the AEF during the entire war, and the first American unit to reach the Rhine River, while suffering 40% killed and wounded—with 171 African Americans from the 369th alone being awarded the Croix de Guerre, or French Legion of Merit for heroism in battle, as well as the entire unit.

Regarding the Black American in the World War for Democracy, are the historic words of Emmett Scott, Special Assistant to the Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. "The Negro, in the Great War for Freedom and Democracy, had proved to be a notable and inspiring figure. The record and achievements of this racial group as brave soldiers and loyal citizens, furnish one of the brightest chapters in American history." American Negroes in the World War, 1919.

This stands in sharp contrast to what Maj. Gen. Robert L. Bullard, Commander of the American 2nd Army during World War I, and an Alabama racist who wrote in 1923 "Poor Negroes! They are hopelessly inferior . . ." "If you need combat soldiers, and especially if you need them in a hurry, don't put your time upon Negroes."

Thus, the framework for the 26th Annual Veterans Braintrust Forum was African Americans, history, advocacy and legacy. The invocation and benediction was presented by Rev.

Dr. Grainer Browning, Jr., setting the tone and sending a message of hope and faith for the discussions to come. Harlem's own Rep. CHARLES RANGEL (D-NY), senior Member of the House Ways and Means Committee led the remarks by describing veterans as a special fraternity of men and women. While also recognizing WWI icon Capt. Hamilton Fish, and historic places such as Hellfighter Square and the Harlem Armory, home of the 369th Veterans Association and Museum. As he said, "when the flag goes up, we fight." But, for many economically it is their only choice, or chance. He also cautioned that there is a lack of confidence in our government (or trust deficit), despite the arguable threat to national security. And amid White House pronouncements there will be no American boots on the ground, versus the fact that between 1600 to 2000 troops are already on the ground. Equally important, he said, the challenge sent to Congress is whether "we are at war" and determining "what is the actual threat to America." Additionally, shouldn't we set aside enough money for those returning from harm's way, and shouldn't everybody be "on call," including those children of those most politically and economically powerful.

Rep. BISHOP, in joining with his colleagues BROWN, RANGEL and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON in thanking Ron Armstead for his continued support, said to the veterans in the audience—"we owe you an immeasurable debt, for without your sacrifices, our freedom and liberties would not be as secure." Further, "this year marks the 100th anniversary of WWI, and we must remember the many sacrifices made during WWI and African Americans that served during this dark period."

On May 18, 1917, the Selective Service Act was passed by Congress requiring all male citizens between the ages of 21 and 31 to register for the draft. However, even before the act was passed, African American males from all over the country eagerly joined the war effort. They viewed the conflict as an opportunity to prove their loyalty, patriotism and worthiness for equal treatment in the United States. This is still true today, WWI veterans and the veterans of today give selflessly of themselves for the love of their country, yet some still have to fight to receive the recognition for their actions and earned benefits.

"It is said 'those who forget the lessons of the past are bound to repeat them.' War has always been full of unplanned consequences for our service members; we must be vigilant in responding to the needs of our veterans, and our obligations in sharing the same passion for defending our nation. We must learn from the past, work on progress for the future, and continue to work on areas that need improvement. I hope that when you leave today's discussion, the information you have heard will build a lasting bond, and help us work together, improving service members and their families quality of life, as well as expanding the opportunities to our service member's still on active duty, and to our veterans."

Finally, BISHOP emphasized this point as we focus on WWI and the impact it had on those African Americans returning from war, "A people without the knowledge of their past history, origin and culture is like a tree without roots."

Rep. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON expressed her disappointment at seeing the President's

issuing of 24 medals of honor, that did not include a certain individual who truly deserves to be honored—specifically, Petty Officer Doris 'Dorie' Miller. Petty Officer Miller was awarded the Navy Cross by President Roosevelt before his death in 1943, although he was never awarded the Medal of Honor, the Navy has concluded that the Navy Cross appropriately recognizes his actions, however, she and many others have always believed this to be distinctly untrue.

Rep. CORRINE BROWN, who has served on the House Committee on Veterans Affairs for over twenty-two years, announced that she was seeking the Ranking Member position for the House Veterans Affairs Committee in the 114th Congress. She noticed that when the Democrats were in charge, they passed the largest veterans health care budget in the history of this country; passed the largest increase of the GI Bill since World War II; and tried to insure veterans against a Republican government shutdown by providing advanced appropriations for health care programs. "These advanced appropriations provide veterans with much needed security in the future."

BROWN looks forward to bringing veterans issues back to the forefront of policy in the House of Representatives along with working together with those veterans and veterans advocates represented here today to present a strong voice for our deserving veterans. She finished by quoting President George Washington, who said, "The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country."

The keynote speaker was the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs Sloan Gibson. Deputy Secretary Gibson was confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs on February 11, 2014—and on May 30, 2014, was appointed Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Deputy Secretary stated, one hundred years ago the first shots were fired that would lead our nation into World War I. The first step in fulfilling President Lincoln's charge to care for those "who shall have borne the battle . . ." And on April 6, 1917, the nation called, and Henry Johnson, Needham Roberts and thousands of others answered the call. Their unit was the 369th Infantry Regiment, known as the "Harlem Hellfighters," who served with the French 16th Division in the Argonne Forest on the Western Front. Pvt. Johnson suffered 21 combat injuries, and Pvt. Roberts a grenade wound in hand-to-hand combat. For their valor they were the first Americans to earn the Croix de Guerre, France's highest military honor. Yet, few details are recorded about Needham Roberts, who died in an asylum in 1949. But, much more is known about Sgt. Henry Johnson's transition from military service, discharge records fail to account for his severe wounds—no Purple Heart, no Pension. Debilitating injuries cost him his job, his family, and he died destitute in 1939, only 32 years old. The VA was not there for him.

Even 75 years later we find that still shocks the conscience, prompting the question the Veterans Braintrust asks: a century after sending our national treasure "Over There," are we

doing any better supporting their transitions over here?

First, in any effort we have to make sure every veteran, regardless of social and economic circumstances, has the opportunity for a happy and fulfilling life. Second, to really do better, the VA has to look at everything we do through the eyes of those we serve—our veterans. And that is where Secretary Bob McDonald is leading us—to a veteran-centric organization that measures performance by veterans' outcomes and impacts, as opposed to inputs, activity, outputs, or good intentions. The metrics that matter are Veteran outcomes and impacts. We won't attempt to recite all the examples, or accomplishments he cited, of the VA doing better such as Veterans Treatment Courts, Vet Centers. . . .

But here are a number of unfortunate facts: homelessness for veterans of color is disproportionately high. While 20% of veterans are minorities nearly half of homeless veterans in temporary shelters are minorities. Another fact is, a disproportionate number of criminal justice involved veterans are minorities. These and similar health disparities led to establishing VA's Office of Health Equity (OHE) in 2012 under the leadership of Dr. Uhenna Uchendu. With OHE's singular mission being to help ensure all veterans receive effective and equitable health care—regardless of race, gender, age, geography, and culture or sexual orientation. In closing, Gibson said, "So are we doing better in supporting warfighters' transitions? The short answer is, yes, we're doing better. But we still have lots to do. All of us, together.

The other very special guest speaker was Three Star Gen. Ronald Bailey, USMC, originally from St. Augustine, Florida. In his remarks, he spoke about the 100th Anniversary of World War I being a rare opportunity to reflect on where we have come from, share stories such as Leo C. Chase, the first soldier to die from St. Augustine as a consequence of Vietnam fighting in the battle of the Ia Drang Valley (which story is vividly told in the 1992 book, "We Were Soldiers Once and Young: Ia Drang—The Battle that Changed the War in Vietnam"). We were also able to extrapolate important lessons, and offer long overdue recognition as part of the healing process. Lastly, he called the Hon. CORRINE BROWN, the 'Lion of the Marine Corps,' for her unwavering efforts in honoring the Montford Point Marines with the Congressional Gold Medal.

PANELISTS

Mike Betz spoke highly about the recent report, which was part of the Million Records Project, an initiative of Student Veterans of America (SVA), which measured for the first-time ever veterans' performance in higher education; D. Wayne Robinson, a retired Command Sergeant Major spoke about Student Veterans of America (SVA) Chapters across the country, student veterans return on investment (ROI) to America and his way of giving back as President/CEO; Col. David Sutherland spoke about the importance of connecting with families and community. He also briefly told the story of Staff Sgt. Donnie Dixon, a career soldier who was killed on his second tour of duty in Baloor, Iraq, and the Easter Seals Center that is named after him to address the urgent needs of military service

members, veterans and their families, or the homecoming; Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend spoke about his personal struggles with coming home from combat and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Prof. Pellom McDaniels, author of the forthcoming "Memoir of Royal Christian, a Black World War I Soldier" (2015), spoke passionately about the importance of WWI, for African Americans social, political and economic advancement; Prof. Adriane Lentz-Smith, author of "Freedom Struggles: African Americans and World War I" (2009), spoke of African American soldiers returning home to join activist working to gain full citizenship rights as recompense for military service; Prof. Joel Beeson spoke about the striking and uncanny parallels between our present moment in history and the time before, during and after WWI. Journalist Yvonne Latty, spoke about the pride that emerged from writing "We Were There: Voices of African American Veterans, From World War II to the War in Iraq" (2004), and later her ambivalence resulting from writing "In Conflict: Iraq War Veterans Speak Out on Duty, Loss, and the Fight to Stay Alive" (2006), and last, but not least Dr. Linda Lagemann spoke out about the flood of mind-altering psychiatric drugs being administered by military physicians for service personnel, and veterans.

Afterward during the comments period Tara Johnson, the granddaughter of Sgt. Henry Johnson, WWI Hero, daughter of famed Tuskegee Airman Herman Johnson of WWII, and mother of Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend, USMC, a Iraq combat veteran spoke with heartfelt emotion that her grandfather died alone and destitute never receiving help for his mental and health-related issues from WWI. Saying, while government has made great strides in the care of returning troops, much more work is still needed, particularly at the family, friends and community level—because we can't afford to throw them (returnees) away.

In recognition of the continuing importance of jobs for returning Iraq and Afghanistan soldiers and their families, the Veterans Braintrust and Disney once again teamed up for a special breakout session highlighting Disney's Veterans Institute's unique "10 STEPS" for creating a Veterans Hiring Program; in addition to discussing strategies, tactics and interviewing techniques for bringing on-board veterans.

Now, despite the fact that there are no longer any U.S. veterans left from World War I, there were a number of World War I descendants and relatives, institutions, organizations, historic places and groups. To name a few, such as the Kenneth Hawkins American Legion Post #61 of Atlantic City, New Jersey that contributed to linking the past with the present. At the family level, there were descendants Rev. Dr. Grainger Brown, Jr., the Grandson of Cpl. Clifton Merimon, 372nd, who earned the Distinguished Service Cross (DSC), Croix de Guerre and Medaille Militaire; Tara Johnson, Granddaughter and Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend, USMC, disabled Iraq soldier and Great-Grandson of Sgt. Henry Johnson of the 369th; Charles Hamilton Houston, Jr., aging son of Lt. Charles Hamilton Houston, Sr., WWI Officer, Harvard Law

School Graduate Class of 1923, and Civil Rights Hero; Roger Morris, Grandson of Lt. James Morris, Sr., a native of Georgia and Graduate of the U.S. Army's first Class of Black Officers in 1917, Jerry Bowman, Grandson of Ira Bowman, who served with the 369th, and Clarence 'Tiger' Davis, whose Aunt, Louvenia Bradley-Harper, traveled to Paris in 1918 to retrieve her son Melvin Harper's body. She came home without his remains, saying, "that he was in a much better place." He is buried in Manheim, Germany.

Equally important, all this served as the broader context for our pre-centennial WWI Forum discussion, which was instructive and insightful. First, many parallels were drawn between WWI and Iraq and Afghanistan returnees, particularly injuries (e.g. PTSD, TBI, suicides and domestic violence), and war's impact on families, both military and civilians.

Second, in answering a couple of historical and philosophical questions such as did WWI end all wars and Save the World for Democracy, and (2) do we learn from history, or repeat it—given that the WWI Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, or Middle East boundaries continue to fuel conflict, and geo-political fighting in the region today (along sectarian, tribal and ethnic lines on the ground)—we would answer a resounding 'no!' Which leads many of us to believe, or say, "the more things change, the more they stay the same."

Third, a long overdue bill (S. 2793) to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to Sgt. Henry Johnson was introduced and passed the Senate on September 18, 2014, with a related bill (HR5459) being referred to the House Armed Service Committee. However, the process is Congress must pass a separate authorization due to the time period for awarding has passed. But, once the legislation is passed it goes to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for verification, and afterward to the President's desk for signing.

Fourth, Dr. Adriane Lentz-Smith says, "there's actually a deeper and longer story, or view of the origins of the Civil Rights Movement, than that of the 50's Brown v. Board of Education decision of 1954 & 60's successful passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act." New scholarship lends a sense of a longer and harder civil rights struggle, one that dates back to the World War One era (U.S. Supreme Court's Plessy v. Ferguson decision of 1896) and the aftermath of the Civil War. Leading Dr. Pellom McDaniel's to call for, or recommend the creation of a Consortium for the Study of African Americans in World War One with the support of the Veterans Braintrust of the Congressional Black Caucus to leverage and/or attract filmmakers, scholars, supporters, etc.

Finally, the 26th annual gala reception and awards ceremony hosted by Hon. CORRINE BROWN was held in the Veterans' Committee Hearing Room of the Cannon House Office Building. This year's awards were presented by Ron Armstead before a full house to Linwood Alford, Gregory Cooke, Sgt. Patricia Harris, Col. Conway Jones, USAF, Ret., Will 'It Takes a Village' Smith, Robert 'Bobby' White, Ellis Ray Williams, Come Home Baltimore, Eastern Seals Dixon Military and Veterans Community Service Center, Fulton County Veterans Court and Mentorship Program, Open Door Resource Center, Inc.,

Stone of Hope Program, Student Veterans of America, Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, Inc., Westside All Wars Memorial Building, the "Parting Way" Museum of African American and Cape Verdean American Ethnohistory, Inc., the film 'Choc'Late Soldiers from the USA,' and World War I soldiers Ira Bowman, Lt. Charles Hamilton Houston, Sr., and Sgt. Henry Johnson posthumously. The Rep. BROWN closed the awards segment with a rousing rendition of 'God Bless America.'

Special thanks goes to our historians, families, friends, supporters and staff—Profs. Adrian Lentz-Smith, Joel Beeson, Pellom McDaniels, Journalist Yvonne Latty and Dr. Linda Lagemann; Rev. Dr. Grainger Browning, Jr., Tara Johnson, Sgt. DeMarqus Townsend, USMC, Jerry Bowman, Robert Morris and Clarence 'Tiger' Davis; Dr. Frank Smith, Jr., Prof. Maria Hoehn and Dr. Krewasky Salter; Ralph Cooper, Morocco Coleman, Carmen Wilson II, Robert Blackwell, Elaine Sacks, Mildred Kidd Smith, Tom Harris, Dr. Dorothy Simpson-Taylor, Howard Jefferson, and Dr. Davine Reed; Dr. Richard Lipsky, Education Corporation of America, Smithsonian Channel, National Archives and Records Administration; Austin Brock, Col. Kevin Preston, USA, Ret., and the Walt Disney Veterans Initiative; and Sydney Renwick, Lee Footer, Stephanie Anim-Yankah, Jonathan Halpern, Vernita Stevens, Hannah Kim, Reba Raffaelli, Ronnie Simmons and Shantrel Brown.

**HONORING PROFESSOR DAVID
HILLYER VOORHEES**

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Professor David Hillyer Voorhees and his election as an Education Section Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Mr. Voorhees is an associate professor of earth science and geology at Waubesa Community College, which has campuses in Sugar Grove and Aurora, Illinois. He is being honored for his contributions as an educator and for his role in creating Geo2YC, a national organization for geoscience faculty at two-year colleges. Geo2YC, a division of the National Association of Geoscience Teachers, brings professors from two-year institutions together for networking, support, and research into geoscience education.

I would like to thank Mr. Voorhees for his commitment to science and quality education in our community.

**50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DEATH OF SIR WINSTON
CHURCHILL**

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 24, marks the 50th anniversary

of the death of Sir Winston Churchill. Few leaders in history made such a mark during their lives, and very few have attracted such study and admiration after their deaths.

Even now, 50 years after his passing at age 90 and 75 years after his "finest hour" when Britain and Churchill stood alone against the Nazi menace, new books and articles about his life and leadership pour forth.

The Churchill Centre is a growing international organization with a mission to "foster leadership, statesmanship, vision, courage and boldness among democratic and freedom loving peoples worldwide, through the thoughts, words, works and deeds of Winston Spencer Churchill."

The Churchill Centre and The George Washington University here in Washington are building a National Churchill Library and Center. Hillsdale College is publishing all remaining volumes of The Churchill Documents.

The list of activities related to Churchill is long, even 50 years after his death. And, as one measure of popular interest, there are few historical figures who are more regularly misquoted or falsely quoted on the Internet than he.

I think there are many reasons that Sir Winston continues to fascinate and inspire.

In part, there are his monumental achievements, for few statesmen did as much to shape the world in which we live. Were it not for his vision and his willingness to stand up to the conventional wisdom of his day, history could have had a far different outcome.

In part, it is his oratory. Just as his words inspired his nation and the world to stand up to evil then, they still inspire us today.

In part, there are his writings, which continue to be studied and referenced as Churchill the politician was a leading figure throughout the first half of the twentieth century, and Churchill the author helped shape our understanding of those momentous times.

I also believe that the continuing interest in Winston Churchill stems in substantial measure from the many ups and downs of his career. We all draw inspiration from someone who perseveres through higher accolades and lower derision than us will ever experience.

Finally, Churchill the person remains a dazzling personality, fully of humor and eccentricities adding to the interest of new admirers.

The qualities that he exhibited are timeless—qualities such as courage, patriotism, hard work, loyalty, and love of family.

And, many of the principles for which he stood and fought are timeless as well, such as the need to recognize and confront evil and to nurture and protect freedom.

He believed that the values of Western Civilization are a force for good and that the English-speaking peoples had unique contributions to offer the rest of the world on freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

As one who was half American by blood, he appreciated America.

That appreciation has been returned by millions of Americans over the generations.

His bust has been added to the U.S. Capitol's Freedom Foyer, where it continues to inspire visitors and those of us who work here, thereby continuing to serve as a major link in the "special relationship" between the United States and the United Kingdom.

The lives of great leaders are always worth remembering and studying, and as long as freedom is cherished, I am confident that Sir Winston Churchill will be studied long into the future.

CONGRATULATING THE 2014-2015 ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2014-2015 Illinois State University football team on an outstanding season.

The Redbirds made it to the FCS National Championship game for the first time in school history.

While they ultimately fell short with a heart wrenching 37 seconds to go, they made us very proud.

The team captured their first conference title since 1999 and broke 16 school records. Those included most points in a season, total offense, rushing touchdowns, passing touchdowns, and most wins in a season.

A number of individual Redbirds also received Missouri Valley Football Conference recognition. Head coach Brock Spack was named Coach of the Year, Marshaun Coprich was named Offensive Player of the Year, and Tre Roberson was named Newcomer of the Year.

As a future Illinois State University Redbird dad, I look forward to the opportunity to watch these young players continue in their careers.

Bloomington-Normal and all of Illinois are proud of the effort the team put forth this season. We look forward to their success next year. Go Birds!

HONORING BILL KORTUM

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise today in honor of William (Bill) Kortum, who passed away on December 20, 2014, following a battle with cancer. As a pioneering conservationist, Mr. Kortum championed many successful campaigns and brought lasting environmental protections to Sonoma County and the State of California, and his passing leaves a void that won't soon be filled. Considered by many to be the father of the environmental movement in Sonoma County, Mr. Kortum was known for his strength of conviction and tenacity for protecting the environment. Always kind, always polite, Mr. Kortum knew how to motivate others towards positive change, and he is singularly responsible for instituting many lasting environmental protections, though he would never claim responsibility for them.

As a native of Petaluma, California, Bill Kortum grew up on his father's poultry ranch at a time when Sonoma County's open spaces

were unmarred by urban development. Mr. Kortum went on to graduate from the University of California at Davis Veterinary School, serve his country in the U.S. Army Veterinary Corps, and establish the successful Cotati Veterinary Hospital.

By the early 1960's, Bill Kortum saw how a rapidly growing population would increasingly threaten the natural landscape of Sonoma County. He and his wife, Lucy, opposed unregulated development and fought to pioneer an alternative path. One of the first of many significant environmental victories that Bill Kortum and his allies achieved in Sonoma County was to prevent the planned development of PG&E's nuclear power plant at Bodega Head.

In 1972, Mr. Kortum fought to pass Proposition 20, a measure that established the California Coastal Commission, which continues to guarantee public access to the California coastline. As a visionary leader, he went on to establish Sonoma County Conservation Action, an organization that mobilized voters to secure urban growth limits around all nine cities in the county. He helped to create the Sonoma County Open Space District and championed other key institutions and causes, such as the Sonoma Land Trust, the SMART train, and public access to Lafferty Ranch.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Kortum's many accomplishments and dedication to preserving our nation's natural resources for future generations illustrates the substantial impact that one individual can have on making the world a better place. Mr. Kortum will not soon be forgotten, and his legacy in Sonoma County and along California's rugged coast will continue for years to come. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to him today and express our deepest condolences to his wife, Lucy; children, Frank, Julie Groves, and Sam; grandchildren, Mark Kortum, Holden and Dylan Groves, Will and Grace Kortum; and many nieces and nephews.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR RONALD H.
ROBERTS

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to California and the City of Temecula are exceptional. Temecula has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent to make their communities a better place to live and work. Mayor Ronald H. Roberts is one of these individuals. At a celebration on January 27, 2015, Mayor Roberts will be honored as he retires after many years of City Council service to the Temecula community.

About one month after the City of Temecula's incorporation, Ronald began working on the city's first "Traffic Committee" in January of 1990. In October of the same year, Ronald was selected to serve on the city's first Traffic Commission. In November of 1992, Ronald began his service on the Temecula

City Council, dedicating his time, talents and efforts to his local community. Throughout his tenure, the main objective of Mayor Roberts was to ensure the quality of life for all Temecula citizens continued to thrive, an objective he continued to champion throughout his twenty two years on City Council. Additionally, during his time as Mayor, he has played a pivotal role in the political landscape of the Temecula community, region and state.

Prior to his work on the City Council, Ronald served his community during his time with the California Highway Patrol, retiring after twenty nine years of valiant service. Ronald also freely gives his leadership and experience to many organizations, serving and chairing many boards at the community, regional, and state levels. These organizations include Habitat for Humanity Inland Valley Board of Directors, Temecula Balloon and Wine Festival, City of Temecula Traffic & Transportation Commission, Western Riverside Council of Government Executive Committee, Southern California Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments Transportation & Communications Committee, Riverside County Transportation Commission, Riverside County Transportation Commission Budget & Implementation Committee, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, Southern California Regional Rail Authority/Metrolink Operations Oversight Committee, SCAQMD Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee and National League of Cities Transportation Infrastructure & Services Committee.

As the longest standing City Council Member for the City of Temecula and as a man who has devoted over two decades to this great city, it is only fitting that he be honored as he retires from public service. Mayor Roberts' tireless passion for public service has contributed immensely to the betterment of our region and the state and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he retires and moves onto the next phase of his life.

COMMUNITY LEADERS: URBAN
LEAGUE OF MORRIS COUNTY
AND WILLIAM D. PRIMUS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Urban League of Morris County, located in Morristown, New Jersey, and to remember the life of its founder, William D. Primus, and his many achievements.

The Urban League of Morris County is one of 110 affiliates of the National Urban League, and one of the most active branches in the country. Having served over 4000 families each year, the multi-racial League's self-expressed mission is to "enable African Americans and other minorities to secure economic self-reliance, parity and power, and civil rights; and to provide assistance to any resident desirous of improving their quality of life."

In 1910, Morristown native Ruth Standish Baldwin and Dr. George Edmund Haynes founded the Committee on Urban Conditions among Negroes, which would grow exponentially to become what is known today as the National Urban League. As early as 1919, various organizations in Morris County embraced the National Urban League's mission of social justice for African Americans, and by 1944 a multi-racial group of concerned citizens formed a local affiliate, the Urban League of Morris County.

As the first organization of its kind in Morris County, the Urban League set the standard for serving minorities in the community. It was the first organization in the Morris County community to act as a liaison between African Americans and industry, securing employment opportunities with major corporations for minorities. The League's efforts paved the way for the hiring of qualified minorities into management positions at these corporations. It was also first to coordinate with local high school guidance departments, encouraging African American students to pursue higher education. Moreover, the League was the first to advocate the need for low-income housing in Morristown, resulting in a project for affordable family housing now known as Manahan Village.

Today, the Urban League of Morris County continues to serve citizens of the community in multiple areas, with programs ranging from corporate internships to housing advocacy, from computer training to English as a Second Language classes.

This past week, this incredible organization suffered a great loss, as William Primus, former chairman and CEO of the Urban League of Morris County, passed away. Over the course of his life, Bill Primus, a longtime friend of mine, was instrumental in various accomplishments for the advancement of social services to minorities in the region.

In 1970, Mr. Primus became the first African American member of the Madison Volunteer Fire Department and in 1980, he was the first African American elected to the Madison Borough Council. During his term, Mr. Primus served as vice chairman of the Board of Health and chaired Madison's Housing Authority. As chair, Mr. Primus implemented policies that would lead to the construction of the Rex Tucker Senior Housing Complex in Madison and the town's first affordable public housing.

Over his 14 years of working with the Urban League, Mr. Primus was instrumental in transforming the Urban League into one of Morris County's most active and influential organizations. When Mr. Primus first began working with the organization, it had a budget of \$95,000 and only one full time employee. By the time he retired, it had a budget over \$1 million and 14 full time employees.

Mr. Primus constantly focused on providing affordable housing for the Morris County community. In 2001, he took control of the Morris County Fair Housing Council and transformed it into the Urban League's Fair Housing and Assistance Program. Through this program, the Urban League was able to improve the county's efforts by addressing discrimination and promoting fair practices for housing.

Additionally, Mr. Primus established the Urban League's youth program, offering both

educational and employment services. He created the Summer Work and Youth School Outreach Programs and facilitated the awarding of over 90 academic scholarships during his tenure with the League. Furthermore, Mr. Primus helped me establish the Urban League's Washington intern program that has given so many young men and women from Morris County an opportunity to learn firsthand how Congress works. The Urban League of Morris County handpicks these students and sends them to the Capitol in the summer to serve as interns in my Capitol Hill office.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Urban League of Morris County and celebrating the life of William D. Primus.

RECOGNIZING FORMER IOWA
STATE REPRESENTATIVE ED
SKINNER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of former Iowa State Representative Ed Skinner who passed away on January 12, 2015 in Des Moines at the age of 78.

Mr. Skinner served the people of Iowa and Polk County as State Representative from 1968–1972 and spent many years as the Altoona and Pleasant Hill city attorney. During his time in the legislature, Ed was instrumental in the creation of one of Des Moines' biggest tourist attractions, Living History Farms.

Throughout his life Ed demonstrated a constant and legendary commitment of service to his family, community, state, and nation. He graciously volunteered his time to a number of organizations including the Altoona Lions, the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, and The Iowa Democratic Party, which recognized Ed with their Outstanding Supporter Award in 2013.

"He has been a strong advocate for eastern Polk County and has helped mentor generations of Democratic leaders throughout his life," the party said in a news release at the time.

Mr. Skinner was dedicated to mentoring and helping generations of leaders in Iowa and our nation because he believed in, and lived his life, serving others and working tirelessly for what he believed in.

It was a great honour to have known Ed and worked with him. I know that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring the accomplished life of Ed Skinner and offer our thoughts and prayers to his family and friends.

HONORING ANTHONY HO

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office's Deputy Director of the

Congressional Liaison Division, Anthony Ho. Anthony has served in that important office for more than 10 years. He has played a large role in promoting friendship between the people of our two great nations during his two tours here in Washington, DC.

Anthony earned his B.A. at the National Taiwan University and his Master's degree in Public Administration at the Kennedy School of Harvard University. That education prepared him for the challenges he faces on behalf of one of America's most important allies.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony impressed Members of the House of Representatives and Senate with his diligence, his honesty and his dedication to keeping the friendship between our countries strong.

Deputy Director Ho has been a great help to me, by keeping me informed on issues relating to Taiwan and to the entire Pacific Rim. He will be greatly missed. I wish him, his wife Anne and his son, Anwell all the best. I also want to send a special goodbye to his eldest son Andrew, who did such an excellent job as an intern in my office.

Washington's loss is Taipei's gain and I am sure that Anthony and his family will have a successful and happy time in their homeland. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing the Ho family goodbye and good fortune.

ANAND SHANTAM

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Anand Shantam. Anand joined me as my guest at the State of the Union.

Anand's story is all too familiar. She was unemployed and struggled in poverty.

Four years ago all that changed. She was introduced to DC Central Kitchen, an innovative program to combat hunger and train unemployed adults for culinary careers.

She enrolled in the Culinary Job Training Program and received her food handler's license.

But she also received so much more. She received the support she needed to discover her own confidence. She reignited her passion for cooking.

Upon graduation, Anand re-entered the workforce as the Lead at Kelly Miller Middle School, preparing nutritious, homemade meals for kids. Today, she is a culinary instructor for the very same program that helped her turn her life around.

She has health insurance. She is self-sufficient.

Anand's experience at DC Central Kitchen is an incredible success story of how job training programs help people get back on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to call Anand my friend. And I can't wait to try her kale salad.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK JANUARY

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, few Americans have heard the term "Black January," yet it is imbedded in the memory of all Azerbaijanis. Black January marks the evening of January 19, 1990, when at midnight Russian troops stormed the capital city of Baku. Armed with a state of emergency declared by the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet Presidium and signed by then President Mikhail Gorbachev, the invasion was intended to suppress a growing independence movement, but the result was the opposite. This violent incident inflamed Azerbaijani nationalism and contributed to the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Leading up to Black January, the national independence movement had gained momentum with growing demonstrations for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Emerging democratic groups were leading the political agenda and were projected to succeed in upcoming Parliamentary elections in March 1990. The Soviet Union sought to "restore order" by indiscriminately firing on peaceful demonstrators in Baku, including women and children. The protesters were calling for independence from the Soviet Union and the removal of Communist officials. More than 130 people died that night and in subsequent violence, over 700 were injured, 841 were arrested, and 5 went missing.

According to a report by Human Rights Watch entitled "Black January in Azerbaijan," "among the most heinous violations of human rights during the Baku incursion were the numerous attacks on medical personnel, ambulances and even hospitals." The report concluded that "indeed the violence used by the Soviet Army on the night of January 19–20 constitutes an exercise in collective punishment. The punishment inflicted on Baku by Soviet soldiers may have been intended as a warning to nationalists, not only in Azerbaijan, but in other Republics of the Soviet Union."

In the days after the invasion, thousands of Azerbaijanis surrounded Communist Party headquarters demanding the resignation of the republic's leadership. The Baku City Council demanded that Soviet troops be withdrawn. The Soviet legislature in Azerbaijan condemned the occupation as "unconstitutional" and threatened to call a referendum on secession unless Soviet troops were withdrawn within 48 hours.

Soviet troops were eventually withdrawn from Baku, but political control was maintained for almost another 2 years until Azerbaijan's parliament declared independence in October 1991. Today, Azerbaijan has developed into a thriving country with double digit growth, in large part due to a freely elected president and parliament, free market reforms led by the energy sector, and, most importantly, no foreign troops on its soil.

January 20 is the day on which Azerbaijani citizens stood up to Soviet soldiers and martyrs gave up their lives for freedom from communism and dictatorship. I ask my colleagues

to join me in recognizing the tragic events of Black January that precipitated the independent Republic of Azerbaijan and the fall of the USSR.

RECOGNIZING ALAMEDA COUNTY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY NANCY
O'MALLEY

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Alameda County District Attorney Nancy O'Malley on being named by the Lions Club of Livermore as the "2015 Alameda County Outstanding Citizen Of The Year." I look forward to speaking in honor of Nancy this Saturday when she receives her award.

I was privileged to work under Nancy for seven years as an Alameda County prosecutor. She is well deserving of this distinguished honor.

Nancy was born, grew up, went to college, and graduated from law school in the Bay Area. She rose through the ranks of the Alameda County District Attorney's Office after joining in 1984, becoming Chief Assistant District Attorney and then elected as the first female District Attorney in 2011.

Nancy is a stellar, tough, but fair prosecutor, putting countless dangerous criminals behind bars to help protect the Bay Area. In particular, she is nationally known for her work on issues surrounding violence against women, child abuse, domestic violence, and exploitation. She is also a tireless advocate on behalf of victims and their families.

Her work has been truly innovative. For example, Nancy created the Heat Exploitation and Trafficking (HEAT) unit, the first such division in the country dedicated to stopping child sex trafficking and punishing perpetrators. She also established the Alameda County Family Justice Center, a model way to achieve justice for and provide services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, elder abuse, and human trafficking all under one roof.

In addition to enforcing the law, Nancy has fought to change it for the better and improve public policy. One of her recent efforts is to achieve an end to the unconscionable rape kit backlog, both nationally and in Alameda County.

Nancy has been recognized by many for her achievements. She was awarded the House Victims' Rights Caucus 2014 Lois Haight Award of Excellence and Innovation and was a 2004 inductee in the Alameda County Women's Hall of Fame, just to name a few of her honors.

I want to applaud Nancy for her latest award. The East Bay is truly fortunate to have her standing up for victims on our behalf.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL
CELEBRATION OF THE NEW MA-
DRID COUNTY COURTHOUSE

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the centennial celebration of the New Madrid County Courthouse. As one of the five original counties in the state of Missouri, this courthouse is a landmark symbol for justice and peace serving its citizens for over 100 years.

The New Madrid County Courthouse relocated to its current location through the support of the community raising \$20,000 to supplement the bond issue.

In the fall of 1934, President Truman gave his speech near the front steps of this courthouse for his second Senate campaign before becoming the first Missouri born president.

In celebration of the courthouse's longevity in service, the county has reinstated the 1821 county seal as the official seal. There will be 24 stars featured on this seal representing Missouri as the 24th state in the Union.

Today, the dedicated staff members of New Madrid County Courthouse continue to create a safe environment and provide peace and order for the community. It is my pleasure to recognize the centennial celebration of the New Madrid County Courthouse.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,086,048,044,499.39. We've added \$7,459,170,995,586.31 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING TOM CAMERON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tom Cameron for being selected to receive an Excellence in Mentoring Award, the highest award for a youth mentor in Iowa.

Tom volunteers his time to the Mentoring Advantage Program (MAP) at Community Youth Concepts. He has donated countless hours over the past 2 years to improving the lives of young people. Not only has he worked to improve the lives of his mentees, but he

has also worked to increase awareness for the need and opportunities for youth mentors in the state of Iowa. Attending company volunteer fairs and connecting potential mentors to opportunities is another important aspect of Tom's volunteerism.

Tom Cameron has had a profound impact on the youth of Iowa and he deserves to be commended for his time and efforts. It's a great honor to represent Tom in the United States House of Representatives because he is a great living example of Iowa values that continue to make our state a great place to live and work.

HONORING EAST JOLIET FIRE
PROTECTION DISTRICT

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the firefighters and paramedics of the East Joliet Fire Protection District and to recognize the past 75 years of service to the community of Joliet, Illinois.

Since the formation of the East Joliet Fire Protection District in 1940, the protection of our community has been in the hands of truly dedicated volunteers and professionals. With each alarm, the firefighters, paramedics and support staff of the East Joliet Fire Protection District perform heroic acts to save lives and protect property. If not for its service, many businesses, homes, and members of our community would not be here today.

I would like to thank the members of the East Joliet Fire Protection District for all that they do to protect the community they have set out to serve.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT ROSS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Robert Ross, a successful business owner, exceptional law enforcement officer and dedicated public servant who is retiring from the San Mateo City Council after five years of service. He was the Mayor in 2014 and Deputy Mayor in 2013. Robert is a genuine, hard-working and deeply committed city council member and will truly be missed.

Robert was first elected to the council in 2009 after a 27-year-career as a police officer in San Mateo. His experience in law enforcement made security and sustainability one of his priorities for the city. As a real estate agent for 25 years, Robert also brought substantial business experience to the Council, guiding the city toward financial stability.

While on the Council, Robert served on the City Council Audit and Budget Committee, the City Council Legislative Committee, the Community Development Department Audit Committee, the Grand Boulevard Task Force, the North B Street Improvement Initiative and the

Planning Commission. In addition, he was very active in the Association of Bay Area Governments, the League of California Cities, San Mateo County Council of Cities, the San Mateo-Foster City Elementary School Board, the San Mateo Oversight Board, the San Mateo Union High School District Board, the Sister City Association and the South Bayside Waste Management Authority.

Robert received his Police Officers Standard & Training at the Modesto College Police Academy and his BSBA in Business Administration from the University of Phoenix. He started his law enforcement career as a police officer in Hayward in 1979 and transferred to the San Mateo Police Department in 1981 where he rose through the ranks to Police Lieutenant in 2003. His professionalism and proactive approach have been recognized and he has been commended on numerous occasions. For example, in the late 1980s, then Corporal Ross was in charge of setting up a task force to fight drug crimes in San Mateo. The group became known a "Ross' Raiders" and their effective anti-drug campaign was lauded by the City Council, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, the District Attorney, the San Mateo County Trial Lawyers Association and the late Congressman Tom Lantos.

Among the many awards Robert received was a Lieutenant's Commendation for proactive policing, the San Carlos/Belmont Exchange Club Officer of the Year Award, Employee of the Quarter by past Police Chief Don Phipps for ongoing leadership and proactive policing, the Trial Lawyers Association's Police Officer of the Year Award, the Peninsula Lions Club's Police Award for outstanding service to the community, the Gordon Joinville Special Merit Award for day-to-day excellence in policing, and the Medal of Honor, the Police Department's highest award for saving a life during a fire.

Whether in his capacity as a city council member, a peace officer, a small business owner or a San Mateo resident, Robert has always seized opportunities to help his community. He has given countless presentations at our schools to help troubled and underprivileged youths find a positive direction in their lives. He has visited homes of at-risk youth gang members during the holidays handing out presents. He has worked with the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center and the Tongan Interfaith Council to prevent and solve conflicts. He has worked with Samaritan House to assist needy families. He is a mem-

ber of the San Mateo Lion's Club which supports local and international charities.

It is obvious from this long list of accomplishments and engagements that Robert Ross has a heart of gold and an inexhaustible drive to help others. Because of his vision and commitment, San Mateo is a better place. I feel privileged to count Robert as a friend and colleague and wish him well as he shifts his focus to his personal and family life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize the lasting contributions Robert Ross has made while serving as Mayor, City Councilmember and law enforcement officer. He will always be a role model and inspiration to his fellow San Mateo residents.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA PADRE PIO LODGE #2350

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 2015

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Sons of Italy in America Padre Pio Lodge #2350, located in West Orange, New Jersey as it celebrates its 40th Anniversary.

The Sons of Italy in America, a Fraternal Organization created on June 22, 1905 by six Italian immigrants living in Little Italy, began as an organization seeking to establish homes and shelters for the elderly, life insurance and mortuary funds, and scholarship funds. The founding members of the Sons of Italy in America sought to form a support system for Italian immigrants, offering these people assistance in becoming American citizens and provide educational opportunities in assimilation into American culture. The organization continues this rich tradition through its various lodges across the country, including the Padre Pio Lodge #2350, located in West Orange.

Since 1975, the Sons of Italy in America Padre Pio Lodge #2350, has promoted Italian traditions and heritage in Essex County. The Padre Pio Lodge functions as an important aspect of society, especially through its partnership with multiple charities. The Padre Pio Lodge avidly supports the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Fund, Cooley's Anemia Foun-

dation, Alzheimer Association, Alicia Rose Teen Age Cancer Foundation, Doug Flutie Foundation for Autism, and Arthritis Foundation. The Lodge also assists two local food banks, donates toys and school supplies to schools and churches during the Christmas season, and supports our troops through Operation Shoebox.

The Padre Pio Lodge continues the Sons of Italy in America tradition of awarding students with scholarship opportunities. The Lodge holds education to be of utmost importance, and seeks to offer a helping hand to students in the area. In 2014 alone, Padre Pio Lodge gave scholarships to eleven qualified high school seniors.

This year, the Lodge announced that it would honor Sam Fumosa, a Charter member and Past State President of the Sons of Italy in America, with the Paul Ippolito Memorial Award. Sam participated in the Garibaldi-Meucci Museum on Staten Island and the Commission for Social Justice of OSIA. The Padre Pio Lodge will also honor Rosalind Aquino with the Angela DeNuzio Award for service to the Lodge and Anthony Benevento with the Michael D'Aries Award for dedication to the Lodge. Both Rosalind and Anthony worked tirelessly to ensure that the Lodge remained open during times of low membership. Because of their efforts, the Lodge now includes 125 members, with more joining every day.

To celebrate 40 successful years of promoting Italian heritage and supporting the local community, the Lodge will host a Carnevale celebration on Saturday, February 7th, 2015 at Hanover Manor, located at 16 Eagle Rock Avenue, East Hanover, New Jersey. Carnevale, a traditional Italian celebration dating back to the year 1268 A.D., includes music, food, and dance. The Lodge's Carnevale on February 7th will surely be a celebration not worth missing.

I commend the members of the Sons of Italy in America Padre Pio Lodge, especially committee chair, Dawn Giambattista, for their dedication to promoting the rich legacy of Italian heritage in America. The Lodge has consistently demonstrated a dedication and commitment to advancing the community of West Orange.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Sons of Italy in America, Padre Pio Lodge #2350 as it celebrates its 40th Anniversary.

SENATE—Monday, January 26, 2015

The Senate met at 4:30 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for Your un-failing love. Purify our hearts, making us fit vessels for Your use.

Lord, You know the many challenges that confront this legislative body, so guide our Senators with Your wisdom. Encourage them to live worthy of Your Name. Remind them that ultimately they will be judged by their productivity, for Your Word declares, "By their fruits You will know them." Today let Your presence continue to be felt on Capitol Hill.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. McCONNELL. This weekend President Obama's Chief of Staff lamented that the Senate has taken several weeks to debate an infrastructure project, the Keystone jobs bill. I agree it is about time to bring the Keystone debate to a positive conclusion, and we will do that soon. We have had a lot of floor discussion. We have considered Democratic and Republican amendments. All in all, the last few weeks have been time well spent. The debate has been good for our country. But tonight is our chance to notch another win for the middle class by supporting cloture and then actually passing this bipartisan jobs bill.

We have heard rumors that some in the Democratic leadership are pressuring rank-and-file Democrats—even Democrats who cosponsored this bill—to block Keystone's jobs with a filibuster instead. This is really disappointing when you consider all that our friends on the other side have been saying about the filibuster for so many years.

What is most disappointing, though, is the apparent reasoning for the Keystone filibuster. The Democratic leadership is claiming that there haven't been enough opportunities to consider amendments. Yet nine current Senate Democrats voted for the Keystone project just a few weeks ago without having the opportunity to offer or debate even a single amendment. Nine current Senate Democrats just a couple of months ago voted for the Keystone project without having the opportunity to offer or debate even a single amendment.

This time around, the new Republican majority allowed more amendment rollcall votes on just this one bill—this one bill—than the previous leadership allowed on every single bill from last year combined. Altogether, there were more rollcall votes on this bill than we got on amendments on the Senate floor all of last year combined.

I would also note that a majority of amendments we have taken rollcall votes on were also offered by the minority, by the Democrats. We also offered our friends on the other side an opportunity to consider more amendments just a few days ago. They objected to it at the time. Even so, it is still my hope that we will be able to consider more amendments from both sides of the aisle. Instead of filibustering this bill or blocking their own amendments, which we experienced the other night, I am asking my Democratic friends to work with the bill manager, Senator MURKOWSKI—who has done a fantastic job on this bill—to get amendments lined up.

Let's keep up the positive momentum generated by a more open legislative process that actually clearly has benefited both parties. A Keystone filibuster cannot succeed without the support of Democrats who voted for a Keystone bill just a few weeks ago without any amendments—any amendments—and who are cosponsoring the jobs bill today. I truly hope these Democrats won't vote to block Keystone jobs now just because a different party controls the Senate. The American people voted decisively against this type of partisan gridlock back in November. They want us to work together to get things done. Why don't we just continue to do that?

The debate over this bipartisan bill has already had so many positive effects on the Senate as an institution. It has shown Senators the benefits of a more open process, it has given a real voice to the minority, and it represents a decisive change from the broken Senate of recent years.

Here is how the assistant Democratic leader put it just a few days ago:

We are in a healthy environment on the floor of the Senate where we are pursuing amendments and active debate.

It is "great to see" this happening, he said. I couldn't agree more. That is exactly the way we ought to operate.

I would urge the Senate not to fall into the old partisan habits. Let's keep working together. Let's cooperate to get this important infrastructure project over the finish line and onto the President's desk.

I am calling on all of my colleagues—especially the cosponsors of this bipartisan bill, especially those who have supported Keystone without any amendments in the past—to vote for jobs and progress tonight, not the kind of gridlock American voters rejected so emphatically.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in a short period of time, less than an hour, the Senate is going to vote on whether to end the debate on Senate bill 1.

Senate bill 1 is the Republican's No. 1 priority this year. They are new to the majority in the Senate, and they got to choose the first and most important bill to call, and they chose this bill, Senate bill 1.

This bill will override the President's authority when it comes to making a decision on building the Keystone Canadian pipeline—Canadian pipeline. You see, Keystone is a Canadian corporation, and the Republicans in the Senate decided the highest priority when it comes to America's economy is to help this Canadian corporation.

There will certainly be construction jobs involved in the construction of this pipeline, but there will only be 35 permanent jobs that come out of this. The No. 1 priority for the Senate Republican majority is 35 permanent jobs. Most McDonald's hamburger franchises have more than that number of jobs.

But, having said that, let's talk about where we are on the floor of the Senate at this moment. In their new role as majority party, the Republicans asked us to take up this legislation, and they said: We want to go to the point we have made over and over during the past several years—we should have an open amendment process.

I am here to tell you that we have cooperated. I was quoted—I am honored, flattered—by the majority leader on the floor as saying I think it is healthy. I have said that for a long time. What changed in the Senate is not just the new majority but the new minority. Our feeling on our side is we need to be constructive, offer amendments, offer different points of view, offer different approaches, debate them on the floor, accept the will of the Senate, and move forward on legislation. That is what we have tried to do on this Keystone XL bill, and we have really offered amendments on the Democratic side that we think get to the heart of this debate.

My Republican friends and Senators like to characterize this as the Keystone jobs bill.

We started off by saying: Here is an idea. Let's say that the Canadian tar sands brought in through this pipeline and refined in the United States—the ultimate products, the oil products that come out of this refinery, are going to be there for Americans first, that Americans can use the gasoline and diesel fuel and jet fuel. In other words, it is going to stay in America.

The Republicans said no. We have to be prepared, after we go through all of this and build this Canadian pipeline, that ultimately none of the products will be used in the United States.

Then we said: OK, if we can't use the ultimate products coming out of this pipeline to help the American economy, then let's at least agree that we will build this Canadian pipeline in the United States with American-made steel. Let's put our steelworkers and foundries to work fabricating the steel to build the pipelines so we will create good-paying American jobs supplying the materials.

The Republicans voted no.

Then we said: Well, at the end of the day, these refineries, after they have processed Canadian tar sands, end up with a miserable byproduct called petcoke. It has some positive applications, but sadly, in many instances it is piled up stories high—even in the city of Chicago, within our city limits—and blows all over the neighborhood and into the lungs of children and elderly people. So let's at least have standards for the storage and handling of this byproduct that is going to come out of this Canadian pipeline.

The Republicans voted no.

Then we had a vote on whether we should be concerned with the environment. Using Canadian tar sands to

make oil products puts more greenhouse gases in the air, more carbon dioxide, and should we be mindful of this.

If you read the votes that took place last week, it is unclear, uncertain as to where the Republicans stand on this issue. In fact, one Senator from North Dakota offered what I thought was a good amendment acknowledging this issue and then at the very end voted against his own amendment, which is rare in the Senate annals, but it shows you how conflicted many Republican Members were on the basic environmental issues.

Now let's get to the procedure and where we stand. Last Thursday night was troubling. After the constructive consideration of over a dozen different amendments on both sides of the aisle, the Republican majority leader said: Now bring out the next group of amendments. And we did. The Democrats cooperated. We produced six amendments we wanted up next, and the Republicans produced six amendments they wanted up next. An hour later, within an hour after producing the list, the Senate majority leader came to floor and said: That is it; we are not going to get this done as I wanted to get it done. We are going to start tabling the Democratic amendments, one after the other.

So the Members who offered the amendments, who had worked on the amendments stood at their desks as each amendment came up and said: I would like 60 seconds to just explain the amendment I wrote that we are about to vote on. Each and every time, the Republicans objected to 60 seconds of debate.

This is considered the world's greatest deliberative body. Yet the sponsors, the authors of the amendments were denied 60 seconds to even explain their amendments. It didn't leave a very good taste in the mouths of many Democrats—not even those who were supporting this Keystone Canadian Pipeline. Many of them think this is unfair.

If we are going to have a good-faith, bipartisan environment to consider amendments, let's go back and forth—Democrat, Republican—and let's consider the major issues before us. There are still major unresolved issues, health and safety issues, with pending amendments.

I approached the majority leader as he was leaving the floor and I said: Even if we do not invoke cloture this evening, let's work together on a bipartisan basis. Let's come up with these lists of amendments. Let's do this in a conscientious, good-faith effort to complete this bill.

I think we can achieve it. My hat is off to Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Republican Senator, who has come to the floor, leading this effort on the floor with the debate, but I have a special place in my heart for the Democratic

side, where two other Senators have been outstanding in bringing us to this point on the issue. Senator MARIA CANTWELL from Washington is leading our effort on the Democratic side in full partnership with Senator BARBARA BOXER of California, and many others.

As was suggested by a Senator last week, it is time for the boys to get off the stage and let the ladies come back in and consider these amendments and bring us to the right conclusion of thoughtful debate, important issues considered, and a vote in the U.S. Senate on this legislation.

REMEMBERING ERNIE BANKS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last week America lost a hero and Chicago lost one of its greatest. Cubs Hall of Famer Ernie Banks passed away Friday night.

He was known as Mr. Cub. His love for the game of baseball was matched only by his passion for the city of Chicago.

He was a Hall of Famer in every sense of the word. He won the hearts of not just Cubs fans but baseball fans across the Nation with his power hitting and Golden Glove performances, and he endeared himself to everyone he ever met with his humble approach to the game of baseball and the game of life.

Before Hall of Famer Ernie Banks became Mr. Cub, he was 17 years old playing in a sandlot in Dallas, TX. That is where Cool Papa Bell, one of the legendary leaders in the Negro League, discovered this young man and signed him to play for the Kansas City Monarchs for \$7 a game.

While playing for the Monarchs, Ernie Banks was managed by another legend, Buck O'Neil.

Playing for the Negro League legend had a profound impact on young Ernie Banks. Buck had so much love for everybody that Ernie decided to model his life after him. It was with the Monarchs that Ernie learned to play with boundless energy and enthusiasm. He learned to express his joy for the game and took to heart the message Buck O'Neil, the manager, would often shout at him: "You gotta love this game to play it!" Ernie Banks loved it, and it showed.

Years later, O'Neil reunited with Ernie Banks when O'Neil agreed to manage the Cubs in 1962. Incidentally, he was the first African-American manager in Major League Baseball.

As one of the first African-American baseball players in the Major Leagues, Ernie Banks helped break down the color barriers. The Hall of Fame slugger and two-time MVP made his Major League debut at Wrigley Field in 1953, and he became the first African American to suit up for the Chicago Cubs.

He was only 180 pounds. He was not the most intimidating batter at the

plate, but he had powerful wrists that generated tremendous bat speed. He whipped the bat through the ball, hitting 512 home runs in his career, with 2,583 hits, 1,636 RBIs, and having a career batting average of .274.

From 1955 to 1960, he was the most prolific home run hitter in the game, hitting more home runs than either Hank Aaron, Willie Mays, or Mickey Mantle during those years.

In 1958 and 1959, he was named the most valuable player in the National League. He was the first ever to win the award in consecutive years.

He was also the first player to have his jersey number retired by the Cubs, and on game days his number 14 flies proudly over the left field foul pole at the friendly confines of Wrigley Field.

Not surprisingly, Ernie Banks was inducted into Cooperstown the first year he was eligible. But it wasn't the numbers on the back of the baseball card that made Mr. Cub a beloved member of Chicago and the community. It was his passion for the game and the appreciation he showed to everyone he encountered.

Over the last several days, I have heard from baseball fans sharing their stories of meeting Mr. Cub. Nearly all were humbled by the opportunity to meet their hero, but even more impressed to find that Ernie was just as appreciative of his fans as they were of him.

It is an understatement to say that the Chicago Cubs had some tough seasons during Ernie's 19-year career. The Cubs had not won a World Series since 1908 or a National League title since 1945. But every day, win or lose, Ernie would lace up his cleats, step on the field, and smile for the whole world to see. You could not help but love watching him play.

And for Ernie Banks, the eternal optimist, he always believed this was going to be the year for the Cubs. Every spring he predicted, without fail, the Cubs were going to win the pennant.

Well, Ernie never got to play in the post season. But his love of the game never wavered despite this. He became famous for his contagiously positive attitude. He often remarked: "It's a great day for baseball. Let's play two." That was the charm of Mr. Cub.

An 11-time All-Star, first-ballot Hall of Famer, selected to baseball's All-Century team in 1999, it was never about accolades or money for Ernie. He played for the pure joy of the game.

After hitting his 500th home run, becoming only the 9th player to achieve that feat, he summed up his feelings by saying: "The riches of the game are in the thrills, not the money." That is an inspiring message.

In 2013, I contacted some friends in the White House and asked President Obama to consider a Medal of Freedom for Ernie Banks. I felt that his impres-

sive career with the Cubs and his courage in breaking down the color barrier in baseball were reason enough. But more than these amazing achievements, Ernie's spirit set him apart.

It was a special moment to be there at the White House when Ernie Banks received the Presidential Medal of Freedom. I was honored to see it and experience it.

After being awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, we held a reception for him in my office up here. I don't know if there have ever been so many humbled politicians coming by my office looking for an autograph. He happened to sign this photo for me that day that I have in the Chamber. I remember JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia—a faithful Atlanta Braves fan—made a point of being there to meet Ernie Banks. And I remember HARRY REID, when he met Ernie Banks, said: "I used to play a little baseball." Ernie Banks said to him: "Well, Senator REID, what position did you play?" He said: "I was a catcher." Ernie Banks said: "If you were truly a catcher, get down in that catcher's position." Somehow or another, HARRY REID got down in that catcher's position right in my office to prove it to Ernie Banks.

Ernie could not have been more gracious with his time, signing autographs for everybody who showed up. He made time for everybody.

The North Side of Chicago and Wrigley Field will not be the same without Ernie. "Let's play two" will echo off the bricks and ivy for generations to come. His positive, hopeful, Cub view of life filled every room and every baseball diamond he ever touched.

And now it would seem they need to find a new roster spot on the Field of Dreams—and everyone better be ready for daytime double-headers too.

Ernie Banks, your spirit, passion, and sunny outlook on life will be missed.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf.

Murkowski (for Sullivan) amendment No. 67 (to amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel.

Cardin amendment No. 75 (to amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline.

Murkowski amendment No. 98 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities.

Flake amendment No. 103 (to amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs.

Cruz amendment No. 15 (to amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports.

Moran/Cruz amendment No. 73 (to amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Daines amendment No. 132 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I came to the floor to speak about a measure that is supported by Members of both sides. I was listening to the remarks by the minority whip who commemorated the life of Ernie Banks.

REMEMBERING ERNIE BANKS

I began school in Chicago in the early 1960s, when Ernie Banks was playing, and it is to be noted for the record that my grade point average would have been higher had I not spent so many afternoons at Wrigley Field watching the Cubs play. During that time all the games were played during the day, and as such I missed a few classes to watch our beloved Cubs.

But our beloved player—perhaps the most beloved player in baseball history—Ernie Banks was a true delight.

I wish I had time to speak more on that particular issue, but what I would like to direct my attention to is a bipartisan-supported measure, S. 1. The American people, in November, said: Get back to Washington. Work together, and get things done. And one of which was the Keystone Pipeline. It has bipartisan support. In fact, on the motion to proceed to this measure, 10 Democrats joined Republicans in this effort. And that is what we are debating here.

MEDICAL DEVICE ACCESS AND INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT

But I am here to talk about a second bill that certainly deserves to be in the top five of pieces of legislation that have bipartisan support and will hopefully result in passage and then sent to the President. And, hopefully, with a number of Democrats joining Republicans in these efforts, the President will take a second look at his veto threats on measures that have bipartisan support.

It was Winston Churchill who said that a nation trying to tax itself into prosperity “is like a man standing in a bucket and trying to lift himself up by the handle.”

Unfortunately, one of Indiana’s most vibrant, growing industries is stuck in the bottom of the bucket because of a small provision tucked away in the 2,000-page ObamaCare law, which imposes on them an excise tax, a 2.3-percent excise tax on every sale they make of medical devices, hindering innovation and job creation.

Medical device manufacturers in my State directly employ over 20,000 Hoosiers and indirectly support thousands of additional jobs. These are jobs that pay well above the average—56 percent higher wages than the average wage rate in Indiana. So these are top-quality jobs, providing significant employment for a significant number of Hoosiers.

We have more than 300 FDA-registered medical device manufacturers in our State, and this is true of many other States. This industry is boosting our State’s economy, our Nation’s economy, and producing technologies that are changing and saving lives.

Products ranging from wheelchair van lifts to artificial knees, hips, and shoulders, to catheters used in heart procedures, have improved or saved the lives of many Hoosiers and countless others not only in my State, not only in America, but across the globe.

Since the implementation of this excise tax—passed in the ObamaCare Act in 2010, imposed in 2013—this destructive tax has caused companies to freeze hiring, lay off workers, and shelve plans to expand and build new facilities.

A survey by the Advanced Medical Technology Association found that the device tax forced manufacturers to let go of or avoid hiring 33,000 workers in 2013.

Look, I thought we were trying to get people back to work. I thought we were working to pass bipartisan legislation that would benefit this country and benefit those who are seeking employment.

Cook Medical of Bloomington was forced to table plans for a major expansion because of the device tax.

In 2013 testimony before the Senate Budget Committee, Cook Medical chairman Steve Ferguson stated:

Cook has made the difficult decision that without repeal [of the medical device tax], we will move important new product lines outside of the U.S. Our previous plans to open up five new manufacturing facilities in American towns are now on hold as we use capital intended for these projects to pay the device tax.

The negative impact of this tax is not only felt by large employers such as Cook Medical, it also hurts gross sales of companies that are not making a profit but are developing innovative new ways to find benefits for the

health and safety, and even the life, in many cases, of those who need these medical devices.

As a result, these companies are not profitable because they are having to pay the tax. They are struggling to launch new innovations to save and improve lives. For instance, a small Warsaw, Indiana-based manufacturer, which develops and sells orthopedic implants for children, had to shelve two important projects simply because it had to use its resources to pay the medical device tax.

After the tax was implemented, an employee of that company shared his story with me. Because of this tax, he said, the manufacturer is now largely inhibited from working on important new products, such as a device that reduces a wheelchair-bound child’s discomfort.

How ironic that ObamaCare, which the President said would increase the health benefits for Americans in coverage, is actually a barrier to improving lives and health outcomes.

Last week, I joined nine of my Senate colleagues, including five Democrats, to introduce the Medical Device Access and Innovation Protection Act. Our legislation would eliminate this tax and has strong bipartisan support.

During the last session of Congress, 79 Senators voted to pass a bipartisan amendment to the fiscal year 2014 Senate budget resolution that called for the repeal of this device tax—79 Members, 34 Democrats and 45 Republicans. It does not get much more bipartisan than that.

So we are hoping that while this may not be labeled S. 2, it certainly stands in the top three or four issues that have strong support and will respond to the call of the American people in November to get back to Washington, get together, work on things with bipartisan support that are going to improve our economy and get people back to work, and get it up to the President.

I hope my colleagues will see that this egregious, harmful tax, tucked away in the Affordable Care Act, will force us to move forward, repeal it, and result in the kind of improvements the American people are asking us to address. It is long past time for Washington to stop punishing medical device innovators in Indiana and across the country. I am urging my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, we are trying to figure out how to do a fair division of the time that remains. I ask unanimous consent that Senators STABENOW and PETERS have 5 minutes between them to discuss an amendment they have been working on, followed by Senator CARDIN, who would have 3 minutes to explain his, followed by myself having 2½ minutes to discuss

my amendment, then Senator HEITKAMP would have 5 minutes after that, and then the remaining time for Senator SESSIONS. Because that would be equal. That would add to our having as much time as Senators SESSIONS or MURKOWSKI, whoever at that point wants to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am seeking clarification. Is the Senator from California asking that these respective Members have an opportunity to speak to amendments or to get their amendments pending?

Mrs. BOXER. Well, some will ask for amendments to be pending. I know I will. Some will not ask that; they just want to be heard. But there is 30 minutes left in the debate. Your side just finished. Obviously, if we do not want to be fair, somebody could grab the time on our side now and talk for 30 minutes. We do not think that is right. We are trying to divide it up between our side and your side. So I have divided about 15 minutes on our side and given 15 minutes to Senator SESSIONS, who wanted to be heard on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, again, I am seeking clarification here, because up until this point in time, what we have done, in order to get amendments pending, is the ranking member and I have kind of worked back and forth in terms of what it was that would come up as far as pending.

As far as Members just seeking to speak to amendments, I certainly do not have a problem with what the Senator from California has proposed. I am trying to get some other understanding. I was also—my understanding is that I had the time beginning at 5:15 p.m. reserved. I think there is a little bit of confusion here.

Mrs. BOXER. Reclaiming my time, we have already wasted 4 minutes of the 15. The Senator can object if she does not want to allow us to have an amendment pending, but I am going to start off here. Is the Senator still objecting? Instead of Senator SESSIONS, I will give—now it is about 12 minutes to you at the end. Is that all right with the Senator?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, again, I am trying to understand. If Members just want to speak to their amendments, there is not a problem with what the Senator has suggested. It is just the question of whether we are getting amendments pending, because we have been going back and forth, side to side, up to this point in time.

I will be happy to put the microphone down and let the Senator from California speak to her amendment while

Senator CANTWELL and I talk about how we get more amendments pending. That way she can get talking.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, if I might say this: Every Senator has a right to ask unanimous consent on anything. If the Senator does not like it, she can say, "I object." I do intend to—I cannot speak for anybody else. I want to make my amendment pending because it is germane. I want to make sure it is heard. It is about public health. So if my friend does not want to agree to this unanimous consent, then I think what we will do is I will hold the floor and I will yield to colleagues for questions and they can make their points.

I do not understand my friend's objection to the way we have it laid out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. There continues to be objection. I would like to meet with the ranking member to continue a process of back-and-forth to make amendments pending. I have no objection to the Senator from California speaking to her amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Well, I am going to take the time now—the entire time—and yield to colleagues for them to ask me questions. So I will speak for 2 minutes or less and then I am going to ask unanimous consent on my amendment.

We want to have a study of the significant human health impacts of the Keystone Canadian XL tar sands pipeline. I do not believe they were adequately addressed in the supplemental environmental impact report or completely analyzed.

I held a press conference with doctors from Canada who spoke about the adverse impact on the health of people living near the pipeline. We have had spills along the pipeline in Michigan, in Arkansas. Those spills are not adequately cleaned up as we speak.

As Senator CANTWELL informed me, there have been an additional two spills since the new Congress came into session. From extraction to transportation to refining to waste storage, misery follows the tar sands. We know there are dangerous air pollutants and carcinogens that have been documented from tar sands refining—all of this to help a Canadian private company make a whole bunch of money, and we cannot even keep the oil in this country.

Are you kidding me? Thirty-five permanent jobs. The least we can do is have an in-depth health impact study before we approve this pipeline.

I am very sad to say—you know, we still have this kind of gag-athon going on from the other side. They would not even let people speak for 1 minute on their amendment. That is why I am grabbing the floor here. I could not even get agreement to divide up the time, so I am taking the time.

I will be happy to yield to my friend from Michigan, through the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much to my friend and colleague and leader from California.

I first want to say thank you to Senators MURKOWSKI and CANTWELL who have worked so hard with Senator BOXER moving forward a process that, until Thursday night, was working very well going back and forth.

Before we authorize the building of a new oil pipeline in America, it is important for us to consider the safety of pipelines we already have.

In 2010, a pipeline that runs from Canada through Michigan spilled nearly a million gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River, causing the largest inland oil spill in U.S. history. That cleanup cost \$1.2 billion.

Nine days ago, another pipeline broke in Montana, and for the second time in 4 years, tens of thousands of gallons of oil emptied into the Yellowstone River, making that water unsafe to drink.

Right now in Michigan, we have a 61-year-old pipeline which runs along environmentally sensitive areas and goes beneath the Straits of Mackinac and our magnificent Great Lakes.

That pipeline carries 1.2 million gallons of tar sands oil per day and has undergone only a few upgrades since it was first installed in 1953. A spill would be devastating, not only to the region but to all Americans—because the Great Lakes are a vital source of our Nation's fresh water supply.

Yet none of the companies transporting heavy tar sands crude are required to pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which would ensure that taxpayers are not footing the bill.

When we offered an amendment to fix that, the Republicans said no.

America's economy is only as strong as our natural resources, and those resources are threatened every time a pipeline breaks.

Making matters worse, Republicans said no to amendments that would keep the oil in America, guarantee the pipeline be built with American steel and use American workers.

So Americans take all of the risks with very few, if any, rewards.

Because Republicans refuse to make this Canadian oil company pay into the oil spill fund, American taxpayers may have to bailout the company if the pipeline breaks.

So, before our Colleagues vote on behalf of the oil companies to approve the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, it is critical that we pass the amendment that my friend and partner from Michigan and I have introduced.

This amendment ensures that we address the safety of the pipelines that we have now—before beginning construction on Keystone. And it would

ensure that the heightened safety standards being applied to Keystone exist in pipelines around the Great Lakes.

The Republican majority has promised an open amendment process, so I certainly hope that when my colleague from Michigan offers this amendment in a few moments, the Republican majority will allow a vote on this critical pipeline safety amendment—even though Big Oil may not like it.

Again, the American people are taking all of the risks when the oil will not even stay in America. The least Congress can do is guarantee the pipelines are safe.

I would ask my friends to join with Senator PETERS and me in saying that before we authorize the building of a new oil pipeline in America that we have to consider and strengthen the safety of pipelines, the pipelines we already have. In 2010, a pipeline that runs from Canada through Michigan spilled nearly 1 million gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River—this has been talked about before—causing the largest inland oil spill in U.S. history.

So we need to vote on Senator PETERS' and my amendment. The cleanup itself cost \$1.2 billion. Nine days ago, another pipeline broke in Montana. For the second time in 4 years, tens of thousands of gallons of oil emptied into the Yellowstone River, making that water unsafe to drink. So would my friend from California agree with me and share concerns that under the Straits of Mackinac—and our gorgeous, beautiful Great Lakes—we have a 61-year old pipeline that runs through environmentally sensitive areas, goes right under the water, and has only been upgraded a couple of times since 1953?

Before we pass this Keystone Pipeline bill, we should make sure our Great Lakes have the pipeline safety we need, as well as all of our pipelines across the country.

Would my colleague agree with that?

Mrs. BOXER. I could not agree more with my friend. Her question is pertinent and to the point of this debate. We are giving permission to a Canadian company to come through and use America as a passthrough. They are going to leave behind petcoke, leave behind spills—they have already done it before with the tar sands pipeline. This is the hardest oil to clean up.

I absolutely know that my friend Senator PETERS has a question as well.

Without losing my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment. I will wait for the objection to be heard. I am not going to plow through this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. That was my amendment No. 128. I am very disappointed, because what the Senator is talking about, making sure the pipelines are safe, and what I am talking about, a health study, are quite related.

I know my friend from Michigan wanted me to yield for a question. I am happy to do so.

Mr. PETERS. I appreciate the Senator from California yielding for a question, as I am listening to this debate and hearing from my colleague, the Senator from Michigan, as to the importance of pipeline safety, as we are now debating a very comprehensive bill to give approval for one specific pipeline in this country, which I think is very much an unprecedented type of vote in the Senate.

My question is: Why do we not have an opportunity, or would the Senator not agree that we should have an opportunity, to offer amendments? I know I am new to the Senate, but I was informed this would be an open amendment process. My idea of an open amendment process means you can actually offer amendments. It means you can also actually debate amendments. That is an open process, particularly something as important as protecting our Great Lakes, this incredible, immense body of freshwater, one of the largest bodies of freshwater in the world. We have a pipeline that goes through there, above the lakebed, that could potentially be catastrophic if there is a break.

As Senator STABENOW mentioned, in Michigan we have already had the most expensive pipeline break in history—4 years of cleanup of Canadian tar sands oil, oil that sinks to the bottom of the river. It is more expensive to clean up—over \$1.2 billion in cleanup. So you can imagine if we had a pipeline break in the middle of the Great Lakes. It would be catastrophic to this country, it would be catastrophic to the State of Michigan, but really catastrophic to the entire world. It is a risk we cannot take.

That is why we have authored a commonsense amendment that says we should ensure that there is adequate inspection, that PHMSA has the resources they need in order to inspect this, and if there are special requirements to protect the Great Lakes, as there were special requirements for Keystone, it should also be available to other pipelines, particularly in sensitive areas such as the Great Lakes.

That is why, in the spirit of an open amendment process, in the spirit of this great deliberative body, where people are allowed to debate the big issues affecting our world, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 70.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. If I could answer the question posed to me by my friend—he asked do I think there ought to be an open amendment process. Not only do I think there should be, we were promised an open amendment process. What occurred here at midnight on Thursday night, before the Senate left—some of our colleagues who are running for President went out to my beautiful State to make their case, as they have every right to do. But instead of staying on Friday, we adjourned on Thursday night. It was anything but an open amendment process.

I see the Senator from Massachusetts on the floor. He had a critically important amendment. He asked for 60 seconds to explain his amendment. I have been here over 20 years. I have never seen a situation, ever, where five Members in a row, five great Senators representing their great States, were told: Sit down; we are gagging you. That is what happened. This is wrong. So we are going to be asked to proceed today and shut down the amendment process even further. I do not know how the Senate is going to vote. However the Senate votes, it votes. But the bottom line is, this has been anything but an open amendment process. My friend is absolutely right.

I know the Senator from Maryland wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, could I ask my colleague from California to yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. The question I am going to ask Senator BOXER to respond to is: What are the consequences if we invoke cloture about 15 minutes from now when that comes up for a vote on the floor?

There were many of my colleagues who had amendments they wanted to offer. They filed those amendments.

Unless those amendments become pending, it is my understanding that—and unless those amendments meet the very narrow germaneness rule—they may be relevant to debate—but the germaneness rules are pretty tough so that unless we defeat cloture, we may not have an open amendment process.

I know the majority leader talked about an open amendment process, but many of my colleagues—including this Member, who has additional amendments I would like to have considered—will not be able to get those amendments considered, if I understand it, Senator BOXER, unless the cloture motion is defeated.

Let me talk for one moment about amendment 75, which I filed and is pending, and I think is critically important.

What that amendment would do is allow our Governors and our county officials to be able to get information about the risk to their drinking water as a result of the potential spills on the

aquifers. This is not a hypothetical question because the Ogallala Aquifer, which is the country's largest underground freshwater resource, is crossed by the proposed line of the Keystone. Therefore, it is of major concern to the Governors and local officials what a potential spill could have with regard to their drinking water supplies, to their communities. At some places the aquifer is within 5 feet of the surface. So a spill could have a dramatic impact on the supply of safe drinking water.

As has already been pointed out by my colleagues in Michigan, in July 2010 there was a pipeline rupture near Marshall, MI, that released 843,000 gallons of tar sands oil. It had a horrific impact on the environment, and it is still difficult to see the end in sight because of the cleanup difficulties in this thick, tar sands oil.

On March 29, 2013, there was a pipeline rupture in Mayflower, AR, that caused an incredible challenge to the cleanup.

So my amendment is pretty simple. My amendment would allow that information to be made available to our Governors and our local officials so that they could then notify the President that they have a concern on the route and allow that to be considered before the pipeline is constructed, giving our local governments the opportunity to be heard—to have the information and then be heard on this very important issue.

My question to the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, is: If we are going to have an open amendment process, how can that be if the cloture motion that was filed by the majority leader were to become approved? Wouldn't that deny us that full, open amendment process that we had heard was going to be used in this Congress?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend for the question.

Again, we were promised an open amendment process.

I wish to make a point to my friend who has worked so hard on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I am so appreciative of his work. Do you know, if an amendment like yours does not pass, what it means is that American companies will be treated in a much harsher fashion than a Canadian foreign oil company—in other words, because the other side is just saying: No more facts, no more information, no more environmental impact statement—even though we know there are health impacts due to the tar sands.

The Senator has pointed out the possibility of having a bad impact on drinking water. We have seen what has happened in West Virginia when we don't worry about that.

So my friend is absolutely right, and I am honored that he asked me to comment on this particular amendment.

And I hope that he will ask—I know you are pending. I hope that you are going to get a vote on this amendment one way or another.

I know some other colleagues may want to ask a question.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Would the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. I am pleased to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I thank the Senator.

From the start, let me say that Senator BOXER and I are not on the same side on the principal bill. I have long been one of the staunchest supporters of the Keystone XL Pipeline bill.

A lot of what we have heard today is about the consequences of aging infrastructure. So the question I have for Senator BOXER is: Would it not make sense, as we are talking about this Keystone XL Pipeline bill, that we find common ground that we all should agree that we need the resources to have the regulatory authority and the regulatory personnel to go out and make sure that aging infrastructure—the infrastructure underneath the Great Lakes and what happened now in the Yellowstone River—that we have a robust and very complete PHMSA organization that has the personnel to go out and follow the pipeline, test the pipeline, and review the results? But even as important to me is PHMSA's role in making sure that our transportation of oil on the railroad is actually adequate, that we have adequate regulation.

So one of my amendments—not pending but filed—is, in fact, an amendment that would address directly what I would hope would be common ground for everyone in the Senate, which is making sure we are, in fact, regulating interstate pipelines.

I also wish to talk about how we have an “all of the above” policy that everybody talks about where we somehow don't seem to get to that point.

One of the amendments I have at the desk, which I would dearly love to call up and make sure that it gets a vote, is an amendment that would provide a long-term—just 5 years—glide path for wind energy.

I think we have seen, as we have included this in the tax extenders, this stop-and-go policy that has, in fact, not only put the companies' lives on hold but also their employees' lives.

I am hopeful. We don't know how the vote is going to turn out. No one knows until the vote is done, but I am hopeful that we will be able to come back and introduce so many of these amendments that my colleagues have advanced—some of which I agree with and some of which I don't.

But that is the nature of the Senate—that we actually have a vote, because I think, as a believer, I have good ideas but my ideas should have a debate in the Senate.

But wouldn't the Senator agree that one common area that we all share is making sure that we have a robust regulatory environment to protect our waterways, to protect our farmers' soil from any leaks, and to make sure that any leaks, to the extent they are preventable, are prevented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my colleague from North Dakota, of course, I agree with her. We don't agree on the tar sands pipeline, but we do look for common ground, and she has found it. The importance of inspecting the infrastructure can't be overstated.

I say to my friend, before she leaves the floor, this is a picture of a recent spill. Actually, it was 2013. It still has not been cleaned up in Arkansas because the pipeline burst—200,000 gallons of tar sands burst from the pipeline, and it spilled all over the streets of a subdivision. Residents were exposed to high levels of benzene, a known carcinogen, and hydrogen sulfite. They suffered from dizziness, nausea, and headaches—all classic symptoms of exposure to the chemicals found in tar sands.

Rainfall causes oil to float to the top of the soil and off gas. What is happening here is it still has not been cleaned up.

My friend has an amendment that would say: Let's inspect the infrastructure to make sure things such as this do not happen. Of course, I support it. I hope she will vote her conscience and hopefully vote to keep this amendment process open.

I know my friend from Massachusetts has a question, and I yield to him if he does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. The Senator has to ask if I would yield for a question.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator. I thank the Senator for taking the time to have this very important discussion in the Senate this afternoon.

This past Thursday night the majority leader decided they would not allow for a debate on an amendment I was propounding that would have imposed a tax on the Canadian oil as it is being transported through this proposed pipeline. In the eventuality of an oil spill, the Canadians would have to have contributed to.

The majority did not make it possible for me to speak for even 1 minute on ensuring that the Canadians had to pay the tax in the event there was an oil spill with their oil in the United States of America, while Americans would have to do so.

This is the question I am going to propound to the Senator from California. Right now we know that there is increasing carbon pollution in the

atmosphere, which stacks the decks, increasing the chances that our country, our planet would draw an extreme weather joker that would have catastrophic consequences for our country or for any other place in the world. We know that while no one storm can be attributed to climate change, scientists agree there is an increase in the intensity and the frequency of extreme weather events. In fact, in the 2013 consensus report bulletin of the American Meteorological Society said: “The number of severe regional snowstorms that occurred since 1960 was more than twice the number that occurred during the preceding 60 years” in the United States of America. So my question to the Senator from California is: Shouldn't we be debating this issue of increased frequency of snowstorms, of rain storms, of droughts, of extreme weather conditions? And isn't this something that Members should be allowed 1 minute, at least, to address, if not a full debate of these issues that have been triggered by the Republicans deciding they wanted to bring this bill onto the floor as their No. 1 priority for the year 2015? Is that not the subject we should be discussing and should it not be an open debate?

That is the question I propound to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I would say in response to my friend's question, I was so shocked when the Senator asked for 1 minute to explain his amendment and we heard multiple Republicans saying: No, no, a thousand times no.

As Senator DURBIN said, this is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. I grew up thinking that was true. I never saw this before where colleague after colleague after colleague after colleague was essentially shouted down. I haven't seen it here.

It has reached a new low with a Republican majority since. They absolutely won a huge election victory. There is no question about it. There was the promise that it would be an open process, and then we can't even have colleagues talk for 1 minute.

I know the Senator from New Jersey has a question as well. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, because time is running out at 5:30.

Mr. BOOKER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will.

Mr. BOOKER. I am grateful that Senator BOXER will yield for a question.

This is a question I have of Senator BOXER, and I wish to get her feedback because of her years of experience, her wisdom, and her depth of understanding on this issue. I think there needs to be an amendment for critical protection.

The need for regulation requires agencies to supplement already issued

environmental impact statements when significant new circumstances come about. When there is information about these new challenges to the environmental impact of a project, something really has to happen.

So this pending bill deems that the final environmental impact statement issued last January would fully satisfy the NEPA, that this would remove the obligation of permitting agencies to supplement that EIS if any new circumstance or information is discovered.

The amendment would change that and would preserve the obligation of agencies to supplement—if we had such an amendment, it could really protect that.

I was told by a lot of people that NEPA is sort of referred to as the environmental modern day Magna Carta. In other words, it is such a critical set of protections. If we have a circumstance in which there is a significant change in the pipeline—say they just decide to change the direction or move it a little bit and it goes through an entirely new area—not to be able to take into consideration new information, new circumstances where an environmental impact statement abated, seems to be wrong. It actually seems to be giving this company, this foreign company, more information, more opportunity than our current American companies.

I would love for the Senator to comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Senator BOOKER should be proud of this contribution to this debate and what he is doing in the environment committee.

Let me say quickly—because I know we are running out of time—here is the deal. You raised the golden standard—NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. The underlying bill says everything is satisfied. All you want to make sure of in your amendment is that if there is new information which shows this could harm the public—maybe cause more cancer, cause more asthma, and cause other problems—that we need a supplemental EIS, that we need a supplemental study before we approve this pipeline. Right now, they are not letting you offer that amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today we are voting to end debate on the Keystone Pipeline bill.

I want to be clear right from the start. I do not support this bill. I will vote against cloture and against final passage of the Keystone Pipeline bill. And I am disappointed about the way it is being jammed through to a vote.

I supported the motion to proceed to this bill for one reason and only one reason—because we were assured there would be an open amendment process.

We started that process last week. We have worked back and forth be-

tween Republican and Democratic amendments. Many of those amendments are important. And I believe we should continue until every Senator who wants to amend this bill has had a chance to make his or her case.

I have an amendment for a renewable electricity standard which would create hundreds of thousands of 21st-century American jobs in my State and across the country. We owe it to all Americans to consider this and other amendments that would improve the bill.

The bill as it stands is not acceptable on many levels.

First, I am concerned that the new leadership chose to begin with a bill mandating a single pipeline for a foreign private company. This is a questionable use of the Senate's time and an unprecedented piece of legislation. Congress has never gotten involved in mandating a pipeline of this nature. But that is where we are. Now we are voting to cut off debate. The majority leader moved last week—late in the night—to set aside the Democratic amendments and bring an end to debate.

So we have a bill with a questionable beginning and a regrettable ending. The result is a missed opportunity to seriously address the energy needs of our country.

I said at the beginning of this debate that we are faced with a choice, a profound choice. We can deny that our climate is warming. We can fall behind our economic competitors. We can ignore the danger to our planet and to our security. That is one choice. Or we can move forward with a clean energy economy, with an energy policy that makes sense, that creates jobs, that protects the environment, and that will keep our Nation strong.

We had a good debate on climate change during this bill about whether or not humans significantly contribute to it. Many Senators made it clear where they stand. Many agree that yes humans are significantly contributing to climate change.

But while that is good for the record, it doesn't do much for the reality, because we have fallen short of taking any real action to address this great challenge. In fact, we are now compounding the problem by trying to pass this bill.

The bill lacks a comprehensive energy policy; it lacks even trying to set one. This is not a "do it all" energy bill. This isn't even a "drill, baby, drill" bill. This is a "drill, Canada" bill.

I believe we should continue working on the bill to address serious climate solutions, like a renewable electricity standard. The Keystone Pipeline is an investment in doing things the old way—importing foreign oil. Instead of doubling down on foreign oil, we should be talking about how we can move

America forward by investing in the homegrown energy of the future.

A national renewable electricity standard would combat global warming, while creating hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country. It will help maximize our energy potential, while strengthening our economy and our energy security.

Let's vote on that, and let's move forward to meet the real energy needs of American families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. My time has expired. I thank the Chair very much for his patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls related to the cloture motions on Senate amendment No. 2 and S. 1 be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Murkowski amendment No. 2: the Keystone XL pipeline approval act.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Murkowski amendment No. 2: the Keystone XL pipeline approval act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 39, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 29 Leg.)

YEAS—53

Alexander	Donnelly	Murkowski
Ayotte	Enzi	Paul
Barrasso	Ernst	Perdue
Bennet	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Graham	Rounds
Capito	Grassley	Sasse
Cassidy	Hatch	Scott
Coats	Heitkamp	Sessions
Cochran	Heller	Shelby
Collins	Hoeven	Sullivan
Corker	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Tillis
Cotton	Johnson	Toomey
Crapo	Lankford	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Daines	Manchin	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Kirk	Mikulski	Rubio
McCain	Moran	Warner
McCaskill	Reid	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the Murkowski substitute amendment No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger Wicker, Richard Shelby, Michael Enzi, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator

from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 39, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 30 Leg.)

YEAS—53

Alexander	Donnelly	Murkowski
Ayotte	Enzi	Paul
Barrasso	Ernst	Perdue
Bennet	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Graham	Rounds
Capito	Grassley	Sasse
Cassidy	Hatch	Scott
Coats	Heitkamp	Sessions
Cochran	Heller	Shelby
Collins	Hoeven	Sullivan
Corker	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Tillis
Cotton	Johnson	Toomey
Crapo	Lankford	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Daines	Manchin	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Kirk	Mikulski	Rubio
McCain	Moran	Warner
McCaskill	Reid	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the cloture vote on S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are here this evening, after the conclusion of two cloture votes where we have failed to get the sufficient 60 votes that are required to cut off debate and move forward on this bill.

As the floor manager, I will be working with my counterpart on the energy committee, Senator CANTWELL, to define a list of amendments and define the universe we are talking about. Perhaps we can work toward an agreement that will allow for additional amend-

ments to be processed and ultimately allow us to get to passage of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

This measure, S. 1, is a bipartisan measure that will work to create jobs for this country and will not only help with our relationship with our friends and allies to the north but is also widely supported by the American public. I am hopeful that what we will be able to do tonight—by working with colleagues—is to again define how we will get to the final resolution of this very important bill.

Last week we saw this measure include several important energy efficiency bills—including the adoption of the measure of the Senator from Ohio—particularly the one provision that relates to water heaters, which is very time sensitive. We were also able to add two sense-of-the Senate provisions to S. 1. One provision relates to the oil spill liability trust fund and the other provision is related to the issue of climate change.

Here we are, more than 2 weeks into debate on the Keystone XL Pipeline, and we voted on a total of 24 amendments to the bill. We voted on more amendments last week than we did in all of 2014. In fact, Thursday was a long day for all of us. We moved out 15 amendments, and that was as many as we had voted on in all of 2014. In 2014, this Senate voted on 15 amendments. This past Thursday, we voted on 15 amendments in one day on this Keystone bill. We are now up to 24 amendments, and we have made some progress.

I am very aware that not everyone is fully happy with where we are right now. We hit our first bump in the road—back to regular order—but that is the way we have to roll with some things every now and again. I hope we are at the point where we will be able to get back on track, a track that will allow for again closure of this very important measure.

I wish to remind Senators that we are in this place where we had to vote on cloture because we got to a point last week where a unanimous consent request to vote on the then-pending 12 amendments was blocked. I will also remind colleagues that invoking cloture on a bill does not end all debate. We still have up to 30 hours of additional debate time left, and during that time amendments that are germane to the underlying bill can still be called up, considered, and voted on. We have quite a few of those left.

In fact, at last count the amendments that have been filed to date—there are 143 amendments that I have on my tally today that have been filed. I don't know if that is a current, up-to-the-minute accounting. We asked Members to have their amendments in by 3 this afternoon and second-degrees filed by 5 p.m. My point to colleagues is that there is still much to be done

with this bill if your interest is voting on amendments.

I wish to repeat something that the majority leader commented on when we came into session just a little bit ago. We were on this bill just 2 months ago, and at that time there was a grand total of zero amendments that we voted on—zero. So now, as I mentioned, we have at least three that have been incorporated into the bill already—two sense of the Senate, one on climate, one on the oil spill liability trust fund, and one on energy efficiency. Again, there are some 140 to 150 amendments that have been filed.

I am glad we have this process going on. I am glad to see these amendments. For those who suggest that somehow or other the majority is closing down the opportunity for debate or to offer amendments, all we need to do is look where we were 2 months ago. Two months ago this bill had zero amendments. Fast forward to today, and we have had votes on 24 amendments to this bill. We have adopted at least 3 of those amendments, and again there are some 140-odd amendments that are out there.

I want us to get through this measure, and I wish to do so in a way that is respectful to the process, respectful to Members, and that dignifies this institution. We have a lot out there, and I recognize that.

I have had Members from both sides of the aisle ask me: How do I get my amendment pending? How do I get it to the point so it can be considered? We will be working on that issue tonight and into the morning.

I thank my colleague from Washington because I do think we have truly been trying to work in good faith.

My colleague from North Dakota has a few words on the process, and then I would like to reclaim my time for just a few more moments, if I may.

With that, I turn the floor over to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the bill manager on our side of the aisle, the good Senator from Alaska, as well as the bill manager on the Democratic side, the Senator from the State of Washington, for working together and trying to get a list of all of the amendments and do everything possible to get them scheduled for a vote.

I ask that Members on both sides of the aisle work with the bill managers to try and get a list of amendments so they can be scheduled for a vote. As the Senator from Alaska said, we have already had at least 19 amendments. We know there are more amendments that Senators would like to have a vote on, and we appreciate and understand that. There has been a real effort to try to get those votes scheduled.

Again, I thank the bill managers for their hard work and ask that Members

on both sides of the aisle work with the bill managers to try and get those amendments identified where they need to have a vote and get them scheduled so we can get to the votes in a timely manner so Members can have as much information as possible ahead of time in order to consider their respective issues and have a vote.

We have to remember that in trying to go back to an open amendment process and regular order, there is some work on figuring out how to get that going and to do so in a bipartisan way, and of course we are working through it on this legislation.

A final point: At the end of the day, we will be discussing more about this legislation, but it comes down to how the individual Members of this body feel about this underlying legislation. It is about energy, jobs, economic growth, and national security at a time when energy security for our country is so very important. Again, this goes to the underlying merits.

Let's see if we can't get these amendments scheduled and vote on them and move this along as well as we can this week and get that done. It is not only important for this legislation, but we want to have that same kind of open process with other legislation as well. It is about getting the work done for the American people.

With that, I yield back to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his leadership on this issue. He has been persistent, diligent, and very articulate as we have moved through the process, and I appreciate that a great deal.

I thought I was going to be spending the vast majority of my time this week going through each of these many amendments that Members have presented. As I mentioned, we have 140-plus amendments. But my attention on Keystone and the issues in front of us was dramatically pulled away because of an announcement by the administration which I learned of late on Friday evening, and which was the first announcement today.

The fact is I am not in a very good mood right now. I am not in a very good mood, and I think it is probably true to say that most Alaskans are not in a very good mood, because folks back home woke up Sunday morning to the news that this President effectively declared war on our economic future in the State of Alaska.

I know those are pretty hard words. It has been suggested by some in the administration that perhaps I am overreacting. Let me tell my colleagues, when our economic opportunities as a State, which lie in our natural resources, are denied us as a State and the promises that were made when we entered the Union—the compact we

made—we are now not able to see those promises, then there is nothing else. There is no other way to describe it than that it is a war on our economic future.

We have winter going on in Alaska right now. In my hometown where I went to high school, I think it was about 30 below this weekend. Up on the North Slope, temperatures are about 60 degrees below zero. It is pretty cold.

The President, in his video where he made his announcement that he is moving to put the Arctic Coastal Plain in de facto wilderness, described the area in the North Slope as fragile, that the wildlife is fragile. I will tell my colleagues, the area in the coastal plain, the area in ANWR is an amazing place. It is a special place, as are so many places in Alaska. It is an amazing place. I am blessed to call it home. But the President decided on Sunday that this was the perfect day to announce his unilateral decision to manage the Arctic Coastal Plain as de facto wilderness.

Now the coastal plain—and I don't have my maps, but we are going to be seeing a lot of maps of Alaska and ANWR coming up here. The coastal plain is the area on the very northern part of the State, and it is part of the nonwilderness portion of ANWR. People need to understand that ANWR is a huge area. It is 19.7 million acres. It is an area the size of the State of South Carolina. There are portions of ANWR that have been designated as wilderness and they were designated as wilderness back in 1980, along with other areas in the State of Alaska that were designated as wilderness. In fact, so much wilderness—close to 60 million acres of wilderness designated in 1980—so much so that there is actually a provision in the law, in ANILCA, that says, that is enough. Alaska has given enough, in the sense that more than half of the wilderness area in the United States of America is in Alaska. That is, Alaska has more than half of all of the other wilderness in all of the remaining 49 states. Alaska has more than half. So the sense was there will be no more wilderness declarations in Alaska. Yet, the President announces Sunday that, in addition to the coastal plain, effectively all of the balance of ANWR will be managed as wilderness.

So what does this mean to a State such as Alaska? Again, history is going to be important in this discussion going forward because the area in the coastal plain—the 1002 area—and it is designated as such because of a section in the law—the coastal plain was specifically set aside in 1980 for further study of its oil and gas potential. So a decision was made back in 1980 where we had more than 100 million acres in Alaska that were turned into Federal law, but it was recognized that this area—that 1.57 million acres—was unique because of its resource potential. It was identified in law as such.

And it said, We are going to reserve this. We are going to study it for its oil and gas potential.

Then, in the 1980s, the Reagan administration did just that. They studied the coastal plain and they recommended that it be open to responsible energy development. Ever since then we have been seeking permission to open up just 2,000 acres on the coastal plain for that very purpose—for oil and gas exploration.

We are not talking about opening up the full coastal plain. We are not talking about touching any of the area that was designated as wilderness in 1980. We are talking about a development that would have an impact on an estimated surface area of 2,000 acres in a 1.57-million acre area that has been set aside specifically for this.

So when we think about what that means, we learn that 2,000 acres is .1 percent of the entire 1002 area. It is .01 percent of ANWR. When we put it into context, 99.9 percent of ANWR would remain untouched if all we were seeking to do was to access the 2,000 acres.

We also know that if we were able to access this small area within the coastal plain that we can gain access to an estimated 10.3 billion barrels of oil. If we produce oil at that rate of 1 million barrels a day, it will last almost 30 years.

Right now we have an oil pipeline in Alaska, the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline, which bisects the State 800 miles from the North Slope down to Valdez, and it has been doing a fine job of providing resources to the country in an environmentally sound and safe manner. It is an engineering miracle. It is fabulous. What it lacks right now is more oil in the pipe. We are less than half full. So the State of Alaska is being aggressive in looking for how we might not only fill up the pipe to help Alaska and to help the country and to bring about jobs and bring about revenues, but how we can do so in a responsible manner.

We think we have some pretty high standards in Alaska, and we need to. This is extreme environment. It is tough working there right now, let me tell my colleagues. They don't shut down because it is cold. In fact, this is the only time of the year they can explore out there, because the environmental safeguards are such that we can't take exploration rigs out on the tundra in the summer where it might leave a mark. No. We wait until it is the coldest, the darkest, and the ground is frozen as far as it possibly can. So this is the time of year that we are hoping to be able to do more.

But what this President is doing is not only saying no to that 2,000 acres we are seeking to access that will be bringing us a million barrels a day, potentially, for 30 years and allowing for jobs and a resource—no to that 2,000 acres—he would say no forever. He would not only say no to oil and gas de-

velopment, but no to anything else. No road, no airstrip, no nothing.

The President is saying the Congress has to make this decision, and in fairness, that is true. It is only the Congress that can make that decision to convert the coastal plain to permanent wilderness. But the reality is he has made this decision, and he has made it without us. What happens under this comprehensive conservation plan—this CCP—this area is now immediately treated as wilderness, with or without our approval. So that designation may not be there, but how is it being treated? It is being treated as wilderness.

I would assert this is in clear violation of the “no more wilderness” clause—the “no more” clause in ANILCA. It is so frustrating. It is so infuriating to think that we acknowledged that some 30 years ago, when ANILCA was passed, and that recognition—when so much of the State of Alaska was put off limits to any form of development, to place it in wilderness status and to have the Federal Government agree that we had done our part, that we had contributed enough of our lands.

The Presiding Officer is from a State that has wide open spaces. What do we do as a State if we have so much of our State—66 percent of the State of Alaska that is federally held? And we all know there are different aspects to Federal public lands. BLM lands mean something, Park Service means something, refuge status means something, and wilderness status means something else altogether. So when we acknowledged and the Federal Government acknowledged no more in Alaska, we thought that would be respected. We thought that might be respected. But, apparently, this President is going to choose to ignore it.

My colleagues can tell this is an argument and a debate I feel very strongly about, and I feel very strongly about it because I have been living with it my entire adult life. For as long as I can remember, we have been talking about how might it be possible to look into these extraordinary reserves and resources that we know are in the 1002 area. There have been highs and there have been lows. Back in 1995, when it was my father and Ted Stevens who were working this issue, they were able to successfully get it through the Congress only to have it vetoed by President Clinton. And then 10 years later, it was Senator Stevens and myself who were able to get it so close; we were one vote shy in the Senate. The House has passed ANWR, I believe Congressman YOUNG told me today, on 12 separate occasions. Now we are back yet another 10 years later. So maybe this is an issue that keeps coming back every 10 years.

This wasn't the worst part of the news I was dealing with this weekend. At the same time I was given a heads-

up that the administration was going to be releasing this CCP—this comprehensive conservation plan that will treat ANWR as wilderness—I was told that we are going to see the announcement of the administration's 5-year lease/sale plan. That is substantial for us. As folks know, we have been trying to advance the leases that have been sold in the Beaufort and in the Chukchi for some period of time, and it has been a tortured process, as many people know. But what we are told is that with the lease/sale that will be announced, portions of the Beaufort Sea and the Chukchi Sea will be indefinitely withdrawn from the next 5-year plan for the Outer Continental Shelf which, again, is due to be released.

I think it is important to know we have had deferrals off of our coasts in the Beaufort and the Chukchi, but these are no longer going to be deferrals. They are going to be withdrawals, which means that not only will they not be included in this lease sale from 2017 to 2022, but they will stay in place until such time—it is an indefinite withdrawal—as the next President, whoever he or she may be, should decide to change it. It is different than a withdrawal.

What it then says to us is, okay, no, we are going to lock up ANWR permanently so that the resources that may be available to you—as much as a million barrels a day coming down through your pipeline to supply this country—no, put that off limits, and, oh, the offshore you want to try to advance, we are going to make it a little more difficult because we are going to take these areas and we are not going to include them in this 5-year lease sale. In fact, we are going to indefinitely withdraw them.

This could have significant impact on our ability to access the estimated 23 billion barrels of oil of Alaska's North Slope. Again, when we are talking about how we are going to fill up that pipeline, we have been working toward those opportunities offshore. But there is a third gut punch to Alaska that is coming—a third.

Remember, all these were supposed to be unveiled this week. What a week.

First, close off ANWR permanently.

Second, make the offshore that much more difficult.

And third is in the area where all those who said no to wilderness, go over to the National Petroleum Reserve, that is where you should be accessing this oil. Well, okay, that is where folks are going. ConocoPhillips is trying to access some leases in the National Petroleum Reserve. These are leases that were awarded in 1998, so more than a few years to be working through all of the issues here.

What we learned was that the terms and conditions of the mitigation that are going to be required by the Department of the Interior to allow Conoco to

proceed with the alternative that would allow for a short road to access the pad, those mitigation costs and other requirements are going to be so much that the project will no longer be economic.

Think about it. Years in the process and the permitting and the cost that goes into it, years to get there.

I don't think most people know—do you realize how much oil is produced on Federal lands in Alaska? It is a real easy answer because it is a big fat zero. There is none. There is no oil that is produced on Federal lands. We have been trying to make it happen.

We have been going to the National Petroleum Reserve because we have been put off limits with ANWR. It hasn't been made permanent wilderness. We haven't been able to access it because that too takes permission from Congress. So the whole area where our State has these resources—these reserves, ANWR to the east, Beaufort, Chukchi offshore, National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska—what this administration is doing is saying this “all of the above” strategy for an energy plan for America, we are starting to think in Alaska that means everybody but Alaska.

I just can't articulate the anger, the frustration. As I tried to convey my thoughts to the Secretary, I said, I am just not sure if this administration doesn't care about Alaska and its people at all or whether you even think of us. But I have come to the conclusion that they still view us as a territory, a place where you could come in and do what you will because you are a territory. Well, we are not a territory. We are 1 of the 50 States. We are one of those stars on that flag. Last time I checked, we had just as many rights as any other star on that flag.

What is coming at my State and the arrogance with which this administration is treating us is unacceptable, and it will not stand. Everybody wants to know, what are you going to do about it? What are you going to do about it? I am going to make sure that people understand who we are, that people understand that there are human beings who live in the 1002 area. You are going to take an area and declare it wilderness. People live there. Children go to school there. Yes, we actually have a polar bear watch to make sure the kids don't leave their homes early in the morning to go to school when it is still dark, and there might be a polar bear out there.

Things are different in Alaska, but we still live there. We still want a quality of life for the people that is not unlike what we would have here. We don't want to have communities where we still have no sanitation facilities, where people are hauling their human waste in a bucket in the corner of the house and dumping it in a lagoon. We don't want to be in that situation. But

you know what, it seems as though we have to get permission to do anything, and that permission is routinely denied. Or if it is denied, they delay it indefinitely so that it adds to your cost.

We pay more for our energy. We pay more to keep warm in the State of Alaska than you do anywhere else. You might say, of course, it is colder up there. You know, back here it is going to be cold in New York. There is nobody in New York who is paying \$10 a gallon for fuel like the people in Kobuk are paying. There is nobody in Massachusetts who is going to get hit by this storm and it is going to be cold and is paying \$7.50 for fuel like the people in Fort Yukon are paying.

We live there because we want to live in Alaska. It is an amazing place. We make a lot of sacrifices. But one of the sacrifices that we won't make, one of the things we will not give up, is to be treated like some second-class citizens, to be treated like a territory that has no rights. So when we are full participants and we say there are special places in Alaska that should be wilderness—and we signed off on that in 1980—then negotiate with us. Talk to us about what happens next.

But I made the statement—again, it is harsh words, but I have suggested that this administration is one that is willing to negotiate with Iran, but they are not willing to negotiate with Alaskans. Those days are over. Those days are over.

We have some issues to deal with in front of us right now as we move through the legislation in front of us. We have been focused on energy for a good couple of weeks-plus now. I am glad of that. I am glad we are going to be able to work through a process where we can move through some of these amendments. But know that the words I have spoken tonight on the floor are words that come from my heart as an Alaskan.

This is not about politics. This is not about me being able to wield some muscle because I have the gavel in the Interior appropriations committee. This is about Alaska as a State and our rights as a State. This is about a compact that was made with the State of Alaska, about how we would be able to use and access our lands, how we would be able to care for the people who call Alaska home. This is pure passion that drives my comments, and my comments will be echoed not only by the full Alaska delegation, as small as we are, but by our Governor, by our legislature, by our elected officials, by people who live all around the State, including the people who live in the coastal plain in ANWR.

This is serious, and Alaskans are going to take this very seriously. You will be hearing a lot more from us.

With that, I thank my colleagues for the indulgence of time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. May I first inquire of the distinguished bill manager whether I may take a moment to seek to call up an amendment or whether they have present business they need to attend to on the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I was going to give some comments in addition to my colleague from Alaska about the process and where we are and respond to some of the comments she has made. If the Senator from Rhode Island could wait a few minutes, is that possible?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Happily.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Point of inquiry: Do I understand that the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to make his amendment pending or just speak to the amendment?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I simply wish to make my amendment pending, and at a convenient time I would like to do that. There was a bit of an aura of good feeling on the floor when the distinguished chairman of the energy committee and distinguished Senator from North Dakota were discussing an orderly approach for getting the amendments pending. Since then, we have heard a good deal about frustration and anger and a bad mood, so I am not sure—maybe a little time to revert to that previous aura might not be in order, but I am only seeking to get my amendment pending.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I do know the Senator from Washington and I were hoping to get a plan and a proposal for colleagues so that they would better understand how we might proceed tomorrow. And because we haven't had that opportunity to do that as of yet, I would like the chance to consult with Senator CANTWELL here. My concern is that if we start getting all these amendments pending right now before we reach some kind of a path forward, it could get complicated.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Rather than face an objection to my unanimous consent request, I will defer it until the chairman and her ranking member have a chance to go through that process, and I will come back at an appropriate time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. We are here tonight because we haven't ended debate on the Keystone Pipeline bill. We haven't ended debate because our colleagues voted to not end debate on this important measure, and I think for good reason.

Our colleagues from both sides of the aisle got to offer amendments last week, to discuss them, and have a chance to vote on them. I would say

this is a very different process from what happened in December, where basically an up-or-down vote was going to be given on a process.

So I am glad my colleagues—like from Michigan where they had a major tar sands spill in their State—who want to offer amendments on pipeline safety can do so. I want my colleagues to be able to offer amendments as it relates to security and safety, particularly when it relates to safe drinking water and the issues of the pipeline.

Since this bill has been introduced, two major pipeline spills have been discovered. So just within the time we have been on this bill, 3 million gallons of brine spilled from a pipeline in North Dakota. That was discovered on January 6, the same day we started with this bill being introduced.

On Friday North Dakota officials discovered that the contamination from the spill reached the Missouri River. So on January 17, 30,000 gallons of oil were spilled into the Yellowstone River, a different incident, from a pipeline that broke in Eastern Montana. It temporarily shut down drinking water services for 6,000 people in Glendive, MT. So you bet these issues are important to me, and they are important to my colleagues. I hope we do not have to rush through the process of having a vote on these amendments. I think all of my colleagues see the Thursday night event, where the discussion was, let's get four or five amendments or six pending amendments and then coming back 1 hour later to table them is not the kind of legislative process we are used to here.

I hope in the next couple of days my colleague and I can work on these in a much more productive fashion, with the list of amendments that Members want to offer and a timely way to debate them. Hopefully my colleague from Alaska and I could actually work with our colleagues, and either get some of them accepted or work for a vote schedule that would actually allow us to have the vote and have the debate as opposed to tabling.

This Senator is not arguing that any side does not have a right to table an amendment. I am simply saying: I think colleagues want to know what the process is going to be and whether they can discuss this.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a story that is about one of those pipeline spills. It is about the Federal Government issuing warnings to the pipeline company in November about the concerns regarding those spills.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From EnergyWire, Jan. 23, 2015]

FEDS ISSUED WARNING TO PIPELINE COMPANY
IN NOVEMBER

(By Mike Soraghan)

Federal officials issued a warning late last year to the owner of the Montana pipeline

that contaminated a city's drinking water for keeping poor records about the condition of the system.

And the owners of the Poplar pipeline have had at least seven pipeline spills since early 2008, records show, along with other spills at production facilities.

Bridger Pipeline LLC officials say the warning letter from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration is unrelated to the leak of 50,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River.

"I don't believe there is a link between that letter and what we're dealing with," said Bridger spokesman Bill Salvin. "That seems to be a difficult connection to make."

A thick layer of ice on the river is hampering cleanup efforts centered on Glendive, Mont., where the water treatment plant was shut down after cancer-causing benzene was detected in supplies.

Crews have recovered about 10,000 gallons of oil from the rupture directly beneath the river, about 50 feet from the south shore.

The spill's cause remains unclear, but oil sheens have been reported as far away as Williston, N.D.

The warning letter last year resulted from a 2012 inspection by federal officials. Chris Hoidal, director of PHMSA's Western Region, wrote that the company had conducted 24 inspection digs for external anomalies, but then employees failed to note the condition of the pipeline as required.

Salvin said that "steps have been taken" to address the concerns laid out in the letter. "We take all requirements very seriously," he said.

Federal officials have undertaken another inspection in connection with the record-keeping, in addition to the spill investigation.

The warning came about six years after a spill that led to a more serious enforcement action by PHMSA. The agency said that the company failed to accurately update its reports on a May 2008 spill from the pipeline.

In the same enforcement action, PHMSA charged that Bridger failed to perform a pressure test on tubing installed at a pipeline station in 2007 and 2008.

The agency also alleged that the company was too slow to review its emergency operations manuals and failed to keep up on inspections. The company paid a \$45,000 fine.

This image was taken from a drone surveying the ice slotting oil containment trench carved in the ice of the Yellowstone River near Crane, Mont. Photo courtesy of Unified Spill Command.

The company also paid a \$100,000 fine in an enforcement action brought in 2005 regarding the qualifications of its personnel.

PHMSA inspections also led to two other enforcement actions in September 2005 and February 2007 that did not lead to fines.

Montana records show that Bridger Pipeline had two spills in 2009, another in 2010 and a fourth in 2012. The total released in the four spills was about 3,300 gallons of crude oil.

In August, a gasket failure caused a Bridger pipeline to spill about 4,000 gallons of crude in Mountrail County, N.D.

In addition, another company's 6-inch fuel line was broken during excavation of a new pipeline by Bridger on Sept. 1, 2014, in McKenzie County, N.D. Dry natural gas was released to the atmosphere, but inspectors noted that it could have led to an explosion.

Bridger is part of Casper, Wyo.-based True Oil LLC. In May 2014, True's Belle Fourche pipeline ruptured, spilling 25,000 gallons of crude oil into an ephemeral drainage near

Casper, according to federal records. The oil traveled about 3 miles in the drainage.

True Oil's production operations have had at least 16 spills since early 2009 in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado and North Dakota, according to state records. The largest was a spill of more than 30,000 gallons of oil and wastewater in 2011 in Campbell County, Wyo.

Ms. CANTWELL. To me this is an issue where we have had some debate about the pipeline and the oilspill liability trust fund. I would hope we would come back to that issue because these issues about spills and safety and security should be part of the debate. But I go back to the larger issue which is I hope we turn down this legislation overall.

To me all of the issues we are talking about, whether it is about safe drinking water, whether it is about oilspills and the requirements on these companies or if it is about whether TransCanada can take U.S. property under eminent domain or whether it is about the route itself, all of these questions in my mind are premature for us, the Congress, to decide.

Over 60 percent of the American people say they want this pipeline decided in a normal process. They want the State Department, in this instance because it crosses a border, to be the entity that determines national interest. So I do not want to predetermine that when there are so many important issues to be negotiated. The very company that wanted to negotiate with the State Department on this pipeline was negotiating some of the original routing. Yet at the very time the State Department was telling them the original routing would not work, they were here trying to persuade Members to vote for the authority to override the President and to give that routing, which we now know was flawed.

I do not want to be premature about this. I do not want to be premature about cutting off debate. I want to get to these amendments before us and get the bill done with the input of my colleagues, given that the debate was brought up to the floor.

If you ask me what I want to debate, I would be debating some other legislation because I do not think this bill is going to be signed by the President of the United States.

I would be debating energy tax policy on clean energy items. I would be debating other things that I think would be impacting more our energy strategy for the future, our economy, and job creation. I think there are a lot of those out there. I hope my colleague from Alaska and I, once this debate is over with, will be able to sit down and talk about these issues, in a bipartisan fashion, and work with the committee.

In 2007, we passed the Energy Independence and Security Act out of the energy committee on a bipartisan basis. It was landmark legislation that unleashed a lot of investment. It unleashed investment in making sure we

had higher fuel efficiency cars in our country, which was good for the consumer because they got a car that got more mileage. It made investments in things such as the smart grid and other energy infrastructure.

I hope that is what we will get back to, because when I look at what is happening—I know my colleague from Alaska just talked about some of these issues as it related to Alaska. I know she means what she says when she says she is speaking from the heart and working hard for Alaskans. I visited Alaska with her and my colleague, then-Senator-from-Alaska Mark Begich. I visited many parts of Alaska.

I understand. Alaskans want to have an economic opportunity. They want their energy to be cheaper. I would say I am empathetic to the issue because we have five refineries in the State of Washington. We are the fifth largest refining State in the Nation. A lot of our oil comes from Alaska. So I can tell you that people in the Northwest are furious that even though we have those refineries—so a lot of refining capacity and the oil comes from Alaska—we still have some of the highest gas prices in the Nation. Many times we have asked for various investigations about why we have the highest gas prices in the Nation and why this issue continues to plague us.

I know my colleague, when she speaks about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or ideas about more drilling, that it is about getting more oil supply. But more oil supply from Alaska has not helped Washington consumers have cheaper gasoline prices.

So I want to continue to diversify our economy off of fossil fuels and onto other things. I hope we will get a chance to work on an energy bill that does that. If I could just address for a couple of minutes the issue of the President's decision to move forward on a plan that would help preserve the Arctic wildlife refuge as wilderness. My colleague from Alaska mentioned this issue is something that has been going on for some time. She is right.

The predecessors that she and I—the former chair of the energy committee, Scoop Jackson, and the former late Senator Ted Stevens—everybody has been a part of this. I actually was here at a pretty dramatic floor debate on this issue in 2005, in which some people wanted to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for drilling, even to the degree that they put that as a rider on the Defense bill. We were able to stop that. I think that was the will of Congress, that they did not want to see drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

But we have had this discussion since 1960, when Dwight Eisenhower set aside originally 9 million acres, and in 1980, thanks to the work of Scoop Jackson, Congress passed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act,

which expanded the refuge to 19 million acres.

I have visited the refuge. I do believe it is a critical habitat for wildlife and the Gwich'in people who called this the sacred place where life begins. It is truly special. I do think we have had many discussions about this. This action probably will not be the last of them, but I do applaud the President for taking the Arctic refuge, which is habitat for 45 different species of land animals, 36 different species of fish, 180 species of birds—and has the greatest variety of plant and animal life of any park or refuge in the polar Arctic. I do believe it is an ecosystem and an ecosystem that is unlike anything else we have in the United States.

So I am proud the President has taken what has been a refuge that was lacking a plan and has now put a wilderness plan in place or the elements of what it will take to preserve those various species and animals and that very special place.

I know my colleague feels very strongly about the President's announcement. I think a refuge plan that is based on science and public comment—we have had a plan, but this is the first plan to say we are going to protect this area. It recommends 12 million acres of refuge, including the coastal plain as wilderness. It is one of the most pristine and unique public places.

I am confident America can meet our energy needs without opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I am convinced we can come up with an energy strategy that is much more compelling for the future of the United States, one in which we can lead and one in which we can help other countries, whether it is what the President did with China in getting an agreement or working with India or all the things we are doing to try to be a leader in what is energy efficiency and ways to impact the marketplace so consumers can look for cleaner, more efficient uses of fuel.

So this is going to be a continuing debate in this Congress between a 19th century view of energy policy and a 21st century view of energy policy. I would ask my colleagues to think about these countries the President has just recently visited. He went to China. No one thinks China's air standard is what we should have in the United States. India has had its own challenges. They have hundreds of millions of people who are without electricity needs.

So the question is whether these sources of energy are going to be that solution, whether a dirty source of fossil fuel is going to be the solution or whether we can work together on cleaner energy solutions. I think we can do that.

In fact, I am excited the United States can be a leader in these technologies, which will result in more job

growth, just as those previous energy bills did when we worked together for higher fuel efficiency standards, for more energy efficiency, to come up with more sources of diversified fuel. I am very confident we are going to, in the next few years, usher in a new era of aviation.

We have already proven we can fly airplanes with a 50-50 drop in jet fuel. We now have to prove we can manufacture those large sources and get planes flying on that. What a great accomplishment that will be in reducing carbon emissions and giving the flying public and those airlines something that is much more affordable than what we have been dealing with for the last 10 or 15 years.

I look forward to my colleague and I working tomorrow—some tonight and a little bit starting early tomorrow—on how we move forward with this legislation. I know my colleague and I see a path forward. Similar to any two people who are trying to manage a bill on the floor, we also know we have all of our colleagues to work with because nothing in the Senate operates unless it operates through our process and working collaboratively or, I should say, it can work, it is just going to take a very long time.

So we pledge to work in the next few days to try to get an amendment process that will not be prematurely cut off after 1 hour of a pending bill but will come to terms, and hopefully our colleagues will work with us to limit the number of those amendments and we can move forward to legislation that we think will help our economy grow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I know our colleague from Delaware is wishing to speak. If I may just proceed to do the closeout and he would be able to speak after that.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENTRAL ILLINOIS XPRESS BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the remarkable strength and spirit of the Central Illinois Xpress basketball team and its coach Tariq Toran.

As the only team of girls in an all-boys fifth grade basketball league in Springfield, IL, the Central Illinois Xpress has defied the odds and emerged as a powerhouse in the Illinois AAU boys' league. With an impressive record

of 8 wins and 2 losses in the first half of the season, Coach Toran and the Central Illinois Xpress girls have made a name for themselves not just back at home, but across the Nation.

Strong, confident, and determined, the team comprised of nine girls ages 10 and 11 years old do not shy away from hard work and tough competition on the basketball court. With a series of two-on-one drills coupled with push-ups and sprints, these girls know how to practice hard and play hard. The Xpress girls use their summers to compete in a higher division comprised of older girls, which helps prepare them to play against tough teams during the season.

This tireless preparation and fearless attitude brought Coach Toran to sign the girls up for the all-boys' league this year. So far, the team's success has been undeniable. With their dribble drives, crisp passes, and methodical game play, the Central Illinois Xpress players have racked up more than enough wins to show the boys, and the community, that they are a force to be reckoned with this season.

These girls know what it means to push themselves for excellence, to fight for something against the odds, and to prove themselves to those, including some of the boys they are playing, who don't expect a girls team to be strong and play smart, aggressive ball.

It is my pleasure to wish these fifth-grade girls in Springfield the best of luck in the second half of this season.

RECOGNIZING THE VERMONT STATE POLICE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, during the closing days of the 112th Congress, and for the duration of the 113th Congress, I had the privilege of serving the Senate as the President pro tempore. It of course was a great honor, and a humbling one, to serve the Senate and to represent Vermont in this position. With this designation, because of the matter of presidential succession procedures, I was assigned a security detail. I have spoken before about the outstanding work of the U.S. Capitol Police, and about how much Marcelle and I appreciate the sacrifices they made in the course of their service.

Today I want to thank the Vermont State Police for their outstanding service and steadfast support during my time as President pro tempore. With their extensive and comprehensive knowledge of Vermont's unique landscape and communities, the Vermont State Police coordinated with the U.S. Capitol Police and provided essential guidance, information and support. I thank them for their professionalism and dedication.

I would like to thank in particular Lieutenant Garry Scott who commands the Traffic Safety Unit of the Vermont State Police Department; Corporal

Owen Ballinger, who was an integral part of the everyday operations; Sergeant Teresa Randall; Sergeant Mark Perkins; Sergeant Trevor Carbo; Trooper Jerry Partin; and Trooper Dustin Robinson. These law enforcement officers were able to blend the requirement of a full security detail in unobtrusive ways that enabled us to go about our daily lives and to perform our responsibilities. These dedicated and courteous officers went above and beyond the call of duty, and for that Marcelle and I are infinitely grateful.

I also thank Colonel Thomas L'Esperance and Lieutenant Colonel Matt Birmingham for their constant support.

SELECTION OF HAROLD "HAL" COLSTON AS THE 2014 BURLINGTON FREE PRESS VERMONT OF THE YEAR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is a delight to call the Senate's attention to an outstanding Vermonter who was recently recognized for his work to help Vermonters who have struggled with social and economic injustice.

Since 1997, the Burlington Free Press has invited readers to nominate a Vermont resident to be recognized as Vermonter of the Year. Those nominated are among the best doers and visionaries the Green Mountain State has to offer, and each nominee has made a difference in his or her community. Previous winners have included philanthropists, college presidents, a former Governor and a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. On the eve of the New Year, the Burlington Free Press named Hal Colston the 2014 Vermonter of the Year.

Hal is a resident of Winooski and certainly deserves this honor. Since relocating to Vermont 25 years ago, Hal's dedication to social, economic, and racial justice has served his community well. He has maintained a steadfast voice for those unable to be heard on their own.

Hal is well known for his entrepreneurial spirit, and he has successfully created and led numerous nonprofit initiatives. In announcing Hal's selection, the Free Press aptly calls him a "serial do-gooder." He received national recognition after founding Good News Garage, which enables individuals and families to move away from poverty by providing reliable transportation. Similarly, he recognized that those in poverty are often without the support networks necessary to move beyond such vulnerable circumstances. As a result, he established NeighborKeepers, an organization that focuses on building supportive community networks that direct families toward the resources they need to succeed. Today he leads the Partnership for Change, a diverse group of community stakeholders seeking to remodel

the Burlington and Winooski School Districts by establishing a student-centered learning system.

As communities work to overcome the challenges of poverty and individuals pursue more prosperous lives for themselves and their families, it is the passionate dedication to serve by leaders such as Hal Colston that makes the greatest difference.

In recognition of Hal Colston's service, I ask unanimous consent that Aki Soga's article from the December 31, 2014, edition of the Burlington Free Press be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Dec. 31, 2014]

VERMONT OF THE YEAR: HAL COLSTON

You might call Hal Colston a serial do-gooder.

The Winooski resident has laid down a track record of work to improve the lives of people in the community during his 25-year tenure in Vermont.

Colston is best known as the founder of Good News Garage, the nonprofit that fixes donated vehicles for low-income people.

He also is known for launching NeighborKeepers, an initiative to help families in need build relationships with those who can provide the support they need.

He was instrumental in forcing Vermont to confront the issue of racial profiling by the police.

Colston says he sees every day as an opportunity to make a difference.

"We get them one at a time with no guarantee for tomorrow," he said. "May all of us spend our days wisely to improve the common good."

Colston's understated demeanor often belies his passion. He works to give voice to those who are unable to be heard on their own. He has shown the courage to tackle difficult issues.

Colston's quiet devotion to bringing the people together and looking out for those who find themselves in unfortunate circumstances especially stand out in a year that saw the streets of this country fill with protest—both peaceful and violent—against injustice.

For his years of service to the community in the name of social and economic justice, the Burlington Free Press editorial board names Hal Colston 2014 Vermonter of the Year.

In nominating Colston for Vermonter of the Year, Laban Hill of Winooski writes, "Hal has spent his life devoted to our community and making a difference in both small and large ways."

Colston's work with Good News Garage has earned him national recognition, including an appearance on the Oprah show. The idea is simple. For many, one of the bigger barriers to economic independence is the lack of reliable transportation. Good News Garage tackles that problem in the most direct way possible by awarding reliable cars to those in need.

Colston founded the organization in 1996 after meeting a Lutheran minister he had heard in Philadelphia shortly before moving to Vermont. That chance encounter led to developing an idea and seed funding from what he calls a pan-Lutheran organization. He launched the nonprofit under the wing of the Lutheran Social Services New England.

Nearly two decades later, Good News Garage has awarded more than 4,000 vehicles.

SECOND CAREER

His career in community service also includes a stint as associate director of Community Action in Burlington, now Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity, as executive director of the Vermont Commission on National and Community Service and as diversity coordinator for the social services nonprofit HowardCenter.

Colston also spoke out clearly and firmly when African-Americans in the community charged that local police were using racial profiling in stops.

In an April 2007 *My Turn* piece in the *Free Press*, Colston wrote, "I believe that racial profiling in Vermont is an epidemic," going on to recount his own experience with "driving while black."

Colston did more than complain. He worked to open a dialogue within the community, including the police, that allowed people to talk openly about issues surrounding race.

"We're building trust," he said. "I don't believe we will ever eradicate racism, but how do we heal from the wounds?"

All this was a major shift for a man who had made a career as a chef and restaurateur in Philadelphia, and arrived in Vermont in 1989 to become the director of catering at the New England Culinary Institute in Essex.

Colston called his career change a midlife crisis, but said the work put him in touch with his core values, "truth and justice."

Today, Colston is engaged in what is perhaps his biggest challenge to date. He serves as director of Partnership for Change, a collaboration between the Burlington and Winooski school districts. The mission is to re-imagine public education to better prepare students from diverse social, economic and cultural backgrounds to succeed in school, in their careers and as members of their communities.

"The reason I love Vermont is it's got its challenges. But it's really on a human scale. You can have a conversation," he said.

For his steady faith in the ability of each person to make a difference, and putting that faith to work in the service of his community, Hal Colston is the 2014 *Vermont* of the Year.

A NOMINATING LETTER

I would like to nominate Hal Colston for *Vermont* of the Year.

Hal is director of Partnership for Change, which is remodeling Burlington and Winooski school districts by establishing a student-centered learning system that enables all learners to develop skills, knowledge, and relationships necessary to become confident, motivated, and self-sufficient learners who are successful in college and careers and are engaged in their communities.

Hal and his team are changing the way education is delivered in our communities so that it is more rigorous and more equitable.

Over the years Hal has been an integral and essential part of our community. He founded Good News Garage, which is one of the first nonprofit social enterprise car donation programs in the U.S. He also founded NeighborKeepers, which was a community nonprofit that helped the generational poor become financially secure.

Hal has spent his life devoted to our community and making a difference in both small and large ways. He seems like the ideal candidate for the Burlington *Free Press's* *Vermont* of the Year. In addition, there

has never been a person of color who has been recognized as *Vermont* of the Year. It's about time.

There are so many people of color in Vermont who are making important contributions to our community. Now is the time to begin recognizing them.

LABAN HILL.

TRIBUTE TO LORENZO GOCO

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute and thank a dedicated and capable individual, Lorenzo Goco, who retired from the Senate on Friday after 20 years of expert service.

For the past 6 years, Lorenzo has served as the deputy staff director of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, SSCI. He has worked on the committee since 1995, when he was brought over by Senator Bob Kerrey. He has seen the highs and the lows of Senate life, and has made a valued contribution to the committee, to the Senate, and to the national security of the United States.

Since the beginning of my chairmanship of the committee in 2009, Lorenzo has been the heart of the Democratic staff. Without drawing attention to himself, he has gotten things done—whether it meant setting the schedule and wrangling agency witnesses to attend on short notice, assisting the intelligence community to see the wisdom of the committee's approach, or bridging the divide between the majority and minority in the rare case of disagreement, Lorenzo kept the committee on track and headed in the right direction.

As the deputy staff director, Lorenzo is responsible for everything but gets the credit for nothing. He has represented the SSCI at the weekly meeting of Democratic staff directors more often than the actual staff director, and he has had my full faith in representing the committee and me countless times. Often, a line of committee staffers will build in front of his door as people seek his advice on how to handle an issue or ask a question about a program.

Classification prevents me from relating on the Senate floor most of the projects that Lorenzo has contributed to or overseen in his time on the committee staff. But they include numerous reviews of CIA covert actions, reviews of acquisition programs by the National Security Agency and the National Reconnaissance Office, and the budget review of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Due to CIA's declassification of the underlying information, I can say that Lorenzo was part of the committee's excellent work in investigating CIA's role in a shootdown of a missionary plane in Peru. He was instrumental in the committee's report on the prewar intelligence assessments of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, and a constant force behind the staff's work

on the Study of CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program.

The committee's success in enacting six intelligence authorization bills in the past 6 years is in good measure a result of Lorenzo's work in drafting the legislation and the classified annexes they contain, working with other committees in the Senate and the House, and negotiating provisions with the executive branch.

There are plenty of congressional staff that are passionate advocates for aggressive action for this cause or that. Other staff focus on protecting their boss and as a result are more judicious and deliberate. Some are experts on process; some are experts on substance. Lorenzo is all of the above. His depth of experience on intelligence matters is unparalleled today in the Senate. He fights strongly for what he believes in, and has at times pushed me to be stronger on a cause than I might otherwise be. But he is always cool, calm, and collected, and manages to navigate the buffeting winds and tempestuous times that we face all too often.

I am sorry to see a key part of my team go, but I wish Lorenzo the best of luck. I have no doubt that he will have more time to spend with his wonderful wife Audrey and his three boys, whom I know are the source of unending pride, and perhaps the occasional bout of parental frustration. With any luck, they'll grow up like their father.

Thank you, Lorenzo, for your steadfast service.

RESTORING FULL TIME TO FORTY HOURS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks from last week's Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

RESTORING FULL-TIME TO FORTY HOURS

Let me start by telling some stories of what's happening in Tennessee:

In Murfreesboro, Tennessee, Middle Tennessee State University has started limiting hours for part-time workers. This means students can no longer accept multiple on-campus work assignments. And graduate assistants might have to wait tables instead of picking up extra on-campus grant-funded research projects that would better further their careers.

From its headquarters in Knoxville, Regal Entertainment Group, the nation's largest movie theatre chain, announced last year that it was cutting employee hours from 40 to below 30 in order to comply with Obamacare. According to a news report, "One Regal theatre manager [said] the move has sparked a wave of resignations from full-time managers who have seen their hours cut by 25 percent or more."

In Johnson City, Pam Cox, the director of finance for Johnson City Public Schools, told

a local news outlet about a year ago that her district will have to hire more people to work fewer hours. She said, "It'll be challenging to find people and it'll also hurt the employees because where they've been able to work as much as they wanted in these types of positions with no benefits attached to it now we're going to be saying, 'we can't let you work . . . even though you want to and you're good at your job, we can't give you the hours, give you the pay, because we can't afford to give you the insurance.'"

So why are these things happening in Tennessee—and in every other state across the nation?

Obamacare requires businesses with 50 or more full-time employees to provide health insurance to those employees or pay a penalty at tax time. That penalty is \$2,000 for each employee whom the government says should have been covered by an employer plan and \$3,000 for every employee who receives a subsidy in the exchange.

The law, passed without any Republican support, defined full-time as an employee who works more than 30 hours a week. It is a strange definition—one that sounds more like France than the United States.

The average American between the ages of 25–49 works 8.8 hours per day, or 44 hours per week, according to the American Time of Use Survey published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The Obamacare definition of full-time is nearly one-third lower.

Many businesses can't afford Obamacare's mandate and must reduce their number of full-time employees.

The result of all this is that thousands of workers are getting a pay cut. Their work schedules are being reduced to 29 hours a week and below.

This is not enough money for these workers to earn a living. Many must take second jobs.

A Hoover Institution study found the 30-hour definition puts 2.6 million working-age Americans with a median income under \$14,333 for individuals and \$30,000 for families at risk of losing jobs and hours. The study found:

89 percent of those affected don't have a college degree.

60 percent are between the ages of 19 and 34.

63 percent of those most at risk of lost hours are women, of which half have a high school diploma or less.

These are Americans who are often working one of their first jobs, trying to work their way up the economic ladder. You have to start with a lower-paying job, a job that doesn't require as many skills, and hope that someday your hard work will lead to a higher-paying one.

Many of these Americans are working in service industries, such as hospitality, retail and restaurants. But the Obamacare provision is affecting all kinds of employers.

In September 2014, Investor's Business Daily reported that at least 451 employers, county governments, public schools, community colleges and universities across the country have laid off staff or reduced employee work hours to comply with the new Obamacare definition of full time.

Our public schools can't charge higher prices to cover these mandates. They have to cut services like special education, coaches and bus drivers.

Three surveys published by Federal Reserve Banks in August found employers are increasing their proportion of part-time workers.

The Federal Reserve Banks of New York and Philadelphia specifically asked manufacturers what changes they had made because of Obamacare, and in both cities, nearly 1 in 5 respondents reported that they had increased their proportion of part-time workers.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta also surveyed businesses about changes in part-time employment and found that 25 percent of respondents currently have a higher share of part-time workers primarily because "full-time employee compensation costs have increased relative to those of part-time employees." More troubling is that 31 percent of respondents believe they will have more part-time workers 2 years from now.

There is bipartisan support for repealing this provision. This bill has 34 cosponsors—mostly Republicans, including every Republican member of this committee—but Senator DONNELLY and Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia, also a Democrat, support it.

Republicans have talked a lot about wanting to repair the damage of Obamacare. We have also talked about wanting to get results.

This bipartisan bill should be an important step to doing both.

In fact, this reminds me of why so many of us like being on this committee—because the issues we work on affect so many Americans.

When we talk about fixing No Child Left Behind, we're talking about 50 million children in 100,000 public schools.

When we talk about making it simpler to apply for a Pell Grant to go to college, we're talking about simplifying a form that 20 million families fill out each year.

When we talk about modernizing the Food and Drug Administration and making it easier for Americans to access lifesaving drugs, we're talking about something that affects nearly every American.

But today we are focused on 2.6 million Americans who are mostly low-income and at risk of losing jobs and hours.

I look forward to hearing what our witnesses have to say.

TRIBUTE TO COMMEMORATE THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE RELEASE OF THE IRAN HOSTAGES

MR. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate in the RECORD the anniversary of the release of the Iran hostages on this date in 1981.

Soon the Senate will be consumed by a great debate regarding the proper strategic approach our Nation must take to ensure that Iran does not develop a nuclear weapons capability. Tomorrow, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hear testimony from both State Department and the U.S. Treasury about the current state of play in negotiations with Iran. Next week, the Senate Banking Committee is meeting to consider perspectives on the strategic necessity of Iran sanctions that will further the debate. I, for one, welcome that important discussion, although I recognize that some of my colleagues hold views that are different from my own on how best to contain Iran.

There is, however, yet another important policy matter related to Iran that not only deserves but also de-

mands the unified, bipartisan support of every Senator. Thirty-four years ago today, January 20, 1981, 52 of our fellow American citizens returned home after a harrowing 444-day ordeal of being illegally held hostage in Iran. We sent these diplomats, Foreign Service personnel, along with officers and enlisted members of our Armed Forces, to Iran in service to our Nation as they were seeking only to strengthen ties between our two countries. There was even an American businessman involved. Nevertheless, they all paid dearly for this service by being forced to endure humiliating treatment, brutal interrogations, mental and physical torture, and even mock firing squad executions while their families suffered endless waiting and genuine fear of their loved ones' imminent demise.

Although their return was a joyous occasion for our entire Nation and we celebrated as one people honoring our heroes, those 444 days took a toll not only on the hostages but also on their family members—a toll that continues for many to this day. Unfortunately, we failed to recognize both the long-term impact their incarceration experience and ill treatment would have on many of them and the support they would need. In many instances, the results have been tragic. Among the former hostages and their families, there have been suicides, advanced PTSD-type depression, divorces, alcoholism, and drug dependency. Unfortunately, Phil Ward, a communications officer from Virginia who committed suicide in the fall of 2012, was one who never fully recovered from the cruelty of those events.

We must help to ease this burden and provide these brave Americans with the same measure of justice and healing our courts have already awarded to other hostage victims and their families. While the Algiers Accords, the document which secured the release, bars the former hostages and their families from legal action against Iran for the brutality they endured, to this day they remain not only the first victims of modern hostage-taking but the only Americans barred from seeking justice from Iran. The former hostages and their families have already waited more than three decades to experience the full support of the government they so heroically served and to see some accountability by their captors. Therefore, I will soon introduce legislation to compensate the hostages and their families by assessing penalties on those who continue to do business with Iran in violation of U.S. sanctions policy. This legislation, however, represents but one solution to an issue that is three decades overdue. Another or perhaps an additional option would be to strongly recommend that as a condition of the ongoing nuclear negotiations, such compensation come directly from "frozen" assets that for

more than a year now have been released to Iran at the rate of \$700 million a month.

Accordingly, I look forward to righting this injustice by working with any or all of my colleagues as we stand united in support of the former hostages and their families.

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the Penn State University Nittany Lions Women's Volleyball program for winning the 2014 National Collegiate Athletic Association, NCAA Championship.

Led by four returning starters and legendary coach Russ Rose, the Penn State University Nittany Lions concluded the 2014 season by defeating the Brigham Young University Cougars in straight sets to win the NCAA Championship. The Nittany Lions finished with a record of 36 wins and only 3 losses.

With the 2014 championship, the Nittany Lions have claimed six of the last eight NCAA Championships and seven overall in women's volleyball, setting the record for the most women's volleyball championships by a single program in history.

The 2014 Nittany Lions Women's Volleyball team brought together a group of student-athletes who excelled both on the court and in the classroom. For their efforts on the court, four Nittany Lions were selected to the AVCA Division I All-America team, with Senior Micha Hancock earning both First-Team All-American honors and becoming the fourth Nittany Lion in program history to earn AVCA DI National Player of the Year honors.

Special congratulations go to Junior Megan Courtney who was selected as the 2014 NCAA Tournament Most Outstanding Player and to Freshman Ali Frantti, who earned AVCA DI National Freshman of the Year honors.

Not to be outdone in the classroom, six Nittany Lions earned spots on the Fall Academic All-Big Ten list for their academic performances this season.

Today I want to recognize the significant contributions that the Penn State University Women's Volleyball team has made to collegiate athletics and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with Coach Russ Rose at the helm. I wish them all the best as they continue to lead by example for student-athletes everywhere and set the stage for the program's continued success into the future.

EDUCATING TOMORROW'S WORKFORCE ACT OF 2015

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today the United States ranks 12th in the world in the percentage of 25-34 year olds

achieving post-high school degrees. We need to make changes that help keep students engaged in their futures while also ensuring our educational programs are adequately preparing students for the jobs of the 21st century.

Career and technical education, CTE, programs are proven to help keep students more engaged in the classroom and less likely to drop out of high school, and to help meet the needs of high-growth, skill-intensive industries looking for the next generation of workers. The U.S. Department of Education announced that the average U.S. high school graduation rate is 80 percent, while the graduation rate for students in CTE concentrations is higher than 90 percent. 81 percent of high school dropouts say real-world learning opportunities would have kept them in school.

The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act is a major source of Federal support for the development of career and technical skills among secondary and postsecondary students. Last reauthorized in 2006, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act needs to be modernized to meet the demands of the 21st century workforce and ensure that students have access to the highest-quality CTE programs.

This is why I am pleased to introduce with my colleagues, Senator PORTMAN and Senator BALDWIN, the Educating Tomorrow's Workforce Act, which would amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act to raise the quality of CTE programs. This legislation defines what constitutes a rigorous CTE curriculum and requires Perkins grant recipients to incorporate key high-quality elements in their programs including credit-transfer opportunities; academic and technical skills assessments; training tools that align with today's industries; CTE-focused professional development for teachers, administrators, and counselors; and CTE curriculum alignment with local, regional, and State workforce demands. Additionally, the bill improves links between high school and postsecondary education to help ease attainment of an industry recognized credential, license, apprenticeship, or postsecondary certificate to obtain a job in a high-demand career field and promotes partnerships between local businesses, and other community stakeholders to create pathways for students through work-based learning opportunities.

When I was Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I worked on a number of educational issues, but one that I was most proud of was starting the Governor's Career and Technical Academies. At the start of my term as Governor we had nine academies. The Republican Governor who followed me continued the academies, and at the end of his term there were 23. The Edu-

cating Tomorrow's Workforce Act encourages these models and allows states and localities to use Perkins grant funding to establish CTE-focused academies.

I am proud to introduce this commonsense, bipartisan legislation to raise the quality of CTE programs and ensure that high-quality career and technical education helps students develop skills that meet the needs of 21st century employers.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DALTON VERNON MARTIN

• Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I wish to honor the memory and service of Dalton Vernon Martin, chief petty officer, U.S. Navy, Retired, and sheriff's deputy, East Baton Rouge Sheriff's Department, who passed away 4 years ago, on January 23, 2011. Mr. Martin devoted his life and career to the service of others which was evident in his combined 61 years of military and civil service to our great Nation and the Baton Rouge community.

Born in St. Francisville, LA, Mr. Martin first excelled as a high school boxer, compiling a record of 63 victories in 65 bouts. He dedicated that resolve and fighting spirit towards serving and defending his country, enlisting in the U.S. Navy to fight in World War II and the Korean war, including the Pacific battles of the Gilbert and Marshall Islands, Tarawa, and Okinawa. Mr. Martin served onboard the USS *Charleston*, USS *Taswell*, and the USS *Indianapolis*.

After a distinguished 38-year career in the Armed Forces, Mr. Martin retired from active duty and embarked on a new mission of service as a deputy of the East Baton Rouge Sheriff's Office. Here, Mr. Martin spent 23 years protecting his fellow citizens and upholding the rule of law.

Mr. Martin lived a life of service, but he never sought to label himself as the hero he truly was. He spoke honestly and openly about the fear and sadness that are inseparable from the glory and honor of serving in combat. He was grateful for the opportunities afforded by his service to visit the farthest reaches of the world, but he served for no other reason than to defend his country and one day return home to his beloved Louisiana.

If the measure of a person is by what they leave behind, then Mr. Martin sets a standard to which we should all aspire. His life's story is yet another testament to the strength and legacy of the "greatest generation." And for his wife Christy, his children Paul, John, and Susan, and his grandchildren Erin, Tristan, Madeleine, Jack, Lauren, and Caroline, his spirit and legacy live on. The country he helped to preserve as

the greatest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world remains forever grateful.●

TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW J. WATTS

● Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor Pastor Matthew Watts, a dear friend and a truly inspiring West Virginian whose ministry career spans more than three decades.

I have personally known Reverend Watts for many years now, and he truly embodies what it means to be a great West Virginian. He is a man of deep conviction and unwavering passion for justice. He is an uplifting force to many and a role model to many more.

I have known Pastor Watts for many years, and as the former Governor, the reverend would visit often and bring me his thoughts, suggestions, and ideas. I always appreciated his sincere candor and genuine interest in improving our state.

As a native of Mount Hope, located in beautiful Fayette County, Pastor Watts currently serves as senior pastor of the Grace Bible Church of Charleston. He is a graduate of the West Virginia Institute of Technology with a bachelor of science in civil engineering, which led to a 20-year career with the Union Carbide Corporation. His theological study and training from the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago and the Christian Research and Development Center in Philadelphia, combined with his years of experience in corporate America, have blessed him with a vitally unique perspective on economic development.

In December of 1996, he left Union Carbide to pursue his ministry and focus on community service projects. A year later, he established the HOPE Community Development Corporation, a nonprofit organization with the mission of empowering inner-city communities through spiritual renewal, education, employment training and economic development.

With this perspective, he developed Kingdom Management Consultants, which assists minority owned businesses with startup and expansion, as well as provides supportive strategies to those seeking employment.

His active community involvement has truly set the standard in West Virginia throughout the years. Much of his community service is still done through the HOPE Community Development Corporation, which now has a branch specifically for youth.

Reverend Watts always amazes me with his unique ability to relate to strangers. While he is strong in stature and his voice is so commanding, his approach is dynamic, sincere, and composed.

His years of unwavering service and leadership have certainly not gone unrecognized. In 1996, he received the

West Virginia Small Business Administration's Small Business Advocate of the Year Award. In 2002, Pastor Watts was awarded the Washington Times Foundation Leadership Award for Faith Based Organization of the Year. He was also the 2004 recipient of the Crown of Peace Award for Exemplary Leadership in Reconciliation and Peacemaking from the Inter-religious and International Peace Council.

Pastor Watts is a strong leader, mentor, and friend to so many within West Virginia. It takes a truly remarkable individual to accomplish so much in community service. Particularly now, having just celebrated Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day and as we near Black History Month, it is fitting that we should celebrate such an inspiring individual as Pastor Watts. His community service programs have empowered countless minority groups within our State and are sure to continue the tradition of excellence for many years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7. An act to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

The message also announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. AMASH of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN of Minnesota, Mr. HANNA of New York, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona, and Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7. An act to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-371. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Final Sequestration Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-372. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Children and Families (Family Support), Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-373. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund, ETC Annual Reports and Certifications, Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 160(c) from Obsolete ILEC Regulatory Obligations that Inhibit Deployment of Next-Generation Networks" ((RIN3060-AF85) (FCC 14-190)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-374. A communication from the Acting Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Call Completion" ((RIN3060-AJ89) (FCC 14-175)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-375. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernizing the E-rate Program for Schools and Libraries, Connect America Fund" ((RIN3060-AF85) (FCC 14-189)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 21, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-376. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0567)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-377. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD656) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-378. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Framework Action to Modify the Commercial Annual Catch/Limit Annual Catch Target Regulations for Three Individual Fishing Quota Species Complexes" (RIN0648-BE23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-379. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Transshipment, Port Inspection, and Vessel Identification" (RIN0648-BE12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-380. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2015 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts" (RIN0648-XD688) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-381. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and State Grants Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Mexican Wolf" (RIN1018-AY00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-382. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and State Grants Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision to the Regulations for the Nonessential Experimental Population of the Mexican Wolf" (RIN1018-AY46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-383. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the Western Distinct Population Segment of the Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*)" (RIN1018-AY53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-384. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Foreign Species Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Straight-Horned Markhor as Threatened With a Rule Under Section 4(d) of the ESA" (RIN1018-AY42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-385. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds" (RIN1018-AZ80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-386. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Late-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations" (RIN1018-AZ80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-387. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2014-15 Late Season" (RIN1018-AZ80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-388. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Gunnison Sagegrouse" (RIN1018-AX71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-389. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for Gunnison Sagegrouse" (RIN1018-AZ20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. Res. 39. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 250. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit threats against former Vice Presidents and members of their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 251. A bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 252. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless a statement on tax transparency is provided in the bill; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 253. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 254. A bill to lower health premiums and increase choice for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 255. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. Res. 39. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 40. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States and others to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 41. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2014 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the

basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 73

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 73, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction.

S. 85

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 85, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a simplified income-driven repayment plan, and for other purposes.

S. 108

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 108, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve access for students to Federal grants and loans to help pay for postsecondary, graduate, and professional educational opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 143

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes.

S. 158

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 158, a bill to authorize health insurance issuers to continue to offer for sale current group health insurance coverage in satisfaction of the minimum essential health insurance coverage requirement, and for other purposes.

S. 165

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 165, a bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide

prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 168

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 168, a bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of major revenue legislation.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 35

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from

California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISC), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 35, a resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

AMENDMENT NO. 48

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 48 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 92

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 92 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 251. A bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce with my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, the Prescribe a Book Act. I thank Senators MARKEY, STABENOW, and WARREN for joining us as original cosponsors of this bipartisan bill.

Literacy skills are the foundation for success in school and in life. Developing and building these skills begins at home, with parents as the first teachers. Children who are read to frequently at home are more likely to become frequent readers themselves in later years. Indeed, according to Scholastic's Kids and Families Reading Report, among children ages 6–11, 60 percent of frequent readers, those who read 5–7 days per week for fun, were read to aloud by a parent 5–7 times per week before they entered kindergarten. This highlights the important role that parents play in building their children's literacy skills.

To help support the parental role in literacy, the Prescribe a Book Act

would create a federal pediatric early literacy grant initiative based on the long-standing, successful Reach Out and Read program. The program would award grants on a competitive basis to high-quality nonprofit entities to train doctors and nurses to discuss with parents the importance of reading aloud to their children and to give books to children at pediatric check-ups from 6 months to 5 years of age, with a priority for children from low-income families. It builds on the relationship between parents and medical providers and helps families and communities encourage early literacy skills so children enter school prepared for success in reading.

I was pleased to see last year that the American Academy of Pediatrics, AAP, recognized the important role that pediatric providers play in enhancing children's literacy skills. In a policy statement, AAP recommended that pediatric providers promote early literacy development for children from birth to at least kindergarten entry, including by counseling parents on the importance of reading to their children and through providing age-appropriate books to high-risk, low-income young children.

Evidence shows that the pediatric literacy model works. Research published in peer-reviewed, scientific journals has found that parents who have participated in the Reach out and Read program are significantly more likely to read to their children and include more children's books in their home, and that children served by the program show an increase of 4-8 points on vocabulary tests. I have seen up close the positive impact of this program on children and their families when visiting a number of Rhode Island's Reach Out and Read sites. Building on existing efforts, which in the past have been supported by Federal funding included in the appropriations process and distributed by the Department of Education, and matched by tens of millions of dollars from the private sector and State governments, the Prescribe a Book Act would establish a formal authorization modeled on this type of successful public-private partnership. By so doing, it would leverage Federal dollars to expand pediatric literacy initiatives so that more young children reap the developmental benefits of having books at home and being read to by their parents.

I urge our colleagues to join us in co-sponsoring the Prescribe a Book Act, and to work to include its provisions in the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 252. A bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless a statement on tax transparency is provided in the bill; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 252

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Tax Transparency Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. TAX EFFECT TRANSPARENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 102 the following:

"§ 102a. Tax effect transparency

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Each Act of Congress, bill, resolution, conference report thereon, or amendment there to, that modifies Federal tax law shall contain a statement describing the general effect of the modification on Federal tax law.

"(b) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A failure to comply with subsection (a) shall give rise to a point of order in either House of Congress, which may be raised by any Senator during consideration in the Senate or any Member of the House of Representatives during consideration in the House of Representatives.

"(2) NONEXCLUSIVITY.—The availability of a point of order under this section shall not affect the availability of any other point of order.

"(c) DISPOSITION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may raise a point of order that any matter is not in order under subsection (a).

"(2) WAIVER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any Senator may move to waive a point of order raised under paragraph (1) by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

"(B) PROCEDURES.—For a motion to waive a point of order under subparagraph (A) as to a matter—

"(i) a motion to table the point of order shall not be in order;

"(ii) all motions to waive one or more points of order under this section as to the matter shall be debatable for a total of not more than 1 hour, equally divided between the Senator raising the point of order and the Senator moving to waive the point of order or their designees; and

"(iii) a motion to waive the point of order shall not be amendable.

"(d) DISPOSITION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a Member of the House of Representatives makes a point of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition of whether any statement made under subsection (a) was adequate or, in the absence of such a statement, whether a statement is required under subsection (a).

"(2) CONSIDERATION.—For a point of order under this section made in the House of Representatives—

"(A) the question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Member making the point of order and by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House of Representatives adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be;

"(B) in selecting the opponent, the Speaker of the House of Representatives should first

recognize an opponent from the opposing party; and

"(C) the disposition of the question of consideration with respect to a measure shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this section with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

"(e) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—The provisions of this section are enacted by the Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 102 the following new item:

"102a. Tax effect transparency."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 39—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 39

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,219,522.

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$5,519,181.

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$2,299,659.

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 40—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EFFORTS BY THE UNITED STATES AND OTHERS TO PREVENT IRAN FROM DEVELOPING A NUCLEAR WEAPON

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 40

Whereas any acquisition by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran of a nuclear weapon would pose a grave threat to international peace and stability and the national security of the United States and United States allies, including Israel;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is a leading state sponsor of terrorism, continues to materially support the regime of Bashar al-Assad, and is responsible for continuing and gross violations of the human rights of the people of Iran;

Whereas, since 2006, the United Nations Security Council has adopted multiple resolu-

tions demanding an end to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran's illicit nuclear activities and Iran's full cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) regarding its nuclear program and international commitments;

Whereas the United States Government has led the international community in imposing costly economic sanctions against the Islamic Republic of Iran, which have contributed to the decision of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to return to the negotiating table and provided leverage to press Iran's leaders to agree to end Iran's illicit nuclear activities;

Whereas the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran entered the present negotiation with the five permanent Member States of the United Nations Security Council, plus Germany (the “P5+1”), having previously violated its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and not complied with multiple United Nations Security Council Resolutions;

Whereas the Joint Plan of Action, also known as the interim agreement, was entered into by the P5+1 and Iran on November 24, 2013, in order to facilitate good faith negotiations toward a final comprehensive agreement that prevents Iran from developing a nuclear weapon;

Whereas, under the Joint Plan of Action, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has ceased enrichment of near-20 percent uranium gas, eliminated its stockpile of near-20 percent uranium gas, halted significant construction activities at the Arak nuclear reactor, halted the installation of additional centrifuges and not operated its most advanced centrifuges to accumulate enriched uranium, agreed to more intrusive international inspections of its enrichment sites and provided managed access to its centrifuge assembly workshops, centrifuge rotor production workshops and storage facilities, and uranium mines and mills;

Whereas the International Atomic Energy Agency concluded in a January 20, 2015, report that Iran has not enriched uranium above 5 percent at any of its declared facilities, has not made “any further advances” to its activities at the Natanz and Fordow fuel enrichment plants or the Arak reactor, and has continued to provide managed access to uranium mines and mills, daily access to the enrichment facilities at Natanz and Fordow, and managed access to centrifuge assembly workshops, rotor production workshops, and storage facilities;

Whereas the P5+1 and Iran have extended the terms of the Joint Plan of Action and have set a target date for reaching a political framework agreement by the end of March 2015 and a deadline of July 1, 2015, to reach a final comprehensive agreement, including relevant technical annexes;

Whereas, in a public speech on January 12, 2015, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Samantha Power stated that, “increasing sanctions would dramatically undermine our efforts to reach this shared goal . . . of getting Iran to give up its nuclear program”;

Whereas, during a press conference on January 16, 2015, Prime Minister David Cameron stated that, “it's the opinion of the United Kingdom that further sanctions [against Iran] or further threat of sanctions at this point won't actually help to bring the talks to a successful conclusion and they could fracture the international unity that there's been, which has been so valuable in presenting a united front to Iran”;

Whereas, during a press conference on January 16, 2015, President Barack Obama stated, “On Iran, we remain absolutely committed to ensuring that Iran cannot develop a nuclear weapon. The best way to achieve that now is to create the space for negotiations to succeed. We should not impose further sanctions now; that would be counterproductive and it could put at risk the valuable international unity that has been so crucial to our approach.”;

Whereas any final comprehensive agreement with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran must prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon in any manner;

Whereas any final comprehensive agreement with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran must allow for the prompt reimposition of sanctions if the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran fails to comply with the final comprehensive agreement; and

Whereas Congress retains the sole authority to repeal statutory sanctions against the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Senate—

(1) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran will not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon and that all instruments of United States power and influence must remain on the table to prevent this outcome;

(2) supports the ongoing diplomatic efforts of the United States Government and the members of the P5+1 countries to reach a comprehensive agreement with Iran that prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon;

(3) affirms that support for the prompt reimposition of suspended sanctions as well as the imposition of additional sanctions against Iran would be strong and widespread in the Senate in the event—

(A) negotiations fail to achieve a comprehensive agreement;

(B) Iran violates the Joint Plan of Action; or

(C) Iran violates any final comprehensive agreement on its nuclear program;

(4) agrees that future new sanctions against Iran may include measures further targeting Iran's energy, financial, and strategic economic sectors, and its foreign currency transactions, as well as the designation of additional Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran officials linked to its illicit nuclear program and sanctions evasion; and

(5) supports the universal rights and democratic aspirations of the people of Iran.

SENATE RESOLUTION 41—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2014 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 41

Whereas the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as “NDSU”) Bison won the 2014 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I

Football Championship Subdivision title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 10, 2015, in a hard-fought victory over the Illinois State Redbirds by a score of 29 to 27;

Whereas NDSU has won 12 NCAA Football Championships;

Whereas NDSU has now won 4 consecutive NCAA Football Championships since 2011, an unprecedented achievement in Football Championship Subdivision history;

Whereas the NDSU Bison have displayed tremendous resilience and skill over the past 4 seasons, with 58 wins to only 3 losses, including a streak of 33 consecutive winning games;

Whereas an estimated 17,000 Bison fans attended the Championship game, reflecting the tremendous spirit and dedication of Bison Nation that has helped propel the success of the team; and

Whereas the 2014 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title was a victory not only for the NDSU football team, but also for the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University football team as the 2014 champion of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision;

(2) commends the North Dakota State University players, coaches, and staff for their hard work and dedication; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans that supported the Bison in their successful quest to capture another Division I trophy for North Dakota State University.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 144. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 145. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 146. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 147. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 148. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 149. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 150. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 151. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 75 proposed by Mr. CARDIN to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr.

RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 152. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 153. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 154. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 155. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 156. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 157. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 158. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 159. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 160. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 161. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 162. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 163. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 164. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 165. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 166. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment in-

tended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 167. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 168. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 169. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 170. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 171. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 172. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 173. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 174. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 175. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 176. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 177. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 178. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 179. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 208. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 60 submitted by Mr. MENENDEZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr.

and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 234. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 115 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 235. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 145 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 236. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 145 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 237. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 145 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 238. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 55 submitted by Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 239. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 75 proposed by Mr. CARDIN to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 240. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 59 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 241. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 242. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 144. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FOREST CARBON INCENTIVES PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLIMATE MITIGATION CONTRACT; CONTRACT.—The term “climate mitigation contract” or “contract” means a 15-year contract that specifies—

(A) the eligible practices that will be undertaken;

(B) the acreage of eligible land on which the practices will be undertaken;

(C) the agreed rate of compensation per acre; and

(D) a schedule to verify that the terms of the contract have been fulfilled.

(2) CONSERVATION EASEMENT AGREEMENT; AGREEMENT.—The term “conservation easement agreement” or “agreement” means a permanent conservation easement that—

(A) covers eligible land that will not be converted for development;

(B) is enrolled under a climate mitigation contract; and

(C) is consistent with the guidelines for—

(i) the Forest Legacy Program established under section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c); or

(ii) any other program approved by the Secretary for use under this section to provide consistency with Federal legal requirements for permanent conservation easements.

(3) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term “eligible land” means forest land in the United States that is privately owned at the time of initiation of a climate mitigation contract or conservation easement agreement.

(4) ELIGIBLE PRACTICE.—The term “eligible practice” means a forestry practice, including improved forest management that produces marketable forest products, that is determined by the Secretary to provide measurable increases in carbon sequestration and storage beyond customary practices on comparable land.

(5) FOREST CARBON INCENTIVES PROGRAM; PROGRAM.—The term “forest carbon incentives program” or “program” means the forest carbon incentives program established under subsection (b)(1).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a forest carbon incentives program to achieve supplemental greenhouse gas emission reductions and carbon sequestration on private forest land of the United States through—

(A) climate mitigation contracts; and

(B) conservation easement agreements.

(2) PRIORITY.—In selecting projects under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide a priority for contracts and agreements—

(A) that sequester the most carbon on a per acre basis; and

(B) that create forestry jobs or protect habitats and achieve significant other environmental, economic, and social benefits.

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To participate in the program, an owner of eligible land shall enter into a climate mitigation contract.

(B) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS.—An owner or operator shall not be prohibited from participating in the program due to participation of the owner or operator in other Federal or State conservation assistance programs.

(4) REVERSALS.—In developing regulations for climate mitigation contracts under this subsection, the Secretary shall specify requirements to address intentional or unintentional reversal of carbon sequestration during the contract and agreement period.

(c) INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to owners of eligible land financial incentive payments for—

(A) eligible practices that measurably increase carbon sequestration and storage over a designated period on eligible land, as specified through a climate mitigation contract; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2), conservation easements on eligible land covered under a conservation easement agreement.

(2) NO CONSERVATION EASEMENT AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—Eligibility for financial incentive payments under a climate mitigation contract described in paragraph (1)(A) shall not require a conservation easement agreement.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations that specify eligible practices and related compensation rates, standards, and guidelines as the basis for entering into the program with owners of eligible land.

(e) SET-ASIDE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the discretion of the Secretary, a portion of program funds made available under this program for a fiscal year may be used—

(A) to develop forest carbon modeling and methodologies that will improve the projection of carbon gains for any forest practices made eligible under the program;

(B) to provide additional incentive payments for specified management activities that increase the adaptive capacity of land under a climate mitigation contract; and

(C) for the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program of the Forest Service to develop improved measurement and monitoring of forest carbon stocks.

(2) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—In establishing the program, the Secretary shall provide that funds provided under this section shall not be substituted for, or otherwise used as a basis for reducing, funding authorized or appropriated under other programs to compensate owners of eligible land for activities that are not covered under the program.

(f) PROGRAM MEASUREMENT, MONITORING, VERIFICATION, AND REPORTING.—

(1) MEASUREMENT, MONITORING, AND VERIFICATION.—The Secretary shall establish and implement protocols that provide monitoring and verification of compliance with the program, including both direct and indirect effects and any reversal of sequestration.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—At least annually, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(A) an estimate of annual and cumulative reductions achieved as a result of the program, determined using standardized measures, including measures of economic efficiency;

(B) a summary of any changes to the program that will be made as a result of program measurement, monitoring, and verification;

(C) the total number of acres enrolled in the program by method; and

(D) a State-by-State summary of the data.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—Each report required by this subsection shall be available to the public through the website of the Department of Agriculture.

(4) PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS.—At least once every 2 years the Secretary shall adjust eligible practices and compensation rates for future climate mitigation contracts based on the results of monitoring under paragraph (1) and reporting under paragraph (2).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this section such sums as are necessary.

SA 145. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress is in agreement with the opinion of virtually the entire worldwide scientific community and a growing number of top national security experts, economists, and others that—

(A) climate change is real;

(B) human activities contribute to climate change; and

(C) climate change has already begun to cause problems in the United States and around the world;

(2) the Energy Information Administration projects that fossil fuels could continue to produce 68 percent of the electricity in the United States through 2040; and

(3) it is imperative that the United States invest in research and development for clean fossil fuel technology.

SA 146. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 3, insert “, on the condition that any steel purchased or used for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the pipeline and cross-border facilities after the date of enactment of this Act shall be manufactured in the United States, or, if the steel purchased or used is not manufactured in the United States, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify that no such steel is available for purchase” before the period.

SA 147. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 2, insert the following:

Section ____ . Sense of Congress Regarding Green Building Programs.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) The U.S. building sector consumes nearly 40 percent of the nation's energy.

(2) Investments in building efficiency are among the most cost-effective, energy-saving measures the federal government can deploy to save money for taxpayers, families and businesses, grow the domestic economy, create jobs, reduce emissions and make the United States more energy secure.

i. The State Energy Program converts every dollar of federal finding into \$7.22 in energy cost savings, according to a study by Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The study also found that for every \$1 of State Energy Program federal funding, the program leverages \$10.71 in state and non-federal funds.

ii. The Weatherization Assistance Program saves low-income families up to 22.9 percent on their home energy costs.

iii. From 2009 to 2011, the Federal Energy Management Program arranged energy savings performance contracts that leveraged almost \$1.2 billion in private-sector investment to save the federal government and taxpayers more than \$3.5 billion in energy and water costs.

iv. A 2012 analysis of federal appliance and equipment efficiency standards prepared by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy and the Appliance Standards Awareness Project found that federal efficiency standards already established would save consumers about \$27 billion in 2010, increasing to \$61 billion in 2025.

(3) Federal building energy efficiency programs related to the construction and operations and maintenance of buildings play a key role in cost-effectively reducing energy and water waste in both the private and public sector.

(4) Reducing energy and water use in buildings requires a network of federal programs that strategically target different segments of the diverse building sector and use a variety of approaches.

(5) The Government Accountability Office report, entitled “2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue” recommends enhanced coordination between agencies to increase effectiveness of complimentary programs. This report did not find any specific instances of program duplication and it did not recommend the elimination of any green building programs.

(b) Sense of Congress—It is the sense of Congress that—

1. The federal government successfully employs a variety of federal green building programs to address the complex challenge of reducing energy and water waste in buildings.

2. Federal green building programs save U.S. families, taxpayers and businesses energy and money, boost domestic job creation and strengthen the U.S. economy.

3. The federal government should encourage enhanced coordination between agencies, State and local governments, tribes and the private-sector to increase continued effectiveness and avoid unnecessary duplication of federal green building programs.

SA 148. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) INITIAL DISCLOSURE.—Every covered entity which has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during the period beginning on December 1, 2012, and ending on the date that is 165 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall file with the Commission a statement

containing the information described in paragraph (2) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT DISCLOSURES.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements (other than covered disbursement reported under subparagraph (A)) and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

“(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

“(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

“(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

“(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than \$200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

“(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

“(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20))) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to that account during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

“(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

“(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered entity’ means—

“(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

“(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person—

“(i) holds one or more tar sands leases, or

“(ii) has received revenues or stands to receive revenues of \$1,000,000 or greater from tar sands production, including revenues received in connection with—

“(I) exploration of tar sands;

“(II) extraction of tar sands;

“(III) processing of tar sands;

“(IV) building, maintaining, and upgrading the Keystone XL pipeline and other related pipelines used in connection with tar sands;

“(V) expanding refinery capacity or building, expanding, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

“(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

“(VII) refinement of tar sands;

“(VIII) importing crude, refined oil, or byproducts derived from tar sands crude;

“(IX) exporting crude, byproducts, or refined oil derived from tar sands crude; and

“(X) use of production byproducts from tar sands, such as petroleum coke for energy generation.

“(C) TAR SANDS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘tar sands’ means bitumen from the West Canadian Sedimentary Basin.

“(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered disbursement’ means a disbursement for any of the following:

“(A) An independent expenditure.

“(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

“(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

“(ii) is made—

“(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

“(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and

“(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

“(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

“(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered dis-

bursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000; and

“(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

“(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.”.

SA 149. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not take effect until the date that, pursuant to an Act of Congress, the limit on liability for oil spills at onshore facilities is modified to be unlimited.

SA 150. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis based on the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referred to in section 2(b) of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNORS.—The President shall provide a copy of the analysis described in subsection (a) to the Governor of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located.

(c) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under subsection (b), a petition to the President requesting that the pipeline not be located in the affected municipality or county.

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—A petitioner may withdraw a petition submitted by that petitioner under subsection (c) at any time.

SA 151. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 75 proposed by Mr. CARDIN to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and, insert the following:

____ . COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis based on the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement referred to in section 2(b) of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO GOVERNORS.—The President shall provide a copy of the analysis described in subsection (a) to the Governor of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located.

(c) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under subsection (b), a petition to the President requesting that the pipeline not be located in the affected municipality or county.

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—A petitioner may withdraw a petition submitted by that petitioner under subsection (c) at any time.

SA 152. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . THIRD-PARTY CERTIFICATION UNDER ENERGY STAR PROGRAM.

Section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) THIRD-PARTY CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall revise the certification requirements for the labeling of consumer, home, and office electronic products for program partners that have complied with all requirements of the Energy Star program for a period of at least 18 months.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—In the case of a program partner described in paragraph (1), the new requirements under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall not require third-party certification for a product to be listed; but

“(B) may require that test data and other product information be submitted to facilitate product listing and performance verification for a sample of products.

“(3) THIRD PARTIES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents the Administrator from using third parties in the course of the administration of the Energy Star program.

“(4) TERMINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an exemption from third-party certification provided to a program partner under paragraph (1) shall terminate if the program partner is found to have violated program requirements with respect to at least 2 separate models during a 2-year period.

“(B) RESUMPTION.—A termination for a program partner under subparagraph (A)

shall cease if the program partner complies with all Energy Star program requirements for a period of at least 3 years.”.

SA 153. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FEDERAL BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

Section 305(a)(3)(D) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking subclause (III) and inserting the following:

“(III) SUSTAINABLE DESIGN PRINCIPLES.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—Sustainable design principles shall be applied to the siting, design, and construction of buildings covered by this clause.

“(bb) SELECTION OF CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS.—The Secretary, after reviewing the findings of the Federal Director under section 436(h) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)), in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense relating to those facilities under the custody and control of the Department of Defense, shall determine those certification systems for green commercial and residential buildings that the Secretary determines to be the most likely to encourage a comprehensive and environmentally sound approach to certification of green buildings.

“(cc) BASIS FOR SELECTION.—The determination of the certification systems shall be based on ongoing review of the findings of the Federal Director under section 436(h) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)) and the criteria described in clause (iii).

“(dd) ADMINISTRATION.—In determining certification systems under this subclause, the Secretary shall—

“(AA) make a separate determination for all or part of each system;

“(BB) use criteria that does not prohibit, disfavor, or discriminate against any specific technology, brand, product, or material based on a hazard characteristic or other arbitrary measure and is based on an objective assessment of relevant technical data; and

“(CC) use environmental and health criteria that are based on risk assessment methodology that is generally accepted by the applicable scientific disciplines.”.

(2) in clause (iii), by striking “identifying the green building certification system and level” and inserting “determining the green building certification systems”;

(3) by redesignating clauses (vi) and (vii) as clauses (vii) and (viii), respectively;

(4) by striking clauses (iv) and (v) and inserting the following:

“(iv) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct an ongoing review to evaluate and compare private sector green building certification systems, taking into account—

“(I) the criteria described in clause (iii); and

“(II) the identification made by the Federal Director under section 436(h) of the En-

ergy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)).

“(v) EXCLUSIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), if a certification system fails to meet the review requirements of clause (i)(III), the Secretary shall—

“(aa) identify the portions of the system, whether prerequisites, credits, points, or otherwise, that meet the review criteria of clause (i)(III);

“(bb) determine the portions of the system that are suitable for use; and

“(cc) exclude all other portions of the system from identification and use.

“(II) ENTIRE SYSTEMS.—The Secretary shall exclude an entire system from use if an exclusion under subclause (I)—

“(aa) impedes the integrated use of the system;

“(bb) creates disparate review criteria or unequal point access for competing materials; or

“(cc) increases agency costs of the use.

“(vi) INTERNAL CERTIFICATION PROCESSES.—The Secretary may by rule allow Federal agencies to develop internal certification processes, using certified professionals, in lieu of certification by certification entities identified under clause (i)(III).”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(ix) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(I) DETERMINATIONS MADE AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2015.—The amendments made by section ____ of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act shall apply to any determination made by a Federal agency after December 31, 2015.

“(II) DETERMINATIONS MADE ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 31, 2015.—This subparagraph (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act) shall apply to any determination made by a Federal agency on or before December 31, 2015.”.

SEC. ____ . HIGH-PERFORMANCE GREEN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

Section 436(h) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17092(h)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “SYSTEM” and inserting “SYSTEMS”;

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Based on an ongoing review, the Federal Director shall identify and shall provide to the Secretary pursuant to section 305(a)(3)(D) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(D)), a list of those certification systems that the Director identifies as the most likely to encourage a comprehensive and environmentally sound approach to certification of green buildings.”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “system” and inserting “systems”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) an ongoing review provided to the Secretary pursuant to section 305(a)(3)(D) of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6834(a)(3)(D)), which shall—

“(i) be carried out by the Federal Director to compare and evaluate standards; and

“(ii) allow any developer or administrator of a rating system or certification system to be included in the review;”;

(C) in subparagraph (E)(v), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) a finding that, for all credits addressing grown, harvested, or mined materials, the system promotes the use of domestic products that have obtained certifications of responsible sourcing; and

“(H) a finding that the system incorporates life-cycle assessment as a credit pathway.”.

SA 154. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 3, line 9, and insert the following:

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect—

(1) the availability or scope of judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, of any agency action relating to—

(A) the pipeline or cross-border facilities described in subsection (a); or

(B) any related facility in the United States; or

(2) the form or venue of any proceeding for, or the court with jurisdiction of an action seeking, judicial review of an agency action described in paragraph (1).

SA 155. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in subsection (b) relieves any Federal agency of the obligation of the Federal agency to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the obligation of the Federal agency to prepare a supplement to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement described in subsection (b) in connection with the issuance of any permit or authorization needed to construct, connect, operate, or maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the environmental impacts resulting from the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline and cross-border facilities, including from greenhouse gas emissions associated with the crude oil being transported by the pipeline.

SA 156. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (referred to in this section as “LIHEAP”) is the main Federal program that helps low-income households and senior citizens with their energy bills, providing vital assistance during both the cold winter and hot summer months.

(2) Recipients of LIHEAP assistance are among the most vulnerable individuals in the country, with about 90 percent of LIHEAP households having at least one member who is a child, a senior citizen, or disabled, and approximately 20 percent of LIHEAP households including at least one veteran.

(3) The number of households eligible for LIHEAP assistance continues to exceed available funding, with current funding reaching just 20 percent of the eligible population.

(4) The average LIHEAP grant covers just a fraction of home energy costs, leaving many low-income families and senior citizens struggling to pay their energy bills and with fewer resources available to meet other essential needs.

(5) Access to affordable home energy is a matter of health and safety for many low-income households, children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans.

(6) Funding LIHEAP at \$4,700,000,000 annually would ensure that more low-income households, households with children, senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, and veterans can meet basic home energy needs.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that LIHEAP should be funded at not less than \$4,700,000,000 annually.

(c) **DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—This section takes effect on the day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 157. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON ENERGY SECURITY.

Not later than 1 year after the date on which the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in section 2(a) begin operating and annually thereafter for the next 10 years, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the effect of the pipeline and cross-border facilities with respect to the energy matters of the United States considered in section 1.4 of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

SA 158. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON FEDERAL PERMITTING EFFICIENCY.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that identifies—

(1) whether the more than 2,300-day process associated with the approval of the applica-

tion described in section 2(a) meets the goal of Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note; relating to issuance of permits with respect to certain energy-related facilities and land transportation crossings on the international boundaries of the United States) to “expedite reviews of permits as necessary to accelerate the completion of energy and transmission projects”; and

(2) a full accounting for the hours of Federal employees, and all associated costs to taxpayers, that were devoted to the review of the cross-border permit application for the Keystone XL Pipeline during the period beginning on September 19, 2008, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 159. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 2 of the amendment, add the following:

(f) **REPORT ON THE MOST ENVIRONMENTALLY BENEFICIAL MODE OF TRANSPORTING OIL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall, based on a review of the final environmental impact statement described in subsection (b), submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that identifies the mode of transportation for oil between the United States and Canada that is estimated to result in—

(1) the lowest number of injuries and fatalities;

(2) the lowest volume of oil spilled; and

(3) the lowest transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.

SA 160. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 2 of the amendment, add the following:

(f) **PROHIBITION OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL MITIGATION MEASURES FOR CONNECTED ACTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No Federal agency shall require mitigation measures with respect to any of the specific projects identified in section 4.8.5 of the final environmental statement described in subsection (b) that are in addition to the mitigation measures described in that subsection.

(2) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) prevents a State or local agency from requiring mitigation measures with respect to the projects referred to in that paragraph under applicable State or local law.

SA 161. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) **PERMITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(2) **PERMITTING CERTAINTY.**—On the completion of the permitting process with respect to the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), the Administrator

of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not restrict activities allowed under a permit issued under section 404(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(c)) with respect to the pipeline.

SA 162. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that determines the number of construction jobs and permanent jobs that are projected to be associated with—

(1) the project for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in section 2(a);

(2) the renewable energy and transmission projects that have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(3) the renewable energy and transmission projects provided assistance under the temporary loan guarantee program of the Department of Energy under section 1705 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16516).

SA 163. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON THE DEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES ON OIL AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCED IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that assesses—

(1) whether potential, continued, or growing instability in Yemen, Venezuela, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and other energy-producing countries is likely to impact world oil and natural gas production during the 20-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) whether the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline would reduce the projected dependence of the United States on oil and natural gas from any of the countries described in paragraph (1) or the regions in which those countries are located.

SA 164. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”):

(1) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 165. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 166. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ RELEASE OF CERTAIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.**—With respect to Bureau of Land Management land identified as a wilderness study area and recommended for a wilderness designation under section 603(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(a)), if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has not designated the wilderness study area as wilderness, the area shall no longer be subject to—

(1) section 603(c) of that Act; or

(2) Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

(b) **FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE LAND.**—With respect to land administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service that has been recommended by the President or the Secretary of the Interior for designation as wilderness under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has not designated the land as wilderness, the land shall no longer be managed in a manner that protects the wilderness character of the land.

SA 167. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

No area of the coastal plain (as defined in section 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3142)) shall be managed as a wilderness study area without the express authorization of Congress.

SA 168. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 23 on page 3 and insert the following:

cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) **PERMITS.**—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(c) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(d) **PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

SA 169. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 9 and all that follows through the end of the amendment and insert the following:

cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) **PERMITS.**—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(c) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(d) **PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

SA 170. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(f) **LIMITATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), none of the crude oil and bitumen transported into the United States by the operation of the Keystone XL pipeline under the authority provided by subsection (a), and none of the refined petroleum fuel products originating from that crude oil or bitumen, may be exported from the United States.

(2) **WAIVERS AUTHORIZED.**—The President may waive the limitation described in paragraph (1) if—

(A) the President determines that a waiver is in the national interest because it—

(i) will not lead to an increase in domestic consumption of crude oil or refined petroleum products obtained from countries hostile to the interests of the United States or with political and economic instability that compromises energy supply security; and

(ii) will not lead to higher gasoline costs to consumers than consumers would pay in the absence of the waiver;

(B) an exchange of crude oil or refined product provides for no net loss of crude oil or refined product consumed domestically; or

(C) a waiver is necessary under the Constitution, a law, or an international agreement.

SA 171. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress supports the permanent protection of public land as National Monuments and other appropriate designations for the preservation and benefit of future generations;

(2) National Monuments should focus on historic and natural features and cultural sites on Federal land deserving of protection; and

(3) public input from local communities, bipartisan elected leaders, and interested stakeholders, existing land use rights, and existing criteria enumerated in established

law should be considered in making recommendations for potential National Monuments.

SA 172. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Federal law enforcement officers protect the public and put their lives at risk every day;

(2) it is necessary for officers to carry firearms to protect themselves in dangerous situations;

(3) Federal law enforcement officers are required to follow detailed guidelines on the use of their firearms; and

(4) Environmental Protection Agency law enforcement officers are required to—

(A) follow guidelines originally established by the attorney general of President George H.W. Bush; and

(B) complete the same training as all other Federal law enforcement officers, including officers for the Secret Service, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, the Federal Protective Service, and the United States Marshals Service.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Environmental Protection Agency law enforcement officers should follow all applicable Federal laws (including regulations), policies, and practices; and

(2) if an Environmental Protection Agency law enforcement officer fails to follow applicable laws (including regulations), policies, and practices, or is found to engage in illegal or improper conduct, the officer should be held fully accountable under applicable laws.

SA 173. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 98 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, strike line 3 and all that follows through the end of the amendment and insert the following:

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund, with the objective of helping developing countries deal with the impacts of climate change and advancing mitigation efforts;

(2) many communities in the United States, including many rural and indigenous communities, face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries and are also being impacted by climate change;

(3) these communities include indigenous and traditional communities in the Arctic region of the United States;

(4) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural and other vulnerable communities in the United States; and

(5) the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in vulnerable communities in the United States, including rural and indigenous communities, while also helping to fund climate change adaptation and mitigation in developing countries.

SA 174. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING OF CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund, with the objective of helping developing countries deal with the impacts of climate change and advancing mitigation efforts;

(2) many communities in the United States, including many rural and indigenous communities, face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries and are also being impacted by climate change;

(3) these communities include indigenous and traditional communities in the Arctic region of the United States;

(4) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural and other vulnerable communities in the United States; and

(5) the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in vulnerable communities in the United States, including rural and indigenous communities, while also helping to fund climate change adaptation and mitigation in developing countries.

SA 175. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. CERTIFICATION REGARDING USE OF FIREARMS BY EPA EMPLOYEES.

Section 3063 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “certification under subsection (c) and” after “Upon”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Prior to authorizing a law enforcement officer of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry firearms under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall certify that—

“(1) the officer has been trained in the proper use of a firearm; and

“(2) carrying a firearm is necessary for the officer to carry out the duties of the officer

under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a).”.

SA 176. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2 of the amendment, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices)—

(1) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(A) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a); and

(2) shall be modified to include a provision requiring that the designation of National Monuments in any States in which the pipeline or cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) is to be located shall be subject to—

(A) consultation with each unit of local government within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located; and

(B) the approval by the Governor and legislature of each State within the boundaries of which the proposed National Monument is to be located.

SA 177. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. REPORT ON FEDERAL PERMITTING EFFICIENCY.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that identifies whether the more than 2,300-day process associated with the approval of the application described in section 2(a) meets the goal of Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note; relating to issuance of permits with respect to certain energy-related facilities and land transportation crossings on the international boundaries of the United States) to “expedite reviews of permits as necessary to accelerate the completion of energy and transmission projects”.

SA 178. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. INCLUSION OF OIL DERIVED FROM TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL.

This Act shall not take effect prior to 10 days following the date that diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of section 4612(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SA 179. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PIPELINE INSPECTIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no activities may restrict the pipeline safety inspections described in the prevention and mitigation measures section of the Executive Summary to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, including aerial surveillance and integrated sensors within the pipeline.

SA 180. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 142 submitted by Mr. MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 181. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 146 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 182. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 149 submitted by Mrs. GILLIBRAND and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 183. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 170 submitted by Mr. MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 184. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 178 submitted by Mr. MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 185. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 141 submitted by Mr.

MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 186. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 140 submitted by Mr. MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 187. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 139 submitted by Mr. MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic

SA 196. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 37 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed

to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 197. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 54 submitted by Mr. MARKEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 198. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 55 submitted by Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 199. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 57 submitted by Mrs. BOXER and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 200. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 82 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 201. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 81 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects

that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 202. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 70 submitted by Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 203. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 131 submitted by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the section, add the following:

() APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply until the date the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that—

(1) at least 12 consecutive editions of the Monthly Energy Review of the Energy Information Administration report that domestic crude oil production has exceeded domestic crude oil consumption for the applicable month; and

(2) the Reference Case of the Annual Energy Outlook for the applicable year projects that domestic crude oil production will exceed domestic crude oil consumption during the subsequent 10-year period.

SA 204. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 59 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 205. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 59 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 206. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 59 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”):

(1) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal oper-

ation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 207. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 116 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 208. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 60 submitted by Mr. MENENDEZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 209. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 60 submitted by Mr. MENENDEZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”):

(1) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 210. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 60 submitted by Mr. MENENDEZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 211. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 31 submitted by Mr. KAINE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 212. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 31 submitted by Mr. KAINE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 213. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 31 submitted by Mr. KAINE and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 214. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 114 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that

might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 215. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 114 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 216. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 114 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of

State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”):

(1) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 217. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 115 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 218. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 115 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 219. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 11 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 220. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 11 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 221. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 11 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the “FSEIS”):

(1) “The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route” (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) “The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project” (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) “. . . approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios” (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 222. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

to amendment SA 8 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 223. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 8 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known

and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 224. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 8 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 225. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 7 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 226. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 7 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 227. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 7 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 228. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 12 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 229. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 12 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 230. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 12 submitted by Mr. MERKLEY and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 231. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN,

Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 232. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 233. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to

the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 234. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 115 submitted by Mr. COONS and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed

Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 235. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 145 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENERGY COSTS AND SUPPLIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should—

(1) reject efforts to impose economy-wide taxes, fees, mandates, or regulations that will—

(A) increase the cost of energy for families and businesses of the United States; or

(B) destroy jobs; and

(2) prioritize policies that encourage and enable innovation in the United States that might lead to energy supplies that are more abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure.

SA 236. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 145 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(2) any payments the United States ultimately makes to the Green Climate Fund will be redistributed to finance adaptation and mitigation efforts in developing countries that are parties to the Convention;

(3) none of the eligible developing country parties to the Convention is an Arctic nation;

(4) the residents of the Arctic, many of whom represent vibrant indigenous and traditional cultures, too often face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries;

(5) despite the fact that the United States is an Arctic nation, President Obama has made no similar effort to provide financial assistance to the residents of the United States Arctic region, even though many of those communities have opportunities for adaptation projects;

(6) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural communities in the United States;

(7) the United States should prioritize adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities before allocating any taxpayer dollars to the Green Climate Fund; and

(8) to the extent that Congress appropriates any taxpayer dollars for adaptation, those funds should first be applied to known and anticipated adaptation needs of communities within the United States.

SA 237. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 145 submitted by Mr. MANCHIN and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ACKNOWLEDGING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress is in agreement with the following findings of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State for the Keystone XL Project (referred to in this section as the "FSEIS"):

(1) "The analyses of potential impacts associated with construction and normal operation of the proposed Project suggest that significant impacts to most resources are not expected along the proposed Project route" (FSEIS page 4.16-1, section 4.16).

(2) "The total annual GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions (direct and indirect) attributed to the No Action scenarios range from 28 to 42 percent greater than for the proposed Project" (FSEIS page ES-34, section ES.5.4.2).

(3) "... approval or denial of any one crude oil transport project, including the proposed Project, is unlikely to significantly impact the rate of extraction in the oil sands or the continued demand for heavy crude oil at refineries in the United States based on expected oil prices, oil-sands supply costs, transport costs, and supply-demand scenarios" (FSEIS page ES-16, section ES.4.1.1).

SA 238. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 55 submitted by Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1 of the amendment, strike line 4 and all that follows through page 2, line 6, and insert the following:

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy shall compile and make available to the public on the Internet third party studies assessing the potential environmental, energy, and economic impacts of by-products generated from the refining of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in section 2(a), including petroleum coke.

SA 239. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 75 proposed by Mr. CARDIN to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve

the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2 of the amendment, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 4, line 13, and insert the following:

(b) ANALYSIS OF LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

SA 240. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 59 submitted by Mr. SCHATZ and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2 of the amendment, line 2, insert before the period the following: “, recognizing that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) requires only a ‘hard look’ at alternatives and that the factual basis for the referenced recommendations are subject to change”.

SA 241. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline, and to the Governors of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located, an analysis based on the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement described in section 2(b) of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(b) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under subsection (a), a petition to the President requesting additional review of the pipeline.

(c) WITHDRAWAL.—A Governor may withdraw a petition submitted under subsection (b) at any time.

SA 242. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMMUNITY RIGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a), the President, or the designee of the President, shall provide to

each municipality or county that relies on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the pipeline, and to the Governors of each State in which an affected municipality or county is located, an analysis based on the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement described in section 2(b) of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of that pipeline.

(b) EFFECT ON CONSTRUCTION.—Construction of the pipeline described in section 2(a) may not begin if the Governor of a State with an affected municipality or county submits, not later than 30 days after receiving an analysis under subsection (a), a petition to the President requesting additional review of the pipeline.

(c) WITHDRAWAL.—A petitioner may withdraw a petition submitted by that petitioner under subsection (b) at any time.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2014 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 41, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 41) congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2014 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Committee on Finance, pursuant to section 8002 of title 26, U.S. Code, the designation of the following Senators as members of the Joint Committee on Taxation: the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, and the Senator from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Tuesday, January 27; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1. I ask that the time until 12:30 p.m. be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half. I further ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we continue to talk to Members on both sides of the aisle to set up a path toward passage on this bill that will include some amendment votes on pending amendments and others that are waiting in the queue. We will look to set some of those votes tomorrow after lunch.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator COONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Delaware.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to speak about our ongoing debate about the Keystone XL Pipeline and the need for this debate to shift to a much larger conversation.

Tonight, as we are continuing in what has been 1½ weeks of debate in our Senate about this single, foreign-owned pipeline, it is my hope that we will begin a larger, broader conversation about America's energy and climate needs.

We have so far voted on amendments confirming that climate change is real, on the future of natural gas and oil exports, on energy efficiency provisions, on rules to ensure that we buy American, and on funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the oil-spill fund.

I, myself, have an amendment, No. 115, that I am hoping we will have a chance to take up, debate, vote on, and pass—one that recognizes that given

that the Senate has acknowledged the reality of climate change, we must now move forward to take action to prepare to adapt to those changes—changes that have already begun.

I come from the State of Delaware, the lowest mean-elevation State in America, where our Governor, Jack Markell, has led a community-driven process of preparing for adapting to the coming impact on our infrastructure—our public, private, State, local, and Federal infrastructure in Delaware.

We have to recognize that our Federal Government will have financial liabilities to help State, local, and tribal governments prepare for the impacts of climate change on their infrastructure and to prepare for the impacts of climate change on our Federal infrastructure.

My amendment, I hope, will be taken up, debated, and passed, but the larger point I want to make is this is just the beginning of the much larger debate we need to have about our Nation's energy and climate future.

Energy has long been and will remain central to a strong, diverse, and vibrant economy for our Nation. Throughout our history, Americans have benefited greatly from abundant sources of energy at home. From coal to oil to natural gas, we have been blessed by natural resources that have powered our economy. But new challenges today require new approaches. As human-generated greenhouse gas pollution wreaks havoc on our global climate, we need to come together to create a cleaner and lower-carbon energy future.

There is no single pathway to stop climate change or to deal with it, but there are a number of approaches we need to look at and that I hope we will consider taking.

Tonight I wish to briefly mention four different areas where there were bipartisan bills in the last Congress—areas that I hope, in the spirit of comity and debate in the Senate, we could reconsider and make them part of this broader energy and climate debate.

First, we could start by establishing and implementing a national quadrennial energy review which would ensure that every administration, current and future, takes a hard look at our Nation's energy landscape, the challenges that we face, and to build a blue print for how we will deal with these challenges and overcome them.

Today we already conduct these kinds of quadrennial reviews for the Pentagon, for the State Department, and for the Department of Homeland Security. They allow us to take a big picture and strategic look at our policies, our challenges, and to chart a predictable, longer term path forward.

It is time we did the same for our country's energy challenges. This administration is already at work doing this, but Congress needs to act to en-

sure that future administrations will continue this practice.

Second, we can invest in clean and renewable energy and in energy efficiency technology so that we can out-innovate the rest of the world and lay the groundwork for job creation, not only for today but for tomorrow. We can do this through sustained, annual program funding and through smart and innovative financing models that lower the cost of clean energy, such as expanded master limited partnerships.

Third, we can improve the way our national labs collaborate with the private sector so that the innovation pipeline that takes ideas from the lab to the market is smooth, efficient, and predictable so that today's discoveries are tomorrow's world-changing products.

And, fourth, we can improve STEM education and skills training throughout America so that every day we are training tomorrow's future energy innovators.

We can do this. We need to do these things.

I will admit that at times it can seem quite daunting. But in this country we should have no doubt that if we focus our greatest minds on these challenges, there is no limit to what we can achieve. The bottom line to all this is that we don't have a choice. Pretending otherwise is an exercise in denial.

We need to curb emissions from transportation. We need to reduce pollution from powerplants. We need to better finance clean energy solutions. We need to strengthen our infrastructure so we are more resilient in the face of coming climate challenges. We need to address the real challenges of energy and water demand. We need to improve our regulations so that we do more to protect and conserve our land. And we need to invest in research, development, and the demonstration of new and innovative technologies. Overall, we can and should institute smart and market-based regional and national policies that will lower carbon pollution and send businesses and households the signal that the future is in cleaner not in dirtier energy technology.

We need to do all this and bring the rest of the world along as well because our national energy and climate challenges are not just ours, they are the world's, and we need to come together around the world to get this done. The administration's clean power plan rules and the recently announced accord with China are all great initial steps in this direction. It is my hope as we continue this debate that we will come together in the Senate to show we are willing to rise to these challenges as a nation as well.

Mr. President, for me, all of this ultimately comes down to our obligations—yes, of course, to our Nation, to

our constituents, to our home States, but particularly as parents to our children and to future generations. Every day when I get to return home from the train station after taking what is often a late-evening train from Washington to Delaware, I get to see my family, and it is my children who leave me most concerned about the question of whether I will be leaving them a safer and healthier world than we received.

My daughter Maggie in particular is passionate about the environment and is concerned about whether what we do here is not just helping to create jobs today—although that is an important issue for us to turn to—but whether we are helping to preserve our world for tomorrow. Maggie helps keep me focused not just on this quarter, this month, this election, or this term, but on the next 50 years and on whether what we do here leaves to our children and their children a cleaner and a better and brighter future. That is what our focus should be—on the future, on what we are doing not just for today but for tomorrow and all the days after that.

I hope when the debate about this one pipeline is over we will refocus our energies on the bigger picture and on the great and big challenges we face together. That is what we get elected to do, and that is what our time demands.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to speak for a few minutes about our Nation's economic relationship with Africa and one area of concern I have as we work toward further strengthening our ties.

Since its passage under President Clinton, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, known as AGOA, has been a powerful tool for increasing trade and boosting economies across the African Continent, and no country has taken greater advantage of the opportunities provided through AGOA than South Africa.

Over the past 4 years, as the chairman of the African Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have worked closely with African leaders and know the importance of AGOA to their economies and to their growing middle classes. Just last week I met with a group of African trade ministers who emphasized to me how important prompt reauthorization of AGOA is to them, to their nations, and to tens of thousands of men and women who work in reliance upon AGOA.

AGOA is not a partisan issue. I have worked closely with my Republican colleague and friend from Georgia Senator ISAKSON on its reauthorization. But, as I have also long believed, trade must be fair, and with increased trade

comes a responsibility by both parties to play by the same set of rules.

I am concerned because I fear that South Africa's refusal to drop its antidumping duties that prevent American poultry from having free and fair access to the South African market will have negative repercussions for our relationship and South Africa's economy.

Much of the time, nations will use antidumping duties to prevent other countries from exporting artificially cheap goods into their economies, putting their own businesses at an unfair disadvantage. But what South Africa has done for years in this area lacks any merit. They are using the same justification that China has used to ban American poultry imports. They claim our poultry is being sold below market value. Not only is this claim false, the World Trade Organization recently deemed China's nearly identical ban to be illegal.

American companies want the chance to sell healthy, affordable, and safe poultry to South Africa and at a fair market value. So during the Africa leaders summit last August, which brought the heads of state of more than 50 African nations here to Washington and to our Capitol, I had the opportunity to meet with President Zuma of South Africa as well as other South African senior officials. During our meeting we discussed their country's policies toward our country, the importance of renewing AGOA, and also my concerns about their unfair practices with regard to our poultry industry. I was optimistic that following our constructive conversations, we could work together with them and with South Africa's poultry industry to get rid of this inappropriate trade barrier. In September we also had constructive meetings where our Ambassador and their Ambassador were present, and leaders of both poultry sectors began constructive conversation. But soon thereafter their willingness to engage abruptly stopped. They apparently think they can continue to benefit from AGOA and shirk their most basic trade responsibilities.

In my home State of Delaware the poultry industry supports more than 13,000 jobs and has long been the backbone of our agriculture sector. I have made clear to our friends and partners in South Africa that although I deeply believe in their nation's promise and future, my first responsibility is and always will be to my home State and my constituents. Across the country—and Senator ISAKSON's State of Georgia is the single biggest poultry-growing State in the country—the United States supports 1.8 million American jobs, contributing more than \$470 billion to our Nation's economy.

So I want to be clear about this tonight, as I have been before. I support AGOA's reauthorization, and I hope we can negotiate a fair path forward. But

South Africa cannot expect to continue to reap the benefits of increased trade without following fair trade rules. They can't expect us to open up our markets wide to duty-free and quota-free access for South African goods if they will not fairly open theirs. If they insist on maintaining their longstanding and illegal antidumping duties on American poultry, I will do everything in my power to ensure they do not continue to benefit from AGOA. The choice is theirs.

Senator ISAKSON of Georgia and I communicated this concern to President Zuma back in December in writing, and this week we will write to the Senate Finance Committee with the same message. We only have a short period of time where we can get a long-term extension of AGOA done, and I will work hard to reauthorize and improve AGOA so its benefits are even more widely felt on the continent of Africa, but I won't allow it to include countries that violate fair trade rules, which means an important ally and partner of the United States—South Africa—won't be included if they are not willing to play by the rules. There are too many jobs at stake, too much work to do to allow a critical trading partner such as South Africa to continue its unfair treatment of American industry.

I hope and pray we can still resolve this needless impasse, but if we don't, my commitment and my path forward is clear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:29 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 27, 2015, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

DALLAS P. TONSAGER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 21, 2020, VICE JILL LONG THOMPSON, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be lieutenant commander

GEORGE F. ADAMS
JOHN E. ADKINS
WILLIAMS C. ALBRIGHT
HILLARY A. ALLEGRETTI
DOUGLAS W. APPERSON
PATRICK N. ARMSTRONG
STEVEN B. ARNWINE
CHRISTOPHER P. ARTAC
CHRISTOPHER A. AUMENT
JPHILIP J. BALEM
CHRISTIAN J. BARGER
JEFFERY C. BARNUM
ERIKA F. E. BARRON
NICHOLAS A. BARROW
SEAN H. BARTONICEK
JAMES A. BATES JR.
EILEEN BECK
MATTHEW M. BECK
WILLIAM W. BELCHER
MICHAEL S. BELL
NATALIA M. BEST
BRENDAN A. BLAIN
TOLAN J. BLANCHARD
ORION R. BLOOM
SARA BOOTH
AMALIA D. BOYER
SARAH E. BRENNAN
DAKATA B. BRODIE
MARK H. BROWN
STEVEN R. BRUGMANN
BRIAN J. BRUNS
BRADLY T. BURNESSE
DEREK J. BURRILL
ERIN M. CALDWELL
MATTHEW B. CAPON
KYRA N. CARBAJAL
JANE N. CARLEY
MICHAEL A. CARR
MICHAEL J. CARROLL
LENELL J. CARSON
REY F. CASTILLO
STEPHEN A. CHAINE
WILLIAM R. CHEW
MICHAEL A. CHOCHOLAK
JOEL C. COITO
JUDSON A. COLEMAN
MICHELLE COMEAUX
CHRISTOPHER M. CONDIT
JAMES O. CONNER
MICHAEL P. CORTESE
WILLIAM F. COTY III
TIMOTHY N. CRONIN
BEN W. CROWELL
CHRISTOPHER K. CUMBERLAND
KRISTEN A. CURRAN
CAREN C. DAMON
LEO T. DANAHER
JOSHUA J. DAUBENSPECK
HOLLY J. DEAL
CHAD E. DEJOURNETT
ANTHONY M. DESTEFANO
ANTHONY E. DEWINTER
EDWARD L. DIPIERRO
JOSHUA M. DIPIETRO
ADAM J. DISQUE
MICHAEL J. DOUGHERTY
MEGAN L. DREWNIK
BENJAMIN J. DUARTE
JAYME L. DUBINSKY
MICHAEL S. DYKEMA
CHAD A. ECKHARDT
DONALD W. EDMON II
SARA M. ELLIS-SANBORN
PATTON J. EPPERSON
JUSTIN M. ERDMAN
RYAN R. ERICKSON
VINCENT E. ESCOBEDO
DANIEL W. EUSTACE
SCOTT L. FARR
BOBBIE-JEAN FELIX
JOHN A. FERREIRA
BRIAN M. FINN
SUSAN M. FISCHER
KIRK C. FISTICK
ARI D. FITZWATER
DONALD F. FLUSCHE
JUSTIN M. FORBES
KARYN S. FORSYTH
PETER F. FRANCISCO
ROCCO W. FRANCO
ZACHARY D. FUENTES
LAUREN U. FULLAM
JEFFREY M. GARVEY
ELIZABETH A. GILLIS
DANIEL A. GONZALES
SARAH P. GRAHAM
SIMON C. GREENE
MARK C. HAINES
JARED A. HARLOW
JONATHAN R. HARRIS
COURTNEY A. HARRISON
ANNA M. HART-WILKINS
WILLIAM K. HAYWOOD
CORYDON F. HEARD
JAMES L. HELLER
KIMBERLY A. HESS
GORDON A. HOOD
SCOTT R. HOULE
ROBERT M. HUNTER
THOMAS J. HUNTLEY

JEFFERY B. HUSTACE
 JESSE E. HYLES
 KENNETH R. INGRAM
 CHRISTOPHER A. JASNOCH
 ROXANNE B. JENSEN
 ERIC S. JESIONOWSKI
 TIFFANY A. JOHNSON
 JENNIFER M. JOJOLA
 LEE H. JONES
 ERICA KELLY
 MATTHEW V. KEMPE
 ANDREW A. KENNEDY
 HAROLD J. KIFFER
 BRUCE W. KIMMELL
 RAYMOND S. KINGSLEY
 JOHN M. KIRK
 SCOTT R. KOSER
 BRIAN A. KUDRLE
 FRANK R. KULESA
 GRAHAM E. LANZ
 DEWEY E. LAWSON
 JAN J. LEAGUE
 NICHOLAS D. LEITER
 JOHN M. LISKO
 AMY M. LOCKWOOD
 MICHAEL A. MAAS
 JONATHAN R. MACKIN
 ANDREW P. MADJESKA
 HEATHER M. MAJESKA
 BRETT A. MAJOR
 ROBERTSON MARQUARDT
 THOMAS E. MARSH
 MICHAEL T. MARTIN
 JUSTIN M. MATEJKA
 BENJAMIN D. MAZYCK
 CHRISTOPHER N. MCANDREW
 JON M. MCCAMISH
 MICHAEL D. MCCARTY
 KATHRYN A. MCCORMACK
 MARC R. MCDONNELL
 TYLER J. MCGILL
 MICHAEL S. MCGRAIL
 JEREMY M. MCKENZIE
 RENEE V. MCKINNON
 DAVID M. MCLOUGHLIN
 JACOB T. MCMILLAN
 BRIAN K. MEADOWCROFT
 JOSE A. MERCADO
 RUSSELL P. MERRICK
 MARCUS R. MERRIMAN
 PAUL J. MILLER
 RYAN C. MILLER
 GARY R. MILLS
 MATTHEW J. MITCHELL
 DANIEL P. MOCHEN
 JASON M. MOLINARI
 JEREMY J. MONTES
 MICHAEL C. MORGAN
 FRANKLIN J. MORRISON
 SEAN F. MORRISON
 MATTHEW K. MOTHANDER
 ELLEN M. MOTOI
 LISA T. MOTOI
 DENNIS R. MOULDER
 MICHAEL T. MYERS
 GINNY R. NADOLNY
 AARON G. NELSON
 NATHAN L. NOYES
 WAYNE T. O'DONNELL
 ANDERSON J. OGG
 ERIC D. OLIPHANT
 JEFFREY S. OLK
 ROLAND T. ORR
 BRIERLEY K. OSTRANDER
 JEFFREY K. PADILLA
 JON P. PARKER
 STARR E. PARMLEY
 TREVOR E. PARRA
 ANDREW L. PASZKIEWICZ
 MICHAEL A. PATTERSON
 JENNIFER G. PAULSON
 KRISTYN E. PECORA
 PIERO A. PECORA
 KENNETH E. PEPPER
 KRYSIA V. POHL
 BRITTANY C. POLEY
 RYAN B. POPIEL
 CHRISTOPHER D. PRESNELL
 MATTHEW J. PRESS
 STEVEN L. PUFFER
 NICHOLAS O. RAMIREZ
 HECTOR R. RAMOS
 JEDEDIAH A. RASKIE
 DARYL J. REED
 RAYMOND J. REICHL
 PATRICK S. REID
 BENJAMIN M. ROBINSON
 MICHAEL T. ROSS
 SARAH K. ROUSSEAU
 ERIC E. ROY
 KYLE T. RUSSELL
 JOSHUA H. SAGERS
 LARRY J. SANTOS
 NATHANIEL F. SARGENT
 DERRICK D. SAUNDERS
 SHANNON F. SCAFF
 MICHELLE M. SCHOPP
 MAEGAN R. SCHWARTZ
 JOSEPH R. SEMKE
 NICHOLAS C. SENTUK
 BROOK I. SERBU
 BONNIE M. SHANER

REBECCA B. SHULTS
 JARED L. SILVERMAN
 RICHARD S. SLOCUM
 CLINTON P. SMITH
 DALLAS D. SMITH
 JACK B. SMITH
 JUSTIN C. SMITH
 KELLY L. SMITH
 LAURA M. SPRINGER
 ERIC D. STAHL
 ROBERT C. STARR
 PARRIS R. STRATTON
 JUSTIN W. STROCK
 RACHEL A. STRYKER
 RACHEL A. STUTT
 COLLEEN A. SYMANSKY
 MICHAEL C. THOMAS
 TIMOTHY S. TILGHMAN
 JONATHAN T. TILLMAN
 GERALYN M. VAN DE KROL
 JUSTIN O. VANDENHEUVEL
 STEVEN B. VANDERLASKE
 ERIC J. VELEZ
 OSVALDO E. VERA
 GABRIEL T. VIGIL DIAZ
 PHILIP C. WADE
 JEREMY A. WEISS
 JONATHAN I. WELCH
 KEITH R. WILKINS
 SCOTT K. WILLIAMS
 BRADLY G. WINANS
 KEITH D. WOOLDRIDGE
 MARK L. WYCKOFF
 CHRISTOPHER T. YANE
 CARLTON D. YOUNG
 JEFFREY S. ZAMARIN
 JOSHUA L. ZIKE
 ANDREW H. ZUCKERMAN

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KOREY E. AMUNDSON
 MICHELE MARIE E. ARMENTROUT
 JOHN D. BEATTY
 BRUCE M. BENDER
 VICKEN ALBERT BEZJIAN
 JEANNE E. BISESI
 SEAN C. BITTNER
 AMY JEANETTE BOEHLE
 DANIEL R. BOURQUE
 JUDAH C. BRADLEY
 WILLIAM M. BRANDT, JR.
 WILLIAM R. BRIDGEMOHN
 SCOTT B. CALVERT
 MAUREN B. CARROLL
 DAVID M. CASTANEDA
 ROBERT D. CHURCHILL, JR.
 HOWARD T. CLARK III
 LAWRENCE ANDREW COLBY
 STEPHEN P. COLVIN
 MARK A. DEATON
 LAURIE A. DICKSON
 MATTHEW A. DORNAN
 JOHN L. DOUCET III
 GEORGE M. DOUGHERTY
 BRIAN A. DOYLE
 PETER C. DRAHEIM
 PATRICK LAWRENCE DUFRANE
 DENISE J. EDWARDS
 ANDREW J. ELBERT
 DAVID ANDREW EMERY
 STEVEN GREGORY ENGLAND
 PATRICK L. ERDMAN
 JIM FABIO
 WILLIAM J. FRIDAY, JR.
 CADE C. GIBSON
 JAMES L. GREENWALD
 ERIKA L. GRIFFITH
 DAVID S. HALES
 EDWARD G. HAMILL
 GREGORY P. HAYNES
 DENIS A. HEINZ
 GARY ALAN HELFELDT
 CHRISTOPHER J. HOBBS
 CHRISTINE FRANCIS HOLLIDAY
 RANDALL I. HONKE
 RHYS WILLIAM HUNT
 PATRICK E. JOCHEM
 MAXIE G. JOLLEY II
 LORI C. JONES
 LYNN E. JUI
 AMBER R. KASBEER
 THOMAS K. KERR
 CHRISTINE P. KLINK
 DAVID J. KNOLMAYER
 JASON M. KNUDSEN
 GREGORY T. LARGEN
 ROGER S. LAW
 MICHAEL J. LEE
 LELAND K. LEONARD
 MICHAEL F. LESMAN
 DAVID DONALD LESSICK
 DAVID E. LINEBACK
 DAREL L. LONGYEAR
 BRUCE K. LYMAN
 CARL J. MAGNUSSON
 LISA M. MALONEY
 LISA MARIE MANION

TIMOTHY H. MARTZ
 JOHN T. MASER
 PRESTON J. MCCONNELL
 PRESTON F. MCFARREN
 JENNIFER B. MCGONIGLE
 JEROME MCLEN
 THOMAS J. MCNAMARA
 CRAIG MCPKE
 KEVIN J. MERRILL
 TIMOTHY J. MICHEL
 JAMES THOMAS MOORE
 DANA N. NELSON
 STEPHEN D. NELSON
 ANDREW H. NICHOLS
 JADE B. NORSTROM
 RODERICK C. OWENS
 TIMOTHY EARL OWENS
 BELINDA A. PETERSEN
 JAMES B. PETTIGREW
 SEAN P. PIERCE
 LAURA J. RADLEY
 ESTEBAN L. RAMIREZ
 JOSHUA C. REDDEN
 KIRSTIN J. REIMANN
 MICHAEL JOE REMUALDO
 ERIC T. RIVERA
 WILLIAM A. ROCK
 CHERIE E. ROFF
 SARAH HELEN RUSS
 CHARLES E. SARGENT
 JOSEPH H. SAVAGE, JR.
 ANDREW D. SCHAD
 MICHAEL T. SCHULTZ
 JAMAR D. SCOTT
 GERARD K. SIMON
 NICOLE C. SLOMINSKI
 EUGENE B. SMITH III
 RYAN S. SPAULDING
 DOUGLAS A. STOFFER
 TIMOTHY I. STRETCH
 DIANA F. STRIEDIECK
 MICHAEL C. THODE
 TODD R. TRUMPOLD
 LANCE F. TURNER
 SANDRA I. VANDIVIERE
 MICHAEL J. VANZO
 ERIC A. VITOSH
 KENT A. WATSON
 JAMES CAMERON WEST
 THOMAS W. WHITE
 GIL BRADLEY WILLIAMS
 NOEL F. WILLIAMS
 BRUCE M. WINHOLD
 BRIAN E. WISH
 PETER A. WOJCIECHOWSKI
 KENNETH P. WOODCOCK
 WILLIAM A. WOOLF
 ANNE E. YELDERMAN
 CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK E. HEATHERLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KARIS K. GRAHAM
 CHARLES T. TOWERY
 MARVIN WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JESUS A. FLORES
 ROBERT C. GOLDFRAP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ERICA R. AUSTIN
 WILLIAM C. AUSTIN
 DIANE CAROL BOLDT
 ROBERT A. BORICH, JR.
 ROBIN L. BRODRICK
 PETER J. CAMP, JR.
 STEPHEN P. DELANGE
 STEPHEN A. GONTIS
 KENNETH P. GORNIC
 GAYLE L. HELLINGER
 JOSEPH S. KIEFER
 CATHERINE J. MCSWAIN
 LAURA J. MEGAN POSCH
 JULIO A. OCAMPO
 JONATHAN M. POLK
 SLOAN M. PYE
 RICHARD G. STEPHENSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GERARD IRVELT BAZILE
 JUNE M. COOK

PAUL B. DESCHNER
TERRY A. HAAG
CHAD M. HIVNOR
GREGORY S. HSU
JOSEPH C. LAWLOR
REINALDO MORALES, JR.
GREGORY A. PINNELL
RICHARD D. QUINTANA
ALFRED CHARLES ROSSUM
EUGENE M. SHUSTERMAN
JEFFERSON R. THURLBY
GRISelda E. TIU
KENNETH J. WRIGHT
FREDERICK L. YOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

STEPHEN L. NELSON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARY J. ABERNETHY
MAUREEN ANN ALLEN
MONSITA J. FALEY
THERESE JULIA KERN
CHERYL A. KNIGHT
JOSEPH MICHAEL MATSON
MATTHEW D. SOMMER
KAREN B. STEINER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL D. AYRES
TAMMY LYNN BURTSCHI
JULIE M. CLEMENT
MICHAEL D. NELSON
JOHN G. OLMEDO
MICHELLE L. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LAURA J. MCWHIRTER
DENISE J. THOMPSON
GREGG E. WENTWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

NICHOLAS J. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ERIC M. CHUMBLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

SCOTT L. WILSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

JOHN P. HARTKE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

ALYSSA B. Y. ARMSTRONG
CHARLES S. BARRS III
BURNES C. W. BROWN
GRANT T. BRYAN
BRYAN J. CARLSON
PATRICK M. CERONE
FRANCIS E. ECLEVIA, JR.
ROBERT S. FAIRLIE
CHRISTIANA M. FLOECK
JASON L. FREDERICK
JESSE W. GASKELL
BRIAN S. GIBSON
BRANDON R. GILESSUMMERS
JOHN W. GILLIGAN
WILLIAM S. GREEN
ROBERT V. HEINZE
KEVIN F. HENDERSON
JOHN E. HOLTHAUS

BENJAMIN K. JONES
AARON K. JORDAN
TOWNEY G. KENNARD III
KEVIN M. KERNO
LEANDRA N. KISSINGER
MATTHEW R. LEWIS
KEN H. LUSK
THOMAS C. MANEMEIT
JOSHUA L. NORVILLE
JOSEPH W. NUTTING
ROBERT W. PERRIS
DWIGHT D. ROBERTS
ANDREW B. SAMPLE
ANTONIA K. SHEY
JEREMY J. SHIPLOV
SCOTT J. TEDRICK
ARTURO TREJO
CHRISTOPHER A. WILLIAMS
KARI E. YAKUBISIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MIRIAM BEHPOUR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THOMAS P. MURPHY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JERMAINE M. CADOGAN
MICHEAL J. CORBIN
AUSTIN E. WREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ANTHONY K. ALEJANDRE
NATHANIEL W. BAKER III
TRACY G. DENMARK
HERMAN E. HOLLEY
KYLE L. HOLLIS
BRIAN E. KELLY
JONATHAN R. KISSER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

PAUL M. HERRLE
ROBERT R. KONO
JAIMEY L. POLK
ROBERT W. PUCKETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

REBECCA L. WILKINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JAY B. DURHAM
ANDREW K. LAW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DANIEL H. CUSINATO
DONALD E. PILCHER
EDUARDO QUIROZ
JOSE C. SOTO
HENRY W. SOUKUP
WILLIAM C. VOLZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RYAN M. CLEVELAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

NICHOLAS K. ELLIS

MARIO A. ORTEGA
ANTHONIE L. SCOTT
JAMES M. WEATHERS
KOLLEEN L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JONATHAN L. RIGGS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRETT D. ABBAMONTE
THOMAS R. ABBOTT
BRETT E. ACKERBAUER
JASON D. ACTIS
GREGORY P. ADAMS
AKEEM O. ADELAGUN
JEFF W. ADUSEI
ROY AGILA
ARTEM S. AGOULNIK
FRANK ALBA, JR.
JOSHUA D. AMBROSE
JAYME M. ARENAS
ANDREW H. ARMSTRONG
ERIC R. ARMSTRONG
JAMES N. ARRASMITH
JEFFREY W. ARROYO
HAMILTON N. ASHWORTH
ORLANDO L. ASHWORTH
CHRISTOPHER T. ATHANAS
JOSHUA M. AVINA
BRIAN M. BAGLEY
COLTER J. BAHLAU
MATTHEW D. BAILEY
DAVID B. BAIN
RAMON BALLESTER III
LUKE I. BALTHAZAR
MATTHEW P. BANKS
NICOLE A. BARBAREE
ROBERT D. BARBAREE III
JEFFREY J. BARNES
RYAN M. BARRY
MICHAEL G. BASHARA
NICOLE V. BASTIAN
JONATHAN R. BEARCE
THOMAS J. BECK
JAMES E. BEESON
SCOTT A. BEIMER
BLAZE A. BELOBRAJDIC
AMY L. BERNARD
JENNIE L. BERNIER
BESSIE L. BERNSTEIN
ANDREW S. BIDDLELL
GARY R. BILLINGS
SCOTTY E. BLACK
JARED D. BLAKE
GARRETT A. BLAKELY
PATRICK E. BLANKENSHIP
BRIAN T. BLOCK
MATTHEW E. BLOSE
DAVID J. BLOSSOM II
GEOFFREY T. BLUMENFELD
TODD B. BOESE II
JARED E. BOMBACI
LUKE A. BORGAN
NICHOLAS K. BORNIS
STEPHEN W. BORRETT
DREW T. BOSSART
BRIAN R. BOSTON
JOSHUA BOURNE
STEVEN P. BRADFORD
JAMES R. BRAME
CHRISTOPHER E. BRANDT
JOHN A. BRENNAN
DERRICK F. BREVILLE
JEFFREY M. BREWER
PAUL A. BRILLANT
PAUL M. BRISKER
JASON W. BRITAIN
REX L. BROOKS III
EDWARD C. BROWN
TYLER G. BRUMMOND
AARON A. BRUSCH
JONATHAN L. BRYANT
ERIC C. BRYE
JESSAMY J. BUBAN
CHAD A. BUCKEL
THOMAS A. BULJTEN
CODY P. BURAS
CLINT J. BURBACH
JAMES A. BURKART
RODNEY L. BURKS
TYLER E. BURNHAM
CHRISTOPHER J. BUSCEMI
DAMIEN M. BUTEL
JUSTIN G. BUTLER
EBEN C. BUXTON
ADAM M. CAMPBELL
DAVID M. CAMPBELL
JUSTIN C. CAMPBELL
NELSON F. CANDELARIO, JR.
CHRISTIAN S. CARLSON
RICHARD F. CARMEAN
SARAH A. CARRASCO
JEREMY L. CARROLL
JONATHAN C. CARTRETT
CHARLES A. CASEY

MATTHEW A. CAVE
CHRISTOPHER J. CAYERE
BRIAN M. CLEGG
PAUL B. CLIFFORD II
JAVIER V. COBA
JOHN C. COLEMAN II
CRAIG W. COLLINGS
STEVEN T. CONTRASCERE
DEREK A. COOK
JODY L. COOLEY
JAMES R. CORRINGTON
PATRICK W. COSGROVE
STEVEN W. COULON
MARC E. COUVILLON
JAMES M. COVEY, JR.
JAMES E. COVINGTON III
NATHAN H. COX
THOMAS A. COYLE
JOSHUA J. CRAVENS
BRADLEY S. CREEDON
JACOB V. CRESPIN
MATTHEW T. CROMPTON
WILLIAM W. CRONKRIGHT
DAVID R. CROOKHAM
JAVIER CRUZ, JR.
DOMINIC J. DALY
JOSHUA J. DARBY
JAYSON M. DAVIDSON
JEREMY L. DAVIS
ARMANDO A. DAVIU
MATTHEW S. DECOURSEY
JAMES E. DEE
MATTHEW D. DEFFENBAUGH
ANTHONY J. DEFURIO
PATRICK C. DEGRAAF
CHRISTOPHER M. DEMARS
JASON R. DEMPSEY
SALVATORE A. DEPAOLA
JARROD T. DEPASQUALE
WALTER R. DICKSON
NICHOLAS R. DIMITRUK
MATTHEW P. DINEEN
ROBERT J. DOLEZAL
MICHAEL R. DONLIN
DAMON A. DOYKOS
JAROD A. DRENNAN
ADAM W. DREXLER
ANIA V. DRISCOLL
DAVID J. DRISCOLL
THOMAS E. DRISCOLL
WALTER C. DRIVER III
NOLAN P. DUCHATEAU
KELSEY L. DUCKWORTH
GREGORY M. DUESTERHAUS
TIMOTHY DUEY
MICHAEL S. DUFFY
PATRICK E. DUNCAN
JOEL D. DUNIVANT
IAN G. DUNLAP
DAVID C. DUNSWORTH
JEREMY B. DURRETTE
GREGORY W. DYSON, JR.
BENJAMIN D. EARLY
NATHANIEL M. EARLY
MATTHEW E. EARNHARDT
ANDREW C. ECKERT
JOSHUA S. EDWARDS
BUDDY J. ELLIS
WILLIAM B. ERDEL
ADAM K. ERNST
MATTHEW T. ESPOSITO
ADRIAN R. EVANGELISTA
BRIAN T. EVERETT
BLAIR W. FAULK
ADORJAN S. FERENCZY
BURR FERGUSON, JR.
LEO FERGUSON III
SEAN J. FERN
CHARLES D. FERREIRA
ADAM J. FERRONE
MATTHEW J. FICHTNER
JASON H. FINCHER
JOHN P. FINKEN
BRIAN J. FISHER
CRAIG T. FITZHUGH
AUSTIN C. FLETCHER
VICTOR V. FLORES
JUSTIN D. FLOYD
SEAN P. FOLEY
CHRISTOPHER J. FOOTE
JOHN F. FORSHTAY
JAMEY D. FOSTER
JOSEPH D. FOSTER
MICHAEL A. FOX
DAVID C. FRANK
JOHN C. FRASER
BRETON A. FREDERICK
TIMOTHY C. FRETWELL
CHRISTOPHER M. FREY
THOMAS A. FREY
LUCAS C. FROKJER
JOSEPH A. FRY
JOHN A. FULTON
MATTHEW C. GAEDE
ALBERT GARCIA IV
ADAM C. GARDNER
MICHAEL L. GARDNER
GARRON J. GARN
ROSS A. GARNETT
PAUL J. GATES, JR.
MATTHEW D. GAYLER
ANITA J. GENETTI

MICHAEL A. GERSON
BRIAN J. GILBERT
MARCUS D. GILLETT
MICHAEL J. GLEESON
JUSTIN P. GOGEL
BRAD A. GOLDBVARG
NATHAN L. GOLIKE
RACHEL A. GONZALES
JOSHUA K. GORDON
PATRICK G. GRAHAM
SCOTT D. GRANIERO
JOEL W. GRAVES
JACOB O. GRAY
SAMUEL P. GRAY
JAMES M. GREEN
MATTHEW J. GREEN
ANDREW B. GREER
JOSHUA D. GREER
NICHOLAS S. GREGSON
DANIEL W. GRINER
DUANE M. GROSS
FELIX GUERRA III
PHILLIP L. GUILLORY II
ANDREA N. GULLIKSEN
NATHAN J. GULOSH
JONATHAN D. GURFEIN
SCOTT D. GURLEY
JORDAN M. GWIAZDON
DAVID K. HAGLUND
REBECCA R. HAGNER
MATTHEW HALTON
AARON M. HAMBLIN
BRIAN HANSELL
NOLAN G. HARDAGE
BRIAN J. HARP
THOMAS M. HARRIS
BRIAN M. HART
GREGORY A. HARTFELDER
BENJAMIN D. HARTLEY
LESLIE A. HARVEY
NICHOLAS J. HARVEY
REBECCA M. HARVEY
KURT R. HASSELL
ANTHONY R. HATALA
NATHAN W. HATFIELD
RORY J. HAYDEN
DALLAS J. HAYES
MICHAEL K. HAYES
RICHARD W. HEASER, JR.
RYAN T. HEIDER
CARL J. HEIM
SCOTT H. HELMINSKI
MATTHEW L. HENDRICKSON
NICHOLAS S. HENRY
LUCAS F. HERNANDEZ
PETER J. HICKSON
EMMALINE J. HILL
MARK J. HODGES
JASEN L. HOFFMAN
MARCUS A. HOFFMAN
KERRY A. HOGAN
JUSTIN P. HOOD
JUSTIN A. HOOKER
TRAVIS L. HORD
ADAM A. HORNE
JACOB E. HOSKINS
WILLIAM R. HOUCK
ALISTAIR E. HOWARD
JOHN HUDOCK IV
JOHN C. HUENEFELD II
JACOB M. HUMMITZSCH
JUSTIN D. HUNTER
CHARLES R. IBATUAN II
HEATHER A. ICHORD
KARL E. IGLER
FREDRICK M. INGRAM
LUIS O. IZQUIERDO
BLAKE JACKSON, JR.
RUSSELL J. JACKSON
NATHAN D. JACOB
PAUL N. JAENICHEN
RICHARD S. JAHELKA
ANTHONY N. JANSEN
ANDREW M. JAROSZ
TANZANIA R. JAYSURA
CEDRIC A. JEFFERSON
MICHAEL F. JIABIA
ESTEBAN JIMENEZ
COLE W. JOHNS
DANIEL J. JOHNSON
JEROMY R. JOHNSON
MATTHEW B. JOHNSON
SAMUEL A. JOHNSON
BLAKE G. JOHNSTON
JACOB P. JONES
MACKENZIE R. JONES
PORTER B. JONES
SAMUEL P. JONES, JR.
ZACHARY P. JONES
PATRICK H. JOSEPH
JOSE A. JURADO III
JESSICA J. KARLIN
ERIC T. KAUFFMAN
ELIZABETH R. KEALEY
GARY A. KEEFER
RUSSELL H. KEENE
ELISHA D. KELLER
JOHN G. KENNEDY
WILLIAM T. KERRIGAN
BRENT L. KERSHAW
MICHAEL J. KIBLER
JASON M. KIKTA

BENJAMIN J. KILEY
DOMINIC F. KIMBEY
ANDREW D. KINGSBURY
JARROD L. KLEMENT
JARED P. KLUSMANN
LUKE B. KNORRA
DANIEL R. KOCAB
ANDREW W. KOCH
DUANE H. KORTMAN, JR.
ASHLEY A. KOSAVANNA
RYAN T. KREBSBACH
JARED A. KROGH
AARON M. KRUDWIG
THOMAS A. KULISZ
LUCAS T. KUNCE
CHRISTOPHER A. KURKA
SHELLEY R. KURTZ
STEPHEN A. LACOVARA
BART P. LAMBERT
KYLE E. LARISH
ANTHONY L. LAVISTA II
NICHOLAS B. LAW
LISA Y. LAWRENCEAROCCHO
CHRISTOPHER G. LEASE
EVERETT D. LEDMAN, JR.
BRAD A. LEEMAN
JOSEPH R. LENNOX
MARK A. LENZI
BRANDON G. LEV
JONATHAN M. LEWENTHAL
DANIEL D. LEWIS
ANDREW J. LINCOLN
MICHAEL T. LIPPERT
JOHN P. LLOYD
GAVIN K. LOGAN
JOEL M. LOMASNEY
CARRICK T. LONGLEY
MICHAEL A. LOWE
PAUL M. LOWMAN
MATTHEW A. LUKE
CLAYTON C. MACALONEY
ANDREW A. MACDOUGALL
MICHAEL C. MADDOCK
MICHAEL B. MAGEE
CHAD J. MAGRO
GABRIEL M. MAGUIRE
PATRICK R. MAHONEY
ADAN A. MALDONADO
KENNETH W. MALONE
PAUL A. MANN
SHANE M. MANN
DAVID S. MANWILLER
DANIEL A. MARQUEZ
CORBETT B. MARTIN
SAMUEL J. MARTIN
MATTHEW D. MARTINEZ
NICOLAS L. MARTINEZ
BRAXTON H. MASHBURN
KARI N. MATTHEWS
WESLEY J. MATTHEWS
NATHAN T. MCANDREWS
LABARRON L. MCBRIDE
EMILY C. MCCABE
THOMAS G. MCCABE
BRIAN L. MCCARTHY
MICHAEL M. MCCOLLUM
KEITH J. MCGILVRAY
DAVID R. MCGRATH, JR.
ELIZABETH A. MCKEON
JAMES G. MCKEON
JOHN P. MCLAUGHLIN
JAMES S. MCLEAN
STEPHEN M. MCNEIL
MATTHEW S. MCNERNEY
MICHAEL R. MCNICOLL
JOHN A. MCNULTY
WESTON S. MCPHEE
JILL A. MCQUISTAN
DANIEL W. MECKLEY
ALEXANDER M. MELLMAN
BENJAMIN T. MENCKE
JOHN R. MENZEL
SCOTT R. MERCER
WILLIAM T. MESSMER
CHARLES R. MICHALK
AARON E. MIDDLETON
BRIAN W. MILLER
JONATHAN R. MILLICAN
BRANDON L. MILLS
ERIC L. MITCHELL
JUSTIN M. MOEYKENS
RAZY MOLINA
MAIA MOLINASCHAEFER
ARNOLD R. MOLLETTE
ROBERT A. MONROE
WILLIAM J. MORAN
ANDREW L. MUELLER
GRAHAM E. MUELLER
JONATHAN M. MUELLER
NICHOLAS W. MULL
ANDREW D. MYERS
DANIEL J. NARDIELLO
EMILY J. NASLUND
JOHN B. NAUGHTON II
BRIAN J. NAWROCKI
TIMOTHY C. NEDER
ANGELA M. NELSON
DAVID C. NELSON
WILLIAM D. NELSON
ROBERT J. NEMAN
COLIN J. NEWBOLD
ANDREW C. NEWBRANDER

ANTHONY J. NGUYEN
 ANDREW D. NICHOLSON
 NICOLE F. NICHOLSON
 SETH A. NICHOLSON
 THOMAS L. NICHOLSON III
 JARON M. NIX
 THANE A. NORMAN
 RICHARD S. NORTON
 MARK P. NOSTRO
 EDWIN D. NUNEZ
 JAMES P. OBRIEN, JR.
 CHARLES M. OLMSTED
 TOMMY L. OLSON
 KIERAN R. ONEIL
 JOSHUA J. ONUSKA
 JANE R. OREN
 CHRISTOPHER T. ORR
 IZAC E. OSSIANDER
 GREGORY D. OSTRIN
 JAROD N. OVERTON
 DOUGLAS B. PACK
 GEOFF S. PALMER
 JAY M. PALMER
 PANAGIOTIS A. PAPADOPOULOS
 MATTHEW J. PARENTE
 BRIAN PARK
 FRANCIS M. PASCUCCI
 CHRISTOPHER A. PASSERELLA
 TIMOTHY L. PATRICK
 MARK R. PATRIDGE
 WILLIAM T. PAXTON
 EUGENE G. PAYNE IV
 JERRY E. PEACOCK
 QUINCY R. PEARSON
 MARK S. PECKHAM
 STEPHEN F. PENNY, JR.
 ALEJANDRO C. PEREZ
 CHRISTOPHER G. PERGOLA
 TODD A. PETERSON
 KYLE A. PETKOVSEK
 MARK M. PHELPS
 HEATH A. PHILLIPS
 KENNETH N. PHILLIPS
 HANSON W. PITCHFORD
 MARIA C. PLOSKI
 JOSEPH A. PLOT
 AARON K. POLANCO
 ANTHONY G. POLLMAN
 WILLIAM J. POMEROY
 TRAVIS R. POST
 AARON R. POWELL
 DOUGLAS T. PUGH
 JEFFREY P. PULLINGER
 SHEREL D. QUINONEZAVILA
 JOSEPH D. QUIRK
 MICHAEL D. RADIGAN
 ANTHONY D. RAMEY
 AUGUSTO D. RAMIREZVALDEZ
 ADRIAN J. RANKINGGALLOWAY
 LECELLE D. RAPALLINI
 DOUGLASS L. RAUSCHELBACH
 ANDREW R. REAVES
 KEVIN M. RECTOR
 JARED L. REDDINGER
 STEPHEN N. REIFF
 THOMAS M. RICE
 SAMUEL A. RICHARD
 PATRICK W. RICHARDSON
 TODD B. RICHARDSON
 TIMOTHY F. RIEMANN
 PHILIPP E. RIGAUT
 JOSEPH T. ROBERTSON
 JEFFERY H. ROBICHAUX
 GAVIN T. ROBILLARD
 JOHN C. ROCK
 SALOMON RODRIGUEZ
 CHRISTOPHER T. ROGERS
 ERIC S. ROGERS
 MICHAEL Y. ROGERS
 NATHAN M. ROLLINS
 CARL J. RONHAAR
 JOHN D. ROTH
 BRADLEY K. ROTHMAN
 JARROD C. ROTHMAN
 CURTIS R. RUBECK
 RICHARD RUIZ
 ZANE M. RUNNING
 JEFFREY A. RZASA
 GEORGE A. SAENZ, JR.
 ANTHONY N. SAMA
 GARY J. SAMPSON
 TAJ T. SAREEN
 JOHN A. SAUTTER
 ANTHONY B. SCARCELLA
 STUART P. SCHELLER, JR.
 WILL A. SCHMITT
 JASON C. SCHNEIDER
 ROBERT C. SCHOTTER
 CHRISTOPHER E. SCHREINER
 JOHN T. SCHREINER
 JASON T. SCHULZE
 JESSE P. SCHWEIG
 CAROLINE A. SCUDDER
 REGINALD M. SEALEY II
 JUSTIN M. SHARPE
 TAYLOR E. SHENKMAN
 WAYNE SHEW
 WAN J. SHO
 STEVEN J. SICLARI
 SCOTT M. SILVA
 WILLIAM B. SIMI
 DWANE SIMS

JOHN R. SISSON
 ERIC J. SKOCZENSKI
 COURTNEY E. SLAPETER
 JOSEPH L. SLUSSER
 KEVIN T. SMALEY
 CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH
 JASON L. SMITH
 JEREMY B. SMITH
 JOHN K. SMITH
 JUSTIN G. SMITH
 KENNETH W. SMITH
 KEVIN A. SMITH
 MATTHEW T. SMITH
 JASON M. SNOOK
 ADAM M. SNYDER
 KEVIN M. SOEDER
 JARROD M. SOKOLOWSKI
 GUNNAR A. SPAFFORD
 JAMES J. STANFORD
 NICHOLAS B. STATS
 MICAH A. STEINPFAD
 JASON T. STEPHENSON
 CAYCE M. STEVENS
 RYAN A. STEVENS
 ROBERT L. STEVENSON III
 NICKOLAS A. STEWARD
 RYAN C. STEWART
 ANDREW W. STGEORGE
 JESSE C. STICE
 WILLIAM H. STROM
 BRIAN J. SULLIVAN
 PATRICK C. SULLIVAN
 CHAD SUMMERVILLE
 JUSTIN E. SUMNER
 EARL A. SWEIGART, JR.
 ADDISON T. TAFEL
 HOI W. TAM
 BILL C. TAMAYO, JR.
 DILLON C. TAYLOR
 EVAN E. TAYLOR
 MICHAEL A. TAYLOR
 ERIKA M. TEICHERT
 BRYCESON K. TENOLD
 JEFFREY M. THARP
 ADAM B. THOMAS
 CRAIG W. THOMAS II
 JAMES C. THOMPSON, JR.
 STEVEN K. THOMPSON
 CHARLENE L. THOREEN
 GABRIEL W. TIGGS
 WILLIAM M. TOMASZEK, JR.
 DAVID L. TRAN
 VIET B. TRAN
 CHAD E. TUCKER
 SETH E. TUFVESSON
 RAYMOND J. TUNG
 PETER C. TUNIS
 DANIEL T. TURAJ
 RYAN J. TUTTLE
 NICHOLAS A. TVERDOSI
 NICHOLAS R. TYSON
 DONALD W. UNDERWOOD
 GEORGE M. UREKE
 KATELYN M. VANDAM
 GRAHAM C. VANDUSEN
 GREGORY A. VAUGHAN
 DOUGLAS J. VERBLAAUW
 MATTHEW D. VERDIN
 RYAN E. VONREMBOW
 RICHARD J. WAGNER
 MORGAN J. WALKER
 MICHAEL T. WALLACE
 MICHAEL P. WALLS
 MICHAEL L. WATKINS
 JOSEPH J. WEAKLEY
 MICHAEL R. WEBB
 NEVILLE A. WELCH
 ADAM D. WELLINGTON
 RICHARD J. WHALEN III
 PATRICK J. WHERRY
 JONATHAN G. WHITE
 MICHAEL D. WHITEFORD
 JASON P. WHITTAKER
 ROBERT W. WICKHAM
 JOSEPH T. WIDMAYER
 JOSEF H. WIESE
 MATTHEW D. WILCKENS
 CHRISTOPHER F. WILDT
 ADAM S. WILKIE
 JON K. WILKINS
 JOHN L. WILLIAMS II
 CURTIS A. WILLIAMSON
 MICHAEL W. WILLIAMSON
 NATHAN S. WILLIS
 LOGAN K. WILLMAN
 SEAN D. WILLS
 KYLE S. WILT
 ANDREW G. WIMSATT
 ERIC P. WINKOFESKY
 CHRISTOPHER D. WINN
 DAVID J. WINSLOW
 JAMES J. WISSMANN
 MARK A. WLASCHIN
 JAVIER W. WONG
 LISA S. WOO
 DOUGLAS A. WOODCOCK
 BRANDON H. WOODS
 JOSHUA W. WORT
 ADAM YANG
 DAVID M. YORCK
 PETER J. YOUNG
 KENNETH M. ZEBLEY

JASON E. ZELLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MATTHEW F. AMIDON
 THOMAS M. ARMAS
 MARK C. BOONE
 ERIC A. BORSONI
 CHARLES W. BREWER
 BRIAN T. CASKEY
 ALEXANDER J. CHOTKOWSKI
 RICHARD J. CREVIER
 SEAN N. DAY
 DOMINIC J. DEFAZIO
 KYLE R. DEWAR
 STEFAN M. DIRGHALLI
 RICHARD G. ERICKSON
 FRISCILLA P. FAILMEZGER
 PHILIP B. FARR
 SPENCER T. FARRAR
 KEITH M. FULLER
 MARK J. HENDERSON
 JON S. HETLAND
 MARGARET M. JOHNSON
 JOHN F. KELLIHER III
 JOHN G. KERWOOD
 ALBERT K. KIM
 PATRICIA S. KLOP
 MARK A. LAMELZA
 AMBER M. LEHNING
 KIM J. MAHONEY
 MATTHEW A. MCGARVEY
 ARTHUR B. MCKEEL
 EDWARD D. MCNULTY
 SETH M. MILSTEIN
 JOHN E. MOORE
 KYLE J. MOORE
 PAUL R. OUELLETTE
 JOHN F. PETERSON
 CATHLEEN M. REYNOLDS
 BENJAMIN P. RICHMOND
 JOAQUIN A. SALAS
 MATTHEW C. SHORTAL
 KENT E. WALSH
 DANIEL P. WHISNANT
 JOHN A. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID C. WALSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT W. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAWN R. ALONSO
 JAMES H. BAIN
 THOMAS P. BAJUS II
 DAVID G. BARDORF
 JOHN B. BARRANCO, JR.
 ANDREW J. BERGEN
 ANTHONY C. BOLDEN
 RICHARD T. BRADY
 TIMOTHY G. BURTON
 CURTIS W. CARLIN
 ADAM L. CHALKLEY
 DARIN J. CLARKE
 JOSEPH R. CLEARFIELD
 MARK H. CLINGAN
 ERIC D. CLOUTIER
 SCOTT E. CONWAY
 ELMER K. COUCH
 JOSEPH E. DELANEY
 STEVEN J. DELAZARO
 WILLIAM L. DEPUE, JR.
 JONATHAN P. DUNNE
 KYLE B. ELLISON
 CHRISTOPHER R. ESCAMILLA
 JAMES P. FALLON
 PETER C. FARNUM
 WALKER M. FIELD
 DOM D. FORD
 SCOTT A. GONDEK
 THOMAS D. GORE
 WENDY J. GOYETTE
 RYAN R. GUTZWILLER
 ROBERT J. HALLETT
 ANDRE T. HARRELL
 GARRETT R. HOFFMAN
 BRIAN M. HOWLETT
 MIKEL R. HUBER
 LAWRENCE K. HUSSEY
 EDWARD L. JEEP
 SCOTT R. JOHNSON
 TERRY M. JOHNSON
 CRAIG C. LEFLORE
 RAUL LIANEZ
 GEORGE W. MARKERT V
 JAMES C. MCARTHUR

January 26, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 161, Pt. 1

1157

PATRICK S. MCDONIEL
MARIA S. MCMILLEN
HALSTEAD MEADOWS III
ROBERT S. MORGAN
CHANDLER S. NELMS
KEVIN A. NORTON
KEVIN T. OROURKE
BRIAN R. PETERSON
FORREST C. POOLE III

MATTHEW S. REID
ERIC J. ROPELLA
RICHARD J. SCHMIDT
TIMOTHY A. SHEYDA
FARRELL J. SULLIVAN
JOHN P. SULLIVAN, JR.
LELAND W. SUTTEE
MICHAEL C. TAYLOR
DONALD J. TOMICH

CARLOS O. URBINA
NICHOLAS P. VAVICH
ROBERT S. WHITE
STEVEN J. WHITE
ZACHARY M. WHITE
JOHN J. WIENER
VINCENT J. YASAKI

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 26, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 26, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICK W. ALLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, paying for college is hard work, and it is getting more difficult as tuition and fees continue to increase at rapid rates.

Fortunately, American families have an investment tool known as a 529 plan to help them save for their child's college education. Since 2001, students have been able to withdraw earnings from these plans tax free if the funds are used to pay for qualified higher education expenses.

It was disheartening to learn last week that President Obama now wants to tax those withdrawals and treat the earnings as student income, which would hurt a child's chances of receiving financial aid. With student loan debt surpassing credit card debt, it is incredibly irresponsible of the President to take away this valuable tool that millions of American families use to save for college.

House Republicans will fight this attempt to raise taxes on hardworking American families. We want to encour-

age, not discourage, families from investing in their child's future.

PRESIDENT EARNS THREE PINOCCHIOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "Our diplomacy is at work with respect to Iran where, for the first time in a decade, we have halted the progress of its nuclear program and reduced its stockpile of nuclear material."

This absurd claim by the President last week earned him three Pinocchios from The Washington Post. Many disagree, including a former International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, official, who says:

It appears that the production of centrifuge components continues. No new nuclear components have been installed, but it does not mean that the production of those came to a halt.

For over a decade, the United States, along with the rest of the U.N. Security Council, has tried, but failed, to reach a deal with Tehran on its nuclear weapon program. Iran has defiantly marched toward developing nuclear weapons, while refusing to negotiate with the United States in good faith. Instead, its leaders have continued to call for the destruction of Israel and the destruction of the United States. Now, isn't that lovely.

Just this November, in the midst of nuclear negotiations, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps released this statement:

The United States is still the great Satan and number one enemy of the Islamic Revolution and the Islamic Republic and the Iranian nation.

Iran's actions over the years are not surprising. After all, it is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. Using both its own military operatives and its proxy, Hezbollah, Iran has planned attacks, terror, and murder throughout the globe. Hezbollah is the puppet, but Iran pulls the strings.

Finally, after years of Iran stalling and defying calls to halt its nuclear weapon development, the West played hardball with sanctions, primarily targeting Iran's bank and energy industries. The sanctions worked. Iran's GDP dropped for the first time in 20 years, and Iran finally came to the negotiating table.

Then came the white flag and the great retreat of 2013. The administration relaxed sanctions just when Iran

was beginning to feel the consequences of its actions. Relaxing sanctions has helped Iran, helped its economy, and resulted in Iran reverting to its defiant ways.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions worked. Now is not the time to retreat, appease and play the Chamberlain. If anything, we should increase sanctions. Congress is trying to do that, but the President has now publicly told Congress—and Iran—that he will veto any legislation that increases sanctions. This seems to be at odds with United States national security. Negotiators in Europe and the U.S. want to relax sanctions. They are acting like timid sheep. They cannot lay down with the jackal of the desert, Iran, for they shall be his mutton meal. Mr. Speaker, loosening up on sanctions is foolish, dangerous, and not dealing in reality.

Further, the Iranian negotiations do not even discuss intercontinental ballistic missiles. Why is Iran building intercontinental ballistic missiles? Prime Minister Netanyahu said it best:

Iran isn't building ICBMs for Israel. They have missiles that can hit us. They are building ICBMs to hit America.

Iran wants ICBMs to carry a nuclear weapon across the pond to us, the U.S. A top adviser to Iranian President Hassan Rouhani recently said:

Obama is the weakest of all U.S. Presidents.

Now is the time for the leader of the free world to prove Iran wrong. The world, including our enemies, are watching. The U.S. must make it clear and unequivocal: there will be no reductions in sanctions without verified steps to show that Tehran is abandoning, not just freezing, its nuclear weapon program. If Iran obtains nukes, the consequences are all bad. Israel will be less secure. The United States will be less secure. Other nations, like Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt, will all seek and obtain nukes to balance power in the Middle East.

The Iranian Government cannot be dealt with like normal countries. This "hug diplomacy" with them is not in the national security interest of the U.S. Their Supreme Leader has never wavered on his religious and political agenda to destroy the United States. Iran must be forced to cease its nuclear weapon program by sanctions. We must impose such sanctions that cripple Iran's economy to force the Iranians to stop their nuclear weapon development. And hopefully at some point the people of Iran will soon have had

enough warmongering by its leaders and replace their government.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this people's House, as we are in the beginning days of this new Congress. Encompass with Your power all the walls of this building, truly a symbol to the world of inalienable rights and the freedom of people.

Guide and protect Your elected servants in government and all who work in this place. May all who visit here be treated with respect and kindness.

May the comings and goings of Your people be under the seal of Your loving care and all work accomplished here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REMEMBERING CHIEF JAMES ALLEN

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of a terrific leader and public servant in northwest Arkansas, Rogers Police Chief James Allen, who passed away last Thursday after a long battle with cancer.

Chief Allen began his law enforcement career in 1977 as a patrolman and EMT for the Jacksonville, Arkansas, Police Department, and then served with the Arkansas Alcoholic Beverage Control Enforcement Division and the Pulaski County Sheriff's Office before moving to Bentonville in 1989, where he enjoyed 22 years of faithful and dedicated service as that city's chief.

In 2011, Chief Allen left Bentonville to serve my hometown of Rogers, where his leadership and professionalism were admired by all. He leaves behind a law enforcement community shaped impeccably by a firm but fair leadership standard.

Our two communities, Mr. Speaker, mourn with his family and friends, and it is with a heavy heart that we say good-bye to this respected law enforcement professional.

Rest in peace, Chief Allen. Our State and Nation are forever grateful for your service.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT CRISIS

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here and speak on the House floor for the first time. I want to thank my constituents, the 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Montgomery County, for giving me this unique opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak about an issue that affects millions of Americans in the middle class, myself included—the student loan debt crisis. While I applaud President Obama's announcement of the America's College Promise proposal, which would provide 2 years of community college to responsible students, we do need to make expansion of higher education more enduring through the weight of legislative action.

According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student loan debt has become the largest form of consumer debt in the United States other than mortgages. The financial load on America's students has more than tripled over the past decade to well over \$1 trillion. The formidable costs that aspiring students face as they consider college or trade school poses an enormous obstacle to their personal and professional development.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to many other occasions to speak about this issue, as we clearly have to deal with it as a nation and come together.

INDIA HUMAN RIGHTS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the state of religious freedom and pluralism in India. In a very troubling pattern, India's historic pluralism is being replaced with intolerance, division, and majoritarianism.

Reports from NGOs, one of which I will submit for the RECORD today, have documented a rise in attacks by Hindu nationalists against minority Christian populations in the first 100 days of the new government. Continuing reports show a pattern of targeting religious minorities, including India's notably moderate Muslim population. The burning of churches, brutal beatings, intimidation, and arrests of pastors have created a tenuous climate in Indian society.

As the government embarks on economic reforms, it should not ignore the plight of minorities. Newly elected Prime Minister Modi must speak out and act on this violence. Furthermore, the Obama administration must forcibly speak out on behalf of oppressed populations. Human rights should be elevated in the strategic dialogue between our two countries. Our government must display moral clarity in our approach to gross violations of international religious freedom—no matter where they occur.

FULFILLING PROMISE TO PHILIPPINE ARMY VETERANS

(Mr. TAKAI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in righting a wrong that has existed since the end of World War II. Around 250,000 Filipino soldiers fought alongside U.S. forces in World War II. In 1946, President Truman stated that it is a "moral obligation of the United States to look after the welfare of the Philippine Army veterans."

Forty-four years later, President Bush signed the Immigration Act of 1990, which offered citizenship to around 26,000 Filipino World War II veterans, but it did not include their immediate families. Today, the number of surviving veterans is dwindling. Fewer than 4,000 are still alive. Many of these veterans live in Hawaii.

It is our duty to see this obligation through and to take care of those who have fought for our country. We must lift limitations on immigrant visas and restrictions for their children. I ask you to join me in making good on our Nation's commitment to these service-members.

SECURING OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I traveled to McAllen, Texas, down to our border, to once again tour the intake facilities that are being used to process the tens of thousands of individuals who are crossing into the United States each year.

This problem has not gone away. Last summer, I spent time at home listening to my constituents at town hall meetings. The number one concern for Texans was the influx of illegal immigrants into our State. For Texans, this has meant a strain on our classrooms, a strain on our hospitals, a major strain on local law enforcement and our economy in general.

Last year, the President refused to come to the Texas border. The President so far has refused to govern. The President has refused to follow the rule of law and continues to turn our once-porous border into a wide-open space.

As such, we must do all we can to secure the southern border and send a loud and clear message to the child traffickers and to the drug smugglers who are taking children on a treacherous journey from Central America to the United States and setting them up for failure once they are here. We must end this human rights crisis. The correct way is to secure our southern border.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROPOSAL

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week in his State of the Union Address, President Obama proposed to fund publicly the first 2 years of community college for all Americans.

As a former community college president, I am a huge fan of community colleges and the great educational opportunities they provide students from all walks of life. However, I am reminded of the old Peanuts cartoon where Linus says to Lucy: "Every time there's a good suggestion, someone brings up the budget."

Making higher education affordable and attainable for America's students must be a priority, but President Obama's \$60 billion proposal is the wrong approach for the Federal Government to take. Rather than yet another top-down Federal Government boondoggle, we need to focus on new ways to promote innovation, access, and completion, and we need to eliminate Federal impediments that prevent institutions from delivering higher education in more creative, cost-effective ways.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 26, 2015 at 12:47 p.m.:

That the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 38, relative to the death of Wendell H. Ford.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. SMITH, New Jersey, Chairman.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. SMITH, New Jersey, Chairman.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1533

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

DISPENSING WITH MORNING-HOUR DEBATE ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the

House of January 6, 2015, regarding morning-hour debate not apply tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PRIORITIZATION ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 514) to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 514

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Human Trafficking Prioritization Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The International Labor Organization estimates that nearly 21,000,000 people are subjected to modern slavery around the world at any given time and that the majority of the enslaved are women and girls.

(2) Congress authorized the creation of a Department of State Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (division A of Public Law 106-386) in order to directly assist the Secretary of State in his or her effort to coordinate a United States Government interagency response to domestic and international trafficking in persons.

(3) The Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons monitors trafficking worldwide and produces the online and printed versions of the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, which is Congress' primary resource for human trafficking reporting, analysis, and recommendations on the United States and 186 countries around the world.

(4) The annual Trafficking in Persons Report contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, and these tier rankings have become an essential diplomatic tool for promoting protection for victims, prevention of trafficking, and prosecution of perpetrators.

(5) Some countries have openly stated, and many others have confided, that dramatic improvements in the country's human trafficking record were directly related to avoidance of a low tier ranking in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report.

(6) Ambassador Mark Lagon, former Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (2007-2009), testified before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on April 18, 2013, that “[T]he State Department does a tremendous job in producing a report which tells it like it is, offering objective rankings. Yet at times it pulls punches, typically due to the urging of regional specialists rather than the TIP Office’s dedicated experts on trafficking.”

(7) Ambassador John Miller, former Ambassador-at-Large to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (2002-2006), recently stated that, “Upgrading the status of the Office to a Bureau will not create additional bureaucracy—it will simply give JTIP and the Ambassador-at-large who heads it equal standing with regional and functional bureaus at the State Department. That standing is absolutely essential for the issue to remain a priority, especially when multiple U.S. interests are engaged.”

(8) The tier ranking process authorized by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 has been in some instances compromised by the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking subordinate stature within the Department of State.

(9) It is essential for Congress and the Secretary of State to be accurately informed regarding United States and foreign country successes and failures in the fight against human trafficking.

(10) The diplomatic power and credibility of the Trafficking in Persons Report is based on rigorous scholarship and scrupulous application of the minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking and is undermined by political, rather than factual, tier rankings.

(11) Strong and effective anti-slavery policy requires that officials from the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking have equal hierarchical standing with State Department regional bureaus and direct access to the Secretary of State.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State will be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Office status is changed to that of a Bureau within the Department hierarchy;

(2) the change in status from Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to a Bureau can be accomplished without increasing the number of personnel or the budget of the current Office;

(3) a Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Bureau were headed by an Assistant Secretary with direct access to the Secretary of State, rather than an Ambassador-at-Large; and

(4) the Secretary of State should review the current use of the 24 Assistant Secretary positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) and make appropriate revisions, consolidations, and eliminations, to ensure that those positions reflect the highest Departmental needs and foreign policy priorities of the United States, including efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

SEC. 4. BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(e) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(e)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING” and inserting “BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking” and inserting “Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons”;

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “Office” and inserting “Bureau”; and

(C) in the sixth sentence, by striking “Office” and inserting “Bureau”; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), by striking “Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking” and inserting “Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons”.

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or in any other Act to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall be deemed to be a reference to the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

SEC. 5. REPORT REGARDING DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) for each current Assistant Secretary of State position—

(A) the title of that Assistant Secretary of State;

(B) how long that particular Assistant Secretary designation has been in existence; and

(C) whether that particular Assistant Secretary designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation for such mandate or authorization; and

(2) whether the Secretary intends to designate one of the Assistant Secretary of State positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

SEC. 6. COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.

Section 110(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (D) and (E), a country that—

“(i) was included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for 4 consecutive years after the date of the enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008; and

“(ii) was subsequently included on the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(C), may not thereafter be included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for more than 1 consecutive year.”.

SEC. 7. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for “Diplomatic and Consular Programs” to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials into the RECORD that they may wish to include.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, as our House of Representatives continues its fight against human trafficking, I rise in support of this legislation, which is called the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act. This legislation will elevate consideration of trafficking issues within the Department of State to ensure that they receive the same attention as other diplomatic concerns. This is a struggle we have had for some time, trying to elevate these issues so that they are on par and given the seriousness that we have tried to drive here in Congress.

Congress created the Department of State’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. We created that institution a decade and a half ago. We did it in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000. The purpose of this Office was to better communicate and coordinate U.S. Government efforts to combat both domestic and international trafficking.

In line with this mandate, the Office prepares the annual Trafficking in Persons Report, which details anti-trafficking efforts of other countries and classifies countries as falling into one of three tiers based on their efforts to combat human trafficking.

These TIP Reports and their tier rankings have proven, as you know, extremely useful in helping our diplomats fight human trafficking. It allows us to transform this issue into a global policy priority. We know that foreign governments have made real improvements in their work to combat trafficking as a result of these TIP Reports; and the reason this is so, of course, is because, as you talk to foreign governments, they are very concerned about the threat of a low tier ranking. That gets international attention today. That is sort of the leverage that we have on these governments to pass laws that are serious about going after trafficking.

But we also understand that this annual exercise is periodically constrained by the Department’s regional diplomats who fear we may agitate foreign governments when hard truths

surface. A former Ambassador at Large on trafficking issues testified before Congress that the Department sometimes “pulls punches” and defers to regional specialists on the TIP Report’s tier rankings rather than the TIP Office’s trafficking experts.

This is what we want to counter because what we want is the maximum pressure for foreign governments to follow through on their international commitments to try to abolish human trafficking. By elevating the Trafficking Office to a bureau, this measure will give these experts the bureaucratic standing they need to ensure their concerns are fully heard, effectively leveling the playing field for this annual process.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of our Human Rights Subcommittee, for his years of leadership in this fight against human trafficking and for reintroducing this bill, which passed this House last July.

I also thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) specifically for his efforts, as we have traveled in Asia, to pressure these governments to end human trafficking.

I urge the Members to support this important measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 514, the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act.

First, let me thank the gentleman from California, Chairman ROYCE, and the gentleman from New York, Ranking Member ENGEL, for their leadership on this issue. I particularly want to thank my outstanding colleague from New Jersey, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, for introducing this important piece of legislation and for the work he has done for so many years on this issue. This bill will elevate the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to the status of a bureau within the State Department.

Put simply, human trafficking is slavery. Victims of human trafficking are deprived of their individual freedoms and suffer unimaginably harsh, coercive, and heartbreaking conditions.

Reports indicate that there is no place in the world where children, women, and men are safe from human trafficking. That means that every government in the world has a responsibility to combat this problem.

The United States has made significant progress toward responding to these crimes within our borders and abroad since Congress passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act in 2000. Mr. Speaker, today we can take the next step forward by elevating the State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons to a bureau.

This Office is already doing incredible work. The annual Trafficking in Persons Report has become the global gold standard in assessing how well governments around the world are meeting this challenge and how serious they take their responsibility to eradicate this horrific practice. Their work is forging partnerships and driving innovation on how best to approach this problem, and the Office plays a key role in coordinating our whole-of-government approach to this problem. Elevating the Trafficking Office to a bureau sends a strong message to the world that the United States remains committed to combating modern-day slavery.

Passing this legislation alone will not end this despicable practice, and it is not a problem that we will solve quickly or easily. However, every step we take enhances our ability to prevent these crimes, protect victims, and punish those responsible.

Mr. Speaker, we passed the same bill last Congress. I urge my colleagues to support and pass this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, the author of this bill, but also, frankly, the architect of a long-running strategy in this institution, in this Congress, to abolish this form of human slavery. When I think of William Wilberforce, the one Member I know who exemplifies that spirit today is the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, who has worked on this mightily since the late nineties, and we are pleased that his bill is up before us today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, Chairman ROYCE, for his very kind words and for working to expedite the consideration of these important bills. This is an historic week in the House as we seek to pass 12 bills to fight human trafficking.

As the prime author of the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, as well as reauthorizations in ’03 and ’05, I believe the bills under consideration by the House today will further prevent the horrific crimes of human trafficking, protect and assist the victims, and aid the prosecution of those who exploit and abuse.

I would also like to offer my profound appreciation to Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY for ensuring that all of the hard work done in a bipartisan way in the House in the 113th session is not lost nor will it be delayed but, rather, immediately sent back to the Senate for action.

Leader MCCARTHY has explored numerous ways, in meeting after meeting

with Members, again, on both sides of the aisle, to find ways to prevent, to prosecute traffickers, and to protect victims. His deep personal commitment to ending modern-day slavery has and will continue to make a major difference.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this bill on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from California, Ranking Member KAREN BASS, who is the chief cosponsor.

I am proud to say the United States continues to lead the world in our trafficking responses at home and abroad, charting the course of best practices for other countries to follow. One of the most successful ways the U.S. transmits our best practices and ensures accountability for the minimum standards to eliminate human trafficking is the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons in the U.S. Department of State.

Over the last 15 years, this Office has been led by talented and dedicated Ambassadors—including the most recent one, Luis CdeBaca, with whom we work very closely—who have produced the annual Trafficking in Persons Reports, laying bare the record of almost every country for the world to see and summarizing the country’s progress in what we call the annual tier rankings.

□ 1545

For the record, the TVPA established Tier 1 countries. They are the ones that fully meet the minimum standards prescribed in the law. Tier 2 countries do not meet the minimum standards but are making a significant effort to do so. Tier 2 Watch List countries are in a grace period and in real danger of becoming Tier 3 without real action, not just promises of action.

Tier 3 countries do not meet the standards and are not making significant effort to do so. Along with the embarrassment of being listed on Tier 3, Tier 3 countries are susceptible to sanctions by the U.S. Government.

Since the TIP Report’s inception, Mr. Speaker, more than 100 countries have enacted anti-trafficking laws, and many countries have taken other steps required to significantly raise their tier rankings—citing the TIP Report as a key factor in their new anti-trafficking efforts. It is a very robust effort in our Embassies, and every country of the world is a part of it.

We have found a system that works; but, tragically, it is sometimes misguided, muffled, and marginalized by unrelated bilateral concerns and by the internal structure of the U.S. Department of State.

As my dear friend, the chairman of the committee, said a moment ago, it was Ambassador Mark Lagon who talked about how they produce a great report, but then, typically, due to the urging of regional specialists rather than the TIP Office’s dedicated experts, the ranking and the process goes awry.

The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, or H.R. 514, will remedy this problem by keeping the fight against human trafficking from being lost in the politics of other U.S. interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 514 will raise the status of the J/TIP Office to that of a bureau, ensuring that the leadership of J/TIP is present and has an equal voice at meetings with the other bureaus and the Secretary of State.

Former colleague, John Miller, an Ambassador at Large from 2002 to 2006 said:

Upgrading the status of the Office to a bureau will not create additional bureaucracy—it will simply give J/TIP and the Ambassador at Large who heads it equal standing with regional and functional bureaus at the State Department. That standing is absolutely essential for the issue to remain a priority, especially when multiple U.S. interests are engaged.

We are not authorizing the J/TIP Office to be larger, but for the excellent work of the Office to be consistently heard at a higher level.

In addition, the bill stops countries and other State Department bureaus from gaming the tier ranking system by limiting the time problem countries can use promises of action to avoid a tier downgrade.

Currently, a country can sit on the Tier 2 Watch List for up to 4 years with Presidential waivers, effectively stringing the U.S. along with promises to take action, but never actually taking action. After 4 years, by law, the country must be automatically downgraded to Tier 3.

The law worked very well in its first implementation in the 2013 reporting cycle, but we discovered a problem in 2013, when China was prematurely upgraded from Tier 3 to the Tier 2 Watch List. As the law is currently written, Mr. Speaker, China can, again, game the system with promises and no action for 4 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman as much time as he might consume.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will hold countries like China accountable by limiting to 1 year the amount of time a country can stay on the Tier 2 Watch List after the country was previously auto-downgraded to Tier 3.

The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act builds on the successes of J/TIP and the tier ranking system for the sake of approximately 21 million people still living in modern-day slavery and, again, does so without increasing the cost of government.

The Human Trafficking Prioritization Act will give J/TIP the integration, it will give it the voice it deserves within the State Department, and it will ensure accurate accountability for countries failing to meet minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and, again, I thank my friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, seeing that I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have already mentioned the impact that these TIP Reports have. I want to point out that it is not every day that we can claim this kind of impact for a U.S. Government report.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have traveled and tried to enforce these laws know how effective this is. This legislation here would make the TIP Report an even more influential diplomatic tool.

I, again, want to thank Subcommittee Chairman SMITH for his authoring the legislation and moving it through committee.

I urge Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 514, "Human Trafficking Prioritization Act."

I support this bipartisan legislation which amends the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to change the status of the State Department Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to that of the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

Mr. Speaker, this change in the name of this vital office can be accomplished without an increase in funding or personnel.

H.R. 514, a bipartisan Foreign Affairs Committee bipartisan bill, directs the Secretary of State to report to Congress on each current Assistant Secretary of State position the exact title and length of designation as Assistant Secretary, and whether that designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation; and

Further, the Secretary of State is asked whether they intend to designate one of the Assistant Secretary of State positions as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

I have a concern regarding the bill's amendment of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to prohibit subsequent inclusion for more than one consecutive year on the special watch list of countries whose compliance with minimum standards for the elimination of human trafficking is full, partial, or insignificant if the country:

was included on the list for four consecutive years after enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, and

was subsequently included on the exclusive Tier 3 list of countries not making significant efforts to bring themselves into compliance with such standards.

It is important that the mechanisms for reaching determinations regarding compliance with anti-human trafficking measures are consistent and reliable over time.

There should be care taken that places around the globe with long histories of human trafficking do not find ways limit access to information that would better measure their progress in eradicating the practice and bring to justice those involved.

According to the Report, the most common form of human trafficking (79%) is sexual exploitation. The victims of sexual exploitation are predominantly women and girls. Surprisingly, in 30% of the countries which provided information on the gender of traffickers, women make up the largest proportion of traffickers. In some parts of the world, women trafficking women is the norm.

The second most common form of human trafficking is forced labor (18%), although this may be a misrepresentation because forced labor is less frequently detected and reported than trafficking for sexual exploitation.

Globally about 20% of all trafficking victims are children. Unfortunately in parts of Africa children are the majority, these numbers rise to 100% in some parts of West Africa.

Many of those who are victims of human trafficking are exploited in locations near their home.

According to the 2009 United Nations Report on "Human Trafficking Exposes Modern Form of Slavery" research reveals that internal regional and domestic trafficking are a source of the problems.

The United Nations Protocol against Trafficking in Persons reports that in the past few years the number of Member States seriously implementing the Protocol has doubled going from 54 to 125 out of the 155 nations.

In 2009, there were many countries that lacked the necessary legal framework or political will to take on the issue of human trafficking.

I join my colleagues in working to strengthen laws nationally and internationally against human trafficking, and supporting the allocation of resources toward that end.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 514.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 514.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL MEGAN'S LAW TO PREVENT DEMAND FOR CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 515) to protect children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in

tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 515

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “International Megan’s Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Angel Watch Center.

Sec. 5. Sense of Congress provisions.

Sec. 6. Enhancing the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.

Sec. 7. Assistance to foreign countries to meet minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking.

Sec. 8. Rules of construction.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Megan Nicole Kanka, who was 7 years old, was abducted, sexually assaulted, and murdered in 1994, in the State of New Jersey by a violent predator living across the street from her home. Unbeknownst to Megan Kanka and her family, he had been convicted previously of a sex offense against a child.

(2) In 1996, Congress adopted Megan’s Law (Public Law 104–145) as a means to encourage States to protect children by identifying the whereabouts of sex offenders and providing the means to monitor their activities.

(3) In 2006, Congress passed the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248) to protect children and the public at large by establishing a comprehensive national system for the registration and notification to the public and law enforcement officers of convicted sex offenders.

(4) Law enforcement reports indicate that known child-sex offenders are traveling internationally, and that the criminal background of such individuals may not be known to local law enforcement prior to their arrival.

(5) The commercial sexual exploitation of minors in child sex trafficking and pornography is a global phenomenon. The International Labour Organization has estimated that 1.8 million children worldwide are victims of child sex trafficking and pornography each year.

(6) Child sex tourism, where an individual travels to a foreign country and engages in sexual activity with a child in that country, is a form of child exploitation and, where commercial, child sex trafficking.

(7) According to research conducted by The Protection Project of The Johns Hopkins University Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, sex tourists from the United States who target children form a significant percentage of child sex tourists in some of the most significant destination countries for child sex tourism.

(8) In order to protect children, it is essential that United States law enforcement be able to identify child-sex offenders in the United States who are traveling abroad and child-sex offenders from other countries entering the United States. Such identification requires cooperative efforts between the United States and foreign governments. In exchange for providing notice of child-sex offenders traveling to the United States, foreign authorities will expect United States authorities to provide reciprocal notice of child-sex offenders traveling to their countries.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CENTER.**—The term “Center” means the Angel Watch Center established pursuant to section 4(a).

(2) **CHILD-SEX OFFENDER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “child-sex offender” means an individual who is a sex offender described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911) by reason of being convicted of a child-sex offense.

(B) **DEFINITION OF CONVICTED.**—In this paragraph, the term “convicted” has the meaning given the term in paragraph (8) of section 111 of such Act.

(3) **CHILD-SEX OFFENSE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “child-sex offense” means a specified offense against a minor, as defined in paragraph (7) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911), including—

(i) an offense (unless committed by a parent or guardian) involving kidnapping;

(ii) an offense (unless committed by a parent or guardian) involving false imprisonment;

(iii) solicitation to engage in sexual conduct;

(iv) use in a sexual performance;

(v) solicitation to practice prostitution;

(vi) video voyeurism as described in section 1801 of title 18, United States Code;

(vii) possession, production, or distribution of child pornography;

(viii) criminal sexual conduct involving a minor, or the use of the Internet to facilitate or attempt such conduct; and

(ix) any conduct that by its nature is a sex offense against a minor.

(B) **OTHER OFFENSES.**—The term “child-sex offense” includes a sex offense described in paragraph (5)(A) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 that is a specified offense against a minor, as defined in paragraph (7) of such section.

(C) **FOREIGN CONVICTIONS; OFFENSES INVOLVING CONSENSUAL SEXUAL CONDUCT.**—The limitations contained in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 111(5) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 shall apply with respect to a child-sex offense for purposes of this Act to the same extent and in the same manner as such limitations apply with respect to a sex offense for purposes of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006.

(4) **JURISDICTION.**—The term “jurisdiction” means any of the following:

(A) A State.

(B) The District of Columbia.

(C) The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(D) Guam.

(E) American Samoa.

(F) The Northern Mariana Islands.

(G) The United States Virgin Islands.

(H) To the extent provided in, and subject to the requirements of, section 127 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16927), a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(5) **MINOR.**—The term “minor” means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

SEC. 4. ANGEL WATCH CENTER.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish within the Child Exploitation Investigations Unit of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) of the Department of Homeland Security a Center, to be known as the “Angel Watch Center”, to carry out the activities specified in subsection (d).

(b) **LEADERSHIP.**—The Center shall be headed by the Director of ICE, in collaboration with the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and in consultation with the Attorney General.

(c) **MEMBERS.**—The Center shall consist of the following:

(1) The Director of ICE.

(2) The Commissioner of CBP.

(3) Individuals who are designated as analysts in ICE or CBP.

(4) Individuals who are designated as program managers in ICE or CBP.

(d) **ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center shall carry out the following activities:

(A) Receive information on travel by child-sex offenders.

(B) Establish a system to maintain and archive all relevant information, including the response of destination countries to notifications under subsection (e) where available, and decisions not to transmit notification abroad.

(C) Establish an annual review process to ensure that the Center is consistent in procedures to provide notification to destination countries or not to provide notification to destination countries, as appropriate.

(2) **INFORMATION REQUIRED.**—The United States Marshals Service’s National Sex Offender Targeting Office shall make available to the Center information on travel by child-sex offenders in a timely manner for purposes of carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (e).

(e) **NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **TO COUNTRIES OF DESTINATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center may transmit notice of impending or current international travel of a child-sex offender to the country or countries of destination of the child-sex offender, including to the visa-issuing agent or agents in the United States of the country or countries.

(B) **FORM.**—The notice under this paragraph may be transmitted through such means as determined appropriate by the Center, including through an ICE attaché.

(A) **GENERAL NOTIFICATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Center transmits notice under paragraph (1) of impending international travel of a child-sex offender to the country or countries of destination of the child-sex offender, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with any appropriate agency, shall make reasonable efforts to provide constructive notice through electronic or telephonic communication to the child-sex offender prior to the child-sex offender’s arrival in the country or countries.

(ii) **EXCEPTION.**—The requirement to provide constructive notice under clause (i) shall not apply in the case of impending

international travel of a child-sex offender to the country or countries of destination of the child-sex offender if such constructive notice would conflict with an existing investigation involving the child-sex offender.

(B) SPECIFIC NOTIFICATION REGARDING RISK TO LIFE OR WELL-BEING OF OFFENDER.—If the Center has reason to believe that to transmit notice under paragraph (1) poses a risk to the life or well-being of the child-sex offender, the Center shall make reasonable efforts to provide constructive notice through electronic or telephonic communication to the child-sex offender of such risk.

(C) SPECIFIC NOTIFICATION REGARDING PROBABLE DENIAL OF ENTRY TO OFFENDER.—If the Center has reason to believe that a country of destination of the child-sex offender is highly likely to deny entry to the child-sex offender due to transmission of notice under paragraph (1), the Center shall make reasonable efforts to provide constructive notice through electronic or telephonic communication to the child-sex offender of such probable denial.

(3) SUNSET.—The authority of paragraph (1) shall terminate with respect to a child-sex offender beginning as of the close of the last day of the registration period of such child-sex offender under section 115 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16915).

(f) COMPLAINT REVIEW.—The Center shall establish a mechanism to receive complaints from child-sex offenders affected by notifications of destination countries of such child-sex offenders under subsection (e).

(g) CONSULTATIONS.—The Center shall seek to engage in ongoing consultations with—

(1) nongovernmental organizations, including faith-based organizations, that have experience and expertise in identifying and preventing child sex tourism and rescuing and rehabilitating minor victims of international sexual exploitation and trafficking;

(2) the governments of countries interested in cooperating in the creation of an international sex offender travel notification system or that are primary destination or source countries for international sex tourism; and

(3) Internet service and software providers regarding available and potential technology to facilitate the implementation of an international sex offender travel notification system, both in the United States and in other countries.

(h) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State may provide technical assistance to foreign authorities in order to enable such authorities to participate more effectively in the notification program system established under this section.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS.

(a) BILATERAL AGREEMENTS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should negotiate memoranda of understanding or other bilateral agreements with foreign governments to further the purposes of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, including by—

(1) establishing systems to receive and transmit notices as required by title I of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); and

(2) establishing mechanisms for private companies and nongovernmental organizations to report on a voluntary basis suspected child pornography or exploitation to foreign governments, the nearest United States embassy in cases in which a possible United States citizen may be involved, or other appropriate entities.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CHILD-SEX OFFENSES COMMITTED ABROAD.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should formally request foreign governments to notify the United States when a United States citizen has been arrested, convicted, sentenced, or completed a prison sentence for a child-sex offense in the foreign country.

SEC. 6. ENHANCING THE MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 108(b)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(b)(4)) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including severe forms of trafficking in persons related to sex tourism”.

SEC. 7. ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

The President is strongly encouraged to exercise the authorities of section 134 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152d) to provide assistance to foreign countries directly, or through nongovernmental and multilateral organizations, for programs, projects, and activities, including training of law enforcement entities and officials, designed to establish systems to identify sex offenders and provide and receive notification of child sex offender international travel.

SEC. 8. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude or alter the jurisdiction or authority of the Department of Justice under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.), including section 113(d) of such Act, or any other provision of law, or to affect the work of the United States Marshals Service with INTERPOL.

(b) ANGEL WATCH CENTER.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude the Angel Watch Center from transmitting notice with respect to any sex offender described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911) or with respect to any sex offense described in paragraph (5) of such section.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS.—Activities carried out under this Act shall not impede, hinder, or otherwise impact negatively any investigations of the Department of Homeland Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking will strengthen law enforcement efforts to combat this rather horrific crime that damages hundreds of thousands of young children worldwide every year.

This bill before us today was passed unanimously by the House in the last

Congress in substantially the same form. This year, we hope to engage the Senate and get it to the President's desk.

Over the years, Congress has passed laws, including Megan's Law and the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, to require the registration and require the public notification of convicted sex offenders. These steps have helped families and communities protect their children and have helped law enforcement officials investigate and certainly prosecute domestic cases involving repeat sex offenders.

A growing problem, however, is the appalling industry of child sex “tourism,” in which adults travel overseas to exploit children in other countries. Unfortunately, a significant number of Americans are engaging in this practice and engage in it while the countries of destination lack sufficient resources to deal with the rising number of child predators.

Many children victimized by this terrible crime have also been trafficked—that is, recruited or transferred to be exploited for someone else's profit. The International Megan's Law helps us fight back.

At present, there are multiple U.S. agencies seeking to combat human trafficking and combat child sex tourism. By better coordinating their efforts, we can be much more effective. Importantly, our proactive efforts to help countries identify incoming child predators will also encourage them to alert us when those foreigners convicted of sex offenses against children attempt, themselves, to enter into the United States.

In particular, this bill officially recognizes an Angel Watch center within the Department of Homeland Security's Child Exploitation Investigations Unit. Operation Angel Watch originated as a partnership with the U.S. Customs and Border Protection and currently collects and analyzes the foreign travel data of convicted child sex offenders to determine whether notification to U.S. officials or foreign governments is warranted.

Last year alone, Angel Watch sent over 2,000 leads to nearly 100 countries as part of this effort to proactively and strategically alert international law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, this bill solidifies the Angel Watch center as an important part of the U.S. response to child sex tourism. Importantly, it improves the timeliness of the information that the center receives by requiring the Justice Department to share its travel records promptly. This will allow Angel Watch to better detect and report the travel of child predators.

Now, we do have one change in the bill from last year, and that change is an additional rule of construction which states that nothing in this act will impede any investigations being

carried out by the Department of Homeland Security.

This was added at the request of non-governmental organizations who were concerned that the bill's activities could divert resources from the Department's other investigative work. To avoid any confusion, I want to make clear that this rule of construction does not supersede the bill's general notification provisions which require the Department of Homeland Security to attempt to alert a convicted offender whose travel is reported to their country of destination.

These general notification provisions were the product of a bipartisan agreement, and I want to state my appreciation for the good work of those staffers who came together from across the aisle and from different committees to develop them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the bill's author, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his persistent leadership and his persistent dedication to this issue.

I would also like to recognize the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as Ranking Member ENGEL and Mr. CICILLINE for their collaboration on this bill, which I encourage all Members to support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 515, the "International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 515 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 515 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 515, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 515.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 515, the International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 515 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 515, known as the International Megan's Law, and yield myself such time as I might consume.

I would first like to commend my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his leadership on human rights and anti-trafficking issues and for his hard work and the hard work of his staff on this bill, as well as Ranking Member KAREN BASS of California.

I also want to recognize the contributions of the Judiciary Committee to this legislation. I am pleased that the two committees, Foreign Affairs and Judiciary, were able to come together to work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, around the world, as many as 27 million people are victims of human trafficking. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime reported that among reported incidents of human trafficking, one in three is a child. Many sex offenders target children in regions with extreme poverty and low levels of law enforcement and prosecution. These repulsive acts violate our deepest moral values, and we have a responsibility to respond appropriately.

The International Megan's Law would help prevent child sex offenders and traffickers from exploiting vulnerable children when they cross an international border. The bill would establish an Angel Watch center within Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security that would provide advance notice to foreign countries when a convicted child sex offender travels to that coun-

try. The bill also calls on the President to negotiate agreements with foreign governments that would encourage information sharing on known child sex offenders.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to encourage governments around the world to devote their respective resources toward combating this issue. Protecting trafficked children provides timely victim identification, placing victims in a safe environment, and providing them with widespread support services, such as physical and mental health care, educational opportunities, legal assistance, and reintegration with their families and communities.

Unfortunately, a single law cannot abolish child sex tourism or child sex trafficking, but the International Megan's Law represents a huge step in the right direction by protecting victims and potential victims from terrifying harm.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, we passed the same bill last Congress, and I urge my colleagues to do so again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Human Rights Subcommittee and the author of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership and for marking this bill up in the last Congress. We went through it in regular order. Chairman ROYCE, ELIOT ENGEL, and staff were outstanding.

I also want to thank BOB GOODLATTE, who has been a very strong proponent of this legislation, as well as ALBIO SIREs, who is the chief Democratic sponsor, and our other cosponsors: Mrs. HARTZLER, CAROLYN MALONEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. YOHIO.

Mr. Speaker, there is no higher duty or responsibility of government than to protect children from violence and predatory behavior. We have a duty to protect the weakest and the most vulnerable. The International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking, H.R. 515, will protect children from child sex tourism by notifying destination countries when convicted pedophiles plan to travel. And to protect American children, the bill encourages the President to use bilateral agreements and assistance to establish reciprocal notification so we will know when convicted child sex offenders are coming here.

Mr. Speaker, I actually got the idea of International Megan's Law in a conversation with a Trafficking in Persons delegation from Thailand during a meeting in my office in 2007. I asked the Thai officials what would they do if we were to notify them of travel by a

convicted pedophile. Each of the dozen officials said they would bar entry into their nation of such a predator.

Today will mark the third time in 8 years that this bill has passed the House—and I do hope it will pass—with strong support from both sides of the aisle, the second in its present, more streamlined form. The only change in this version is an additional clause in 8(c) underscoring the fine investigatory work of the Department of Homeland Security in the area of child exploitation and Congress' support for its continuance in Angel Watch, as well as in the investigations of the Cyber Crimes Center.

This provision is not intended to supersede notification requirements elsewhere in the bill.

I am encouraged that the Senate has signaled its support and willingness to improve commonsense U.S. procedures preventing the sex trafficking of children by high-risk predators. I look forward to working with our colleagues in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, child sex predators thrive on secrecy, a secrecy that allows them to commit heinous crimes against children. In 1994, a young girl from my district was lured into the home of a convicted pedophile who lived across the street from her. Megan Kanka, 7, was raped and murdered. No one, including Megan's parents, knew that their neighbor had been convicted of child sexual assault. The outrage over this tragedy led to the enactment of Megan's Laws—public sex offender registries—in every State in the country.

It is imperative that we take the lessons we have learned on how to protect our children from known child sex predators within our borders and expand those protections globally.

Mr. Speaker, a deeply disturbing 2010 report by the GAO, entitled "Current Situation Results in Thousands of Passports Issued to Registered Sex Offenders," found that at least 4,500 U.S. passports were issued to registered sex offenders in fiscal year 2008 alone.

Meanwhile, law enforcement and media reports continue to document Americans on the U.S. sex offender registries who were caught sexually abusing children in East Asia, Central and South America, and elsewhere in the world. It is the same horror movie replayed over and over.

Homeland Security's Angel Watch program has been doing an outstanding job in alerting countries about potential danger from American sex offenders. H.R. 515 would codify and streamline this excellent program, ensuring that actionable information about child sex offender travel actually gets to the destination country in time for those countries to assess the potential dangers and respond appropriately, whether that is to allow entry, deny entry or a visa, monitor travel, or

limit travel. Once notified, nations are empowered to take protective action.

International Megan's Law also directs the President to include guidance in diplomacy, training, and technical assistance abroad on how other countries can create their own public or private sex offender registries similar to what we have in the United States, and how we can use these registries to alert the United States when a child sex offender is intending to travel here to abuse our children. The goal is reciprocity, reciprocal notice to protect children at home and abroad from known sex offenders.

I personally have spoken to foreign officials and nongovernment representatives who have asked me when the United States Congress is going to do something about American sex offenders who are traveling to their country to rape their children. I hear this especially in the developing world. H.R. 515, the International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking, is a serious response to that question.

I would also point out parenthetically, as the Special Representative for Combating Trafficking at the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly last year, we got passed a resolution calling for this kind of noticing country to country so the secrecy is taken out of sex tourism designed to exploit and abuse children.

I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

One last comment about the bill before us. The rule of construction was added to the bill, and I would like to make it clear that this rule of construction does not supersede the bill's general notification requirements, which require the Department of Homeland Security to try to alert a convicted child sex offender whose travel is reported to their country of destination, which is one way of deterring them.

Child sex tourism is an outrageous crime, and we have the responsibility to do everything we can to make it difficult for offenders to prey on their victims. I strongly support this bill and encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You have heard today about the horrific child sex tourism industry. This is only going to get worse if we do not take action. Furthermore, there are child victims here at home, too. An increasingly mobile society has made it easier for child predators to commit, and evade justice for, their heinous crimes.

The bill before us today represents a concerted effort to combat this appalling injustice. Better communications among U.S. officials and our foreign

counterparts all around this globe means more of these criminals can and will be stopped from exploiting children overseas.

Again, I commend Chairman SMITH for his work on this bipartisan legislation. I encourage Members to support passage of H.R. 515, International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 515 International Megan's Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking.

This legislation protects children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

Child sex tourism, where an individual travels to a foreign country and engages in sexual activity with a child in that country, is a form of child exploitation and, where commercial, child sex trafficking.

Human trafficking is a problem for the United States because the U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 17,500 foreign nationals are trafficked into the United States, the largest number of people trafficked into the United States come from East Asia and the Pacific and the next highest numbers coming from Latin America and Europe.

Law enforcement reports indicate that known child-sex offenders are traveling internationally, and that the criminal background of such individuals may not be known to local law enforcement prior to their arrival.

The commercial sexual exploitation of minors in child sex trafficking and pornography is a global phenomenon.

The International Labor Organization has estimated that 1.8 million children worldwide are victims of child sex trafficking and pornography each year.

It is estimated 2.8 million children living on the streets of this nation are at risk for trafficking into the sex industry.

Children who are abused or victims of molestation are most vulnerable.

If they are lured into human trafficking they are isolated from the rest of the world and start living lives controlled by pimps, escort and massage services, private dancing clubs, pornographic clubs and much worse.

The State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons produces the annual Trafficking in Persons Report ("TIP Report"), which is Congress' primary resource for human trafficking reporting, analysis and recommendations for the United States and 186 countries around the world.

These kids are not criminals. They are victims, robbed of their innocence by adult criminals.

They are boys and girls who have been taken advantage of and are unable to escape an ugly system.

I support H.R. 515 because it is focused on helping at-risk and vulnerable children rather than treating them as criminals.

Specifically, the bill requires that state plans for federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment:

1. provide procedures to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking;
2. provide training for child protection service workers to appropriately respond to reports of child sex trafficking; and
3. develop and implement policies and procedures to connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

Additionally, the bill requires States to report annually the numbers of children identified as victims of sex trafficking within the already existing National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System.

H.R. 515 also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress outlining the prevalence and type of child trafficking nationwide as well as the current barriers to serving child victims comprehensively.

I strongly support H.R. 515 and urge my colleague to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 515.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 357) to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel relating to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 357

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Human Trafficking Prevention Act”.

SEC. 2. EXPANDED TRAINING RELATING TO TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) is amended—

- (1) by inserting “, including members of the Service (as such term is defined in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903))” after “Department of State”; and

- (2) by adding at the end the following: “Training under this paragraph shall include, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) A distance learning course on trafficking-in-persons issues and the Department of State’s obligations under this Act, targeted for embassy reporting officers, re-

gional bureaus’ trafficking-in-persons coordinators, and their superiors.

“(B) Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before such individuals depart for their posts.

“(C) At least annual reminders to all such personnel, including appropriate personnel from other Federal departments and agencies, at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking in persons specific to the country or jurisdiction in which each such post is located, and appropriate procedures to report information that any such personnel may acquire about possible cases of trafficking in persons.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a committed participant in this body’s decade-and-a-half-long fight against human trafficking since the passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000. Although we have made some progress and raised global awareness on this issue, there are still today somewhere around 20 million people around the world who remain subject to the horrors of this modern day slavery, either through trafficking for exploitation for work or child sex trafficking. Most of these victims are women, and many, as you know, Mr. Speaker, are children.

Given the high stakes, U.S. officials working overseas must be able to recognize the signs, the telltale signs, of this terrible crime. If they do not know which groups are most vulnerable, or what activities should raise their suspicions, then successful action is very unlikely.

Though current law requires that State Department personnel be trained to identify trafficking victims, it does not prescribe how they should be trained. This bill does. The Human Trafficking Prevention Act would specify minimum training requirements for the Department of State. These would include a training course for Department personnel who deal with trafficking issues, in addition to trafficking briefings for all of our Ambassadors and all of our deputy chiefs of mission before they depart for their posts. It also ensures that U.S. officials

stationed overseas get annual updates on trafficking-related developments related to the countries where they are working.

We have done a lot to move legislation to force other countries to adopt legislation. But our Ambassadors overseas and their deputies overseas need this education.

While the State Department currently appears to be meeting many of the standards, we all know that practices can change, and by specifying reasonable minimal requirements for such training, this bill strengthens existing law at no additional cost to our taxpayers.

I want to recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY), who authored this measure, which passed as H.R. 4449 during the last Congress, and I want to thank him for reintroducing the bill that is before us today.

While we are discussing improvements to the anti-trafficking practices of our foreign affairs agencies, I also want to invite my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 400, the bipartisan Trafficking Prevention in Foreign Affairs Contracting Act, that my ranking member of the committee, ELIOT ENGEL, and I recently introduced and which we hope to move forward promptly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY), for introducing this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is modern-day slavery. Its victims are robbed of both their freedom and dignity. Human trafficking violates the founding principles of the United States—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and humanity’s very fundamental principle of respect.

According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, almost every nation in the world is affected by trafficking. There are at least 152 countries of origin and 124 countries of destination affected by human trafficking, totaling over 510 trafficking flows around the world.

Human trafficking victims often pay to be illegally transported into various countries, only to find themselves at the mercy of their captors, deprived of their freedom. They are forced into various forms of servitude to repay their debts. Frighteningly, the U.N. also reports that 1 in 3 known victims of human trafficking is a child. In some areas of the world, such as Africa and the Middle East, children constitute 62 percent of their human trafficking incidents. Women and girls account for 70

percent of trafficking victims worldwide, and men make up over 60 percent of trafficking incidents for forced labor. Human trafficking victimizes people of all ages, genders, and ethnicities.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Human Trafficking Prevention Act which is designed to ensure that representatives of our government recognize incidents of human trafficking when they see it.

H.R. 357 would expand Federal training requirements for State Department personnel on identifying and preventing human trafficking. This training includes specific training in persons, briefings for all Ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before such individuals depart for their post.

This bill would also require that annual reminders be sent to appropriate diplomatic personnel about the key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking in persons at their respective Embassy and consular post.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will better prepare our Nation's public servants to quickly identify incidents of human trafficking and take swift action as they serve abroad. We passed the same bill last year, and I urge my colleagues to do so again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY), the author of this important bill.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

I would like to thank my colleagues Mr. ROYCE and Mr. CICILLINE and my cosponsors, and I would like to acknowledge Majority Leader MCCARTHY for his leadership on taking up this legislation at the beginning of this new Congress.

No matter what part of the country you are from, human trafficking is an issue that we have to address now because lives are at stake. The State Department estimates that millions of children, women, and men are trafficked each year and forced into modern-day slavery as part of an evil and fast-growing industry.

We know that the crime of human trafficking is dramatically underreported, and most of it happens invisibly; therefore, a critical part of the work we are doing today is to bring human trafficking out in the open, so we can raise awareness and prevent it from happening to more of the world's most vulnerable populations.

We must also remember that this happens right here in our communities, all across our own country. Behind all

of these numbers and statistics, there are real faces and real stories of women, men, and, too often, children—women like Mandy Palmer of western New York who 4 years ago met a man named Ryan online. Ryan was not who he pretended to be. Ryan turned out to be a human trafficker, a pimp who forced Mandy into prostitution and threatened her family.

New York continues to be one of the top hubs of human trafficking where sex trafficking, child labor, and indentured servitude happen all too frequently. Just one organization in New York, Safe Horizon, has worked with more than 600 victims in recent years.

In the Hudson Valley, we have seen it in Newburgh, in Poughkeepsie, places like Wappingers Falls, places like New Windsor, and even small villages like Pound Ridge. Story after story tells us that this disgusting, this horrifying practice of modern-day slavery happens right here, right in our own neighborhoods, in our own backyards.

Just 10 days ago, authorities took action against a major sex trafficking ring in Albany, New York. Nine women who had traveled here from a foreign country were forced into prostitution at four different massage parlors.

In another community in the Hudson Valley, about an hour away from New York City, a man tricked teenage girls to travel to the United States on tourist visas from countries like Brazil, Hungary, and France. He instructed these women to lie to both Immigration and State Department officials in order to gain access to our country.

It is precisely this type of situation that my legislation seeks to stop. We must ensure that our men and women on the front lines of our borders have the resources and training they need in order to identify and stop human trafficking at its source, before these women, children, and men enter the United States out of their own culture, away from their own language many times, and become isolated and become victims.

As part of our goal to end human trafficking, we can make sure that our Foreign Service officers and other government personnel have the tools and training they need to spot and to identify these victims and to stop this trafficking across international borders.

In the past, the State Department estimated that between 14,000 and 17,000 foreign nationals were trafficked into the United States every single year. Although the Federal Government has a zero tolerance policy on human trafficking, our Foreign Service officers, who often have face-to-face contact with these victims when they are obtaining U.S. visas, currently undergo minimal training to define, identify, and recognize the indicators of this human trafficking so they can stop it at the source.

My legislation would expand new minimum training procedures for For-

eign Service officers and other government personnel in order to identify and stop this human trafficking before people cross these boundaries and end up in our own communities, before it becomes too late, when they are here and victimized.

We know criminals will do just about anything to adapt to our new methods and to avoid getting caught, so this bipartisan legislation also requires annual updates to keep on top of key problems, threats, the new methods, and to identify new warning signs of trafficking.

I want to thank my colleagues across the aisle because, by working together, we have a new opportunity to come together to combat this monstrous practice of trafficking in children, women, and men. Victims of human trafficking cannot wait another day. Today, we have an opportunity to do something together to combat this growing problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my legislation, H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the fight to end human trafficking has been a priority in my tenure as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee here in the House, but I am pleased that the House leadership and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have chosen to make it our focus during this early week of the session.

Our actions today are not a conclusion on this issue. They are an opening salvo by the 114th Congress to continue our fight against modern slavery. This bill seeks to ensure that U.S. personnel overseas are properly equipped to combat the scourge of human trafficking and deserves our unanimous support.

There are other steps which we need to take, frankly, as an institution in order to continue to put leverage at the disposal of our diplomats and new measures into law to protect the victims of trafficking. As we go forward, we will do that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act by the gentleman from New York, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a global scourge. Time and time again, there are missed opportunities to identify and assist victims of human trafficking. This may be due to a lack of training to recognize signs of trafficking, or perhaps a hesitancy to intrude into the "privacy" of others.

There are numerous points of contact with the victims of trafficking, however, and at each point there are people who can intervene if they know how to identify victims of trafficking.

Traffickers often move their victims to avoid detection. Whether by plane, train or bus, they come into contact with flight attendants and the like, as well as border officials.

In July of 2010, I chaired a conference in Washington, D.C., to bring together the relevant U.S. agencies, such as the Customs and Border Patrol, various U.S. airlines, and non-governmental organizations to focus on interdicting traffickers by training commercial transportation employees to recognize the indicators for trafficking. Speakers, including Deborah Sigmund, founder of a non-government organization called Innocents at Risk, explained how flight attendants were the “first line of defense” in the fight against human trafficking.

Flight attendants are in the unique position to observe a potential trafficking in progress and then call a trafficking hotline or inform the pilot to radio ahead so that the proper authorities can intervene.

Former flight attendant Nancy Rivard, President of Airline Ambassadors International, told us how she and other flight attendants compared notes one day and were shocked and dismayed at how often they had noticed what they suspected was a trafficked woman or child on their flight, but had no training or protocol to do something about it. Nancy has been doing a great deal about it ever since, training airline employees around the United States and world.

Just last year, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) released a similar training initiative, the Blue Lightning program, to domestic U.S. airlines—including Delta, JetBlue, Allegiant, and North American Airlines. With minimal modifications, the training is also easily adaptable to bus drivers and station operators, train conductors, trucking associations, and other transportation industry professionals.

In December 2013, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, or OSCE, which comprises 57 countries from Europe and North America, endorsed my plan to make anti-trafficking training for airline employees, other public and commercial carriers, as well as hotel employees, a primary goal in the international strategy to combat human trafficking. In an earlier session, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly (OSCEPA) adopted my resolution to implement such training in each member country.

But what about our State Department personnel working overseas? Are they properly trained to be able to recognize the signs of this heinous crime and violation of fundamental human rights?

Current law does require that State Department personnel be trained to identify trafficking victims, and there are many fine foreign service officers tasked with addressing trafficking issues.

But, it does not prescribe any minimum training requirements. H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act, would mandate several minimum training requirements on this issue within the Department of State.

These would include a training course for Department personnel who deal with trafficking issues, in addition to trafficking briefings for all Ambassadors and Deputy Chiefs of Mission before they depart for their posts. The legislation also requires that annual reminders be sent to appropriate personnel on key trafficking issues related to their countries of focus.

By specifying the minimum requirements for such training, this bill strengthens the existing law. And notably, it does so at no additional cost to taxpayers.

I want to thank Mr. MALONEY for authoring this measure, and adding to the body of legislation developed by the House to address this critical issue.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 357, the “Human Trafficking Prevention Act.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to expanding the training and capability of federal government personnel in detecting and combating human trafficking and assisting its victims.

Throughout my tenure in Congress and a founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus, I have advocated on behalf of victims of human trafficking, especially children, who are the most vulnerable and innocent victims.

I am also committed to ensuring that law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in people.

H.R. 357 strengthens the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 by amending it to require training related to trafficking in persons for all State Department personnel. Specifically, the bill requires the following:

1. A distance learning course on trafficking in persons issues and the Department of State’s obligations under the Act to be completed by embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus’ trafficking in persons coordinators, and their supervisors;

2. Specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before they depart for their posts; and

3. Annual reminders to all such personnel and other federal personnel at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of key human trafficking problems, threats, methods, and warning signs.

This legislation does for the State Department what the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4660, “Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Act for 2015,” approved by the House in the last Congress does for the Justice Department.

That amendment, adopted in May 2014 by the House, provides another tool in law enforcement’s arsenal to tip the balance in favor of victims by ensuring funding for the Attorney General to provide training for State and local law enforcement agencies on immigration law that may be useful for the investigation and prosecution of crimes related to trafficking in persons.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in humans, and especially child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society and those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

To effectively combat human trafficking, we need to provide resources and training to government personnel to assist victims and apprehend criminals.

By providing the necessary training and support, we will catch more human trafficking criminals and save lives, and prevent many other persons, including children, from becoming human trafficking victims.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 357, the Human Trafficking Prevention Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 357.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCING SERVICES FOR RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS VICTIMS OF YOUTH TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 468) to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 468

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” before the semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” after “assault”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting “, including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 351(a) by striking “or sexual exploitation” and inserting “sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 468.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is not just a concern in foreign countries. It is happening right here in the United States and many times in our own backyards.

In Michigan, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has referred more than 13,000 CyberTipline reports of suspected child sexual exploitation to law enforcement.

Last Congress, I hosted a series of human trafficking forums in my district which brought together county prosecutors, sheriffs, the State police, and members of the southern Michigan Task Force on Human Trafficking to discuss how our community is dealing with these heinous crimes and hear feedback on what additional actions Congress can take to help local law enforcement combat trafficking.

One of the things I heard at my district roundtables is the need for improved resources for victims' advocacy and support, especially for youth victims and at-risk youth. Federal and State officials, law enforcement, the courts, all of us have a moral obligation to eradicate trafficking and support its victims.

It will take close coordination between all stakeholders to achieve the dual goals of ending the human trafficking epidemic and assisting the victims. That is why I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 468, the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act.

This legislation will help better serve our most vulnerable youth who are victims of extreme trafficking. This legislation amends the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to use existing grant resources to train staff on the effects of human trafficking in runaway and homeless youth victims and for developing statewide strategies to reach such youth.

It also allows the Secretary to utilize the existing Street Outreach Program to provide street-based services for runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman JOE HECK, for his leadership on this bill, as well as the Education and the Workforce

Committee chairman, Mr. KLINE, and the ranking member, Mr. SCOTT, for their work on moving this legislation forward. Our Nation's runaway and homeless youth deserve access to services that will help them escape a life of crime, abuse, and neglect.

Passing this simple fix to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act will help ensure that those suffering from the trauma of these deplorable crimes will have access to the care and support they need.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 468, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 468, the Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2015.

I am honored to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. KLINE, and appreciate their leadership on this important issue.

Our bill makes important changes in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, so that victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking can get more of the help that they need. We know that trafficking and youth homelessness are often affecting the same populations.

Young people that have run away or are homeless are particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation and trafficking, and programs targeted towards the runaway and homeless youth should be simultaneously equipped to support victims of trafficking when there is such an overlap.

Research consistently confirms the correlation between running away and becoming exploited through prostitution. For example, according to a 2006 FBI Uniform Crime Report, girls who run away from their homes, group homes, foster homes, or treatment centers are at high risk of being targeted by a trafficker or becoming exploited.

Street outreach programs were created to provide services to runaway and homeless and street youth who have been subjected to or are at risk of being subjected to sexual abuse. Every year, 25,000 of these young people find shelter as a result of these programs.

The legislation being considered today ensures that street outreach programs can rely on funding already available through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. This allows the Department of Health and Human Services to provide street-based services such as individual assessments, treatment, counseling, or other shelter for runaway and homeless youth who are also victims of trafficking.

Additionally, the bill authorizes States, organizations, and other entities to use runaway and homeless

youth research grants for staff training to work with these young victims. Such additional training will allow service providers to successfully address the behavioral and emotional effects of the abuse and assault that these victims endure.

Our bill also enhances training programs so that staff will be able to recognize and respond to the unique needs of trafficking victims. This is a small but important change, one necessary to improve services available.

Updating the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act with this legislation is an important first step, but it is also important for Congress to consider reauthorizing the entire act, which expired last year.

□ 1630

In the 113th Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee approved a bipartisan reauthorization bill that would provide other critical support to runaway and homeless youth, including extending time for safe and appropriate shelter, establishing performance standards for assistance programs, strengthening data collection, and ensuring that adequate resources for all runaway and homeless youths are available.

It is my hope that the House can continue the spirit of bipartisanship and comprehensively update the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Our Nation's most vulnerable youth need us to come together and work together on their behalf.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and for his consistent, continuous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, as a father and grandfather, I find it difficult to imagine anything more terrifying than a loved one falling victim to youth sex trafficking. Yet each year, hundreds of thousands of children and families are forced to live with the pain and suffering that stems from this deplorable crime.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. This crime is taking place right here in our own country. It is impacting our communities, our families, and our children. We face a national crisis, and it demands a national response.

Fortunately, there are heroic efforts underway to fight this heinous crime, care for the victims, and support their families.

The dedicated staff at the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, or NCMEC, are on the front lines

every day identifying victims, assisting law enforcement in the recovery of missing children, and returning children to their loved ones.

NCMEC is also partnering with schools and employers to enhance support for victims and their families. Parents with children in school are probably familiar with Lifetouch photography. Through its SmileSafe Kids initiative, Lifetouch is making it easier for parents and NCMEC to alert law enforcement of a missing child in order to accelerate the search and rescue.

NCMEC and others are always finding new ways to help, and so should we, and that is why we are here today. We have learned too often victims fall through the cracks of States' child welfare systems. Those who may be runaway or homeless youth do not have access to the full range of services they need.

And believe it or not, due to a flaw in the law, there are times when children are treated as criminals—as criminals, Mr. Speaker—rather than the victims of a violent crime.

Congress has an opportunity to address these challenges and strengthen our support for victims of youth sex trafficking. I want to thank my Republican and Democratic colleagues for working with us on this important effort, including Mr. WALBERG, as I mentioned earlier; the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. SCOTT; and Representatives JOE HECK, KAREN BASS, and JOYCE BEATTY.

I am pleased that in the early days of the 114th Congress, we are taking action to address youth sex trafficking. It reflects both the seriousness of this crime and our commitment to the victims and their families.

I urge my colleagues to support these important legislative proposals.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his statements in support of this legislation. I thank Mr. HECK for sponsoring it, and Mr. KLINE as the leader on this committee.

This is a privilege of service in this body, when we can come together in a bipartisan fashion to do what is right for our country; but, in this case, to do what is right for our defenseless young people, many of whom have been caught into a web that offers nothing but pain and misfortune for the future. To take a stand on this issue, to stand for opportunity, to push back against the dark clouds of crime that prey on young people is something that we can stand together on.

I think we have said significant words in support of this legislation. Now it is time to get to work, and the best way to do that, Mr. Speaker, as you and I both know, is to pass it.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 468, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I rise in strong support of H.R. 468, "Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking Act of 2015."

I support this bipartisan legislation which amends the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 by inserting the phrase "sever forms of trafficking in persons" and including "youth who are victims of trafficking," in the definitions for the law.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking in persons is an inconceivable, callous and inhumane crime that unquestionably deserves the nation's utmost attention. It is particularly difficult to see the victimization of the very young who are sold or tricked into becoming victims of Human Trafficking.

I join my colleagues in working to strengthen laws against human trafficking, and supporting the allocation of resources to further the efforts of law enforcement and aid agencies in identification of youth victims and provide vital support to preventing further victimization and to reclaim the lives of the most vulnerable among us—our children from traffickers.

It is estimated 2.8 million children living on the streets of this nation are at risk for trafficking into the sex industry. Children who are abused or victims of molestation are most vulnerable.

If they are lured into human trafficking they are isolated from the rest of the world and start living lives controlled by pimps, escort and massage services, private dancing clubs, pornographic clubs and much worse.

The work of the authors of this bill contribute to raising public awareness must be at the forefront of our hearts and minds and these unlawful, immoral traffickers, beyond a doubt must unavoidably be brought to justice. We must seek them out and press them from our society by standing up together with a collective voice saying, "Human trafficking stops today, right now, with us."

Mr. Speaker, I along with my Colleagues on the Committee on Homeland Security held a field hearing in Houston Texas last year on the issue of Human Trafficking.

The day before that hearing local law enforcement with support from federal law enforcement agencies raided a house where suspected victims of human trafficking were being held.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas is one of the nation's largest hubs for human trafficking, with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

In 2006, the Department of Justice National Conference on Human Trafficking identified the I-10 corridor as one of the main routes for traffickers. Interstate I-10 links the major Texas urban areas Houston, San Antonio and El Paso and dozens of mid- and small sized towns in between.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to raise public awareness and force the activity of traffickers and their victims out of the shadows into the light.

Raising the visibility and status of the governmental entities charged with the responsibility of documenting the problems, successes,

and remaining challenges confronting the United States and the international community in eradicating the scourge of human trafficking is a positive step forward in achieving this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 468.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 468.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 469) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 469

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.

Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking "and" at the end of clause (xxii); and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

"(xxiv) provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B));

"(xxv) provisions and procedures for training representatives of the State child protective services systems about identifying and assessing children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures for such training with respect to children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)); and

"(xxvi) provisions and procedures for identifying services (including the services provided by State law enforcement officials, the State juvenile justice system, and social service agencies, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters) and procedures for appropriate referral to address the needs of children who are sex trafficking victims, and which may include provisions and procedures

for the identification of such services and procedures with respect to children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B));”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (v);

(ii) by inserting “and” at the end of clause (vi); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) the provisions and procedures described in clauses (xxiv) and (xxvi) of subparagraph (B);”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIM.—The term ‘sex trafficking victim’ means a victim of—
“(i) sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10))); or
“(ii) a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(A)).”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The number of children identified under clause (xxiv) of subsection (b)(2)(B), and of such children—
“(A) the number identified as sex trafficking victims (as defined in subsection (b)(4)(C)); and
“(B) in the case of a State that has provisions and procedures to identify children who are victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)), the number so identified.”.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a report that—

(1) describes the specific type and prevalence of severe form of trafficking in persons to which children who are identified for services or intervention under the placement, care, or supervision of State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization child welfare agencies have been subjected as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) summarizes the practices and protocols utilized by States to identify and serve—

(A) under section 106(b)(2)(B) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)), children who are victims of trafficking; and

(B) children who are at risk of becoming victims of trafficking; and

(3) specifies any barriers in Federal laws or regulations that may prevent identification and assessment of children who are victims of trafficking, including an evaluation of the extent to which States are able to address the needs of such trafficked children without altering the definition of child abuse and neglect under section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term “severe form of trafficking in persons” has the meaning given the term

in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)).

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term “victim of trafficking” has the meaning given the term in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 469.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, domestic child trafficking is a serious problem, sadly, in the United States. Around 300,000 American youth are at risk of sexual commercial exploitation and trafficking each year. That is why the House of Representatives is considering a number of bills this week that seek to ensure that human trafficking victims are treated as victims and have access to the services they desperately need.

As a Member of Congress, I have worked on legislation to help address this problem in the past and will continue that important work this year. I have also held local roundtables in Michigan with victims, advocacy, and law enforcement groups to do everything I can to work with my communities to address this heinous crime.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that 68 percent of likely sex trafficking victims were involved in the child welfare system at one time. Instead of properly identifying and assisting trafficked and exploited children, these children are often sent to the juvenile justice system, where they are labeled and treated as criminals. These innocent victims are victimized by the very system that was designed to protect them.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 469. The Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015 will help protect child victims by improving practices within State child welfare systems to identify, assess, and document sex trafficking victims. The House passed this legislation by a voice vote last summer, and I thank my colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, for her work on this important legislation again this Congress.

H.R. 469 amends the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to direct

States to implement and maintain procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are victims of sex trafficking.

The bill also requires that States train child protective services workers on how to identify these children and the services necessary to meet their needs, and it would improve reporting on the number of children identified as sex trafficking victims.

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report on the type and prevalence of youth trafficking victims in the welfare system, provide a summary of State practices for serving youth trafficking victims, and report on any barriers in Federal law that prevent identification and assessment of youth victims of trafficking.

It is imperative that we continue to pass legislation that helps victims of both labor and sex trafficking, to ensure that victims receive the services they need to escape a life of abuse.

Again, I would like to thank Congresswoman KAREN BASS and Chairman KLINE of the Education and the Workforce Committee for their work on this important bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 469, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015, sponsored by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

This bill will support victims of child sex trafficking by helping them find services they need, by training child protective services workers to identify cases of child sex trafficking, and by improving data collection on the number of child sex trafficking victims.

This legislation would also require the Department of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress that describes the type and prevalence of severe forms of trafficking to which identified victims are subjected.

This bill also summarizes State practices to identify and serve trafficking victims and those at risk of trafficking and describes Federal statutory or regulatory barriers that may prevent child trafficking victims from getting the services they need, including an evaluation of the State's capacity to address such victim's needs.

The bill would also allow the State welfare agencies to include child labor trafficking in their provisions of staff training. Under the bill, if a State includes child labor trafficking in those responsibilities, the States must also collect data on the number of those victims.

The bill is a product of good bipartisan work and diligent negotiations by the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

BASS) and her staff and Democratic and Republican staffs in the Education and the Workforce Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, which has the backing of child welfare advocates and will improve services and responses to child trafficking victims.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, one who understands this process from his time in the court of law as a judge.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

This bill, Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, H.R. 469, is an excellent piece of legislation. As mentioned, it is a bipartisan piece of legislation.

I want to thank KAREN BASS from California and Chairman KLINE from Minnesota for bringing this to the floor.

This is one of many, many pieces of legislation dealing with trafficking that have come and will come to the House floor the rest of today and tomorrow, bipartisan pieces of legislation.

In my short tenure of 10 years here in Congress, I have never seen a subject that had so many people interested on both sides of the aisle and so many pieces of legislation coming to the House floor, all with the purpose of trying to rein in this scourge of human trafficking in the United States.

The public seems to be a little more concerned about other matters than the issue of trafficking, at least the media does. They spend a lot of time talking about how much air is in footballs when we probably should be dealing with how much criminal activity is taking place in America where America's children are being kidnapped and put into slavery.

One example of this is the bill that Ms. BASS has brought to us, and that is the one regarding child welfare agencies in States.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that 60 percent of American children involved in human trafficking, somewhere in their background they were in foster care. I am not saying foster care caused that. I am just saying that somewhere they make the route through foster care. We are not doing what we should do in dealing with our children to protect them from this scourge of trafficking.

This legislation goes a long way to help people in States, State government, to take care and make sure that children do not get taken up in this human trafficking that is taking place in the United States.

□ 1645

I come from Houston. Unfortunately, Houston is one of the hubs in the United States for human trafficking.

Because of our location in the United States—near an international border—we have not only domestic trafficked victims go through our city but international trafficked victims and their children, their young people.

I want to congratulate Ms. BASS and the House and the leadership of the House for bringing this legislation and legislation like it up to the floor to make sure that America understands and criminals understand America's children are not for sale.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the sponsor of the bill and a strong supporter and advocate for foster children.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, which I introduced with a group of bipartisan Members of Congress.

The same version of this bill was unanimously passed in the 113th Congress. This legislation demonstrates how critical it is that Members of Congress work together to move policy that protects children from being sexually exploited. The work that both sides of the aisle have done on sex trafficking demonstrates a strong commitment to preventing our most vulnerable populations from becoming victims.

First, I would like to thank Chairman KLINE, Representative WALBERG, and Ranking Member SCOTT for their leadership on continuing to support this legislation that works towards ensuring that no child in the United States becomes a victim of sex trafficking. I am grateful for their knowledge and assistance that helped bring this important bill to the floor today. I would also like to thank Judge POE for his ongoing leadership on this issue.

My colleague and friend, Representative TOM MARINO, has been a leader in fighting for children in the foster care system. Mr. MARINO, along with the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth cochairs—JIM McDERMOTT, TRENT FRANKS, JIM LANGEVIN, and DIANE BLACK—all served as original cosponsors of H.R. 469 and have demonstrated leadership by both making significant change in the child welfare system and by bringing attention to the horrendous intersection between sex trafficking and our child welfare system.

The U.S. Department of Justice reports that between 2008 and 2010 40 percent of sex trafficking cases involved the exploitation of children. Tragically, many of these children are forgotten without the appropriate services to ensure their safety. This highlights the failure of our system to prevent them from becoming victims.

More than 200,000 youth in our country are at risk of trafficking per year.

In my hometown of Los Angeles, the Probation Department reports that 61 percent of identified trafficking victims are foster youth. It is noteworthy that this statistic comes from the Probation Department and not the child welfare department. This legislation hopes to correct that. We want to make sure that child welfare agencies, in addition to juvenile justice, begin to document this problem.

In Los Angeles, we are fortunate to have the STAR Court, which is a specialized, collaborative courthouse designed to serve youth who have been trafficked. The STAR Court team reports that 80 percent of the girls entering their courtroom have previously been involved in the child welfare system.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout the country as part of our Nationwide Listening Tour. Unfortunately, I have heard far too many stories about youth in foster care falling through the cracks in the system. Sometimes they are thought to be runaways. Sadly, they report that no one looked for them and that, in fact, they had not run away but had been abducted or tricked or drugged by a pimp when the system assumed they were bad girls who had just run away.

Most of us were so moved by one woman that we often repeat her story. She told us in hearings that she felt the foster care system prepared her for exploitation because her pimp was the first person who told her that he loved her and that, while in foster care, she was moved so often and told so often that she was just a paycheck that she formed no healthy attachments and had nowhere to turn.

We have to close the cracks in our system that leave a child feeling her pimp is the only one she can turn to or that she would rather be with a pimp than be bounced around from foster home to foster home. The system that is supposed to be designed to help vulnerable children should not turn around and victimize the children or allow them to fall into the hands of exploiters.

Many of the young survivors we have met told us that, during the time they were being trafficked, they had numerous encounters with the child welfare system but that no one asked what was happening to them, especially girls in group homes. Pimps know this population is especially vulnerable. H.R. 469 will allow child welfare agencies across the Nation to develop State protection plans to outline provisions and procedures to identify and assess all reports of children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking.

H.R. 469 begins to prepare the child welfare system for this population. A first step is to document the extent of the problem. Another step is to ensure

that each State has a plan to train social workers to identify and address the needs of this population. Arresting these children should not be the way we provide services. Arresting them treats them as criminals, and one has to question if jail is ever an appropriate place to provide the type of services these children need.

H.R. 469 also requires that, within 1 year, the Department of Health and Human Services report to Congress on the prevalence and type of trafficking they have encountered. The report will assess State practices used to identify and serve trafficking victims and Federal laws and policies that might, in fact, prevent States from supporting these victims, including the absence of trafficking in the Federal definition of "child abuse and neglect" under CAPTA, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

I am encouraged by the momentum that has been created to reform our child welfare system and to ensure that vulnerable children are provided with the resources they need. I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, and to continue to work together in Congress to combat domestic minor sex trafficking.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri, Congresswoman WAGNER, an aggressive and outspoken advocate for children since arriving here in Congress, an opponent of trafficking, and who has much to say but who also has had much evidence of action on this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

I also want to thank Judge POE, who has fought this fight for so very many years.

It is marvelous to have seen in the 113th Congress five pieces of legislation on human trafficking move through this Chamber. Now, tomorrow, we will pass 12 pieces of human trafficking to end the scourge of sex slavery in this country and beyond, and I could not be more proud of this Chamber and of the bipartisan effort to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015, sponsored by Representative KAREN BASS.

Congresswoman BASS has been a long-time leader in Congress on the issue of human trafficking. Her legislation will strengthen the child welfare response to trafficking by ensuring that each State develops a plan that would identify children at risk of becoming victims of human trafficking. According to the Department of Justice, upwards of 300,000 American children are at risk of becoming the victims of crime.

One of the greatest challenges we face in combating this problem is a

lack of accurate and reliable statistics. Frequently, those most at risk of falling victim to human trafficking are not identified early enough to intervene. By ensuring that child welfare agencies have systems in place to properly identify, to assess, and to document child victims of trafficking, H.R. 469 will move us towards a comprehensive, total solution to the scourge of human trafficking in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to be sponsoring, at the end of our debate here, a Special Order on the issue of human trafficking. I invite all of my colleagues to join me on the floor as we talk about this important issue and about the 12 pieces of human trafficking legislation that will come forward tomorrow.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), who, in arriving here just this term, has rolled up his sleeves and has already taken aggressive action on issues that make a difference.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding this time and for his efforts in this most noble fight.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015, which directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop and publish guidelines to assist State child welfare agencies in efforts to serve youth who are victims or who are, perhaps, most importantly, at risk of becoming victims of human trafficking. In addition, this bill amends the Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Act to require a State plan for foster care and adoption assistance to identify children who are victims of human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, as the father of three sons and as the grandfather of precious, precious twin granddaughters, nothing terrifies me more than the thought of a loved one's falling victim to human sex trafficking. However, families all across our country suffer this horrific situation every day. I believe all of my colleagues would agree that protecting every child in this country is our number one priority; yet children in State welfare systems slip through the cracks and go unnoticed every day.

In the Georgia General Assembly, where I had the honor and privilege of serving for the past 10 years, I worked alongside my friend, State Senator Renee Unterman, to enact one of the Nation's toughest crackdowns on human trafficking by strengthening protections for the victims of these crimes and by increasing penalties for those who commit them. In fact, last year, we went a step further by requir-

ing businesses to post information on a 24-hour, toll-free hotline for victims of human trafficking so that they could call for help.

I hope the guidelines that have been established under this law will encourage other States to follow Georgia's lead. Our utmost priority should be providing to these children, who have suffered at the hands of evil, access to care and support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I would like to thank the chief sponsor and other supporters of the legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I think much has been said today that causes us to understand that what we are dealing with in this bill is the fact that there are entities that are supposed to be protecting children, that are supposed to be providing resources—law enforcement and welfare and human service entities—that are missing the mark. A lot of that comes from inadequate recordkeeping statistics and from the lack of knowledge of how this is having the greatest impact in negative ways on children's lives. We would do very well today to follow the advice and direction from speakers who have already spoken on this issue.

Pass this legislation, and provide further hope for children caught in the trap of human trafficking and enslavement that comes from this crime. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 469.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015. I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, for introducing this bill and for all she does on behalf of foster youth.

As an original cosponsor of this bill and a co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I encourage all my colleagues to support this important legislation. In the previous Congress, similar legislation passed the House by a vote of 399-0—a strong show of support for foster youth.

Foster youth are some of the most at-risk children in our society. They are often the victims of abuse or neglect; and too many face trials and tribulations beyond their years. So much that we take for granted—a stable home, living with our siblings, or returning to the same school year after year—are constant obstacles for these children.

This legislation will specifically address the link between girls in foster care and sex trafficking, and will require states to develop a child protection plan to identify and assess all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of trafficking. Additionally, states must provide training plans for child protective services workers to appropriately respond to reports of child trafficking and have procedures in place that will connect child victims to public or private specialized services.

I am proud to support this bipartisan legislation, and again I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 469, Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015. Human trafficking is a form of modern-day slavery. This bill would make it possible to accurately identify and help children from the child welfare system who are trafficked into the sex trade.

The sickening fact is that human trafficking is a big, booming business—trafficking a child for sex can be more lucrative than drug trafficking. This is why I am glad to join my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, in taking additional steps to protect our sons and daughters from this horrible crime.

As we recognize January as Human Trafficking Awareness month, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan legislation so that we may protect our most vulnerable children, including those in the foster care system, who have been victimized through no fault of their own.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support H.R. 469, the “Strengthening Our Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015,” which strengthens the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Pub. L. 93–247) by requiring that state plans for federal grants for child abuse or neglect prevention and treatment programs include elements focused on human trafficking.

Trafficking in humans is a major problem across the globe and in our own country. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge and protect our children, especially those without parents to care for them, from being exploited and falling through the cracks.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus, I understand how important it is to defend those who are too young to defend themselves.

This problem is personal for me because according to the U.S. Department of Justice, my home city of Houston, Texas is the epicenter of human trafficking in the United States with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year’s massive effort “Operation Cross Country” led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

Between 1998 and 2003 more than 500 people from 18 countries were ensnared in 57 forced labor operations in almost a dozen cities throughout the State of Texas.

Currently, our state child welfare systems do not properly identify and help the children that have been taken by this horrible industry.

Even more disturbing is that the protections provided by our child welfare systems often do not extend to young victims of trafficking.

Hard as it is to believe, in some states trafficked youths are not even regarded or classified as victims.

Houston is a popular trafficking hub in part because the city is so diverse, with large His-

panic, Asian and Middle Eastern populations, which allows traffickers and their victims to blend into local communities.

A recent report estimated that 25% of all trafficking victims in the U.S. end up in Texas.

Rather, they are treated as youthful offenders and consigned to the criminal justice system.

The city is so diverse, the traffickers and victims easily blend into the community.

The TIP Report also contains tier rankings of each country on which it reports, which are used to help protect victims, prevent trafficking and prosecute traffickers.

According to a report published in the Northwestern Journal of International Human Rights, Mexican authorities are working to address the problem of trans-border human trafficking, but the country’s “legal framework remains largely untouched and hence limited in its crime-fighting scope and effectiveness.”

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas is one of the nation’s largest hubs for human trafficking, with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year’s massive effort “Operation Cross Country” led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

In general The Center shall carry out the following activities:

1. Receive information on travel by child-sex offenders.

2. Establish a system to maintain and archive all relevant information, including the response of destination countries to notifications under subsection where available, and decisions not to transmit notification abroad.

3. Establish an annual review process to ensure that the Center is consistent in procedures to provide notification to destination countries or not to provide notification to destination countries, as appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things that can and must continue to be done is to raise public awareness of the continuing prevalence of modern day slavery and human trafficking.

Such identification requires cooperative efforts between the United States and foreign governments. In exchange for providing notice of child-sex offenders traveling to the United States, foreign authorities will expect United States authorities to provide reciprocal notice of child-sex offenders traveling to their countries.

Raising the visibility and status of the governmental entity charged with the responsibility of documenting the problems, successes, and remaining challenges confronting the United States and the international community in eradicating the scourge of human trafficking is a positive step forward in achieving this goal.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 469.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act.

Human trafficking is an ongoing atrocity that preys on the youngest and most vulnerable of

our society. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security estimates that twenty million people worldwide are victims of human trafficking.

In my home state of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, Atlanta is now widely considered a hub in the complex web of illegal human trafficking in our nation. Hundreds of young women and children are ensnared in this criminal enterprise and are funneled through metro Atlanta on a daily basis. One of the most egregious aspects of human trafficking is that it takes place in the shadows, and we can only estimate the number of young women and children this affects. Congress must do all we can to combat and eliminate this terrible practice that threatens the foundation of our country.

I am pleased that the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act is being debated on the floor today, Mr. Speaker. This legislation, along with other measures passed through the U.S. House of Representatives this week, will make a significant contribution in the fight to end human trafficking.

Specifically, H.R. 469 creates and expands stringent reporting requirements for state child welfare institutions so that we can more easily track illicit activity. With this information, we will be more equipped to address the needs of children who are trafficking victims. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 469.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 469.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MISSING CHILDREN’S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 246) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 246

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking, including child prostitution”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1700

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 246.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 246, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives continues its commitment to bolstering enforcement efforts against human traffickers in the United States and ensuring that we properly identify and serve victims.

I want to thank Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY for her leadership on this issue and for introducing H.R. 246, which will improve the ability of law enforcement officials and others to respond to and assist these victims.

The House voted 409-0 to pass this legislation last summer, and as previous House efforts have done, the bills being considered today attempt to change for the better how we view victims.

For too long, these victims have been seen as willing participants and treated as actors in the criminal scheme; however, we now know that, oftentimes, individuals are trapped as victims by human trafficking organizations and, sadly, many of these victims are children.

Congresswoman BEATTY's legislation will ensure that we view victims of sex trafficking not as participants, but as victims, and ensure that child sex trafficking crimes are reported.

Under current law, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children operates the CyberTipline to provide online users and electronic service providers a means of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation in many areas, including child prostitution.

H.R. 246 would replace the term "child prostitution" with "child sex trafficking" in the CyberTipline reporting categories to reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims whose situation should be taken seriously when reported.

It would also ensure the public recognizes that child prostitution is included in how NCMEC uses the term "child sex trafficking" and thus should still be reported to the CyberTipline.

Again, I want to thank Congresswoman BEATTY, along with the Education and the Workforce Committee and House leadership for recognizing the need to steadfastly address this dreadful practice.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 246, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 246, a bill to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking.

The bipartisan bill, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), would amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act by adding the term "child sex trafficking" to the list of items which may be reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's CyberTipline.

Under the act, the center operates the CyberTipline to allow online users and electronic service providers a way of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation, including child prostitution.

The term "trafficking" more accurately describes the circumstances by which children are sexually exploited and reinforces the notion that they are victims, not criminals. Adding trafficking to the list of items that may be reported to the center will not only help the center continue its outstanding work of finding and helping victims, but it will also help experts in the field of missing and exploited children better understand the nature and extent of the problem.

I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Ohio for introducing this important legislation, and I appreciate her partnership with the majority, including the chairman of the full Committee on Education and the Workforce, Chairman KLINE; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG); and other sponsors.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 246, a bipartisan bill I introduced which will help victims of child sex trafficking by decriminalizing their behavior.

First, I would like to thank Chairman KLINE from Minnesota and Ranking Member SCOTT from Virginia of the Education and the Workforce Committee for bringing this important bill to the floor for consideration.

I want to also thank Representative WALBERG, who is managing the bill, for his kind words and his leadership. He is managing the bill today for the Republicans. I also thank Congresswoman KAREN BASS and Congresswoman ANN WAGNER for their leadership and support.

Also, I would like to thank Senator PORTMAN, who I partnered with on this issue last Congress and who introduced the companion legislation in the Sen-

ate. I look forward to working with him again during the 114th Congress to advance this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, the House passed this exact bill unanimously by a vote of 409-0. Today, I hope that my colleagues in the House will again approve this legislation with overwhelming bipartisan support so we can better assist victims of child sex trafficking and ensure they are viewed and treated as victims, not criminals.

Earlier this month, I had the opportunity to participate in Ohio's sixth annual Human Trafficking Awareness Day, which was held in my district at the Ohio statehouse. It was standing room only. The event was chaired by State Representative Teresa Fedor from Toledo, who has spent a lifetime on this issue. There, we heard story after story from victims, survivors, and advocates, just like the ones we heard on the House floor earlier today.

Almost every time I am home in my district in Ohio, I hear from people who are concerned about the victims of child sex trafficking. Constituents implore me to have Congress do more to protect those among us who are the most vulnerable, those who are being forced into what many deem modern-day slavery.

This is for a good reason. Human trafficking is one of the fastest-growing crimes in the world. In fact, according to the U.S. State Department, human trafficking is the world's second largest criminal enterprise, after the illegal drug trade. Criminals involved in trafficking trade prey on those children already at risk in our society, the children who fall through the cracks in our society.

In the United States, some 300,000 children are at risk each year of commercial sexual exploitation. Mr. Speaker, many of these children are runaways, homeless, and in and out of foster care. These children deserve better.

The average age of a trafficked victim in the United States is 12 years of age. Mr. Speaker, this is shameful. At 12 years old, children should be playing sports, participating in their school science fair, learning new languages, or just being children. They should not be for sale night after night.

In my home State of Ohio, each year, there is an estimated 1,100 Ohio children who become victims of human trafficking, and over 3,000 more are at risk. Ohio is the fifth leading State for human trafficking because of its proximity to a waterway that leads to an international border and a system of interstate highways that allow an individual to exit the State within 2 hours to almost anywhere.

The I-75 corridor runs through Toledo, Dayton, and Cincinnati. It is infamous for subjecting children to the horrors of sex trafficking, with reports of victims being repeatedly abused.

We know that no single system can successfully combat trafficking. Preventing, identifying, and serving victims of trafficking requires a multi-coordinated approach across all levels of government. We need to encourage all people: when they see something, say something.

How can concerned citizens report activities of suspected child exploitation? Currently, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children operates a CyberTipline, which receives leads and tips regarding suspected crimes of sexual exploitation committed against children.

This CyberTipline is operated in partnership with the FBI, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the United States Postal Inspection Service, United States Secret Service, United States Department of Justice, as well as other State and local enforcement agencies.

These reports are constantly monitored to help ensure children in imminent danger get first priority. More than 2.8 million reports of suspected child exploitation have been made to the CyberTipline between 1998 and October of 2014.

Under current law, child sex trafficking is not identified as one of the types of sexual exploitation that should be reported to the CyberTipline, even though the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children encounters child victims of sex trafficking and currently uses this term on its Web site in order to encourage the public's reporting of these types of crimes.

Instead, the statute uses the term "child prostitution"—yes, child prostitution, Mr. Speaker—which we know does not fully and accurately capture these types of crimes against children. My bill would add the phrase "child sex trafficking, including child prostitution," to section b(1)(p) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

This legislation was crafted in order to improve and update the law in order to reflect the current state of Federal laws and to reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims and not criminals.

Mr. Speaker, children in sex trafficking situations are often misidentified as "willing" participants. We know there is a widespread lack of awareness and understanding of trafficking.

Take, for instance, a story I recently heard about Holly, who is a survivor of human trafficking. When Holly was 14 years old, she ran away from home with a man she had met at a shopping mall. Holly and this man exchanged phone numbers. He continued to pursue Holly over the course of many months.

Convincing her to run away with him was not an overnight accomplishment. He got to know her, analyzed her troubles, and asked about her dreams. He

did this so that when Holly was on her summer break from the eighth grade, the pressures of her 14-year-old world boiled to the surface.

With all this confusion and pressure Holly was feeling, this predator was able to convince her to flee towards what she thought was opportunity, possibility, and freedom. In reality, Holly ran right into the clutches of a sexual trafficking ring. Within hours of running away with what turned out to be a manipulative and threatening pimp, she was coerced into prostitution.

Fortunately for Holly, eventually an officer on the street thought that she seemed underage, so he approached her and arrested her. She was soon recognized to be a victim and began the long journey toward healing. Today, I am proud to say that Holly is an advocate for stronger anti-trafficking laws and greater protection for survivors of all forms of human trafficking.

This bill, H.R. 246, is intended to protect young children like Holly, to rescue and restore them. By adding the term "child sex trafficking, including child prostitution," to the Missing Children's Assistance Act, we will be able to continue to fight the perception that sex trafficking is a voluntary, victimless crime, and this will exclude them from prostitution.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1715

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time, and so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, how much time is available on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), who has worked on all of the bills we have considered today.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 246, a bill to improve the response to victims of child trafficking.

First, I would like to commend my colleague, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, for her commitment to transforming the language that we use to discuss child victims of sex trafficking and for taking the lead on this important legislation. After all, a child cannot consent to sex, so a child cannot be considered a prostitute. And her exploiter should never be called a john; he should be called what he is, a child molester.

While trafficking advocates and organizations have worked tirelessly over the years to ensure that the framework and language we use to describe child victims of trafficking recognizes that they are, in fact, victims, we still have

a long way to go. These children have gone through enough trauma. They do not need to continue to hear language that places the blame on them for a crime that an adult committed.

Phone hotlines and cyber tip lines operated by organizations throughout the country are critical to ensuring that individuals have a means to report these incidents of human trafficking and child exploitation.

Under this legislation, reports of domestic minor sex trafficking to the CyberTipline of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children would be classified as "child sex trafficking" and no longer as "child prostitution." This change would reinforce the fact that the children are victims and not criminals.

Representative BEATTY's bill is another critical building block to transforming the framework and dialogue around child victims of sex trafficking. I look forward to continuing to change the conversation and urge my colleagues in the House to support this important legislation.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time. I want to thank all of the sponsors of the legislation for bringing it forward, this and the other two bills that we have also considered.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The passage of this legislation shows the House's commitment to providing the necessary tools and policies to help reduce child sex trafficking and better serve these victims, and on the recommendations and admonition of my colleagues today, again I would say, these victims in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is good work that we are doing here. I submit, it is probably the type of work that our constituents are calling us to work across the aisle to accomplish.

During the human trafficking roundtables I have held in my district, law enforcement officials have consistently raised the need to make community members aware of the real and present threat of human trafficking. We must work to not only educate children, but also families and the general public, about the safety risks.

The statistics on sex trafficking and exploitation among young people are startling. Approximately one out of six runaway youth are likely victims of sex trafficking, and roughly one out of three youth are lured into prostitution, victimization, sex-trafficked within 48 hours of running away from home.

This is happening all over the country and not just in my home State.

Therefore, I urge all Members to lead efforts in their districts to continue the conversation about human trafficking to learn what more we can do in our communities and to curtail this heinous crime.

H.R. 246 is another step to educating our communities about human trafficking victims, and it continues our work to ensure that we are doing what we can to help reduce this horrible crime.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 246.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 246, a bill "To Improve The Response To Victims Of Child Sex Trafficking," which broadens the issues to be reported on the federal tip line on Internet-related child sexual exploitation run by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to explicitly include child sex trafficking—specifically, by replacing the term "child prostitution" with the term "child sex trafficking, including child prostitution."

Trafficking in humans is a major problem across the globe and in our own country. As lawmakers, we have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge and protect our children, especially those without parents to care for them, from being exploited and falling through the cracks.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I understand how important it is to defend those who are too young to defend themselves.

This problem is personal for me because according to the U.S. Department of Justice, my home city of Houston, Texas is the epicenter of human trafficking in the United States with over 200 active brothels in Houston and two new ones opening each month.

Houston has also surpassed Las Vegas for the dubious distinction of having the most strip clubs and illicit spas serving as fronts for sex trafficking.

Human trafficking in Texas is not limited to Houston. During the 2011 Dallas Super Bowl, 133 underage arrests for prostitution were made and during this year's massive effort "Operation Cross Country" led by the FBI, several pimps were arrested.

Between 1998 and 2003 more than 500 people from 18 countries were ensnared in 57 forced labor operations in almost a dozen cities throughout the State of Texas.

The Justice Department's Internet Crimes against Children Task Force (which coordinates with 61 federal, state and local law enforcement task forces) reports that the number of child victims of prostitution increased by more than 900% between 2004 and 2008.

Currently, our state child welfare systems do not properly identify and help the children that have been taken by this horrible industry.

Even more disturbing is that the protections provided by our child welfare systems often do not extend to young victims of trafficking.

Hard as it is to believe, in some states trafficked youths are not even regarded or classified as victims.

Rather, they are treated as youthful offenders and consigned to the criminal justice system.

These kids are not criminals. They are victims, robbed of their innocence by adult criminals.

They are boys and girls who have been taken advantage of and are unable to escape an ugly system.

I support H.R. 246 because it is focused on using technology to minimize the sex trafficking of vulnerable children and empowers people by giving the opportunity and means to report suspicious activity.

Under current law, the Health and Human Services Department (HHS) provides an annual grant to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children for a range of activities, including running a tip line that allows online users and Internet service providers to report Internet-related child sexual exploitation.

This tip line includes reports on child pornography, online enticement of children for sexual acts, child prostitution, sex tourism involving children, extra familial child sexual molestation, unsolicited obscene material sent to a child, misleading domain names and misleading words or digital images on the Internet.

I strongly support H.R. 246 and urge my colleague to join me in voting for its passage which will help bring an end to the evil practice that is child sex trafficking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 246.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU, IRAN, AND THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I support Speaker BOEHNER's invitation to Prime Minister Netanyahu to address this body to discuss the Iranian threat and the growing instability in the Middle East due to the rise of global jihadist networks.

A nuclear-capable Iran will spark an arms race in the region and directly threaten America's interests as Iran continues to make progress on its intercontinental ballistic missile program. But as grave as this threat is to America, it pales in comparison to the existential threat that it poses to our democratic ally, the Jewish State of Israel.

No other nation is more familiar with the Iranian threat and the pitfalls of our ongoing nuclear negotiations

than Israel, and that is why it is imperative that we hear firsthand from Prime Minister Netanyahu on Israel's assessment of Iran's nuclear program and other terrorist threats that are emanating from the Middle East.

Thank you, Speaker BOEHNER, for that invitation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JERMAINE KEARSE

(Mr. HECK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Gandhi once famously said: "Strength does not come from physical capacity. It comes from an indomitable will."

Jermaine Kearse has been making plays in Washington State for more than 10 years, first as a Lancer at Lakes High, then as a Husky at the University of Washington, and since 2012 as, of course, a Seattle Seahawk.

You may very well have seen his game-winning catch in the NFC Championship game in the end zone. But that game wasn't a cakewalk for Jermaine by any means. There were interceptions and there were drops.

It was on the sidelines, however, that one of Jermaine's injured teammates said to him to forget about it and to remember that there are still plays to be made here.

Ever want to give up? Ever think it is too hard? Ever think the odds are stacked against you? Remember the will of Jermaine Kearse and the Seattle Seahawks. Tell yourself there are still plays to be made.

Congratulations, number 15. Lake-wood and the entire 10th Congressional District are very, very proud of you and, frankly, we can't wait to see you fly in Glendale and make the New England Patriots shake and the earth move.

Go, Hawks.

ANWR DESIGNATION IS AN ENERGY MORATORIUM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an area of great concern. The Obama administration has just announced their intention to designate more than 12 million acres of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska as wilder-ness.

Now, this move would place a de facto moratorium on oil and gas production on the largest onshore, unexplored, and potentially productive areas in the United States.

While this area only represents about 8 percent of the total size of ANWR,

the Energy Information Administration suggests a great potential for the recovery of oil and gas based upon nearby plays in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the President often touts America's move towards greater energy independence. The irony is that most of that, much of this production has occurred on private lands and by private hands. Placing new prohibitions on Federal lands is simply doublespeak.

Thomas Edison once said, and I quote, "Seeming to do is not doing."

Mr. Speaker, while we may not be focused on energy prices at the moment, planning for the future is as prudent as it is wise. I encourage the administration to think about our future. The American people deserve as much.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in connection with a criminal case currently pending before that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of packages of human trafficking legislation to be considered by the House of Representatives this week, 12 different pieces of legislation. I also rise today in support of all the good work done by my colleagues here in Congress on the issue of human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, as a former United States Ambassador, I was exposed firsthand to the horrors of human trafficking on an international level. I witnessed and reported on devastating consequences of human trafficking, where innocent women and children were dragged into the dark abyss of sex slavery. But never in my wildest dreams did I ever think human trafficking was so rampant right here in the United States of America. Americans are being forced into sexual slavery by ruthless human traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, right now there are young women being forced into prostitution in virtually every district across this Nation. It is hiding in plain sight. In fact, I was shocked to learn that my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, has been identified as one of the top 20 areas for sex trafficking in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is before our eyes. It is in our communities, it is in our neighborhoods, and it is in our cul-de-sacs. It is right here before us. Every year, thousands of young Americans' lives are impacted by this despicable crime. However, there is hope.

I take hope from the work done by the law enforcement professionals who are on the front lines every day protecting our Nation's children from those who would seek to exploit them. I take hope from those who work in victims services and their tireless efforts to help survivors recover, heal, and forge new lives out of the horrors of sexual enslavement. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I take hope from all the survivors, the survivors of this hideous crime. Their strength gives us strength, their resolve gives us inspiration, and their steadfast commitment to ending sex trafficking gives us all the courage to fight.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, because of the efforts of many individuals and groups, I am happy to report that Congress has taken notice of this serious problem. Years of work by Representatives NOEM, POE, PAULSEN, HULTGREN, REICHERT, SMITH, among many others, have raised awareness of this issue and have laid the foundation for the long overdue action Congress is presently taking. I am grateful that many of my colleagues have held events in their home districts to raise awareness and education of this crime.

Last year in St. Louis, I participated, along with Judge POE, in a conference at which the private and public sectors came together to share best practices about combating human trafficking. Representatives DAVIS, HUDSON, WALBERG, ROSKAM, COFFMAN, HUIZENGA, and HECK, among so many other Members of my colleagues, have all held human trafficking events in their districts to raise awareness and offer solutions to end sexual assault

and human trafficking. I applaud these efforts, and I look forward to continuing this work for years to come.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is much, much work to be done. As legislators, we have an obligation to come together and do something because we can, because we should, and because we must.

The legislation that we are voting on this week in the House of Representatives will provide prosecutors with the tools they need to prosecute traffickers and will provide social service providers with the resources they need to assist victims in healing. These bills will mandate much-needed awareness and training, and will provide government agencies with the accurate, dependable statistics they need to combat this terrible crime.

I am so proud of the action this body has taken to recognize and address this problem, which has so long festered in the shadows.

I am equally proud of all my colleagues today who have come to the floor to speak up for the victims of human trafficking, to show them they are not alone, that we are with them, and that we will no longer be silent in the face of such depravity.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN). He is reintroducing his bill, the Sex Trafficking Demand Reduction Act. The bill urges nations to recognize the link between the purchase of commercial sex and the prevalence of human trafficking in society, and to confront the former in order to effectively combat the latter. The bill targets demand.

He has hosted anti-trafficking forums for Members of Congress at which the anti-trafficking documentary "Nefarious" was shown. The producers of the film from Exodus Cry attended.

He is a member of the House leadership Human Trafficking Task Force and the Human Trafficking Caucus, and he has worked with the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission on efforts to help human trafficking victims both in the U.S. and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, RANDY HULTGREN.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognition of Human Trafficking Awareness Month and Human Trafficking Awareness Week here in the House of Representatives.

I especially want to thank my good friend and colleague from Missouri, ANN WAGNER, for hosting tonight's Special Order.

Today, human trafficking represents a modern form of slavery. It is a crisis that victimizes 21 million people worldwide. In my home State of Illinois, the National Human Trafficking Resource Center estimates that 25,000 women and girls are exploited each year by sex traffickers. Because of its strategic location as a major transportation and

commercial center, Chicago has become a major national hub for human trafficking.

As a member of the Congressional Human Trafficking Task Force, we are working to coordinate the efforts of the congressional leadership and international anti-trafficking groups to punish perpetrators, rescue and bring hope to victims, and assist nations in their fight against the global epidemic of trafficking in human beings.

Through legislation like that which the House will bring to the floor this week, I am pleased to see this body take critical steps to target the perpetrators of human trafficking and enhance efforts toward eradicating it.

Later this week, I will be reintroducing my own bill, the Sex Trafficking Demand Reduction Act. Evidence suggests a clear link between the purchase of commercial sex and the prevalence of sex trafficking in a society. Where there is a robust demand for commercial sex, human trafficking as an industry and practice thrives as well. The Sex Trafficking Demand Reduction Act highlights this link and requires national governments to factor in their efforts to combat demand as part of their overall fight against human trafficking.

Human trafficking is the most insidious of criminal enterprises. It targets the youngest and most vulnerable in society, stealing their innocence and depriving them of any hope of escaping a downward spiral of depravity and despair. Thankfully, we are all becoming increasingly aware of the extent of human trafficking and the magnitude of the effects on its victims. Through the persistent efforts of international anti-human trafficking groups, national, State, and local governments, the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, and dedicated individuals concerned about the communities in which they live, we have made sustained inroads towards eradicating the scourge of human trafficking. We can envision the day when human trafficking will no longer represent a blight on humanity, a day when victims will experience complete restoration.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for this opportunity to speak.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to this bracelet that I have on that many of my colleagues are going to be wearing over the next 2 days as we pass 12 pieces of human trafficking legislation. This tab bracelet was handmade by dedicated volunteers to raise funds for Crisis Aid International safe homes in my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri. The safe homes provide comfort and support for young women rescued from the horrors of sex trafficking.

The bracelet project, which was inspired by an 11-year-old victim wanting to make a difference, has become the

symbol of hope for these precious young people.

Join me. I ask all my colleagues to join me in wearing this bracelet to spread awareness about the scourge of sex slavery.

Next, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Last year, Congresswoman BEATTY partnered with Senator PORTMAN from Ohio to introduce bipartisan, bicameral legislation, the Bringing Missing Children Home Act, to improve law enforcement reporting and response procedures in cases of missing children, the most vulnerable victims of child trafficking and sexual exploitation.

This Congress, she introduces H.R. 246, which would improve and update the Missing Children's Assistance Act in order to reflect the current state of Federal law and reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims and not criminals.

I am a proud cosponsor of the gentlewoman's legislation, and it is my pleasure to yield to the gentlelady from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, first let me just say thank you to my colleague from Missouri, Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, for organizing tonight's Special Order hour but, probably more importantly, a bipartisan Special Order hour. And let me say, I proudly wear this bracelet in honor of all of those survivors.

I also want to note that her work as a former United States Ambassador exposed her firsthand to the horrors of human trafficking on an international level. Her work has raised awareness of this problem and has laid the foundation for congressional action.

Despite international efforts to eradicate human trafficking, it still exists and affects communities in every country, including the United States. This transnational crime exploits the weakest and often subjects victims to mental and physical abuse.

Human trafficking is an estimated multibillion-dollar-a-year international enterprise that forces the weakest among us into the horrors of modern day slavery.

It is also one of the fastest-growing crimes in the world. In fact, according to the United States State Department, human trafficking is the world's second-largest criminal enterprise. Mr. Speaker, after illegal drug trade, it is forced prostitution, domestic slavery, and forced labor.

It is also oftentimes underground and masked so well that it is difficult to recognize. These victims are our housekeepers, our farmworkers brought into the United States by labor brokers who promised a job but enslaved these victims instead. Sex traffickers target the weakest members of our society by using violence or threats or other coercive means to keep victims enslaved.

Human trafficking deprives individuals of their most basic and unalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is why we must continue to work to end human trafficking and support the victims by providing resources and assistance during their time of need.

My home State of Ohio is the fifth-leading State for human trafficking. In Ohio, an estimated 1,100 Ohio children become victims, with some 3,000 more at risk. In fact, a preliminary report on the scope of the problem in Ohio cited that 13 years of age is the most common age for youth to become victims of child sex trafficking.

During my time in public service, as a public servant both in the Ohio Legislature and here, I have heard story after story of heartbreaking personal human trafficking experiences from Ohio. Just 2 weeks ago, my hometown paper, The Columbus Dispatch, reported that a massage spa in central Ohio was serving as a front for organized prostitution, where 18 women who spoke little or no English were forced to work there, eat there, and sleep there. Authorities believe that these women were likely trafficked into the United States to work in a sex trade.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a copy of this article placed into the RECORD.

[From the Columbus Dispatch, Jan. 15, 2015]

(By Theodore Decker)

Behind the Powell storefront—between a dentist's office and a dessert shop—the women slept each night on massage tables.

Rarely, investigators say, did they appear to leave the Amsun Massage Spa, a business that caught the attention of Powell police not long after it opened last fall in a strip mall at 128 E. Olentangy St.

The women worked there. They ate there. They slept there. They might not have had a choice, authorities said.

Local, state and federal investigators announced yesterday that the massage parlor was a front for organized prostitution and was one of four addresses raided in Delaware and Franklin counties as part of Powell's investigation. A parallel federal investigation resulted in searches of other addresses, although details of those raids were under court-ordered seal yesterday.

The combined searches turned up 18 women who speak little or no English and might have been trafficked to work in the sex trade. Investigators said various agencies have stepped in to provide shelter and other support to the women.

"They don't know the culture, they don't speak the language, and they're very untrusting of law enforcement," said Nathan Emery, special agent in charge of the Columbus office of the federal Homeland Security Investigations agency.

The women fear deportation, a threat that was used by their employers to keep them in line, police said. Authorities are trying to pin down their identities and countries of origin.

"We are not just arresting those who are suspected of trafficking women for sex, we are also rescuing those who may be victims of this heinous crime," said Cmdr. Gary

Cameron of the Columbus police narcotics bureau.

Powell's search warrants were served at Amsun Massage in Powell; Amsun Massage, 1000 High St., Worthington; Rainbow Massage, 5564 Hilliard-Rome Rd. on the Far West Side; and a Jasmine Court residence on the Far West Side.

A man and woman from Columbus were arrested: Xiao Shuang Chao, 56, and Qing Xu, whose age was unknown. Investigators aren't sure of the couple's relationship but said they operated the businesses locally. They face organized-crime charges in Delaware County Common Pleas Court.

Powell Police Chief Gary Vest said that soon after Amsun opened, his department was tipped that women were living there and providing sex-related services to clients.

Emery said women are brought to the United States by human traffickers and, instead of finding a better life, "to pay off their debts, they're put into forced servitude."

Mrs. BEATTY. Because of the importance of this issue in my State and in our Nation, I engaged during my first term in Congress to pass a sex trafficking bill, 400-9. Last year, as you heard from Congresswoman WAGNER, I partnered with Senator PORTMAN from Ohio to introduce bipartisan, bicameral legislation, the Bringing Missing Children Home Act, H.R. 3905.

This Congress, I have introduced H.R. 246, which would improve and update the Missing Children's Assistance Act in order to reflect the current state of Federal law and reinforce that children who are sex-trafficked or sexually exploited are victims and not criminals.

Lastly, my bill would add the phrase "sex child trafficking, including child prostitution" to section b(1)(P) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act to fight the perception that sex trafficking is a voluntary, victimless crime.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, in speaking against and bringing awareness of human trafficking. Our country, our constituents, our children need our help.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and her friendship. Thank you so much, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY.

Next, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman TED POE. Judge POE has been a longstanding advocate for victims of crime. He has dedicated his life to promoting justice and giving voice to survivors and, as a Member of Congress, has been a tireless advocate for legislation that provides a comprehensive approach to address the problem of human trafficking in the United States. Congressman POE has been a friend and a colleague and a kindred spirit to me in the House of Representatives. His championing of victims' rights has inspired countless survivors of crime to stand up for their rights and demand change.

I yield to the Congressman from Texas, Judge TED POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that this effort to combat human trafficking in the United States, in my opinion, is led by the ladies of the House on both sides, the Republicans and the Democrats. The spunk of my friend from Missouri and all of the others who have spoken and will speak later on these pieces of legislation is obvious.

□ 1745

There are 12 bills, Mr. Speaker. They are bipartisan bills on one subject. As long as I have been here, I have never seen so much attention by all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle moving and trying to fix a problem as this.

Twelve pieces of legislation—many of those passed last year, they just never got voted on in the Senate—and we are bringing them up again. Once again, it is the ladies to whom America owes a great gratitude to. My grandmother used to say that there is nothing more powerful than a woman who has made up her mind. The ladies of the House have made up their mind on the issue of trafficking. They are not going to tolerate it, and neither are the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic to me that this tremendous amount of legislation—this important subject—is getting so little play in the national media. It seems that the media and America, I guess, is more concerned about the disappearance of air in footballs than they are about the disappearance of America's children that are being trafficked across the United States.

The worst thing that is taking place among our youth is the slavery that is happening to them. The runaways, the throwaways, and the stowaways of America's children are disappearing into this scourge of slavery, as it has been rightfully called.

Many of us remember how we got involved in trying to prevent this. My first experience was meeting a little girl in Peru at the age of 7 whose name is Lilly. Lilly could not speak because of the numerous assaults that had been committed against her before she was rescued. It is not just kids in South America or Central America or overseas; it is America's children that are being trafficked.

We have to make it clear that these young girls, primarily, that are on the streets and that are being sold and bartered by these slave masters are not criminals. These are not prostitutes. These are victims of crimes. America needs to change its focus and its understanding that when we see that occurring, that person is a victim, not a criminal.

As has been mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the leading ways that

criminal organizations are making money because, in the drug trade, you get drugs and you sell them one time; plus the risk of apprehension is greater for drug sales than with the selling of kids. Children can be sold multiples times a night, and they are.

When the trafficker is captured, very often, nothing happens, so that is why this lucrative trade continues to make money, but it also continues to make money because there is a demand in this country for this scourge.

These men, primarily, that abuse children are criminals. They are sex offenders. They are child molesters. Some call them johns. They are not johns. John was a good guy. He is in the Bible. Why would we call them that?

They are child molesters, and we need to recognize them for what they are. We need to know who they are. Their names need to be published, and they need to go to jail for what they do because we have to go after the demand.

That is why I have introduced the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act along with my friend CAROLYN MALONEY from New York. CAROLYN MALONEY—a New York Democrat and a Texas conservative Republican, that is just about as bipartisan as you can get, Mr. Speaker. We are separated by a common language, to coin the phrase; but on this issue, like most Members of the House, we are united that we are going to stop this.

This bill does a few things. It goes after the trafficker, the slave master. It helps law enforcement capture them and put them in jail. That is why we build prisons. Then it goes after the victim—the child—rescues them, restores them, and finds a place for them.

Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that in the United States, according to the Humane Society, there are about 3,000 animal shelters? We need them all. I have got three Dalmatians. I got one of them from a shelter in Dallas. I call him the weapon of mass destruction. We need those shelters.

But did you know that, according to Shared Hope International, there are only about 300 beds for minor sex-trafficked victims in the United States? That ought not to be. They need more places to go when the police rescue them.

God bless the police. Many times, when they find these children, they know they are sex-trafficked victims, but there is no place to put them, so they put them in the juvenile justice system. That is not a good idea, but that is the only place they are safe. We need to find residences and homes for them. That is what this bill does.

The third thing it does is it goes after the demand, the person in the middle, the customer that abuses children, the rapist. We are going after those guys, Mr. Speaker. The days of

“boys being boys” is over. Those people are going to be arrested and prosecuted for the crimes that they have committed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD some of the numerous anti-trafficking organizations that have helped all of us in this legislation.

ANTI-TRAFFICKING, CHILD WELFARE, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Children at Risk (Houston), Rights for Girls, Shared Hope International, End Child Prostitution and Trafficking—USA, National Children's Alliance, National Association to Protect Children, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Equality Now, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, Fraternal of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Criminal Justice Association, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call these groups the victims' posse that helps us in this issue.

The last thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, is I used to prosecute criminals. I was a judge in criminal court for 22 years. Sexual assault is what it is called now, but the crime really is rape. It is rape of America's greatest resource: children.

We cannot tolerate this. We ask sometimes: Why are we even here? Well, I can tell you why we are here. We are here to make sure that all Americans, including American children and those immigrants that have been sold into the United States, are protected from crimes like rape.

Mr. Speaker, children are not for sale. I am glad to see that the House is making sure that they will not be for sale in the future. I thank the gentlelady for the time.

And that is just the way it is.

Mrs. WAGNER. Thank you, Judge POE, for your tremendous leadership in this area and so many others dealing with victims' rights.

It is now my pleasure to recognize the gentlewoman from New Hampshire, Representative ANN KUSTER. Representative KUSTER has been a strong proponent of human and women's rights, advocating for a number of bills that support fighting sexual assault and human trafficking, including her bipartisan legislation to improve whistleblower protections which was passed into law last year to protect military members who report instances of sexual abuse.

Last Congress, Representative KUSTER and I joined together in co-authoring a letter condemning the kidnapping of nearly 300 girls by the terrorist group Boko Haram and calling on the United States Government to work with the United Nations to enact more comprehensive financial sanctions against the organization.

I thank her for her leadership on this area, and it is my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire, Representative ANN KUSTER.

Ms. KUSTER. Thank you, Judge POE, and to my dear colleague, ANN WAGNER, and to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for tackling this issue.

I am proud to join my colleagues in passing these six commonsense bills which I have pushed for across the aisle to strengthen protections for victims of sex trafficking, and Judge POE has done a great job setting the stage here for the child who is the victim of sex trafficking.

I think we all need to work on our language and our understanding. He is absolutely correct. I look forward to passing more of these reforms tomorrow and to continuing our bipartisan work together.

It saddens and astonishes me that in today's world, human trafficking remains such a serious problem both here at home and abroad. Throughout the world, thousands of women and underage children are being trafficked and forced to commit sexual acts against their will.

As Judge POE so eloquently stated, rape, that is what we are talking about. It is sickening that individuals advertise and promote this heinous practice in order to make a quick profit. Representative WAGNER's legislation, the SAVE Act, which I helped to reintroduce, would penalize individuals who knowingly host and sell advertisements for the commercial exploitation of minors and trafficking victims.

Last Congress, as she eloquently stated, I was very proud to reach across the aisle and join Representative WAGNER to lead all House women—every single House woman Member, Republican and Democrat—in urging the Obama administration to push the United Nations Security Council to add Boko Haram to the Al-Qaida Sanctions List, following the abduction of nearly 300 schoolgirls threatened to be sold into sexual slavery by this terrorist group.

The horrific kidnapping of the female Nigerian school students captured the world's shock and horror; however, human trafficking is not just a foreign issue. Together, we can be a powerful bipartisan voice against the horrors of this and other instances of human trafficking.

Both Democrats and Republicans in the House understand the importance of working together to protect women and girls, and they know that trafficking isn't just a political issue, it is a human issue.

I have organized discussions on this topic back home in New Hampshire where I have heard from community leaders, law enforcement officials, academic researchers, advocates, and—most importantly and, frankly, most eloquently—the trafficking victims themselves about the ongoing occurrence of human and sex trafficking taking place right here in our own backyard.

Domestic child sex trafficking is a serious problem in the United States, with an estimated 293,000 American youth at risk of commercial sex trafficking and exploitation.

It is imperative that we pass these bills to help law enforcement rescue domestic victims, track down their exploiters, provide additional tools for prosecutors to treat trafficked minors as victims instead of criminals, and ensure access to protective services. Again, I commend Judge POE for his eloquent description.

I applaud the House leadership for bringing to a vote these bipartisan bills to prevent trafficking and provide support to victims. As a mother, I honestly cannot even imagine the anguish and the pain that these families go through as they fight to bring their loved ones back home.

It is essential that we pass these bills and, moving forward, that we do everything together to support States' and countries' efforts to eliminate human trafficking.

Thank you, Representative WAGNER, and to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for organizing this worthy effort.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire for her leadership and her friendship on so many matters that we come together.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to introduce the gentlewoman from Tennessee, Representative DIANE BLACK. She was an original cosponsor of my SAVE Act that we will be introducing tomorrow and that I will have the pleasure to talk about on the floor during debate tomorrow.

She has sponsored roundtables in her district with law enforcement and community leaders on the impact of human trafficking in her home State of Tennessee, and she has worked with End Slavery Tennessee to see firsthand their efforts to combat trafficking in her State.

She is a leader among us for all victims, all those who have no voice. She is a friend and a dear colleague. It is my pleasure to yield to the representative from Tennessee, Congresswoman DIANE BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlelady and my good friend from Missouri for yielding to me, and I also thank her for all her tireless hours of work in not only bringing up this issue so that we will be more aware, but also in finding solutions so that we can help those that are victims.

I am honored to wear the bracelet that is made by the survivors, and I thank her for her endless and tireless work on behalf of these young women—young women and men—who have become victims.

Mr. Speaker, for many Americans, the issue of human trafficking is far removed from their daily lives, something that is relegated to foreign countries and maybe history books, but the

truth is human sex trafficking is the third largest criminal enterprise in the world, with an estimated 300,000 young Americans at risk of becoming victims.

According to the Department of Justice, those most likely to fall prey to this heartbreaking crime are 12- to 14-year-old girls. These young women are someone's daughters, and we cannot turn a blind eye to their plight.

Last year, I had the opportunity to visit End Slavery Tennessee, a nonprofit that works tirelessly to confront trafficking in my State. Their mission is taken from the Book of Isaiah, "to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives, and release from darkness for the prisoners."

This week, the House will take meaningful steps to fulfill this vision by taking up a series of bipartisan bills addressing the impact of trafficking. This includes the SAVE Act, sponsored by my good friend from Missouri, legislation that I cosponsored to go after the online advertisers who profit off of the sale of these innocent victims.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, no single act of Congress will stop all acts of trafficking, or even bring justice for every victim whose innocence has been stolen by this evil activity, but we cannot let our inability to do everything stop us from doing something.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue and so many others.

It is now my pleasure to yield to a brandnew freshman Member, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER). Combating human trafficking is a priority for Congressman WALKER, and this is his very first bill introduced here in Washington, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015. It aims to help end this unconscionable industry. North Carolina is ranked as a top State for labor and sex trafficking, and this vital legislation works to effectively train and inform Department of Homeland Security personnel to better detect and intersect human traffickers and their victims.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman WAGNER for her work in organizing this Special Order, and I also thank Representative MARK MEADOWS in allowing us to lead with such an important piece of legislation.

It was only a week ago that we celebrated the life of Martin Luther King, Jr., who famously said: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

We now have the opportunity to act upon one of the greatest injustices of our time—the growing criminal industry of human trafficking.

All across America, vulnerable young men, women, children, and even entire families, are being victimized and exploited in unspeakable ways. These precious human beings are seen by

their traffickers as a commodity, valued only for the profit they can turn. We must not remain silent about such depravity. Rather, we must engage with immediate fervor on this significant humanitarian crisis.

Victims of human trafficking can literally be hidden in plain sight. However, we know that the United States is considered a leading destination for human traffickers. It is a top source of income for organized crime and involves more than half the street gangs in our Nation. From our big cities to our small towns, this billion-dollar industry is here. And unless we move quickly, it will be here for some time. It is growing, and it must be eradicated.

Law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and nonprofit groups such as Alamance for Freedom in my own Sixth Congressional District of North Carolina are on the front lines of this battle, and they are pleading for our help. Here in Congress, we hear your voices. Most importantly, we hear the voices of those trapped in this evil, modern-day slavery.

There is an immediate need for training that will enable officers and agents to identify and rescue victims of human trafficking.

Last week, I introduced my first bill, H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015. This bipartisan legislation works to effectively train and inform the Department of Homeland Security personnel to better detect and intercept human traffickers and their victims.

We took an oath a few weeks ago promising to protect the people of this great country. I am convinced that part of this high calling is to protect those who are victims of human trafficking. Our President even says that the fight against human trafficking is one of the greatest human rights causes of our time, and the United States will continue to lead it. Well, now is the time to lead.

This bill will provide the very necessary training skills in identifying victims of human trafficking as they enter and move about across this country. It is not a final step, but an important one that can immediately save these precious individuals from years of abuse. Let us do so with boldness, courage, and an unflinching dedication to those who need us the most.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank Congressman WALKER for his leadership, and congratulations on your first piece of legislation—it is so very important—that you will be bringing forward tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure for me to cosponsor with the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) this Special Order on human trafficking. I look forward tomorrow to a number of bills that are going to pass in this United States House of Representatives. I look forward to speak-

ing tomorrow on the SAVE Act that will go after advertisers of this hideous and heinous crime.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield back the remainder of my time so the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) may speak. She has been a friend and a partner on the issue of human trafficking since her time in Congress. She has been a real partner to me as we moved this legislation forward. We were able to move, as I said, five pieces of legislation last Congress and will be moving 12 tomorrow with her leadership and support on this very, very important issue. She has a wonderful piece of legislation, H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015. I am a proud cosponsor and look forward to its passage tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to condemn the horrific tragedy of human trafficking. Globally, there are 20.9 million people who have been trafficked. Not one U.S. State has been spared—sadly men, women and children in every state have been victimized. This is not just a global problem, it is an American problem and it is right here in our own backyards.

I witnessed this problem first hand while working in Washington State for the King County Sheriffs Office. All too often, I spoke to young girls on the street one day, urging them to get off the streets, and the next they had disappeared. This was allowed to happen for far too long, because for many of us, these girls and even many boys are invisible. We do not want to see the problem and so we too often choose to look the other way and pretend it isn't real—not in our communities.

We have to make the problem—and the solutions—visible. Last year, I introduced and passed legislation which became law that helped—will help—prevent the sex trafficking of youth in foster care. The children in federal and state care are often the most vulnerable to becoming trafficking victims. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited children, as many as 6 in 10 of the young women forced into selling their bodies on the streets are current or former foster children. I was honored to have been able to lead the efforts to change that reality last Congress. I stand today to join my colleagues in continuing to raise awareness and pledge my commitment to keeping up the fight on behalf of our children and working to enact additional legislation to end human trafficking.

This week, we will vote on legislation sponsored by Congresswomen WAGNER, ELLMERS and NOEM, Congressman PAULSEN, JOHNSON and POE and many others which will go a long ways towards preventing the trafficking of countless men, women, boys and girls. This is a fight we must all be in together. We must all join with our colleagues, with law enforcement, and with those who are dedicated to ending human trafficking across the globe to say "no more".

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) will control the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a real problem, and it is happening right here in America. It is not just happening overseas. And whether you live in a State like mine of South Dakota or in New York City, it is impacting every single State in our country, right in our backyards.

The first step to recovery is admitting you have a problem, and boy, do we have a problem. I am thrilled that we have so many Members here to speak on this important issue, not only the problems we are having, but what we are doing this week to address those here in this country, to give as many tools to our law enforcement officers to make sure that we address the problems we are seeing on our streets every single day and protect as many children and victims as possible.

I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO). He has been extremely active in the fight to end human trafficking through legislation on Capitol Hill as well as through community engagement at his home in Florida. In his district, Congressman YOHIO has brought together representatives from Homeland Security, from local police and sheriff's offices, and State's attorneys for roundtable summits to raise awareness and develop best practices for ending human trafficking in Florida.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the great State of South Dakota.

I rise in solidarity with the growing coalition that is united in the global fight against human trafficking. The numbers are overwhelming. We have all heard the estimates of over 22 million people being trafficked worldwide; sometimes, though, they seem far away. People often say: That kind of stuff doesn't happen here. It happens overseas. It doesn't happen right here.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is happening in our own backyards. There is an estimate of over 1 million teenagers running away every year in the United States. Runaways are most at risk and vulnerable to trafficking. In fact, runaways are typically picked up and pimped out or trafficked within the first 48 hours.

Just 5 days ago in my home State of Florida, a 15-year-old girl was discovered by police in a motel being sexually abused and trafficked several times a day. Her parents had been handing out missing child flyers in the neighborhood. Luckily, someone recognized her picture from an online ad and contacted authorities. That young girl went from being a runaway to a trafficking victim in less than a month.

That precious 15-year-old child could have been anybody's child. It could have been yours or mine. However, it is not just runaways that become victims of trafficking. Traffickers don't discriminate based on economic class, race, gender, or age. Traffickers are motivated by profit, solely profit.

The average cost of a slave worldwide is roughly \$90. Human trafficking is a \$30-plus billion industry, and it is the second largest source of revenue for terrorists around the world. As the world's fastest growing criminal enterprise, it is shocking how little people know about this horrendous practice. Furthermore, it is appalling how little is put forward in effort to stop it.

This week, the House of Representatives will pass a series of bills designed to streamline law enforcement resources, toughen penalties for offenders, and provide resources to victims. I commend the sponsors of these bills as well as all Members up here today who are willing to stand up and say enough is enough. Human trafficking is not a Republican or Democrat issue. Taking a stand against trafficking is something we all must do, remembering that, while January is National Human Trafficking Awareness Month, we must all be vigilant and active in our fight.

No, Mr. Speaker, your neighborhood and my neighborhood are not immune. No city is exempt, and these victims are part of our daily lives, quietly suffering with almost nowhere to turn. We cannot in good conscience continue our daily routines without making every effort to stamp out the practice of forced labor, domestic servitude, and sex trafficking.

I encourage all Americans to go to the Department of Homeland Security's Web site and watch the Blue Campaign video to become familiar with the common signs of human trafficking. Let's all work to stomp out this scourge of activity on humanity.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for being involved in the issue and working so hard to protect as many victims as possible across the country.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER). Last year, Congresswoman HARTZLER held a human trafficking summit in Columbia, which was one of her most successful events that she did all year. Additionally, she held a foster care listening session with Congresswoman BASS where they also listened to concerns regarding foster youth and how human trafficking does impact our children who are involved in foster care.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Representative NOEM's leadership on this and the opportunity to share tonight how horrific this crime is and how we must unite and stand together to put an end to it.

With almost 21 million victims globally and more than 293,000 American youth at risk of sexual commercial ex-

ploitation and trafficking each year, this heinous crime must be stopped. This week, I am proud to work with my colleagues to vote on legislation that will take steps to do just that.

Tonight I would like to share the story of an amazing woman in my district that I had the privilege of meeting last year. Misty, a survivor of human trafficking, was first trafficked at the age of 14, and it would be 16 more years before she would finally escape a world in which she was brutally beaten and tortured regularly to keep her submissive. When she was severely injured 5 years ago, she thought she was going to die and was too tired to go on anymore. It was then that she agreed to go with a kind police officer who found her that day to get some help.

There aren't words to adequately describe the strength and courage of this woman who testified against her trafficker; who, thankfully, because of Misty's testimony this fall, was found guilty of all charges. Despite the horrific conditions Misty had to endure, she willingly shares her story with others and says her experience motivates her to help others who have been in similar situations. It is women like Misty who inspire me to fight against this scourge in our society. It is a crime against humanity, and it must be stopped.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentlewoman for being involved in the issue and for telling the stories that so many of us need to hear. It is when you hear these stories that truly your heart is impacted to where you can't let it go, where you start to work day in and day out to do all that you can to make sure that we have the tools necessary to stop this industry.

I turn next to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is a longtime advocate for human rights and for the alleviation of human suffering. He is the sponsor of International Megan's Law, which cracks down on the practice of sex tourism. He is also sponsor of the Human Trafficking Prioritization Act, which will make sure that our government gives human trafficking the top priority it deserves in our diplomacy with other countries.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mrs. NOEM for yielding and for the leadership that she has demonstrated, along with Congresswoman WAGNER. As Judge POE said, women of our caucus have stood up and are leading the fight to combat human trafficking with a zero tolerance policy.

This is an historic week in the House as we seek to pass 12 bills to fight human trafficking. As the prime author of the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 as well as reauthorizations of that law in 2003 and

2005, I believe the bills under consideration by the House today and tomorrow will further prevent horrific crimes of human trafficking, protect and assist victims, and aid the prosecution of those who exploit and abuse.

A special thanks to our Republican leadership, especially Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS and Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, who have made this a priority for the House. Hopefully, it will be extended to the Senate, and the President will follow that lead.

When I first introduced TVPA, Trafficking Victims Protection Act, in 1998, the legislation was met with a wall of skepticism and opposition. People both inside of government and out thought the bold new legislation that included sheltering, asylum, and other protections for the victims, long jail sentences and asset confiscation for the traffickers, and tough sanctions for governments that failed to meet minimum standards was merely a solution in search of a problem.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, for most people at the time, the term “trafficking” applied almost exclusively to illicit drugs or weapons. Reports of vulnerable persons, especially women and children, being reduced to commodities for sale were often met with surprise and credulity or indifference. It took 2 years and numerous congressional hearings to overcome opponents and muster the votes for passage.

Now, according to the ILO, approximately 21 million people are victimized. Some put the number as high as 36 million subjected to modern-day slavery. The ILO also says that traffickers make profits in excess of \$150 billion a year.

We do have a tier system. We have a trafficking office, an Ambassador at Large; we have a robust effort on the State level. Many States have passed laws that mirror what we have done on the Federal level, so that there are more tools in the tool box to put these traffickers behind bars and to liberate the women and children.

For the past 15 years, we have seen progress on a number of anti-trafficking fronts, including laws, over 300 laws around the world to combat trafficking; and an estimated 125,000 victims have been rescued worldwide.

We also, over the past decade, have had federally funded some 42 anti-human trafficking task forces and 85,000 law enforcement officers have been trained; still, there are still far too little prosecutions and far too few liberations of those who have been trafficked.

The best estimates available now are that there are at least 100,000 American children, mostly runaways. The average age of initial enslavement is 13 years old. Let me say that again: 13-

year-old girls are exploited in the commercial sex industry each year.

These children, when found, are often unnecessarily charged for prostitution, fined or put in juvenile detention, when there are other options available. They need to be protected, not prosecuted.

Again, I want to thank our leadership for making this such a high priority. This is modern-day slavery. I thank my good friend and colleague for her leadership. We have got to end modern-day slavery.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for his continued leadership on this issue. For years, he has invested time and effort and heart and soul into protecting as many victims as possible, and for that, we will always be grateful.

I want to yield to the good Representative from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN). Representative PAULSEN has been a longtime defender of the victims of human trafficking. In fact, in 2006, when he was a member of the Minnesota Legislature, he was the author of legislation that would form the first statewide human trafficking task force.

That task force was the first step toward Minnesota’s safe harbor law. The legislation that he will have here on the floor this week is modeled after that on a Federal level, and I certainly appreciate his time and investment in protecting as many children and victims as possible.

I yield to Representative PAULSEN.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I want to thank her for her leadership, along with Representative WAGNER, in coordinating and drawing attention to what this horrific crime truly is, spending a little bit of time on the House floor.

When you hear the words “sex trafficking” and “human trafficking,” a lot of people just think this is something that happens in faraway countries, that it doesn’t happen in the United States. It is very sad to say that it is happening right here in our own backyards, knowing that these traffickers are exploiting young girls for their own financial gain, right in our own communities.

We are talking about 12-, 13-, and 14-year-old young girls. It is pretty hard to imagine, but it is true. It is happening in our cities. It is happening in our suburbs. It is happening in rural towns. I will say I realize how critical it is now to educate our community about what I have learned from actually speaking and talking with some of these victims.

I remember speaking with Dayanna. Dayanna is age 13. She tells the story about how, within days of meeting this so-called boyfriend, she finds herself in Philadelphia, in Chicago, being trafficked and has the wherewithal to escape with her life.

Then I meet the mother of another young girl who was violently raped and murdered this last February. The only good news I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that the Twin Cities, which is home now to Minneapolis, being number 13 in the level of sex trafficking, human trafficking that occurs, is also home to many leaders now in the fight against human trafficking.

Over the last 2 years, I have met with great leaders that are inspiring the community to make a difference and pass model legislation that is now being replicated across the country.

I think of Vednita Carter at Breaking Free. I think of Grant Snyder who is a Minneapolis police sergeant who was the very first officer in Minneapolis that was dedicated to working with trafficking victims; and now, he leads his department in teaching local law enforcement, both in Minnesota and in other States around the country, about how to build trust and better relationships with at-risk youth.

We have also got our county attorneys like John Choi, who has been leading the fight, getting top convictions now for a lot of these abusers.

The nonprofit community has been topnotch as well, with Catholic Charities, Brittany’s Place, the Harriet Tubman Center, and the Family Partnership all making a difference.

It does give you hope, Mr. Speaker, that such a large and passionate group of people now are working together to put an end to this modern-day slavery, so the message is spreading.

I will tell you this: we need more safe harbor laws. We need them. Minnesota became the fifth State in the country to approve safe harbor legislation. That means we are essentially treating these children as victims, giving them the services they need and not treating them as criminals. That is really critical.

After the safe harbor legislation went into effect in Minnesota, guess what? We started arresting more johns than ever before. Trafficking convictions more than doubled. It is time that we bring what is working in Minnesota to the national level as well.

I know tomorrow we are going to be voting on this legislation to have this safe harbor legislation that I have authored pass with bipartisan support. A number of other legislation will pass with bipartisan support.

The good news, as the gentlewoman knows, is this is about saving lives, and we are going to make a difference.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on establishing safe harbor laws. Truly, what they do is that they make sure the victims are not prosecuted, that they are treated like the victims that they truly are.

It is so important that we get his bill passed tomorrow, along with my bill and the other bills that will be coming to the floor. A lot of time and effort

has been put into these to make sure that they are right, that they give the tools to our law enforcement officers to make sure that this industry is ended as soon as possible.

I now would like to turn to the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative EMMER. He is from Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District and is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

As part of his responsibility through his committee work, Mr. EMMER works closely with the committee to oversee Federal agencies, international organizations, and NGOs to discuss and to improve governmental responses to human trafficking.

With that, I yield to the Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM and Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, for their leadership here tonight.

Nearly a year ago, Boko Haram terrorists in Nigeria kidnapped more than 200 teenage girls with the intent of selling them off into slavery. This crime against humanity sparked international outrage, but a distracted world soon turned their attention and their backs on these young women.

Unfortunately, this was not an isolated tragedy in some faraway nation. We are in the midst of a global crisis. On every continent and in every nation, millions of human beings are sold and enslaved, forced into labor and prostitution against their will.

In the United States alone, hundreds of thousands are trafficked by transnational drug cartels and criminal organizations. The Justice Department estimates there are more than 200,000 children across the U.S. at risk of trafficking.

Human trafficking is a \$30 billion per year enterprise, with thousands trafficked annually. This is not just an American problem, but there is work that we can do at home to combat this growing problem.

Congress must do everything within its power and authority to ensure that resources and judicial tools are being used to improve prosecutions, protect victims, and prevent future trafficking. Thankfully, we are not starting with nothing.

One way we can combat trafficking is through safe harbor laws that have been instituted across the country, including my home State of Minnesota. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR, for her leadership on protecting victims and assisting prosecutors by forwarding safe harbor laws at the national level.

Her leadership, with the support of countless others—including especially

my colleagues JOHN KLINE and ERIC PAULSEN—comes from an ongoing effort from everyday Minnesotans looking to make an impact and rescue young men and women trapped in the sex trade.

There is also an existing network of organizations that provide services to victims of trafficking that are both life altering and lifesaving.

In my district, three such organizations stand out. Breaking Free and Heartland Girls' Ranch help women escape sexual exploitation through housing, mental health support, and education. The Link, in Carver County, provides support programs to youth and families to combat homelessness and works with at-risk children to help them reach their full potential.

Organizations like these are vital in the fight against trafficking. They make a real difference, and their efforts should be celebrated.

Congress will take important votes tomorrow to streamline agency processes and responses, improve the effectiveness of grant awards, and expand the scope of outreach and child protection initiatives.

To our collective shame, the tragedy of human trafficking persists. The words spoken tonight and the votes cast in this Chamber tomorrow cannot merely be symbolic gestures. They must be followed by action and constant vigilance. Our children deserve nothing less.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words and for his actions and the actions that we will be taking here on the House floor this week.

I turn now to the gentlewoman from Virginia, Representative COMSTOCK. She has been a leader in the fight against human trafficking in the Commonwealth of Virginia and now here on the House floor. I yield to the Representative from Virginia.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues for this opportunity to recognize this month as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, and I thank my colleagues Congresswomen ANN WAGNER and KRISTI NOEM for organizing this effort.

I really appreciate how we are working together to raise awareness about this terrible crime that is happening in my district in northern Virginia and the Shenandoah Valley, throughout Virginia, and throughout—unfortunately—our country. This growing criminal enterprise we know knows no boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, the Fairfax County Police Department in my district has established the northern Virginia Human Trafficking Task Force to crack down on this scourge. In the past 12 months alone, just to give you an idea of this crime that is in the local area, the task force has had 156 leads, 109 victim re-

coveries, 267 victims identified, and 73 suspects.

Mr. Speaker, while we have done great work to combat this terrible crime in Virginia, we clearly have more work to do on every level: the local level, State level, and national level.

Four years ago, Virginia, for example, was at the bottom of the Polaris Project anti-human trafficking State rankings. Now, we are at the top because we passed many of the kind of bills that we are going to be able to pass here tomorrow and additional bills that are going to be here tomorrow.

I am very honored to be able to join all of my colleagues and with our faith-based organizations and our law enforcement officials and to be able to continue this work now on a national level and to be able to vote for these important bills that we will be addressing tomorrow.

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 351, LNG PERMITTING CERTAINTY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-5) on the resolution (H. Res. 48) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS A TRAGEDY

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to come to the floor at the end of the Special Order hour that Mrs. NOEM and Mrs. WAGNER have organized to join my colleagues in talking about the bills that are before us.

Human trafficking is an issue that affects every single county and community across this country—every single one. In my State of Tennessee and in the greater Nashville area, we have a wonderful organization, End Slavery Tennessee, that is doing great work to reach out, to minister, and to help.

I am so pleased that this week we are going to take the time to bring to the floor legislation that will be of help in training our medical personnel, that will also empower and encourage our law enforcement organizations and our faith-based and not-for-profit organizations.

This is a tragedy, modern-day slavery, that is taking place, the sex trafficking and the human trafficking, and

I am so pleased that Congress is standing together to do something about it.

□ 1830

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be able to stand here in support of H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act. This is one of many pieces of legislation this week that we are going to be doing in the Congress, and I am so grateful to all of the people who have been involved in this critically important issue. I would especially mention the Co-chair of the Congressional Foster Youth Caucus, KAREN BASS, for introducing this groundbreaking legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey said a society is measured by how it treats those in the dawn of life, those in the shadows of life, and those in the twilight of life. This is such a critical issue to protect the 400,000 children in America who find themselves in foster care and vulnerable to being preyed upon by traffickers who know all too well how to exploit a child's hunger for love, acceptance, and a sense of belonging.

We must put the structures in place to treat child victims of trafficking like victims instead of treating them like criminals.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I remind us all that our first job here is to protect those who cannot protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to stand here today in support of H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act. I commend my colleague Representative KAREN BASS, the founder of the Co-chair of the Congressional Foster Youth Caucus, for introducing this groundbreaking legislation and for continuing to devote herself tirelessly to making a better future for these abused and neglected children.

Hubert Humphrey said a society is measured by how it treats those in the dawn of life, those in the shadows of life, and those in the twilight of life. Mr. Speaker, this is so applicable to our nation's foster youth. Right now over 400,000 children in America find themselves in foster care for no fault of their own. . . . And it is that trauma of abuse or neglect, that brought them into foster care in the first place, on top of being in unfamiliar circumstances, that makes them exponentially more vulnerable to be preyed upon by traffickers, who know all too well how to exploit a child's hunger for love, acceptance, and a sense of belonging.

For too long, and far too often, victims of trafficking have been allowed to fall through the cracks in the system. We have not put structures in place to treat child victims of trafficking like victims, and not treat them like criminals.

This legislation will begin to bridge the gaps where law enforcement and child protection workers need to be better equipped in order to best protect children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking. It also requires the submission of annual reports on the number of child victims of sex trafficking, and the reporting of that data to Congress so that we can better assess how to prevent child sex trafficking, and remove barriers that keep us from truly serving those that have become victims, and most of all, to protect the hundreds of thousands of vulnerable children to keep them from ever having to endure the evil of sex trafficking.

I am grateful for my colleague Representative BASS's leadership on this issue, and to House Leadership for recognizing the priority that must be placed upon protecting some of our nation's most vulnerable children. And I pray we will continue to work and stand together for the right of every child to be safe, protected, cherished, and loved.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, although slavery was abolished 150 years ago, today, modern slavery still exists in the form of human trafficking.

Human trafficking involves the use of force, fraud, or coercion to control other people for the purpose of forced labor or sexual exploitation. According to the FBI, sex trafficking is the fastest-growing business of organized crime in the world.

Approximately 20.9 million victims of human trafficking exist in our world today, and hundreds of thousands of those victims are here in the United States.

California is not excluded from this criminal activity. In fact, within my congressional district in Orange County, there have been over 350 cases of human trafficking since 2004.

Victims are lured and manipulated by false promises of lucrative jobs, a loving relationship, or new opportunities and are usually between the ages of 12 to 14 when they first become victims of sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing we can all agree on, it is this: we must put an end to human trafficking and bring those responsible to justice.

Through bipartisan efforts, we can work to stop human trafficking both in our communities at home and abroad.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HECK of Nevada (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of mandatory military duty.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, January 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to submit for printing in the Congressional Record, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on January 22, 2015.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interests of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

Enclosure.

(As adopted January 22, 2015)

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of House Rules.—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(2) of House Rule XI, each Subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its Rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee Rules III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and XI, *infra*.)

(b) Authority to Conduct Investigations.—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) Authority to Print.—The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee and its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be paid from applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of House Rule X in accordance with clause 1(c) of House Rule XI. (See also paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of Committee Rule IX.)

(d) Vice Chairman.—The Member of the majority party on the Committee or Subcommittee designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be the vice chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule XI.

(e) Presiding Member.—If the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee is not

present at any Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing, the vice chairman shall preside. If the Chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee are not present at a Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing the ranking Member of the majority party who is present shall preside in accordance with clause 2(d), House Rule XI.

(f) Publication of Rules.—The Committees Rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair is elected in each odd-numbered year as provided in clause 2(a) of House Rule XI.

(g) Joint Committee Reports of Investigation or Study.—A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

**RULE II.—COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS—
REGULAR, ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL**

(a) Regular Meetings.—Regular meetings of the Committee, in accordance with clause 2(b) of House Rule XI, shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business if notice is given pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI. The Chairman shall provide each Member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as practicable, a written agenda of such meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chairman or a majority of the Committee. (See paragraph (f) of Committee Rule XI for provisions that apply to meetings of subcommittees.)

(b) Additional Meetings.—(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or after concurrence with the Ranking Minority Member, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such additional meetings pursuant to the notice from the Chairman.

(2) A hearing or meeting may begin sooner than specified in clause (1) (in which case the chair shall make the announcement specified at the earliest possible time) if the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of Members required under the Rules of the Committee for the transaction of business.

(3) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter the Chair shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) Special Meetings.—If at least three Members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those Members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for such special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matters to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk of the Committee for such purpose) shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting

of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measures or matter to be considered at that special meeting in accordance with clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk) of the Committee shall notify all Members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered, and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

**RULE III.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS;
BROADCASTING**

(a) Open Meetings and Hearings.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing by the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House Rule XI. (See Appendix A.)

(b) Broadcasting and Photography.—Whenever a Committee or Subcommittee meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall:

(1) To the maximum extent practicable the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(2) Be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of House Rule XI (See Appendix A). When such radio coverage is conducted in the Committee or Subcommittee, written notice to that effect shall be placed on the desk of each Member. The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, shall not limit the number of television or still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(c) Closed Meetings—Attendees.—No person other than Members of the Committee or Subcommittee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or Subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session that has been closed to the public as provided in clause 2(g)(1) of House Rule XI.

(d) Addressing the Committee.—A Committee Member may address the Committee or a Subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration (See Committee Rule VIII(e) relating to questioning a witness at a hearing). The time a Member may address the Committee or Subcommittee for any such purpose shall be limited to 5 minutes, except that this time limit may be waived by unanimous consent. A Member shall also be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend his or her remarks beyond such subject.

(e) Meetings to Begin Promptly.—Subject to the presence of a quorum, each meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(f) Prohibition on Proxy Voting.—No vote by any Member of the Committee or Subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(g) Location of Persons at Meetings.—No person other than the Committee or Sub-

committee Members and Committee or Subcommittee staff may be seated in the rostrum area during a meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee unless by unanimous consent of Committee or Subcommittee.

(h) Consideration of Amendments and Motions.—A Member, upon request, shall be recognized by the Chairman to address the Committee or Subcommittee at a meeting for a period limited to 5 minutes on behalf of an amendment or motion offered by the Member or another Member, or upon any other matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend the time limit. Every amendment or motion made in Committee or Subcommittee shall, upon the demand of any Member present, be reduced to writing, and a copy thereof shall be made available to all Members present. Such amendment or motion shall not be pending before the Committee or Subcommittee or voted on until the requirements of this paragraph have been met.

(i) Demanding Record Vote.—

(1) A record vote of the Committee or Subcommittee on a question or action shall be ordered on a demand by one-fifth of the Members present.

(2) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. If the Chairman postpones further proceedings:

(A) the Chairman may resume such postponed proceedings, after giving Members adequate notice, at a time chosen in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member; and

(B) notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition on which proceedings were postponed shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(j) Submission of Motions or Amendments In Advance of Business Meetings.—The Committee and Subcommittee Chairman may request and Committee and Subcommittee Members should, insofar as practicable, cooperate in providing copies of proposed amendments or motions to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or the Subcommittee twenty-four hours before a Committee or Subcommittee business meeting.

(k) Points of Order.—No point of order against the hearing or meeting procedures of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entertained unless it is made in a timely fashion.

(l) Limitation on Committee Sitzings.—The Committee or subcommittees may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

(m) Prohibition of Wireless Telephones.—Use of wireless phones during a Committee or Subcommittee hearing or meeting is prohibited.

RULE IV.—QUORUMS.

(a) Working Quorum.—One-third of the Members of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, other than as noted in paragraphs (b) and (c).

(b) Majority Quorum.—A majority of the Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for:

(1) the reporting of a bill, resolution or other measure (See clause 2(h)(1) of House Rules XI, and Committee Rule IX);

(2) the closing of a meeting or hearing to the public pursuant to clauses 2(g), 2(k)(5)

and 2(k)(7) of the Rule XI of the Rules of the House;

(3) the authorizing of a subpoena as provided in clause 2(m)(3), of House Rule XI (See also Committee Rule VII.); and

(4) as where required by a Rule of the House.

(c) Quorum for Taking Testimony.—Two Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE V.—RECORDS.

(a) Maintenance of Records.—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee and Subcommittee action which shall include:

(1) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcripts, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved, and

(2) written minutes shall include a record of all Committee and Subcommittee action and a record of all votes on any question and a tally on all record votes.

The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and by telephone request and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Not later than 24 hours after adoption of an amendment to a measure or matter, the chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(b) Access to and Correction of Records.—Any public witness, or person authorized by such witness, during Committee office hours in the Committee offices and within 10 calendar days of the close of hearings, may obtain a transcript copy of that public witness's testimony and make such technical, grammatical and typographical corrections as authorized by the person making the remarks involved as will not alter the nature of testimony given. There shall be prompt return of such corrected copy of the transcript to the Committee. Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall receive copies of transcripts for their prompt review and correction and prompt return to the Committee. The Committee or Subcommittee may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any Member or witness if it determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time in which to make such corrections and further delay would seriously impede the consideration of the legislative action that is subject of the hearing. The record of a hearing shall be closed 10 calendar days after the last oral testimony, unless the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise. Any person requesting to file a statement for the record of a hearing must so request before the hearing concludes and must file the statement before the record is closed unless the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise. The Committee or Subcommittee may reject any statement in light of its length or its tendency to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Property of the House.—All Committee and Subcommittee records (including hearings data, charts, and files) shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Members serving as Chairman and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto. The Majority Staff Director shall promptly notify the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of any request for access to such records.

(d) Availability of Archived Records.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House Rule VII. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of the need for a Committee order pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such House Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available.

(e) Special Rules for Certain Records and Proceedings.—A stenographic record of a business meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee may be kept and thereafter may be published if the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is need for such a record. The proceedings of the Committee or Subcommittee in a closed meeting, evidence or testimony in such meeting, shall not be divulged unless otherwise determined by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(f) Electronic Availability of Committee Publications.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE VI.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT.

For the purpose of carrying out any of its function and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee and each of its subcommittees is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings.

RULE VII.—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS.

(a) Issuance of Subpoenas.—In accordance with clause House Rule XI, clause 2(m), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by a majority of the Committee or by the Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member. Such consultation shall occur at least 48 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(b) Oaths.—The Chairman of the Committee, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witnesses.

RULE VIII.—HEARING PROCEDURES.

(a) Power to Hear.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rule X and XI, the Committee and its subcommittees are authorized to sit and hold hearings at any time or place within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned. (See Committee Rule VI and paragraph (f) of Committee Rule XI for provisions relating to Subcommittee hearings and meetings.)

(b) Announcement.—The Chairman of the Committee shall after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, make a public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least 1 week before the commencement of the hearing. The Chairman of a Subcommittee shall schedule a hearing only after consultation with the

Chairman of the Committee and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, and the Chairmen of the other subcommittees after such consultation with the Committee Chairman, and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of such hearing at least 1 week before the hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or the Subcommittee, with concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or Subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, shall request the Majority Staff Director to make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record, and shall promptly enter the appropriate information into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(c) Scheduling of Witnesses.—Except as otherwise provided in this rule, the scheduling of witnesses and determination of the time allowed for the presentation of testimony at hearings shall be at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise.

(d) Written Statement; Oral Testimony.—(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a Subcommittee, shall insofar as practicable file with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee, at least 2 working days before the day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony. Witnesses shall provide sufficient copies of their statement for distribution to Committee or Subcommittee Members, staff, and the news media. Insofar as practicable, the Committee or Subcommittee staff shall distribute such written statements to all Members of the Committee or Subcommittee as soon as they are received as well as any official reports from departments and agencies on such subject matter. All witnesses may be limited in their oral presentations to brief summaries of their statements within the time allotted to them, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, in light of the nature of the testimony and the length of time available.

(2) As noted in paragraph (b) of Committee Rule VII, the Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(3) To the greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony:

- (i) a curriculum vitae;
- (ii) disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current calendar year or either of the 2 preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness; and
- (iii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than 1 day after the witness appears.

(e) Questioning of Witnesses.—Committee or Subcommittee Members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee for that purpose. Each Member so recognized shall be limited to questioning a witness for 5 minutes until such time as each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness for 5 minutes; and thereafter the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may limit the time of a further round of questioning after giving due consideration to the importance of the subject matter and the length of time available. All questions put to witnesses shall be germane to the measure or matter under consideration. Unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise, no Committee or Subcommittee staff shall interrogate witnesses.

(f) Extended Questioning for Designated Members.—Notwithstanding paragraph (e), the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member may designate an equal number of Members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 60 minutes.

(g) Witnesses for the Minority.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party Members on the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least 1 day of hearing thereon as provided in clause 2(j)(1) of House Rule XI.

(h) Summary of Subject Matter.—Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable, the Committee shall make available immediately to all Members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee shall, to the extent practicable, make available to the Members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter. (See Committee Rule XI(f).)

(i) Open Hearings.—Each hearing conducted by the Committee or Subcommittee shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage, except as provided in clause 4 of House Rule XI (see also Committee Rule III(b)). In any event, no Member of the House may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing unless the House by majority vote shall authorize the Committee or Subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular bill or resolution or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by means of the above procedure.

(j) Hearings and Reports.—(1)(i) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation. A copy of the Committee Rules (and the applicable provisions of clause 2 of House Rule XI, regarding hearing procedures, an excerpt of which appears in Appendix A thereto) shall be made available to each witness upon request. Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of profes-

sional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; but only the full Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(ii) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (i) of this rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the Rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or Subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or Subcommittee shall afford a person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and the Committee or Subcommittee shall receive and shall dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(iii) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee or Subcommittee. In the discretion of the Committee or Subcommittee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee or Subcommittee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings. A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee or Subcommittee. (See paragraph (c) of Committee Rule V.)

(2) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day) in advance of their consideration.

RULE IX.—THE REPORTING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) Filing of Reports.—The Chairman shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee and shall take or cause to be taken all necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or other measure to a vote. No bill, resolution, or measure shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of Committee is actually present. A Committee report on any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (not counting days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the Committee, for the reporting of that bill or resolution. The Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall notify the Chairman immediately when such a request is filed.

(b) Content of Reports.—Each Committee report on any bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall include as separately identified sections:

(1) a statement of the intent or purpose of the bill or resolution;

(2) a statement describing the need for such bill or resolution;

(3) a statement of Committee and Subcommittee consideration of the measure including a summary of amendments and motions offered and the actions taken thereon;

(4) the results of the each record vote on any amendment in the Committee and Subcommittee and on the motion to report the measure or matter, including the names of those Members and the total voting for and the names of those Members and the total voting against such amendment or motion (See clause 3(b) of House Rule XIII);

(5) the oversight findings and recommendations of the Committee with respect to the subject matter of the bill or resolution as required pursuant to clause 3(c)(1) of House Rule XIII and clause 2(b)(1) of House Rule X;

(6) the detailed statement described in House Rule XIII clause 3(c)(2) and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, except that the estimates with respect to new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law;

(7) the estimate of costs and comparison of such estimates, if any, prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with such bill or resolution pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if submitted in timely fashion to the Committee;

(8) a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes finding;

(9) an estimate by the Committee of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and for its authorized duration or for each of the 5 fiscal years following the fiscal year of reporting, whichever period is less (see House Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2), (3) and (h)(2), (3)), together with—(i) a comparison of these estimates with those made and submitted to the Committee by any Government agency when practicable, and (ii) a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) with appropriate levels under current law (The provisions of this clause do not apply if a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report);

(10) a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the Committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

(11) the changes in existing law (if any) shown in accordance with clause 3 of House Rule XIII;

(12) the determination required pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92-463, if the legislation reported establishes or authorizes the establishment of an advisory committee;

(13) the information on Federal and intergovernmental mandates required by section 423(c) and (d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as added by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-4);

(14) a statement regarding the applicability of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act, Public Law 104-1;

(15) a statement indicating whether any provision of the measure establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program. The Statement shall at a minimum explain whether—

(A) any such program was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139; or

(B) the most recent catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220, as amended by Public Law 98-169), identified other programs related to the program established or reauthorized by the measure; and

(16) a statement estimating the number of directed rule makings required by the measure.

(c) Supplemental, Minority, Additional, or Dissenting Views.—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views, all Members shall be entitled to not less than 2 subsequent calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such date) in which to file such writing and signed views, with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee. When time guaranteed by this paragraph has expired (or if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the Committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk of the House not later than 1 hour after the expiration of such time. All such views (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(1) and House Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1)), as filed by one or more Members of the Committee, shall be included within and made a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that bill or resolution.

(d) Printing of Reports.—The report of the Committee on the measure or matter noted in paragraph (a) above shall be printed in a single volume, which shall:

(1) include all supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

(2) bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views (and any material submitted under House Rule XII, clause 3(a)(1)) are included as part of the report.

(e) Immediate Printing; Supplemental Reports.—Nothing in this rule shall preclude—

(1) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views has been made as provided by paragraph (c); or

(2) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report on any bill or resolution that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

(f) Availability of Printed Hearing Records.—If hearings have been held on any reported bill or resolution, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have the record of such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such bill or resolution by the House. Each printed hearing of the Committee or any of its subcommittees shall include a record of the attendance of the Members.

(g) Committee Prints.—All Committee or Subcommittee prints or other Committee or

Subcommittee documents, other than reports or prints of bills, that are prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Chairman of the Committee or the Committee prior to public distribution.

(h) Post Adjournment Filing of Committee Reports.—(1) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a Member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than 7 calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(2) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chairman of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least 7 calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a Member of the Committee.

(i) Conference.—The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE X.—OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

(a) Oversight Plan.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Chairman shall convene the Committee in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress. Such plans shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing such plans the Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(1) consult with other committees of the House that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction, with the objective of ensuring that such laws, programs, or agencies are reviewed in the same Congress and that there is a maximum of coordination between such committees in the conduct of such reviews; and such plans shall include an explanation of what steps have been and will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(2) review specific problems with Federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals;

(3) give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority;

(4) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review at least once every 10 years; and

(5) include proposals to cut or eliminate programs, including mandatory spending programs, that are inefficient, duplicative, outdated, or more appropriately administered by State or local governments.

The Committee and its appropriate subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as provided in clause 2(d) of House Rule X. The Committee shall include in the report filed pursuant to clause 1(d) of

House Rule XI a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee under clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(b) Annual Appropriations.—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) Budget Act Compliance: Views and Estimates (See Appendix B).—Not later than 6 weeks after the President submits his budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request, the Committee shall, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year (under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—Appendix B) that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) Budget Act Compliance: Recommended Changes.—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (See Appendix B).

(e) Conference Committees.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determine the number of conferees the Chairman deems most suitable and then recommend to the Speaker as conferees, in keeping with the number to be appointed by the Speaker as provided in House Rule I, clause 11, the names of those Members of the Committee of not less than a majority who generally supported the House position and who were primarily responsible for the legislation. The Chairman shall, to the fullest extent feasible, include those Members of the Committee who were the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House and such other Committee Members of the majority party as the Chairman may designate in consultation with the Members of the majority party. Such recommendations shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members on the Committee. In making recommendations of

Minority Party Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(f) Hearing on Waste, Fraud, and Abuse.—(1) The Committee, or a Subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following the establishment of the Committee on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs which the Committee may authorize.

(2) A hearing described in subparagraph (1) shall include a focus on the most egregious instances of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement as documented by any report the Committee has received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States.

(g) Hearing on Agency Financial Statements.—The Committee or a Subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing in any session in which the Committee has received disclaimers of agency financial statements from auditors of any Federal agency that the Committee may authorize to hear testimony on such disclaimers from representatives of any such agency.

(h) Hearing on GAO High-Risk-List.—The Committee or a Subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing on issues raised by reports issued by the Comptroller General of the United States indicating that Federal programs or operations that the Committee may authorize are at high risk for waste, fraud, and mismanagement, known as the 'high-risk-list' or the 'high-risk series'.

(i) Activities Report.—(1) Not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, the Committee shall submit to the House a report on the activities of the Committee. After adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, whichever occurs first, the Chair may file the report, a copy of which shall be made available to each Member of the Committee for at least 7 calendar days, with the Clerk of the House at any time.

(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee during that Congress.

(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee pursuant to clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken with respect thereto.

RULE XI.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Number and Composition.—There shall be such subcommittees as specified in paragraph (c) of this rule. Each of such subcommittees shall be composed of the number of Members set forth in paragraph (c) of this rule, including ex officio Members.¹ The Chairman may create additional subcommittees of an ad hoc nature as the Chairman determines to be appropriate subject to any limitations provided for in the House Rules.

(b) Ratios.—On each Subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members, there shall be included the ex officio Members of the subcommittees and ratios below reflect that fact.

(c) Jurisdiction.—Each Subcommittee shall have the following general jurisdiction and number of Members:

General Farm Commodities and Risk Management (___ members, ___ majority and ___ minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to commodities including barley, cotton, cottonseed, corn, grain sorghum, honey, mohair, oats, other oilseeds, peanuts, pulse crops, rice, soybeans, sugar, wheat, and wool; the Commodity Credit Corporation; risk management policies and statutes, including Federal Crop Insurance; producer data and privacy issues.

Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit (___ members, ___ majority and ___ minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to commodity exchanges; agricultural credit; rural development, energy; rural electrification.

Conservation and Forestry (___ members, ___ majority and ___ minority)—Policies and statutes relating to resource conservation, forestry, and all forests under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Nutrition (___ members, ___ majority and ___ minority)—Policies and statutes relating to nutrition, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and domestic commodity distribution and consumer initiatives.

Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research (___ members, ___ majority and ___ minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to horticulture, including fruits, vegetables, nuts, and ornamentals; bees; and organic agriculture; policies and statutes relating to marketing and promotion orders; pest and disease management; bioterrorism; adulteration and quarantine matters; research, education, and extension; and biotechnology.

Livestock and Foreign Agriculture (___ members, ___ majority and ___ minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to all livestock, poultry, dairy, and seafood, including all products thereof; the inspection, marketing, and promotion of such commodities and products; aquaculture; animal welfare; grazing; foreign agricultural assistance and trade promotion.

(d) Referral of Legislation.—

(1)(a) In General.—All bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks after being referred to the Committee. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may determine that the Committee will consider certain bills, resolutions, or other matters.

(b) Trade Matters.—Unless action is otherwise taken under subparagraph (3), bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee relating to foreign agriculture, foreign food or commodity assistance, and foreign trade and marketing issues will be considered by the Committee.

(2) The Chairman, by a majority vote of the Committee, may discharge a Subcommittee from further consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter referred to the Subcommittee and have such bill, resolution or other matter considered by the Committee. The Committee having referred a bill, resolution, or other matter to a Subcommittee in accordance with this rule may discharge such Subcommittee from further consideration thereof at any time by a vote of the majority Members of the Committee for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another Subcommittee.

(3) Unless the Committee, a quorum being present, decides otherwise by a majority vote, the Chairman may refer bills, resolutions, legislation or other matters not specifically within the jurisdiction of a Sub-

committee, or that is within the jurisdiction of more than one Subcommittee, jointly or exclusively as the Chairman deems appropriate, including concurrently to the subcommittees with jurisdiction, sequentially to the subcommittees with jurisdiction (subject to any time limits deemed appropriate), divided by subject matter among the subcommittees with jurisdiction, or to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chairman for the purpose of considering the matter and reporting to the Committee thereon, or make such other provisions deemed appropriate.

(e) Participation and Service of Committee Members on Subcommittees.—(1) The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall serve as ex officio Members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittees. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member may not be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

(2) Any Member of the Committee who is not a Member of the Subcommittee may have the privilege of sitting and nonparticipatory attendance at Subcommittee hearings or meetings in accordance with clause 2(g)(2) of House Rule XI. Such Member may not:

(i) vote on any matter;

(ii) be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum;

(iii) participate in questioning a witness under the 5-Minute Rule, unless permitted to do so by the Subcommittee Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member or a majority of the Subcommittee, a quorum being present;

(iv) raise points of order; or

(v) offer amendments or motions.

(f) Subcommittee Hearings and Meetings.—(1) Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and make recommendations to the Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction after consultation by the Subcommittee Chairmen with the Committee Chairman. (See Committee Rule VIII.)

(2) After consultation with the Committee Chairman, Subcommittee Chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their subcommittees and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make any announcement relating thereto. (See Committee Rule VIII(b).) In setting the dates, the Committee Chairman and Subcommittee Chairman shall consult with other Subcommittee Chairmen and relevant Committee and Subcommittee Ranking Minority Members in an effort to avoid simultaneously scheduling Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings to the extent practicable.

(3) Notice of all Subcommittee meetings shall be provided to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee by the Majority Staff Director.

(4) Subcommittees may hold meetings or hearings outside of the House if the Chairman of the Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee is consulted in advance to ensure that there is no scheduling problem. However, the majority of the Committee may authorize such meeting or hearing.

(5) The provisions regarding notice and the agenda of Committee meetings under Committee Rule II(a) and special or additional meetings under Committee Rule II(b) shall apply to Subcommittee meetings.

(6) If a vacancy occurs in a Subcommittee chairmanship, the Chairman may set the dates for hearings and meetings of the Subcommittee during the period of vacancy. The

Chairman may also appoint an acting Subcommittee Chairman until the vacancy is filled.

(g) Subcommittee Action.—(1) Any bill, resolution, recommendation, or other matter forwarded to the Committee by a Subcommittee shall be promptly forwarded by the Subcommittee Chairman or any Subcommittee Member authorized to do so by the Subcommittee.

(2) Upon receipt of such recommendation, the Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall promptly advise all Members of the Committee of the Subcommittee action.

(3) The Committee shall not consider any matters recommended by subcommittees until 2 calendar days have elapsed from the date of action, unless the Chairman or a majority of the Committee determines otherwise.

(h) Subcommittee Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee without the prior consultation with the Chairman of the Committee or a majority of the Committee.

RULE XII.—COMMITTEE BUDGET, STAFF, AND TRAVEL

(a) Committee Budget.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority Members of the Committee, and the minority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget for each session of the Congress. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and subcommittees. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted to minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall take whatever action is necessary to have such budget duly authorized by the House.

(b) Committee Staff.—(1) The Chairman shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate. (See House Rule X, clause 9)

(2) The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who may delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(3) From the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to any primary or additional expense resolution, the Chairman shall ensure that each Subcommittee is adequately funded and staffed to discharge its responsibilities and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff (See House Rule X, clause 6(d)).

(c) Committee Travel.—(1) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff regarding domestic and foreign travel (See House Rule XI, clause 2(n)

and House Rule X, clause 8 (reprinted in Appendix A)). Official travel for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Committee Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and its subcommittees and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(i) The purpose of the official travel;

(ii) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;

(iii) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and

(iv) The names of Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

(2) In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to the Committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated in clause (1).

(3) Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

(4) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of Members of the Committee or is employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of 35 such currencies;

(i) No Member or employee of the Committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law; and

(ii) Each Member or employee of the Committee shall make an itemized report to the Chairman within 60 days following the completion of travel showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose, and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed by the Chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

RULE XIII.—AMENDMENT OF RULES

These Rules may be amended by a majority vote of the Committee. A proposed change in these Rules shall not be considered by the Committee as provided in clause 2 of House Rule XI, unless written notice of the

proposed change has been provided to each Committee Member 2 legislative days in advance of the date on which the matter is to be considered. Any such change in the Rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after its approval.

ENDNOTES

1. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee serve as ex officio Members of the Subcommittees. (See paragraph (e) of this Rule).

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit the Rules of the Committee on Armed Services for the 114th Congress, as adopted by the committee on January 14, 2015.

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman"), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee Chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee Chairmen, and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer

and export controls, joint interoperability, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. In addition the committee will be responsible for intelligence policy (including coordination of military intelligence programs), national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements that are part of the Intelligence Community. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of seven standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborn unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and Department of Energy national security programs.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related

consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

(b) **Membership of the Subcommittees**

(1) Subcommittee memberships, with the exception of membership on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively. Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all other Majority members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all other Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(4) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) **Committee Panels**

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) **Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces**

(1) The Chairman of the Committee, or a Chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee, may designate a task force to inquire into

and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as Chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall similarly appoint the Ranking Minority Member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee whose Chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three days before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be

promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee or subcommittee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or sub-

committee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee or sub-

committee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may be recognized by a subcommittee chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings; and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be

signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

“Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning wit-

nesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or the most senior Minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, Minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)B(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information that is received which is classified as Confidential or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or chairmen of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member

of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than January 2nd of each odd-numbered year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, January 22, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit the Rules of the Committee on Homeland Security for the 114th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. On January 21, 2015, the Committee on Homeland Security met in open session and adopted these Committee Rules by unanimous consent, a quorum being present.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Enclosure.

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(A) *Applicability of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.*—The Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives (the “House”) are the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security (the “Committee”) and its subcommittees insofar as applicable.

(B) *Applicability to Subcommittees.*—Except where the terms “Full Committee” and “subcommittee” are specifically mentioned, the following rules shall apply to the Committee’s subcommittees and their respective Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members to the same extent as they apply to the Full Committee and its Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(C) *Appointments by the Chairman.*—Clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the House shall govern the designation of a Vice Chairman of the Full Committee.

(D) *Recommendation of Conferees.*—Whenever the Speaker of the House is to appoint a conference committee on a matter within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker of the House conferees from the Full Committee. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall do so with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(E) *Motions to Disagree.*—The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(F) *Committee Website.*—The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee web site for the purposes of furthering the Committee’s legislative and oversight responsibilities, in-

cluding communicating information about the Committee’s activities to Committee Members, other Members, and the public at large. The Ranking Minority Member may maintain a similar web site for the same purposes. The official Committee web site shall display a link on its home page to the web site maintained by the Ranking Minority Member.

(G) *Activity Report.*—Not later than January 2 of each odd numbered year, the Committee shall submit to the House a report on the activities of the Committee. After adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, whichever occurs first, the Chair may file the report with the Clerk at any time and without approval of the Committee provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a Member of the Committee.

RULE II.—COMMITTEE PANELS.

(A) *Designation.*—The Chairman of the Full Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of Members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that warrant enhanced consideration and to report to the Committee.

(B) *Duration.*—No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment.

(C) *Party Ratios and Appointment.*—The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be comparable to the Full Committee, consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, with all Majority members of the panels appointed by the Chairman of the Committee and all Minority members appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority Members so appointed who does not currently chair another Subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(D) *Ex Officio Members.*—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee may serve as ex-officio Members of each committee panel but are not authorized to vote on matters that arise before a committee panel and shall not be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for any purpose other than taking testimony.

(E) *Jurisdiction.*—No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(F) *Applicability of Committee Rules.*—Any designated panel shall be subject to all Committee Rules herein.

RULE III.—SUBCOMMITTEES.

(A) *Generally.*—The Full Committee shall be organized into the following six standing subcommittees and each shall have specific responsibility for such measures or matters as the Chairman refers to it:

(1) Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence;

(2) Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security;

(3) Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies;

(4) Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency;

(5) Subcommittee on Transportation Security; and

(6) Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications.

(B) *Selection and Ratio of Subcommittee Members.*—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall select their respective Members of each subcommittee. The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be comparable to the Full Committee, consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, except that each subcommittee shall have at least two more Majority Members than Minority Members.

(C) *Ex Officio Members.*—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall be ex officio members of each subcommittee but are not authorized to vote on matters that arise before each subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall only be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(D) *Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.*—Except as otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Full Committee, each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Full Committee on all matters within its purview. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chairman of the Full Committee. To the greatest extent practicable, no more than one meeting and hearing should be scheduled for a given time.

(E) *Special Voting Provision.*—If a tie vote occurs in a Subcommittee on the question of forwarding any measure to the Full Committee, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for Full Committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the Subcommittee without recommendation.

RULE IV.—TIME OF MEETINGS.

(A) *Regular Meeting Date.*—The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of business of the Full Committee shall be at 10:00 a.m. on the first Wednesday that the House is in Session each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

(B) *Additional Meetings.*—At the discretion of the Chairman, additional meetings of the Committee may be scheduled for the consideration of any legislation or other matters pending before the Committee or to conduct other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(C) *Consideration.*—Except in the case of a special meeting held under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI, the determination of the business to be considered at each meeting of the Committee shall be made by the Chairman.

RULE V.—NOTICE AND PUBLICATION.

(A) Notice.—

(1) *Hearings.*—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing before the Full Committee or subcommittee, which may not commence earlier than one week after such notice. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The names of all witnesses scheduled to appear at such hearing shall be provided to

Members no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of such hearing.

(2) *Meetings.*—The date, time, place and subject matter of any meeting, which could be a briefing, other than a hearing or a regularly scheduled meeting, may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof except in the case of a special meeting called under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. These notice requirements may be waived if the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business.

(a) Copies of any measure or matter to be considered for approval by the Committee at any meeting, including any mark, print or amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be provided to the Members at least 48 hours in advance. Any substitute amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be provided to the Members at least 24 hours in advance.

(b) At least 48 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter, the text of such measure or matter, including any mark, print or amendment in the nature of a substitute, shall be made publicly available in electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site. Any substitute amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be made publicly available in electronic form at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after concluding a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the text of such measure or matter as ordered forwarded or reported, including any amendments adopted or defeated, shall be made publicly available in electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site.

(3) *Publication.*—The meeting or hearing announcement shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record. To the greatest extent practicable, meeting announcements shall be entered into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources.

RULE VI.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS; BROADCASTING.

(A) *Open Meetings.*—All meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except as provided by Rule XI of the Rules of the House or when the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by recorded vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, compromise sensitive law enforcement information, tend to defame, degrade or incriminate a witness, or violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives.

(B) *Broadcasting.*—Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee shall permit that hearing or meeting to be covered by television broadcast, internet broadcast, print media, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the

House. Priority shall be given by the Committee to members of the Press Galleries. Pursuant to clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(C) *Transcripts.*—A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during a Committee hearing. All transcripts of meetings or hearings that are open to the public shall be made available.

RULE VII.—PROCEDURES FOR MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.

(A) *Opening Statements.*—At any meeting of the Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall be entitled to present oral opening statements of five minutes each. Other Members may submit written opening statements for the record. The Chairman presiding over the meeting may permit additional opening statements by other Members of the Full Committee or of that subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(B) *The Five-Minute Rule.*—The time any one Member may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration by the Committee shall not exceed five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be extended when permitted by unanimous consent.

(C) *Postponement of Vote.*—The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time, provided that all reasonable steps have been taken to notify Members of the resumption of such proceedings, including circulation of notice by the Clerk of the Committee, or other designee of the Chair. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(D) *Contempt Procedures.*—No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House unless and until the Full Committee has, upon notice to all its Members, met and considered the alleged contempt. The person to be cited for contempt shall be afforded, upon notice of at least 72 hours, an opportunity to state why he or she should not be held in contempt prior to a vote of the Full Committee, with a quorum being present, on the question whether to forward such recommendation to the House. Such statement shall be, in the discretion of the Chairman, either in writing or in person before the Full Committee.

(E) *Record.*—Members may have 10 business days to submit to the Chief Clerk of the Committee their statements for the record, and, in the case of a hearing, additional questions for the hearing record to be directed towards a witness at the hearing.

RULE VIII.—WITNESSES.

(A) *Questioning of Witnesses.*—

(1) Questioning of witnesses by Members will be conducted under the five-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion permitted by clause 2(j)(2) of House Rule XI.

(2) In questioning witnesses under the five-minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall first be recognized. In a subcommittee meeting or hearing, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee are then recognized. All other Members who are present before the commencement of the meeting or hearing will be recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee, alternating between Majority and Minority Members. Committee Members arriving after the commencement of the hearing shall be recognized in order of appearance, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, after all Members present at the beginning of the hearing have been recognized. Each Member shall be recognized at least once before any Member is given a second opportunity to question a witness.

(3) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion, may permit an extension of the period of questioning of a witness beyond five minutes but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority party and the Minority and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(4) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion, may permit Committee staff of the Majority and Minority to question a witness for a specified period of time, but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority and Minority staff and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(B) *Minority Witnesses.*—Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the Minority party Members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those Minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(C) *Oath or Affirmation.*—The Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(D) *Statements by Witnesses.*—

(1) Consistent with the notice given, and to the greatest extent practicable, witnesses shall submit a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings (including, where practicable, an electronic copy) with the Clerk of the Committee no less than 48 hours in advance of the witness's appearance before the Committee. Unless the 48 hour requirement is waived or otherwise modified by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the failure to comply with this requirement may result in the exclusion of the written testimony from the hearing record and/or the barring of an oral presentation of the testimony. The Clerk of the Committee shall provide any such prepared or written statement submitted to the Clerk prior to the hearing to the Members of the Committee prior to the commencement of the hearing.

(2) In the case of a witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vita and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing. Such disclosures shall include the amount and source of

each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing, and the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter jurisdiction of the hearing originating with a foreign government. Such statements, with the appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

RULE IX.—QUORUM.

Quorum Requirements.—Two Members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence. One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for conducting business, except for (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings to the public, pursuant to Committee Rule IV; (3) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. The Chairman's staff shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member's staff when scheduling meetings and hearings, to ensure that a quorum for any purpose will include at least one Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE X.—DECORUM.

(A) *Breaches of Decorum.*—The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, by censure and exclusion from the hearing; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(B) *Access to Dais.*—Access to the dais before, during, and after a hearing, markup, or other meeting of the Committee shall be limited to Members and staff of the Committee. Subject to availability of space on the dais, Committee Members' personal staff may be present on the dais during a hearing if their employing Member is seated on the dais and during a markup or other meeting if their employing Member is the author of a measure or amendment under consideration by the Committee, but only during the time that the measure or amendment is under active consideration by the Committee, or otherwise at the discretion of the Chairman, or of the Ranking Minority Member for personal staff employed by a Minority Member.

(C) *Wireless Communications Use Prohibited.*—During a hearing, mark-up, or other meeting of the Committee, ringing or audible sounds or conversational use of cellular telephones or other electronic devices is prohibited in the Committee room.

RULE XI.—REFERRALS TO SUBCOMMITTEES.

Referral of Bills and Other Matters by Chairman.—Except for bills and other matters retained by the Chairman for Full Committee consideration, each bill or other matter referred to the Full Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to one or more subcommittees within two weeks of receipt by the Committee. In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Full Committee. Bills or other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned or discharged by the Chairman.

RULE XII.—SUBPOENAS.

(A) *Authorization.*—The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the Full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member prior to issuing any

subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member at least 24 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall notify Members of the Committee of the authorization and issuance of a subpoena under this rule as soon as practicable, but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

(B) *Disclosure.*—Provisions may be included in a subpoena with the concurrence of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, or by the Committee, to prevent the disclosure of the Full Committee's demands for information when deemed necessary for the security of information or the progress of an investigation, including but not limited to prohibiting the revelation by witnesses and their counsel of Full Committee's inquiries.

(C) *Subpoena duces tecum.*—A subpoena duces tecum may be issued whose return to the Committee Clerk shall occur at a time and place other than that of a regularly scheduled meeting.

RULE XIII.—COMMITTEE STAFF.

(A) *Generally.*—Committee staff members are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of House Rule X and must be eligible to be considered for routine access to classified information.

(B) *Staff Assignments.*—For purposes of these rules, Committee staff means the employees of the Committee, detailees, fellows, or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee. All such persons shall be either Majority, Minority, or shared staff. The Chairman shall appoint, supervise, where applicable determine remuneration of, and may remove Majority staff. The Ranking Minority Member shall appoint, supervise, where applicable determine remuneration of, and may remove Minority staff. In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may appoint, supervise, determine remuneration of and may remove shared staff that is assigned to service of the Committee. The Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments, including appointments by the Ranking Minority Member, as required.

(C) *Divulgence of Information.*—Prior to the public acknowledgement by the Chairman or the Committee of a decision to initiate an investigation of a particular person, entity, or subject, no member of the Committee staff shall knowingly divulge to any person any information, including non-classified information, which comes into his or her possession by virtue of his or her status as a member of the Committee staff, if the member of the Committee staff has a reasonable expectation that such information may alert the subject of a Committee investigation to the existence, nature, or substance of such investigation, unless authorized to do so by the Chairman or the Committee.

RULE XIV.—COMMITTEE MEMBER AND COMMITTEE STAFF TRAVEL.

(A) *Approval of Travel.*—Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any Committee Member or Committee staff shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Committee Member or Committee staff only in connection with of-

ficial Committee business, such as the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and meetings, conferences, site visits, and investigations that involve activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Full Committee.

(1) *Proposed Travel by Majority Party Committee Members and Committee Staff.*—In the case of proposed travel by Majority party Committee Members or Committee staff, before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following: (a) the purpose of the travel; (b) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (c) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; (d) the estimated total cost of the travel; and (e) the names of Members and staff seeking authorization. On the basis of that information, the Chairman shall determine whether the proposed travel is for official Committee business, concerns a subject matter under the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, and is not excessively costly in view of the Committee business proposed to be conducted.

(2) *Proposed Travel by Minority Party Committee Members and Committee Staff.*—In the case of proposed travel by Minority party Committee Members or Committee staff, the Ranking Minority Member shall provide to the Chairman a written representation setting forth the information specified in items (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of subparagraph (1) and his or her determination that such travel complies with the other requirements of subparagraph (1).

(B) *Foreign Travel.*—Committee Member and Committee staff requests for foreign travel must include a written representation setting forth the information specified in items (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of subparagraph (A)(1) and be submitted to the Chairman and, absent extenuating circumstances, to the Ranking Minority Member, not fewer than ten business days prior to the start of the travel. Within thirty days of the conclusion of any such foreign travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Chairman a written report summarizing the information gained as a result of the travel in question, or other Committee objectives served by such travel. The requirements of this section may be waived or abridged by the Chairman.

(C) *Compliance with Committee Travel Policy and Guidelines.*—Travel must be in accordance with the Committee Travel Policy and Guidelines, as well as with House Rules, the Travel Guidelines and Regulations and any additional guidance set forth by the Committee on Ethics and the Committee on House Administration. Committee Members and staff shall follow these rules, policies, guidelines, and regulations in requesting and proceeding with any Committee-related travel.

RULE XV.—CLASSIFIED AND CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(A) *Security Precautions.*—Committee staff offices, including Majority and Minority offices, shall operate under strict security precautions administered by the Security Officer of the Committee. A security officer shall be on duty at all times during normal office hours. Classified documents and controlled unclassified information (CUI)—formerly known as sensitive but unclassified (SBU) information—may be destroyed, discussed, examined, handled, reviewed, stored, transported and used only in an appropriately secure manner in accordance with all applicable laws, executive orders, and

other governing authorities. Such documents may be removed from the Committee's offices only in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures, as determined by the Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall govern the handling of such documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(B) *Temporary Custody of Executive Branch Material.*—Executive branch documents or other materials containing classified information in any form that were not made part of the record of a Committee hearing, did not originate in the Committee or the House, and are not otherwise records of the Committee shall, while in the custody of the Committee, be segregated and maintained by the Committee in the same manner as Committee records that are classified. Such documents and other materials shall be returned to the Executive branch agency from which they were obtained at the earliest practicable time.

(C) *Access by Committee Staff.*—Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to Committee staff members with appropriate security clearances and a need-to-know, as determined by the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member, and under the direction of the Majority or Minority Staff Directors.

(D) *Maintaining Confidentiality.*—No Committee Member or Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, to any person who is not a Committee Member or authorized Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, any testimony given before the Committee in executive session except for purposes of obtaining an official classification of such testimony. Classified information and controlled unclassified information (CUI) shall be handled in accordance with all applicable laws, executive orders, and other governing authorities and consistently with the provisions of these rules and Committee procedures.

(E) *Oath.*—Before a Committee Member or Committee staff may have access to classified information, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information received in the course of my service on the Committee on Homeland Security, except as authorized by the Committee or the House of Representatives or in accordance with the Rules of such Committee or the Rules of the House.

Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained by the Clerk of the Committee as part of the records of the Committee.

(F) *Disciplinary Action.*—The Chairman shall immediately consider disciplinary action in the event any Committee Member or Committee staff member fails to conform to the provisions of these rules governing the disclosure of classified or unclassified information. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff, criminal referral to the Justice Department, and notification of the Speaker of the House. With respect to Minority staff, the Chairman shall consider such disciplinary action in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE XVI.—COMMITTEE RECORDS.

(A) *Committee Records.*—Committee Records shall constitute all data, charts and files in possession of the Committee and shall be maintained in accordance with clause 2(e) of House Rule XI.

(B) *Legislative Calendar.*—The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee Member showing any procedural or legislative measures considered or scheduled to be considered by the Committee, and the status of such measures and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of such revisions shall be made available to each Member of the Committee upon request.

(C) *Members Right To Access.*—Members of the Committee and of the House shall have access to all official Committee Records. Access to Committee files shall be limited to examination within the Committee offices at reasonable times. Access to Committee Records that contain classified information shall be provided in a manner consistent with these rules.

(D) *Removal of Committee Records.*—Files and records of the Committee are not to be removed from the Committee offices. No Committee files or records that are not made publicly available shall be photocopied by any Member.

(E) *Executive Session Records.*—Evidence or testimony received by the Committee in executive session shall not be released or made available to the public unless agreed to by the Committee. Such information may be made available to appropriate government personnel for purposes of classification. Such information Members may examine the Committee's executive session records, but may not make copies of, or take personal notes from, such records.

(F) *Availability of Committee Records.*—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action including recorded votes and attendance at hearings and meetings. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of each amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, including the name of the Member who offered the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against each such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, as well as the names of those Members present but not voting. Such record shall be made available to the public at reasonable times within the Committee offices and also made publicly available in electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site within 48 hours of such record vote.

(G) *Separate and Distinct.*—All Committee records and files must be kept separate and distinct from the office records of the Members serving as Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. Records and files of Members' personal offices shall not be considered records or files of the Committee.

(H) *Disposition of Committee Records.*—At the conclusion of each Congress, non-current records of the Committee shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House.

(I) *Archived Records.*—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member on any

communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

RULE XVII.—COMMITTEE RULES.

(A) *Availability of Committee Rules in Electronic Form.*—Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall make its rules publicly available in electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site and shall submit such rules for publication in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chairman of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(B) *Changes to Committee Rules.*—These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Full Committee provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each Member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken and such changes are not inconsistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House of Representatives Rule XI, I am submitting the Committee on the Judiciary's Rules of Procedure for publication in the Congressional Record. These rules were adopted by a vote of the Committee on January 21, 2015.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

RULE I.

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

RULE II. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Wednesday of each week while the House is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) The Chairman shall furnish each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee with the date, place, and a list of bills and subjects to be considered at a Committee or Subcommittee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session).

(d) At least 48 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the text of such legislation shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(e) In an emergency that does not reasonably allow for the notice as requirements in (c) and (d), the Chairman may waive the notice requirements with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(f) To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to a measure or matter shall be

submitted in writing or electronically to the designee of both the Chairman and Ranking Member at least 24 hours prior to the consideration of the measure or matter. The Chairman may use his discretion to give priority to amendments submitted in advance.

(g) Committee and Subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e. meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(h) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon demand, of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(i) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any Subcommittee thereof for which a majority is not required, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or Subcommittee, respectively.

(j)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time.

(2) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (1), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(3) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(k) Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and may be published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee.

(l) Without further action of the Committee, the Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE III. HEARINGS

(a) The Committee Chairman or any Subcommittee Chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by it on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee, or Subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or Subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or Subcommittee Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee hearings shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(c) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence before the Committee or any Subcommittee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of two Members.

(d) In the course of any hearing each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the interrogation of a witness until such time as each Member who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee which are decided to be printed shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Individuals, including Members of Congress, whose comments are to be published as part of a Committee document shall be given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription in advance of publication. Any requests by those Members, staff or witnesses to correct any errors other than errors in the transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Prior to approval by the Chairman of hearings conducted jointly with another congressional Committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the verbatim transcript.

RULE IV. SUBPOENAS

(a) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(b) In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its Subcommittees in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(c) At least two business days before issuing any subpoena pursuant to subsection (a), the Chair shall consult with the Ranking Member regarding the authorization and issuance of such subpoena, and the Chair shall provide a full copy of the proposed subpoena, including any proposed document schedule, at that time.

(d) The requirements of subsection (c) may be waived in the event of an emergency that does not reasonably allow for advance written notice.

RULE V. BROADCASTING

Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio and still photography subject to the requirements of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE VI. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The full Committee shall have jurisdiction over: copyright, and other such matters as determined by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(b) There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, with jurisdictions as follows:

The Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: constitutional

amendments, constitutional rights, Federal civil rights, claims against the United States, non-immigration private claims bills, ethics in government, tort liability, including medical malpractice and product liability, legal reform generally, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: Administration of U.S. Courts, Federal Rules of Evidence, Civil and Appellate Procedure, judicial ethics, patent and trademark law, information technology, other appropriate matters as referred to by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: Federal Criminal Code, drug enforcement, sentencing, parole and pardons, internal and homeland security, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prisons, criminal law enforcement, and other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: immigration and naturalization, border security, admission of refugees, treaties, conventions and international agreements, Federal charters of incorporation, private immigration bills, non-border immigration enforcement, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: bankruptcy and commercial law, bankruptcy judgeships, administrative law, independent counsel, state taxation affecting interstate commerce, interstate compacts, antitrust matters, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each Subcommittee to which such Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such Subcommittee.

RULE VII. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective Subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other Subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

RULE VIII. NON-LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

No report of the Committee or Subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or Subcommittee issuing the report shall have been apprised of such report and given the opportunity to give notice of intention to file supplemental, additional, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the time in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and

legal holidays when the House is not in session).

RULE IX. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use according to the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

RULE X. OFFICIAL COMMITTEE WEBSITE

(a) The Chairman shall maintain an official website on behalf of the Committee for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

(b) The Chairman shall make the record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded in the full Committee available on the Committee's official website not later than 48 hours after such vote is taken. Such record shall identify or describe the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of the Members voting present.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee or its Subcommittees, the Chairman shall make the text of each such amendment publicly available in electronic form.

(d) Not later than 3 days after the conclusion of a Committee meeting, the transcript of such meeting and the text of all amend-

ments offered shall be made available on the Committee website.

(e) The Ranking Member is authorized to maintain a similar official website on behalf of the Committee Minority for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the Minority to Committee Members and other Members of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 27, 2015, at noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, QATAR, SAUDI ARABIA, AND IRAQ, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 12 AND DEC. 17, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	12/13	12/14	UAE		898.30		(³)				898.30
	12/14	12/14	Qatar				(³)				
	12/14	12/15	Saudi Arabia		459.10		(³)				459.10
	12/15	12/16	Iraq		11.00		(³)				11.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	12/13	12/14	UAE		898.30		(³)				898.30
	12/14	12/14	Qatar				(³)				
	12/14	12/15	Saudi Arabia		459.10		(³)				459.10
	12/15	12/16	Iraq		11.00		(³)				11.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	12/13	12/14	UAE		898.30		(³)				898.30
	12/14	12/14	Qatar				(³)				
	12/14	12/15	Saudi Arabia		459.10		(³)				459.10
	12/15	12/16	Iraq		11.00		(³)				11.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	12/13	12/14	UAE		898.30		(³)				898.30
	12/14	12/14	Qatar				(³)				
	12/14	12/15	Saudi Arabia		459.10		(³)				459.10
	12/15	12/16	Iraq		11.00		(³)				11.00
Robert Karem	12/13	12/14	UAE		898.30		(³)				898.30
	12/14	12/14	Qatar				(³)				
	12/14	12/15	Saudi Arabia		459.10		(³)				459.10
	12/15	12/16	Iraq		11.00		(³)				11.00
Committee Total					6,842.00		(³)				6,842.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY, Chairman, Jan. 16, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, Jan. 20, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHARLES W. DENT, Chairman, Jan. 15, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Chairman, Jan. 7, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Jan. 22, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 21, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Jan. 14, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TREY GOWDY, Chairman, Jan. 7, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

120. A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Assistance Loans, Loan Deficiency Payments, and Sugar Loans (RIN: 0560-AI28) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

121. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRA, OCC, Department of the Treas-

ury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Subordinated Debt Issued by a National Bank [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0024] (RIN: 1557-AD73) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

122. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, OCC, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules, Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Interim Final Revisions to the Definition of Qualifying Master Netting Agreement and Related Definitions [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0028] (RIN: 1557-AD91) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

123. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, OCC, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0026] (RIN: 1557-AD89) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

124. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, OCC, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold Adjustment [Docket No.: OCC-2014-0027] (RIN:

1557-AD90) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

125. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Dayton, OH) [MB Docket No.: 14-159] [RM-11735] received January 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

126. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-462, "License to Carry a Pistol Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

127. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-537, "Pepco Cost-Sharing Fund for DC PLUG Establishment Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

128. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-536, "Grandparent Caregivers Program Subsidy Transfer Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

129. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-490, "Grocery Store Restrictive Covenant Prohibition Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

130. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-505, "Inspector General Qualifications Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

131. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-506, "District Government Certificate of Good Standing Filing Requirement Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

132. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-555, "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

133. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-475, "H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Incentive Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

134. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-522, "Standard Deduction Withholding Clarification Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

135. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-588, "Trauma Technologists Licensure Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

136. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-499, "Metropolitan Police Department Commencement of Discipline and Command Staff Appointment Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

137. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-498, "Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System Conformity Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

138. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-494, "St. Matthews Evangelical Lutheran Church Community Garden Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

139. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-500, "Douglas Knoll, Golden Rule, 1728 W Street, and Wagner Gainesville Real Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

140. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-463, "Zion Baptist Church Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

141. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-466, "Bishop Iola B. Cunningham Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

142. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-484, "Commission on Health Disparities Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

143. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-467, "Civil Marriage Dissolution Equality Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

144. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-485, "Disposition of District Land for Affordable Housing Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

145. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-468, "Nap Turner Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

146. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-488, "Special Education Quality Improvement Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

147. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-483, "Food Policy Council and Director Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

148. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-474, "Medical Marijuana Expansion Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

149. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-491, "Retirement Technical Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

150. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-487, "Enhanced Special Education Services Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

151. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-495, "Transaction Modernization Electronic Delivery or Posting Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

152. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-471, "N Street Village Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

153. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-496, "Closing of a Portion of the Public Alley System Square 368, S.O. 13-09586, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

154. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-469, "Stroke System of Care Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

155. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-497, "Captive Insurance Company Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

156. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-470, "Record Sealing Decriminalized and Legalized Offenses Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

157. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-493, "Truth in Affordability Reporting Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

158. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-489, "Vehicle-for-Hire Innovation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

159. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-472, "Solid Waste Facility Permit Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

160. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-473, "Repeal of Prostitution Free Zones and Drug Free Zones Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

161. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-486, "Special Education Student Rights Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

162. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-470, "Record Sealing Decriminalized and Legalized Offenses Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

163. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-482, "Affordable Homeownership Preservation and Equity Accumulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

164. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

165. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Groundfish Fisheries Off Alaska [Docket No.: 140304195-4947-02] (RIN: 0648-BE06) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

166. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0257; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-18051; AD 2014-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

167. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0759; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-028-AD; Amendment 39-18052; AD 2014-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

168. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0566; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-041-AD; Amendment 39-18050; AD 2014-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

169. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0448; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-055-AD; Amendment 39-18048; AD 2014-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

170. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0453; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-18049; AD 2014-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

171. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0057; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-210-AD; Amendment 39-18044; AD 2014-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

172. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0717; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-026-AD; Amendment 39-18045; AD 2014-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received

January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

173. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0053; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-18047; AD 2014-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

174. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1029; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-18042; AD 2014-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

175. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Area Boundary Descriptions; Cape Canaveral, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0875; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASO-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

176. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0450; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-18037; AD 2014-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

177. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0256; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-01-AD; Amendment 39-18046; AD 2008-14-02 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

178. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0567; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-18043; AD 2014-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 48. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-5). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 522. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review over 6 years of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 523. A bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COOK, Mr. ZINKE, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 524. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. AMASH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BARR, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 525. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 526. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 527. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BENISHEK (for himself, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HANNA, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SALMON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 528. A bill to direct Federal public land management officials to exercise their authority under existing law to facilitate use of and access to Federal public lands for fishing, sport hunting, and recreational shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 530. A bill to reduce the amount of foreign assistance to Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador based on the number of unaccompanied alien children who are nationals or citizens of such countries and who in the preceding fiscal year are placed in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 531. A bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New

York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 532. A bill to provide that 6 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. COLE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 533. A bill to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 534. A bill to authorize a State or a portion of a State to conduct a demonstration project designed to test methods of program integration and coordination of services with the goals of moving individuals and families towards self-sufficiency, reducing welfare dependence, and increasing work and earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 535. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the Filipino Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 536. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve waivers under the Medicaid Program under title XIX of the Social Security Act that are related to State provider taxes that exempt certain retirement communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HILL, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BARR, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 537. A bill to require any communication using Federal funds to advertise or educate the public on certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Healthcare and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 to state that such communication was produced at taxpayer expense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 538. A bill to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of years Representatives and Senators may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs.

LOWEY, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 49. A resolution honoring the victims of the Holocaust, commending countries and organizations for marking the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, and expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to strengthen the fight against anti-Semitism, bigotry, and intolerance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 50. A resolution calling for the release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who was captured by Russian forces in Eastern Ukraine and has been held illegally in a Russian prison since July 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H. Res. 51. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8, clause 1:

The Congress shall have power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article One, section 8, clause 18

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper

for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution which, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, also allows Congress to prevent the federal government from interfering with Americans' ability to grow and process industrial hemp. This act is also justified by the Ninth Amendment and the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which recognize that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and to the States.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes;" Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to establish . . . uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;" and Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 to 17, and Section 9, Clauses 1 to 2, 4, and 7, of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of specific legislative powers granted to Congress by those sections, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;"

Article III, Section 1, Clause 1, Sentence 1, Section 2, Clause 1, and Section 2, Clause 2, Sentence 2, of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress; Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of power granted to Congress to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and, Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of power granted to Congress to lay and collect income taxes, including determinations of the manner in which that power will be exercised.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law. and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: To Establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization;

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have the Power . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution into the government of the United States, or in any department of officer thereof

Article I, Section 9: No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 26.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V whereby the U.S. Constitution may be altered.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 93: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 94: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 109: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. BUCHSHON.

H.R. 114: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 154: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 158: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 159: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 160: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 173: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 181: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 184: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 188: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 228: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 232: Mr. CHABOT and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 238: Ms. LEE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 246: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 247: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 253: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 254: Mr. SERRANO.

- H.R. 255: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 256: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 285: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 287: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 295: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 310: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MICA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 315: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 321: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 350: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 351: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EMMER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 353: Mr. JONES and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 357: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. Pittenger.
H.R. 364: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 381: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 402: Mr. ROSS and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 410: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 414: Mr. HURT of Virginia.
H.R. 418: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 427: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BOST, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 429: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 430: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 448: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. FARR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 452: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 460: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 465: Mr. BUCK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BOST, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 468: Mr. KILMER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 469: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MENG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 484: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MESSER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 514: Mr. ROYCE, Ms. MENG, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 515: Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.J. Res. 11: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 11: Mr. YOHO, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BABIN, and Mrs. ROBY.
H. Res. 28: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 36: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK JANUARY

HON. MADELINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, one of the seminal events in 20th century was the demise of the Soviet Union, which altered the balance of power in the world, most profoundly in Europe and Central Asia. But the event that sparked the tinderbox of democratic uprisings through the sphere of Soviet satellites began in Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijanis remember the night that democratic fire was sparked; it was January 20, 1990. The Azeris called it "Black January." At midnight on that fateful night, 26,000 armed Russian troops stormed into Baku with tanks.

The weeks and months prior to Black January had seen a surge in the national independence movement. Hundreds of thousands of Azeris pushed then USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's glasnost policy by publicly marching for independence and territorial integrity.

Some of the emerging democratic groups were projected to win seats in the upcoming Parliamentary elections. Since only Communists could hold government office in a Soviet satellite, Gorbachev moved quickly to put down the independence movement.

Gorbachev declared a state of emergency to repress a growing independence movement. The Soviet heavyhandedness served only to elevate Azeri resolve and passion. Soviet troops, under orders to "restore order," tried dispersing the throngs of peaceful Azeri demonstrators by firing arbitrarily into the crowds on the Baku streets, killing women and children who were among the protesters calling for independence from the Soviet Union.

Over 130 Azeris were killed in the violence of Black January; 611 were injured, nearly 1,000 were arrested, and five were never found.

Human Rights Watch's report "Black January in Azerbaijan," said that, "among the most heinous violations of human rights during the Baku incursion were the numerous attacks on medical personnel, ambulances and even hospitals." Human Rights Watch concluded, "The punishment inflicted on Baku by Soviet soldiers may have been intended as a warning to nationalists, not only in Azerbaijan, but in other Republics of the Soviet Union."

The standoff between nationalists in Azerbaijan and the Soviet leaders in Moscow escalated into an Azeri threat to hold a referendum on secession unless Soviet troops withdrew in 48 hours. Soviet troops were hampered when Azerbaijani oil tankers blockaded the Baku harbor, keeping Soviet naval vessels at bay.

Soviet forces withdrew, but formal independence would come nearly two years later.

On this day, Azeri patriots stood up for their freedom, sealing the fate of the Soviet empire and forever changing the history of the world.

I ask my colleagues to join me in standing with the people of Azerbaijan today in solitude and gratitude for their passion for independence and remembrance of the lives lost on Black January.

RECOGNITION OF DEAN LESTER'S 20 YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. THOMAS J. ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a member of my staff, Dean Lester, on his 20 years of service to the House of Representatives and the people of the United States.

Dean came to Washington, DC in January, 1995 to work for his home state Congresswoman, Representative Helen Chenoweth-Hage of Idaho. He fondly remembers the "united sense to accomplish things" in the first 100 days of that year as the House embarked on a hectic schedule to implement the Contract with America.

Dean must have enjoyed that fast pace, because even when Congress slows down or goes into recess, he maintains a full schedule. Over time, he began working for multiple House offices at once, and he now serves as office and financial administrator to eight different members of Congress. In total, Dean has worked for 20 members of Congress in 20 years.

Dean is an irreplaceable member of every staff on which he serves. He tracks our budgets, manages our office moves, and ensures all of our equipment is working properly; in short, Dean makes sure the trains run on time. He knows every inch of this building and every trick of the trade. When a problem arises, we call Dean and we can always count on him to fix it.

Dean is a mentor and guide not just to younger staff members but to senior staff and members of Congress as well. Through it all, he maintains a sense of humor, an upbeat attitude, and a positive view of what we can accomplish together. He reminds us of why we came here and what an incredible, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity it is to serve.

Dean, we could not do our jobs without you. For your tireless work ethic, your dedication to Congress and the people of this great country, and your 20 years of service, we salute you.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S SUE PARDUE

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved Sue Pardue. For decades, Sue was a leader and integral part of the Northwest Florida community, and she will be missed by all who were fortunate to know her.

Sue married her loving husband of more than 42 years, Alvin, in 1972, before moving to Pace, Florida, where they started a family and became an integral part of the Pace community. While raising her five children, Sue also took steps to further her education, receiving bachelor's, master's, and PhD degrees from the University of West Florida. Sue used her education and kind-hearted nature serving as a counselor at many institutions in Northwest Florida, including Pace Assembly Ministries, Santa Rosa Correctional Institute, and Pensacola Family Care for Youth, amongst many others.

While raising a family and working as a counselor, Sue also took an active role in many community organizations helping to serve the community that she loved. Sue was deeply devoted to serving the Lord, and she served for many years as head of the Children's Ministries at Pace Assembly of God and the Women's Ministries at Pensacola First Assembly of God, while also holding a position on the church's board. In addition to her service at her church, Sue was deeply involved in many other organizations, including: Concerned Citizens for Gifted Children, Crisis Line Counseling, RSVP Advisory Board, Red Cross, Advisory Board for Children's Home, Advisory Board for Guardian Ad Litem, Pace Water System, Family Promise, Pregnancy Resource Center, and Santa Rosa County Bond Review Board.

To some, Sue will be remembered as a devoted servant of Jesus Christ, working tirelessly to spread His word at her church and throughout Northwest Florida. To others she will be remembered as a highly educated, hard-working, and dedicated counselor. To her family and friends, she will always be remembered as a loving wife, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother.

On behalf of the United States Congress, my wife Vicki and I send our deepest condolences and prayers to Sue's husband, Alvin; her children, Donna, Deniece, Brian, Edwin, and Calvin; her seven grandchildren and two great-grandchildren; and the entire Pardue family.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN HONOR OF 2015 NASCAR HALL
OF FAME INDUCTEE BILL ELLIOTT

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Bill Elliott upon his induction into the sixth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame. There is a rhyme that holds true about this inductee, "Awesome Bill from Dawsonville."

The Dawsonville, Georgia, native got his first career win at the 1976 Carolina 500 at "The Rock" in Rockingham, North Carolina. In fact, Bill reached victory lane six times at tracks within North Carolina's 8th congressional district.

These wins are just a small part of one of the greatest careers in NASCAR history.

In 1985, Elliott won the first "Winston Million" in NASCAR history by winning three of four races in NASCAR's then "Grand Slam." In that season, he won the Daytona 500 at Daytona International Speedway, the Winston 500 at Talladega Superspeedway, and the Southern 500 at Darlington Raceway. He is one of only two drivers in the Winston Million era to ever accomplish this feat and for being the first to accomplish it he was given the nickname "Million Dollar Bill."

In 1988, Elliott earned NASCAR's Winston Cup championship. His win total of 44 ranks him in the top 20 all-time NASCAR Cup Series winners and Elliott also garnered 16 Most Popular Driver Awards during his illustrious career.

It is a true honor to congratulate him on his due induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

IN HONOR OF 2015 NASCAR HALL
OF FAME INDUCTEE WENDELL
SCOTT

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Wendell Scott upon his posthumous induction into the sixth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

Wendell Scott was the first African-American to become a full-time competitor in the series and he did this after serving three years in the U.S. Army during World War II.

He started racing in 1947 and experienced immediate success behind the wheel. He gained the respect and admiration of his competitors and fans as they observed his skill as a mechanic, skill as a driver and his exceptional work ethic.

Scott won over 100 races in the next decade at local area tracks. He made his first start in NASCAR's premier series March 4, 1961, at Piedmont Interstate Fairgrounds in Spartanburg, South Carolina. In 1963, Scott became the first African-American to win a NASCAR premier series event.

Although Scott passed away in 1990, his impact on racing can still be felt today. It is

truly an honor to extend these congratulatory remarks for United States Army veteran Wendell Scott for his racing career and his posthumous induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

IN HONOR OF 2015 NASCAR HALL
OF FAME INDUCTEE FRED
LORENZEN

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing superstar Fred Lorenzen upon his induction into the sixth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

The Elmhurst, Illinois, native got his start in NASCAR as a mechanic with the famed Holman-Moody team in 1960, but was elevated to lead driver by the end of that year.

In 1964, Lorenzen began one of the most dominant five race runs in NASCAR history in which he led 1,679 of the possible 1,953 laps. This stretch of lap-leading highlights how dominant Lorenzen was between 1962 and 1967. He won multiple major events during this period such as the Daytona 500, World 600, and the American 500.

Nicknamed the "Elmhurst Express," Lorenzen notched 26 wins on the NASCAR circuit and he reached victory lane five times in the 8th district of North Carolina.

It is an honor to congratulate him on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 39, I was unavoidably detained during the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

**RECOGNIZING MS. SAILOR
GUTZLER**

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself, and Representative JOHN SHIMKUS, to recognize Ms. Sailor Gutzler. On January 2, 2015, a small Piper PA-34 plane carrying the family of Marty and Kimberly Gutzler crashed in the remote forest of Kuttawa, Kentucky, located in the First Congressional District of Kentucky. The family was headed back home to Nashville, Illinois, located in the Fifteenth Congressional District of Illinois, from a family vacation in Key West, Florida.

Marty, Kimberly, their nine-year-old daughter Piper, and fourteen-year-old niece Sierra Wild-

er were instantly killed in the crash. Miraculously, the Gutzler's youngest daughter, seven-year-old Sailor, emerged from the wreckage alive and as the lone survivor. With a broken wrist, no shoes, and wearing only a T-shirt and shorts, the second grader bravely searched the cold, dark forest for nearly a mile until she found the only inhabited house in a 1,400 acre area.

Young Sailor arrived at the home of Larry Wilkins, "with lips trembling, crying, trying to talk" according to Wilkins. This brave young girl, grief stricken and mangled, managed to point authorities in the direction of the crash, but is left without her parents, and with the trauma of this tragic event.

This tragedy made national news, and Sailor was deemed the "Miracle Girl" by People Magazine. Sailor's strength and courage is truly remarkable, and we want to recognize her brave actions on that night and in the days following. Young Sailor has even noted that she has to be strong for her mom and dad, because they would want her to be strong.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Sailor and her surviving family. It is truly a miracle this young girl survived and we are certain God has a purpose for her.

IN HONOR OF 2015 NASCAR HALL
OF FAME INDUCTEE REX WHITE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Rex White upon his induction into the sixth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

After being diagnosed with polio as a child, White didn't imagine automobiles as anything more than a source of transportation. However, by the time he started racing in NASCAR in 1956, White was ready to start one of the most consistent careers in NASCAR history.

The Taylorsville, North Carolina, native finished among the top five in 110 of the 233 races he participated in. His skill on the short tracks that dominated the schedule in his era allowed him to tally up top five and top ten finishes at a historic rate.

White won six times during his 1960 championship season and his victory total ranks 22nd among all-time premier series winners.

Rex White was named one of NASCAR's 50 Greatest Drivers in 1998 and it is an honor to congratulate this North Carolina native on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

DOLLY MAE NAVE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dolly Nave, who passed away on December 23, 2014, at her home in San Rafael, California. As a dedicated community organizer and leader, Ms. Nave helped to transform recreational facilities in the City of San

Rafael for the benefit of countless Marin County residents.

In the 1980s, on behalf of Ms. Nave's eight children and the children in the local community, Ms. Nave rallied the support of local contractors and volunteers to donate the equipment, labor, and funding necessary to breathe new life into public schools and city-owned recreation fields and facilities. Ms. Nave continued to improve recreational facilities throughout her life, and founded the Marin Bocce Federation in Albert Park, San Rafael.

Ms. Nave was a skillful community leader who possessed the necessary organizational skills to always put the pieces in place and get the job done. She was the project manager for the construction of Marin Community Fields in Larkspur and was in the forefront of numerous projects at San Rafael High, initiating the successful "Save Night Football" campaign. A volunteer at Albert Park for 35 years, she became known as the "Angel of Albert Park" because she was one of its foremost advocates. In 1993, she was a founding board member and construction chair of the Marin Bocce Federation in Albert Park. The ten bocce courts are now used by more than 1,000 players a week.

Ms. Nave's work did not go unnoticed, and her longstanding commitment to others was recognized by numerous awards including San Rafael Citizen of the Year, the Marv Lechner Award from San Rafael High, and Woman of the Year for California's Third Senate District in 1991. She was also one of the first women to be inducted into the Marin Athletic Foundation High School Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, Dolly Nave's selfless efforts have benefited countless residents of San Rafael and Marin County. Her legacy will not soon be forgotten as her accomplishments can be seen all around the City of San Rafael. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband, Rich; three sons, Richard Jr., Paul and Tom; and three daughters, Sheri, Kathy and Patti; as well as her twenty-four grandchildren and seventeen great grandchildren. Ms. Nave was predeceased by her sons, Bruce and Louie.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,087,425,445,178.53. We've added \$7,460,548,396,265.45 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE FY15 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 240, the FY2015 Homeland Security Appropriations bill, which included the adoption of five anti-immigrant amendments. By including these policy riders, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to hold hostage and disrupt funding for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Failure to promptly fund the Department of Homeland Security puts our country at risk.

At the end of last year, House and Senate Appropriators came to a compromise agreement on funding for the Department of Homeland Security at a level of \$39.67 billion, \$1.5 billion above the President's request. This agreement contained funding for many important programs vital to our national security interests. Unfortunately, Speaker BOEHNER decided to abandon that agreement and instead have a negotiation between the far right and the far, far right.

In particular, I strongly oppose the inclusion of an amendment offered by Congressman ADERHOLT that would deny the use of any funds or fees for the administration to implement the President's Executive Action on immigration that was issued last November. As many legal experts have determined, there is clear precedent for this action, which seeks to further secure our border and prioritize deporting felons over families. In fact, over the last 50 years, every President has used executive authority to take limited action on immigration, including six Republican Presidents.

I was also very disappointed that an amendment offered by Congresswoman BLACKBURN was adopted in final passage of this bill. This amendment would prevent Dreamers in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (DACA) from renewing the two-year Deferred Action they have already received. This would effectively end the DACA program—which has already provided temporary protection for 700,000 individuals who were brought to the United States as children—and would subject hundreds of thousands of Dreamers to deportation.

If our Republican colleagues want to address immigration issues, they should start by taking up legislation to fix our broken immigration system. Over 18 months ago, the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill with bipartisan support. House Republicans allowed that bill to die in the House without allowing it to come to a vote. Republicans should come up with a proposal to reform our broken immigration system. They should not threaten to defund the Department of Homeland Security because of their inaction.

It is especially unfortunate that these anti-immigrant amendments were adopted because the bill that had previously been agreed to contained funding for many critical programs. Specifically, I appreciate the robust funding in the bill provided for the SAFER and

AFG fire grant programs which have helped pay for emergency vehicles and increased staffing needs at a time when the numbers of volunteer fire fighters across the country has been declining. Furthermore, in light of this week's cyberattack on the U.S. Central Command's Twitter account, I am encouraged by the bill's funding for cyber security programs. I am also pleased to see the increased funding provided for the Secret Service, which has experienced well reported challenges last year.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to play politics with our national security. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

IN HONOR OF 2015 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE JOE WEATHERLY

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Joe Weatherly upon his posthumous induction into the sixth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

The Norfolk, Virginia, native established himself as one of boldest personalities in NASCAR history. Affectionately called the "Clown Prince of Stock Car Racing" for pulling such antics as wearing costumes during practice laps, he was all business come race time.

Weatherly won the 1953 NASCAR modified championship and then in 1962 and 1963 he won the NASCAR premier series championships. He also earned five victories on tracks in the 8th district of North Carolina during his career.

His tragic death in 1964 due to injuries sustained during a race that season made him the first reigning champion to die during the season.

Weatherly was previously inducted into the American Motorcycle Association Hall of Fame and the Motorsports Hall of Fame of America and it is a great honor to extend these congratulatory remarks for one of NASCAR's 50 Greatest Drivers of all-time on his posthumous induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

IN RECOGNITION OF BISHOP PARNELL M. LOVELACE, JR.

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Bishop Parnell M. Lovelace, Jr. as he steps aside from his position as Senior Pastor of the Center of Praise Ministries of Sacramento, California. As a spiritual leader, he has served the Sacramento community since he founded the Center of Praise Ministries in 1989. Before this he held various other positions for which our community is grateful. As his congregation, family, colleagues and community leaders gather to celebrate his efforts, I ask my colleagues to join

me in honoring his many years of contributions to the Sacramento region.

Bishop Lovelace has been an enthusiastic and effective spiritual leader. He received his Bachelor of Arts in Social Work from Oral Roberts University and Master of Arts in Social Work from the University of Oklahoma. He received early spiritual training at Sacramento's Shiloh Baptist Church, and went on to receive his Certificate of Completion from the Jack W. Hayford School of Pastoral Nurture at King's College and Seminary, a Master of Arts in Practical Theology with High Honors from Oral Roberts University, and his Doctor of Ministry from the Talbot School of Theology at Biola University.

In addition to leading the Center of Praise Ministries, Bishop Lovelace was a public servant in Oklahoma and Sacramento, where he held a number of positions, including being the Sacramento Regional Office Manager and Case Worker for the Koinonia Foster Homes, a Pediatric Medical Social Worker for the University of California, Davis Medical Center, and served as the Vice Chairperson for the Board of Directors of CARES Community Health clinic.

In 1989 Bishop Lovelace led the Center of Praise Ministries' founding meeting and it has grown exponentially since then. As Senior Pastor, he has contributed an unimaginable amount of time and effort to improving our community and has made it a priority to reach out to those in need. Other important positions he has held include a stint as a Senior Fellow with the American Leadership Forum's Mountain Valley Chapter, Advisory Board Member of East Lawn, Inc., leadership within 100 Black Men of America, Inc., co-pastoral chair of the 2012 Luis Palau Sacramento Festival, and he served as member of the Board of Trustees at William Jessup University.

Not surprisingly, Bishop Lovelace has received numerous honors throughout his career. Some of his most recent awards include being honored by the Martin Luther King, Jr. International Board of Preachers and Collegium Scholars at Morehouse College, receiving the 2012 President's Award from the Sacramento Black Chamber of Commerce, and in 2013 he was named Person of the Year by the Observer Media Group.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of his dedication to the betterment of our community, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking and recognizing the Bishop Parnell M. Lovelace, Jr. for his many years of service and in wishing him and his family all the best.

IN RECOGNITION OF PAUL DAVID LANTZ, PRESIDENT OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY ALLIANCE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Paul Lantz as he completes his term as President of the Jewish Community Alliance of the Greater Wyoming Valley. Under Paul's dedicated leadership, the Jewish Community Alliance has made great strides in pre-

paring for its future, most notably in the acquisition of land that will allow for establishment of a new Jewish Community Center for the Wyoming Valley. This project will maintain many of the traditional aspects and artifacts of the current structure but will also allow the center to expand into a modern facility designed to meet future needs. The Jewish community in the Wyoming Valley has had a rich history of charitable and educational works dating back many years, and this project will allow this work to continue well into the future.

Educated at Connecticut College, Paul graduated with a bachelor of arts in zoology. After receiving his master's in business administration from the University of Connecticut, Paul went to work for Price Waterhouse in New York as a CPA. In 1981, he moved to Wilkes-Barre with his wife, where they still reside. Paul is actively involved in the Wilkes-Barre community in many ways. In addition to serving as the President of the Jewish Community Alliance, Paul has also served on the board of several non-profit organizations, such as the SPCA, the Domestic Violence Service Center, The Wyoming Valley Children's Association, and the Boys & Girls Clubs. Currently, Paul is the owner and President of the A. Rifkin Co. in Wilkes-Barre and Hope Uniform & Security Products in Columbia, New Jersey.

I congratulate Paul on his work as President of the Jewish Community Alliance of the Wyoming Valley, and I commend him for his dedication, his quiet confidence, and his selflessness in offering his time and talents on behalf of others.

LIST OF INCIDENTS TARGETING THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY IN INDIA

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the following list of incidents of religious persecution targeting the Christian community in India was compiled by the Evangelical Fellowship of India, a charter member of the World Evangelical Alliance and an accredited NGO with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The Evangelical Fellowship of India expresses concern at the alarming rate at which the Christian community is being targeted in India. The EFT's Religious Liberty Commission recorded more than 38 incidents targeting the Christian community in November-December 2014, with 31 incidents taking place in December alone. The incidents range from physical violence, false accusations, disruption of church services/Christmas functions, to the hate campaigns and the pressure to convert to Hinduism that the Christian community is facing almost on a daily basis in India.

LIST OF INCIDENTS STATE WISE

Uttar Pradesh—13 incidents
Madhya Pradesh—8 incidents
Chhattisgarh—4 incidents
Delhi—4 incidents
Punjab—2 incidents
Bihar—2 incidents
Tamil Nadu—1 incident
Karnataka—1 incident

Assam—1 incident
Andhra Pradesh—1 incident
Gujarat—1 incident

BHOPAL, MADHYA PRADESH (4TH NOVEMBER 2014)

Members of Bajrang Dal attacked 7 Christians including one Pastor from Mumbai, beat them up and got them arrested in Bhopal. The Christians were stripped and beaten mercilessly by fists and belts, causing internal injuries.

INDORE, MADHYA PRADESH (7TH NOVEMBER 2014)

A Christian was falsely accused, detained and later arrested on allegations of forced conversions in Indore. According to reports from local sources, Hindu extremists threw cross necklaces in the house where the Christians had gathered and then stormed inside alleging forced conversions. A police complaint alleging that the Christian was forcing them to wear cross necklaces and hence converting them was filed at the local police station. The Christian was detained for over four hours at the Chandan Nagar Police Station post the incident and was released later.

UDUMALPET, TAMIL NADU (16TH NOVEMBER 2014)

Over 100 Hindu extremists attacked a Christian community in Udumalpet, Tamil Nadu. The community was attacked when they were participating in a prayer service. The attackers not only beat the Christians present but also burnt more than 20 vehicles belonging to the Christians. They desecrated Bibles, burnt the altar of the Church and destroyed Church property including musical instruments. The Christians were threatened even when they were being treated for injuries at the local hospital.

RAJNANDGAON, CHHATTISGARH (16TH NOVEMBER 2014)

Members of the VHP and the Bajrang Dal stormed the Sunday worship service of the Masihi Aradhna Church in Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh and beat the Church members up. The attackers were looking for the Pastor who was hidden by the Church members as there was a threat to his life.

KOLAR, KARNATAKA (23RD NOVEMBER 2014)

Hindu extremists attacked the Calvary Apostolic Church in Bangarapet, Karnataka. They beat up Church members resulting in eight church members seriously injured. Two members among the eight injured suffered broken legs.

JAGDALPUR, CHHATTISGARH (26TH NOVEMBER 2014)

Media reports carried the news that under pressure from the VHP, the Catholic missionaries in Bastar area of Chhattisgarh state have agreed that the principals in their schools, normally referred to as "Father", would now be addressed as "Pracharya", or "Up-pracharya", or "Sir". The reports also mentioned that the missionaries have also agreed to put up photographs of "Maa Saraswati" and "great personalities who have worked for national interest" in their educational institutions. Local Catholic sources have denied such an agreement and complained of pressure from the VHP.

ASSAM (26TH NOVEMBER 2014)

Pastor of the Believers Church in Moran Amguri, Sivasagar District of Assam received threats from local Hindu leaders to vacate the building that the congregation uses for Church services in one month's time or face the consequences.

DELHI (1ST DECEMBER 2014)

A Catholic church in East Delhi's Dilshad Garden area, St Sebastian's Church, was

completely gutted in a fire, in the early hours of 1st December 2014. Later, Christians took to the streets to protest the burning, and demanded a judicial enquiry as foul play is suspected. The Governor of Delhi has instituted a Special Investigation Team to probe into the matter.

DELHI (2ND DECEMBER 2014)

Four unidentified men broke into the Catholic convent in Rohini area of Delhi. The CCTV captured the images when the break in happened.

DELHI (6TH DECEMBER 2014)

Unidentified people pelted Our Lady of Fatema Church with stones during mass at about 6 p.m. in the Jasola area of New Delhi damaging windows and causing the Syro-Malabar Catholic congregation to rush out in alarm.

ALIGARH, UTTAR PRADESH (9TH DECEMBER 2014)

The RSS and the Dharma Jagran Manch announced that they planned to convert 4000 Christian and 1000 Muslim families in Aligarh on Christmas Day. BJP MP Yogi Adityanath supported the event visibly among others. The organizers said that Christmas was chosen as the day for conversion because the event is a "shakti pariksha" (test of strength) for both religions.

LUDHIANA, PUNJAB (11TH DECEMBER 2014)

Members of the Shiv Sena attacked the Kalvari Church, Ludhiana prompting the police to deploy heavy security to protect the Church building. Shiv Sena members later surrounded the local police station alleging forced conversion.

ALIGARH, UTTAR PRADESH (12TH DECEMBER 2014)

Newspapers reported that the Dharm Jagran Samiti (DJS), an RSS offshoot, distributed pamphlets in Aligarh seeking donations for converting Christians and Muslims to Hinduism. The pamphlet said that it costs Rs 2 lakh to convert a Christian and Rs 5 lakh to convert a Muslim. The DJS had set December 25 as the date for a major conversion ceremony and put down an annual target of 2 lakh conversions—1 lakh Muslims and 1 lakh Christians in the area.

RATLAM, MADHYA PRADESH (12TH DECEMBER 2014)

Members of the Bajrang Dal stormed a Christian meeting in Ratlam. Madhya Pradesh along with the media and the police forcing the organizers to cancel the meeting. The organizers and the speakers of the meeting were taken to the police station but were later released. CSP P S Ranawat told the media that no evidence about the alleged conversions, forced or otherwise, was found in the initial probe by the police.

BASTAR, CHHATTISGARH (13TH DECEMBER 2014)

NDTV and other national media organizations reported that the BJP Lok Sabha MP from Bastar, Dinesh Kashyap presided over a ceremony that saw 33 Christian families being converted to Hinduism. The local Christians had complained of pressure from VHP and BJP earlier asking them to convert to Hinduism.

HYDERABAD, ANDHRA PRADESH (13TH DECEMBER 2014)

Christians were attacked and beaten by Hindu extremists for singing Christmas carols in Hyderabad, seriously injuring a pastor and four others. The violence occurred while Pastor Bhim Nayak of Banjara Baptist Church and fifteen church members sang Christmas carols and visited Christian families in the city's Singareny Colony. Local re-

ports say that some thirty "Hindu extremists" attacked the Christians and a vehicle they had hired for the evening festivities.

PIPRAICH, UTTAR PRADESH (16TH DECEMBER 2014)

Christians including 4 women were arrested from a Christmas function at Navipur village, Pipraich, Uttar Pradesh and were kept in custody for more than 20 hours before being released. They were accused by Hindu groups of indulging in forced conversion but the police let them go after a detailed investigation.

BEHRAICH, UTTAR PRADESH (16TH DECEMBER 2014)

Pastor Mahendra Kumar from Behraich, Uttar Pradesh was arrested and kept in custody for two days before being released without any charges. He was arrested following complaints of local Hindu groups. The Hindu groups are also targeting a Christian social service organization working in the area, according to local reports.

BHAGALPUR, BIHAR (18TH DECEMBER 2014)

Three Christians who had recently converted to Christianity were forced to re-convert to Hinduism. According to media reports the three converts returned to the Hindu fold after they were threatened with a social boycott.

UTTAR PRADESH (18TH DECEMBER 2014)

Dharm Jagran Manch leader Rajeshwar Singh told media that his organization plans to root out Christianity and Islam from India by December 31, 2021, adding that Christians and Muslims essentially have no right to live in the country.

VARANASI, UTTAR PRADESH (19TH DECEMBER 2014)

Hindu extremists disrupted a Christian prayer meeting and beat up Christians in Varanasi on December 19, 2014. Pastor Shobhnath and local Christians were participating in prayer and fasting in a village in Chiraigaon Block, Varanasi, when 10-12 people came in a Bolero (SUV), entered the house forcefully, and started beating the Christians. They took away Bible and other literature and also destroyed household furniture. According to local sources the attackers are office bearers of RSS and BJP. The matter was reported to the local police.

VALSAD, GUJARAT (19TH DECEMBER 2014)

According to media reports, Vishwa Hindu Parishad "officially brought back to the Hindu fold" some 100 Christian tribals who had "embraced Hinduism earlier" in south Gujarat. VHP activists later claimed as many as 900 had been "reconverted". The 'zhar wapsi' ceremony was conducted this afternoon at Arnai, a village in Kaprada taluka of Valsad district. A news website called scroll.in later investigated the issue and did not find a single convert in the area, a far cry from what was claimed by the VHP.

RATLAM, MADHYA PRADESH (19TH DECEMBER 2014)

A week after insisting that there was no evidence of conversion, forced or otherwise, the Ratlam Police booked Pastor Jose Matthews, the organiser of a Christian convention under the state's anti-conversion law. The convention organised by the Indian Pentecostal Church of God and the United Christian Council (UCC) on December 12, at Ratlam was attended by Christians and was stormed by Bajrang Dal people alleging conversions.

CHHATTISGARH (20TH DECEMBER 2014)

Media reports said that the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) is getting ready to clear

the controversial anti-conversion Bill passed by the Chhattisgarh Assembly in 2006. The Dharma Swatantraya Adhiniyam Act, 2006, brought by BJP's Raman Singh government in the state says the return of a person to his ancestor's religion or own original religion shall not be construed as "conversion." The Bill also says that a district magistrate will have to be intimated 30 days prior to the conversion and he will be the final authority on the subject.

PUNJAB (21ST DECEMBER 2014)

In media reports, the RSS and its affiliates claimed that they are engaged in a massive reconversion or 'ghar wapsi' programme to get Christians back—not just to Hinduism, but also to Sikhism, in Punjab. The organizations claim to have helped some 8,000 people 'return home' in the last three years, some 3,500 of them over the last one year.

DELHI (21ST DECEMBER 2014)

RSS announced that it will organize a reconversion rally at Ramliha Maidan in New Delhi on Christmas day with at least 25000 people in attendance.

KHARGONE, MADHYA PRADESH (24TH DECEMBER 2014)

A Christian couple, Wilson and Rashmita, was taken into custody under the state's anti-conversion law from a village near district headquarters Khargone, Madhya Pradesh. The couple were a part of a Christmas program held on 24th December at Nayanagar, about 28 kilometres from Khargone, where they live. Members of a Hindu group who alleged conversions disrupted the Christmas program and called the police who then arrested the couple. According to local sources, the Hindu groups produced false witnesses against the couple alleging that they had offered 5000 Rupees every month to a woman if she converts to Christianity.

UJJAIN, MADHYA PRADESH (24TH DECEMBER 2014)

Akash Sisodia from Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh was attacked by members of the Bajrang Dal while he was leading a Christmas prayer service in Ujjain Madhya Pradesh. According to reports, the Bajrang Dal people who were accompanied by the police and media people produced false witnesses and got Sisodia arrested. He was kept in custody for three days before being released, as charges against him could not be substantiated.

UTTAR PRADESH (25TH DECEMBER 2014)

Seven people including two pastors were arrested on Christmas day from Urai. Raibareilly and Kushinagar areas of Uttar Pradesh. The Christians were arrested on after BJP members complained of forcible conversions. However according to media reports no such conversions could be verified.

BARLOI, MAU, UTTAR PRADESH (25TH DECEMBER 2014)

Police stopped a Christmas function in Barloi village of Uttar Pradesh following objections by Hindu groups. Local BJP leader Dr. Alka Roy was also accompanying the police as they forced the Christians to stop the Christmas function.

MAINPURI, UTTAR PRADESH (25TH DECEMBER 2014)

Police in Mainpuri, Uttar Pradesh, stopped a Christmas celebration following complaints by Hindu groups alleging conversions. However according to media reports, no evidence of any conversion was found after investigation. The Christmas celebrations were organized at the home of one Shankar Lal Verma in Kharagjeet Nagar,

Mainpuri. After Hindu groups complained the police reached the spot, stopped the celebrations, dispersed the gathered people and arrested Shankar Lal. He was later released as the charges against him were not proved true.

KHANDWA, MADHYA PRADESH (26TH DECEMBER 2014)

Christians were attacked during a Christmas celebration in village Coloni near Khandwa. The mob cornered the Christians just about they were going to have lunch and threw stones at them. Later the police came and arrested 13 Christians including three very young children, 8 months, 4 years and 7 years and took them to Borgaon police station where they were charged under IP 295 A. The Christians including the children were in police custody till 31st December 2014 till their bail was secured. Earlier Hindu groups in the district court also roughed up a lawyer who appeared for the Christians. The groups told the lawyer to get off the case and not represent the Christians anymore.

VARANASI, UTTAR PRADESH (27TH DECEMBER 2014)

Police arrested Pastor Ashok Prajapati from Varanasi following allegations of forcible conversions. According to reports, Hindu groups as well as the police threatened him and asked him to stop holding prayer meetings in the area. He was released in the evening the same day.

AMETHI, UTTAR PRADESH (27TH DECEMBER 2014)

BJP leaders and Bajrang Dal people threatened Pastor Ramchand from Amethi, Uttar Pradesh of dire consequences if he carries on with worship services in the area. The pastor left the village keeping in mind his own security and has approached the local police for protection.

ALLAHABAD, UTTAR PRADESH (27TH DECEMBER 2014)

More than 25 members of the Youth wing of the BJP and other Hindu groups stormed into the Sam Higginbottom university alleging conversions. The attackers tore banners with Bible verses written on them, shouted anti-Christian slogans, burnt the effigy of the vice chancellor of the University, Dr. R B Lal, and entered into a fight with the security personnel. Two of them were caught and handed over to the police.

GAYA, BIHAR (28TH DECEMBER 2014)

Christians in Gaya, Bihar sought police protection after several outfits of the Hindu right-wing threatened them of dire consequences if they do not convert to Hinduism. In a petition containing two pages of signatures, given to the police, the Christians accused the VHP, the RSS and the Bajrang Dal of indulging in intimidation and force.

INDORE, MADHYA PRADESH (28TH DECEMBER 2014)

Hindu extremist groups forcibly took two Catholic missionaries to police station after disrupting an interfaith meeting organized at the Geeta Bhavan. Indore, Madhya Pradesh. The activists of Bajrang Dal and Dharma Jagran Manch accused Father Prasad and Brother Sleva of trying to convert Hindus to Christianity. They demanded that the police arrest the missionaries, after registering a First Information Report against them. The missionaries were however, let off as charges against them proved to be frivolous. The next day the Hindu groups proceeded to purify Geeta Bhavan by pouring milk and cow urine on the place where the missionaries had been participating in the interfaith meeting.

DEORIA, UTTAR PRADESH (28TH DECEMBER 2014)

Members of Hindu Yuva Vahini and the police disrupted a Christian worship service at Salempur, Deoria district, Uttar Pradesh. Jaswant Masih and his wife Suman, who have been conducting prayer services for many years in their own home, were arrested and taken to the police station following complaints by the Hindu groups that the couple were involved in forcible conversions. Later, Police, denied any incident of conversion. "A Christian family has been organising prayers for past many years and people go there. It is just a matter of faith and nothing else," said inspector Ram Yadav.

HONORING FRED T. NOLAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Fred T. Nolan, a native of Dyer, Tennessee, but raised in Paducah, Kentucky, and has lived in Jackson, Mississippi since his graduation from Tougaloo College in the early 1960s. One of his early career choices was teaching in the Jackson Public School District (JPS).

Mr. Nolan taught two years at the then Brinkley High School located on Livingston Road and was a ninth grade teacher of Social Studies and Mathematics. He left JPS to pursue other career options and worked briefly for the Urban League of Jackson as director. The majority of his career spanned 25 years as the executive director of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, a division of Housing Urban Development (HUD).

After fully retiring from HUD in 1996, Mr. Nolan rejoined the JPS family as a substitute and limited service teacher. He worked three years in a limited service capacity at Siwell Middle, Lanier High, and Forest Hill High schools.

Mr. Fred Nolan is married to Mrs. Kisiah Nolan, a former JPS Board member and president. His son, Fredrick Nolan, is coordinator of the JPS WATCH D.O.G.S. program. The Nolans also have two daughters: Renee Nolan Johnson of Huntsville, Alabama, and Adrienne Nolan Colar of Smyrna, Georgia. All three of their children are graduates of the Jackson Public School District.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Fred T. Nolan for his dedication to serving others.

IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 185, THE REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 185, the so-called "Regulatory Accountability Act."

Today's bill is yet another attempt by House Republicans to limit the ability of federal agen-

cies to enforce commonsense rules and regulations. While supporters of this reshaped bill claim it is needed to curb overregulation, in reality, it would simply prevent federal agencies from doing their jobs and working to ensure there are safeguards in place to protect consumer health and safety. In fact, H.R. 185 would create more red tape by imposing over 60 new barriers in the federal rulemaking process.

One of the most burdensome provisions in this legislation requires agencies to conduct a cost-benefit analysis for all proposed rules and possible alternatives, even if the rule is limited in scope and has a minimal economic impact. Moreover, agencies would be obligated to adopt the option that was the least costly in the short term, without taking into account the long term impact and costs it would have on public health and safety. This is a myopic way to govern and would create paralysis within the rulemaking process.

President Obama has already implemented significant reforms to the rulemaking process. In January 2010, the President signed an Executive Order that required agencies to determine if the benefits of proposed rules are justified considering their cost to society. He required an interagency review of overlapping rules and regulation between agencies that may prevent innovation in the private sector and instituted a policy to allow agencies to consider input from affected public and private stakeholders and experts when developing rules and regulations. Moreover, federal agencies under President Obama issued significantly less rules during his first four years in office when compared to President Bush's first term.

At a time when Congress should be doing everything it can to create jobs and improve the economy, this bill is nothing but a distraction. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

RECOGNIZING CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK 2015

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it comes as no surprise that the 2015 theme for Catholic Schools Week is "Catholic Schools: Communities of Faith, Knowledge and Service." As a man of faith and a graduate of Bishop Egan High School in Fairless Hills, I can tell you that both my wife Kathy and I have benefitted greatly from our value-centered Catholic upbringing. As have each of our six children—Katie, Maggie, Molly, Jimmy, Mick and Tommy.

In the 8th District of Pennsylvania, we have so many proud Catholic institutions to send our children to. The commitment of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia to our local community is unmatched. These local institutions have spent years building solid communities of faith and knowledge—all of which give back to the greater community in many ways. The rigorous academic curriculum, coupled with spiritual teachings of passion, kindness and respect, give our children the background they need to be upstanding citizens.

In the words of Pope Francis, "It is important not to turn in on ourselves, burying our own talent, our spiritual, intellectual, and material riches, everything that the Lord has given us, but, rather to open ourselves, to be supportive, to be attentive to others. Set your stakes on great ideals, the ideals that enlarge the heart, the ideals of service that make your talents fruitful. Life is not given to us to be jealously guarded for ourselves, but is given to us so that we may give it in turn." Our Catholic School upbringing teaches us to be the best that we can be, and in turn, use the skills that we acquire to give back to the community. I truly value everything that our local Catholic Schools bring to our area, and I am honored to celebrate with you this week.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained I was unable to cast a vote for roll call vote 44. If I had been present I would have voted "NO".

TRIBUTE TO DUPONT PIONEER CRICK RESEARCH CENTER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the construction and subsequent opening of the DuPont Pioneer Crick Research Center in Johnston, Iowa.

The \$40 million DuPont Pioneer Crick Research Center, located in Johnston, Iowa, showcases the investment toward innovation, safety and stewardship of Pioneer agricultural products and contributing to global food security. The 180,000 square foot state-of-the-art research facility will be home to over 400 Pioneer employees, and includes 84,000 sq. ft. of laboratory space, 31 conference rooms, and flexible, ergonomic work stations. The Crick Research Center features an on-site fitness center and cafeteria for employees.

I commend DuPont Pioneer and their staff for providing cutting edge agricultural services that help to improve yields and create a sustainable livelihood for farmers around the world. I urge my colleagues in the United States Congress to join me in congratulating DuPont Pioneer for their numerous achievements' including the opening of the DuPont Pioneer Crick Research Center. I wish them and all of their employees the best of luck moving forward.

RECOGNIZING MR. BOB GODSHALL

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend of mine, Pennsylvania

State Representative Bob Godshall for the 50 years of service he has given to our community, and the state of Pennsylvania. Representative Godshall has served 32 years in the Pennsylvania Legislature representing the 53rd District in Montgomery County, PA—an area which encompasses the Indian Valley portion of my Congressional District.

Prior to his work in the legislature, Bob served 3 years as Montgomery County Controller, and 17 years on the Souderton School Board. He also served 3 years as Montgomery County Open Space Director, where he helped bring Montgomery County's beautiful park system to fruition. Bob was also instrumental in the creation of the United States Constitution Center in Philadelphia—a place where thousands of visitors come to pay tribute to the founding fathers each year.

Aside from his many accomplishments, Bob has also been very kind, generous and supportive of me in my work representing the 8th Congressional District. In 2012, when I found out that my district would be taking on a new portion of Montgomery County, Bob was the first person I called. Everyone in the Indian Valley has a story about Representative Godshall, usually involving Bob "helping them, their family or their neighbor." I've never met anyone more dedicated to his community and beloved by the people who live there.

Bob—it's been a pleasure working with you and getting to know you over the past few years. Thanks for everything you have done, and continue to do for our area.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 28

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the impact of the "Budget Control Act of 2011" and sequestration on national security.

SD-106

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine MAP-21 reauthorization, focusing on Federal and state perspectives.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress, committee rules of procedure, subcommittee assignments, S. 192, to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, an original bill entitled, "Strengthening Education Through Research Act", and any pending nominations.

SD-430

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, subcommittee assignments, and rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

SD-419

10 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) budget and economic outlook for fiscal years 2015-2025.

SD-608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine freight rail transportation, focusing on enhancing safety, efficiency, and commerce.

SR-253

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of the Attorney General.

SH-216

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, and rules of procedure for the 114th Congress.

SR-428A

11 a.m.

Committee on Finance

Business meeting to consider H.R. 22, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SD-215

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine combating financial exploitation of vulnerable seniors.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine protecting America from cyber attacks, focusing on the importance of information sharing.

SD-342

Committee on Indian Affairs

Organizational business meeting to consider selection of the Chairman and

Vice Chairman of the Committee, committee rules of procedure, and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine Indian country priorities for the 114th Congress.

SD-628

4 p.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee, rules of procedure for the 114th Congress, and subcommittee assignments.

SR-328A

JANUARY 29

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine global challenges and the U.S. national security strategy.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act of 2015".

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine improving the performance of transportation networks, focusing on stakeholder perspectives.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 33, to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas.

SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine employer wellness programs, focusing on better health outcomes and lower costs.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To continue hearings to examine the nomination of the Attorney General.

SH-216

12 noon

Committee on Rules and Administration

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing

expenditures by the committee during the 114th Congress.

S-219

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold closed hearings to examine the campaign against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

SVC-217

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

FEBRUARY 11

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the Internet.

SR-253

POSTPONEMENTS

JANUARY 28

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine articulating the case for American leadership in the world, focusing on the national interest.

SD-419

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 27, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, thank You for giving us another day.

It is Your nature to hold us in Your living presence always. It is our nature to think of You or of others only momentarily or in passing.

Be with each of us that we may be our very best and prove ourselves worthy of Your love and Your grace.

Bless the Members of the people's House in their work and deliberations today that they might merit the trust of the American people and manifest the strength of our republican democracy to the nations of the world.

Without You, O Lord, we can do nothing. With You and in You, we can establish a community of peace, goodness, and justice now and forever.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUIGLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MODERNIZING 529 SAVINGS PLANS

(Ms. JENKINS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 529,

a bill that Congressman KIND of Wisconsin and I introduced to make sensible enhancements to 529 college savings plans.

The 529 plans enjoy growing popularity, primarily with middle class families who are looking for ways to responsibly prepare for the growing cost of college. The 12 million 529 accountholders across the country are able to choose a plan whose funds will then grow and be withdrawn tax free to pay for college expenses such as tuition or room and board.

H.R. 529 will make several technical changes to 529 plans that will allow students to purchase a computer using their 529 funds, remove the unnecessary distribution aggregation requirements from the accounts, and allow 529 funds to be redeposited if the student withdraws from college. These modernizations will allow 529 plans to help families get the most out of their savings.

I ask my colleagues to join me in this effort.

REMEMBERING ERNIE "MR. CUB" BANKS

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, the Chicago Cubs, baseball, and all sports has lost a legend. Ernie Banks, "Mr. Cub," passed away last Friday.

From humble beginnings, Ernie won two MVPs as a power-hitting shortstop and became an All-Star and a Hall of Famer. But perhaps more importantly, he overcame the racism he faced to become an amazing ambassador for the Cubs, his beloved Wrigley Field, and the game itself.

You could not have met a more decent, kinder, happier soul on any field of endeavor. It was for these roles that he was honored with the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Ernie, thanks for reminding us that baseball is a game that should be watched and played for fun. Indeed, let's play two. You will be missed.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, January is Human Trafficking Awareness Month, and I am pleased that the

House is taking up a number of bipartisan measures this week to help eradicate this disturbing crime and assist its victims.

To most Americans, human trafficking is something that happens in faraway lands. Unfortunately, the reality hits much closer to home. Right now, over 300,000 young Americans are in danger of falling victim to this fast-growing criminal enterprise. As both a member of the Human Trafficking Task Force and a representative for anti-trafficking advocates and organizations in my district in Pennsylvania, I am well aware of the devastating impact of this modern-day slavery here in our Nation and in our communities back home.

But 2015 can be the year we take significant steps to end this scourge. The work on the ground in Bucks and Montgomery Counties by organizations such as Worthwhile Wear, The Well, Network of Victim Assistance, as well as faith-based groups, law enforcement, and concerned citizens is making an impact and increasing awareness and strengthening our response locally.

The legislation under consideration this week on Capitol Hill allows this Congress to work together to ensure that we can support those impacted by this crime and combat and ultimately defeat human trafficking in our Nation and, hopefully, around the world.

REMEMBERING RONNIE BERLACK AND BRYCE ASTLE

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the lives of Ronnie Berlack and Bryce Astle, two members of the United States Ski Team who were taken from us far too soon by a tragic avalanche while training in Austria in early January.

These two young men dedicated themselves to representing our country with skill and dignity as members of the national ski team. They were both very talented. But, sadly, we will never know how high their stars may have risen.

Ronnie and Bryce touched many others with their love of life, their drive to compete, and their commitment to their teammates. Ronnie was a native of Franconia, New Hampshire, the same town that produced skiing great Bode Miller. He started skiing at Cannon Mountain before attending Burke

Mountain Academy in Vermont and coming into his own as a talented ski racer. Bryce spent most of his childhood in Utah, where he spent weekends skiing with his family at Alta and Snowbird. They first met while competing against each other in FIS races, before training together last summer and becoming great friends.

In the wake of this horrible tragedy, everyone who knew these two young men has spoken to their integrity, their adventurous spirits, and their big, big hearts. They spent their lives working hard at the thing they loved the most. My heart goes out to their family, their many, many friends, and the entire ski racing community.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, it is shocking: human trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world. In my home State of Ohio, the most common age a child becomes victimized by trafficking is 13 years old. At 13, a child should be looking forward to their first days of high school, not living in fear. In 2014 alone, in Ohio, 98 arrests were made in human trafficking investigations, involving 181 potential victims.

Today, the House is fighting back.

The anti-trafficking bills this week will take aim at modern trafficking networks and the criminals who seek to abuse the lives of their victims. These bills encourage States to adopt safe harbor laws, enhance services for homeless youth, and further protect children in our Nation's foster system. We must help survivors reclaim their lives through heightened public awareness and increased collaboration among governments.

Our Founders declared inherent and inalienable the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Human trafficking violates these core rights. A strong commitment to every human life will help the millions who suffer in the dark shadows of this heinous crime.

CONGRATULATIONS, COACH MIKE KRZYZEWSKI

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, to congratulate Coach Mike Krzyzewski of Duke University on becoming the first coach in the history of Division I NCAA basketball to win 1,000 games. Blue Devils everywhere are proud of

this remarkable feat, the crowning achievement of a career that has seen Coach K win four national titles and two Olympic gold medals.

As fellow Duke fans will note with relish, many of these 1,000 wins came against other storied ACC programs such as Carolina, NC State, and Wake Forest. That makes Coach K's historic achievement all the more impressive.

I taught at Duke and then represented the campus for a number of years. I know firsthand of Mike Krzyzewski's character and integrity. He is not only a world-class coach; he is also a committed educator who has trained and inspired his players to succeed in whatever they undertake in life.

The Emily Krzyzewski Center in Durham, behind which Mike was the driving force, stands as a memorial to his mother and as a sign of his dedication to at-risk youth as they aspire to a college education.

So on behalf of the Duke community, whose core values Coach K exemplifies, and on behalf of the House of Representatives, congratulations. We look forward to watching you build on your winning tradition for many years to come.

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, earlier this month the United States Department of Agriculture announced \$370 million for 115 conservation projects in 50 States. These dollars are a result of the Regional Conservation Partnership Program which was recently created in the 2014 farm bill by the consolidation of numerous regional conservation programs previously authorized under the 2008 law.

This RCPP funding will also leverage an additional \$400 million through non-Federal matching funds. Roughly 40 percent of these total dollars are going towards national or multistate projects, and about 35 percent towards "critical conservation areas," which include the Great Lakes region, the Chesapeake Bay watershed, as well as other high priority agricultural regions.

As chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, the committee will be closely watching how USDA administers this critical program through oversight of the conservation title in the coming year.

I strongly support commonsense, voluntary agriculture conservation. I look forward to working with USDA and the various stakeholders on how to make these programs as effective and results driven as possible.

CONGRATULATIONS, COACH MIKE KRZYZEWSKI

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise with Congressman PRICE to recognize the head coach of Duke University men's basketball team on becoming the winningest Division I men's basketball coach in our Nation's history.

Coach Mike Krzyzewski's 1,000th career victory came Sunday afternoon in New York City at Madison Square Garden against the Red Storm of St. John's University, a thrilling second half game.

Over his 35 years as their head coach, he has led the Blue Devils to four NCAA Division I championships, 13 ACC tournament championships, and 12 ACC regular season championships. People like Grant Hill, Johnny Dawkins, Shane Battier, and even my son-in-law, Dahntay Jones, all honed their skills under the watchful eye of Coach K and went on to successful careers in the NBA.

Coach K is a four-time Olympic gold medal winner—in 1984 and 1992 as Team USA's assistant coach, and in 2008 and 2012 as its head coach. In his most recent book, entitled, "The Gold Standard: Building a World-Class Team," Coach K has said leading Team USA to gold was one of the "most gratifying experiences" of his life.

Mike Krzyzewski's accomplishments are impressive by any measure. Perhaps most impressive, though, is his work off the basketball court. In addition to supporting countless charities over the years, he and his wife, Mickie, founded the Emily Krzyzewski Center, named in honor of his mother. The center mentors school-aged children to prepare them with the skills needed for college and beyond.

When asked what he would like to be remembered for, Coach K said: "Just the fact that I'm an honest man, a truthful person, and somebody who cares about people, not just himself."

Coach K serves as an inspiration to so many around the Nation and the world. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Coach Mike Krzyzewski on his historic 1,000 victories.

□ 1215

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my south Florida colleague, Congressman TED DEUTCH, in a resolution commemorating today, the

International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi extermination camp at Auschwitz.

Today serves as a somber and grim reminder of the evil mankind is capable of as over 1.3 million people were systematically murdered in Auschwitz alone, including over 1.1 million Jews. As painful as it is to speak about the horrors of Auschwitz, we have a moral obligation to honor the memories of those who were murdered during modern humanity's darkest period.

As anti-Semitism grows throughout Europe, we must take a solemn vow that these deaths were not in vain and that we will never forget, that we will never allow such atrocities to occur again.

BORDER SECURITY BILL IS DANGEROUS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, it is now week 4 in the new Republican Congress. There is still no jobs bill anywhere in sight. Instead of taking up an infrastructure bill or a minimum wage bill to give working families bigger paychecks, we are seeing a dangerous immigration bill that will actually hurt our Nation's security.

Next week, Republican leadership is abandoning a bipartisan border security bill from the last Congress and instead trying to pass an irresponsible and unworkable \$10 billion bill that simply appeases the extreme voices within their caucus.

Border security experts say this bill would be ineffective. They call it unserious and dangerous for our Nation's security. Secretary Jeh Johnson says that if enacted, it would actually leave the border less secure.

This does not combat threats or secure our border. It simply requires the Federal Government to spend billions of dollars of taxpayer money on unnecessary projects.

If we really wanted to do something here in this House about border security, let's bring up the Border Security Results Act that was unanimously passed by the Homeland Security Committee in the last Congress, bipartisan and unanimous, and it would get things done.

OPERATION TAXPAYER INITIATIVE

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, Granite Staters are fed up with Washington's wasteful ways. The government's irresponsible spending has led to billions of your dollars being wasted to fund projects that already exist. In-

stead of ensuring that the most truly in need receive a hand up, your taxpayer dollars are instead being handed out to increase Washington's bureaucracy.

That is why I have launched Operation TAXPAYER, an ongoing initiative designed to eliminate the wasteful plaguing of our government, running up our debt, and crowding out funding for worthwhile programs.

As part of this initiative, I have introduced H. Res. 45, a bipartisan bill to fundamentally alter the way legislation is brought to the House floor.

Under H. Res. 45, every piece of legislation awaiting consideration by Congress would receive a duplication score by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, with the goal of providing Members the necessary knowledge to identify whether or not a new bill creates a new program or project that already exists within our government.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan step that will allow our government to finally take sizable bites out of our debt and deficit while ensuring the protection of safety nets for all Americans.

SECURE OUR BORDER ACT WILL COMPOUND SECURITY CONCERNS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, cancellation of this week's vote of the Secure Our Border Act is a relief for northern border communities, including my western New York district.

This legislation would require a biometric exit system at every border crossing which would duplicate inspections and significantly slow the flow of people and goods across the northern border.

The Beyond the Border agreement already allows for exit data to be shared between Canadian and U.S. officials; thus, the implementation of this system at the northern border would be redundant at least.

Already congested border crossings, such as the Peace Bridge in western New York, would see longer delays which would ultimately create disastrous economic effects and compound security concerns. A Peace Bridge authority official said that implementation of this program would effectively shut down the northern border.

Investments in personnel and infrastructure should be made along our borders, but we must take into consideration the unique needs of northern and southern border communities and protect the strong economic relationship that is essential to the United States and Canadian economies.

THE WORLD NEEDS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join in remembering one of the darkest stains on the history of the world.

Today, on International Holocaust Remembrance Day, we pay homage to the lives that were lost and remember the freedom that triumphed the day the death camps were liberated. On this day 70 years ago, thousands of prisoners were liberated at Auschwitz, the Nazi death camp where over a million Jews lost their lives.

In all, more than 6 million Jews were killed by the Nazis, wiping out a part of European culture that existed for more than a thousand years. Today, Europe confronts a new wave of anti-Semitism as we witnessed in the murders recently at the kosher market in Paris.

What the world needs is religious freedom and the promotion of faith as a force for good. We also need strong military alliances that suppress racial hatred and genocide whenever it raises its ugly head.

After the death camps were liberated, Jews still confronted an anti-Semitic Europe, and they made their way to Israel. When they fought for the war of independence in 1948, half the soldiers were survivors from the death camps.

Today, when we remember the victims, let us also remember that it was the liberation of the survivors that helped found a new state: the state of tolerance, democracy, and freedom that Israel so proudly embodies.

REMEMBERING JERRY "J.R." MCBRIDE

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, as the 114th Congress continues to set its course for the coming term, I rise today to honor Jerry "J.R." McBride, a member of the DuPage County Board, who died of cancer in October at the young age of 47.

I rise not to dwell on his passing but to suggest that we all may take a moment to learn a few lessons from his life. J.R., as he was affectionately called, lived his life by focusing on the needs of others.

He was a family man. He cared deeply about his wife, Becky, and his five children. He was a community man, helping more area nonprofit organizations than I have time to mention here.

Perhaps most important for those of us in Congress, J.R. was a public servant who put the needs of his community and his constituents ahead of politics and partisanship.

J.R. was an equal opportunity listener and a friend to Republicans and Democrats alike. He knew the importance of cooperation and of compromise, of humor and humanity. He saw in his fellow public servants the common aspiration to do what is right for the people that we have been elected to represent.

Mr. McBride recognized that we are all in this together, and he was committed to working together for the greater good. That lesson, along with his accomplishments for DuPage County and his memory, will live on.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS A HEINOUS CRIME

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this week, we will take up legislation that helps combat one of the fastest growing, most despicable criminal enterprises in the world: human trafficking.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, we had a reported 82 incidents of human trafficking cases last year and a reported 426 calls of human trafficking violations. I am pleased that late last year, Pennsylvania added itself as a State that enacted stricter human trafficking laws, as have most other States nationwide. Pennsylvania was also named as one of the five most improved States.

Our work on this issue, though, is far from over. Legislation this week takes important steps in the right direction, by streamlining law enforcement resources. It enhances victim services, and it criminalizes those who knowingly advertise the commercial exploitation of children. It also allows Federal grants to support shelters for victims.

I applaud the efforts of my colleagues in the House for raising awareness of this heinous crime, and I encourage bipartisan support of all of the human trafficking legislation that we are considering this week.

WE MUST REMAIN VIGILANT IN PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp.

Seventy years ago, following the atrocities of the Holocaust—which left 6 million Jews, 1 million Roma, 250,000 mentally and physically disabled individuals, and 9,000 homosexuals brutally murdered simply because they were

different—the world's democracies stood together and declared: "Never again."

These two simple and powerful words greet visitors to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum as a reminder that it is our collective responsibility to promote religious tolerance and stand up against persecution or totalitarianism in any form.

The recent attacks at a kosher market and at the satirical magazine *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris, the kidnapping of 276 Christian schoolgirls by Boko Haram in Nigeria, and beheading by the Islamic State of journalists and of 13 teenage boys last week for the simple act of watching a soccer game underscore the unfortunate and troubling reminder that we must remain vigilant and undeterred in our fight to protect the most human rights.

"Never again" must be more than an aspirational statement; it must be fact.

THE TRAGIC REALITY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. YOUNG of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the tragic yet growing reality of human trafficking. This evil exists even in the United States of America. Here at home, 300,000 young Americans are in danger of becoming victims of sex trafficking.

Most troubling is how quickly these youths vanish in the shadows. Within 48 hours of being on the street, one in three kids will be lured into sexual exploitation, according to the National Network for Runaway Youth.

That is why we must build awareness. Education is power. Please seek out the organizations that can educate you so that you can make a difference. In Iowa, we have the Iowa Network Against Human Trafficking, Iowa Teens Against Human Trafficking, Braking Traffik, and many, many other fantastic community and religious organizations working to raise awareness and combat human trafficking in the State.

Look them up. Get involved. We will work together to end trafficking because our women and children are not safe. This isn't something that just happens across the oceans; this is happening at home.

MERCHANT MARINERS ARE OWED A DEBT OF GRATITUDE

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, in World War II, more than 200,000 brave Americans answered the call of duty by joining the merchant marine, braving troubled seas to deliver crucial supplies to

the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific. They faced enemy attack. Thousands perished at sea, and hundreds more were captured.

Unfortunately, the veterans of the merchant marine who risked their lives in the service of this Nation were never eligible for the provisions of the GI bill that helped millions of veterans go to college, secure a home, and transition seamlessly into civilian life.

To right this wrong, I am introducing the Honoring Our World War II Merchant Mariners Act of 2015. This bill would provide the one-time payment of \$25,000 to fewer than 5,000 surviving World War II mariners.

With many of these forgotten heroes well into their nineties, time is running out to repay this debt of gratitude. I encourage my colleagues to act quickly in cosponsoring this important legislation.

□ 1230

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I was pleased that the Speaker expressed support for infrastructure improvements on "60 Minutes" last Sunday.

America is in desperate need of repair.

Officials in San Diego just reported that it would take \$3.9 billion to maintain their infrastructure, and there is no doubt that my colleagues are facing similar circumstances in their home districts.

The longer we wait, the longer we drag our feet on this issue, the bigger the price tag grows. The economic benefits of an improved infrastructure are clear. S&P is estimating that \$1.3 billion in infrastructure investment creates 29,000 construction jobs, and that is not including indirect job creation.

But we all know this is more than an economic issue. We are risking the safety of the American people who are traveling every day on crumbling roads and bridges.

Madam Speaker, what are we waiting for? There is much to gain by acting and yet so much to lose by doing nothing.

BOKO HARAM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring, recognizing, and respecting those who traveled through the devastation and horror of the Holocaust. To those who lost their lives, I prayerfully mourn them. For those who survived, I champion them and thank them and make a

commitment as we have done as brothers and sisters, Republicans and Democrats, and as Americans: Never again.

I rise as well to speak of the heinousness of the acts of Boko Haram and the killing and murderous acts against innocent children in Nigeria. We must stand together and act against this crisis. We must recognize that this bloodshed will not stop.

I am grateful that Secretary Kerry is in Nigeria and collaborating on what the next steps are. I want to thank the United States military, which has provided insight and cooperation.

But, Madam Speaker, there needs to be more. We need to have a waiver of some of the provisions dealing with utilization and collaboration in the Nigerian military. We must ask them to do what is right. We cannot sit by while the bloodletting Boko Haram continues to kill women and children across Nigeria. Enough—it must stop now.

DECLARING WAR ON IMMIGRANTS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, last week, House Republicans voted to eliminate DAPA, a program that would protect nearly 40 percent of undocumented immigrants, promote family unity, and boost our economy. They also voted to end DACA, which has helped some 630,000 DREAMers, including 10,000 in Nevada, come out of the shadows and pursue the American Dream.

This Republican attack is not only being waged at the Federal level. Yesterday, Nevada's Republican attorney general joined more than two dozen other States in a lawsuit challenging President Obama's executive action on immigration, although every President since Eisenhower has used similar executive authority to protect immigrants in our country.

So what then is the real reason for this declaring war on immigrants? Could it be that they want to keep a desperate underclass to fill those low-wage, no-benefit jobs? Or do some fear that these folks might become citizens and vote them out of office? Regardless of the reason, these modern day know-nothings should be ashamed of themselves.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF GLOBAL SAI MOVEMENT

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Global Sai Movement, which celebrates the teachings and ideals of

Shirdi Sai Baba, the most respected of the 19th century Indian perfect masters and renowned for his teachings of respect, compassion, and acceptance. He transcended religious barriers, earning accolades from Hindus, Christians, and Muslims.

Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy deserves great credit for his earnest and humble leadership of the Global Sai Movement. Since 1989, Dr. Satpathy has proven himself to be an exemplary leader, working to improve the welfare of others in the spirit of Sai Baba's teachings.

He has established nearly 350 cultural and community centers around the world and has sponsored international cultural and spiritual festivals.

At a time when many parts of the world are in turmoil, much of it due to sectarian divisions, Dr. Satpathy and the Global Sai Movement offer a bridge of goodwill and vision for a peaceful future.

REMEMBERING LEON COUNTY SHERIFF LARRY CAMPBELL

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Madam Speaker, today I rise to remember and honor Leon County Sheriff Larry Campbell, who after 50 years of public service lost a long-fought battle with cancer on December 24, 2014.

Sheriff Campbell first joined the Sheriff's Office during his senior year at Florida State University after serving in the Marine Corps. He was elected sheriff in 1996, a position of trust he would hold until his passing.

Sheriff Campbell was respected by law enforcement across our State for his leadership. He was also well known for being an avid supporter of charitable causes, including the United Way and American Heart Association.

Sheriff Campbell is survived by his wife, Michelle; his son, Jack; and two daughters, Jeannette and Stephanie.

Our community will remember Sheriff Campbell as a dedicated public servant. We owe him and his family a great debt of gratitude.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Speaker will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION, INTERVENTION, AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 350) to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 350

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogues the activities of the Federal Government and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses, preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking, the commercial sexual exploitation of children, and other similar topics that the Task Force determines appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report, which shall include—

(1) information on the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) information on each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking”.

SEC. 5. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “victim of trafficking” has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 350, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in favor of H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015 introduced by Representative KRISTI NOEM of South Dakota.

As we have heard on the floor repeatedly this week, human trafficking generally and child sex trafficking specifically is a horrible crime that sadly exists in all corners of our country. Studies suggest that over 290,000 youth are at risk of human trafficking in the United States, with children as young as 12 years old becoming victims of commercial sexual abuse. While Federal, State, and local law enforcement have made great strides to combat and eradicate human trafficking, there remains work to be done on this front.

As in all things, to effectively combat human trafficking, we must first fully understand the problem. H.R. 350 requires the existing Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to survey and catalogue the methods being employed by our Federal and State governments to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses and to report on best practices that can improve the response. The bill also directs the Government Accountability Office to report on Federal and State efforts to fight trafficking, including the grant programs aimed at assisting victims and fighting this crime.

Finally, in order to help young victims move on from their trauma, H.R.

350 clarifies that existing Federal trafficking grants may be used for programs that provide housing for victims of sex trafficking. Currently, 29 States do not have shelter beds dedicated to the victims of sex trafficking. This provision would help address that travesty.

Similar legislation was passed in the House last Congress but was not enacted into law.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here and on the other side of the Capitol to pass this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015. As a result of those consultations, I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further consideration of that bill, so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 350, the Foreign Affairs Committee does not waive jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this, or any other, legislation. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 350.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 350, the “Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015.” As you noted, the Committee on Foreign Affairs was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of H.R. 350 so that it could proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Foreign Affairs is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 350.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third-largest criminal enterprise in the world. The scourge of our society is estimated to be a \$9 billion industry in the United States and as much as a \$30 billion industry worldwide.

All of the criminals and all of those who wish to do wrong realize that it is a bigger and better business than drugs because, tragically and unfortunately and with great sadness, they use their product over and over again. They use these innocent persons, many women, many children, many boys, over and over again.

Because this criminal activity rarely occurs in public view, it is difficult to say exactly how many children are being victimized. What we do know, however, is that the problem is extensive. All you have to do is walk along any of the streets of major cities and find homeless teenagers, or even younger than that, and you will find out that in some way they have been tainted and touched and brutalized by sex trafficking.

Madam Speaker, an estimated 290,000 American children are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that one of every seven endangered runaways who reported to the center are likely victims of minor sex trafficking.

I am told that the average age of minors entering the sex trade is between 12 and 14 years old. Vulnerable youth are primary targets. They are more easily lured into prostitution and other forms of child exploitation, while runaways and children in foster care are especially vulnerable. Child victims of sex trafficking can and do come from a type of home or socioeconomic background that makes them particularly, if you will, in the line of fire.

The bottom line, however, Madam Speaker, is that all of these children are deserving of rescue, recovery, protection, and shelter. One of the advocacies that I had in my own hometown was to provide for children in foster care that had aged out, because those are likely victims, unbeknownst to themselves, and they are worthy of saving.

The bill before us, H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015, is an important step toward pursuing traffickers and those who solicit the services of trafficked individuals. It mandates a review of Federal and State prevention activities by the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and

Combat Trafficking, and this review is to be done in consultation with nongovernmental organizations. That is a great partnership.

The purpose of this review is to identify best practices in the prevention of trafficking. This study, along with the mandated GAO, will provide much-needed intelligence to be shared among those Federal, State, and local agencies dedicated to combating sex trafficking.

And might I add, Madam Speaker, that what is also needed is a commitment, an investment of resources, to not just have the studies but to make sure that we match the importance of this legislation with resources.

Witnesses testified at a Homeland Security Committee field hearing in Houston in March of last year, which I convened and brought Members of Congress to Houston for, which has a particularly serious problem.

First, one of the biggest limitations on the ability of area law enforcement agencies to successfully combat human trafficking in and around Houston is a lack of data sharing. Another witness said we—local enforcement—need the Feds to build a Houston trafficking regional database accessible only to vice and human trafficking personnel to store, share, and search data on all aspects of Houston-area human trafficking investigations.

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, the need for the information that will be collected by the GAO study and the Interagency Task Force to monitor and combat trafficking is not only needed, it is long overdue.

This bill also addresses a major concern that anti-trafficking advocates have shared with me—the lack of housing or shelter for survivors. Trafficked kids need a way out, someplace to escape. Without such refuge, these children will return to their traffickers, and their traffickers will be waiting for them. This bill provides funding for local shelters so they get the support they need to house survivors and to get these young people started on the path to recovery.

Today, we are considering several bills that address domestic minor sex trafficking, and it is right that we do all we can to protect our children. Most statistics indicate that the average age of a female when she is first victimized in human trafficking is a very young year of age. With this fact alone, we can understand why the majority of Federal investigations and prosecutions of trafficking involve minors. One of the statements we made on the floor today with all of these bills is that the minors are victims—they are not the criminals—and they need to be saved. That is what we are committing to.

I will share with you the testimony of another witness at last year's field hearing. The witness said:

Many of the females my officers are encountering on the streets, in the massage parlors, at the strip clubs, and on the Internet sites are typically 18 to 21. We know from experience that, while these young women may be adults now, they have, with all likelihood, been under the control of a pimp trafficker for many years.

Madam Speaker, I met those women. Yes, they have been under the horrible domination of these traffickers for many years, and some were sold by their parents. We need to take definitive steps to ensure that this group of victims does not fall through the cracks because we are focusing on the minors. We do this by ensuring that the laws we pass and the supportive assistance we establish are also available to these older young women.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act. I compliment the sponsors and cosponsors, and I encourage them to remember that there are still those other victims of human trafficking who are equally deserving of our consideration and protection. While we will accomplish much in combating human trafficking by our actions today, let us commit ourselves to doing more.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 350, the "Human Trafficking Prevention, Intervention and Recovery Act of 2015."

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime, and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world. This scourge of our society is estimated to be a \$9.8 billion industry in the United States and as much as a \$30 billion industry worldwide. Because this criminal activity rarely occurs in public view, it is difficult to say exactly how many children are being victimized. What we do know, however, is that the problem is extensive.

Madam Speaker, an estimated 290,000 American children are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children estimates that one of every seven endangered runaways reported to the Center are likely victims of minor sex trafficking. I am told that the average age of minors entering the sex trade is between 12 and 14 years. Vulnerable youth are primary targets. They are more easily lured into prostitution and other forms of child exploitation, and while runaways and children in foster care are especially vulnerable, child victims of sex trafficking can and do come from any type of home or socioeconomic background.

The bottom line, however, Madam Speaker, is that all of these children are deserving of rescue, recovery, protection and shelter. The bill before us, H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking, Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Act of 2015, is an important step toward pursuing traffickers and those who solicit the services of trafficked individuals. It mandates a review of federal and state prevention activities by the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, and this review is to

be done in consultation with nongovernmental organizations. The purpose of this review is to identify best practices in the prevention of trafficking. This study, along with the mandated GAO will provide much-needed intelligence to be shared among those federal, state and local agencies dedicated to combatting sex trafficking.

Witnesses at a Homeland Security Committee field hearing held in Houston in March of last year testified,

First, one of the biggest limitations on the ability of area law enforcement agencies to successfully combat Human Trafficking in and around Houston is our lack of data sharing.

Another witness stated,

We (local law enforcement) need the feds to build a Houston Trafficking Regional Database, accessible only to Vice/Human Trafficking personnel to store, share, and search data on all aspects of Houston area Human Trafficking investigations.

Madam Speaker, the need for the information that will be collected by the GAO study and the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking is not only needed. It is long overdue!

This bill also addresses a major concern that anti-trafficking advocates have shared with me—the lack of housing or shelter for survivors. Trafficked kids need a way out, some place to escape to. Without such a refuge, these children will return to their traffickers. This bill provides the funding for local shelters to get the support they need to house survivors and get these young people started on the path to recovery.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering several bills that address domestic minor sex trafficking, and it is right that we do all we can to protect our children. Most statistics indicate that the average age of a female when she is first victimized into Human Trafficking is years old. For this fact alone, we can understand why the majority of federal investigations and prosecutions of human trafficking involve minors.

I must share with you, however, the testimony of another witness at last year's field Houston field hearing. That witness said,

... (many of the females that my officers are encountering on the streets, in the massage parlors and strip clubs, and on the internet sites are typically age 18-21. We know from experience that while these young women may be adults now, they have, in all likelihood been under the control of a pimp/trafficker for many years. We need to take definitive steps to ensure that this group of 'victims' does not fall through the cracks because we are focusing on the minors by ensuring that the laws we pass and the support/assistance we establish is also available to these young women.

In closing, Madam Speaker I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 350, the Human Trafficking, Prevention, Intervention and Recovery Act of 2015, and I encourage them to remember that there are still those other victims of human trafficking who are equally deserving of our consideration and protection. While we will accomplish much in combating human trafficking by our actions today, there is still much more to be done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may

consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), the author of this bill.

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, for many years, my perspective of human trafficking was based off of a scene I had seen in a movie. It was a scene in which a father came to a playground, took the hand of his 6-year-old daughter, took her off to have sex with someone, and then brought her back to play. That was a scene from a country far, far away, but it changed me forever. Oftentimes, when I have thought about human trafficking or sex trafficking over those years, I have thought about its being far, far away from home. Then I began to learn about what a problem we have here in the United States.

It is not just happening in other countries. It happens here. It happens in States like New York, Florida, and California, but it also happens in South Dakota, and that is devastating for me for many reasons. I have two daughters, and I know that the average age that a young girl is trafficked is between the ages of 12 and 14. I have a son who is 12, and the average age of boys who are trafficked is between the ages of 11 and 13. I cannot imagine my children having to go through what some of these victims have had to go through.

I also spent my life involved in many different youth organizations. I have been a children's minister for many years. I still teach Sunday school. I have also been involved with 4-H. I have spent my life with kids, trying to help their lives become better so that they can build the kinds of traits and character they need to benefit the world. I recognize that many children don't have those opportunities; yet I see the devastating effects of this industry here in our country.

They say one of the first steps to recovery is admitting that you have a problem. We have got a huge problem in this country, and that is why you will find these bills on the House floor today. We want to make sure that we not only recognize that there is a problem, but that we give our law enforcement officers as many tools as possible to get rid of this industry and to help as many victims as possible.

Hundreds of thousands of children are trafficked every single year in the United States. Most of these victims are women and girls. Many come from tough backgrounds that have led them to the situations they are in today; but did you know that most of them, if they are involved in the sex trafficking industry, are forced to have sex 25 to 48 times a day? That is unfathomable to me. We as a nation have a responsibility to do everything that we can to prevent trafficking. When prevention efforts fail, we have a responsibility to help those victims recover.

I know many of my colleagues today have also made this a priority, and I

am grateful for their leadership on this issue. Last year, we passed many of these bills through this House, but they got hung up in the Senate even though they were extremely bipartisan over here in the House. That is why they are back again today, because we need to get these bills signed into law to save our children.

Now, as we begin the 114th Congress, our resolve is brought forward again to fight against human trafficking. I am grateful for everyone here today who has sponsored the bills, who has worked on behalf of these bills, and I am grateful for their leadership to make sure that we pass these bills and get them signed into law.

The bill that I have sponsored here today is going to make sure that when we spend Federal resources that they are spent in a manner that is going to actually help kids and help people get out of this industry. It is going to make sure that we are cooperating with nonprofits and with other organizations that have been involved in the industry before and that were being effective while we put those efforts forward. Then it is going to make sure that we have the dollars available to have shelters for those victims who are trying to come out of this situation. We have fewer than 200 beds available for victims in this country who want to recover, who want to heal, and who want to get on with their lives in pursuing the American Dream, like so many other people in this country have. That is why this bill is important. That is why all of these bills are important. It is why we need to pass them.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as I have no further requests for time, I will just close by saying our children need our response. They are suffering. It is important that we work together to minimally provide them with the shelter that they need and with the resources that they need to eliminate the scourge of human trafficking and sex trafficking. With that, I ask for the support of the underlying legislation, H.R. 350.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I think this is an example that this House can do important things on a bipartisan basis. I commend the gentlewoman from South Dakota for introducing the legislation, and I commend the gentlewoman from Texas for supporting the legislation, and I urge an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 350.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 159) to stop exploitation through trafficking, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 159

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. SAFE HARBOR INCENTIVES.

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(c), by striking "where feasible" and all that follows, and inserting the following: "where feasible, to an application—

"(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

"(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law that—

"(A) treats a minor who has engaged in, or has attempted to engage in, a commercial sex act as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

"(B) discourages the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

"(C) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including child welfare services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services."; and

(2) in section 1709, by inserting at the end the following:

"(5) 'commercial sex act' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

"(6) 'minor' means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

"(7) 'severe form of trafficking in persons' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)."

SEC. 3. REPORT ON RESTITUTION PAID IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "1590," the following: "1591,";

(2) by striking "and 1594" and inserting "1594, 2251, 2251A, 2421, 2422, and 2423";

(3) in clause (iv), by striking "and" at the end;

(4) in clause (v), by striking "and" at the end; and

(5) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

"(vi) the number of individuals required by a court order to pay restitution in connection with a violation of each offense under title 18, United States Code, the amount of

restitution required to be paid under each such order, and the amount of restitution actually paid pursuant to each such order; and

“(vii) the age, gender, race, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role in the offense of individuals convicted under each offense; and”.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.

Section 107(b)(2) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.—Beginning in fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, of amounts made available for grants under this paragraph, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make grants for a national communication system to assist victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons in communicating with service providers. The Secretary shall give priority to grant applicants that have experience in providing telephone services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.”.

SEC. 5. JOB CORPS ELIGIBILITY.

Section 144(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3194(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)). Notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual described in this subparagraph shall not be required to demonstrate eligibility under such paragraph.”.

SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.

Section 566(e)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

“(D) assist State, local, and other Federal law enforcement agencies, upon the request of such an agency, in locating and recovering missing children.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 159, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This weekend is one of America's greatest sports traditions—the Super Bowl. As most Americans huddle around the television, either rooting for their teams or against the rival as the case may be, sadly, many American children are huddled on the streets or in hotel rooms—the victims of sex trafficking.

A sinister side to major sporting events and to other large events is that a portion of the attendants come looking to abuse young children as much as they come for the headline events. While no one knows exactly how much the incidence of child sex trafficking increases during these events, it is known that pimps do bring children and other victims from around the country to offer them for sale at the Super Bowl and at other similar events. During last year's Super Bowl, the FBI and other law enforcement agencies arrested more than 45 traffickers and rescued 16 child victims of sex trafficking, including victims as young as 13 years old and some who had been reported missing by their families.

Compounding this tragedy is the fact that most States have no exception to their prostitution laws for minor victims of trafficking. These children must often fear arrest and prosecution when law enforcement manages to locate and rescue some sex trafficking victims. This must stop. In recognizing the need for protection and support for the growing number of child victims of commercial sex trafficking, an increasing number of States have taken steps to establish so-called “safe harbor” provisions that either decriminalize minor prostitution or divert minor victims to the services and support needed for recovery.

H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, introduced by Mr. PAULSEN of Minnesota and Ms. MOORE of my own State of Wisconsin, seeks to continue this trend by encouraging the States, through preferential treatment in the Federal COPS grants, to enact safe harbor legislation that ensures these victims are treated as victims and not as criminals and that they are directed to support services and not to detention facilities.

The bill also codifies a “national human trafficking hotline” that ensures young victims are eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps program. It requires the Attorney General to report on sex offender convictions, and it clarifies the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service to help locate and recover missing children, many of whom are vulnerable to becoming sex trafficking victims.

This bill passed the Judiciary Committee by voice vote. Similar legislation passed on the House floor unanimously last Congress, but it was not enacted into law.

There is no such thing as a child prostitute—just victims of commercial

sexual abuse at the hands of adults, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 159.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 159, the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015.” Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 159 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 159, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill, or any other similar legislation, and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, January 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,

Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 159, the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015,” which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably to the House on January 21, 2015.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 159 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

Finally, I am pleased to include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 159.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The manager, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, is right. These are certainly both cases and legislation that, one, we are appalled at with the case studies that we

have seen and with the legislation that we seek in a bipartisan manner to solve that exploitation.

I rise in support of H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015. The Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act is another weapon in the war against sex trafficking in our country.

Madam Speaker, we are truly at war. As we stand here today, some child is being sex-trafficked—some runaway who is away from her family, not able to be found, not finding a place of refuge—falling into the deadly hands, if you will, of someone who will take advantage of her almost for the rest of her life. In Houston, I met women who had engaged in or who had been subjected to that in the early part of their lives, and they will tell you how it follows them for a long, long time, so they subject themselves to drugs and alcohol to eliminate the pain.

This bill contains important victim-based initiatives to help combat sex trafficking. One of those initiatives, the national safe harbor law, is essential to making sure that victims of sex trafficking are not criminalized but, instead, are diverted to Child Protective Services. Only 12 States have safe harbor laws for minor victims of sex trafficking. That is far too few. Obviously, we need all 50 States to have this safe harbor.

My colleagues, there is no such thing as a child prostitute. There are only child victims of rape. Children cannot give consent. There is no such thing as a child prostitute. Likewise, it is illegal for adults to have sex with children, children who by their very ages are under the age of consent. Sex with a minor, again, is rape. The seriousness of the offense is not diminished by having the john pay for the sex, making him feel good. It is still rape. It is time we stopped referring to the customer—the person having sex with a child—with such a polite title as a “john.”

In addition, we must label those who provide the johns with children, with minors, as what they are—horrific and horrible and vile criminals. The person who is the john is a rapist, a child rapist. We must punish those who prey on the vulnerable, and that includes not only the pimps and the traffickers, but also the rapists.

□ 1300

On the other hand, in an effort to help their recovery, we must not continue to victimize the victims. This bill empowers victims by providing for a national hotline to request help. The importance of this national hotline must not be underestimated.

In my earlier statement, I spoke of a field hearing that I convened last March in Houston as a member of the Homeland Security Committee. During that hearing, Mr. McClelland, the chief of the Houston Police Department, tes-

tified that an 18-year-old victim of human trafficking contacted the national hotline asking for help to escape her violent pimp.

The young victim had been forced to have sex with a john who ended up stabbing her and leaving without paying any money—a stabbing. She was fearful and wanted to get the money. It was a horrible situation.

While her injuries were not life threatening, she did require medical attention for her injuries. However, the pimp refused to take her to get medical treatment, and she owed him to make up the money that the previous john who stabbed her did not pay.

Vice's human trafficking unit received the information from hotline personnel and were able to contact, locate, and rescue the young female. They also arrested the pimp and charged him with felony of compelling prostitution. Madam Speaker, I wish there was a harsher charge, but it was good work by the local law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, this story ends well. The young victim was reunited with family members that same day. This case serves as a great example of how law enforcement and nongovernmental organizations can successfully work together to not only rescue victims of human trafficking, but also arrest the perpetrators of this crime and get them off the street and away from other victims who are still out there.

H.R. 159 also helps victims obtain restitution, and this is what I like; it puts them back on the right track by giving them eligibility for the Job Corps program, where we have seen lives turn around. It wants to say to them: You are valuable, you are worthy, and you have a future.

This bill will help ensure that all victims of sex trafficking are treated as victims in every State and every jurisdiction. For these reasons, I join with my colleague, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and urge my colleagues to support this legislation as well.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 159, the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015.”

The Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act is another weapon in the war against sex trafficking in our country. This bill contains important victim-based initiatives to help combat sex trafficking. One of those initiatives, the National Safe Harbor Law, is essential to making sure that victims of sex trafficking are not criminalized, but instead are diverted to child protective services. Only 12 states have safe harbor laws for minor victims of sex trafficking.

My colleagues, there is no such thing as a “child prostitute”; there are only child victims of rape. Likewise, it is illegal for adults to have sex with children who, by their very age, are under the age of consent. Sex with a minor is rape! The seriousness of the offense is not diminished by having the “john” pay for the sex. It is still rape, and it's time we stopped referring to the customer, the person having sex

with a child, with such a polite title as a “john.” He is a rapist, a child rapist! We must punish those who prey on the vulnerable, and that includes not only the pimps and traffickers but also the rapists.

On the other hand, we must not continue to victimize the victims. In an effort to help their recovery, this bill empowers victims with a national hotline to request help. The importance of this national hotline must not be underestimated.

In my earlier statement, I spoke of a field hearing that the Committee on Homeland Security held in Houston in March of last year. During that hearing Mr. Charles McClelland, Jr, Chief of Police, of the Houston Police Department, testified,

... an 18 year old female victim of Human Trafficking ... contacted the National Human Trafficking Resource Center Hotline asking for help to escape her violent pimp. The young victim had been forced to have sex with a “john” who ended up stabbing her and leaving without paying her any money. While her injuries were not life threatening, she did require medical attention for her injuries, however, the pimp refused to take her to get medical treatment until she earned him more money to make up for the money that the previous “john” did not pay. Vice/Human Trafficking Unit personnel received the information from Hotline personnel, and were able to contact, locate, and rescue the young female, and also arrest the pimp and charge him with felony compelling prostitution.

Madam Speaker, this story ends well. This young victim was reunited with family members that same day. This case serves as a great example of how law enforcement and non-governmental organizations can successfully work together to not only rescue victims of Human Trafficking, but also arrest the perpetrators of this crime and get them off the street and away from other victims who are still out there.

H.R. 159 also helps victims obtain restitution and grants them eligibility for Job Corps programs. This bill will help ensure that all victims of sex trafficking are treated as victims in every state and in every jurisdiction.

For these reasons I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), the principal author of the bill.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is easy and comfortable to think that sex trafficking only happens in countries outside the United States. The truth is that more than 100,000 are at risk of being trafficked for commercial sex here in the United States each and every year, here in America.

We have a word for a situation when one group of people is dehumanized and has their basic human rights snuffed out for someone else's economic gain. That word is slavery. The problem we have today is not a thing of the past. It is not from some remote corner of the world that you can't find on a map.

Slavery in the form of human trafficking is happening right now. It is happening in our cities, suburbs, and rural communities. It is happening in each and every one of our congressional districts.

I am sad to say that Minneapolis, Minnesota, my home State, has actually been listed as one of the 13th largest centers for sexual exploitation of children in the entire country.

I realize how critical it is to educate our community about what I have learned from talking to victims like Dayanna, who became a 13-year-old trafficking victim. Dayanna didn't get a lot of love and attention from her mother or family.

While she took it upon herself to take care of her brothers and sisters, she longed for someone to give her love and attention. She ended up being seduced by a man who promised to be her "boyfriend."

Guess what? At age 13, within days after running away with him, she found herself being trafficked in Chicago and Philadelphia, without a home and separated from her family. Only a daring jump from a second-story window actually allowed her to escape.

Many might think that if Dayanna had come from a different family situation, she wouldn't have been trafficked; sadly, that is not the case.

I will never forget meeting with the mother of a young woman named Brittany. Brittany was a very young girl who was violently raped, murdered, and then found dead in an impound lot last February. Unlike Dayanna, Brittany had a loving family. She worked with children at a local recreation center and taught dance lessons.

Despite these circumstances, Brittany was also a victim of sex trafficking but was too embarrassed to speak out until it was too late. As Brittany's mother told me: "It doesn't matter if victims have a home because if sex trafficking can happen to my daughter, it can happen to any young girl."

That is exactly what we are talking about: young girls who are only 12, 13, or 14 years old. They are not old enough to have graduated from high school. They are not old enough to have voted in an election. They are not old enough to pass their driver's license exam. In fact, in most States, these girls would be considered criminals that should be incarcerated and charged with prostitution instead of being treated as victims.

We found that criminalization only traumatizes these girls and actually isolates them from the community and the services that they need and deserve. That is why, Madam Speaker, we need this legislation, H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which focuses on incentivizing States to have safe harbor laws.

Safe harbor laws ensure that these girls are treated as victims. Safe har-

bor laws will give legal protection for minor victims and provide them with specialized social services.

We know that by bringing these victims out of the shadows, we can make sure they get the services they need, including medical and psychological treatment, housing, legal services, educational assistance, job training, and more.

Law enforcement can then focus on actually bringing the perpetrators of these awful crimes to justice. This bipartisan legislation incentivizes States to adopt these safe harbor laws, so we can expand on the successes we have seen in States like Minnesota.

In 2011, Minnesota became the fifth State to approve safe harbor legislation. After their safe harbor laws went into effect, guess what? Law enforcement in Minnesota began arresting more johns than ever before, and human trafficking convictions more than doubled. Best practices evaluated by law enforcement and victims groups show that removing the fear of prosecution from victims actually works.

Today, only a little over a dozen States have full safe harbor laws. We have got to do more to protect these victims and be sure the pimps and johns are brought to justice.

This legislation also helps victims by codifying a national human trafficking hotline and making victims eligible for Job Corps services. By giving them an avenue to access for job skill training, they can begin to rebuild their lives.

Madam Speaker, the bill also helps law enforcement by allowing the U.S. Marshals Service to support other State, local, or Federal law enforcement agencies that are investigating missing child cases.

Finally, the bill increases oversight by requiring additional reporting to Congress on restitution orders in trafficking cases. These provisions are all essentially critically important pieces in the effort to combat sex trafficking.

I want to thank my colleague GWEN MOORE from Wisconsin for her advocacy, passion, and partnership on this legislation and moving it forward on a bipartisan basis. I also want to thank the leaders of the Judiciary Committee team who have recognized that this is a top priority and moved it quickly early in this session of Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleague, Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota, as well, in passing each and every one of these anti-trafficking bills and getting them on the President's desk, so we can continue to save the lives of children.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), who has championed these bills.

Ms. MOORE. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 159, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which has been so diligently pushed through with the superb partnership of Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota. It has been a thrill to partner with him throughout this process.

This is a bipartisan collaboration because, unfortunately, this is a bipartisan problem. Solving the problem of sexual exploitation of children will require work on all of our parts because it is a financial boom. People become multimillionaires in this illicit trade.

Also, the gentlewoman from Texas has worked so diligently to combat sex trafficking in places like Nigeria, and I joined with her on that initiative.

It is very disheartening to know that right here, within our own borders, the FBI estimates that at least 100,000 children in the United States of America are currently trafficked and another 200,000 are right on the cusp. They are at risk of sexual exploitation.

These victims are not "women of the night" or sexualized women who are doing it of their own free will—no. The average age of these victims is 13. It is an embarrassing statistic. It is embarrassing to report that my own hometown of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has become known as a sex trafficking hub for both children and adults.

In 2013 alone, just on a random day, the FBI did a sweep and rescued 10 juvenile girls from sex traffickers in Milwaukee. Trafficking is all too common in communities across the Nation—from urban settings, rural settings, suburban settings, and from coast to coast.

Predators victimize vulnerable young people such as those in the foster care system. They prey upon those living in poverty; but what we do know is they also seek out higher-income children, going after those children who may have problems in their own homes. Some are LGBT identified.

There is no safe harbor for children unless we create it through laws such as this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. I am proud of this legislation, I am pleased to cosponsor it, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 159.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we have all come today with an important project, and that is to help save our children.

I wouldn't want to leave this very important bill that talks about saving our children from sex trafficking without letting our colleagues know that we want every possible act of human

trafficking to be reported at 1-866-347-2423. We want those who are victims to know that they can seek help, too, at 1-888-373-7888.

The statement we are making is that we are doing everything we can to extinguish and eliminate this heinous tragedy in our country. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and to recognize that we must stop exploitation through trafficking.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 159, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is another example of bipartisan cooperation in the House of Representatives. I do wish to commend the principal author of the bill, Mr. PAULSEN from Minnesota, an original cosponsor; Ms. MOORE from Wisconsin; and my colleague, the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

We have all worked together. Hopefully, we can send this bill over to the other body, and they will promptly pass it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 159, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

STOP ADVERTISING VICTIMS OF EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 285) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 285

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act of 2015” or the “SAVE Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. ADVERTISING THAT OFFERS CERTAIN COMMERCIAL SEX ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a)(1), by inserting after “obtains,” the following: “advertises,”.

(b) MENS REA REQUIREMENT.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a), by inserting after “knowing,

or” the following: “, except where, in an offense under paragraph (2), the act constituting the violation of paragraph (1) is advertising,”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1591(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, or advertised”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, or advertised”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 285, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act, H.R. 285, introduced by Mrs. WAGNER of Missouri, is an important yet modest bill. It uses one word, just one word, to clarify that, just as it is against the law to prostitute a child on the street, it is likewise against the law to prostitute a child through an advertisement.

By adding the word “advertises” to the existing Federal sex trafficking statute at 18 United States Code, section 1591, this bill makes clear that Congress intends to prohibit the knowing advertising of child sex trafficking to the same extent as the other conduct prohibited by law.

H.R. 285 is a technologically neutral bill and applies to all advertisements that sell children for sex over which there is Federal jurisdiction, regardless of whether they appear on the Internet or somewhere else. It is important to remember that these advertisements, as well as all speech promoting illegal activity, are specifically not protected speech under the First Amendment.

In order to bring a case against the trafficker under this legislation, the government must prove that the defendant knew that they were advertising and knew or recklessly disregarded the fact that the ad involved a minor or someone involved through force, fraud or coercion.

However, this legislation raises the bar even higher for defendants who, while not directly placing the ads, do knowingly benefit from the placement of advertising.

Specifically, the bill requires the government to show that these defendants knew that the advertisement involved a minor or a coerced adult. Reckless disregard is not sufficient.

H.R. 285 only clarifies that people who advertise sex trafficking could face criminal liability.

Under current law, there is the additional possibility of civil liability for defendants who violate the Federal sex trafficking statute. However, under section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, online publishers of third-party advertisements are generally immune from civil liability for such advertisements. H.R. 285 does nothing to disrupt or modify the immunity already provided by section 230.

Congress has criminalized advertising multiple times in recent years. Title 18 of the Federal criminal code currently prohibits advertising promoting counterfeit currency, section 491; obscene or treasonous material, section 552; and the unlawful sale of military medals, section 704, among other things.

It is wholly appropriate for Congress to prohibit the advertising of illegal goods or services. Having done so for illegal advertisements involving animal cruelty, prescription drugs, and counterfeit items, today we take the commonsense step of prohibiting advertising that offers sex with children and coerced adults.

While the Internet has indisputably done much good, U.S. law enforcement has identified online advertisements as the primary platform for buying and selling sex with minors.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), an active and committed member of the House Judiciary Committee and ranking member on the Commercial Subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 285, the SAVE Act.

Human trafficking is never okay. It is a vile crime that no one should be subjected to, but the SAVE Act goes too far.

This bill would impose a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 to 15 years for posting or facilitating the posting of advertisements online. We should be eliminating mandatory minimum sentences, not creating new ones.

This bill is not specific enough. It could potentially apply to communications providers and facilitators who are not actually engaged in sex trafficking.

For example, an employee at an online advertising network that has no role in the types of ads they receive could face 10 to 15 years in prison for simply going in to work every day and helping advance the business. Web

hosts and ad networks oftentimes do not have advance warning of the ads that are being sent to them.

During our Judiciary Committee markup, I offered an amendment that would have removed mandatory minimums from the legislation, giving the judge hearing the case, of course, the discretion to impose a wise and just punishment.

I believe in the overall goal of the legislation, but I do not agree with its execution. Judges, working with the sentencing guidelines, should determine sentences, not legislators.

Mandatory minimums fail to reduce crime, they waste taxpayers' money, and often violate common sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of this bill.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 285, the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation, or SAVE, Act.

But Madam Speaker, I also rise today in support of all the good work done by my colleagues here in Congress on the issue of human trafficking.

Madam Speaker, as a former United States Ambassador, I was exposed firsthand to the horrors of human trafficking on an international level. I witnessed and reported on the devastating consequences of human trafficking, where innocent women and children were dragged into the dark abyss of sexual slavery.

But never, never in my wildest dreams did I ever think human trafficking was so rampant right here in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, right now there are young women being forced into prostitution in virtually every district across this Nation. In fact, I was shocked to learn that my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, has been identified as one of the top 20 areas for sex trafficking in the United States.

Madam Speaker, this is a problem that is hiding in plain sight. Every year, thousands of young American lives are impacted by this despicable crime.

However, there is hope. I take hope from the work that is done by law enforcement professionals who are on the front lines every day protecting our Nation's children from those who would seek to exploit them.

I take hope from those who work in victims' services and their tireless efforts to help survivors recover, heal, and forge new lives out of the horrors of sexual enslavement.

Most importantly, I take hope from all the survivors of this hideous crime. This bracelet, Madam Speaker, was

made by survivors at a safe house called Crisis Aid International in my own hometown of St. Louis, Missouri.

Their strength gives us strength, their resolve gives us inspiration, and their steadfast commitment to ending sex trafficking gives us the courage to fight.

I am grateful for the many colleagues that I have who have supported legislation and held events in their home districts to raise awareness and education of this crime. Our work has yet to begin.

However, Madam Speaker, there is much, much work to do still. Legislators, we have an obligation to come together and to do something because we can, because we should, and because we must.

Over the last 10 years, prostitution has slowly but persistently migrated to an online marketplace. Classified services like backpage.com and others are the vehicles for advertising the victims of sexual slavery in this world.

Pimps and traffickers blatantly advertise their victims' sexual services with provocative photographs and unsubtle messages, complete with per-hour pricing. The traffickers pay Web sites like Backpage and others to display their messages, and these Web sites, accordingly, reap enormous profits at the expense of victims of sex trafficking.

Many of these ads feature children and trafficking victims, and they are resulting in thousands of children every year being openly sold for sex on the Internet.

Madam Speaker, government intervention is necessary to end facilitation of sex trafficking by Web sites like backpage.com and others who commercially advertise this criminal activity.

Companies that base their business models off the profits made by selling sex with children should not be allowed to operate.

The SAVE Act seeks to criminalize this behavior, thereby dramatically reducing the victimization of vulnerable children and women forced into sexual slavery in the United States.

Madam Speaker, this legislation passed the House last year in an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 392-19.

I recognize that it is critically important that innocent actors are protected from the liability, while giving prosecutors the means to combat human trafficking.

To be clear, Madam Speaker, this legislation prohibits only those advertisements that the government can prove actually offer sex with a child or sex with an adult who is involved due to force, fraud, or coercion.

There is well-established precedent for Congress to criminalize the advertising of legal goods and services, as the chairman has outlined previously. Surely, advertisements offering sex with children should also be subject to the same restrictions.

Criminalizing the advertisement of trafficking victims will stem the flow of money, resulting in a reduction of both demand and supply.

The victims of sex trafficking are not nameless, faceless children. They are our daughters, our granddaughters, our nieces, and our neighbors. They are the vulnerable youth of our society, the ones who should be protected the most, Madam Speaker, not exploited for money and greed.

I urge my colleagues to support the SAVE Act because it will provide the tools necessary for law enforcement to combat the sexual exploitation and enslavement of women and children in the United States.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who has served so ably on this committee, and we congratulate him for his ranking position on the Education Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 285, the SAVE Act. While I support the underlying goal of ensuring that those who facilitate sex trafficking through advertising are prosecuted to the full extent of the law, I am opposed to the bill's mandatory minimum sentencing provisions.

Mandatory minimum sentences have been studied extensively and have been found to distort rational sentencing systems, discriminate against minorities, waste money, and often require a judge to impose sentences that violate common sense. To add insult to injury, studies have shown that mandatory minimum sentences fail to reduce crime.

Under this bill, the advertising of sex trafficking will result in a mandatory penalty of 10 or 15 years, depending on the circumstances of the crime. There is no doubt that many of these individuals prosecuted under this bill should receive long prison sentences, but in some cases a mandatory sentence of 10 or 15 years may not be justified.

This is particularly troublesome when you consider the possible scope of defendants who could be prosecuted under the bill. Notably, the prohibition on advertising does not only apply to the sex trafficker who places the ad, or the employee who accepted the ad, but also includes those who benefit financially from the ad.

□ 1330

That is all of the employees, including the receptionist or the computer guy, everybody on the payroll who might have seen the ads or read in the paper that the company publishes some illegal ads but decided to look the other way; they should be held responsible under the provisions of the bill. And many of them would certainly

warrant a sentence of 15 years or even more, but not all of them.

Madam Speaker, mandatory minimum sentences didn't get into the criminal code at all once but one at a time, each one part of an otherwise good bill. If we expect to get rid of mandatory minimums, we have to first stop passing new ones like this.

Madam Speaker, if people ask why a judge in Florida had to sentence Marissa Alexander to 20 years for firing a warning shot at her abusive boyfriend, or why some drug dealer's girlfriend got 25 years when she had no meaningful role in his drug dealing, or why the United States has 5 percent of the world's population but 25 percent of the world's prisoners, they would not understand why anybody said they had to vote for a bill that further expands mandatory minimum sentences.

Fifteen years in prison, mandatory for everybody on the payroll that gets caught up in this bill—that is what is in this bill. There is no discretion afforded to the judge. The sentence would have to be imposed, whether it makes any sense or not.

Madam Speaker, if we expect to repeal mandatory minimum sentences, the first order of business is to stop passing new ones. This bill contains a new mandatory minimum that someday will require a judge to impose a sentence that violates common sense. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee for his hard work on this issue, and I appreciate the time.

While it goes without saying that the growth of the Internet and smartphones have proven to be of great value in many aspects of our lives, these tools can also be used by criminals to facilitate the commercial sexual exploitation of children and other victims by providing an easy way for pimps or traffickers to market child sex trafficking victims to those who seek to do them harm. With just a click of a button, individuals can now use Web sites to advertise, schedule, and purchase sexual encounters with minors, just like they would use these services to hire a ride home.

The SAVE Act, introduced by Mrs. WAGNER from Missouri, makes a technical clarification to an existing Federal sex trafficking statute to make clear that the law extends to traffickers who knowingly sell sex with minors and victims of force, fraud, or coercion through advertising, as well as to people or entities that knowingly benefit from the sale or distribution of such advertising.

While much of the growth of this terrible crime is on the Internet, this bill

is technology neutral and applies to all advertising of children for sex, regardless of the medium. It is important to note that these advertisements, as with all ads and other speech promoting illegal activity, are not protected speech under the First Amendment.

H.R. 285 was the subject of robust committee process both last Congress and this, and the bill was reported out of the Judiciary Committee last week by voice vote. The legislation that is on the floor today strikes the right balance by protecting victims from commercial sexual exploitation, while also ensuring that constitutional rights are respected and innocent third parties are not wrongly prosecuted.

This legislation simply clarifies and modernizes Federal criminal law to keep pace with the evolving trend of exploiting the Internet for criminal gains. The bill passed the House floor last Congress with wide bipartisan support but was not enacted into law.

I commend my colleague from Missouri, Congresswoman WAGNER, for sponsoring this important legislation again.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I urge the United States Senate to take up this bill. Let's get it signed into law by the President of the United States. It would help save our children from the horrors that people understand but do not want to see. It is good legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We started out this afternoon by saying that we join together in stopping the scourge of human trafficking and sex trafficking, and I still stand by that premise. I support the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act. I do believe that adding advertising and having the provision in the law that includes mens rea is an important protection, that there must be an intent to sell and to advertise victims of exploitation.

This, of course, is part of a number of proposals that we are considering today—and we hope we are successful—to combat sex trafficking; but, as we have discussed with respect to these other bills, much more must be done to prevent sex trafficking as well as to aggressively investigate and prosecute these crimes. H.R. 285 amends the current Federal sex trafficking statute so that advertising would now be one of the prohibitive means of facilitating this type of exploitive criminal conduct.

We know, of course, that technology, however, sometimes is tricky. The bill correctly recognizes the fact that sex traffickers increasingly obtain customers for their illegal acts through the means of mass communication, either through various forms of print media or via the Internet. Maybe they

throw in the cell phone or hard line as well, but they are out to get their victim. They are out to get that child. They are out to get that young woman or young man, boy or girl, and we must stop them in their tracks. In fact, sex traffickers use generalized marketplace Web pages to advertise, as well as sites and pages devoted to advertising the availability of commercial sex.

While the Internet has enriched our lives greatly, these sex traffickers are only interested in using it in the most vile manner; and they use the Internet to perpetrate heinous criminal schemes, such as the selling of minors for sex. Without question, sex traffickers who advertise their scheme should be penalized for their criminal acts.

While I realize that some have raised questions about how the advertising prohibitions under this bill would apply to online companies, I am concerned that we have a free use of that, if I might throw in a word, "net neutrality." Because of this, we adopted an amendment during the Judiciary Committee's markup last Congress and now again, in a bipartisan effort, to address such concerns. That amendment is included in the text of H.R. 285.

We know, for example, however, that with the way the Internet is, some innocent person might wind up finding things on their site that they may not have had anything to do with. We hope the standard of mens rea will help those individuals have a defense.

So as it relates to this legislation, I raise concerns, as my colleagues have done, about the utilization, conduct, of mandatory minimums, primarily because of the vastness of the Internet, and our friends made the point that this advertising could wind up or some act could wind up on there without their knowledge.

We know the one-size-fits-all approach, which is part of the mandatory minimum approach, to criminal actions in the form of mandatory minimums has greatly contributed to our Nation's crisis of overincarceration, and our Judiciary Committee, rightly so, has looked at this over the years.

In the markup of this bill, the Judiciary Committee did not adopt an amendment that would have removed application of the statute's mandatory minimum penalties and instead allow a judge to apply an appropriate sentence under the circumstances of the case up to the statute's existing penalty, which I support enthusiastically, life in prison.

Given the complicated nature of Internet communications networks with respect to how advertisements are delivered, the role of the judge might help to carve through, to ferret out, the facts and determine the level of guilt. So authorizing life imprisonment

is a good thing. It would allow sufficient latitude for the imposition of extremely lengthy sentences where appropriate.

I am hoping as we move forward with this legislation, which has a very important premise and point, that we will have the opportunity to discuss with our colleagues in the Senate to see how we can best make sure that this bill works to, in essence, target the bad guys and make sure that it does it fairly and directly, because sex trafficking, as I have always said on this floor, should be weeded out. Sex trafficking should not be.

I ask my colleagues again to consider the mandatory minimum. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 285, the "Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act," is among a number of important proposals we are considering today to combat sex trafficking.

As we have discussed with respect to these other bills, much more must be done to prevent sex trafficking as well as to aggressively investigate and prosecute these crimes.

H.R. 285 amends the current federal sex trafficking statute so that advertising would now be one of the prohibited means of facilitating this type of exploitative criminal conduct.

The bill correctly recognizes the fact that sex traffickers increasingly obtain customers for their illegal acts through the means of mass communication, either through various forms of print media or via the Internet.

In fact, sex traffickers use generalized marketplace Web pages to advertise, as well as sites and pages devoted to advertising the availability of commercial sex.

While the Internet has enriched our lives greatly, these sex traffickers use the Internet to perpetrate heinous criminal schemes such as the selling of minors for sex.

Without question, sex traffickers who advertise their schemes should be penalized for their criminal acts, while I recognize that some have raised questions about how the advertising prohibitions under this bill would apply to online companies.

Because of this, we adopted an amendment during the Judiciary Committee's markup last Congress to help address such concerns. That amendment is included in the text of H.R. 285.

Nevertheless, I cannot support this bill in its current form because it would subject yet another category of conduct to mandatory minimum sentences.

Mandatory minimums lead to sentences that sometimes are not appropriate based on the facts of a particular case. A one-size-fits-all approach to criminal actions in the form of mandatory minimums has greatly contributed to our Nation's crisis of overincarceration.

In the markup of this bill, the Judiciary Committee declined to adopt an amendment that would have removed application of the statute's mandatory minimum penalties and instead allow a judge to apply an appropriate sentence—under the circumstances of the case—up to the statute's existing maximum penalty of life in prison.

Given the complicated nature of internet communications networks with respect to how advertisements are delivered, the role of the

judge in evaluating each case is particularly important.

And, authorizing life imprisonment would allow sufficient latitude for the imposition of extremely lengthy sentences—when appropriate.

Because of this defect involving mandatory minimum sentences, I must oppose the bill that we consider today.

By voting "no," the House will allow the Judiciary Committee time to fix this serious flaw.

With this important consideration in mind, I must ask my colleagues to oppose the bill today so that we may consider a better bill dealing with this aspect of sex trafficking in the near future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I am an avid supporter of the Internet; I have been one since the late 1970s. However, there is a dark side to the Internet. There are back pages out there and Web sites that have a business model to make money off of exploiting child sex slaves, advertising child sex slaves.

This bill gives law enforcement the tools they need to investigate and prosecute those who advertise the victims of sex trafficking. This bill advances a compelling government and humanitarian interest to protect our children from those who seek to buy and sell them like products. This bill makes it illegal to knowingly profit from the distribution of advertising that offers a commercial sex act in violation of section 1591 of the Federal criminal code, which deals with the sex trafficking offense.

The SAVE Act doesn't seek to restrict the free, legitimate exchange of information and ideas. I heard some of my colleagues on the other side—the gentleman from Georgia and others—express concern about innocent employees of Web sites or sites like Google that may accidentally index one of these sites or somebody who has an online forum on their Web site and somebody makes an off-topic post. That is why we added the word "knowingly." I want the legislative history of this bill to show that "knowingly" is important. They have got to know that they are advertising for victims of human trafficking.

It was carefully crafted so that legitimate Internet companies and legitimate Web sites are protected, but it is absolutely critical that we go after those who are trafficking in persons and advertising and profiting off of it. They absolutely need to be held accountable.

Protection of America's First Amendment right to freedom of speech is fundamental, especially on the Internet, and that was one of the guiding principles of creating this. Less regulation of the Internet, low regulation of

the Internet is important, but there are some things you have got to draw the line on. Profiting off of advertising or profiting at all from child sex trafficking is unacceptable, and this law fixes that to the best of our ability while still protecting folks' First Amendment rights.

I am proud to work with my colleague from Missouri, Representative WAGNER, in working to combat this terrible crime of human trafficking.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman, if he has any further speakers.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have two additional requests for time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Congresswoman WAGNER, and all the other Members for their hard work on this important legislation put forward last night and today to combat human trafficking.

Human trafficking is a 21st century form of slavery, and it is devastating lives across the country. In Arizona's Second Congressional District, a lack of resources to identify victims, prevent instances of trafficking, and prosecute those who participate leads to many young girls and boys being victimized by these traffickers.

I spoke very recently with Jerry Peyton, the founder of an organization called Sold No More, dedicated to ending trafficking in Tucson, Arizona. Jerry experienced the devastation of trafficking firsthand in his own family. His daughter Lisa, who was a high school honors student, ran away from home after the death of her boyfriend, where she quickly was preyed upon by traffickers and forced into smuggling and prostitution. Jerry found his daughter living with five men who ran a drug ring and was able to rescue her, yet the police never apprehended the men who victimized Lisa. The only police record of this innocent reads: "A juvenile returned to the custody of her parents."

Jerry's family's experiences highlight the growing need for resources to train law enforcement to identify and respond to instances of trafficking. He told me that in Pima County there is not a single law enforcement officer in any agency dedicated full-time to the trafficking issue.

Before 2010, there had not been a single case of sex trafficking in Pima County, despite arrests for prostitution that treat victims like criminals. When they place online ads in back pages for clearly young victims, within 24 hours,

there are 100 calls that come in looking to exploit these victims. This is wrong.

We can start raising awareness of trafficking by changing the perception of trafficking victims. It is estimated that only about 10 percent of those trafficked in our country have come across the border. The overwhelming majority are runaways and vulnerable children who are preyed upon.

□ 1345

These are our neighbors being trafficked in our communities, not some distant far-off place. Under the surface of our communities, sex trafficking is a prevalent and devastating reality. Widely-attended events like the Super Bowl coming up in Glendale, Arizona, or the annual gem show in Tucson act as a magnet for traffickers and, unfortunately, their victims.

It is critical that we pass this bill to prosecute all offenders who victimize and participate and advertise, including online, in the trafficking of children. We also must support efforts to raise awareness and educate those who work in law enforcement, health care, child protective services, and elsewhere to prevent all trafficking, give law enforcement the tools they need to be proactive, and care for the victims after they have been rescued.

I support this legislation and the 11 other bills put forward to combat human trafficking, and I urge support from my colleagues.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and discuss this issue briefly. It just came to me last week when my 13-year-old daughter turned 14 and I looked at her and have seen her with her friends, just the scourge, the horrendous things that are done to these young ladies, whether it is here or internationally.

I was brought back to a visit I had last year to an organization called WAR, Women At Risk International, in my district, the Second District of Michigan, where they are trying to use civilian first responders to identify those signs of trafficking to make sure that those aren't those police reports saying "minor returned to parent" and that they are able to utilize the things that they see or suspect as a way of pulling those girls out of those situations.

It is heartfelt that I want to make sure that this body pursues this issue, and I commend all of our colleagues who have dealt with this as we are trying to create these circles of protection and hope around these women and children that are in this horrible situation.

Madam Speaker, I commend everybody for this legislation, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, in closing, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, we have had three bills so far, and we are getting ready to offer two others that all speak to this very devastating impact on our children—human trafficking and sex trafficking. I think the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act, H.R. 285, does focus on a particular niche that is heinous.

Our children are on the Internet, they are tech savvy, and they easily can become victims of an attractive site or attractive sounds and music, so I think this legislation, again, pinpoints a very serious issue.

The bill is an amendment of an existing legislation that includes a mens rea. There must be intent; but we do know, in the course of legislation, we have the opportunity to make sure that what we do does meet the test of getting those who are truly the perpetrators.

I would hope as this bill moves to the Senate, as we recognize the importance of this legislation, we, again, be reminded that one size does not often fit all and that judges can rightly have discretion to a sentence of life.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation so that we can have a comprehensive approach to legislative bills that have been on the floor today to attack head on, if you will, those who prey on our children, young men and women, people who find themselves lost with no place to go and become the serious victims of child pornography, sex trafficking, and human trafficking. As Members, we know that, many times, the entire life of that individual is changed forever.

I yield back the balance of my time and ask for support of the underlying bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have spent about an hour and a half today talking about how bad this problem is. The two previous bills were passed unanimously by voice vote.

There seem to be two arguments against the current bill. One is that the net might be too broad. That has been responded emphatically by putting a "knowingly" standard in so that somebody who is innocent will not be caught up if an advertisement for sex trafficking appears without their knowledge.

The second is the philosophical debate on mandatory minimum sentences. I think there are some crimes where there ought to be a mandatory minimum sentence. I know many of my colleagues sincerely disagree with that, but believe me, advertising kids—minor kids—for sex should be something that puts you in jail for some time.

I am glad this bill allows for life sentences in case of egregious offenses, but I think that even in ones that might be

less than egregious, spending some time in jail will show this country and maybe others who may be tempted to get involved in this horrific business that if you are caught, you are going to spend some time.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 285.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 181) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 181

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. VICTIM-CENTERED SEX TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (j);

(2) by striking subsections (a) through (f), and inserting the following:

"(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to develop, improve, or expand comprehensive domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

"(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

"(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

"(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

"(B) address the unique needs of victims of child human trafficking;

"(C) facilitate the rescue of victims of child human trafficking;

"(D) investigate and prosecute acts of child human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

“(E) implement and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of victims of child human trafficking for prostitution offenses;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-child human trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;

“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

“(iii) travel; and

“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-child human trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenses, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking; and

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims' services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;

“(ii) social service agencies;

“(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;

“(v) legal services agencies; and

“(vi) non-governmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering services to victims of child human trafficking;

“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for child human trafficking victims that include—

“(A) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(B) the development of specialized and individualized treatment programs for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

“(ii) life skills training;

“(iii) housing placement;

“(iv) vocational training;

“(v) education;

“(vi) family support services; and

“(vii) job placement; and

“(C) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and non-governmental organizations to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement; and

“(4) the establishment or enhancement of victims' services programs for victims of child human trafficking, which offer services including—

“(A) residential care, including temporary or long-term placement, as appropriate;

“(B) 24-hour emergency social services response systems; and

“(C) counseling and case management services.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period prior to the date of the submission of an application under this section;

“(B) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(C) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant; and

“(D) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 1 year after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 3 times and for a period of not greater than 1 year.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall enter into a contract or other agreement with an academic or non-profit organization that has experience in issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct an annual evaluation of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section, and shall submit any such evaluation to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(f) OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section is subject to the requirements of section 10 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2014.

“(g) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section.

“(h) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section may not exceed—

“(1) 70 percent in the first year;

“(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

“(3) 50 percent in the third year.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18;

“(2) the term ‘child advocacy center’ means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

“(3) the term ‘child human trafficking’ means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or unit of local government that—

“(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

“(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking; and

“(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking;”;

(3) in subsection (j) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “Secretary of Health and Human Services” and inserting “Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services,”; and

(B) by striking “fiscal years 2008 through 2011” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2019”.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE ACT OF 1990.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting “, including human trafficking and the production of child pornography” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.”.

SEC. 4. STREAMLINING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(A) by inserting before “section 1591” the following: “section 1581 (peonage; obstructing enforcement), section 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),”; and

(B) by inserting before “section 1751” the following: “section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “human trafficking, offenses pertaining to child pornography, child sexual abuse, coercion and enticement of children,” after “kidnaping,”.

SEC. 5. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and a photograph taken within the previous 180 days” after “dental records”;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution; and”.

SEC. 6. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “or maintains” and inserting “maintains, patronizes, or solicits”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “or maintained” and inserting “, maintained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) by striking “knew that the person” and inserting “knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person”.

SEC. 7. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that all task forces and working groups within the Violent Crimes Against Children Program engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex.

SEC. 8. HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.

Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”.

SEC. 9. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—In fiscal year 2015, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of covered grantees to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of such funds. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of covered grantees to be audited each year.

(b) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A covered grantee that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible for an allocation of grant funds from the covered grant program from which it received a grant award during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subsection (g)(3).

(c) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If a covered grantee is awarded funds under the covered grant program from which it received a grant award during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the covered grantee is ineligible for an allocation of grant funds as a result of subsection (b), the Attorney General shall—

(1) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the covered grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(2) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the Fund from the covered grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(d) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.

(1) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term “nonprofit”, when used with respect to an organization, means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(2) **PROHIBITION.**—A nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall not be eligible to receive, directly or indirectly, any funds from a covered grant program.

(3) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is a covered grantee shall disclose in its application for such a grant, as a condition of receipt of such a grant, the compensation of its officers, directors, and trustees. Such disclosure shall include a description of the criteria relied upon to determine such compensation.

(e) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.

(1) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts made available under a covered grant program may be used to host or support a conference that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy (as designated by the Deputy Attorney General) provides prior written approval that the funds may be expended to host or support such conference, except that a conference that uses more than \$20,000 in such funds, but less than \$500 in such funds for each attendee of the conference, shall not be subject to the limitation under this paragraph.

(2) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under paragraph (1) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

(3) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this subsection.

(f) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts made available under a covered grant program may not be used by any covered grantee to—

(A) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(B) lobby any representative of the Federal Government or a State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(2) **PENALTY.**—If the Attorney General determines that a covered grantee has violated paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) require the covered grantee to repay the grant in full; and

(B) prohibit the covered grantee from receiving a grant under the covered grant program from which it received a grant award during at least the 5-year period beginning on the date of such violation.

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term “covered grant program” means the following:

(A) The grant program under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b).

(B) The grant programs under section 214 and 214A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002, 13003).

(2) The term “covered grantee” means a recipient of a grant from a covered grant program.

(3) The term “unresolved audit finding” means an audit report finding in a final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that a covered grantee has used grant funds awarded to that grantee under a covered grant program for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued.

SEC. 10. CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea agreement or deferred prosecution agreement.

“(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503(c) of the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607(c)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims' Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting “, unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration” before the period; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “this chapter, the term” and inserting the following: “this chapter:

“(1) **COURT OF APPEALS.**—The term ‘court of appeals’ means—

“(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

“(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

“(2) **CRIME VICTIM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term”;

(B) by striking “In the case” and inserting the following:

“(B) **MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.**—In the case”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **DISTRICT COURT; COURT.**—The terms ‘district court’ and ‘court’ include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”.

(b) **APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) child human trafficking (as such term is defined in section 203(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as added by this Act) has no place in a civilized society, and that persons who commit crimes relating to child

human trafficking should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law;

(2) the United States, as a leader in monitoring and combating human trafficking throughout the world, must hold all nations to the same standards to which we hold our Nation;

(3) those who obtain, solicit, or patronize a victim of trafficking for the purpose of engaging in a commercial sex act with that person, are committing a human trafficking offense under Federal law;

(4) the demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking, and the elimination of that human rights violation requires the elimination of that demand;

(5) United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking are not required to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled; and

(6) as matters stand on the date of enactment of this Act, there are insufficient services and programs for victims of severe forms of human trafficking in the United States, including United States citizens and lawful permanent residents.

SEC. 12. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (F), as subparagraph (G);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (G), as subparagraph (H); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members might have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials to H.R. 181, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as has been stated today, we are dealing with a very im-

portant and critical issue in America. It seems, however, that the Super Bowl is coming up this weekend.

The national media and Americans seem to be concerned more about the disappearance of air in footballs than they are about the disappearance of America's greatest resource: our children—children that are being trafficked throughout the United States, bought and sold for sexual assault.

It is not just an international crime; it is a crime here in America. Unfortunately, my hometown of Houston, Texas, is one of the hubs for trafficking because of its location.

We have today several bills, bills that passed yesterday and bills that will come up today—and hopefully all will pass—that deal with this scourge and slavery that is taking place in America.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. GOODLATTE from Virginia; and also the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER; the ranking member, SHEILA JACKSON LEE; and also the former ranking member, BOBBY SCOTT, for their work on these types of legislation that came up last year. Because the Senate didn't act on them, these bills are being brought up again.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, I am glad to be the original sponsor, but I am also thankful that my friend, CAROLYN MALONEY from New York, who has been working on trafficking issues long before I was ever in Congress, is the original cosponsor on the Democrat side.

Madam Speaker, you don't get much more bipartisan than a New York liberal Democrat and a conservative Republican from Texas. We are just separated by a common language. Other than that, we get along quite well, especially on this issue.

When Brooke was 7, Madam Speaker, her mother was ill in the hospital. Her care was then entrusted to a nanny; but protecting her was not what the nanny had in mind. Instead of taking care of Brooke and making sure that she was healthy and safe, the nanny sold her into sex slavery. She was a trafficking victim. She was 7.

As is common with child trafficking victims, Brooke was also a victim of child pornography. She was subjected to the most sadistic forms of abuse. She was 7. All she wanted to do was be safe.

Stories like Brooke's and other survivors' make it clear that human trafficking is quite serious. It is occurring with the most vulnerable group of Americans: young children. I have four kids, three daughters. I have 11 grandkids; seven of them are granddaughters. We all believe, I think, the greatest resource of America is our youth, and their lives and their souls are being stolen every day for money, for filthy lucre.

This crime happens in America, and it happens across the seas, and it is all about money. I understand that the greatest criminal enterprise for money is drug trafficking, but close behind is the sex slave trafficking.

Why is sex slavery such a money-maker? Well, unlike drugs that are sold one time, children are sold numerous times. As our friend, KRISTI NOEM, of South Dakota mentioned earlier, children sometimes are sold up to 50 times a day, Madam Speaker.

Plus, the consequences for the criminals is not as great as the consequences for drug smugglers, and the risk of apprehension is not as great. This bill tries to deal with all three entities that are involved in sex trafficking. There is the trafficker, the slave master; there is the consumer, the child abuser; and then there is the child—they are victims of crime, and the American social conscience needs to change to understand these children are not criminals, and they are not prostitutes. They are children that are victims of slavery. We need to change that conscience, and we need to change it legally as well.

Now, in all fairness to police, many times, they see a child on the street; they arrest the child for child prostitution and file a juvenile crime case against that individual. Many times, they don't have a place to take the child.

We have approximately 3,000 animal shelters in the United States. I got one of my three Dalmatians from an animal shelter. We need those animal shelters, but there are less than 300 beds for child sex trafficking victims. Why is that? There is no answer, except we need to deal with it.

Police don't have a place to take the rescued child, except they put them in the criminal justice system, which is not a good thing. It doesn't help the child at all recover, even though everybody knows that the child is a victim. We need places to take children. We need to treat those children like victims of crime.

That is what this bill does. It helps rescue and restores victims of crime. On the other end, the slave master, well, it punishes them. As Chairman SENSENBRENNER said, life sentences are appropriate for some people, and that is quite appropriate, at least a minimum sentence of life, and that is what this bill does as well.

The bill also goes after the demand, the consumer. Those men—primarily—are the child molesters. They are child abusers, and for too long, society has kind of looked at that situation as, “Oh, well, boys will be boys.”

Madam Speaker, those days are over. The days of “boys being boys” is over in America, and this law will go after the consumer. We need to know who they are. You talk about photographs on the Internet, their photographs

ought to be on the Internet after they are convicted, but the law goes and punishes them as well.

□ 1400

It gives law enforcement, child welfare, health care officials, and others who will come in contact with victims training. It also clarifies some State and Federal wiretap laws. It allows law enforcement officials the flexibility to obtain warrants in all Federal human trafficking investigations so that they are better able to follow evidence and target criminal networks, because there are networks throughout the country that are taking children and selling them every night.

Madam Speaker, we will only be able to reduce the demand by putting the demand behind bars, where they belong. Girls are not property; they are little girls. And the same is true of boys who are being trafficked in the United States as well.

The legislation here also strengthens and clarifies the Trafficking Victims Protection Act by making it clear for judges, juries, prosecutors, and law enforcement that criminals who purchase sex acts from trafficked victims should be a priority and be prosecuted. That is why we build prisons, for people like that—the demand and the traffickers.

So I am encouraged by the tremendous support in the House on these 12 bills, bipartisan bills, coming up. And I do want to commend the ladies of the House who have been the ones—on both sides of the aisle—advocating and making sure that this legislation comes to the House floor.

Passage of Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will be a major step toward ridding our country of modern-day slavery. Brooke and her mother have worked through Brooke's issues after she was trafficked at 7. They are working together. She has been rescued and restored, and she is an advocate for better legislation and protection of children like she was when she was trafficked. But the message is, Madam Speaker, our children are not for sale, period.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am glad that the manager, Congressman POE, set the tone again for the vigorousness of the bipartisanship around what all of us want, which is to, in essence, cut out the cancers of human trafficking and sex trafficking.

Let me first of all congratulate Mr. POE, Judge POE, a Texan whose language I can fully understand, as well as his partner, Congresswoman MALONEY. Over the years, she has championed the rights of women and the empowerment of our children: what a great partnership, Judge POE and Congresswoman MALONEY. I am delighted to join with

them in my commitment to fighting human trafficking and sex trafficking in supporting H.R. 181, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2014, marked up in the Judiciary Committee. Many amendments were accepted, and so this bill has a holistic approach.

I am also glad that we did not run away from this issue in Houston, as we convened a hearing that I called for with my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to openly and forthrightly listen to law enforcement, people who had been victimized, adults who are still suffering from what had happened to them as a child. This hearing was held in March. It was a field hearing, titled, "Combating Human Trafficking in Our Major Cities." It was a fitting venue because, regrettably, Houston has been noted as a human trafficking hub in the United States. But it was the important contributions of my colleagues, many on the floor today, who added to the record to begin to craft or to continue to work on important legislation such as the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I am glad that we are here again to move it so it can ultimately be signed by the President of the United States.

At that hearing, we heard testimony from Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials regarding an operation the day before in which they discovered and rescued 115 from a packed, rancid stash house in south Harris County. It was not completely vetted as to whether or not all of the individuals in the stash house or some of the individuals or a few were victims of human trafficking or sex trafficking. I would venture to say that their future would not be a future worthy of promoting. Ninety-nine of those victims were men, 16 were women, one of whom was pregnant, and 19 others were juveniles. You wonder what would happen to the juveniles.

I went to that stash house. It was a terrible scene. All of them had been kidnapped and smuggled into the United States. And as previously said, human trafficking, sex trafficking, is a great business for those who are of that kind of vile mind because they can use them and use them and use juveniles over and over again, some of whom, however, have been driven to such low ends of the Earth, meaning the victims, that their life is ruined. Some have probably been driven to suicide.

Trafficking of any human being, especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in civilized society. The term "slavery" has often been used. And it is true that slavery exists around the world. We need to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in children.

These children have suffered the worst imaginable trauma, and as a re-

sult, they require and are deserving of comprehensive and tailored services to assist in their recovery. We need to ensure that funding is in place to provide for such comprehensive services. This bill is an essential step toward combating the crisis of domestic minor sex trafficking and helping survivors begin their lives anew. Throughout this afternoon, we have said that they have to have an opportunity to change their lives.

While the rescue of trafficking victims is necessary, so is the prosecution of traffickers. While we habitually refer to those who solicit commercial sex acts from minors as "customers" and "johns," and I have said this before on the floor, the cold, hard fact is that these people are nothing more than child rapists. We need to stop being polite and call them what they are—child rapists. Let us not let them hide behind polite names such as "john," particularly when they prey on our children.

Federal courts have interpreted the existing statute, title 18 U.S.C. section 1591, to cover the acts of patronizing and soliciting. Therefore, the specifications of the terms "patronize" and "solicit" in this bill simply clarify and emphasize the fact that these actions are actually covered.

Those who patronize and solicit are already criminally liable under the language contained in the original text of section 1591. Under this legislation, a child rapist will no longer be able to find refuge in any jurisdiction. This bill will also promote the coordination of investigations among Federal, State, and local law enforcement and enhance reporting data for missing children—everything that the witnesses at the March 2014 hearing told us call for this.

Let me say that I am also grateful that this bill emphasizes the local, State, and Federal collaboration. As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, which is what the hearing was held under, under the auspices of the Homeland Security Committee, we recognize that is part of the threat to national security. The utilizing of our children, the victimizing of our children, the co-opting of our children, the soliciting of our children, and this bill gets right at the target.

Human trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal industry in the world, generating over \$32 billion annually. This bill is the most comprehensive piece of legislation to deal with this problem over the years, and it is a great foundation to continue to build, to weed out every nuance, every person hiding behind the rock who is dealing in sex trafficking and human trafficking.

For years, we have labeled child victims of sex trafficking as prostitutes and juvenile delinquents rather than the victims that they are. We have seen runaways and we have condemned

them for being a runaway, but we don't know the horrible stories and what they have experienced. They are victims of criminal conduct, and we need to treat them that way—not prostitutes, not juvenile delinquents.

This bill recognizes and treats victims as victims, provides for more services and shelters for them, and provides resources to law enforcement, child welfare, health care officials, and others who will come into contact with them.

One of the early organizations, the Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which I have associated with throughout my entire time in the House of Representatives, early on raised the clarion call that we must do something about these exploited and missing children. I know that they are celebrating as we have been on the floor talking about human trafficking and sex trafficking.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Judiciary Committee saw fit to adopt section 11 in H.R. 181, the Jackson Lee amendment, which expresses a sense of Congress that human trafficking has no place in a civilized society and that perpetrators of such vile acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and we can build on this for finding those who may be thinking that they are squeezing outside the law.

Mr. Speaker, as a global leader in combating global trafficking throughout the world, the United States must hold all nations to the same standards by which we hold ourselves. The demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking. Elimination of that violation requires elimination of that demand. I am glad that we are here confronting it head-on, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 181, the "Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015."

Madam Speaker, last year, on March 20, 2014, the Homeland Security Committee, of which I am a member, held a field hearing titled, "Combating Human Trafficking in Our Major Cities," in my home city of Houston. It was a fitting venue because, regrettably, Houston is a human trafficking hub of the United States.

At that hearing my colleagues, Chairman McCaul, Judge POE, Congressman AL GREEN, Congressman FARENTHOLD, and I heard testimony from Federal, state and local law enforcement officials regarding an operation the day before during which they discovered and rescued 115 people from a packed, rancid stash house in south Harris County. 99 of those victims were men, 16 were women, one of whom was pregnant, and 19 were juveniles. All of them had been kidnapped and smuggled into the United States.

Trafficking of any human being, especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in civilized society. We need to ensure that state

and local law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in children.

These children have suffered the worst imaginable trauma, and as a result, they require and are deserving of comprehensive and tailored services to assist in their recovery. We need to ensure that funding is in place to provide for such comprehensive services. This bill is an essential step toward combatting the crisis of domestic minor sex trafficking and helping survivors begin their lives anew.

While the rescue of trafficking victims is necessary, so is the prosecution of traffickers. And while we habitually refer to those who solicit commercial sex acts from minors as "customers" and "johns," the cold, hard fact is that these people are nothing more than "child rapists." We need to stop being polite and call them what they are—"child rapists"!

Federal courts have interpreted the existing statute, Title 18 United States Code, section 1591, to cover the acts of patronizing and soliciting. Therefore, the specifications of the terms "patronizing" and "solicit" in this bill simply clarify and emphasize the fact that these actions are actually covered.

Those who patronize and solicit are already criminally liable under the language contained in the original section 1591. Under this legislation, child rapists will find no refuge in any jurisdiction. This bill will also promote the coordination of investigations among federal, state and local law enforcement and enhance reporting data for missing children—everything that the witnesses at the March 2014 Houston field hearing called for.

Human Trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal industry in the world, generating over \$32 billion annually. This bill is the most comprehensive piece of legislation to deal with that problem in years.

For years we have labeled child victims of sex trafficking as prostitutes and juvenile delinquents rather than as the victims they are. They are victims of criminal conduct, and we need to treat them that way. This bill recognizes that and treats victims as victims, provides for more services and shelters for them, and provides resources to law enforcement, child welfare, healthcare officials and others who will come into contact with these victims.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that the Judiciary Committee saw fit to adopt as Section 11 of H.R. 181 the Jackson Lee Amendment which expresses the Sense of Congress that human trafficking has no place in a civilized society and that perpetrators of such vile acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Madam Speaker, as the global leader in combating human trafficking throughout the world, the United States must hold all nations to the same standards to which we hold ourselves. The demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human right violation of human trafficking. Elimination of that violation requires the elimination of that demand.

I received yet more tragic illustration of the global horrors of human trafficking as recently as last evening during a meeting with the Prime Minister of Jamaica. Last year Jamaica improved its position in the U.S. State Department's Annual Trafficking in Persons ("TIP")

Report after it passed amendments to its Trafficking in Persons Act. Those amendments stipulated harsher penalties for offenders with penalties of up to 30 years.

Despite this new legislation, Jamaican children subjected to sex trafficking in the country's sex trade remains a serious problem with reports of sex trafficking of children and adults occurring on streets and in night clubs, bars, and private homes. The Jamaican government realizes that it must move more vigorously to not only prosecute, convict and punish trafficking offenders, but to also identify, and assist more victims.

Madam Speaker, while it is entirely proper for the United States to hold all nations to the same standard to which we hold ourselves, it is also entirely proper for the United States to lend assistance to those nations that may lack the resources needed to effectively combat Human Trafficking. I hope that we will give consideration to providing such assistance in future anti-human trafficking legislation.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I must also thank Representative POE and his staff as well as Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for working together to address a point raised by an amendment that Rep. POE offered and withdrew during the bill's markup. The changes that were made to the bill as a result of that collaborative work yielded some real improvements to the bill.

For these reasons I support H.R. 181 and encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who has made it a priority to stop, to combat the scourge of human trafficking by bringing numerous bills before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his long dedication to addressing this very serious problem and for yielding me this time.

Few nightmares equal the terrible reality that thousands of American children awake to each day. Held against their will, before the day is out, they will be forced to share perhaps a dozen strangers' beds and be subjected to arbitrary violence for any real or imagined infraction.

Child sex trafficking is one of the fastest growing criminal enterprises in our country, and we must update our laws to combat it. H.R. 181, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, is a targeted effort to deploy our law enforcement and social resources against the worst offenders: those who sexually exploit children and other vulnerable victims.

Rather than simply increasing penalties, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act directly aids the survivors of this crime. The bill creates a comprehensive, victim-centered grant program to train law enforcement, rescue exploited children, prosecute traffickers, and restore the lives of victims. The bill also streamlines existing

law enforcement tools by providing that child advocacy centers can and should use their resources to help victims of trafficking and other types of child exploitation.

H.R. 181 clarifies that State prosecutors may obtain wiretaps, pursuant to a showing of probable cause, for trafficking and other child sex crimes. Additionally, the bill adds several of the Federal antislavery statutes as Federal wiretap predicates—something that should have been done a long time ago.

These important tools simply give police the same investigatory tools they would have if these criminal gangs sold drugs or stolen property instead of sex with children and other victims.

The bill makes the law clear that the men who purchase these children's innocence will be held to the same standard as those who make it available for sale, and hold sex traffickers accountable by increasing the standard for claiming an affirmative defense by requiring defendants to show by clear and convincing evidence that they believed the victim to be 18 years of age or older.

We in Congress have no higher duty than to protect the innocent children of this Nation. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, introduced by my friend and colleague Judge POE, is a critical step toward banishing human trafficking to where it belongs—the realm of nightmares.

Please join me in supporting this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who, as I indicated, has worked unceasingly on empowering the most vulnerable, particularly in her work on empowering women, vulnerable women around the world, providing them rights, and, of course, the work she has done in collaboration with Congressman POE and our committee in her work on this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague for her leadership and for yielding to me.

I want to commend the Republican and Democratic leadership for bringing to the floor a large number of bipartisan bills to address the problem of human trafficking. I particularly want to thank Judge POE for his enlightened leadership. He has brought an informed, intelligent, effective focus on this crime, and he has brought new momentum that is helping this country address this issue.

□ 1415

I thank the bipartisan Women's Caucus that has made this goal, this common goal of attacking the exploitation of children as a joint priority for our caucus and for this Congress.

It is an important way to mark Human Trafficking Awareness Week,

and this modern-day form of slavery happens all across the world. We don't like to admit it, but it is happening right here in America. It is happening in our small cities, our big cities, every State, every race, creed, and color.

There are no reliable estimates, but by some accounts, there are as many as 2 million minors trafficked within the U.S. alone. When they have missing children reports, many of the parents believe their children have been stolen into sex trafficking. Most of these child victims who are sex-trafficked are United States citizens or are here legally in the United States.

Human trafficking, as my colleague pointed out, is the fastest growing crime and the third largest criminal activity in the world, but unlike drugs and guns that are sold only once, human lives can be sold repeatedly over and over and over again until their lives are shattered and destroyed. It destroys lives and comes with a huge social and economic cost.

We can all agree that no child should be for sale in America—not now, not ever. Our children should not be for sale, but they are for sale under the guise of human traffickers and pimps.

I am very pleased to work shoulder to shoulder with Congressman POE on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. As a former judge and a former prosecutor, he knows firsthand how damaging this crime is to the lives of our young people—and it involves young boys, too—and how difficult it is to get a conviction. His knowledge in this area is tremendously appreciated, and his knowledge is in this bill. I thank him for having been the key author on it and for his passion and hard work on it.

This bill directly and specifically supports law enforcement training and prosecution of sex trafficking crimes, and it creates a domestic trafficking victims fund within the Treasury Department to support critically needed services for victims.

We know there are not enough beds; there is no treatment. Many trafficked women tell me they get saved, but then they are put in a park with no place to go, and the traffickers come up and try to get them back into it.

It goes after those who are trying to exploit children and vulnerable women, those who would profit off the misery of others by going after their wallets. It targets the demand side: the child abusers, the child molesters.

Our victims fund will be financed through fines levied on those convicted of child pornography, human trafficking, child prostitution, sexual exploitation, and human smuggling offenses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlelady.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The bill also makes it clear that it is not the victim who is sold and exploited who is the criminal. The criminal is the john, the child abuser who solicits a minor or a trafficker who puts a woman or man out on the street to be bought and sold.

Human trafficking is harmful not only to the victims, but to society at large. Last May, this House passed this bill in total agreement, and I urge the Senate to follow it and pass it also. It is time to help the survivors get the resources they need to rebuild their lives and to punish the evildoers who purchase and sell these innocent children.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge POE for his great leadership in this very important area. It is so encouraging to see the bipartisan commitment. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE and Congresswoman MALONEY, for your strong support.

When I came to Congress, it was my perception that human trafficking was a concern found in other parts of the world, certainly not in North Carolina. After talking to our law enforcement, I found out that North Carolina was within the top 10 States for human trafficking.

As such, I realized that we needed to take care of our own in our own region and hosted a meeting for public officials, church leaders at the Billy Graham Center. We brought in wonderful organizations, Compassion to Act, Justice & Mercy, Neet's Sweets, and others who have been there on behalf of these women.

There are so many important ways that we can provide safety, security, a safe haven for these precious young girls that have been brought into slavery.

Human trafficking is one of the most tragic issues plaguing our world today. Nearly 21 million human beings are living in modern-day slavery, including domestic servitude, forced labor, and sex work. As a nation, we have both a moral and a constitutional obligation to protect the most vulnerable in our society from this horrific exploitation.

I therefore urge all my colleagues today to join in supporting the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 presented by Congressman POE. We need to ensure that we can provide to these young, domestic human trafficking victims the support that they need.

This week, yes, we in the House will devote ourselves to raising awareness of this heinous crime and passing legislation to take significant steps toward the eradication of trafficking, both domestically and abroad.

However, even as Human Trafficking Awareness Month draws to a close, our dedication must not waver. I thank the

chairman for his leadership, and I thank my colleagues for their support.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The previous speaker indicated that we are in the national month acknowledging and recognizing the gravity of human trafficking, and I believe that it calls upon us to stand by the most vulnerable who really can't help themselves.

My last comment before yielding was the demand for commercial sex is a primary cause of the human rights violation of human trafficking, so eliminating that violation requires the elimination of the demand.

What I might not have added, which a number of Members have said, is the violence that goes along with sex trafficking and human trafficking, the violence that goes along when some entity—a person called a pimp, which is an old-time term, really becomes an abuser, a violent abuser and abuses the frail, small body of a little girl or boy because they really haven't risen to the occasion, provided them with their daily infusion of dollars to continue to do their dastardly work.

As I have heard mentioned on this floor, we are not alone here in the United States. For those of us who met the victims of sex trafficking and human trafficking around the world, we understand that America's standards will help others.

What is good about what we are doing today and the underlying bill is that we set a standard that the world can look at, that we are not going to tolerate or be sufferers of the abuse of little children.

Yesterday, as I listened to a great success story spoken about by the Prime Minister of Jamaica, relating their economic success, she was willing to talk about Jamaica's concerted effort at fighting human trafficking.

An island where it might be easy for that trafficker to move from one place to the next, here was a leader of government acknowledging the scourge of human trafficking and that Jamaican children were suffering and subjected to sex trafficking and that it remains a serious problem, but we are going to fight it.

I felt very good about that because you would think that an island that is very much dependent on tourism and entertainment would not have that calling and that cause; but, yes, the fight is spreading.

I believe the Jamaican Government should be congratulated, and I ask other governments to take heed of the underlying legislation, rise to the standard, be part of the total elimination of cutting into the lives of children, of little boys, of little girls, of cutting them off from any kind of aspirations and hope that they could ever have.

Maybe we don't necessarily connect it, but we know the story of the three women that were held for a period of time in our own Nation. Some started out as children. When they were ultimately found, they were women. One cannot help note that the violence that they described was a vile sex trafficking, human trafficking episode. We don't know how many around the Nation that are today, as we stand on the floor of the House, suffering.

I thank Representative POE. I thank my colleague Representative MALONEY and committee staff on both sides of the aisle to help address this issue, and as well, I am glad that this particular legislation will set a standard that this dastardly series of acts will not be suffered by any human being not only in this Nation, but around the world.

With that, I ask support for H.R. 181 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. May I inquire of the Chair as to how much time is left on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of different entities involved in bringing this and other pieces of legislation to the House floor.

There are numerous organizations throughout the United States, small and large, that are determined to stop human trafficking, and I want to thank all of them for their input into this cause and this legislation. I call them the victims' posse. They have rounded up and made sure that we are going to deal with this important issue.

I also want to thank the Members of the House who are cosponsors of this bill, especially CAROLYN MALONEY, my friend from New York, and her tenacious work on this and other pieces of legislation.

I also thank the Members of the House because many times, when they go back home on this specific issue, as mentioned by my friend Ms. JACKSON LEE from Texas, they are holding public forums and hearings about this crime of human trafficking. In fact, there is another one in my district this weekend in Houston.

I want to commend the Members for bringing public awareness to this horrible situation; but not all is gloom, doom, and despair, Mr. Speaker, because of this legislation and other pieces of legislation, but more importantly, the moral will of the House and I think of America is to get a grip on this slavery.

When a crime like this is committed against a person, especially a child, we call it sexual assault, but it is really rape. It is rape, Mr. Speaker, of children. A rapist commits that crime to try to destroy that person, destroy their identity, destroy their self-worth,

to steal their soul. That is what rapists do.

That is why we are going to solve this case or solve these cases as best we can, by preventing them from occurring, by going after those rapists, going after the trafficker, and rescuing the most precious thing we have in our country, which is our children. We are not going to allow the situation where America's children are bartered and sold on the marketplace for sexual assault. Those days are going to be over.

I appreciate all those who have brought this bill to the floor, both sides, and I ask that the House of Representatives vote unanimously on this legislation.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 181, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 460) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term "human trafficking" means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TO IDENTIFY HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to—

(1) train and periodically retrain relevant Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other Department personnel that the Secretary considers appropriate, how to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and, where appropriate, interdict a

suspected perpetrator of human trafficking, during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

(2) ensure that the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) regularly receive current information on matters related to the detection of human trafficking, including information that becomes available outside of the Department's initial or periodic retraining schedule, to the extent relevant to their official duties and consistent with applicable information and privacy laws.

(b) **TRAINING DESCRIBED.**—The training referred to in subsection (a) may be conducted through in-class or virtual learning capabilities, and shall include—

(1) methods for identifying suspected victims of human trafficking and, where appropriate, perpetrators of human trafficking;

(2) for appropriate personnel, methods to approach a suspected victim of human trafficking, where appropriate, in a manner that is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(3) training that is most appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving such training perform their official duties;

(4) other topics determined by the Secretary to be appropriate; and

(5) a post-training evaluation for personnel receiving the training.

(c) **TRAINING CURRICULUM REVIEW.**—The Secretary shall annually reassess the training program established under subsection (a) to ensure it is consistent with current techniques, patterns, and trends associated with human trafficking.

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall certify to the appropriate congressional committees that all personnel referred to in section 3(a) have successfully completed the training required under that section.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees the overall effectiveness of the program required by this Act, the number of cases reported by Department personnel in which human trafficking was suspected and, of those cases, the number of cases that were confirmed cases of such trafficking.

SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE TO NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

The Secretary may provide training curricula to any State, local, or tribal government or private organization to assist such entity in establishing its program of training to identify human trafficking, upon request from such entity.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 460, the bill now under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015, the first bill I have introduced as a Member of Congress.

A few weeks ago, we took an oath promising to protect the people of this great country. I am convinced that part of this high calling is protecting those who are victims of human trafficking.

North Carolina is often ranked as a top State for labor and sex trafficking. This insidious industry is in our own backyard and, unfortunately, it is growing. Just last week, in my own district, local officials announced the formation of the Alamance County Anti-Human Trafficking Advocacy Council to respond to the growing human trafficking problem throughout Alamance County. However, they cannot do it alone, and we must come together to stop this unconscionable industry.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I feel strongly that the men and the women of the Department of Homeland Security have a crucial role in preventing human trafficking. Up to an estimated 17,500 people are trafficked each year into the United States, and many of these victims will pass by either Border Patrol or TSA. We must make certain that these agents are properly trained in the current trends and practices to end human trafficking.

This bipartisan legislation requires the Department of Homeland Security to train Transportation Security Administration, Customs and Border Protection, and other relevant DHS personnel to counter human trafficking in a manner specific to their professional roles and responsibilities.

The bill also ensures that such training will be assessed by the Secretary of Homeland Security on an annual basis so that it is based on the most current human trafficking trends and intelligence and directs the Secretary to report to Congress on the number of suspected cases reported by the DHS officials.

Lastly, this legislation recognizes the critical role that State and local authorities play in preventing human trafficking by authorizing the Department of Homeland Security to make training curricula available to State, local, tribal, and private sector partners.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, human trafficking is one of the most profitable forms of transnational crime in the world, second only to drug trafficking. It is incumbent upon Congress to take action and ensure that DHS personnel are better equipped to prevent this serious threat and this modern-day form of slavery.

The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015 builds on the good work already under way at DHS by mandating position-specific, relevant training to enable effective trafficking countermeasures at points of entry, transit hubs, and other high-risk locations across the country.

I would like to thank Congressman MEADOWS for developing and championing this legislation in the 113th Congress and for working with me to reintroduce the measure in this Congress.

Additionally, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. MCCAUL, for his work on this important issue and for his support of this bill, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. KATKO, for cosponsoring this legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank each of the bill's cosponsors, including North Carolina's own ALMA ADAMS, ROBERT PITTENGER, RICHARD HUDSON, PATRICK MCHENRY, and the aforementioned MARK MEADOWS for their great support of this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated this afternoon was an important afternoon. I thank the gentleman for his legislation and his leadership, and I add my appreciation of the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and, as well, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who previously did four bills, Mr. CONYERS. It seems that we are having bipartisan support on a very important crisis in our Nation and around the world.

In 2014, President Obama said:

At home, we are leading by example. My administration is cracking down on traffickers, charging a record number of perpetrators. We are deploying new technology in the fight against human trafficking, developing the Federal Government's first-ever strategic action plan to strengthen victim services and strengthening protections against human trafficking in Federal contracts. During the past year, the White House has hosted events on combating human trafficking, bringing together leaders from every sector of society. Together, we came up with new ideas to fight trafficking at the national and grassroots levels.

The present legislation before us, as I rise to strongly support it, H.R. 460, is the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015. This is a great partnership between Homeland Security, the committee which I am a senior member on, and Judiciary to fight against human trafficking. In particular, this bill has a very important purpose because our Homeland Security personnel are in our airports and ports, they are along our borders, they are the eyes and ears,

they are the first responders. It is crucial that this bill is effectively working with personnel to train, to deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities and for other work.

This is a very good idea. Human trafficking is not only a crime but also a horrible violation of human rights. Human trafficking is often a hidden crime. Victims of human trafficking may be afraid to come forward and get help because they may be forced or coerced. They may fear retribution or they might not have control over their documents.

According to the most recent estimate from the Department of State, approximately 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked across global borders each year.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas, is one of the Nation's largest hubs in human trafficking. There are over 200 active brothels in Houston and more strip clubs and illicit spas than Las Vegas. These businesses serve as fronts for sex trafficking.

Let me be very clear. This is not a condemnation of my city. This is a recognition that every single elected person; local, county, and State government; and our law enforcement are working every day and we are being successful, in essence, in shutting down strip clubs, illicit spas, and others.

The main factors that contribute to high levels of trafficking throughout the Nation and in Texas are proximity, demographics, and a large migrant labor population. Houston's proximity to the Mexican border, I-10, a highway running cross-country through Houston, and the port make it a popular point. But that is not solely the site of human trafficking. As my colleague has mentioned, it is everywhere. It is a national problem. Therefore, our Homeland Security personnel, thank goodness, will now have the opportunity to have special training so that in the capacity of their work, their eyes and ears will be extra trained to detect those trying to move past the law.

Houston's huge geographic size and large ethnic and culturally diverse population is seen in and around the Nation, which creates optimal conditions. It is not the only city with that.

To combat human trafficking, the Department of Homeland Security, recognizing there needs to be a national campaign, launched the Blue Campaign in 2010. Through the Blue Campaign, DHS works in collaboration with law enforcement, government, nongovernment, and private organizations to protect the basic right of freedom and to bring those who exploit human lives to justice.

This legislation will begin to institutionalize the training. Last year, this

training—the Blue training—was credited when two men were arrested at Miami International Airport. TSA personnel who had received training to detect trafficking observed the interaction between the young men and young woman and noticed the signs.

What we want to do today, again, is to institutionalize and codify this effort so that no human trafficker, no child being held by an adult but being trafficked can escape the eye of our trained Homeland Security personnel, and they can break that hand away from that adult that is trying to do that child harm because they will know that is not the friendly parent or wonderful grandparent or best aunt or uncle. They will know it is a dastardly act.

I support the underlying bill, ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, Human trafficking is not only a crime, but also a horrible violation of human rights.

Human trafficking is often a hidden crime.

Victims of human trafficking may be afraid to come forward and get help because they may be forced or coerced, they may fear retribution, or they might not have control over their documents.

According to the most recent estimate from the Department of State, approximately 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked across global borders each year.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, Houston, Texas is one of the nation's largest hubs for human trafficking.

There are over 200 active brothels in Houston and more strip clubs and illicit spas than Las Vegas; these businesses serve as fronts for sex trafficking.

The main factors that contribute to high levels of trafficking through Houston and the rest of Texas are proximity, demographics, and a large migrant labor force.

Houston's proximity to the Mexican border, I-10, a highway running across country through Houston, and the port of Houston make it a popular point of entry for international trafficking.

Additionally, the presence of two large airports provides ways in and out of the city.

Houston's huge geographic size and large ethnic and culturally diverse population create optimal conditions for trafficking because of the ability to blend in with the community.

To combat human trafficking, the Department of Homeland Security launched the "Blue Campaign" in 2010.

Through the "Blue Campaign," DHS works in collaboration with law enforcement, government, non-government and private organizations to protect the basic right of freedom and to bring those who exploit human lives to justice.

In part, DHS does so by increasing awareness and training for its front line employees such as Transportation Security Officers, Customs and Border Protection Officers, and others.

Last year, this training was credited when two men were arrested at Miami International Airport.

TSA personnel, who received training to detect trafficking, observed the interaction be-

tween the men and a young woman and noticed the signs.

The bill before us today seeks to codify in law the training of DHS personnel on how to deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected trafficker during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities.

For CBP, this means Officers at our ports of entry will be trained on how to identify potential victims of trafficking.

For TSA, it means that screening personnel, who screen approximately 1.8 million passengers a day, will be knowledgeable about signs of trafficking.

Importantly, the bill requires that the training received be appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving the training perform their official duties.

This will help tailor the training received so that it is relevant to the specific personnel receiving the training.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, we have the opportunity to call attention to the human rights crisis that is human trafficking.

January is "National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month."

To ensure that continued attention be paid to this often hidden crime, I urge passage of H.R. 460.

Though the bill before us today will not eliminate human trafficking, it may help prevent it by ensuring that DHS' frontline workforce is properly trained to fight it.

PRESIDENT'S INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE
PROGRESS IN COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS: THE U.S. GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO MODERN SLAVERY

Trafficking in persons, or human trafficking, is the act of recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, or maintaining a person for compelled labor or commercial sex acts through the use of force, fraud, or coercion. Sex trafficking of a minor under the age of 18 does not require the use of force, threats of force, fraud, or coercion. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-386), as amended, describes this compelled service using a number of different terms, including involuntary servitude, slavery, debt bondage, and forced labor.

Human trafficking can include, but does not require, movement. Under the TVPA, people may be considered trafficking victims regardless of whether they were transported to the exploitative situation, previously consented to work for a trafficker, or participated in a crime as a direct result of being trafficked. At the heart of this phenomenon are the traffickers' aim to exploit and enslave their victims and the myriad of coercive and deceptive practices they use.

Human trafficking is an opportunistic crime. Traffickers target all types of people: adults and children, women, men, and transgender individuals, citizens and noncitizens alike. No socioeconomic group is immune; new immigrants, Native Americans, runaways, the homeless, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth are particularly vulnerable. One of the most common assumptions about "average" trafficking victims is that they are vulnerable simply because they come from the poorest, most isolated communities, whether overseas or in the United States. Indeed, many do. Yet some victims, from a variety of backgrounds, have reported that their suffering began with

their aspirations for a better life and a lack of options to fulfill them.

That's where the traffickers come in. Exploiting these realities, traffickers appear to offer a solution—a good job, a brighter future, a safe home, or a sense of belonging, even love. They prey on their victims' hope and exploit their trust and confidence, coercing them into using themselves as collateral for that chance.

In the United States, the President's Inter-agency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons (PITF) and its operational arm, the Senior Policy Operating Group (SPOG), bring together federal departments and agencies to ensure a whole-of-government approach that addresses all aspects of human trafficking—enforcement of criminal and labor law, development of victim identification and protection measures, support for innovations in data gathering and research, education and public awareness, enhanced partnerships and research opportunities, and strategically linked foreign assistance and diplomatic engagement. The agencies of the PITF are the Departments of State (DOS), Defense (DOD), Justice (DOJ), the Interior (DOI), Agriculture (USDA), Labor (DOL), Health and Human Services (HHS), Transportation (DOT), Education (ED), and Homeland Security (DHS), as well as the Domestic Policy Council (DPC), the National Security Council (NSC), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). As part of the PITF, these agencies convene routinely to coordinate both federal policies to combat trafficking in persons and implementation of the TVPA.

Agencies of the PITF have brought together leaders from government, the private sector, advocates and survivors, faith leaders, law enforcement and academia, and have made significant progress following President Obama's March 2012 call to strengthen federal efforts to combat human trafficking, his September 2012 speech announcing a number of new and strengthened initiatives, and the first-ever White House Forum to Combat Human Trafficking in April 2013, where the first recipients of the Presidential Award for Extraordinary Efforts to Combat Trafficking in Persons—survivor advocate Florrie Burke and hospitality and travel company Carlson—were honored.

The pages that follow reflect the work these agencies have accomplished over the past year, as well as their commitment to continue their efforts in the year to come. From strengthening the SPOG and its four Committees to implementing the nation's first-ever Services for Trafficking Victims in the United States, to implementing an Executive Order that strengthens protections against human trafficking in government contracting, PITF agencies are enabling law enforcement and service providers to deploy resources more effectively and raising public awareness both at home and abroad.

Federal agencies also worked to expand partnerships with civil society and the private sector in order to bring more resources to bear in fighting this horrific injustice. Although the primary responsibility, for fighting this crime and protecting its survivors lies with governments, governments alone cannot solve this problem. Everyone has a role—from local law enforcement and first responders to the heads of major corporations and everyday citizens. Effective anti-

trafficking strategies require partnerships that integrate the experiences and guidance of survivors and reach industries, local communities, schools, religious congregations, and multilateral partners. The U.S. government, for example, funds the National Human Trafficking Resource Center (NHTRC), a national hotline (1-888-373-7888) operated by a nongovernmental organization that provides emergency assistance every day of the year, as well as anti-trafficking task forces in which law enforcement and victim service providers combine efforts to respond to this crime in their communities. Significant partnerships and support for nongovernmental efforts have also taken root, including the Partnership for Freedom, where Humanity United and DOJ, HHS, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) launched the first of three challenge award contests, Reimagine: Opportunity, to develop innovative solutions to address human trafficking; twelve finalists will compete to expand access to housing, social services, and economic empowerment for trafficking victims. In addition, DOS has teamed up with Verité, an NGO leader in supply chain management, to implement a project in consultation with federal agencies and other stakeholders to help gather data on the risks of trafficking in the production of goods and provision of services. Working with partners the Aspen Institute and Made in a Free World, Verité will also convene stakeholders and develop a tool for federal contractors and businesses to analyze supply chain risks and adopt ethical sourcing guidelines and compliance plans that align with Executive Order 13627. Finally, partnering with survivors of human trafficking, federal anti-trafficking experts from DOJ, with partners from DHS, DOS, HHS, and the White House, hosted a day-long Survivor Forum and Listening Session to gain insight from a diverse group of survivors in developing more effective programs and strategies.

The Task Force has drawn strength and direction from these partnerships, which have brought procurement officers and CEOs, professors and human resources professional together with law enforcement and victim advocates in the service of freedom. Such effective collaboration has led to concrete results in the United States' efforts to advance government priorities and combat modern slavery both domestically and globally. This compilation of the Obama Administration's accomplishments represents merely a snapshot, as of February 2014, of the work made possible by the multifaceted approach the United States has adopted to combat trafficking in persons. Each day, the Obama Administration strives to improve its strategy and to enhance its partnerships in order to fulfill not only the mandates of the TVPA, but also the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015, and I commend my colleague from North Carolina and the gentlewoman from Texas for their advocacy on this really important issue.

Many of my colleagues that I have heard speak today said they learned

about this when they came to Congress. I learned about this devastating modern-day slavery when I was a United States attorney in the Southern District of Indiana between 2001 and 2007. We started one of the first task forces in the country, and there are task forces across the country that have been focused on human trafficking now for quite some time, but we must do more because even now an estimated 17,500 people are trafficked throughout the U.S. each year. Sadly, this problem disproportionately affects young girls between the ages of 12 and 14 who are lured by these crime networks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I learned during that time with that task force and with my time in the U.S. Attorney's Office these are very difficult crimes to prosecute. The reason they are so difficult to prosecute is because they are difficult to detect, it is difficult to lure victims out of these crime networks, and so we have to do more. We have to educate our law enforcement, we have to educate those who are standing at our ports of entry, those who are standing at our airports and our mass transit areas, and teach them about the warning signs, what they need to be looking for, so we can stop trafficking at the source, prosecute those who are responsible, and save the victims.

That is why I support this bill, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to implement comprehensive training programs on deterring, detecting, and disrupting this human trafficking. Our law enforcement personnel are standing on the front lines. They have to be equipped with the best-practice methods for identifying the victims and the perpetrators so they can bring these perpetrators to justice.

Criminals change their methods all the time, and I am pleased that this bill also requires an annual reassessment of training programs. They have to continue to train. It is time for Congress to act decisively to eradicate human trafficking. We need to do more.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me emphasize what I just said earlier. Two people were caught at Miami International Airport. They were caught by officers of TSA who had received training to detect trafficking and observed the interaction between the two men and a young woman. It was the exact description that I gave—holding a little girl's hand, holding a teenager's hand, looking innocent—but our DHS personnel could be the savers of the day.

□ 1445

Just a few years ago, in our own airport, a number of Chinese nationals—

young women—were brought in, ultimately, to be held against their will. It was astute personnel who knew that even though girls traveled together that something was wrong.

That is why this legislation is so important. The bill before us today seeks to codify in law the training of DHS personnel on how to deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking and, where appropriate, to interdict a suspected trafficker during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities. Our front liners from the Department of Homeland Security are everywhere. There is not a place you can travel when entering this country—through our airports or through our ports—that our agents in some capacity, in some roles, are not there.

For the CBP, this means officers at our ports of entry will be trained on how to identify potential victims of trafficking—smuggling, human slavery. For the TSA, it means that screening personnel, who screen approximately 1.8 million passengers a day, will be knowledgeable about signs of trafficking. Importantly, the bill requires that the training received be appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving the training perform their official duties, streamlining it to make it work. This will help tailor the training received so that it is relevant to the specific personnel receiving the training.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, we have the opportunity to call attention to the human rights crisis that is human trafficking. I am glad that this bill has been generated out of the Homeland Security Committee, which emphasizes the security of this Nation but, as well, the important act of making sure America stands against human trafficking. January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. To ensure that continued attention be paid to this often hidden crime, I urge the passage of H.R. 460. The bill before us today will not eliminate human trafficking, but it may help prevent it by ensuring that DHS' frontline workforce is properly trained to fight it.

In conclusion, let me say that we are all committed. Again, I refer to all of us. To report suspected human trafficking, dial 1-866-347-2423. If you are a victim, to get help, call the National Human Trafficking Resource Center at 1-888-373-7888.

I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership, and I thank our committee chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

I ask for support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, for your eloquence on such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of victims who are trapped in the United States and around the world who are suffering in silence. In many cases, the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security, who are on the front lines of the fight, are trying to end this heinous crime and help these victims.

This legislation codifies some of the good work already being done to train DHS personnel to detect and prevent human trafficking while also ensuring that such training is specific to the professional roles of the personnel who will utilize it. Moreover, this bill will enable the DHS to equip its non-Federal partners to better counter the devastating effects of human trafficking. In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this critically important, bipartisan bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 460, The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important, bipartisan legislation, which will ensure that DHS personnel continue to receive the training they need to detect and disrupt human trafficking.

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I convened a field hearing in Houston during the last Congress to examine the issue of human trafficking. At the hearing, the Committee heard compelling and disturbing testimony on how human trafficking is destroying the lives of vulnerable populations across the globe, including here in the United States.

Simply put, human trafficking is a despicable crime, and it must be stopped. I believe this bill is an excellent step towards that goal.

The Human Trafficking Detection Act of 2015 would ensure that U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security Administration, and other Department of Homeland Security personnel are trained to effectively detect, and to the extent appropriate, intercept and disrupt trafficking in persons, during the course of their normal roles and responsibilities. Not only would this legislation require effective training, it would also ensure that these employees are regularly provided with the most current trends and information on human trafficking and are adequately equipped to counter this growing problem.

While the men and women at DHS carry out their everyday work, many of them are well-positioned to spot traffickers who may try to exploit our nation's transportation systems to move their victims, both from overseas and within our borders.

H.R. 460 also ensures that Congress has insight into the level of success of the training being provided, and that the Department's State and local partners have full access to training curricula to establish their own trafficking awareness programs.

I applaud Mr. WALKER for introducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on this common-sense measure.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, just last summer, Delta launched The Blue Lightning Initia-

tive with the help of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The Blue Lightning Initiative is a computer based training program that provides airlines with the added tools to help ID and report suspected instances of human trafficking.

According to Delta, it is among some of the first airlines to adopt this expansive type of human trafficking detection training.

Delta and others taking on similar initiatives should be applauded for taking the initiative to end Human Trafficking, one of the greatest challenges we face.

As horrific as Human Trafficking is, it is even more troubling that the United States Government is not taking the steps necessary to properly train DHS employees, such as TSA officers, who have the potential to identify cases of trafficking and help save lives.

This type of training is what Rep. MARK WALKER's bill H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act, aims to achieve. Awareness is key and it is essential to ending the human trafficking epidemic that is stealing the freedom of nearly 27 million people worldwide.

Requires DHS to establish a human trafficking training program to be given in classroom or virtually, and to ensure DHS personnel receive this training within 180 days.

This training must include:

Methods to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and be relevant for each federal employee's particular location or professional environment.

This will help to ensure that DHS doesn't simply establish a generic, one-size-fits-all approach for all employees, and is able to provide thorough training specific to each employee's particular job setting.

Other topics determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

A post-training evaluation for personnel receiving such training.

H.R. 460 also allows DHS to provide the human trafficking training curricula to State, local or tribal government, or private organization at the entity's request. This will help these government and private entities establish their own training programs.

CBO: Does not expect H.R. 460 to increase federal spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 460.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 351, LNG PERMITTING CERTAINTY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 48

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Judge HASTINGS, my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Today, Mr. Speaker, I bring to the floor on behalf of the Rules Committee and the Republican Conference a rule and the underlying legislation which helps address a problem that has been created by the Obama administration.

The administration has decided to slow the export of liquefied natural gas to countries with which we do not have a free trade agreement. This means that American companies have plenty of liquefied natural gas to sell to our allies across the globe but that delays by the administration are preventing them from selling it. This decision, I think, comes at a terrible price for the millions of Americans who cannot find work. This decision comes at a terrible price for those in need of a good-paying job—perhaps even of a long career—that will help support their families, their communities, and, most of all, that will help make America stronger.

The administration's inaction also comes at a terrible price for our friends in Europe who are being bullied by thugs, namely the Russian Government. Currently, many of our allies in Europe are forced to buy natural gas from Russia instead of from the United States of America. We have seen how they use this leverage to push around our allies. Our other friends around the globe, such as India, Japan, and Haiti, also need energy, and this administration's inaction is also costing these allies dearly. Let me see if I can paint a picture of how the administration's decision has been executed.

The administration's Department of Energy has slow walked. It has taken

an antiquated approval process for applications to export liquefied natural gas, which is known as LNG. Since 2010, the Department of Energy has only issued final decisions on five of the 37 applications to export LNG to countries with which the United States does not have a free trade agreement. These delays have nothing to do with the environment. In fact, natural gas is one of the cleanest sources of energy in the world. Yes, I think we know what the problem is. The problem is they simply do not want to participate in this marketplace for Americans to have jobs.

As a result of these delays, all of us in America are squandering the boon in liquefied natural gas, which has made the United States the world's largest provider of natural gas in oil beginning, really, in 2013. Here we are now, 2 years later, and it is time for America to come to action. That is, again, why the United States Congress—the Republican Congress—is coming to the American people with a bill to help do something about this.

The administration's broken application process is delaying good-paying jobs at a time when the labor participation rate in our marketplace is at historic lows. That hurts real people. That hurts real people who want and need opportunities to have jobs today, not to look up and find out that Washington is broken and is keeping them from good-paying jobs.

I have much to say about this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, my good friend, for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

The enduring reputation of the 113th Congress will be as the least productive ever. The previous House was also the most closed ever as it pertains to rules, passing more closed rules than any other Congress. Despite controlling both Chambers of the 114th Congress, my friends across the aisle have picked up the dysfunction right where they left off in trying to jam through another piece of legislation regardless of its merits and without giving the House a chance to review it through regular order. It must be understood that there are a significant number of new Members here who didn't have an opportunity, as I did and as the chairman did, to vote on this measure in the previous Congress.

Dysfunction reigns supreme, but don't just take my word for it. Last week, my friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman DENT, offered a summary of the 114th Congress' accomplishments so far:

Week one, we had a Speaker election that did not go as well as a lot of us would have liked. Week two, we got into a big fight over

deporting children, something that a lot of us didn't want to have a discussion about. Week three, we are now talking about rape and incest and reportable rapes and incest for minors . . . I just can't wait for week four.

That was from my colleague Mr. DENT.

Here we are in week four, in my view, wasting time and taxpayer money in debating a solution for a problem that does not exist.

Since the Department of Energy completed its economic impact study, export applications are receiving a decision within about 2 months. In fact, four LNG export projects have already won all of the necessary Federal permits from the Energy Department and from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, with the first project scheduled to come online this year. Therefore, despite H.R. 351's clever name, the only uncertainty regarding the bill is why the House is considering it at all.

This bill originated in the last Congress when we were told that it would help Ukraine shake its energy dependence from Russia. Let me repeat that. This bill originated in the last Congress when we were told that it would help Ukraine shake its energy dependence from Russia. I would like for some of my colleagues on the other side to tell me how Ukraine will be able to benefit from this legislation in light of what I believe the fact to be, and that is that they are not prepared to receive liquefied natural gas from us. In my view, since most of this takes place in the spot neverland of oil and gas sales, I don't believe, when completed, that this gas will reach Ukraine.

Do you know where the highest prices for all liquefied natural gas are both now and, apparently, in the near future? Asia. This gas is going to Asia, not to Ukraine and not to Eastern Europe. I heard some discussion yesterday evening about Hungary, and I dispute whether or not any of it will go there as well.

□ 1500

Furthermore, what was true then remains true now: even when the United States finally becomes capable of exporting liquefied natural gas, Ukraine does not have, as I have pointed out, the capability to receive it. I hope you will understand my uncertainty as to why this bill is on the floor.

H.R. 351 will not make gas prices cheaper here either. LNG is already cheap. In fact, this bill is more likely to increase our natural gas prices, since we are going to be sending more gas overseas, and it will be hard-working Americans paying the cost.

It is not like there are a whole lot of projects waiting to be approved either. With natural gas futures and crude oil prices well below the levels where natural gas is competitive, companies are putting LNG export and development

projects on hold, leaving only more uncertainty as to why we are considering this bill today.

This bill is also incredibly misguided. We cannot solve our energy problems with fossil fuels. It requires a certain kind of arrogance to deny an overwhelming scientific consensus regarding climate change. Importing or exporting more fossil fuels, more drilling, more fracking, more pipelines, it doesn't matter; fossil fuels are a dead end, full stop.

A serious renewable energy plan is the only way to ensure energy independence. Clean energy is the only way we can be sure that we don't leave a devastated planet for our children.

This Congress is starting just like the last one, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This issue about liquefied natural gas and natural gas perhaps comes naturally to Texans. I am from Dallas. I have been around the natural gas industry. I have seen the attributes of energy policy and how important it is.

Let me tell you what: the Republicans have taken a keen interest in this. This is why the marketplace is producing gasoline at \$1.72 a gallon. That is why gasoline prices have fallen, that is why natural gas is plentifully available at a great price—but, Mr. Speaker, it is also jobs behind this.

I will tell you one other thing. It is also a bipartisan idea. Yesterday, this gentleman that I am going to introduce, the sponsor of the bill, BILL JOHNSON, a 26-year veteran of the United States Air Force, came up to the Rules Committee and had one of the most delightful conversations on a bipartisan basis with other Democrats and Republicans and talked about the attributes of jobs and this natural resource.

Thank God we live in America and have these opportunities to where we can help other countries.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the original sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 48, the rule for H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act.

During the 113th Congress, identical legislation to H.R. 351 passed the House of Representatives as H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. Long before its passage, the bill moved through the entire legislative process at the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. This process included a hearing as well as an eventual markup at the Subcommittee on Energy and Power. A subsequent full committee markup followed, and the bill was placed on the Union Calendar.

The House Committee on Rules then established H. Res. 636, the rule for consideration of H.R. 6. After that rule was adopted, the legislation was debated, amended, and ultimately passed the House of Representatives with an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote. The President did not issue a veto threat.

The energy renaissance that has swept across America over the last years has transformed the United States from an increasingly energy dependent Nation—beholden to the whims of OPEC—to our current position as the largest producer of oil and natural gas in the world.

This transformation has provided us with a historic and unprecedented opportunity not just to bolster our economy, but to also fully leverage our energy abundance on the international stage by selling a portion of our natural gas abroad.

Through this abundance of natural gas, America has an opportunity to significantly affect geopolitics if we enact smart policies. It could—and should—be a game changer.

Allowing the export of liquefied natural gas, for instance, will create significant American jobs and wealth for the United States, enhance our energy security, and provide a reliable source of fuel to our allies, some of whom depend on the mood of Vladimir Putin to meet their energy needs.

Unfortunately, our policies have not kept pace with the industry's development. Producers seeking to export LNG face a constantly changing approval process which costs millions of dollars and takes years to navigate.

Not only does this undermine regulatory certainty, but with dozens of projects seeking approval, Washington is making it difficult for businesses to make the investment decisions needed to take advantage of this abundant resource. This delays job creation here at home and reduces our ability to positively influence global politics abroad.

My bill, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act, aims to address this growing problem by cutting through the bureaucratic red tape and implementing a deadline on the Department of Energy to issue a final decision on LNG applications.

Given the amount of time that has already passed since many of the LNG export applications have been filed and their dockets closed, there is no more information to consider and no reason for DOE not to adhere to a deadline.

There is very real risk to inactivity. If Washington waits too long to move forward with export licenses, other countries with their own natural gas resources—Canada, Qatar, and Australia, to name three—will step in to meet the demand. Our competitive advantage, along with the opportunity to create more domestic energy jobs and serve as a check on Russia, will be lost.

Numerous studies have found that LNG exports will create hundreds of

thousands of American jobs, many of them in manufacturing, including the refining, petrochemicals, and chemicals sectors. ICF International estimates that these jobs will occur across the entire value chain, translating into roughly \$1 billion in new wages for American workers over a 6-year period.

Export terminals will also generate millions of dollars in new tax revenue for Federal, State, and local governments, while increasing our GDP and lowering the trade deficit.

It is worth noting that this won't come at the expense of domestic consumers. The U.S. Energy Information Administration stressed that it expects increased overseas demand for LNG will be met by the development of new resources.

In fact, the DOE has concluded that each of the different export scenarios considered “are welfare improving for U.S. consumers” and would result in “an increase in U.S. households’ real income.”

The recent turbulence in Eastern Europe—and throughout the Middle East—has shown all too clearly that energy can be used as a geopolitical tool. Adding a new and reliable source of natural gas onto the world market will diversify our allies’ energy sources and greatly reduce their vulnerability to a single monopolistic supplier.

I am proud to author this legislation. It is a job creator. It helps America in leveraging the geopolitical stage across the globe. We have seen enough delay. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I reiterate that I would hope that some of the speakers from the other side would answer the question as to whether or not this liquefied natural gas is going to reach Eastern Europe. I dispute that.

Just sort of as an aside, I know no one will say anything regarding same, but the fact of the matter is that, for years, the discussion was the price of regular gasoline. Now that it is nearing \$2 and we are the world's biggest producer of natural gas and moving pretty well, I might add—and I am glad to see—along the clean energy line, I just am curious whether President Obama gets any credit at all for any of these changes because those who argued that gasoline would be at \$6 and \$7—I even saw one at \$8 a gallon—I am just curious, since that didn't occur, what the thought is.

I recognize we are here on another subject, but I would hope that we would get an answer regarding the LNG and Ukraine especially.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We really do want to address both of your questions. I think they are both legitimate questions.

First of all, according to Hungary's Ambassador at Large for Energy Security, lifting restrictions on import "would send an extremely important message of strategic reassurance to the region which currently feels more threatened than any time since the cold war."

I will yield in a second to the author of the bill because he understands that piece of the pie.

We talk about thuggery from Russia. The Ukrainians had to renegotiate the amount of money that they were paying just to get their natural gas and stay warm because the Russians raised that price on them. We think that is gouging and taking advantage of people.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) to discuss this point that you asked about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, right now, today, about 50 percent of Russia's revenue comes from taxes on oil and gas. About 80 percent of that resource goes through the Ukraine. The Ukrainian people are under tremendous pressure, as are other European allies, by the Russians.

Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is shipped, increasing supply and competition in the global marketplace will help provide international consumers with greater choice.

In fact, a representative of the U.S. State Department made a similar statement on the benefits of U.S. natural gas exports at a January 8, 2015, Atlantic Council forum. This is from the State Department:

Now, where the gas will go doesn't matter. The fact that we have approved exports of natural gas has already had an impact on Europe.

Just the fact that America is getting into the game has put the Russians on notice that our friends and allies and people that they are currently putting under pressure—the Ukrainians and others—are going to have a choice, and it is going to make a different conversation happen at the table.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that helped clarify it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, it does help us. I thank the gentleman.

Let us keep going on the second part of the question, which was: Can President Obama just get any bit of credit, just any bit, just a small measure? Well, I would respond to the gentleman: yes, but when he earns it.

The President has made it known from the very beginning that he opposed energy policy that the free market tried to produce. Take this example: even though he was at the groundbreaking for the Keystone pipeline, he has been incapable of making a decision for 6 years on something that multiple people, including at least two former Presidents and lots of other people, said it makes a lot of sense to do.

Also, the facts of the case are the Congressional Research Service reported that domestic natural gas production has risen by 19 percent since 2009 but decreased by 28 percent on Federal lands.

□ 1515

So, the idea that the President has tried to help this while reducing it by almost a third from Federal lands, the evidence is just not there to give him credit.

I know that there are people who want to get credit for things even though they didn't do things, even though they didn't complete the task that was in front of them, making decisions, making wise decisions, showing the American people what you stand for.

I would do this for the gentleman and help him out, but the administration clearly has been on simply the other side of that issue and that ball.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Corpus Christi, Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), who was with me on the border this last weekend as we looked at border security. He comes from an energy-rich section of our Nation and represents some of the most vibrant companies that are trying to make this country energy-sufficient and to help make sure that what is at the pump is at a great price and is a great product for consumers.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is important we get this rule done and move on to consideration of H.R. 351.

I am from Corpus Christi, Texas. One of the first things that happened when I came to Congress is, I was visited by some folks from a company that was looking to put a LNG liquefaction plant in the district that I represent. In fact, we have got two pending in the district that I represent.

But the first one, Cheniere Energy, a billion-plus dollar plant to liquefy natural gas and export it, has been waiting since I was elected to Congress, longer than I have been in Congress, over 4 years now, to get this plant approved and online to start selling energy.

I want to address some of the questions that the gentleman from the other side has raised with respect to this.

First and foremost, the technology is there. There is no point for Ukraine or any other country to build the facilities to receive this natural gas until there is a sure and steady supply of this natural gas. And it is a lot easier to get these facilities built in other countries where they don't have to go through the exhausting and sometimes, I would go so far to say, insane permitting process that we have to go through here in the United States.

In fact, there is a company looking at putting in another LNG facility in Port Lavaca that is going to build the facility to liquefy the natural gas on a

barge, pull it up, hook up to the pipeline, and liquefy it. This same barge technology can be used for re-gasification.

You could literally pull a barge into a seaport in the Ukraine, hook up the ship, hook it up to a pipeline, and they could be receiving LNG in a very short order. So it is there for any country.

And listen, there is this talk about how it could possibly run up energy prices and natural gas prices here in the United States. The liquefaction process consumes some of the natural gas. The numbers I hear vary from around 20 percent or so, and so it will always be cheaper to deliver the gas by pipeline here in the United States, so we will always have a competitive advantage with the natural gas that we produce.

But we have got to have a market for that natural gas. Right now, pretty much the only natural gas we are seeing produced out of the Eagle Ford shale in Texas is produced with oil. You drill a well, you get both oil and gas.

We have seen a huge dropoff in drilling for natural gas because the demand is so low and the supply is so high, to the point where we are drilling wells and we have discovered gas, and we shut that well then and don't produce it.

We have got to strike while the iron is hot. We can help improve our balance of trade with the world. We can put people back to work, and it can all be done at no government expense. We have just got to get the regulators in Washington, D.C., out of our hair and let our country do this so we can improve the economy for everybody in America.

We can have a much more secure economy. We can have people back to work. We can have a plentiful supply of energy for the foreseeable future.

You have got Marcellus shale, you have got the Eagle Ford shale, you have got the Barnett shale, you have got Pennsylvania, you have got Texas, you have got North Dakota. There is plentiful natural gas. We need a market for it.

By approving this rule and the underlying legislation, that will happen. Americans will go back to work, and America, as a whole, will prosper.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman very much, not only for taking time to discuss these important issues but really for his representation of an industry that can do so many great things, not only for the American people but, really, to help out our friends around the world.

It becomes a part of a very positive foreign affairs policy that the United States, instead of going overseas to get energy, we can be delivering that energy. Instead of having to have a blue water navy, a navy that is stretched to keep shipping lanes open, we can be

handing these off to other countries to take them.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, there was a vigorous opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, a discussion that not only did BILL JOHNSON take part in but also Mr. GARAMENDI, the gentleman, the Democrat from California, and ED WHITFIELD, the subcommittee chairman, about how the delivery of this LNG can be on American ships.

A shipbuilding industry to build the ships to meet the specifications that would be necessary to put them in the water to deliver these around the world can be an American-made product also.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I do want to point out that the President even understands that there is an ability there for the Ukraine. Speaking in Ukraine recently, he said: "We welcome the prospect of U.S. LNG efforts in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners."

That is a quote somebody sent me from President Obama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, at the Rules Committee, for the first time in a long time, we did not receive a Statement of Administration Policy that the President is opposed to this.

It was a bipartisan presentation in the Rules Committee yesterday. Not unprecedented but a really good feeling about us working together for the common interest, to make sure that the American worker comes out on top of this, that the taxpayer comes out on top of this, that we are producing good legislation that can go to the United States Senate, this time, to be heard and passed on, so that we can get this legislation so the President does earn that part of his check on the box that says: And thank you, Mr. President, for agreeing and working with us. Thank you for helping us out.

I think this can get through the House. I think it can get to the Senate, and I think the President will sign it.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not a positive declaration about the President seeing great things, and me wanting and needing and expecting the President to do what I think is the right thing, then we are simply miscast today.

This is a good thing for America. This is a good thing for both parties. But this is a good thing for our friends around the world and diplomacy also.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Friendswood, Texas (Mr. WEBER), my dear colleague.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Folks, the world is an inherently dangerous place. Watch the news.

Think with me for a minute. When the world has a catastrophe—and it

doesn't matter whether it is a tsunami, an earthquake, whether it is fire, pestilence, whether it is war—when the world has a catastrophe and dials 911, who is it that answers?

It is America, isn't it? With our military.

It is America that answers that 911 call. Now, how do we do that?

It is because this country has the strongest, most stable, most reliable, affordable energy capacity and capability in the world.

America is able to produce goods. I often say the things that make America great are the things that America makes, and our fossil fuel energy supply is what underwrites that.

You don't think that's right?

And I would argue that not only is it America's security; when America is strong, the world is strong. You don't think fossil fuel energy is important, try powering a tank or a jet plane with a solar panel, Mr. Speaker. You won't get very far.

We must remain strong. As I said, for the world to be safe, America has got to be strong. This rule and this bill, H.R. 351, are important not only to America's economy but also our national security and, I would argue, by extension, with the world depending on us, international security.

Yes, we have a stable, long-lasting reliable source of energy here in America. We have the opportunity to export that to our friends around the globe and help them to be safe, help them to be productive.

We will produce American jobs in the process. We will improve our balance of trade, as my friend from Corpus Christi said earlier.

LNG is helping not only with the economy, Mr. Speaker, but with national and, by extension, international security.

I have three plants in my district. The permitting process needs to be expedited and move forward. That is why I rise today in support of the rule, in support of H.R. 351.

Two LNG facilities in my district and one more on the books. They mean jobs. They mean security.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, to support this bill, put Americans to work, help America continue to be a leader, to be safe, and, indeed, help keep this world safe.

I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman stick around for a minute because, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he is most genuinely involved in trying to make sure that discussions about America and our allies and how the world sees us are well understood.

As a man who comes from not only Friendswood, Texas, which, like Mr. FARENTHOLD, is right in the center of this enterprise where we ship our nat-

ural resources around the world, I would really like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman to talk about the impact of foreign affairs.

The gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS, had asked a question about, well, why does this matter?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Thank you. Great questions.

I didn't talk about the fact that I have five ports in my district on the Gulf Coast of Texas, more than any other Member of Congress. Some have four. I have five LNG plants, LPG plants.

Sixty percent of the Nation's jet fuel is produced in my district, 60 percent of the Nation's jet fuel. An extremely large amount, a classified amount of the military's fuel. They won't tell us how much, but a large amount of the military's fuel.

Strategic petroleum reserves abound in my district. Again, we can't find out how much, but it is a huge amount.

From a foreign affairs initiative—and I have been over to Japan, I have been over to the Philippines, I have been to Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan—they want our LNG. They would much rather buy it from us than from the Russian bear.

Don't you know the people in Ukraine would much rather be dependent on us because we are not a dictatorship, at least not supposed to be, and we are not going to cut off their fuel because we have a disagreement with the way the Russian separatists activate or believe?

So it is a foreign affairs, it is a foreign policy initiative. As I said earlier, it helps make the world safer. It helps create jobs over here. It helps with our balance of trade, or imbalance of trade. It is an important issue, and it is one that bears supporting.

Support the rule, support this bill because it is not only important for America from an energy perspective, from a security perspective, but an international or world trade perspective, as well as world security. For foreign policy, it matters.

I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Friendswood, Texas, who, Mr. Speaker, has a keen understanding about not only what is in America's best interest, by serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but who is also a proud man who understands that people who work hard have jobs—clean, natural gas, an opportunity for America to get the benefits of one of God's greatest gifts to the United States that we can share with others.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there are a whole lot of ways for us to look at not only what lies ahead with opportunity, but I think we can also look at some models of success, and one of them might be my home State of Texas.

□ 1530

My home State of Texas has incredible opportunities and benefits that

have arisen from the ability to have energy abundance, the ability to have oil, natural gas, and other elements that can be used in this industry to make our country stronger, but what is happening is that we have also used it to Texas' benefit and America's benefit. That is right.

Just to tell a story, if it weren't for Texas, net job growth over the last 7 years in America would be flat. That means you take all 49 States, level it out—the minuses, the pluses, net it out—America would not have net positive job growth. But because of Texas, I can tell you that we now have created a net increase of 1.2 million jobs in America, net, and that has come because of Texas. So it is literally entirely a Texas product.

The essence of this has come from not just lower taxes, not just better roads, great schools, better education, good people, but it comes from a philosophy of understanding that we need to utilize these natural resources for the benefit of our world. To make jobs, job creation important, instead of delaying things, Texas had to make sure that what we did is we used it to our advantage.

So instead of not making decisions, like this Federal Government does by delaying major initiatives, we signed them into law. We got them done. We made things happen. So by doing that, when you do that, then you stand a chance to better everybody's life.

I would now like to give the gentleman from Florida a chance to finish his time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, I don't want to in any way disparage the lovefest of my friends from Texas. I recognize that everything is big in Texas.

Also, as a child, I even learned the songs of Texas, "The Yellow Rose of Texas," "Deep in the Heart of Texas," a whole bunch of them which I hold dear from my childhood.

I would like to have the gentleman who was called upon as a foreign affairs expert—because he serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee—to know, then, that I guess I too am a foreign affairs expert since I served on that committee for 8 years, served on the Intelligence Committee for 8 years. All of the countries that the gentleman mentioned, I have been to.

I assuredly never got an answer from the chairman or anyone else regarding whether or not Ukraine—and it is not "the Ukraine"; it is "Ukraine"—didn't get an answer as to whether they were prepared to receive liquefied natural gas.

I also know that we are mindful of the sanctions on Russia and how it is impacting them.

I didn't only just go to Ukraine. In their first election after the Orange

Revolution, I was the lead election monitor for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

I don't come to this dance without having some understanding, and I would urge that I still didn't get—although my friend, the chairman, seemed to suggest that the President is deserving of something that he earns, my belief is that the President has allowed for more gas leases than I would have had him do.

I would urge that just off the press, embargoed until noon today, is a press release from the United States Department of the Interior, which receives a lot of negative comment from my colleagues regarding regulations. "Interior Department Announces Draft Strategy for Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing." The draft proposal program includes 14 potential lease sales in eight planning areas—10 sales in the Gulf of Mexico, three off the coast of Alaska, and one in a portion of the mid- and south Atlantic.

Now, let me make it very clear. That might make a whole lot of people happy. It does not make me happy because they are discussing leases in the Gulf of Mexico where, I believe, there is substantial infrastructure from areas like Louisiana and Texas in the western portion of the gulf. I guess we just ignore things like the BP oil spill, and we ignore the potential for those kinds of disasters.

So I can't disagree very much with the chairman regarding much of his statistics, but I want the administration and my friend from Texas, the chairman, to know that, as I have said repeatedly, I will be the last person standing in this House of Representatives opposed to offshore drilling in my State of Florida no matter the views that others have. I believe there is enough wind from our respective oceans to double the amount of energy that we have, and, yes, my friend, there are aircraft that are powered without fossil fuel.

We were originally scheduled this week to also consider a border security bill, but that bill was scuttled yesterday amidst a number of things.

My friends, the Republicans, are pretty lucky. As bad as the snowstorm is, particularly for the New England area of our country, many of our colleagues could not get back here yesterday and probably won't be able to get back here today as well. The reason I say they are lucky is they can hide—by pulling the border bill—under the fact that there was a snowstorm and people couldn't get in here, and that is legitimate, in my view.

The other part of the concern—and we will see about it next week and the week after—is that many conservatives in the Republican Party are jumping ship on the border bill, and that was out there as well. Just like last week, just like last Congress, there is a rift in

the majority, leaving it unable to even pass legislation that all of its Members can agree on.

Unfortunately, we have real problems in this country that my friends are going to have to address. So I look forward to my friends' plan to repair our crumbling roads and bridges in this country, and I can't wait to see how this body will combat the national security threat of climate change, in spite of all of your denials.

I hope that my friends intend to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that many of the reforms in our tax structure allow for those persons who are ultrawealthy to pay their fair proportion of what they earn and to reform our Tax Code so that middle-income Americans can benefit and poor Americans can rise to the middle class.

With America's workers' wages stagnant for so long, including our own here in the House of Representatives, we are entering the seventh year without any increase in wages. And those of us who are poorer Members of Congress have experienced the kinds of difficulties of just being here in Washington and the cost for being here. I am seeking no sympathies. It is just a fact.

So with those wages stagnant for so long, I look forward to hearing from my colleagues on how they plan to raise the minimum wage in this country. Because until my friends can address their dysfunction and inability to lead, I am afraid our country is in for 2 more years of uncertainty.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate that most Presidents get a lot of credit on their watch and a lot of negative when things go wrong. For once, our gas prices are down, and my friends can't even bring themselves to say that this President deserves some credit. I do. I see it. He deserves some credit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as I explained earlier, Texas is the great American jobs machine. We talked about how we create jobs because we have effectively used the resources that, in many instances, Mother Nature and God have given us. So now it is time for Washington, I think, to learn from models that we do in Texas, where we learn to capitalize on all of our resources—in this case, the energy revolution that is at hand.

Look, what Republicans have done today is brought a bill that is common sense to the floor to unleash our natural resources, to make sure that it helps out not only our foreign policy, but workers and jobs in this country, and that is important. So it is a policy issue. The Republican Party is dead-on. There is going to be a bipartisan vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the rule governing debate on this bill, H.R. 351, the "LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act."

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-energy exploration. I am not anti-trade. I am, however strongly "pro-jobs," "pro-economic growth," and "pro-sustainable environment."

As a Member of Congress from Houston I have always been mindful of the importance of, and have strongly advocated for, national energy policies that will make our nation energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, fair, and promote the national interest.

Where they fall short, I believe in working across the aisle to improve them if possible by offering constructive amendments.

Although I believe the nation would benefit by increased exports of natural gas, the legislation before contains several provisions that are of great concern to me.

Pursuant to Section 2, subsection (a) of the bill, an application for authorization to export LNG is "deemed" approved if the Department of Energy (DOE) or other federal agencies do not approve or deny the application within 30 days of the conclusion of the site review.

I have three concerns with this regulatory scheme.

First, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with "deeming" something done that has not been done in fact.

Thus, the provision is unwise.

Second, this provision is a remedy in search of a problem. There is no lengthy or intolerable backlog of neglected natural gas export authority applications awaiting action by DOE.

The provision is unnecessary because DOE has to date authorized the export of over 10 billion cubic feet per day of LNG to non-Free Trade Agreement countries.

Together with exports to FTA countries, this level of LNG exports that would transform the United States into one of the world's largest exporters.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because it would require DOE and other agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Supporters of this bill argue that it is vital, in the face of Russian aggression and restrictions, to provide our allies in Europe with additional exports of LNG.

However, because actual exports through approved terminals are not expected to begin until late 2015, this legislation will have no impact on current exports.

And, limiting the time for review would prevent DOE from properly analyzing the domestic impact that of exporting large amounts of LNG.

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimates that increased exports could result

in an increase of as much as 8% in domestic LNG prices.

Given the inherent delicacy involved in assessing the impact of trade authorizations, both domestically and abroad, this state of affairs is likely to lead to DOE erring on the side of caution and denying applications that may otherwise have been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to oppose the rule, and the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 48 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 469 and H.R. 246, each by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 169, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	Dold	Jenkins (WV)
Allen	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Babin	Ellmers	Jordan
Barletta	Emmer	Joyce
Barr	Farenthold	Katko
Barton	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Benish	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Fleming	Kinziger (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Kline
Black	Forbes	Knight
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Labrador
Blum	Fox	LaMalfa
Bost	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Latta
Brat	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Gibson	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Brooks (IN)	Goodlatte	Love
Buck	Gosar	Lucas
Bucshon	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Granger	Lummis
Byrne	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Marchant
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Massie
Carter (TX)	Green, Gene	McCarthy
Chabot	Griffith	McCauley
Chaffetz	Grothman	McClintock
Clawson (FL)	Guinta	McHenry
Coffman	Guthrie	McKinley
Cole	Hanna	McMorris
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Rodgers
Collins (NY)	Harper	McSally
Comstock	Harris	Meadows
Conaway	Hartzler	Meehan
Cook	Hensarling	Messer
Costello (PA)	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Cramer	Hice (GA)	Miller (FL)
Crawford	Hill	Miller (MI)
Crenshaw	Holding	Moolenaar
Culberson	Hudson	Mooney (WV)
Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp	Mullin
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney
Delaney	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Denham	Hunter	Neugebauer
Dent	Hurd (TX)	Newhouse
DeSantis	Hurt (VA)	Noem
DesJarlais	Issa	Nugent

Nunes	Rothfus	Trott
Olson	Rouzer	Turner
Palazzo	Royce	Upton
Palmer	Russell	Valadao
Paulsen	Ryan (WI)	Vela
Pearce	Salmon	Wagner
Perry	Sanford	Walberg
Pittenger	Scalise	Walden
Pitts	Schweikert	Walker
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi
Poliquin	Scott, David	Weber (TX)
Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)
Posey	Sessions	Wenstrup
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Shuster	Westmoreland
Reed	Simpson	Whitfield
Reichert	Sinema	Williams
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Roby	Stefanik	Yoder
Rogers (AL)	Stewart	Yoho
Rogers (KY)	Stivers	Young (AK)
Rokita	Stutzman	Young (IA)
Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry	Zeldin
Roskam	Tiberi	Zinke
Ross	Tipton	

NAYS—169

Adams	Gallego	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garamendi	Nolan
Ashford	Graham	Norcross
Bass	Grayson	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Al	Pallone
Becerra	Grijalva	Pascarelli
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Rangel
Butterfield	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Capps	Israel	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Chu (CA)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Ciçilline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lawrence	Sires
Costa	Levin	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lewis	Speier
Cuellar	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Loebach	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DelBene	(NM)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	(NM)	Tsongas
Dingell	Lynch	Van Hollen
Doggett	Maloney,	Vargas
Doyle (PA)	Carolyn	Veasey
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Ellison	Matsui	Vislowsky
Eshoo	McCollum	Walz
Esty	McDermott	Wasserman
Farr	McGovern	Schultz
Fattah	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bera	DeFazio	Jones
Buchanan	Duckworth	Lee
Capuano	Engel	Lieu (CA)
Crowley	Heck (NV)	Marino

Meeks
Meng
Neal
Nunnelee

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher

Schock
Slaughter
Walorski

Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schraeder
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—23

Bera
Buchanan
Capuano
Crowley
DeFazio
Duckworth
Engel
Hardy
Heck (NV)
Jones
Lee
Lieu (CA)
Marino
Meeks
Meng
Neal
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Slaughter
Walorski

□ 1606

Ms. MATSUI changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILD WELFARE RESPONSE TO TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 469) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—410

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
DeLauro
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emmer
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Gohmert
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schraeder
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

□ 1616

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 246) to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—411

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
DeLauro
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emmer
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Gohmert
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schraeder
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush

Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Bera
Buchanan
Capuano
Crowley
DeFazio
Duckworth
Engel
Heck (NV)

Jones
Lee
Lieu (CA)
Marino
Meeks
Meng
Neal
Nunnelee

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Slaughter
Walorski

□ 1623

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote numbers 46, 47 and 48. Had I been present, I would have voted no on Roll Call vote number 46, and aye on Roll Call vote number 47 and 48.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, January 27, 2015, I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:

On Roll Call vote 46, on Agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 48 providing for consideration for the bill H.R. 351 to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes, I would have voted NO.

On Roll Call vote 47, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 469, the Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act, I would have voted AYE.

On Roll Call Vote 48, on Motion to Suspend the rules and Pass H.R. 246, to Improve Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking, I would have voted AYE.

CORRECTION TO ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 515, INTERNATIONAL MEGAN'S LAW TO PREVENT DEMAND FOR CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 515, the Clerk be directed to make the correction I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, after line 25 insert the following:

(2) TO OFFENDERS.—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING FOR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2015

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 398) to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a

severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 398

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.

(a) GRANT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and in consultation with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award, on a competitive basis, a grant to an eligible school under which such school will—

(1) not later than 6 months after receipt of the award, develop best practices for health care professionals—

(A) to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(B) to respond appropriately to such individuals;

(2) in developing best practices under paragraph (1), survey, analyze, and evaluate, in consultation with law enforcement personnel, social service providers, and other experts in the field of human trafficking, existing best practices that foster the practice of interprofessional collaboration, including those used by industries other than the health care industry, to determine the extent to which such existing best practices may be adapted for use as part of the best practices under paragraph (1);

(3) develop curricula, training modules, or materials to train health care professionals on the best practices developed under paragraph (1);

(4) not later than 12 months after the receipt of the award, make a subgrant to one entity located near an established anti-human trafficking task force initiative in each of the 10 administrative regions of the Department of Health and Human Services—

(A) to design, implement, and evaluate a pilot program using the best practices developed under paragraph (1) and the curricula, training modules, or materials developed under paragraph (3);

(B) to conduct the pilot program at one or more eligible sites within the respective region, which may include an eligible site that is a school-based health center; and

(C) to complete the implementation and evaluation of such pilot program within a period of 6 months;

(5) not later than 24 months after the receipt of the award, analyze the results of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under paragraph (4), including analyzing—

(A) changes in the skills, knowledge, and attitude of health care professionals resulting from the implementation of the programs;

(B) the number of victims of a severe form of trafficking who are recognized under the programs;

(C) of those recognized, the number who received information or referrals for services offered through the programs; and

(D) of those who received such information or referrals—

(i) the number who participated in follow-up services; and

(ii) the type of followup services received;
 (6) determine, using the results of the analysis under paragraph (5), the extent to which the best practices developed under paragraph (1) are evidence-based; and

(7) submit a comprehensive assessment of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under paragraph (4) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including an identification of—

(A) the best practices that are determined pursuant to paragraph (6) to be evidence-based; and

(B) the best practices that are determined pursuant to such paragraph to require further review in order to determine whether they are evidence-based.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The best practices developed through the grant awarded under subsection (a)—

(1) shall address—

(A) risk factors and indicators to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(B) application of Federal and State law, including reporting requirements, with respect to victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(C) patient safety and security, including the requirements of HIPAA privacy and security law as applied to victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(D) the management of medical records of patients who are victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(E) public and private social services available for rescue, food, clothing, and shelter referrals;

(F) the hotlines for reporting human trafficking maintained by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center and the Department of Homeland Security;

(G) validated assessment tools for the identification of victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(H) referral options and procedures for sharing information on human trafficking with a patient and making referrals for legal and social service assistance related to human trafficking when indicated and appropriate; and

(2) shall not address patient medical treatment.

(c) **DISSEMINATION.**—Not later than 24 months after the award of a grant to a school under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, shall—

(1) post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the best practices that are identified by the school under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(7); and

(2) disseminate to health care profession schools the best practices identified by the school under subsection (a)(7)(A) and evaluation results.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term “eligible site” means a health center that is receiving assistance under section 330, 399Z–1, or 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b, 300).

(2) The term “eligible school” means an accredited school of medicine or nursing with experience in the study or treatment of victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(3) The term “health care professional” means a person employed by a health care provider who provides to patients information (including information not related to medical treatment), scheduling, services, or referrals.

(4) The term “HIPAA privacy and security law” has the meaning given to such term in

section 3009 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300jj–19).

(5) The term “victim of a severe form of trafficking” has the meaning given to such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the ongoing domestic problem with human trafficking. H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act, will create a program dedicated to training our Nation's health care professionals in order to identify the early warning signs for the act of human trafficking.

Oftentimes, members of the medical community encounter these individuals while they are still being trafficked. By training health care professionals and equipping them with the right knowledge, we are enabling them to identify hallmark signs of this despicable act for early intervention.

This pilot program will test and examine the best practices needed for determining the protocol used for implementing human trafficking awareness within the medical community.

As a nurse, I know that our country's medical professionals already play a significant role in caring for victims of human trafficking. This legislation will better prepare those on the front lines, so that they can identify and care for those being trafficked.

Most Americans are unaware as to how prevalent and pervasive human trafficking is within our own borders, but it is time we acknowledge this fact and stand up against this heinous crime.

Our medical base is in a position to help these victims break free, and I am proud to push forth legislation further empowering them. This legislation trains health care workers to recognize the hallmark signs of human trafficking, thus allowing professionals to intervene on the patient's behalf.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, for helping me introduce H.R. 398 in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can all agree that human trafficking is an important problem that deserves Congress' attention, and that all of us support efforts to ensure that our health care workers are better prepared to identify and assist victims of human trafficking.

H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015, would set up a grant, facilitated by the Department of Health and Human Services, to create and address best practices for health care providers to use in the field. The program would then test those practices in 10 pilot programs across the country.

The goal of this legislation is laudable and would certainly take important steps to improve our ability to address the spread of human trafficking in our local communities. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the process that brought this bill to the floor.

This legislation has not gone through a subcommittee or full committee markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee, neither in the 114th Congress nor the previous session. Going through the normal committee process would have allowed Members and staff to make substantive and technical changes to ensure that the Department of Health and Human Services is able to implement this legislation effectively. Members who serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee deserve the opportunity to deliberate on legislation within the committee's jurisdiction and offer amendments to strengthen the bills that we consider.

Additionally, while this bill authorizes a new grant program, it does not authorize any additional appropriations for the Department to carry out this initiative. HHS may not be able to do this work within their limited existing resources. Advancing legislation, Mr. Speaker, that puts new requirements on the Federal Government without authorizing the funds to implement them is not a good precedent to set.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support new legislation that has not gone through the regular order process, but I will not object to considering H.R. 398 on suspension today and advancing the bill by voice vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. DEBBIE

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who is the Democratic sponsor of the bill.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and my colleague Congresswoman ELLMERS from North Carolina and rise today in strong support of the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015, a bill on which I was honored to join as the Democratic lead with my colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

I thank Congresswoman ELLMERS for her leadership on this bill and her willingness to shine a light on the scourge of human trafficking.

I was telling my staff the other day, Mr. Speaker, that it is a truly remarkable and sometimes too rare a thing in our Congress to find a Member who not only reaches across the aisle but who is also willing to work tirelessly to fight for what she believes in and has a staff willing to match that effort. It has been a pleasure working with you and your team on this legislation, as well as on my EARLY Act signed into law just a month ago, on which you served as the Republican lead on that legislation, and I look forward to what we may do together in the future.

Mr. Speaker, after passing legislation that made human and sex trafficking a State crime in my home State of Florida, I knew that, while that was an important tool to combat traffickers, we were just scratching the surface.

I joined Congresswoman ELLMERS on this bill because, though there is still much that we need to learn about the way human trafficking works in the United States, we know enough to know that it is far too prevalent, it preys on the most vulnerable in our Nation, and addressing it requires a comprehensive approach that encompasses prevention, treatment, and going after criminals.

We know that best guesses estimate there are 100,000 to 300,000 American youth currently at risk of being trafficked in the United States. We know that those most likely to be targeted are low-income women, foster youth, younger girls, and girls and women with a history of abuse and estrangement from family. And we know that once a girl is sex-trafficked, she has a life expectancy of just 7 years, during which she will be raped on average by 6,000 different buyers.

If the horror of human trafficking is not a problem that deserves a comprehensive response from all legal, social service, and medical sectors, then I don't know what is. Health care providers are often the first line of defense in these situations, sometimes being the only interaction with an outsider that a victim's trafficker may allow.

The Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015 develops evidence-based best practices for, and training of, health care providers to be

able to identify and properly respond to victims of trafficking, training that means when a girl 12 to 14 years old, the age range that is most at risk of being trafficked, when she is brought into a health care provider for a routine checkup by an older man who is not related to her, that a red flag goes off in a nurse's head or a health care provider's head.

Best practices will mean when a woman comes into an ER for a broken arm but a doctor discovers bruises and scars indicating a pattern of abuse, that that doctor doesn't just simply treat her broken arm and send her home. And resource knowledge means doctors and nurses cannot only identify potential victims but can respond appropriately to ensure that victim will one day become a survivor.

This bill joins several other trafficking bills being heard today on the House floor, including Representative BASS' bill to support youth most at risk for trafficking and Representative NOEM's bill to encourage intra-agency and effective human trafficking intervention and prevention strategies.

These two bills, as well as Representative ELLMERS' and my bill, are all pieces of a larger puzzle, initiatives that, when put together, create a comprehensive and cross-sector response to human trafficking.

We all stand up together today, regardless of political party, to say we do not want to raise our children in a world or a nation where a person can be sold as if she is property to be used by anyone to whom the trafficker offers her.

I am proud to join my colleagues and Congresswoman ELLMERS in the battle to eliminate human trafficking, for my daughters, who are 11 and 15, for my constituents in south Florida, and for the betterment of our world. I might add, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I can assure the gentleman that while I share and understand his concerns on the process, as far as the appropriations, we are going to pursue unobligated funds so that we can make sure that there are the resources available to make sure that this program is funded.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say again to my good friend and colleague from Florida, thank you for putting forward this effort to work with us.

To my colleague, Mr. PALLONE, I, too, believe that we need to work together. So just know that my door is open, that we will continue to work on these issues together, and I am just so glad that in a bipartisan effort today we are all coming together to stand up for victims of human trafficking and again get them on a path to recovery.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend,

who has been a tireless and passionate advocate for women and families and children who are affected by human trafficking really long before many of us were even aware that it was an issue here in this country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding and thank her for her leadership, especially on this extremely important bill, H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would direct grant money to the development of best practices for medical professionals so that they will know how to recognize trafficking victims and how to respond if a potential victim comes into their hospital or clinic.

Mrs. ELLMERS and I, and others, were inspired to do this bill by a Global Centurion report, in collaboration with the Charlotte Lozier Institute, that showed some 88 percent of domestic trafficking victims sought health care at some point during the time that they were being trafficked. That is absolutely amazing. These victimized women have come in contact with health care professionals, and then they leave and go out the door and nothing is done because the health care professional did not recognize the signs of human trafficking. They were in a clinic, hospital, or doctor's office when they were being trafficked, right back out the door to be trafficked again.

With 99 percent of trafficking victims reporting serious health consequences of being trafficked and pimps eager to get their victims healthy for continued exploitation for profit, medical professionals are on the front lines of trafficking interventions. We must make sure that the health care professionals are equipped to assist in effectuating freedom for trafficking victims whenever possible. We must think carefully about protocols for how to report suspected victims to authority. We don't want to put her in further danger. We must strategize ways to ensure the victims receive the help that they need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important bill, and I do hope my colleagues will support it. Again, I thank Mrs. ELLMERS for her leadership on it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers at this time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I just want to say again how proud I am of our Congress and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle coming together to work on very, very important legislation dealing with those who have been trafficked. Human trafficking is a travesty, it is a heinous crime, and it is today's modern-day slavery.

This is something that we must eradicate in this country. This is what the American people need for us to be a part of and work on.

I am just so happy that we are dealing with an issue that is going to affect so many out there in this country who do not have a voice right now. We have the opportunity now to stand up for what is right. We have the opportunity to do what is right, and by us working together and having legislation that will be sponsored in the Senate, as many of us do, we feel very strongly that this will become law, and we will be able to enact it and help those victims so that they can be looking towards recovery and empowering their lives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day with 12 different bills that we are addressing. I am just so proud to be a part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 398, the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015, introduced by Energy and Commerce Committee member RENEE ELLMERS of North Carolina.

I wish this bill and others related to trafficking today were not necessary. But the sad reality is that according to the U.S. Department of Justice, human trafficking is the second fastest growing criminal industry—just behind drug trafficking. Adding to the urgency is that approximately half of all victims are children. It makes you sick.

Human trafficking is a serious crime and a grave violation of human rights. Too often, this is a crime that goes unnoticed and it is one that is not well understood. It is simply too hard to imagine that a crime this horrendous could be happening right here on American soil, let alone in your own backyard. But it is. Not only does human trafficking occur in the United States, it is a lucrative business with billions of dollars in profits. It continues because victims are not easily identified and they are afraid. It happens in our own communities, because we are unaware. Today, we stand up and say no more.

In order for victims of trafficking to break free, they need help. Health care professionals are one of the few groups to interact with trafficked women and girls and can be one source of help as twenty-eight percent of trafficked women sought treatment from a health care professional while being held captive. Recent studies show that health care professionals are well positioned to be first responders if they have the training and skills to identify and help victims.

The Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act would provide for the development of evidence-based best practices to help health care providers to identify and assist victims of human trafficking. The bill requires HHS to award a grant to a medical or nursing school to develop best practices for medical personnel. These best practices will be tested in a pilot program conducted at Community Health Centers (CHCs) in each of the 10 administrative regions. The results of the pilot will be shared with the medical community for their consideration. This bill offers us an important opportunity to work with the medical community to improve awareness and

ensure that human trafficking education and practice becomes a part of basic health care training.

I thank Rep. ELLMERS for her hard work this important piece of legislation and urge its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 398.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMAND THE RELEASE OF NADIYA SAVCHENKO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the immediate release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who remains illegally jailed in Russia.

Ms. Savchenko was captured by Russian-directed forces in eastern Ukraine in June of 2014 and transferred to a prison in Voronezh, Russia. She is still imprisoned there today, now in her second month of a hunger strike that demonstrates to the world the inhumanity of her capture.

We recall the shocking footage of her interrogation in which she was handcuffed to a metal pipe, and yet we are assured by Russia she is "being treated well."

Why, if Russia is not invading Ukraine, as we are so often assured by Russia, should they hold Ms. Savchenko at all?

Yesterday, January 26, was Free Savchenko Day, a global, digital effort to raise awareness to her ongoing fight. The campaign shines a light on the disrespect for international law the Kremlin continues to demonstrate.

I was honored to participate in that campaign and introduce, along with our colleagues from the Ukrainian Caucus, House Resolution 50, calling to mind her struggle and demanding her immediate release.

The hunger strike began on December 13 and her health continues to deteriorate.

Mr. Speaker, Nadiya Savchenko has been a beacon for liberty. I salute her bravery in the face of overt Russian aggression. Her courage shines like a brilliant, brilliant beacon for liberty-loving people everywhere.

God bless her, God bless America, and God bless Ukraine.

□ 1645

REGULAR ORDER

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress has reconvened, none of the important legislation that we have considered here has gone through the regular committee process. Yet, with each election, we send people to the Congress of the United States with a wide range of perspectives, with lots of goodwill, with lots of good intentions—Democrats and Republicans alike. The simple truth, however, is that the House leadership has prevented these voices from being heard in the regular committee process. In fact, Congress has, sadly, become one of the most undemocratic institutions in America.

Mr. Speaker, stop denying the Members of Congress the opportunity and the public the opportunity to find common ground. The failure of the process is at the heart of gridlock. It is at the heart of congressional failure. Allow bills once again to come up through the regular committee process, where amendments are heard, considered, and voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, give Congress the opportunity to work together once again in the spirit of bipartisanship that the American people are so desperately hungry for.

HONORING WILHELMINA HENRY, A PIONEER IN EDUCATION

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pioneer in education, Ms. Wilhelmina Henry, who will be 95 years old this month. Ms. Henry is Stockton, California's, first Black teacher.

Born in South Carolina, she graduated from high school at the age of 16 and went on to earn a degree from the Tuskegee Institute—one of our country's oldest and most prestigious Historically Black Colleges. She began her teaching career after World War II in segregated schools in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama before moving to Stockton in 1947.

Though she faced discrimination and resistance, Ms. Henry persevered with courage and dignity, retiring after almost 50 years of educating our children. Her legacy is carried on by both her daughter, Rachelle Mimms, who is also a Stockton teacher, and at the Stockton elementary school that is named in her honor.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Henry's courage in breaking the color barrier for teachers and in paving the way for many others who have followed in her footsteps.

FIGHTING YOUTH HOMELESSNESS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this week, as we consider measures aimed at combating human trafficking, I remind my colleagues of the estimated 1.6 million runaway or homeless youths under the age of 18 in the United States.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act was enacted in 1974 to help combat these growing numbers, and it is the sole Federal law targeting unaccompanied youths. Through this law, we are able to fund important local programs to serve our homeless youths. They provide shelter, counseling, family reunification, and aftercare, and they reduce the chance that young people will become victims of human trafficking.

I am proud to have introduced and to have helped pass the reauthorization of this important funding in 2008, but that 5-year authorization expired in 2014, and now action must be taken. Congress has a responsibility to help ensure that homeless young people in America have a place to seek shelter and to find safety while laying a foundation for new opportunities.

I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting a reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and help the hundreds of thousands of children who sleep on our streets every night.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, "Work makes you free."

Today, I was thinking about that sign and about the psychological impact and the sadness that it must have had on millions of Holocaust survivors and on victims of the Holocaust as they walked into the concentration camps 70 years ago in Auschwitz and saw that sign, knowing they would never make it out free.

I rise today in remembrance of the 10th anniversary of the International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz.

On this day, we must take a moment to honor the memory of the millions who lost their lives and of those who survived but experienced unspeakable horrors. We must always remember the tragedy of the Holocaust in order to ensure that this dark time in human history is never repeated. Injustices and violence against any person because of one's faith, race, or ethnic background should never be tolerated. Today and every day, we must honor the memory of the Holocaust victims and ensure we renew our commitment to "never again."

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a voice for the thousands of human trafficking victims both abroad and in this country.

Sadly, these voiceless victims are often beaten, starved, and forced to work as prostitutes or to take grueling jobs as migrant and domestic workers. Time and time again, we hear terrible stories of violence, death, and trauma against innocent men, women, and children who have been trafficked through organized crime rings and even terrorist organizations.

As Members of Congress, we must stand up for justice and human dignity. The bills we are considering today will improve collaboration between government agencies, will cut down on human trafficking, and will better protect victims. Ending human trafficking is a bipartisan issue that must remain a priority.

Our country was founded upon the notion of "equality and justice for all." That is why I cosponsored a bipartisan bill with my North Carolina Republican colleague, MARK WALKER. H.R. 460, the Human Trafficking Detection Act, prioritizes training for the prevention and the detection of trafficked victims, and it brings us one step closer to finding a solution to this terrible tragedy of human trafficking.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT WEAPONS FUNNELED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican border bill, originally scheduled for this week, contains a provision buried on page 78 that would expand the Pentagon's 1033 program. This program transfers billions of dollars of Defense Department equipment to law enforcement agencies without any congressional oversight or community input. The bill adds a border securities activities priority to the program that will quietly funnel military-grade weapons to law enforcement for this new, fully defined priority.

It appears some of my colleagues did not learn the tragic lessons of Ferguson, Missouri, last summer as the Nation saw the devastating result of a militarized police force. If this bill is brought back up, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment in order to curb the expansion of this program.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, this chart has been up, really, for the last 4 years, and I keep bringing it back because it is pretty important. This is about American jobs, about how we can rebuild the American economy, and about how we can, at the same time, provide employment opportunities—those middle class jobs that we all want to talk about—and do it in a way that actually improves our environment.

Today, I want to focus on one part of this. I have asked some of my colleagues to join us, and Congresswoman HAHN will be joining us in a few moments to talk about a piece of this.

In the Make It In America agenda, we have these items: international trade, which is critically important that we do right; tax policies of all kinds; our energy policy. Oh. By the way, in the last 5 years, the energy policy of the administration's has almost made the United States energy independent. We are actually producing 4 billion more barrels of oil a day now than we were 6 or 7 years ago, so we do have an energy policy—green energy, moving away from the greenhouse gases; a labor policy; education, the training of our workers; research, which is critically important. We may come to that later today, but I really want to focus on this one which is at the bottom because it is foundational. The foundation of the economy of the United States is the infrastructure.

Way, way back, the Founding Fathers—everybody around here wants to talk about the Founding Fathers and what the Founding Fathers would do and how they would act. I will tell you what George Washington did in his first weeks in office.

He turned to Alexander Hamilton, the Treasury Secretary, and said: Hey, Alex. Develop an economic development plan for me. How are we going to grow our economy?

Treasury Secretary Hamilton came back—he formed a committee of one, and he came back with a plan of, maybe, 30, 40 pages, and in that plan was fundamental infrastructure development.

He said the role of the Federal Government is to make sure that we have postal roads, to make sure that we have ports and canals—the infrastructure of the day.

So, for those who like to harken back to the Founding Fathers—they ought to also consider the mothers. In any case, infrastructure was fundamental. Today, I want to talk about infrastructure, and I want to do it in a way that will really, hopefully, excite this body into passing a very robust, complete surface transportation infrastructure bill.

Now, President Obama and Department of Transportation Secretary Foxx have made a proposal called "Build America." It is a good proposal that covers all of the elements that we need—the highways, the ports, the railroads, freight. All of those things are in that bill. Unfortunately, it didn't have a hearing last year. Hopefully, it will be foundational this year as we consider in the next 3 months a surface transportation infrastructure bill for the United States because, in May, the world comes to an end as the programs of the Federal Government's for transportation expire. We need a new law going forward, so what we want to talk about today is that issue.

I am going to take just a few seconds. Every now and then, somebody sends brochures and studies to us. This one came from Duke University, the Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness: "Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs," and they have got this little executive summary which is really helpful to us:

Old and broken transportation infrastructure makes the United States less competitive than 15 of our major trading partners and makes American manufacturers less efficient in getting goods to market.

Representative HAHN, that is where you want to come in and talk about ports.

This is Duke University:

The underinvestment of infrastructure costs the United States over 900,000 jobs, including 97,000 American manufacturing jobs.

Maximizing American-made materials when rebuilding infrastructure has the potential to create even more jobs. Relying on American-made inputs can also mitigate safety concerns related to large-scale outsourcing.

□ 1700

One of the things that really, really bothers me about my home State of California is the way in which the State of California decided to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. We are talking about a multibillion-dollar project, \$3.9 billion over budget, 12 years late, and the steel in that bridge came from China. How brilliant was that?

One of the principal reasons for the delay was the steel was delayed, the steel was faulty, and the welds were faulty. There were 3,000 jobs in China and zero jobs in the United States. By the way, the Chinese demanded that they be the inspectors on the job—not good at all. This kind of tells us about why making it in America is important.

There is another example. I don't like to brag about New York, since that is a long, long way from my district, but the Tappan Zee Bridge in New York was built with American steel, had a \$3.9 billion total project cost, 7,728 American workers were hired, and it was designed to last 100 years without any major structural maintenance.

I know Ms. HAHN is going to come up here and probably carry on some bragging. We have got a lot to brag about in California, but we cannot brag about what happened with the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge because it was a financial disaster. It was a jobs disaster for the United States, for American workers. Even today, there are continuing reports coming out about the faulty bridge construction.

Infrastructure investment creates American jobs, and if we require that those investments be made in America, we are going to be talking about Americans going back to work. All of us talk about the middle class. Well, let's build the infrastructure, let's use American-made materials, and let's really build American jobs for the middle class.

Ms. HAHN, I believe you have something to say about ports. The fact is that you represent the two biggest ports in America, you will argue: Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI, for having the leadership, certainly, on Make It In America, but really reminding our colleagues and all Americans how important these projects are in terms of repairing our infrastructure, as well as creating good American jobs.

I am here today to join you and many of our colleagues in really pressing Congress this year to take action to improve our Nation's outdated, underfunded ports and to repair and replace crumbling roads and dangerous bridges.

I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I founded and cochair our congressional bipartisan PORTS Caucus, so I work closely with not only Democrats, but I am working very closely with Republicans.

I do know—and I believe this to be true—that this is one area that we can agree on, and that is our infrastructure and transportation. I am really hoping that we can work together across the aisle and understand that making these essential investments in America's transportation and infrastructure will create good-paying jobs, will help American businesses to compete globally, and it will improve the quality of life for families in every single congressional district.

As you said—and I will take bragging rights—I represent the Port of Los Angeles, and ALAN LOWENTHAL represents the Port of Long Beach. Together, we consider them America's ports. They are the largest port complex in the country. They account for about 40 percent of all trade that comes through this country, it comes through our ports.

I am a big advocate for these ports. As the cochair of the PORTS Caucus, I am an advocate for all ports in this country because the entire port network, the entire network of highways, roads, bridges, and infrastructure that

move freight across this country, needs some champions here in Congress.

This freight network is important for moving goods across our country. It is important for small businesses, and even if you live hundreds of miles from the nearest port, whether you realize it or not, everyone depends on our ports to get the goods to the stores, to the factories, and to the businesses that many of our colleagues represent.

Maybe you live or work in an agricultural or industrial area. We know that they produce something that America exports to foreign markets.

You may also have a direct interest in making sure that our freight network—our Nation's transportation system—is in good condition, is modern, efficient, and safe so that cargo can travel to the ports where it is loaded on the ships to get overseas.

I loved that in the State of the Union last week, President Obama said that "21st century businesses need 21st century infrastructure." The deteriorating infrastructure, crumbling roads, and collapsing bridges that are part of our current national freight network are a threat to America's prosperity and our global competitiveness.

Policymakers here in Congress need to recognize the need to make repairs and upgrades, but we have been stuck on how to pay for them.

I introduced a bill last Congress that I am going to reintroduce this Congress that will create a dedicated funding stream for these vital projects—and listen to this—without raising taxes or imposing any additional fees.

I have come up with an idea how to fund our national freight network, and I am hoping I can get broad support in this Congress. Let me repeat: it does not raise taxes one penny, and it does not increase any fees to any businesses in America.

What it does is divert 5 percent of the fees that we already collect on imports in this country—money that currently goes to the U.S. Treasury's general fund—and we can create a new national freight trust fund.

We collect \$39 billion a year nationwide in these import fees. Setting aside just 5 percent of those would give this national freight trust fund about \$2 billion a year that we could use to repair roads, highways, and bridges—the last mile to ease congestion into our ports across this country. Again, it is not going to raise taxes or fees.

I know, as you mentioned, Mr. GARAMENDI, we need to pass a surface transportation bill. I am working with Chairman SHUSTER and some of the committee members on our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to see if my legislation can be a part of that as a way just to fund our freight network.

It is different than funding the highway trust fund, which is our normal roads and bridges. This is different.

This is about the network that moves goods in this country. I hope you will support me.

Thank you for allowing me to speak on this very Special Hour. This is an issue, Mr. GARAMENDI, I know that we agree on. I know that our Republican colleagues will agree with us on this.

Maybe this is the one thing that we can do as a huge gift to the American people: find something in a bipartisan way, some common ground that we agree on, that will really repair infrastructure and create good jobs here in America. I think that is an issue that will, I believe, make the American people happy.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Ms. HAHN. The proposal that you put forward almost seems magical. If it was magic, you would have figured it out—and you did—but to use money that is already going into the general fund and divert it back to what it was really intended to—that is the enhancement of our ports—is entirely sensible.

I suppose that I am a coauthor.

Ms. HAHN. I am sure you are. If you are not, you will be.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am sure I will be.

The rest of the story that we have is that we need to take a look at our transportation infrastructure specifically in a very holistic, universal way. It does us no good to improve the interstate highway system when the link between the ports and the interstate highway system doesn't work.

For example, I-10 in southern California that you and I know so very well is the way you get out of those two ports onto the interstate highway system. It is rather inadequate. That is an example of that linkage that you are talking about.

We have many, many more things to talk about here. I welcome you to stay. We will probably circle back on it.

I see my colleague from Ohio. I think there are some ports in Ohio that quite possibly are in MARCY KAPTUR's district.

Ms. KAPTUR, if you would join us on this issue of infrastructure and jobs and making it in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. What a pleasure it is to join you this evening, and thank you for your continuing leadership on jobs, infrastructure—jobs in America, not outsourcing our jobs elsewhere—and to also be joined by Congresswoman HAHN, such an incredible leader who has made such a difference not just in California, but in communities across this country.

We really appreciate everything that she has done legislatively over these last 5 years to help our ports develop, to connect rail to ports, highway to rail. It is really amazing what her leadership has done in forming the PORTS Caucus. Thank you very much, Congresswoman HAHN.

I rise this evening to join both of you. Obviously, I am in a different part

of the country, but we understand what it means to Make It In America. I think the last company in Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, was the old Government Printing Office that used to print some of its goods here, but it doesn't anymore.

To Make It In America creates jobs here, and what is interesting to look at, Congressman GARAMENDI talks about the transportation and infrastructure bill. No bill that this Congress could pass would create more jobs than that bill. We hope to have it cleared.

I know Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO are working very hard on that. I know Members like Congressman GARAMENDI are helping lift them across the finish line.

The Make It In America agenda will create tens of thousands of jobs across this country. Look at every community you go to, and look at what is unfinished. Old bridges are falling down. There used to be a song, "London Bridge is Falling Down." Well, I think they are falling down in America now. Highways are not complete. We have old airports.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Speaking of bridges falling down, this is the Interstate 5 bridge in northern Washington State that fell down 2 years ago. Interstate 5 is the main intercontinental highway from Mexico to Canada through California, Oregon, and Washington. It created a bit of a traffic jam when it went down.

Ms. KAPTUR. I can only imagine. We have so many unmet needs in my own community that spans a river called the Maumee River, the largest river that flows into the Great Lakes.

We built a new bridge, but the challenge there today is with the weather. Ice is forming on the tensile spans, and they have had to close the bridge for 3 or 4 days at a time, for fear that these ice plates will fall on trucks and cars. We have to fix this problem.

All these issues are all over the country, so the transportation and infrastructure bill is essential. I thought in discussing this tonight that I would put a couple of really important figures on the RECORD.

Congresswoman HAHN talked about ports and her championing the PORTS Caucus here and how much gets imported into our country and what gets exported. Well, here is a chart that gives you a sense of how many more imports come in here than exports go out.

Since the mid-1970s and then the passage of NAFTA here, this represents the growing share of imports over exports into our country. Since about 1975, our country has amassed \$9.5 trillion in red ink with the world.

That is hard to imagine for most people, but that translates into 47.5 million lost jobs in our country just due to trade—not technology, but more im-

ports coming in than exports going out. We have lost two-thirds of our manufacturing jobs.

□ 1715

So when the gentleman champions development in America which yields jobs in America, these are just the figures relating to one country with which we have held a massive deficit since the passage of NAFTA. NAFTA passed back in 1993. Our country moved into a gigantic deficit with Mexico.

Recently, I don't know if the—and this means lost American jobs, to other places, and our people struggling, wages not rising, more part-time work, fewer benefits.

I don't know if the gentleman was able to see what happened with the recent Department of Transportation ruling. They gave a green light to long-haul, cross-border trucking by Mexican-based carriers, despite lingering safety concerns.

It is the jobs, but it is also the safety that you talk about. The Department of Transportation simply looked the other way when the inspector general found serious flaws in the pilot program meant to test this new authority.

Once again, NAFTA led to the lowest common denominator for the continent. Foreign corporate interests trump the safety of the American people. And we know that flawed trade deals cost us jobs. They harm our economy, and they put people at risk on both sides of the border.

So it is time to start fixing the damage, not creating more. I thank the gentleman for allowing us the time to express our views this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Ms. KAPTUR.

You notice our Make It In America agenda, they have trade up here at the top, and you very well pointed out the problems that occur with an unfair trade deal, NAFTA being but one.

At this moment, the President has asked us, Members of Congress, to pass what is known as the Fast Track, which basically gives authority to the President to cut a deal and then bring it to Congress, and we don't get to amend it. It is either an up-or-down vote. They say that is the only way they can negotiate.

Well, if that is so, then that is no way to negotiate because we are the representatives—actually the Constitution very clearly leaves to Congress the issue of international trade negotiations.

It is our responsibility, and I am not about to find a situation in which we give to the administration unfettered authority to cut a deal on international trade when you consider what happened with NAFTA, when you consider some of the other trade deals that have hollowed out the American manufacturing sector.

You put that chart up so very clear. Associated with that chart are real

lives, real middle class families. We had just over 19 million middle class families in manufacturing in 1990. It went down to just over 10 million as a result of these trade deals that you talked about. We are now beginning to come back up, principally because of cheap energy in the United States, natural gas specifically. So we have got a ways to go here.

We need to be really, really careful, as Members of Congress, representatives of the American people, that we don't give away even more American jobs.

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, I thank the gentleman so much for pointing that out.

You know, when the administration and others talk about this latest NAFTA deal, they are calling it the TPP now. They always give it initials or something—NAFTA, CAFTA, KORUS—it is always initials so the American people really can't quite understand what all that is about.

This one they are calling TPP.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Ms. KAPTUR. And the last deal we had was Korea. With Korea they promised, they said, we will be able to sell 50,000 American cars in Korea.

Well, what has happened is they have sold, the Koreans have sold 500,000 here. We never got the 50,000 in there, didn't get it—closed market, deal not kept.

I have a bill that I have introduced in several Congresses called the Balancing Trade Act, which basically says to the executive branch, for any country with which the United States has amassed a \$10 billion trade deficit, let's go back and figure out what is the problem? Why do we have a deficit rather than a balance or a surplus? And before we pass any more trade deals, fix that first.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, one of the problems—we spent a lot of time talking about this 2 years ago, and it has dropped off the discussion table, although it should come back—is the manipulation of the Chinese currency so that China is able to maintain a very, very significant trade advantage vis-à-vis the United States by the pricing of the Chinese currency. Grossly unfair, something that we need, as representatives of the American people and the middle class and the manufacturing sector, to forcefully address in legislation such as you have just described, where the administration is required to look at the problem, and then make suggestions, or correct the problem if it does not take an act of Congress.

We just can't give it away. We are talking about American jobs. We are talking about the middle class.

The President stood here less than 10 days ago in his State of the Union and talked about the middle class. He called it a middle class economic policy—absolutely correct.

But, at the same time, this trade issue intervenes in that program and, quite likely, will further harm the middle class by hollowing out the American manufacturing sector. So let's be careful here about these trade deals.

You talked about the transportation from Mexico. A few years back, I was the insurance commissioner in California, elected by the people of California, and we were discussing with Mexico the insurance on those trucks that, under NAFTA, were supposed to come into the United States.

At that time, and hopefully this has been solved—I am not the insurance commissioner now, but I remember very well—we were unable to develop with Mexico an insurance policy in Mexico that would transfer into the United States and cover these trucks that were in the United States. They said it wasn't necessary.

Well, my staff and I looked at the details of the insurance and we said, this isn't worthy insurance. This isn't going to protect somebody that is run over by a Mexican truck. So we demanded, and at that time, we actually stalled.

But it appears now that the Department of Transportation is moving forward, and I surely hope that this insurance issue has been solved.

Now, if I might go back to a little bit of infrastructure and the transportation issue, as we pointed out in our discussion thus far, we have to come to grips, within the next 3 months, with a new transportation, surface transportation program for the United States.

And these are real jobs. For every billion dollars—again, this comes from Duke University, which produced this report, "Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs"—the Duke Center on Globalization, Governance and Competitiveness, in their summary, they point out that for every billion dollars invested in transportation infrastructure, there are 21,671 jobs created.

For every dollar invested in transportation infrastructure, \$3.54 is returned to the economy.

I have one of those little charts here. This is an older study. I used this 2 years ago. I am going to have to rewrite this because this one says, for every dollar invested in infrastructure investment, \$1.57 is pumped into the American economy. That came from Mark Zandi. But this now is 3 years old.

This new study by Duke University indicates that this number, \$1.57, really ought to be \$3.54. So, wait a minute, fellows. This is even better.

So let's get this transportation bill done. Let's pump it into the economy. And if we just met the minimum needs, as we see them today, it is about \$111 billion a year for the next 5 years that we should spend on this infrastructure for transportation.

That is a lot of money. But even \$100 billion, we would find that we would

create 2,470,000 jobs. That is 58 percent more jobs than the current funding level would provide and over \$400 billion in total economic impact.

So if we want to build the economy, if we really want middle class jobs, we would pass a very robust surface transportation program so that the ports, as Ms. HAHN talked about, so that the highways and the trade programs that you talked about, so that all those things could come together, and we could really jump-start the economy and provide that middle class economic impact that all of us are now talking about, including the President. So this could be done, and we fully intend to do it.

I want to pick up another piece. If you would like to join our—to come back into our discussion, Ms. KAPTUR, please do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, I wanted to divert just a moment, if I could, to tell the story of one valiant American who is a very hardworking American, and when we don't make it in America, what happens to our people.

And I want to encourage citizens who may be listening to call their Member of Congress if they have a story like this from someone in their family, to please share it with us so that we can be a voice for these families across our country who have been harmed and are waiting for a transportation bill to be passed so they can go to work rebuilding America but, meanwhile, being hurt by international trade agreements that have outsourced their jobs.

Tonight, I would like to tell, very briefly, the story of Richard Hahn, a tradesman from northern Ohio whose job was outsourced to Mexico, one of the countries we talked about, and whose current job faces new trade threats as foreign steel floods our market.

Richard Hahn spent a long career with York International as an electrician, 23 years to be exact. He rose through the ranks to the status of 100th in seniority from his dedication and commitment to York International.

But in 2001, York International closed its Elyria, Ohio, facility and moved production to Monterrey, Mexico, leaving 900 workers without work, without a paycheck, without any assistance to move on.

After uprooting production to Mexico, York reached status as the world's largest independent manufacturer of air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery, and this left it as a prime buy for Johnson Controls, which acquired the company in 2005.

Mr. Hahn and many of his colleagues were given no training or retraining to find a replacement job, but York International continued to thrive. Its parent company, Johnson Controls, even continues to receive Department of Defense contracts to manufacture the

same air-conditioning, heating, and refrigeration machinery.

For nearly a year, Mr. Hahn was forced to accept unemployment as he desperately sought work in Elyria, Ohio. Many of his 900 colleagues moved their families out of Ohio, not finding any hope for reemployment in their hometown where they wanted to stay.

Fast forward, a little over a decade now, and Mr. Hahn is facing the trade theft of his job all over again. Although currently employed with U.S. Steel as an electrician, his and 614 colleagues' positions are under threat of layoff. U.S. Steel will have to idle its plant in coming months because they cannot continue to secure contracts to keep it running.

They have had international trade complaints about foreign-dumped steel and, unfortunately, Mr. Hahn's story is not unique. In fact, he said, his story is depicted best by quoting Billy Joel: "We're all waiting here in Allentown, but it sure is getting hard to stay."

The promise of jobs and lives better than your parents' is dissolving, and free trade deals are to blame for the shuttered factories.

Millions of Americans from across this great land have lived their own tale, in their own Allentown, and I encourage them to write or call their Member of Congress, just as Richard Hahn has bravely shared his story with me.

Tell us, tell the Members how trade has impacted your life and your ability to provide for your families. The more stories we receive from the American people, the more tales we can tell here on this floor and work with Congressman GARAMENDI to free our Nation from these flawed deals and make goods in America again so that our people can lead a decent way of life and not have their futures taken from them.

So I wanted to thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight. I used Mr. Hahn as an example of someone who has the finest work ethic, so highly trained, struggling out there to try to maintain work. It shouldn't be this hard in the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very, very much for bringing to our attention one of your constituents who faced this situation. There were 8 million other American workers who found themselves unemployed as these trade deals went into effect and American jobs moved to Mexico, to China, and other places around the world. So we must focus on Mr. Hahn and on those who share that.

□ 1730

Earlier, I think before you actually came in, I talked about steel. Again, this article was from Duke University, and they have a chapter here, "A Tale of Two Bridges." One is the San Fran-

cisco/Oakland Bay Bridge—they have the Chinese flag behind the bridge—built with Chinese steel, almost a \$7 billion project, of which \$3.9 billion was over budget. It was 12 years late. There were 3,000 Chinese workers hired. Very serious questions have been raised about the quality of the construction.

The State of New York, the Tappan Zee Bridge, built with U.S. steel. The total project cost \$3.9 billion. 7,728 workers were hired, and it is designed to last for 100 years without major maintenance. There is Mr. Hahn's job. It is that U.S. steel, made in America.

I very quickly want to give two examples of where Make It In America really, really counts. This is one I have often used. This is near my district—in fact, about a mile or two from my district in Sacramento, California.

In the stimulus bill, in 2009, there was a provision for some \$600 million, \$700 million for Amtrak to buy new locomotives for the east coast here. This is an electric locomotive. There was a sentence added to that \$600 million, \$700 million law for it to be 100 percent American made.

Now, nobody was making locomotives in the United States at the time, nobody. But Siemens, a German company, looked at it and goes, 70, 80 locomotives; a \$600 million, \$700 million contract; made in America—we could do that. So the German company, Siemens, used a plant that they had in Sacramento that was making light railcars and said: Okay. We are going to make light railcars, and we are going to make locomotives.

They are now producing the locomotives 100 percent American made. Hundreds of jobs in the Sacramento area. And then all across America, there are manufacturers that are making the wheels, probably making the doorknobs or the system that attaches to the electrical line overhead.

Made in America. Why? Because Congress wrote a law—by the way, no Republicans voted for it; this was the stimulus bill—made a law that said it must be 100 percent American made.

I don't have a picture. I wish I did. If I had thought about it earlier, I would have brought one.

We are now in the process of deciding how much of our natural gas we are going to export. It is called liquefied natural gas, LNG, liquefied natural gas. There is an export plant, a \$20 billion export plant built on the gulf coast in Texas, owned by a company called Cheniere. They are 3, 5 months away from the first export of that natural gas. There is a lot of discussion about how much we can export without driving up the price, and that would be very harmful to American consumers—home heating, manufacturing, and the like. But what they do export will take 100 ships to export from that single export terminal, 100 ships.

And I am going: Let me see now. Natural gas is a strategic national asset

that has allowed for a reduction in the cost of energy in the United States, extremely important. American mariners are absolutely essential to our national defense, as are the domestic ships. Thirdly, the shipyards are essential for the U.S. Navy. These are three strategic assets that the United States has.

I proposed an amendment last night in the Rules Committee that almost was adopted that said, if we are going to export a strategic national asset, then let us also build two additional strategic assets. The mariners, the captains, the mates, the seamen, let them participate in this export of natural gas, and let's build the ships in America.

There are five terminals that are presently authorized for construction. Cheniere has completed a second terminal of about the same size. It is going in near Corpus Christi, Texas. And there are three others. So we may be talking somewhere between 300 to 400 ships needed to export a strategic national asset.

So my legislation would say, okay, then let us enhance our Nation's security by building those ships in America. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of American jobs in our shipyards, in our manufacturing facilities in Ohio, building the pumps and the pipes and the valves and the compressors that are necessary. This is a big, big deal. And while we guarantee those jobs for the American shipyards, we also strengthen the U.S. Navy's ability to build ships at a reasonable cost.

We could do it. We could actually do this with one simple piece of legislation that isn't more than 20 lines long. Now, that is exciting.

Trains, planes, ships. It is in America's future. It has been in our past. And it is the policies, the policies of the American Government, that set these in place and in motion.

Isn't that exciting? We can do that, Ms. KAPTUR. We can do that. And we can move production to Ohio manufacturing, the shipyards on the gulf coast, the east coast, and the west coast. It is all there for us.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is really exciting, Congressman GARAMENDI. And when you think about our strategic reserve in terms of the military, if America enters conflicts, often we don't have those fleets within the Department of Defense. We have to lease them from the private sector. So we would modernize that capacity for our country in the event it would be needed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly so. Exactly so. It is absolutely critical to our national defense that we have a strong maritime industry. We used to have the biggest maritime industry in the world. We have just given it away for many, many different reasons. But it can be rebuilt.

I want to give one more example, and then I am going to wrap. And if you

would like to participate in the wrap,
then we can do that.

At this moment, Amtrak is out with a request for a proposal to build 30, 33 new trains, high-speed rail trains for the northeast corridor, from Washington, D.C., to Boston, high-speed trains that can go 160, 200 miles an hour, reducing the commute time. That request for a proposal to manufacturers around the world is coupled with a waiver of the Buy America requirements. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayer money and a waiver of the Buy America requirements because Amtrak said they don't build them in the United States. Well, that is true. We don't build high-speed rail in the United States, and we never will if we give waivers.

But if we set in place a solid requirement that American taxpayer money is going to be spent on American-made equipment, we will build in the United States facilities to manufacture high-speed rail. The same thing applies in California with the California high-speed rail system.

In our future, we will have high-speed rail. The question for us in our policy debates is: In our future, will those high-speed rail trains be built in America, or will they be built in China or Korea or Japan or Europe?

I want them to succeed. But, by God, I want America to succeed, too. And I know that if we stick to this Make It In America agenda, we will rebuild the American middle class.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to say, Congressman GARAMENDI, you are such a leader for jobs in America. I am sure your constituents are cheering not just tonight but every day for you and for your work here. You keep the Congress focused, both sides of the aisle, on Make It In America, on trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, research, infrastructure, and, over them all, jobs.

As we close this evening, let me say, this is what the trade deficit looks like today when we know we aren't building, whether it is tubes or whether it is trains or whether it is enough trucks in this country, cars. Imagine if we were to turn it the other way and America started making it in America and exporting to the world rather than the reverse. We would have such an economic recovery, it would astound the American people. It is amazing what we have been able to retain, even with this hemorrhage that has occurred over the last three decades.

Thank you for drawing our attention to the importance of transportation and infrastructure as a key job creator in this country. If we could pass that bill early this year, what we would do for this economy, and add Buy America provisions to several of the bills that will be coming before us. I will join you in that effort.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is exciting, Ms. KAPTUR. It is very, very exciting that a

policy statement, a law put forth by 435 of us here and 100 over in the Senate can really dramatically alter America's economy and do it in a way that doesn't really cost us more money but simply requires that our tax dollars be spent on American-made equipment so that American workers can prosper.

Now, if somebody wants to go out and use their own tax dollars to buy goods from China, that is their business. Fine, go do it. But if it is your tax dollars and my tax dollars, then it ought to be made in America.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time. I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take some time on the floor of the United States Congress—the House of Representatives, to be specific—to honor and recognize the service of our law enforcement agencies across this great country.

You know, we have been dealing with the reactions from the tragic death of Michael Brown last August. Almost continually, every week, we hear of some tragic death, a shooting incident across this country. And we all understand and realize that all loss of life is a tragedy, but there has been an outbreak of violence across this great country that is equally disturbing, resulting in the brutal assassination of two law enforcement officers just before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I was a law enforcement officer for 33 years in King County, which is a county in Seattle, Washington. I started when I was 21 years old in 1972. I worked in a police car, and I was a detective. I worked the street undercover for a short time. I never knew when I left home if I would see my family, when would be the next time that I would see my wife, my children. When I told them good-bye for a day at the office, I didn't know if I was coming back home and neither did they. But every law enforcement officer across this great country lives with that knowledge, and every family member lives with that fear.

I have missed holidays, birthdays, anniversaries. I would be called out in the middle of the day or the middle of the night or on the weekend. I remember one day missing my daughter's birthday. On Christmas Eve, I remember driving around in the middle of the night patrolling, while others had their relatives parked in their driveways; and they were in, sharing Christmas dinner and presents with their family and friends.

But once a cop, always a cop, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I have been in Congress for 10 years, but I was a cop for 33 years.

A lot of people think "cop" is a derogatory remark, but it is actually a badge of honor. I was the sheriff for the last 8 years of my career. One thing I said when I left, if the members of the King County Sheriff's Office, which are nearly 1,100—it is the 12th largest sheriff's office in the country—said that DAVE REICHERT was a great cop, that is what meant the world to me.

□ 1745

If they said I was a good sheriff, that was icing on the cake, but I just wanted to be known as a good cop working my district and my beat and doing the job that I was trained to do and serving the public.

Police officers do what they do because they care. They go to work every day because they want to save lives, not to take lives. They put up with ridicule and harassment, assaults, and even the ultimate sacrifice—death—always facing dangerous situations, putting their lives between their communities—the public—and danger.

Sometimes, as I said, the ultimate sacrifice is made. During my career, I lost a partner and a good friend who was shot and killed in 1982. In 1984, I lost another partner and a good friend who was stabbed to death with a sword.

These men died serving and protecting their community, but they left behind family. They left behind sons, daughters, spouses, orphaned children, and widowed. The men and women who keep us safe find themselves in life-and-death situations far too often. In many instances, Mr. Speaker, taking down a bad guy means losing a good guy too.

Life-and-death situations are never easy. I remember one instance that I was working plainclothes and went in with a group of my team of officers on a drug search warrant. I was the sergeant leading that team.

My assignment was to go in the front door, turn to the right, and make sure that the bathroom in that small apartment was secure. We went in the front door. I kicked in the bathroom door, and I found a person sitting on the toilet.

As he stood, he revealed that he had a rubber band around his bicep and a heroin needle stuck in his arm. I could

see that his eyes were glazed over. I told him to raise his hands; instead of doing that, he grabbed a gun.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could have shot that man. In a split second, he grabbed a gun, and my life was in danger, but I had a feeling I could talk him out of that gun. I just had a feeling I could reason with this man, even though he was high on heroin.

I didn't shoot, and I was able to talk him out of his gun. In fact, he dropped it in the toilet. What would you do, Mr. Speaker, if you were standing there with that decision? In an instant, you had to make a decision: shoot or don't shoot.

Our men and women who wear uniforms every day have to make that split-second decision. Now, they don't always make the right decision, but more often than not, they do. The men and women in uniform across this country are human beings, and they make mistakes, as we all do; we need to understand that.

When the mistakes are made, police officers expect to have scrutiny applied. They expect oversight, they expect to have the action they took reviewed, reviewed, and reviewed, and they respect the rule of law, the process of the review, the investigation, and the judicial process that needs to take place.

As all Americans across this country, we need to recognize that process too. Reacting to bad situations by disregarding the rule of law only makes things worse in this Nation. It creates harm in our communities, rather than harmony. Everyone must come together.

Communities and law enforcement should be partners, protecting our families. Communities and law enforcement should be partners. Just as I was a partner with my partners that I spoke about earlier, communities should be our partner, law enforcement's partner.

What do good partners do? They trust each other. Communities must trust their police department. The police department and the sheriff's office must trust the community, work with one another, and depend on one another.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we do that, if we can stop for a moment, listen to the facts, and respect the law that exists here in the United States of America—the greatest country in the world—yeah, we are not perfect, but we have the best system.

If we all come together and recognize we have the best system—and where it needs to be changed, let's change it—but as the process goes through, let's respect it. If we do that together, Mr. Speaker, we can continue to live in the greatest country in this world.

I want to conclude my opening statements just by saying that I really think it is important for us across this Nation to pause and remember to thank our law enforcement officers.

Every time we see a cop, let's say thank you. It is just one of ways that we can support them and show that support, but I think, even more importantly, let's pray for them and pray for their families, but let's also pray for the communities that they serve, that the communities see the tough job they have to do and the sacrifices they make.

Pray for peace, understanding, cooperation, trust, and let's pray, Mr. Speaker, that we have a partner in each other, a partner that we can trust that will back us up. Law enforcement backing up the community and the community backing up the police officers, that is where I would like to see this go, Mr. Speaker.

We have some other Members here tonight who want to share their comments about their community and their relationship with law enforcement.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman, and I thank you for the time, but I thank you most of all for your service to the people of your community and what you have done for them and your proxy for hundreds of thousands of law enforcement officers that do that day in and day out, and we take them for granted.

I am glad you brought up the subject of families because we sometimes forget that these law enforcement officers have families. They have husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, and friends.

Literally, when they go out every day, those people and their family and their friends are not certain they will come back. How many of us, when we go off to work, our family and friends think, "Well, he may not come back"? What a terrible thing that must be, how difficult that is for the family.

My grandfather was a sheriff in Mobile County in Alabama in the twenties and thirties. I wasn't alive during that point in time, but I remember my father telling stories about that.

When his father would go out at night and they had to do things on patrol or to go out and apprehend somebody who committed a crime and how upset it would leave him as a child thinking: Where is my dad going? Is he going to be okay? We take that for granted, but the families don't take that for granted because they have to live with it day in and day out.

We so often think of law enforcement officers in terms of how they relate to a criminal. Well, oftentimes, the most important person or persons they are relating with are victims.

They are the protectors—in some cases, the saviors—of victims, people who are getting ready to be hurt by a criminal, and—but for a law enforcement officer—they would be hurt and maybe even killed.

Those law enforcement officers rush into an inherently dangerous situation to keep those people from harm and maybe even save them from death. It may be a phone call that goes to 911 in the dead of night, a woman screaming into the phone: My husband has a gun, and he is going to use it against me.

A law enforcement officer is dispensed to that environment, not knowing in that highly emotionally charged moment whether that gun is going to be used on him or the person he has come to save.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again, law enforcement officers find a way to defuse that situation. No one is hurt, the person that is about to commit a crime is apprehended and charged with a crime less than actually hurting somebody, but a person has been saved; a person has been saved from harm or perhaps death.

If you have ever been in that moment and been someone who has been a victim, when a law enforcement officer comes up and saves you in that moment, you realize that but for those law enforcement officers who do that day in and day out, we could all be victims of a horrible crime, and we take that for granted.

My wife, Rebecca, and I were victims of a violent crime. We were stopped one night by three young men who tried to rob us. They had a knife and said they had a gun. My wife was pregnant. They took our jewelry and then threw her to the ground which could have not only hurt her, but hurt the baby.

Fortunately, some of the people involved with the main perpetrator realized it was time to run, and as they did, we could scream out. As we screamed out, neighbors called the police. They came very quickly.

I can tell you when you are in that moment and you feel that sense of fear because people have weapons that they want to use against you and they have already used physical violence against you, when that squad car comes up and the man or men or women in uniform step out, you feel safe.

When they step out of that squad car, they are not safe because they have to go out. Their official duty is to try to apprehend that person and do whatever it takes to protect the rest of us. We take that for granted, and we should never, ever take that for granted.

Mr. Speaker, last year, over 100 law enforcement officers in the United States lost their lives in the line of duty. So far in this young year in the United States already, nine law enforcement officers have lost their lives in the line of duty.

One of them was lost last night in my home county, Baldwin County, Alabama, a police officer—a fine police officer—with the city of Loxley, and we take that for granted. He got in his car at the beginning of the day, kissed his wife, went to work, and didn't come home.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we in America can use times like this to remember what we gain from people who put on the uniform of law enforcement to serve us and to protect us. "Serve and protect," that is the motto.

All of us tonight, millions of us as Americans tonight will go to bed, will put our heads on that pillow, and will go to sleep safe, knowing that these men and women are patrolling the streets of our country to keep danger away from us.

Before we go to sleep every night, perhaps we should do one more thing: let's say a little prayer for those men and women who patrol the streets of our country to protect all of us and maintain the quality of life that we all too often take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this time tonight, your service to your community and to our country, and hope you will continue to remind us in the days to come of what we owe to the men and women that wear law enforcement uniforms throughout America.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments and for being here tonight to share his support of our law enforcement officers across this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank Congressman REICHERT not only for yielding me the time, but also for his service as a law enforcement officer because when he speaks on the floor of the House on behalf of our Nation's law enforcement officers—the men and women who put their lives on the line every day—he speaks from personal experience. I have heard those experiences a number of times, and I thank you for that.

There are others here in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, who have served in law enforcement, and we thank them as well. I am particularly pleased that Dave is hosting this Special Order tonight to show our respect and deep gratitude for the thousands of law enforcement officers across the country who serve our communities and the American people daily.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the rule of law, and every day, law enforcement officers carry out this legacy. They protect our neighborhoods from criminals, fight crime, ensure justice, and keep the peace. They patrol neighborhoods late at night and early in the morning while we sleep in the comforts of our homes.

Since 9/11, our Nation's law enforcement officers are now the first to respond to terrorist attacks. On that tragic day nearly 14 years ago, NYPD officers and other first responders were running into the crumbling towers to save people as everyone else was running out.

In 2010, an NYPD officer was the first one on the scene when a terrorist at-

tempted to ignite a car bomb in Times Square.

□ 1800

The same was true during the Boston Marathon bombings in April 2013. The Boston police responded immediately to aid the wounded and implement emergency plans.

Sadly, many law enforcement have made the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf. Last year alone, 120 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty, including three from the Commonwealth of Virginia. These are sober reminders that our Nation's law enforcement professionals face danger every day as they carry out their duty to protect the American people.

As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I have the privilege to work with Federal law enforcement agencies. All too often, we fail to recognize how the dedicated men and women of law enforcement make sacrifices—some sacrificing their lives—to preserve law and order and keep our communities, our States, and our Nation safe. These brave men and women are heroes and deserve to be recognized and honored for their service to our country.

Again, I thank our law enforcement officer, Congressman REICHERT, for taking this time to have this law enforcement Special Order.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank you, Mr. GOODLATTE, for your comments and for your hard work as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I thank you for coming tonight and sharing your comments.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS). I am sure she wants to talk about her great sheriff in Spokane.

CATHY, it is good to see you.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. That is right, and the former great sheriff from King County, whom I have the privilege of serving with now in the United States House of Representatives. Thank you, Congressman REICHERT, for your leadership and your service both as sheriff and local law enforcement officer, and also for bringing us together tonight.

I see another former sheriff from Florida, RICH NUGENT. We are grateful for those who have served and those who currently serve.

In our darkest hours, we turn to law enforcement to keep us from harm's way. It is easy to take those who serve for granted. Tonight, I am privileged to stand here and to say thank you. Thank you for your service, thank you for your commitment, thank you for the sacrifices and all of the acts of heroism.

When we drop our kids off at school, buckle up our seat belts and hit the roads or kiss our children good night, we know that our first responders will

be there if we ever need them, and they will do everything they can to keep us safe. Sometimes it is nice to know they are out there on the roads in case something happens. Our police officers and firefighters get up every morning not knowing what their day will look like, not knowing with certainty if they will be home for dinner.

At a time when there are growing threats facing America, growing unrest around the world, these men and women are ready to answer the call of duty at any moment. They do it out of a great sense of service and commitment, to serve and to protect. Men and women in uniform across eastern Washington and throughout this country put their lives on the line every day.

In Spokane, yes, Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich and Police Chief Frank Straub, we are so grateful for their leadership, effective leadership, bringing down overall crime rates. It is really a testament to them. I actually have the privilege of working with 10 sheriffs in eastern Washington who are having a tremendous impact on keeping our communities safe.

Their families, too, take on tremendous sacrifices for it is their loved ones who go out into the streets to keep us safe. These are husbands, wives, moms, and dads whose sense of honor and whose commitment to our country is worthy of our profound gratitude. For in America, we are blessed to live in a nation whose law enforcement officers will do everything they can to keep us safe.

So I thank those who serve in eastern Washington and all across the country for serving. These men and women deserve our respect, our thanks, and they deserve a lifetime of appreciation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS for her comments and her support of law enforcement officers and sheriffs that she works with.

Ten years ago—well, a little longer ago than that—I was the president of the Washington State Sheriffs Association, and so I had the opportunity to work with all of the sheriffs and police chiefs in Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for yielding to me, and I thank him for his very distinguished career in law enforcement for all of those 30-plus years. He had a great reputation, served honorably, and was involved in some very high-profile cases that are, I think, worthy of a lot of discussion.

I wanted to take time today to express my strong support for the brave men and women who serve on our Nation's Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies. Particularly, I would like to honor two New York City police officers, Officers Ramos and Liu,

who were brutally slain in an ambush on December 20, targeted simply because they were the New York Police Department uniform.

Officer Ramos was a devoted husband and the father of two young children. He had just celebrated his 40th birthday. Officer Liu, who married just 3 months ago, leaves behind his devastated young wife and parents. All across the Nation, the thoughts and prayers of grateful citizens go out to their families, friends, and officers who served with them.

I live in Allentown, Pennsylvania, not terribly far from New York City. I have to tell you, I believe the New York City Police Department is among the finest big city police departments anywhere in the world. I remember September 11, 2001, we saw firefighters and police officers and others rush down to the Twin Towers.

We recognized and celebrated their heroism because many of them gave that last full measure of devotion on that day. There was no profession more noble than being a police officer at that time, and particularly a New York City police officer. How times have changed in a fairly short period of time.

This extraordinary police department has come under fire because they have implemented very effective police practices which have been a model for the rest of the Nation, have kept crime rates low, and is something we should be celebrating, that department and the men and women who work there. It is a very diverse police department, among the most diverse anywhere.

I would also like to point out one other sad tragedy that we dealt with this year in my own State. It was the beautiful fall foliage of Pennsylvania's Pocono Mountains that was the backdrop of a horror that many northeastern Pennsylvanians had to deal with for several weeks.

We Pennsylvanians recently mourned our own loss on September 12, 2014, when State Police Corporal Bryon Dickson was murdered under what appear to be similar circumstances to those in New York. He was shot to death because of the badge that he wore.

Trooper Alex Douglass was seriously wounded in that same incident. We are pleased to hear that Trooper Douglass is recovering steadily, and we wish him the best in his long road to a full recovery. But what followed that horrific attack and assassination was a truly impressive 7-week manhunt for Eric Frein, the shooter and self-trained, self-described survivalist.

Over 1,000 officers from State and local law enforcement agencies from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York teamed with the FBI, U.S. Marshals Service, and ATF, and it was amazing. What we witnessed was an amazing testament to police work,

which ended successfully with the surrender of Frein, and there were no shots fired. Frein, I should note, is currently standing trial.

Police work is certainly, as Congressman REICHERT knows better than anyone in this room, and Congressman NUGENT, too, they know that police work is inherently dangerous. Officers must enforce the law in any number of difficult situations under pressures few outside the military could possibly understand, from routine traffic stops to domestic violence situations to hostage cases to murder scenes. America's finest must deal with it all. They deserve our support, and they most assuredly have mine.

While we have recently seen a handful of high profile cases of citizens clashing with police, anyone who has ever attended a local crime watch meeting knows that police officers care deeply about the communities they serve. I have attended so many of these meetings over the years, both as a State legislator and even as a Congressman, numerous crime watch meetings in some pretty tough areas, and I was always so impressed with the way the officers immersed themselves in the daily life of the neighborhoods for which they were responsible. No problem was too small. They would deal with it.

Now is the time for all of us to roll up our sleeves and work to address the underlying issues that have animated enormous emotions in communities across our country.

I should point out, too, as a new member of the bipartisan House Law Enforcement Caucus, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance Federal policy that supports all of the brave men and women who have sworn to protect and serve.

I thank the gentleman from Washington State for putting on this hour tonight. We need to spend more time celebrating the fine men and women who serve us.

Mr. REICHERT. I appreciate your comments, Mr. DENT. For so many of the words that you shared, I could make a lot of follow-up statements, but our time is limited. But I do want to focus on one of the points that you made, just briefly.

One of the hardest things that I ever did in my career was in 1982 when my partner, as I mentioned earlier, was shot and killed. It was a 3-day manhunt for the person responsible in the Cascade foothills. Finally, he was captured, and I was the only homicide detective at the scene, and they put me in the backseat with the killer of my good friend and partner. He was handcuffed.

When I got into the backseat, I read him his rights. He had three things to say to me. Number one, of course, he wasn't sorry; number two, I'm thirsty;

and number three, I'm hungry. I think he wanted his handcuffs loosened, too; they were too tight. So I loosened his handcuffs. We stopped at a Burger King and bought him food and got him something to drink, and then, of course, he went to jail.

But to sit in that backseat with the man who just took my partner's life—my good friend, my best friend—3 days before was tough. And those are the kinds of things that cops deal with every day. And thank you for recognizing the emotional difficulty, not only for the officers, but for the community. It was a heavy day, a heavy week, a heavy month for the entire community. And, of course, the family still lives on with the loss of their father and husband.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Thank you so much for your leadership on this critical evening to express the will of so many Members of Congress that hopefully is the will of the American people. I thank you for your service not only here in Congress, but also for serving the people of King County as sheriff.

Mr. Speaker, when we get to call out some of our dear friends who are sheriffs or police chiefs, many times we don't even refer to them by name. It is "sheriff" or "chief." But tonight, I want to talk a little bit about what I call most of my law enforcement colleagues in western North Carolina. I call them friends. I want to tell a few personal stories.

Before I do that, I want to share a little bit about the gentleman from Washington who is leading this tonight, because it is real easy to see the professional side of a Member who serves with distinction here in this body, but sometimes the people back home miss the personal side.

Today, we were discussing a number of bills on human trafficking and the unbelievable blight that is on our Nation and on our world where we have more people today in modern-day slavery than at the height of the slave trade. But it is personal for this gentleman to my left because time and time again, in meetings, he has brought up the plight of those young girls, their being trafficked at the hands of so many that are out there. It is that personal side that we can applaud tonight, not only for my colleague, but for many of the sheriffs and chiefs that I have the honor of knowing because of being in this position.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell story after story, but there is one police chief in my area who shared a story about one of his officers who was working for him who puts his life on the line every single day, and he does it for a little over \$12 an hour. When I heard that, I could hardly believe it, because as we start to see the dedication with which our law enforcement officers truly put

themselves out each and every day, not only them, but their families—and we expect them to come home.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, as has been shared previously, sometimes, they don't come home; so we must do a better job of standing by our law enforcement officers each and every day to thank them, to go out of our way, to make sure that we thank them for their service, thank their families for their sacrifice.

There are birthday parties that are missed, anniversaries that are missed, dinner engagements that are missed because when the phone rings or when the call goes off or when the beeper is alert, they are always there. Not answering that call is not an option for them. They are always available.

Yet in my district back in North Carolina, we have sheriffs who are getting involved to make sure that the homeless have a place, a warm bed, and a hot meal; a sheriff that has actually gone out in his community in one of my counties that makes sure that those that are in need have a place on Halloween night to come and celebrate in a safe environment; dedicated volunteers over and over; a sheriff back home who really works tirelessly to make sure that the needs of those that are most needy in his community are taken care of—story upon story, Mr. Speaker, of people who put politics aside and put the interests of their community first.

Whether it is a Democrat or Republican, they all work together to make sure that what happens is that their community is safe.

Mr. Speaker, they have my back, and I think it is time that the American people stand up and have their back. We need to make sure that we stand with them.

I thank the gentleman for his time, for his leadership on this issue, and for his service.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and also appreciate in the meetings and the hearings that we have been in your commitment to end—not just sort of have an impact on human trafficking, but ending, eliminating human trafficking in this country and across the globe. Thank you for your hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Washington.

I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to law enforcement, recognizing their service each and every day.

I had an opportunity a few weeks ago on this floor to thank and to recognize my local law enforcement community, law enforcement officers, law enforcement leadership from Pinellas County, Florida—the cities of St. Petersburg,

Clearwater, Tarpon Springs, and others—and, with Tarpon Springs, remember an officer who our community lost just 4 days before Christmas, Officer Charles Kondek, whose end of watch was December 21, leaving behind a family and children.

We can pay tribute—which we should and which the vast majority of Americans do every day—but we also are a Congress who must offer solutions and who must act. One of the ways in which we can act is to ensure, just as we do for our men and women of the military, that our law enforcement have the tools and technology necessary to do their job.

While much of local law enforcement is, indeed, funded locally, there is a program—the 1033 program that has been debated so much during this past year—that provides equipment, protective equipment, tools, and technology for our law enforcement officers to do their job. That is a Federal program that should not be controversial.

I have introduced legislation—because we are a solutions-oriented Congress—to continue the 1033 program, but to simply require one thing to address the concerns of so many, and that requirement is that local law enforcement leadership certify before receiving equipment that they have officers trained and capable of using the equipment.

It is very simple. This is equipment that our local law enforcement officers need, and, frankly, if it is not available to them through the 1033 program, they will purchase it as required by their local force, and it will cost local taxpayers the money to do so.

Here is the importance of this legislation. It says two things. First, it says that this Congress, your Representatives, want to do our part to provide for the safety of our law enforcement officers, but, secondly, subscribe to this radical notion that should not be controversial: we trust our local law enforcement leadership to set the right policing tone and to provide for the safety of their communities while they also provide for the safety of law enforcement officers that risk their lives every day, officers like Charles Kondek.

I would encourage this Congress, as we continue to look for ways not just to pay tribute to law enforcement officers, but to support the work they do every day, to consider this legislation that ensures this program will continue to provide tools and technology to law enforcement officers and says: You know what, we, as a Congress, trust our law enforcement leadership back home because they know best how to provide for the safety of our communities, how to set the tone of policing in our communities, and how to protect our law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Washington having this

Special Order and allowing me time this evening.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his staunch support of law enforcement and his support of 1033. We will work together on that, and I am sure other Members of Congress have an interest in working to make sure that that legislation gets passed.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Mr. LAMALFA from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague from Washington, Mr. REICHERT, for this opportunity and, really, privilege to be able to speak about those in law enforcement that are really on duty for us every day and being able to support and show my gratitude for them across our country because we know that they are there daily to keep us safe and secure in our communities.

They have an incredibly important role and a vital responsibility to uphold our rule of law, which is the core of our Constitution and ensures everyone is accountable under the law. Everyone needs to be accountable under the law. That is a huge responsibility.

It is up to us, whether it is in Congress or at the State legislative level or local government, to make sure that they have the tools that they need to do their job. In the time of budget cuts and other constraints put on them, their job gets that much harder; indeed, sometimes, they feel handcuffed in their ability to do their work.

When you speak to the officers sometimes—they always have an air of professionalism about them, but when you really get down to it, sometimes, they don't feel very appreciated and that they don't have the tools to do what they need because of things sometimes the government does or frivolous lawsuits, for example.

We even sometimes see our elected officials participating in vilifying our people in law enforcement. That is really, really irresponsible because we are all in this together, us as lawmakers and those in the executive branch down to our beat officer that has that responsibility. We are supposed to work together in upholding the law and making sure they have the tools, as well as providing oversight.

We want to make sure everybody is behaving the way they should, but as we see so hyped lately with a tiny, tiny minority of incidents out there compared to the contacts—I heard a statistic the other day, much less than 1 percent of contacts that officers have with the public results in any kind of physical action needed, much less than 1 percent; yet you would think, from all the hype, from all the media, it was a much higher number than that.

The vast majority of it is an officer helping you out. You have brushes with the law here and there, but they are very professional in what they do.

What you really need to do is step into their shoes for a minute, think about where they have come from to get where they are.

They had to have a very clean record to get through background to be accepted into academy and be accepted into whatever force that they are working in. It is a high bar. You can't have a bad record in your background. They have chosen to come forward and put themselves at risk.

Look what they go through each day in their jobs if they have made it through academy and were brought on to a force. If they are called into a situation, they don't really have the option of saying: No, I am not going to go.

If someone has called from a home, they have a domestic problem, what have you, they have got to get to a solution because someone's lives may be at stake inside that home, even though there might be something outside that would make you or I uncomfortable, a mean dog in the yard or some characters hanging around outside that you wouldn't normally want to deal with. They have to get to a solution on that because somebody called them, somebody dialed 911, and we expect that they are going to get to a solution.

Officers have to go into every situation prepared for the worst because it could mean their life, maybe their partner's life, or someone else in a vulnerable situation that has called upon them.

If you think about being in their shoes, we all have a responsibility to make their jobs simpler. It could even help us in not being in a mistaken situation because they have to plan for the worst and hope for the best.

I can certainly feel for them in that they might be a little stressed on every call, every car they might pull over for speeding or a broken taillight or having to answer to someone's household or even a bigger deal like a bank robbery.

They have to be prepared every moment because it is their life or the other lives around them. They have to have the protocol and the training to know how to handle that situation just right.

When you look at that high bar, you look at the amount of stress that they are going through to do that, they do an amazing, remarkable job of getting it right; so we need to give them a little grace, a little room to do their job as best they can.

Then we have a responsibility as regular citizens to make their job easier. If they ask for your driver's license and ID, just give it to them. If they ask you to stay in the car so that they can see where your hands are and stuff—they don't know who else is in that car—make it where they can do their job, and you are going to have a heck of a lot better interaction with them.

Use basic common sense. There are instructions out there how to get along

with that. I have even seen comedians out there saying how not to get in trouble with the police.

Pay attention to the common sense on that because we need them more so than ever in a country that is becoming less and less safe, it seems, from outside threats, as well as people within that don't seem to understand the rule of law and sometimes governing officials that don't seem to care about upholding it. We all have the responsibility as citizens.

Those costs have been high because, in the previous year, well over 100 officers have been lost in the line of duty—and that is tragic—trying to defend us.

I am glad to be able to stand here today with my colleague from Washington to recognize their bravery, their devotion, and for all of us to remember how to make their job a little bit easier.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments in support.

There are a couple of things that he mentioned. One, some of those acts that police officers do each and every day to help families—people don't hear about those officers that buy groceries for families that are less fortunate.

I know when I worked on the Green River task force and working with families that had missing daughters or had lost their daughter to—I am not even going to mention his name—the monster serial killer from Seattle, delivering Christmas presents to those families, money out of their own pocket or time out of their own time in building a new bicycle for some young brother of one of the victims.

Those are things that the community in a neighborhood might hear about, but you never see on the news, you never see publicized, and you never really hear about it, so I appreciate that.

The second thing the gentleman mentioned was training, and I really believe that that is one of the things that we can do to help law enforcement officers across this country.

The National Blue Alert Act is another piece of legislation that we, I think, can work together to pass. It should be a bipartisan effort. The COPS Improvement and Reauthorization Act is another tool that we can provide and another bill to try to expedite the claims process for public safety officer benefits program.

In some cases, the Department of Justice has taken 3 to 4 years to decide whether or not a family should receive that benefit, that death benefit, when their spouse has been killed in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his comments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I introduce the next Member of Congress and yield time to him, my good friend and partner who is also

a career law enforcement officer for a couple of different departments, his last tour of duty was as a sheriff in Florida.

There are two career law enforcement officers in Congress, as far as the two of us know, and we are standing right here.

I look at Mr. NUGENT, RICH NUGENT, as my backup here in Congress, and I know he considers me his backup and partners here in supporting our law enforcement officers across this great country, and I thank Mr. NUGENT for his service in law enforcement and to his communities.

I know he has faced some dangerous situations throughout his career. Sometimes, we sit on the floor and share those stories with each other. The only really two that can understand some of these stories are really cops.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. NUGENT.

□ 1830

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington, Sheriff REICHERT. That is a term of endearment. It is won, a title that you earn. It is an opportunity to lead a great body of men and women. So when Sheriff REICHERT wanted to do this hour, it was, like he said, we have each other's back. We have been through issues that we can relate to.

When I first became a law enforcement officer, my mom said: You know, I could picture one of your brothers doing this, but not you. You just don't have that temperament to be that bold, I guess is what she was saying, compared to my brothers.

But at the end of the day, after 39 years, and the last 10 as sheriff before I got elected to this office, those were 39 of the best years, and I guarantee it that DAVE REICHERT feels the same way with his tenure in law enforcement. I started out as a cop outside the city of Chicago and saw issues that I would rather not even mention.

Coming down to Florida was quite a break, it was different. But at the same time, that changed over time too. From a small, sleepy sheriff's office of about 40 individuals to, when I left, we had over 500 folks that served this great Nation in that community.

You hear a lot on the news about law enforcement in that they want to make it sound like we are not human. In reality, I have been to those scenes where a law enforcement officer has been involved in a shooting where he has had to take somebody's life. And that officer was so emotionally distraught, because that is not why they got into the business. It is not why I ever got into the business. You got into the business because you wanted to help people, you wanted to be there to protect people. That is what law enforcement is about.

And, unfortunately, sometimes bad things happen to good people. Sheriff

REICHERT mentioned the fact that sometimes police officers and deputies can make a mistake. We are only human. But when things are moving fast as the speed of light, you have got to think back as to what and why that officer did or didn't do what he did at the time.

And I worry about when elected officials see it as a political expedience to condemn police officers for something that occurred before they ever get the facts. DAVE REICHERT and I sit on the floor and we talk about that, about maybe, just maybe people should wait until the investigation is complete before you condemn somebody, until you walk in their shoes. The sheriff talked about the fact that I can remember back as a rookie having to work, and I took the shifts of guys that had families because I wasn't married when it came down to holidays. I didn't have a family, so I would take the shifts so they could be with their families. But it didn't always work out that way. There was many a time that I missed Christmas, missed birthdays, missed wedding anniversaries because of service, and that is just not me. That is all the men and women that serve this country in local law enforcement and other law enforcement agencies throughout the United States.

Most of the men and women that I served with, I guarantee you could go out and make more money doing something else. They were bright, bright people. But their calling was to be a law enforcement officer. To go out there in the dead of night, climb up in an attic—remember that—you climb up in an attic and you don't know what is up there, except you know there is a bad guy who is up there, and somebody has to go there and do it. At the end of the day, these men and women do it because they love the community they serve.

Congressman REICHERT talked about what police officers do with their own money in regards to buying turkeys for Thanksgiving for families, buying Christmas presents for children that would not have a Christmas, doing summer camps for free for children because these children don't have or didn't have the ability to go to one of those paid summer camps—that is pretty neat. And we would, in our sheriff's office, without using taxpayer money, with donations from clubs like Kiwanis and Rotary and others, pay for that so that these young men and these girls and boys could have the opportunity to interact with law enforcement, to actually see that, do you know what? We are human. That when we do these little games out there in the field and we have the things, water balloons or whatever it may be, that we are real people, because a lot of times, the only time they see a law enforcement officer is possibly during a domestic situation where they are ar-

resting their mom or their dad. And that can jade anybody.

But it can also jade law enforcement, because the things that they see no one here would want to see. There were times when I went home, getting off the midnight shift, and walked in my house at 6 o'clock in the morning. And what I had just seen the night before, you would have a hard time going to sleep, where you would grab your child—I can remember my youngest child at the time, my only child at the time—grabbing him and hugging him because of what I just saw some other parent do to their child that was unspeakable.

Our three sons, they all serve in the military. Our middle son is a Black Hawk pilot in the Florida Army National Guard. He is also a deputy sheriff in one of the major counties in Florida. He wasn't sure if that was the right job because, when they went through the class on child abuse, it struck a chord as a new dad: How could anyone do that to them? But do you know what? He has turned out to be a pretty good cop. And we say that with reverence; it is not a derogatory term.

But the men and women that put on the uniform and that badge do it because they love people, not because they hate them. They do it because they really want to make a difference in their community. Their families are the ones that suffer the most.

When I have had to go to scenes where I have had an officer killed in the line of duty, it breaks your heart. When I was a rookie officer outside of Chicago, right out of the academy, one of my academy mates was killed, shot and killed by a 12-year-old in our first year on the job. You never know when it is going to hit.

When Officer Kondek down in Tarpon Springs went to work on the 21st of December, he kissed his wife and his kids good-bye, expecting to be there for Christmas. Little did he know that that was the last day of his life. The person who killed him shot him and then ran him over with a car. This is not what we want.

Where we want to see the America that I love is, the same respect that we give our soldiers returning from war, that we give that to our police officers. That when you see them in a restaurant or you see them on the street or you see them on a call, thank them for what they do. They will be absolutely surprised and amazed, but grateful.

When my sons are in uniform and people come up to them in the military and thank them for their service, there is no reason we can't do the same for our law enforcement officers.

Congressman REICHERT is probably the most humble guy I know in the stories, and he would never brag about himself, but he is a consummate professional. His bravery is unmatched,

and his leadership, I am sure, at that sheriff's office in Washington State is better for him being sheriff than not.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the sheriff. There might be some people back in Washington State that might disagree with you.

Mr. NUGENT. Well, I guarantee there are some.

Mr. REICHERT. Absolutely.

But I think that what you and I, and everyone who has spoken here tonight, have tried to do is to bring the personality, the humanness in the human heart, of a police officer to America tonight. And I think with two sheriffs here, it is a powerful way from the floor of the House of Representatives to share with people across this Nation through this media our thanks and gratitude to each and every man and woman who wears the uniform, who puts their life on the line, who knows that some day when they leave they know there is a possibility that they may not come home, and the families live with that too.

One quick story. I was stabbed in 1973 or '74. I had my throat slit with a butcher knife at a domestic violence call that we talked about a little earlier. My wife actually found out that I had my throat slit. She was sitting home watching the news, and they showed me being wheeled into the hospital out of the ambulance. She finally got a phone call, but she didn't know if I was going to live or die.

That happens every day in this country, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, that happens every day here. An officer is injured, hurt, or killed somewhere across this Nation. And we need to be there, Mr. Speaker, to support them, we need to be there to pray for them and their families, and we need to be there to pray for our communities that they come together and be true partners in protecting our children and our families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we thank you for the opportunity to gather as Democrats in this 30-minute Special Order opportunity to discuss our Nation's recent free trade agreements. And I will note that nomenclature: free trade. There are concerns about fair trade being the outcome, and we will be talking about that here in this format.

This is more important now than ever before as our United States Trade Representative Ambassador Michael Froman testified before the House and Senate today. The Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations are being held as

we speak this week in New York City. And some Members of Congress have suggested a trade promotion authority bill, better referenced as a “fast track,” that may be introduced in the near future, a fast track that would deny the checks and balances of Congress, one that would not allow us to actively overview the impact of these negotiated settlements, these contracts, and would require a simple thumbs up-thumbs down vote without, again, that interactive quality that serves that responsibility to the Members of Congress.

But before we give away Congress’ ability to conduct proper oversight and review these trade agreements that are currently being negotiated, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we need to discuss how free trade agreements from the past two decades have not delivered on their promises.

These trade deals will have far-reaching impacts on American life. They could include impacts on food safety or perhaps affordable medicine or perhaps regulations with the banking industry, the financial industry.

Let’s not be reckless and allow these deals to move forward without thorough and proper consideration by Congress. Frankly, these deals have not lived up to the hype. President Obama indicated as much in his recent State of the Union message: “I’m the first one to admit that past trade deals haven’t always lived up to the hype.”

So whether it was NAFTA—the North America Free Trade Agreement—or the Korean Free Trade Agreement, supporters of our past FTAs have promised these deals would create a good outcome, create United States jobs, create a lesser trade deficit, and improve global labor and global environmental standards.

□ 1845

Tragically, sadly, this has not been the outcome.

TPP supporters have said this one will be different. The Trans-Pacific Partnership, which could cover a great majority of the international economy, has its supporters saying that this will be a 21st century agreement, far different from those that have preceded it.

Leaked information from the TPP negotiators shows that it is being modeled by the negotiations, themselves, not by the negotiators, showing that it has been modeled on trade policies that have proven to offshore good-paying jobs in our economy and to force wages down for America’s working families. That is why respected economists, including many who have previously supported free trade, such as Jeffrey Sachs, as well as Nobel Prize winners Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman, have expressed skepticism about the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiation. They are coming to realize what many

of our constituents have long known: these trade agreements do not respond favorably to the American middle class.

Sachs’ speech at a trade forum on Capitol Hill included comments that indicated:

I don’t think TPP and TTIP rise close to the standard of being 21st century trade and investment agreements, not even close. They are very much 20th century agreements which were already out of date by the time they were negotiated. This is a NAFTA treaty writ large or these are the same negotiations that we have had in many other cases.

In the New York Times, Mr. Krugman indicated:

I am, in general, a free trader, but I will be undismayed and even a bit relieved if the TPP just fades away. The first thing you need to know about trade deals in general is that they aren’t what they used to be. The glory days of trade negotiations and the days of deals like the Kennedy Round of the 1960s, which sharply reduced tariffs around the world, are long behind us.

Then Mr. Stiglitz, in the New York Times, is quoted as saying:

Based on the leaks—and the history of arrangements in past trade pacts—it is easy to infer the shape of the whole TPP, and it doesn’t look good. There is a real risk that it will benefit the wealthiest sliver of the American and global elite at the expense of everyone else.

Tonight, I hope we can have a thoughtful discussion about jobs, about wages, about environmental standards that could be impacted, about child labor laws that could, perhaps, be thrust upon us that have been promised for every FTA in the past two decades. Sadly, our constituents are looking for that sort of progressive outcome that has not been realized, and, certainly, our workers have been impacted. I represent a district that is tremendously impacted by these trade negotiations.

So, tonight, it is a pleasure to work with my colleagues in order to get out the message about the broken promises of our trade agreements.

I see my good friend and colleague who has been a very passionate voice on speaking out about these issues. He is TIM RYAN, our Representative from Ohio’s 13th District. Let me yield to Mr. RYAN so he can share some thoughts with us.

Welcome.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you so much. I want to thank the gentleman from New York. It is always fun to be here with you in the later evening hours.

As I am listening to you talk about fair trade versus free trade and about some of these agreements, you have just got to go to the communities. I mean, this is not rocket science. Go to the communities that have been impacted over the last 20 or 30 years, going back to NAFTA and CAFTA and all of these other agreements, and look at them. Look at what has happened in places like Youngstown, Ohio, or in up-

state New York or in Connecticut or up and down the east coast.

Mr. Speaker, we have, in Ohio, several companies that, after the NAFTA agreement, started moving, wholesale, their manufacturing facilities from Warren, Ohio, or Youngstown, Ohio, to just over the border in Mexico—to just over the border with cheaper labor and no environmental or labor standards to be seen—and shipping the products right back over, decimating communities across Ohio, like the ones that we represent.

There is a State route in Ohio, State Route 7. It goes from the lake all the way down the Ohio River. If you want to see what these trade agreements have done in the heartland, go take a ride down Route 7, especially the southern part. Go through Steubenville and East Liverpool, Ohio; go down to Portsmouth; go through Athens County, and you will see the erosion of what used to be the industrial might of the United States of America. They have eroded communities.

The ripple effect—the job aspect of it—is of unemployed people. Now there is no one to support the schools. Now there is no one to support the mental health levy. Now there is no one to support the libraries. Now there is no one to throw \$20 in the basket at church on Sunday. The ripple effect throughout these communities has decimated the middle class, our communities, and has reduced opportunity for our young people, whom we want to thrive in manufacturing in the United States.

I don’t want to see the GDP. I don’t want to see numbers. I want to see what it is doing for average Americans and middle class people—period, end of story. How does it help them? Drive through the communities, and you are going to see the evidence that we have not negotiated these agreements. If there is growth and if there are increased profits and if the stock market is going up, where is that money going? It is not going to the middle class people. There used to be middle class people in our congressional districts, and I have told this story before.

We have a \$1 billion steel mill that is located in Youngstown now. Why? The company asked us to fight to put tariffs on the dumped Chinese steel tubing that was coming in, and the President, to his credit, put the tariffs on. They built the steel mill.

So, when you level the playing field—if you are dumping or if you are manipulating your currency, which is something that we have got to get in this agreement: real teeth into the currency manipulation issue—or the environment or labor, then people and companies will reinvest back in the United States, and you can reinvigorate State Route 7, going north and south in Ohio. To me, that is the most important part. What are we going to do? How are

we going to write agreements? How are we going to structure our trade to operate in a way that draws investment into the United States?

One last piece.

The small- and medium-sized manufacturers get hammered in this. Do you want to be pro business? Do you want to be pro middle class, small business, medium-sized businesses, tool and dye makers, mom-and-pop manufacturers that operate in communities like ours—the people who treat their employees like they are family and are the ones who sponsor the Little League team or the soccer team? They are getting wiped out in these agreements, and we are not factoring them in.

If we want a small, robust middle class, business community in the smaller and mid-sized cities in America, these are the kinds of things we need to factor in when we are operating. Yes, we have got to invest in roads and bridges. Yes, we have got to invest in infrastructure. We have got to do research. We have got to make sure that we have an educated, skilled workforce, and we should invest in manufacturing and all the rest; but the trade agreements are key. If you look at what Korea has done to our auto industry and to our trade deficit with Korea—just those two things—we have lost tens of thousands of jobs because of the Korea trade agreement, and our trade deficit with them has skyrocketed.

The proof is in the pudding. If we want to bring back the State Route 7s in the Ohios of America, then we need to do exactly what you are saying, Mr. TONKO, and what ROSA DELAURO is going to say and what others are going to say tonight. We need to reframe the way we talk about this.

I am very thankful for the invite here, and I appreciate your passion and how you believe and understand we have got to do real economic development in upstate New York and in places like my communities. Thank you for being a leader on this issue.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN, for bringing it right down to the basic, core ingredient, and that is the dignity of work for American families. You speak it so well for those you represent in Ohio.

This is about broken promises. It is about promises for jobs, promises for worker opportunity, promises for environmental standards, promises for labor standards. We need to let the American public know exactly what is happening. If you are a believer in fair trade—not necessarily in free trade. If you believe in fair trade and if you don't think of fast track, which is when we circumvent the authorities and responsibilities of Congress, then let your voice in Congress know that. Let everyone know what you are thinking, because these are critical moments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a good friend and colleague who is a very outspoken voice for social and economic justice, who has spoken to the unfairness of these negotiated arrangements for trade, and who has led us as a Democratic Caucus in this House to speak out forcefully about the fast-track process and about fair trade versus free trade. She is none other than my good friend and colleague from the Third District of the State of Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you so much to my colleague from New York and to my colleague from Ohio, TIM RYAN, who is just leaving the floor, and we have got Wisconsin in the House with Mr. POCAN.

Mr. TONKO, thank you for taking the lead on this effort. I can't tell you how proud I am to join with men and women in this body who understand what is going on in the lives of working families today.

Mr. Speaker, they are struggling. We need to walk in their shoes. That is what our job is—to represent their interests in this body. What do we know? We know that, in fact, they are in jobs today that don't pay them enough money to survive. That is why we are organized and are taking on a process which can do nothing but harm them in the future.

All of us who are engaged in this effort have been long supporters of the President's and the administration's, and we believe genuinely that he wants to improve the lives of working Americans; but on the issue of trade, I and all of us will oppose the administration because they are following the exact same trade policy that has failed in the past.

The administration claims that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will bring jobs back to the United States, will raise our wages, but experience tells us that far too many trade agreements have done the exact opposite. The TPP is based on the same model as the Korea free trade agreement, negotiated just 2 years ago. Since that time, the United States' trade deficit with South Korea has exploded by 50 percent. That translates into 60,000 lost jobs. This is a familiar picture: Korean products flood in, and American jobs flood out. When adjusted for inflation, our wages continue to slide.

Princeton economist Alan Blinder estimates that as many as a quarter of American jobs will be offshored in the foreseeable future, and we know from past experience that the people who are laid off will see a significant drop in their wages—that is, if they are able to find another job.

The trade agreements we have signed over the last 25 years have done nothing to ensure fair competition. Let's take one example. The deals have failed to address the problem, which our colleague Congressman RYAN men-

tioned, of currency manipulation. It is an unfair, artificial practice that has been devastating our automotive industry for a generation.

Morgan Stanley estimates that currency manipulation gives each imported Japanese car an effective subsidy of between \$1,500 and \$5,700. That is neither free nor fair.

Leading economist Fred Bergsten of the Peterson Institute wrote in *Foreign Affairs* just within the last several days:

The United States has paid a major economic price for never having established an effective currency manipulation policy.

In the last Congress, 230 Members—both Republicans and Democrats—wrote to the United States Trade Representative to demand the inclusion of a strong and an enforceable currency manipulation chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. So far, we have been ignored and dismissed. Put simply, if the agreement does not address currency manipulation, it will not be worth the paper that it is written on. It will be a green light to those who seek to compete unfairly with American manufacturing, and it will take away American jobs.

The administration's arguments about jobs have failed. They know that experience and the numbers are against them. So, instead, as with past trade agreements, we hear the fallback arguments based on foreign policy.

□ 1900

If you listened to the Trade Representative today in the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Froman, he talked about the danger of China, the specter of China. In the State of the Union, the President said that the TPP would help us counter China's growing influence. This is clearly not the case.

As the economist and Reagan appointee Clyde Prestowitz pointed out in the *Los Angeles Times* last week, "The ever-closing linking of the U.S. economy to those of the TPP countries over the last 35 years has not prevented the rise of Chinese power."

He continued, "nor has it deterred U.S. trade partners and allies from developing ever closer ties with China."

They will not stop doing so just because we sign a trade agreement. In reality, the argument about China is nothing more than an attempt to distract the American public with scare tactics and that we are going to take on China. The administration should be above this kind of fear-mongering.

Throughout this process, the administration has chosen not to consult the Congress fully. Members of Congress have been denied access to the full text of the agreement. The American people have been cut out of the negotiation; yet in the State of the Union, the President asked the Congress for fast-track promotion authority.

A key part of granting that authority has always been the negotiating guidelines that Congress gives to the administration. That is our job—to provide the negotiating guidelines—but the Trans-Pacific Partnership has already been under negotiations for years, first under President Bush and now under President Obama.

Earlier today, the U.S. Trade Representative told our colleagues in the Senate that he expected a deal “in the next small number of months.” How can the Congress give guidance on a deal that we have never seen, a deal that is, for all intents and purposes, already done?

Once again, we see fast track for what it really is. It is an attempt to cut the Congress out of the process altogether. We should not stand for this, and when we get that fast-track bill, we should vote it down. Bitter experience tells us that bad trade deals devastate jobs, devastate wages. That is why we should say “no” to this deeply flawed Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I can’t thank you enough for taking on this job of being here at 7 at night, all of us together, to say “no.” I think what we want to convey to the American public is that we are committed to work on their behalf and to make sure that they have a decent shot at a decent job with good wages.

Thank you so much, Mr. TONKO, for listening.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative DELAURO. You strike a very encouraging cord at the end of your comments.

The American public needs to be engaged, if you believe that Congress should have overview responsibility, a checks and balances agenda, because these agreements need to be front and center about the well-being of American workers, and so call into this process, reach into this process, and share your opinion with those who speak for you in the House.

Is a fast track a thing you want to see—without the information exchange—or do you want Congress to review these contracts and understand what impact there will be on the American economy, on American jobs, on standards for the environment, for public safety, for child labor laws, a number of things?

We appreciate your comments.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just make one other point. So many years ago, when we were discussing the Affordable Care Act, the American public said: Read the bill.

That is what we are asking to do, very simply, to read the bill before we vote on it.

Mr. TONKO. Very well stated. Every bit of American style is about tethering the American Dream. The people come here to have the right to the dignity of work and to pursue that American Dream.

One of our newest faces in Congress in his second term, I believe, has been an outspoken voice for the American Dream. I yield to the Representative from Wisconsin’s Second District to share his thoughts about the process here for fast track and free versus fair trade.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TONKO, for your leadership. I really enjoyed working with you over the last several years. We are actually getting to the point that it looks like this may be coming to a vote in Congress.

This is perfect timing, with another round of negotiations upon us. I am so glad we are on the floor tonight talking about this and trying to channel the energy from the gentlewoman from Connecticut. I love her passion.

This is an issue that goes far back for me. When I was 23, I started a small business in Madison, Wisconsin, a specialty printing business. One of the things we did is source American-made and union-made products. We screen-printed T-shirts and did promotional items like pens and lapel pins we wear as Members of Congress, all things that were done in the United States.

Over the last almost 28 years, trade deal after trade deal, I have watched the number of products made in the United States diminish. T-shirts, it is almost impossible to find a mill that still makes T-shirts and apparel in the United States. Almost everything is done in other countries or overseas, things like pens and our emblem pins. It is almost impossible to find American-made pens.

In my area, just 45 minutes south from Madison, is the city of Janesville, where Representative PAUL RYAN is from and represents. That town used to have a thousand good, family-supporting wages at a company called Parker Pen which made quality, American-made pens. At one point, that was a thousand jobs in that region.

With trade deal after trade deal, finally, a few years ago, we watched the last 150 of those jobs go to Mexico, those family-supporting wages that no longer exist in the company. They were then hit by GM closing down, which allowed even further job loss in that community.

As Representative DELAURO said, it is those people that used to make \$25 an hour in a manufacturing job who lost their job and, now, the best that might be available to them is a \$10-an-hour job. You can’t pay your mortgage when you go from \$25 an hour to \$10 an hour. You can’t send your kids to college when you used to make \$25 an hour and, now, you are making \$10 an hour.

Those are the jobs we have seen all too often leave because of bad trade deals; whether it be New York, Connecticut, Ohio, or Wisconsin, we have all seen the same thing happen across our communities.

As much as I do agree with the President when he said in the State of the Union, Look, I’m the first one to admit that past trade deals haven’t always lived up to the hype—I think we all agree on that. We have seen that. We have seen that the jobs promised don’t happen, and that is why we have concern.

Tonight, I want to talk specifically about fast-track authority. That is where we give up our right as Members of Congress, which means we give up our constituents’ right—a say—in these trade deals. This isn’t a Democratic issue. It isn’t a Republican issue. It isn’t an Independent issue. It is in the Constitution. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says the Congress has the sole power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations.”

For 200 years, that is the way it was, but President Nixon changed that when he seized those powers through a mechanism called fast track. It is a legislative technique used to kind of skid the way through for these trade deals.

The problem with that is when we do fast-track authority, we give up our rights as Members of Congress and, therefore, the public’s right to question what is in one of these trade deals, the next trade deal that can have even more jobs leave the United States.

We give up our ability to debate and to amend these agreements, and that is what fast-track authority is. That is very likely the first vote we would see on the floor of Congress, which the President asked for in the State of the Union, but that gives our sole authority to the President.

Now, I have a lot of respect and I agree with so much of what President Obama has done, but this isn’t about President Obama, and it is not about President George W. Bush and not about President Nixon or any other President who has tried to get these powers. It is about our ability as Members of Congress and the public to have a say through these trade deals.

When you look at this and you think about the history of the fast-track process, the last time we authorized fast track was in 2002, at 3:30 in the morning, right before a congressional recess, to bring this antiquated mechanism into place, and it was approved by only three votes.

Since 2007, Congress has refused this extreme procedure, even after it was getting renamed to try to make it sound a little more palatable.

There are so many reasons why we shouldn’t give up our authority. If you think about it, people say: If we don’t give the President authority, we won’t get trade expansion.

Well, fast track isn’t needed for that. In fact, President Bill Clinton was denied fast-track authority for 6 of his 8 years in his office, but he completed more than 100 trade investment pacts without fast track.

We are giving away our ability to actually see this document which, as you know, we haven't seen. There are 29 chapters, only of which about five affect trade, and everything else from currency manipulation to medicines to food safety, all those things now are thrown into these deals that go way beyond what it was originally in place for, and we would have no say in that.

Fast track has been used 16 times in the history of this country, and usually, it is to enact more controversial trade pacts.

Bottom line, we know that the U.S. Trade Representative right now is redoing their Web site to make it more transparent. Here is transparency to me: show us the text, show Members of Congress the text, show our staff the text, show the public the text.

If this deal is as good as they have promised, then show us how great it is; but if this is nothing more than warmed over fast track or something else that is going to cost us jobs and depress our wages, then that is usually when this procedure is put in place. No offense to this President or to any President, but Congress has to have its say on fast track.

I just want to commend you, again, for doing this. I just wanted to come by for a very few minutes to talk about that, but as this procedure could be coming before us in the coming month or months, we have to be ready.

We are going to work together, as we have been, to make sure we do everything possible to make sure the public knows what is in this deal, and that means Congress has to have our say, and that is why we have to oppose fast track.

Again, I thank the gentleman for this time. I continue to look forward to working with you on this issue.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative POCAN. I again urge the general public out there to engage in this process. Let your Representative know if you believe we should have overview authority and that we should have the chance to know what is in these negotiated agreements.

This affects our American economy, the American Dream. It is about jobs. It is about wages. It is about critical labor standards. It is about critical environmental standards. We can make it happen. We can work on trade issues and have fair trade out there that will grow our economy and grow the American Dream for America's working families.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

179. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2015, pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 6, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

180. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuba: Providing Support for the Cuban People [Docket No.: 150102002-5002-01] (RIN: 0694-AG42) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 2(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 17-14 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

182. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a report on a real estate lease transaction for a Charter School within the Sherman Building, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 411; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

183. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-517, "Lawrence Guyot Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

184. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-518, "Percy Battle Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

185. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-551, "N Street Village, Inc. Tax and TOPA Exemption Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

186. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-514, "Promoting Economic Growth and Job Creation Through Technology Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

187. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-535, "Dedication of a Public Alley in Square 752, S.O. 14-15491, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

188. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-512, "SeVerna, LLC, Real Property Tax Exemption and Real

Property Tax Relief Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

189. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-538, "Trash Compactor Tax Incentive Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

190. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-539, "Behavioral Health System of Care Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

191. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-515, "Winter Sidewalk Safety Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

192. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-519, "Uniform Certificate of Title for Vessels Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

193. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-521, "Cashell Alley Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

194. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-549, "Youth Tanning Safety Regulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

195. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-520, "Department of Parks and Recreation Fee-based Use Permit Authority Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

196. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-501, "Paint Stewardship Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

197. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-530, "Conversion Therapy for Minors Prohibition Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

198. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-503, "Public Space Enforcement Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

199. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-559, "Insurance Holding Company and Credit for Reinsurance Modernization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

200. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-502, "Plan for Comprehensive Services for Homeless Individuals at 425 2nd Street, N.W., Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

201. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-558, "Small and Certified Business Enterprise Waiver and Recertification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

202. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-562, "Inspector General Qualifications Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

203. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-556, "Soccer Stadium Development Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

204. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-554, "Turkey Bowl Revenue Generation and Sponsorship Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

205. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-561, "Firefighter Retirement While Under Disciplinary Investigation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

206. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-553, "Closing of a Portion of Manchester Lane, N.W., adjacent to Square 2742, S.O. 08-3083, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

207. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-560, "Sex Trafficking of Children Prevention Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

208. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-552, "Guardianship Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

209. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-534, "Criminalization of Non-Consensual Pornography Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

210. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-533, "D.C. No Taxation Without Representation Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

211. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-532, "D.C. Rocks, So We Need One Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

212. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-531, "Wage Transparency Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

213. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-540, "Copper Intrauterine Device Access Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

214. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-516, "Dignity for Homeless Families Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

215. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-548, "Community Development Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

216. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-550, "Public-Private Partnership Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

217. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-511, "Housing Production Trust Fund Baseline Funding Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

218. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 Agency Financial Report, as required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

219. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

220. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

221. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

222. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

223. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the FY 2014 annual report, as required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

224. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

225. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2014-15 Late Season [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2014-0017] (RIN: 1018-AZ80) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

226. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2014-0017] (RIN: 1018-AZ80) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

227. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Late-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2014-0017] (RIN: 1018-AZ80)

received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

228. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Fair Play Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0005; T.D. TTB-126; Ref: Notice No. 143] (RIN: 1513-AC07) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

229. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Property Qualifying for the Energy Credit under Section 48 [Notice 2015-4] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

230. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2015 Prevailing State Assumed Interest Rates (Rev. Rul. 2015-02) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

231. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Automatic Approval of Change in Funding Method for Takeover Plans (Announcement 2015-3) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

232. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Application of Retroactive Increase in Excludable Transit Benefits [Notice 2015-2] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

233. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2015-3) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

234. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Administrative Notice rule — Reporting Sick Pay Paid by Third Parties [Notice 2015-6] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 159. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking (Rept. 114-6, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 181. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking (Rept. 114-7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 285. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts (Rept. 114-8).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 350. A bill to direct the Inter-agency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-9, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 399. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-10, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 159 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 350 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 399 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 539. A bill to amend part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for lower income individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 540. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 541. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 542. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of doctors of chiropractic in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 543. A bill to repeal title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 544. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 545. A bill to add engaging in or supporting hostilities against the United States to the list of acts for which United States nationals would lose their nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 546. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 548. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to exclude the application of such title to employment practices that are in compliance with Federal regulations, and State laws, in certain areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 549. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to require the EEOC to approve commencing or intervening in certain litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 550. A bill to direct the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to maintain

up-to-date information on its website regarding charges and actions brought by the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 551. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 552. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate all Federally-imposed mandates over the local budget process and financial management of the District of Columbia and the borrowing of money by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of 529 plans and Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 554. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of 529 plans and Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 555. A bill to require an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to notify individuals in the case that personal information of such individuals is known to have been acquired or accessed as a result of a breach of the security of any system maintained by the Exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr.

JORDAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 558. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 South Pioneer Boulevard in Springboro, Ohio, as the "Richard 'Dick' Chenault Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SIREs):

H.R. 559. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to designate New Jersey Task Force 1 as part of the National Urban Search and Rescue System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 560. A bill to amend the War Powers Resolution to limit the use of funds for introduction of the Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 561. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to assess the impact of school start times on student health, well-being, and performance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 562. A bill to improve transfer of earned school credits for foster youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 563. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Merchant Mariner Equity Compensation Fund to provide benefits to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 564. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reduce predation on endangered Columbia River salmon and other nonlisted species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 565. A bill to stimulate collaboration with respect to, and provide for coordination and coherence of, the Nation's science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education initiatives, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 566. A bill to award grants to improve equality of access to technology-enabled education innovations and understanding of how partnerships of educational agencies and research institutions design and implement such innovations in ways that improve student outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 567. A bill to provide that a former Member of Congress receiving compensation as a highly-paid lobbyist shall be ineligible to receive certain Federal retirement benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 568. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on the impact of thermal insulation on both energy and water use for potable hot water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 569. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on portions of the Outer Continental Shelf located off the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 570. A bill to discontinue Radio Marti and Television Marti broadcasts to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 571. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of whistleblower complaints by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 572. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 573. A bill to make competitive awards to national estuary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BARR, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 574. A bill to prohibit contributions by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to the Housing Trust Fund and the Capital Market Fund while such enterprises are in conservatorship or receivership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 575. A bill to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 576. A bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BARR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 577. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution recognizing the challenges and burdens associated with the rising costs of a college education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. BERA):

H. Res. 52. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the democratic Constitution of the Republic of India and United States-India relations on India's Republic Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H. Res. 53. A resolution condemning the cowardly attack on innocent men, women, and children in the northeastern Nigerian town of Baga; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 54. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to restore service standards in effect as of July 1, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 55. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ethics in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON

of Mississippi, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. COOK, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Res. 56. A resolution affirming the support of the United States for Macedonia's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 57. A resolution urging the Secretary of State that in 2015, a year of significant anniversaries for the Jewish people, United States embassies in appropriate countries should commemorate this anniversary year with significant public events including the message that the opportunities for remembrance and reflection contained in these anniversaries are applicable to all peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. Res. 58. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

1. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, requesting the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Taxing Clause, USC Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States[.]"). The Action for Dental Health Act would use federal tax dollars to provide grants for eligible oral health professionals to purchase mobile dental units to provide free dental services to underserved communities. Furthermore, increasing access to no- or low-cost dental and oral health services improves the nation's public health, or "general welfare[.]". Therefore, the Action for Dental Health Act is a valid exercise of the Taxing Clause.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the civil asset forfeiture procedures and Section 8, Clause 9 extends to Congress the power to create inferior courts and to make rules of procedure and evidence for such courts.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the Sixteenth Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 US Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all

Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8. "Congress shall have the Power . . . (7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads . . ."

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, and 18.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution states that; a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect

Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 21: Mr. JONES, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PERRY and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 93: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 131: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 141: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 159: Ms. BASS and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 173: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 174: Mr. BOST and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 181: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 198: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 199: Mr. PETERS and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 217: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 242: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 246: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 258: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 263: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 264: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 268: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 285: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. RUSSELL and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 287: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 317: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 333: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JOLLY and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 348: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 349: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 350: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 351: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 359: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 367: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 383: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 391: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 398: Mr. KILMER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 400: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 401: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 413: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 419: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 420: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 424: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 426: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 427: Mr. REED and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 430: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 431: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BERA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BARR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SIREs, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 438: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 443: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 459: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 460: Ms. MCSALLY and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 461: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 473: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 478: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 484: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 494: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 509: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 518: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 519: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 525: Ms. TITUS and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 527: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 529: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. LATTA.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 11: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H. Res. 17: Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H. Res. 26: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Res. 28: Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 32: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 45: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YODER, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 49: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 26, 2015]

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in

H.R. 351 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agricultural in H.R. 399 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SENATE—Tuesday, January 27, 2015

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our rock, You are our shield in the time of storm. We give You our hopes and dreams, knowing that You know what is best for our Nation and world.

Sustain our lawmakers. May integrity and uprightness be the standards for their conduct so that they will not be put to shame. Lift the light of Your countenance upon them and be gracious to them. Give them fresh strength and wisdom, as You renew the drumbeat of Your Spirit in their hearts, empowering them to march to the rhythm of Your righteousness.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will resume consideration of the Keystone bill. This is the third week of floor consideration for this bipartisan jobs and infrastructure measure. Senators from both sides have been able to offer amendments and get their ideas voted on. I know Chairman MURKOWSKI is here, and she is working with colleagues to get their amendments in the queue. It is now time to get through the remaining amendments and to vote up or down on passage of the bill.

KEYSTONE JOBS BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Keystone jobs bill is a bipartisan infrastructure project the American people deserve, so the vote last night to filibuster was certainly disappointing. The Keystone jobs bill has been considered and reported out of the energy committee. It has been subject to

weeks of open debate. Senators on both sides have been able to offer and vote on amendments—two dozen so far and counting. Our Democratic friends have had more amendments considered on this bill than Republicans, more amendments than all of last year combined.

Just a few days ago we offered our friends the opportunity to have even more of their amendments voted on. Unfortunately, they rejected that offer. So today I am asking them to reconsider, join us, and work with the bill managers, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL. Let's get your amendments processed, and let's make progress for the American people.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senators who are working on the amendments on the Keystone Canadian pipeline. This is the highest priority of the new Republican majority, a pipeline that is being built on behalf of a Canadian company.

You would think there would be a lot of other possibilities here to create jobs for America, but the Senate Republicans are focused on this one. Ultimately it will produce 35 permanent jobs in America, and this is their highest priority. Had they taken up instead the Federal highway bill—a bill which is looming in terms of a deadline this year—we literally could have created thousands of American jobs across America, not just in one pipeline location. But they chose instead to help this Canadian company build this pipeline.

Sadly, it won't produce products that can help America. We had an amendment offered here on the floor that said any refined products that came from this pipeline would be sold in America. It was defeated. Every Republican voted against that amendment.

Then we offered an amendment that said this pipeline, if it is going to be built in America, should use American steel. Every Republican voted against that, save one.

The notion that we are going to use foreign steel to build a pipeline for a Canadian company so that the refined products from that pipeline can be exported overseas is somehow, in the eyes of the majority in the Senate, an

American jobs bill. I don't think the American people would agree with that. They would understand, if we were taking up the Federal highway bill, that is an American jobs bill. We put construction workers across the United States to work and create an infrastructure that would build on the economy, creating more jobs in communities from Arizona to Illinois, from Florida to the State of Washington. But instead we are focused on the Keystone Canadian pipeline, the highest priority of the Senate Republican majority.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in a little more than a month the Department of Homeland Security in Washington, DC, will run out of money. It is hard to imagine that the agency responsible for combating terrorism in the United States has its budget in question, but that was the design when the people sat down to write the Omnibus appropriations bill last year. The Republicans in the House insisted that if we were going to fund the rest of government, we had to withhold regular funding for the Department of Homeland Security. That is why the deadline of February 27 is looming.

The Department of Homeland Security more than any other single agency is responsible for keeping America safe from terrorism. They supervise and manage the TSA officers and airports. They collect weapons that people try to bring on airplanes. It is hard to imagine that people still do. They try to keep us safe at a time when we know terrorism is a threat not just in the United States but in countries all over the world.

Yet the Republicans in the House and Senate do not want to give regular funding to the Department of Homeland Security. They put it on temporary funding. As Mr. Johnson, the Secretary of this Department, said, it puts them at a real disadvantage at the Department of Homeland Security in keeping America safe. Yet the Republicans have insisted on this. Why? Why would they withhold regular funding for this critical agency? Because they are exercised by the President's decision to issue Executive orders on immigration. Their anger over the President's action has led them to jeopardize the immediate funding of an agency of critical importance to the United States. So they set out in the House of Representatives to add five riders to this appropriations bill which

they insist must be passed if we are going to fund this agency. When you look at these five riders, I think you can understand why many of us think this is nothing short of an outrage.

One of the things which they have set their sights on is a program I have worked on for 14 years here in the Senate. I introduced a bill 14 years ago called the DREAM Act—14 years ago. The concept behind it was very basic: Children brought to the United States by their parents who are undocumented deserve a chance—a chance to make a life in America if they have no serious criminal issues, if they have graduated from high school, if they are prepared to step forward, go to college, or serve in the military. The DREAM Act was introduced 14 years ago with a basic concept: Don't hold children responsible for bad decisions or wrongdoing by their parents. Give these young people a chance.

Sadly, in the House of Representatives there is an anger against these young people that is almost difficult to describe. We think there are almost 2 million of them in America, and 600,000 have stepped forward to qualify for the DACA Program, an Executive order by the President that spares them from deportation while they are living in the United States. But the House of Representatives has insisted that we repeal the DACA Program, not issue any renewals for DACA protection, and not issue any new DACA protection for the 1.5 million who may still be eligible. That is one of their conditions before they will fund the agency that deals with terrorism to protect the United States from terrorism.

This last weekend there were several very unusual and important meetings involving the American political scene. One was in California hosted by the Koch brothers which attracted three of our Senators on the other side of the aisle who were at least considering, if not aspiring to be President of the United States. The Koch brothers called them in for a presentation and questions as part of the process of deciding whether the Koch brothers would support them to be the next President of the United States. That is not the first time that has happened. Others representing special interest groups I am sure have called candidates before. This is a very overt effort by two very powerful men to spend almost \$1 billion in the next political cycle to control the political future of this country.

As troubling as that is for most Americans to hear, there was another forum that I think was equally disturbing in my neighboring State of Iowa. This was a forum called by Congressman STEVE KING. He called it a freedom forum. He attracted a large array of Republican aspirants to the office of President. Included in those were Governor Christie of New Jersey;

Senator CRUZ of Texas; former Senator Santorum of Pennsylvania; Scott Walker, the governor of Wisconsin; former Governor Palin of Alaska; Donald Trump; former Governor Perry of Texas; and former Governor Mike Huckabee of Arkansas. They all came to Iowa to be part of this freedom forum. This freedom forum was sponsored by Congressman STEVE KING.

Without question, Congressman KING has made some of the most outrageous statements about the DREAMers, whom I described earlier, of any Member of Congress. He has compared them to dogs. He has referred to DREAMers as the deportables—whatever that means.

He has one oft-quoted statement: For every valedictorian among the DREAMers, there were 100 who had developed cantaloupe-sized calves carrying illegal narcotics across the border into the United States.

That is the kind of rhetoric which might cause David Duke to blush, but it didn't stop these Republican Presidential aspirants from trekking out to Iowa to pay homage to Congressman STEVE KING.

I would suggest that the Grand Old Party, which I do respect—the party of Abraham Lincoln—would be a party that would be embarrassed by the comments of Congressman KING rather than pay homage to him in the State of Iowa.

I wish to tell the story of one of the DREAMers whom Congressman KING particularly would come to dislike because this is an undocumented person and one of the DREAMers who would be disadvantaged by the Republican action in the House of Representatives which would literally remove the protection this young lady has from deportation.

This is Ola Kaso. Her story is amazing. She was brought to the United States from Albania in 1998 at the age of 5. She grew up in Warren, MI, and her dream was to become a medical doctor and to treat cancer patients. Ola was the valedictorian of her high school class. She took every advanced placement class offered by her school and had 4.4 grade point average.

She was treasurer of the student council and treasurer of the National Honor Society at her school. In 2011, I held a hearing on the DREAM Act. Ola Kaso had just graduated from high school and she came to testify at that hearing. She was the first ever undocumented immigrant to testify before the Senate.

In the fall of 2011, Ola entered the honors program at the University of Michigan where she is a premed student. What has happened to Ola Kaso since DACA was established in 2012? Ola has become involved in public service. In 2013 she worked as an intern in the office of our former colleague Senator Carl Levin. She continued her

studies. This spring Ola will graduate from the University of Michigan with a double major in biochemistry and women's studies.

Keep in mind she completed this degree without any financial assistance from our government. Ola is not eligible for Pell grants or student loans because she is undocumented. She has become involved in nanotechnology, a cutting-edge field that holds great promise for future technological breakthroughs. Ola is now conducting at the Michigan Nanotechnology Institute for Medicine and Biological Sciences. Last year Ola's work was published in the *Journal of Physical Chemistry*. I want to read the name of the article which Ola Kaso published. I hope I will be spared, a liberal arts lawyer, if I stumble over some of these words. But just to give you an idea of her research, the article was entitled "Atomic Force Microscopy Probing of Receptor-Nanoparticle Interactions for Riboflavin Receptor Targeted Gold-Dendrimer Nanocomposites."

Now, that is a mouthful, but it gives you a sense of how much Ola Kaso has to contribute. Next, Ola plans to attend medical school, but if the House Republicans have their way and we pass in the Senate the language which was included as part of the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, Ola Kaso will never have a chance. She will be deported back to Albania, a country she does not know at all. She will be forced to leave the United States.

We will basically give up on the investment we have made as Americans in her education and her potential and tell her: Leave. In the words of Congressman STEVE KING, she is one of the "deportables"—one of the "deportables." Ola sent me a letter recently. Here is what she said about her dreams for the future:

I aspire to ultimately become a surgical oncologist, but more importantly, I intend to work for patients that cannot afford the astronomical fees accompanying life-saving surgeries, patients are denied the medical treatment they deserve. My goal is not to increase my bank account; my goal is to decrease preventable deaths. I wish to remain in this country to make a difference.

Ola is not alone. There are so many DREAMers across this country just like her who want to be part of our future. It is clear this DACA Program works for America. That is why I am asking DREAMers around the country to join me, post their stories about what they have done with DACA on Twitter and Facebook using the hashtag "DACA Works."

I want the American people to understand the human cost of the bill that was passed by the Republicans in the House of Representatives and is now pending before the Senate. If this bill becomes law, DACA will end. Hundreds of thousands of DREAMers will risk deportation to countries they can barely

remember. Will America be stronger if we deport Ola Kaso and others like her, young people who want to use their talents to give back to America, deporting them to countries they have some loose connection to by family ties?

Of course not. It is shameless—shameless to play politics with the lives of these young people. They grew up in this country, attended school in this country, put their hand over their hearts in their classrooms every day to pledge allegiance to the only flag they have ever known. It is shameless for the House Republicans to put homeland security funding at risk in pursuit of punishing these young people. The House Republicans feel so strongly about deporting DREAMers, they are willing to hold our homeland security funding hostage.

The House Republicans are telling the Senate and the President: Deport the DREAMers or we will shut down the Department of Homeland Security. I hope the Senate majority leader will reject this blackmail and bring a clean homeland security appropriations bill to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible.

For our part, the Senate Democrats will insist that the Department of Homeland Security be funded and that the President have the authority, which every President has, to establish America's immigration policies. The Presiding Officer was part of an effort, as I was several years, to try to resolve this issue in a thoughtful, balanced, comprehensive way.

The ultimate bill that was considered before the Senate was not perfect. Parts of it I did not like at all, but we reached a compromise. Over a year and a half ago, we sent that bipartisan bill to the House of Representatives asking them to call it for consideration and amendment. They refused, refused for more than a year and a half to call that bill. Instead, what they have done is launch these attacks on young people such as Ola Kaso.

Is that what America is all about? Is that the best we can do? For the dozen or more Republican Presidential aspirants who made that journey out to Iowa to pay homage to Congressman STEVE KING and his views about immigration, I would ask them to, when they return home: Look around you. There are young people just like this young woman who are only asking for a chance to be part of America's future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf.

Murkowski (for Sullivan) amendment No. 67 (to amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel.

Cardin amendment No. 75 (to amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline.

Murkowski amendment No. 98 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities.

Flake amendment No. 103 (to amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs.

Cruz amendment No. 15 (to amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports.

Moran/Cruz amendment No. 73 (to amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Daines amendment No. 132 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is International Holocaust Remembrance Day, commemorating the genocide that resulted in the murder of nearly 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime. On this day in 1945, the allied forces entered Auschwitz, a complex of concentration and death camps in Nazi-occupied Poland. They liberated more than 7,000 prisoners. Auschwitz was made up of 3 main camps and more than 40 subcamps covering over 15 square miles. Between 1940 and 1945 nearly 1.3 million people were deported to Auschwitz and at least 1.1 million were murdered.

By January 1945 the allied forces were closing in. To eliminate witnesses to their crimes, thousands of prisoners were killed at Auschwitz, and 60,000

were forced to march west days before the liberation.

During these marches SS guards shot anyone who fell behind or could not continue. More than 15,000 died in that march. In the months prior to the liberation, an elderly French inmate urged a young Jewish prisoner named Olga to watch everything she saw, and when the war was over, to tell the world what she had seen. Olga wrote her memoirs in the years that followed and gave voice to those who could no longer speak.

Yesterday, the Washington Post featured the horrific stories of four Auschwitz survivors, including those who suffered under the sadistic Nazi doctor Josef Mengele, known as the Angel of Death. GEN Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the allied forces in Europe also understood the importance of documenting what he saw. After visiting a recently liberated Nazi camp, General Eisenhower urged Washington to send a congressional delegation to witness Nazi crimes firsthand so in the future there could be no attempt to dismiss these allegations as mere propaganda. With the remaining eyewitnesses in their twilight years, the responsibility to ensure that future generations never forget these atrocities falls to us. Recently I joined my colleagues Senators MIKULSKI, CARDIN, KIRK and others and introduced a resolution commemorating this important anniversary. This resolution calls on us to be witnesses to the 1.1 million innocent victims murdered at Auschwitz and honors the legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust.

Last Congress I chaired the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights. Although I am disappointed that the Republicans chose to change the name of that subcommittee under their leadership, I am going to continue to focus on protecting human rights and civil rights.

When I chaired the subcommittee, I tried to give a platform to voices that are not often heard and to examine what needs to be done to protect human rights. Our responsibility in Congress is to focus on legislation, not lamentation. So we wrote legislation and passed bills to hold the perpetrators of serious human rights violations accountable for their crimes.

In 2007 my Genocide Accountability Act was enacted, allowing prosecution of genocide committed outside the United States or by someone other than a U.S. national outside the United States. The following year President Bush signed the Child Soldiers Accountability Act, which I also introduced. In 2010 the Child Soldiers Accountability Act was used to deport Liberian warlord Dr. George Boley.

I have also authored the Trafficking in Persons Accountability Act, the Human Rights Enforcement Act, the

Child Soldiers Prevention Act, the Child Marriage Prevention Act, Congo Conflict Minerals Act, all legislation aimed at protecting human rights in terrible situations, all of which became law.

Our hearts go out to the survivors who mourn their families and the millions of others murdered in the Holocaust. Today many of the survivors will return to Auschwitz. They will recall that moment when they first arrived more than 70 years ago and passed under a sign that mockingly read, in German, "Work makes you free." Standing before them was Josef Mengele to await their fate. Turning right meant death in the gas chamber, turning left may have meant survival, for a few weeks at least. So many voices were silenced that now we have to tell their stories.

As the memory of the Holocaust passes from those who were there to the generations that were not, we cannot forget the importance of remembrance and speaking out against intolerance whenever and wherever it occurs. Unfortunately these horrible crimes still take place. Consider Boko Haram in Nigeria, ISIL in Syria and Iraq, and the barbaric systems of gulag in North Korea. We cannot be silent.

As Holocaust survivor Ruth Eglash said in yesterday's Washington Post:

I used to be an optimist until a few years ago, but the situation in the Middle East has changed and the world does not notice anything. . . . The bottom line is, it can happen again and it is happening again in many places, not necessarily to the Jews, but to anyone.

Our promise to hold accountable those who commit the most unspeakable crimes will ring hollow unless we lead the world in punishing those responsible for the gravest human rights violations. I look forward to continuing working with my colleagues in the Senate to make progress toward ending genocide and human rights abuses everywhere they exist. We should all proclaim in one voice: Never again.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today on the important issue of funding the Department of Homeland Security and to urge my colleagues to come together and pass a clean appropriations bill with regard to this agency.

The Department of Homeland Security, or DHS, is charged with border se-

curity and immigration enforcement. DHS's role extends far beyond immigration. The agency is also responsible for aviation security, emergency management and response, counterterrorism, and cyber security.

Democrats and Republicans have long worked together to make sure our hard-working Federal officers on the border, in our airports, and at our ports can continue their critical work that keeps us safe.

Now the Republican-controlled House would irresponsibly risk shutting down the Department of Homeland Security to score political points over the President's immigration actions. Today I object to the effort to shut down DHS over the President's immigration Executive action because it is not only an irresponsible strategy from a security point of view, but it comes with a real cost in the everyday lives of students and parents.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security is set to expire February 27. The President has been clear that he will veto any policy riders that undo his Executive action and harm millions of students and their families. The House Republican bill forces us to choose between shutting down the Department of Homeland Security or deporting children and families. This is an untenable choice.

Looking at the votes in the House, it is clear some Members of Congress would on the one hand say our immigration focus should be on securing our border, while on the other hand they risk turning off the lights at Border Patrol stations because they disagree with the President's immigration policies.

Last year I led a congressional delegation to McAllen, TX, and to Lackland Air Force Base to see the humanitarian crisis on the border firsthand. My colleagues and I were heartbroken after seeing children as young as 7 years old in Customs and Border Protection facilities.

But what we also saw were hard-working border agents doing the best they could under difficult circumstances in an already stressed immigration system. These agents should know that we in Washington are going to give them the resources they need to do their jobs, not irresponsibly shut down the Department of Homeland Security, for whom they work.

Instead of threatening to shut down the government's primary homeland security agency, we should be working together to once again pass bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform. Republicans and Democrats agree our immigration system is broken.

With his Executive action President Obama took a step to bring millions across the country out of the shadows and keep U.S. citizens and their families together. Congressional action that puts families first is needed if we

are to permanently fix our immigration system.

The President's Executive action helps millions of people across America by allowing certain students and families to register, work legally, and pay their taxes. His action is rooted in the reality that our immigration enforcement officers need to exercise discretion on whom to go after with limited resources and in a broken immigration system.

Those who oppose the President's action, which is reflected in the House Republican bill, say that the President and enforcement officers must act with absolutely no discretion. This position contemplates and, in fact, supports the removal of nearly 12 million undocumented people from our country. This is paramount to a policy of mass deportation.

If mass deportation were enacted, DHS would need an exponential increase in funding and resources. Billions in increased spending without any permanent fixes or reforms is not a viable option. Even if we somehow have the resources to enact the policy of mass deportation, doing so would devastate our economy, removing millions of hard-working people who would no longer be working, running businesses, buying our goods and products. That would lead to over \$2.5 trillion of economic loss to our country in just a decade.

Mass deportation is not a serious solution for immigration reform. It simply is not possible for DHS to remove every undocumented person from this country.

Passing the House bill would just make life even harder for these people, many of whom are already some of the hardest working people in our Nation.

As I mentioned, there are nearly 12 million undocumented people living in communities across America. Many have been living here for years or decades. They are parents, they are small business owners, and they are our neighbors and our children's classmates at school.

They are people such as Bianca, a woman who lives in Hawaii with her family. After moving to the United States on a visa over a decade ago, Bianca met her husband. They moved to the place where they had always dreamed of living—Hawaii, naturally—and began a family there.

Bianca's work visa and her husband's work visa were temporary, and like many immigrant families they faced a tough decision to remain after their visas expired and to continue building a life here in America. Bianca and her husband started with nothing. Today they have two small businesses on Oahu and four American children—children born in the United States. Their businesses employ American citizens. They pay their taxes, and they work hard to provide for their families and be engaged in the community.

Because of the President's order, Bianca and her family no longer live in fear every single day of being torn from the life they have built in Hawaii.

The House Republicans' mass deportation policy is a serious proposal in only one respect. It would result in serious, negative consequences for our economy, our government, and millions of families in our country.

In contrast, prioritizing deporting felons, not families and students, is simply commonsense, and that is what the President's Executive order does.

Now is the time when we should be working together on commonsense and comprehensive immigration reform that the vast majority of Americans support. Comprehensive immigration reform is supported by 70 percent of the American people. In the past Congress, nearly 70 percent of the Senate supported our bipartisan immigration bill.

Our bipartisan bill was a compromise. It strengthened border security, modernized our system, addressed visa backlogs, and allowed millions of undocumented people to step out of the shadows, get in line, and work toward becoming American citizens. Comprehensive immigration reform would have spurred economic growth in our country by over \$100 billion per year while helping to bring down the deficit.

The only thing that kept this bipartisan reform bill from becoming law was the fact that Speaker BOEHNER refused to give the bill an up-or-down vote in the House. Recklessly shutting down the Department of Homeland Security will not fix our broken immigration system. Undoing the President's Executive action will not fix our broken immigration system. We must work together, and we must fund the Department of Homeland Security so that they can continue to protect our country, and we must come together to pass common sense reform that Americans support.

Both sides of the aisle agree that we are a nation of immigrants and our immigration system is broken. We don't need to shut down the Department of Homeland Security or round up and deport millions of families and individuals.

We can start that process with a clean DHS funding bill, and I urge my Republican colleagues to bring one to the floor quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I rise this morning to join our colleagues in discussing the need for a clean, full-year bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Just 30 days from today, funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires unless Congress acts.

I know that sometimes in congressional time 30 days may seem like a long time, but with a scheduled recess in a few weeks and the certain fact that the House-passed bill cannot pass the Senate, we must act soon to prevent a shutdown and provide the resources to keep our country safe.

Luckily, there is a path forward to prevent a shutdown. We should pass the bipartisan, bicameral, Homeland Security funding bill that was agreed to last December.

Just a few weeks ago, Senator MIKULSKI, then Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Congressman ROGERS, Chair of the House Appropriations Committee, negotiated spending bills for the entire government, including the Department of Homeland Security bill. This was a compromise measure. Not everyone got what they wanted, but the bill funded the Department at levels that would ensure the Department can fulfill its mission to secure the homeland.

Then, unfortunately, politics came into play. Some House Republicans demanded the homeland bill be removed from the larger budget because of immigration issues, and now the entire Department is funded on a short-term basis through February 27. Now we face a fundamental question: Are we going to put the country at risk because of an ideological disagreement?

Since Senator MIKULSKI and Congressman ROGERS reached that agreement in December, we have seen many threats to our Nation and to our allies. The U.S. law enforcement community is on high alert for terror threats after attacks in Australia and Ottawa, Canada, and in Paris. Recently, an Ohio man was arrested when it was discovered he was plotting to blow up the U.S. Capitol in an ISIS-inspired plan. Now is not the time to be holding up funding for the Department of Homeland Security because of ideological reasons.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit the Department of Homeland Security's cyber security center in Arlington. The center is where officials are working every day to prevent attacks not just against the Federal Government or against State governments but against the private sector, against U.S. companies such as Sony, and against critical infrastructure such as nuclear powerplants and the electric grid.

Last week, in the Armed Services Committee, former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said that he views cyber security threats to be "as dangerous as nuclear weapons."

We must continue to make important investments in our cyber defenses. But if we fail to fully fund their budget—the clean budget that was agreed to by the House and Senate—their efforts to identify the newest technologies and strategies to protect our cyber infrastructure will be put on hold.

One of the things they talked to me about when I visited the center includes two areas I think are particularly important to our national security. One is the effort to identify a secure emergency response line, which is very critical when we have national emergencies—even the snowstorm we are seeing in the northeast in New Hampshire, where we have several feet of snow that is being predicted. We also need a secure emergency response line so our first responders—the people there on the ground when an emergency happens—can communicate with each other. That is at risk if we pass a CR rather than a clean funding bill.

The other thing at risk is the effort to identify the next generation of cyber threats. There are things being worked on that we don't even know yet, and unless we are ahead of that curve we are not going to be there to protect our cyber system throughout the country. So we need to give the Department of Homeland Security budgetary certainty so it can plan and prepare for these kinds of threats. That is why a short-term continuing resolution should be off the table. We need to pass a bill that funds homeland security for the rest of this fiscal year.

A short-term budget means the Department is on autopilot. That would be extraordinarily bad for business and for our national security. If Homeland Security operates under a short-term budget, new projects and grants are halted, contracts and acquisitions are postponed, hiring is delayed, employee training is scaled back, and grants to our first responders—those people on the ground when something happens—are not going to be awarded, and congressionally targeted reductions—those reductions we want to make in wasteful programs—are also put on hold.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to visit New Hampshire's fusion center. Every State has a fusion center. This is a network of centers designed to serve as a focal point in each State to coordinate terrorism-related information and threats to our national security, to our State security, and to our municipalities. It is a place where first responders, local law enforcement, and in New Hampshire's fusion center, in addition to our State and local folks being represented, someone from the FBI is there on hand, someone from the Department of Homeland Security identifies potential threats and relays that information up and down the chain of command.

In New Hampshire, the fusion center has also been very critical in working to address drug interdiction and to help identify the heroin abuse epidemic that, sadly, we have seen not only in New Hampshire but in northern New England. If we have a short-term budget, new grants to our fusion centers, which are on the front lines of protecting our States and municipalities

against security threats, and the security grants to State and local law enforcement will not be awarded.

Why would we threaten this important public safety and security funding for unrelated ideological reasons?

Secretary Jeh Johnson recently said:

As long as this Department continues to operate on a continuing resolution, we are prevented from funding key homeland security initiatives. These include, for example, funding for new grants to State and local law enforcement, additional border security resources, and additional Secret Service resources to implement the changes recommended by the independent panel. Other core missions, such as aviation security and protection of Federal installations and personnel, are also hampered.

That is a direct quote from the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson.

In addition to what he lays out there, I want to highlight a few specific examples of why a short-term budget—a continuing resolution—is problematic for the Department and for our national security.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement—ICE—could not fund all of its current detention, antitrafficking, and smuggling requirements under a short-term budget. Under a short-term budget, ICE will not have the funding they need to meet their legal mandate to have 34,000 detention beds in place for immigration detainees nor funding for a new family detention center.

So for those people concerned about our border security, concerned about people coming into this country, why would we want to deny funding to address efforts to interdict people coming across the border, to interdict surveillance efforts, to build a new family detention center so we can find out who these people are and whether they should go back to the country they came from? It makes no sense.

Under a short-term budget, there is no funding to hire additional investigators for antitrafficking and smuggling cases to combat the influx of unaccompanied children at the southern border.

Under a short-term budget, no funding is provided to address Secret Service weaknesses identified after the recent White House fence-jumping incident.

Yesterday we saw concerns about how the Secret Service operates. This time I think everybody acknowledged they could not have been expected to intervene in the drone that got dropped on the White House lawn, but it highlights again the threats that are there and why we need to ensure the Secret Service has the resources to reform itself and to make sure the President and officials are protected.

A short-term budget would delay the contract for the Coast Guard's eighth national security cutter we need for maritime security.

In New Hampshire, we have a border with the ocean, so we very much appre-

ciate the work of the Coast Guard, but I think it is critical throughout the country. And one of the things that would be put on hold is upgrading the Coast Guard's ice-breaking fleet.

Last winter alone, when the Great Lakes froze, \$705 million in shipping was lost and 3,800 jobs because we didn't have a Coast Guard ice-breaker that can open a channel on the Great Lakes.

Under a short-term budget, aging nuclear weapons equipment will not be replaced. That causes gaps in an area where mistakes are simply unacceptable and too dangerous even to comprehend.

A short-term budget would delay upgrades to emergency communications for first responders—something I have already talked about—as we think about how they respond to local emergencies.

The best way forward is to provide certainty and stability for the men and women who fulfill homeland security's mission to protect the United States from harm. To ensure our local communities and our States that we are providing the resources they need, we need to pass a clean bill—a clean bill that was agreed to last December.

Lurching from funding crisis to funding crisis is a terrible way to govern. It is an especially terrible way to govern when our Nation is dealing with major threats. The clean bill that was agreed to by the House and Senate last December provides a good budget that strengthens our Nation, protects against known threats, properly supports homeland security and those who serve on the front lines of protecting this country.

The negotiated agreement includes critical increases in funding and support for border security, for cyber security, and for other national security initiatives. It maintains strong maritime security operations provided by the Coast Guard. The agreement fully funds continued cyber security advancements. It invests in innovative solutions for border security, for biological defense, and for explosives detection.

Senators on both sides of the aisle have talked about the importance of border security and a clean bill that robustly funds border security requirements. The clean bill funds customs and border protections requirements to apprehend, care for, and transmit unaccompanied alien children, while maintaining 21,370 Border Patrol agents on our borders and safely facilitating legitimate travel and trade.

The agreement also funds enhanced border security technologies as well as air and marine surveillance along our land and maritime borders to help the Department better interdict illegal crossing of people and narcotics.

It allocates grant funding to train and equip first responders, continuing

real progress and efficient preparedness, as was so evident in New England in the response to the Boston marathon bombing.

And the agreement fully funds known disaster needs and prepares us for the next disaster.

In closing, let us support our national security funding by passing a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of this fiscal year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, today I stand in support of the Keystone Pipeline project. As an Alaskan, I feel it is important to talk about this bill and the importance of American energy infrastructure.

I live in a State with one of the world's largest pipelines. In 1973, after bitter debate—similar to the debate about Keystone—Congress passed a bill that led to the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System—what we in Alaska call TAPS. It almost didn't happen. The Vice President at the time, serving as the President of the Senate, cast the tie-breaking vote. Then, like now, opponents howled. They said TAPS would be an environmental disaster. They said bird and caribou populations would be decimated.

But none of that happened. In fact, birds and caribou flourished, showing we can develop energy infrastructure responsibly with the highest standards in the world. Alaska proves this every day. TAPS was completed in 1978. It has carried almost 17 billion barrels of oil to energy-thirsty American markets. It is a technological and environmental marvel and a critical component of America's energy infrastructure. It has been a resounding success for this country and for my State. It is the engine of growth for Alaska's economy. The proven safest, most environmentally responsible way to transport oil is through a pipeline. I am certain Keystone will also prove a success.

In supporting Keystone, I am also standing for a larger, more important principle—the ideal that the Federal Government should be a partner in opportunity, a partner in progress, not an obstacle. I am standing in support of what has defined this country for centuries—the idea of the American dream.

The American dream is still alive in my home State. Yes, we have major challenges, like all States. But in Alaska, we still have hope. We still dream big dreams, and TAPS helps fuel these dreams.

In Alaska, the very air we breathe is bathed in promise. The people still speak the language of bold ideas and rugged adventure. It is these people of all colors and creeds who make up the tapestry of Alaska that give us our

strength. It is the enormous opportunities of our natural resources—whether world-class fisheries or oil and gas reserves—that drive the economic engine of my State.

But despite this promise and opportunity, I also see anxiety and frustration, and even fear, in the eyes of my fellow Alaskans, just as I know others are seeing this across the country. Despite what we are hearing from this administration, Americans have real reasons to feel this way.

Business startups are at a 35-year low, as is the percentage of Americans actually looking for work. More small businesses failed than were started this past year. Over three-quarters of Americans now believe their kids' future will be less promising than their own.

Believing that we will leave our children a better tomorrow is the essence of the American dream. But for many, that dream is starting to fade. This does not have to be. We live in a State and a country with so much untapped potential, so many opportunities, and so much promise that can bring limitless possibilities for our kids and our grandkids. Yet, in Alaska and throughout America, people are feeling that the heavy hand of the Federal Government is not working in their interests.

The boldness of America is being bludgeoned by bureaucrats, with new Executive orders and regulations arising everywhere. And every time another one of those unneeded, often absurd, regulations is promulgated, a little bit of hope dies.

A little bit of hope dies every time a doctor's office is shuttered or someone loses health care because of the complexities and costs of ObamaCare.

A little hope dies when a rural community wants to build a road that will protect its citizens and is told by the Secretary of the Interior that birds are more important than their lives.

And a lot of hope dies when the people in my State are told that the resources that are rightfully theirs can't be developed, and their lands and waters can't be fished and hunted to put food on their table.

I support the Keystone Pipeline. It will create thousands of jobs. That is why it has the overwhelming support of American labor unions. It will enhance America's energy infrastructure and contribute billions to our economy. That is why it has the support of the American people.

But just one bill, one pipeline, one project is not enough. It is not nearly enough.

Since the founding of this country we have had important debates right here, on this floor, about the role of the Federal Government in our lives. Judging from what Americans are telling us, the reach of the Federal Government has hit its limits, it has exceeded its limits. Our citizens are telling us that their government—and it is their gov-

ernment—has gone well beyond deriving its powers from the consent of the government. What the American people are telling us, what Alaskans are telling me is they want a Federal Government that helps ignite their hope, not smother it.

We have a job to do. We must work to address the anxiety and frustration of the people we serve. We must work to once again unleash the great potential that is Alaska and America. And we must work to reinvigorate faith in the American dream.

How do we do this? Let me suggest two ideas.

First, we must stop delaying economic projects that benefit our citizens. Purposeful delays and roadblocks have been the hallmark of this administration's approach to infrastructure projects that benefit Americans, and Alaska has been ground zero for such delays. Bridges, roads, mines that take years simply to permit, not to build; oil wells that cannot be drilled on Federal lands despite billions of dollars of leases from the private sector to the Federal Government; a state-of-the-art clean coal plant that sits idle for over a decade despite the dire need for lower cost energy throughout Alaska.

The Keystone Pipeline, a project that has been studied for 6 years, is just the latest example of the willful delay that has been the weapon of choice for this administration for killing projects they don't like.

Enough is enough. We are Americans. We know what we are capable of. We built the 1,700-mile Alaskan-Canadian Highway, the Alcan Highway, through some of the world's most rugged terrain, in less than a year. We built the Empire State Building in 410 days. The Pentagon was built in 16 months. There is no reason that Keystone should have been studied for 6 years.

If the executive branch continues to dither on America's economic future, Congress can and should act to expedite such projects. That is what we are doing with Keystone, and that is what I will be pressing the Congress to do for Alaska's and America's next great energy infrastructure project—the Alaska LNG project—which will create thousands of jobs and provide clean and affordable energy to Americans and our allies for decades.

Second, we need more, not less, access to our Federal lands. As Americans, these are our lands. We own them. They are not the Department of the Interior's or BLM's lands. Yet this administration is adamant on keeping us from responsibly developing them. Once again, Alaska is ground zero for their efforts.

Through Executive orders of various dubious legal merit, this administration locked up half the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska. This isn't a national park. NPRA is an area specifically set aside by Congress for oil and

gas development. And just this weekend, in another brazen action, the Obama administration announced they are working to lock up millions of acres of land on Alaska's coastal plain, some of the Nation's richest oil and gas prospects.

This is an affront to Alaskans and Americans who cherish security—energy security—the rule of law, and the strength of our Nation, and it is an affront to Members of Congress regardless of party. How we develop Alaska's lands is an area where Congress, not the Executive, has preeminent authority.

I think the Obama administration needs a reminder of what article 4, section 3 of the Constitution states:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .

This brings me to my third point: We must get back to the rule of law. The rule of law, carefully built up and nurtured for centuries in America, is a fundamental pillar of our great Nation. Most countries don't have it. We do. It is a gift. But if we continue to erode this rule of law, we ultimately undermine what it means to be an American, and it will be hard to get it back.

But I hope, because there are still enough of us here who respect the rule of law and see the Constitution not as a mere suggestion but as the foundation for the structure of our government and our individual liberties. There have been cracks in the foundation recently, but the people sent us here to repair those cracks.

Fourth, while I believe in a limited Federal Government, it is important to recognize where the Federal Government does not have responsibilities, it needs to carry out its duties with more efficiency and compassion, particularly toward the most vulnerable in society. This is especially true when it comes to honoring the sacred trusts of responsibility we have toward our veterans.

That is why I cosponsored the Clay Hunt suicide prevention bill. I am confident my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will quickly vote on this important measure and move it on to the President's desk.

It is also why I will support effective programs where the Federal Government and States can work together to address our problems throughout this country with regard to sexual assault and domestic violence.

Fifth, and finally, we must challenge the conventional wisdom that has existed in this town for decades that the Federal Government's power and intrusiveness should always be expanding like some inevitable force of nature. Nowhere is this more important than reforming the overgrown regulatory thicket that strangles our future.

According to the President's own Small Business Administration, Federal regulations impose an annual burden on our economy of close to \$2 trillion. That is roughly \$15,000 per year per American family. Federal regulations are sapping our strength as a Nation. So many of them don't make sense, and others are not authorized by law or the Constitution as they must be. And, increasingly, those who promulgate and enforce them are showing less and less restraint for the well-being of our citizens.

The recent Obama administration ANWR assault is the latest example, and I will use all of my power to protect the economic growth and prosperity of Alaska. That is why I have already filed amendments with Senator MURKOWSKI to rescind the Obama administration's ANWR order.

I have also filed an amendment that seeks to check another abuse of Federal power. When the EPA was initially authorized in 1970, no one thought it necessary to arm its employees with weapons. But today, in a classic case of Federal Government power creep, close to 200 armed EPA agents are roaming our country. It is a disturbing fact.

But it was particularly disturbing for a small group of miners who, during the summer of 2013, prospecting for gold in Chicken, AK, were swarmed by armed EPA agents.

This wasn't some huge mining conglomerate. This was a small mining operation in interior Alaska—sluice boxes with specks of Alaska gold, and EPA agents armed with rifles, body armor, a helicopter overhead, looking for Clean Water Act violations. They found none. And apart from terrifying the miners, they accomplished nothing.

As Alaska's former attorney general and commissioner of Natural Resources, I have worked with many fine Federal agents, and I understand the importance of sensible regulations that are based on the directives of Congress. But problems arise when regulations become excessive—and big problems arise when regulators are given guns to enforce these regulations. It is our responsibility to say: Enough; to stand up for those we serve, and to roll back Federal power when necessary.

I am all for a country with an armed citizenry. As a marine, I have taken an oath to defend and fight for this critical constitutional freedom. However, I am not for a country with an armed bureaucracy.

Let's give my State and the rest of the country a little hope that we are doing the jobs they sent us here to do. One concrete step in that direction would be to pass this simple amendment I am offering to disarm the EPA. They can certainly do their job without having guns. They have done so in the past, and they should be able to do so in the future.

Finally, I will close with a few words on how I view my mission here. I sus-

pect it doesn't differ greatly from what most of us hope to accomplish. We all want the best for the people we serve and the States we represent. We want to be strong here at home, which will help us be respected once again by our allies and feared by our adversaries. We want our children to be safe and secure, and we want the same for our neighbor.

We want to live in a country of unlimited opportunity—a country of Alaska-sized dreams. We want a government that holds dear what our Founding Fathers knew—that all powers are derived from the consent of the governed. I think most of us can agree that we must unleash our country's enormous economic potential once again.

I believe our government should be helping us, not hindering us from achieving these efforts. I believe unlocking our country's vast energy potential is one of the best ways to re-ignite the American dream.

Despite challenges, despite big government's creep into our lives, and despite armed EPA agents, we continue to live in the greatest country in the world—in the history of the world. There is no doubt about that. The people who sent us here still have big dreams and big hopes. Let's help those dreams grow and their hopes flourish.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate our new colleague from Alaska on his initial address to the Senate and just comment that it could not be more timely, as his State is obviously under assault by this administration. His prescription for the way forward, both for Alaska and America, strikes me as entirely appropriate for our country, and I congratulate our colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I wish to thank the majority leader for his kind words and all my other colleagues who came to witness a new Senator's maiden speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate our new colleague from Alaska. Well said, and welcome. The two Senators from Alaska have dominated the start of this new session, and we are glad they have because they are bringing very important legislation and decisions to this body. So I congratulate both the senior and junior Senators from Alaska for their efforts, and I look forward to working together to accomplish what we all want to accomplish—a growing economy and better opportunities for Americans. The Senator from Alaska is certainly an important component of that in leading the way to that goal.

INDIANA HEALTH CARE

Mr. President, this morning we received the announcement that after nearly 2 years of negotiations, the State of Indiana and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services have reached a major breakthrough, an agreement that approves Indiana's Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0 waiver application by allowing it to move forward and be implemented.

This agreement is great news for hundreds of thousands of low-income Hoosiers and a testament to the effectiveness of the current Healthy Indiana Plan. Now an expansion of that will be made possible through this waiver. It solidifies Indiana's position at the forefront of Medicaid reform and the advancement of consumer-driven health care. Those are key words—reforming a current dysfunctional and broken Medicaid system, advancing consumer-driven health care, getting consumers into the role of making decisions about their health and not just having a government agency say: This is what you can get, and this is what you cannot get or this is what makes you healthy. The Healthy Indiana Plan incentivizes consumers to determine what is best for their own health.

The Healthy Indiana Plan was originally crafted under Indiana's former Governor Mitch Daniels. He extended health care coverage to lower-income residents who earned too much to qualify for Medicaid but too little to afford quality health coverage.

The guiding principle of the original plan was simple. Individually owned and directed health care coverage has a positive effect for individual citizens and the health care system as a whole. We have proven that giving people a stake in their own health care decisions works.

Governor Daniels put it well in a 2010 Wall Street Journal article, stating:

Americans can make sound, thrifty decisions about their own health. If national policy trusted and encouraged them to do so, our sky-rocketing health care costs would decelerate.

The original plan had three main objectives: individual control of health care spending, taxpayer protection based on the stipulation that enrollment could not grow faster than available funding, and disease prevention by incentivizing preventive care.

Then in 2013 our current Governor, Mike Pence, announced plans to reform and expand the original Healthy Indiana Plan to cover more low-income Hoosiers. Today, after more than a year and a half of negotiations, the Healthy Indiana Plan 2.0 has received a green light from the Obama administration. Coverage will begin on February 1 of this year.

I applaud Governor Pence, and I applaud Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell for working together to move forward to continue Indiana's successful consumer-driven approach that empowers members and provides access to quality care.

This agreement will expand an existing proven program to more than 350,000 low-income Hoosiers and allow the State of Indiana to end traditional Medicaid for all nondisabled adults between the ages of 19 and 64. They will be transitioned into the new plan just approved through this waiver.

The answer to our Nation's health care problems is not the broken status quo of ObamaCare. Indiana has shown, and will continue to show, that reforming traditional Medicaid and offering innovative health care solutions is the right way to empower individual citizens as they seek access to quality health care. Once again, Indiana is leading the way nationally by creating State-based innovative ideas for governing.

As I serve individuals and Hoosiers here in Washington, I have often turned to what I call the Indiana model as a blueprint for a more efficient and fiscally responsible Federal Government. I developed a legislative roadmap that I call the Indiana Way—a 10-point plan that takes the model of Indiana, which it has put in place and proven over the last 10 years, and the ideas that I have gathered from Hoosiers as I travel about the State—ideas and plans that will make our State and Nation stronger. Innovative and effective solutions put forward in Indiana are what is desperately needed in Washington today to put our country back on a path to economic growth and opportunity.

I congratulate Governor Pence and our State on this terrific news, and I look forward to continuing to highlight Hoosier's success stories and the Indiana way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge my colleague from Alaska, and I appreciate the comments he made this morning in his first speech on the Senate floor and in choosing to clearly focus on the opportunities that we have as a State and the challenges we face.

I do feel it is unfortunate that, as a State, it seems that our largest battle is against our own federal government. How unfortunate is that? I feel very fortunate to have him as a partner here in the Senate as we take on these initiatives that have such impact and are of such import to our State and to how we fit with the other 49 States. We have no shortage of issues to take up when it comes to Federal overreach and the impact it has on our Nation and our State and how we will be able

to develop our resources. I look forward to working with the Senator in these different areas.

I do have to comment, given where we are in the discussions here on the Senate floor about the Keystone XL Pipeline and what benefit that infrastructure will provide to this country by way of a resource that will help us with our energy security and truly helps us with our national security, is it not better to receive oil from our friend and our ally Canada than it is from Venezuela? To me these are subjects that should not even merit that level of discussion because it is just common sense.

Yet this President and his administration have taken 6 years to get to a point where they may decide on this issue. It has taken 6 years to decide whether it is in our country's best interest to receive oil from a friend and neighbor rather than from those who would do us ill. And then in a stunning act on Sunday—in one breath—this administration has taken an area that has been identified as the greatest source of oil potential that we have in this country, outside of Prudhoe Bay, with an estimated mean average of 10.3 billion barrels, which could provide 1 million additional barrels a day that would come down the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, which my colleague has talked about, and would help us to provide our Nation with the resource we need and would not only help us from a jobs and energy perspective but also from a security perspective.

On one hand, the President is saying, nope, I think I would rather continue to receive oil from Venezuela and Nigeria and all these other countries, and then on Sunday he just decides to put it off limits—the greatest source of oil we have identified in this country to date.

Just this morning, the President released his 5-year lease-sale plan, which is putting off—not deferring but withdrawing—areas in the Beaufort and the Chukchi, which will limit our opportunity for the 23 billion barrels of potential in the offshore there.

As my colleague has noted, the President has taken off half of the national petroleum reserve—the area we have designated for accessing our oil and gas resources. There is a move underfoot right now where this administration, I believe, is going to make the first production in NPRA and push it to a place where it will be uneconomic.

We have a stunning situation. This administration says they want an all of the above energy policy, except maybe in Alaska. We can't do it in ANWR. We are going to push you off of NPRA, and offshore we are going to make it that much more difficult for you. We are going to put the throttle on Alaska's energy opportunities for this country. We are going to put the throttle on Canada and say: Don't run it through

the United States—not down into the gulf coast where we have these refineries.

What is he doing? He is putting our national security at risk with actions such as these.

So when we talk about Keystone XL, this is more than just a pipe or piece of infrastructure crossing the border. We are talking about energy security and national security. Then we have actions from this administration this week that choke off Alaska's energy opportunities. This is why I need my colleague in this fight. Believe me, the Alaska delegation is prepared for it.

It just causes us to wonder why. What are they thinking? What about energy security and national security for this country? We have the potential to be secure. North American energy independence is not a myth. It is real. But we have to have the will to make it happen—we certainly have the resources. We just need the ability, the opportunity to be able to develop them. So get out of the way and let us do that.

My colleague from Washington and I have been working all morning trying to see if we can't identify a series of amendments that we might be able to move to this afternoon. We would like to give colleagues a sense of how we are going to be advancing through these additional amendments, get some additional amendments up pending, and really lay out that process. I think we have had really constructive conversation this morning, and I am encouraged. Obviously, we have a few more issues to work out, but I am hopeful we will be able to announce—hopefully in the short term—a glide-path that will give Members a little more certainty.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise in support of S. 165, which restores

many of the terrorist detainee transfer safeguards that were weakened in the fiscal year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, as well as imposes a 2-year bar on the transfer of detainees to Yemen.

This legislation has been authored by Senator KELLY AYOTTE, one of the Senate's foremost leaders on national security, and its cosponsors include the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator RICHARD BURR, as well as the Senate's preeminent expert on military law, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM.

I am honored to add my name to the list of Senators who have cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. President, the effect of this legislation is to preserve the ability of the United States to detain at our facilities at Guantanamo Bay members of Al Qaeda and the Taliban—the organizations responsible for the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Why is keeping Guantanamo open so important?

Simply put, Guantanamo affords our military a safe and secure location to detain those individuals held under the law of war or for violations of the law of war.

If an enemy combatant is captured during an armed conflict, that individual can be held under the law of war. It is a generally accepted legal principle, affirmed repeatedly by the Supreme Court, that enemy combatants can be held at least until a conflict is concluded.

If an individual is held for a violation of the laws of war, that means they are being detained until they can be prosecuted for a war crime they are alleged to have committed.

The detainee population of Guantanamo contains battle-hardened terrorists. Indeed, the threat they pose is amply demonstrated since 29 percent of Guantanamo detainees released so far are confirmed or suspected of rejoining the fight against the United States.

Now, Mr. President, Cliff Sloan, who was the State Department's envoy for closing Guantanamo Bay, recently wrote in a New York Times editorial that this nearly 30 percent recidivism rate was "deeply flawed." It appears Mr. Sloan only wants the Congress and the American people to consider the confirmed rate rather than the combined confirmed and suspected recidivism rate.

Mr. President, if Congress and the American people are truly to understand the risks inherent in this administration's insistence on releasing Guantanamo Bay detainees, we must consider this combined number. How can that be deeply flawed?

Mr. Sloan goes on to state that the level of recidivism is much lower since 2009. However, this lower rate, if accu-

rate, undoubtedly does not include the five senior Taliban leaders who were illegally released to Qatar and whose 1-year travel ban is about to expire. Unless the Qatari Government prevents it, soon these terrorists will be free to go wherever they wish.

I am also concerned that this new number might not fully incorporate the activities and future actions of those detainees who have been transferred in recent months. One of the major advantages of locating our detention operations at Guantanamo Bay is that it is well-settled law that the United States can hold individuals held under the law of war or for violations of the law of war at our facilities there.

Now, I personally believe current Supreme Court precedent would enable us to hold both law of war and violations of law of war detainees in the United States. However, if these detainees are moved into the United States, every attorney representing detainees would rush to federal court and file new lawsuits seeking their clients' release. Indeed, there exists a very real possibility that a court might release a detainee into the United States, especially in light of the Obama administration's unwillingness, in some cases, to defend against detainees' habeas petitions to the fullest extent. As such, the risks of transferring these detainees into the United States are great.

Guantanamo Bay also affords us a much better environment to bring and hold newly apprehended terrorists. Inside the United States, the Supreme Court has mandated that criminal suspects be read their rights—including their right to remain silent and right to a lawyer—subject to only a narrow public safety exception. Such limits on interrogations severely hinder our ability to gather information from captured terrorists, who have time and again proven to be the source of vital intelligence.

Consider, for example, how officials were only able to interrogate the Boston Marathon bomber for just 16 hours before he was read his rights and immediately stopped cooperating. As one of the longest serving members ever of the Intelligence Committee, I can assure you that it takes far longer to gather all of the important information we can from most terrorists.

Moving detainees into the United States also presents serious domestic security concerns. A number of terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula have become quite adept at jailbreaks. Bringing a concentration of terrorist detainees into the United States therefore could create a particularly appealing target in the homeland for jihadist radicals, whereas at Guantanamo Bay they are essentially isolated in a facility well secured by the U.S. military.

Clearly there are ample and compelling legal and national security reasons

to maintain our detention operations at Guantanamo Bay. That is why Senator AYOTTE's legislation is so important. It ensures we will continue to use this vital facility by restoring the transfer restrictions that have enabled us to keep these individuals in such a secure location.

A little over a year ago, there was a profound change in the laws governing the transfer of Guantanamo detainees overseas. Before fiscal year 2014 legislation, the Congress had repeatedly enacted provisions in the annual Defense Authorization Act which all but prevented the transfer of Guantanamo detainees.

Specifically, these previous laws required the Secretary of Defense to certify in writing, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, that certain criteria had been met before the transfer of a detainee abroad could occur—in particular, that the foreign entity receiving a detainee has "taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States" as well as "taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity."

Despite this, with few exceptions, the law prohibited the transfer of detainees to countries to which detainees had previously been transferred and subsequently reengaged in terrorism. Yet the law did afford the Secretary of Defense a national security waiver that negated the requirements if other standards were met.

So the bottom line here is that under the old law it was very difficult—as it should be—to transfer Guantanamo Bay detainees overseas.

But the Obama administration, bent on an ideological crusade to empty Guantanamo no matter the cost, successfully lobbied to relax these restrictions in the Fiscal Year 2014 Defense Authorization Act. The newly weakened provisions permitted the transfer of detainees overseas as long as the Secretary of Defense determined that "the individual is no longer a threat to the national security of the United States." This is, of course, a lesser standard than requiring a certification that the individual cannot threaten the United States or reengage in terrorist activity.

In addition, under the Fiscal Year 2014 law, the Secretary could even authorize the transfer of a detainee as long as the Secretary determined the transfer was in the interest of the United States and action had been or was to be taken which will substantially mitigate the chance of recidivism.

While the statute does require the Secretary of Defense to take into consideration a number of factors before

making this decision, the reality of the new regime is that the Secretary has far more ability to transfer detainees overseas.

The Obama administration quickly seized on this new power. In the past year the number of Guantanamo Bay detainees has been decreased from 155 to 122. And despite this new transfer authority, the Obama administration had the audacity to violate even the relaxed transfer restrictions less than 6 months after the law's enactment—specifically by transferring five senior Taliban commanders to Qatar without providing Congress 30 days of notification. Since then, the administration, after a brief lull, has continued and even increased the pace of detainees being transferred overseas.

These deeply troubling moves by the Obama administration demonstrate the vital importance of Senator AYOTTE's bill. It restores the previous transfer restrictions. Specifically, it requires the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to certify that certain safeguards are in place and that threat of recidivism is very small before a transfer can be undertaken.

Furthermore, this legislation also places a 2-year ban on the transfer of detainees to Yemen. This restriction is especially important because approximately half of the remaining detainees at Guantanamo are from Yemen.

Yemen is one of our most critical partners in the fight against terror, and we cooperate closely with the Yemeni Government in the fight against Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. But because of the presence of this menacing group within Yemen's borders, the security situation there is dire, and it seems to be deteriorating as we speak.

Just last week the Houthis, a Shia rebel group, seized control of Yemen's Presidential palace, forcing the resignation of the President, Prime Minister, and Cabinet. In December of 2013 AQAP launched a well-coordinated assault on the Yemeni Ministry of Defense that left 52 dead, not to mention a number of jailbreaks from the Yemeni correctional facilities in which, according to press reports, numerous members of AQAP were freed.

The unvarnished truth is that it will take many years and much effort to bring about the security improvements in Yemen needed before we can be confident that detainees returned there will not return to the battlefield. That is why this section of Senator AYOTTE's legislation is so important.

Our policies must be based on defeating the real threats facing our Nation, not pacifying the ideological passions of an extreme few, which is why I was so disappointed by another recent New York Times editorial about this legislation. The Times called Senator

AYOTTE "opportunistic," if you can believe that, for citing the very real threat of a Paris-style attack on the homeland and termed her description of Yemen as "the wild, wild West," as "odd." I cannot imagine a better way to describe the disturbing security situation in Yemen. And based on years of evidence, one can only conclude Senator AYOTTE is right. Frankly, I believe the New York Times owes Senator AYOTTE an apology, and I hope they will be big enough to do that.

We need this legislation because it restores proper protections from the threats posed by released detainees. I hope the rest of my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to make a statement about the Keystone XL Pipeline. This first came before this body some 4 years ago. I said at the time that the pipeline was a good idea. Why? Because it would create construction jobs. It would reduce America's reliance on Middle Eastern oil for our energy. I said also that the pipeline must be built right. What does that mean? It means two things. First, Keystone must be built to the highest of safety standards. That only makes sense. And we must have respect for private property rights when that pipeline is built.

Just like everything else in Washington, the Keystone was eventually made into a political football, and it has dragged on for 4 years. It has taken on a life of its own. And to be straight and level with you, folks on both sides of the aisle have turned it into something much bigger than it really is.

At the start of the 114th Congress, I was hopeful that there would be enough momentum behind the pipeline to finally get it done and begin construction. But since the swearing-in ceremony 3 weeks ago, my faith in our ability to have a deliberative debate has been shaken. Last week's political stunts were simply unacceptable. We can't tell the American people we are going to responsibly govern when in fact we stopped Senators from even speaking on the floor about amendments they have offered.

The majority decried these kinds of practices last Congress. Many of us agreed. But to start with these kinds of actions in the new Congress is discouraging, to say the least. I hope this week we can have an open debate, make this bill better, pick up a few more votes, and finally approve the Keystone Pipeline for building.

Ten days ago an oil pipeline burst in eastern Indiana. It spilled about 40,000 gallons of oil into and around the Yellowstone River. Six thousand residents in Dawson County, MT, had their water cut off for 5 days after oil got into the

local water treatment plant. Cleanup crews are slowly making progress removing oil from an ice-covered river.

This oilspill was unacceptable. What is worse, it was completely preventable. The pipeline that burst last week was nearly 60 years old. It had not been inspected in at least 2 years. Pipelines, just like roads and bridges and railroads, get old and they wear out. If we want pipelines to operate properly, they need to be regularly inspected and upgraded.

In December, during the lameduck, Congress plussed up the budget for PHMSA—the agency that does pipeline inspections—giving PHMSA the resources to hire more than 100 pipeline safety inspectors. It is clear we need to get these folks hired, trained, and working on the ground. We also need to look at how PHMSA spends those dollars and whether resources are adequate to inspect the Nation's 2.6 million miles of pipeline.

Despite the criticisms, pipelines are still the safest way to transport oil. We have seen the headlines—we have all seen them—in recent years of oil trains exploding, trucks running off the road that carry oil.

In 2013, one explosion in Canada leveled an entire town. It killed 47 people. Months later, another oil train traveling in North Dakota burst into flames and caused an entire town to evacuate.

In northwestern Montana, the resort town of Whitefish is situated a few miles west of Glacier National Park. The town is home to a world-class ski hill and one of the world's most pristine lakes. Every day oil tank cars run past Whitefish Lake carrying thousands of gallons of oil. The environmental impact of an explosion or spill on that railroad would devastate that lake, and it would devastate that region, its water supply, and have serious impacts on the State's economy.

In fact, in 1989, a freight train derailed as it was circling Whitefish Lake and four cars slid into the water and leaked out some fuel. Twenty-three years later—just 2 years ago—they finally finished the cleanup. Imagine if those cars were carrying crude as they do today.

Pipelines are the fastest way to transport oil. Until this body can agree that climate change is real and start making smart investments in alternative energy sources, our economy still needs traditional ways.

I have said many times I still power my farm equipment with diesel fuel. I don't have any options. So it is clear to me we need a way to transport oil, and Keystone is that way. And, yes, in Montana, it will create jobs. According to the State Department's analysis, construction of the pipeline would create 3,700 jobs. Over \$700 million worth of construction materials and support costs would come to eastern Montana.

That is not to mention the tax base that would be increased. But safety must come first. We need the best materials; we need more inspections. We simply cannot afford another spill.

Finally, I want to talk about eminent domain. Everyone in this body should agree that a foreign corporation should not be allowed to seize private property here in America. That is a fact. Unfortunately, we couldn't agree on that last Thursday. There was an amendment offered by Senator MENENDEZ stating that TransCanada can only acquire land from willing sellers. But there are Members of the U.S. Senate who put profits of a foreign corporation above the constitutional rights of American citizens. If someone had told me in January of 2007, when I was first sworn in, that my colleagues would one day vote against such an amendment, I simply would not have believed it, but that is exactly what happened. I am disappointed that amendment failed, but I do believe we can improve upon this bill by including commonsense reporting requirements that would ensure this pipeline is built in a transparent way.

Senator CARDIN has an amendment to do just that, and I for one support it. Private property rights should not be a partisan issue, and I would hope my colleagues would join me in supporting this measure. Let's not race to cloture. Let's not race to trample private property rights of Americans. Let's get this bill passed, and let's do it in the right way.

This pipeline is not a long-term solution for our energy problems, but it is one piece of the puzzle. We must make meaningful investments in research and development so we can make carbon-neutral energy sources more accessible and affordable. Until we do that, the reality is that this economy still runs on oil.

This pipeline helps get us to the next step. I still believe in this pipeline. I believe Keystone can boost our energy independence and will create jobs in the short term and over the long haul, but we need to debate this bill. We need a chance to make it better, to make the pipelines safer, and send a message to the American people we are serious about investing in our long-term energy future. If we don't do that, we won't build the Keystone.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the Keystone XL Pipeline. At the outset this Senator

wants to say the conclusion of this Senator is that this is much more about politics than it is about energy policy, than it is about the economy of this country, particularly so since the price of oil has gone from something in excess of \$100 a barrel down to the range of \$46 a barrel.

Likewise, the fact that the United States is now the No. 1 producer of oil in the world—in large part because of our brethren and sistren in the Senate who represent those Northern Plains States as well as the Southwestern States where they are producing all of this newly found oil from the shale rock which has strengthened the economic position of our country. Think about it, No. 1 producer in the world. That is us. As a result, we do not have to be nearly as dependent on the Middle East, from where we used to get at least 50, 60 percent of our oil or from other areas such as Nigeria or Venezuela.

I have just mentioned three very unstable parts of the world. Yet that is the position we have been in, but that has changed. It is now the 21st century. As a result of new technologies, we are the No. 1 producer of oil in the world. So back when we were not, when we were still dependent on foreign oil, there was a discovery in Canada—Western Canada—the ability to extract oil from the heavy tar in these tar sands.

The Canadians wanted an outlet for that. It made it much more appealing to us, to the United States back then, when oil was over \$100 a barrel and we were still importing a lot of it from abroad. But interestingly, the Canadians wanted and suggested a pipeline that would come right through the middle of the United States, from the north in Canada, through the middle of the United States, down to the gulf coast, to the refineries.

Why didn't they go west from the western States of Canada to the Pacific to have an outlet? They had to cross the Rocky Mountains. Of course that was going to be expensive. It was also going to roil up a bunch of the Canadian environmentalists. So the idea of the Keystone XL was born.

What does XL stand for? Extra large. Well, if it was extra large, it implies there is an existing pipeline. Indeed there is. I want to show it to you. This orange line is an existing pipeline coming from Alberta, northeast of Calgary, across Saskatchewan into Manitoba, and then it comes down through North Dakota, South Dakota, eastern Nebraska, and there it forks right at the Kansas line. One line goes east all the way into Illinois, and the other line goes south through Kansas into Oklahoma.

I said at the outset this is much more about politics as opposed to energy policy, as well as economics because this all heated up—XL, extra large—during the last Presidential election. Of

course those who raise this issue were trying to say: Unless you embrace this XL you are against the United States being energy independent.

Well, an interesting thing happened along the way. From Cushing, OK, there was no line directly going to the gulf coast, where the refineries are in Houston and Port Arthur. The President approved that. That has been constructed. I am advised that has just opened in the last few days—so the existing line, all the way from Alberta, Canada, through the heartland of America, all the way to the gulf coast. That is that.

But XL, extra large, to carry more oil, was proposed. The route that is now proposed is here. That looks like it makes sense because it cuts off the dogleg and does a straight line. But originally it had come much further to the west, right over the environmentally sensitive lands of the aquifer in central Nebraska where so much of the water resources for the entire Midwestern United States come from.

This Senator said, back in the Presidential election of 2012: If you really want a bigger pipeline and you want to avoid all of the controversy over the environment, which this proposed route certainly has since it is extra large, why do you not just run it along the existing pipeline? The right of way is already there. Indeed, it is now complete all the way to the gulf coast. Why do you not run it just right along and you would have a lot less opposition?

But no. This Senator comes back to his main point: This is all about politics. It is all about trying to make some look as though they are anti-energy and others look as though they are pro-energy. But it is what it is. It is 2 years later, and here we are.

The proposal is to still come across parts of Montana, South Dakota, further east in Nebraska, and join with the existing pipeline. So what is confronting a Senator such as this who certainly wants us to be energy independent? Well, then, if we are going to have additional oil supplies as a backup, maybe that would be a good consideration. So let's make sure this new source of foreign oil—that we have a chance to use it in this country, since it is going to come right down the middle of America.

No. No. No can do. This foreign oil, for those who are proposing what we are about to vote on, is going right down the gullet of America, right down the middle of America to the gulf coast, and it is going to be exported to foreign countries. So a little old country boy such as I wonders: Now, wait. Let me get this straight. You want foreign oil to build a big oil pipeline to run right through the middle of America as a conduit to send right out to other foreign countries and not be utilized in this country?

Sadly, the answer to that is yes. That is what we are confronting. We had an

amendment that Canada could not export it. We could use it here for American purposes. But sadly that amendment was defeated by the purists who want it to be exactly as they want it to be, a tool of foreign oil to send through the middle of America in a conduit to other foreign nations.

This Senator does not think that is in the interests of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I come first of all in celebration, in celebration that the Senate is finally working again. In just 27 days we have seen more amendments voted on on the floor of the Senate than under the Democratic majority in the entire year of 2014. We once again have a Senate where Republicans and Democrats can offer their amendments, can debate their amendments, and can vote them up or down.

One of the resounding consequences of the election in November is the American people were tired of the Democratic do-nothing Senate. We have a Senate that has shown up to work.

The bill we are voting on, the underlying bill, is an example of what the priorities should be in the Senate. The Keystone Pipeline bill ought to be a no-brainer. It ought to be an example of bipartisan cooperation.

Indeed, one of the very first things I did 2 years ago when I was newly elected to this body was join with 10 Senators, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, in sending a bipartisan letter to the President saying approve the Keystone Pipeline now.

Why? No. 1, it will produce jobs, tens of thousands of high-paying jobs. No. 2, it will increase tax revenue. It will increase revenue for the Federal Government, for State and local governments. That revenue can be used to pay down our national debt to provide for our vital needs.

No. 3, it will enhance our national security by allowing us to move toward North American energy independence rather than being dependent on foreign nations for oil, nations whose interests are very different and sometimes hostile to our own.

No. 4, building the Keystone Pipeline is unequivocally better for the environment.

Indeed, I have joked: If you are a bearded, tattooed, Birkenstock-wearing, tree-hugging, Green Peace activist, you should love the Keystone Pipeline, because if the pipeline is not built, it means we will continue to bring our oil in on overseas tankers and on rail, both of which are far more dangerous for the environment than a pipeline, both of which we know to a certainty that as long as there are tankers on the oceans there will be spills, as long as there is rail there will be spills.

Moreover, if the pipeline is not built north-south, it is not as though our friends the Canadians are simply going to leave the oil where it is, they are going to build the pipeline east-west, and instead of allowing it to be refined in America where it produces high-paying jobs here up and down the gulf coast, the alternative is it would be refined in Asia and China in far dirtier refineries that pollute the environment even more.

So this ought to be a no-brainer. This ought to be an example of where Republicans and Democrats come together in agreement. But, sadly, it is not, and it is not because the modern Democratic Party has made a decision between two traditionally favored children of the Democratic Party. The modern Democratic Party has made a decision that they care more about the campaign donations from California environmentalist billionaires than they do about the jobs for union members.

I suggest that the 100 Senators who are elected to the Senate ought to be fighting for the hard-working men and women. We ought to be fighting for the union members, for all of the men and women who want good, decent-paying jobs, who want to provide for their kids, and who are tired of the stagnation of the Obama economy.

Only last week we heard the President give his State of the Union Address, where he talked about how swimmingly the economy is going.

Well, you know, he was right. If you happen to be one of those California environmentalist billionaires, if you happen to be in the top 1 percent—the millionaires and billionaires whom the President demagogues—then you have indeed become richer under President Obama.

Today the top 1 percent earn a higher share of our economy than in any year since 1928. Those who walk the corridors of power in the Obama administration have gotten fat and happy.

Yet for working men and women, union members, their lives have gotten harder and harder and harder. We have, today, the lowest labor-force participation since 1978. Median income in this country has stagnated for two decades.

Yet what is the Democratic Party doing? Marshalling every vote it can to vote against union members, to vote against hard-working men and women, to stand with the big dollars coming out of California. What a sad, sad statement of priorities that is.

So let me commend majority leader MITCH MCCONNELL for bringing up an open process, allowing Democrats amendments. I would be happy to vote on Democratic amendments all day long and Republican amendments on the merit. Let me commend the majority as well for focusing on the issues that matter to the American people—namely, bringing back jobs and economic growth and opportunity.

Now, in the course of this open amendment proceeding, I have submitted three different amendments. One would get rid of the longstanding anachronistic ban on exporting crude oil that was put in place in the 1970s. It makes no sense in the current environment and is hurting jobs and economic growth.

A second would obviate the need for having this fight every time a cross-border pipeline was built. It would streamline the process for building pipelines so we could move ahead with economic growth.

Both of those amendments, I believe, are sound policy. I think they are supported by the interests of Americans across this country.

After long conversations with my friends and colleagues, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator HOEVEN, we have agreed that we are going to have committee hearings in the coming months focusing on both of those issues, laying out the facts and the data to make clear that these are unambiguously good—whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent or a Libertarian—if you want jobs and economic growth. These reforms are sound reforms to bring back jobs, economic growth, and opportunity.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

The third amendment I have submitted, which I am hopeful we will vote on either today or tomorrow, is an amendment to expedite exports of liquid natural gas. That is what I wish to speak about for just a few minutes.

The amendment that I am presenting will expedite LNG exports to World Trade Organization members, removing unnecessary delays that have been caused by the arbitrary Department of Energy approval process.

Currently, countries under free-trade agreements with the United States enjoy a streamlined, expedited approval process to import our LNG. For projects to FTA countries, current law deems those “in the public interest” and they get a permit “without modification or delay.”

Yet those without such an agreement must, instead, submit to an arduous case-by-case nonstandardized process that ends up discouraging LNG trade and related investments. It ends up killing jobs.

For projects to non-FTA countries, right now there are no time limits and no standardized process by which the Department of Energy determines whether or not the project is “in the public interest” for receiving a permit. The amendment I have offered would open the doors of trade to more than 160 countries in the World Trade Organization to receive this same expedited treatment that we currently have in place for free-trade countries.

This is particularly important not only for economic development, not only for jobs, not only for growth but

also for the enormous geopolitical advantages that it will present to the United States.

In the past several years we have seen the consequences of the Obama-Clinton foreign policy. We have seen the United States receding from leadership in the world, and we have seen other nations—foreign nations—step into that void and use energy as a weapon, as a cudgel—whether it is Venezuela or Iran or Russia.

Allowing expedited LNG exports strengthens our hands against those who would be enemies of America, and it strengthens the hands of our friends and allies. Here at home, according to a 2013 study, in the United States LNG exports could create up to 450,000 new jobs by 2035.

So we will see, when Republicans and Democrats vote on this amendment, where each Senator stands on whether we should allow the private sector to create up to 450,000 new jobs. Every Democrat who votes no can expect to go back to his or her State and face constituents—face the union members who would like to get some of those 450,000 new jobs—and explain why he or she voted against that hard-working man or woman having a job.

Over the same time, GDP growth could generate anywhere from an additional \$15.6 billion up to \$73.6 billion. By 2035 the net gain in manufacturing jobs could mean up to 76,000 new jobs. A lot of the Members of this body like to talk about manufacturing, like to talk about the steel industry, the car industry. It used to be that the backbone of the American middle class was the blue-collar jobs where you could work with dignity, where you could provide for your family, and where you could provide for your kids.

Every Senator who votes no to LNG exports because they want to continue receiving money from the California billionaires had better be prepared to return home to their States, look into the eyes of the manufacturing workers, and explain why he or she voted against 76,000 new manufacturing jobs.

Geopolitically, let's take Ukraine. All of us sat not long ago in the House of Representatives for a joint session when the President of Ukraine addressed us both. We stood over and over—standing, quite literally, alongside Ukraine. If we want action to match those words, then every Senator should vote yes on this amendment.

Ukraine currently relies on natural gas for 40 percent of its energy needs. More than 60 percent of the natural gas that Ukraine gets and depends on comes from Russia, and Russia uses that natural gas as a club to extract economic blackmail on Ukraine.

Last spring I traveled to Ukraine, Poland, and Estonia. As I visited with leaders throughout Europe, these friends of ours said over and over: Help us free ourselves from energy blackmail from Russia.

As of today, the Department of Energy has approved nine export permits to non-free-trade agreement countries within the past 2 years. Twenty-eight applications are currently pending stacked up on the desk, going nowhere.

The increased energy production from allowing us to export the resources we have to friends and allies who want and need it would spur investment and create thousands of jobs for America. It would be a boon to countries such as Ukraine. It would be a boon to Europe, and it would be a boon to the Baltics, which are watching what is happening in Ukraine and wondering: Are we next? It would be a boon to friends of ours, such as Germany, who likewise depend on Russia for significant energy needs.

Today this body faces a pivotal question. Will we lead the world into a new generation of American prosperity and energy prosperity led by the American energy renaissance we are experiencing or will we instead shut off our borders, erect walls, and allow our friends and allies to be dependent on tyrants such as Putin or Maduro.

We need to come together in a bipartisan manner to say we support jobs, we support economic growth, and we support standing united alongside our friends and allies in defense of freedom.

I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Texas.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we all know, there is a big game this weekend, and I wouldn't be surprised if our friends from Washington and from the New England area find themselves a little bit distracted beyond the "snowpocalypse," I guess they call it, all the big snowstorms.

In anticipation of the big game, I am told that 100 million Americans will actually tune in to the Super Bowl this weekend. And here is a shocking statistic. Some 1.25 billion chicken wings will be consumed—1.25 billion chicken wings—and, of course, millions of pizzas, celebrating what has, of course, become in many ways an unofficial American holiday. I am still stuck on the 1.25 billion chicken wings.

Well, while many of us will tune in to cheer our favorite team in the Super Bowl, unfortunately—and what I am on the floor to talk about—there is the dark underbelly of events such as the Super Bowl that don't get the attention they really deserve. Most of us would, perhaps, prefer to avert our gaze or think about other, more pleasant, positive things, but what I want to talk about briefly is the practice of human trafficking.

When many people hear about human trafficking, they think about something that doesn't happen in America;

it happens somewhere else. They might envision brothels in foreign cities or girls being smuggled across other borders. But the sad reality is human trafficking is a problem all across the United States and at all times of the year. But it is especially a problem surrounding big, public events such as the Super Bowl.

Yes, human trafficking is happening in our own backyard, and more than 80 percent of sex trafficking victims in America are U.S. citizens. They are not some person who has been brought to the United States from some foreign country. Eighty percent are U.S. citizens.

As the father of two daughters, one of the most disturbing facts is that the average age of a child who first becomes a victim of sex trafficking is 13 years old.

As I said, recent years have shown an uptick in human trafficking surrounding large events such as the Super Bowl. For example, in Dallas a few years ago, there was a 300-percent increase in sex-for-sale Internet ads. That was in 2011, of course. In 2012, in Indianapolis, police made 68 commercial sex arrests and recovered two human trafficking victims.

One of the worst problems associated with human trafficking is that many of the victims don't actually consider themselves victims yet because they are so young and so vulnerable that they don't actually realize they are being used and their future is literally being destroyed.

In 2013, in New Orleans, police made 85 arrests for suspected human trafficking. Of course, this year the Super Bowl is in Phoenix, and no doubt law enforcement in Phoenix will have a vigilant eye in an effort to identify and crack down on the perpetrators. But the truth is most of this is happening right under our nose and we don't even see it.

We know the police are doing the best they can, but it won't be enough—it won't be enough—to stop each one of these crimes. Indeed, staggering numbers of these crimes will continue to be committed. The Super Bowl will be done and gone next Sunday, but after the confetti is cleared from the field and the fans catch their flights home, the work to end this heinous crime known as human trafficking will continue.

As a matter of fact, January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. Human trafficking is a form of human slavery. We thought that was eliminated from our history following the terrible Civil War that took the lives of 600,000 Americans. If you extrapolate the Civil War to today, in terms of population, that would be 3 million Americans who gave their lives. We had the Civil War in large part because of the bane and the scourge of slavery, but the truth is

human slavery still exists in the form of sex trafficking.

Awareness is important. As we are driving around our city streets—particularly people driving around in Phoenix this weekend—we may actually see some underage girls or others who are actually victims of this crime, and so we need to be vigilant. We need to do what we can to be the eyes and ears of law enforcement and to call in suspicious circumstances. We simply need to do everything we can to stop human trafficking by all means necessary.

This is something that strikes close to home, in Texas, where I come from. Sadly, Texas, in part because of our proximity to the U.S.-Mexican border, sees more human trafficking than many other States. One out of 10 tips received by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center in 2013 involved incidents occurring in Texas—1 out of every 10 tips. And Texas reported more than 1,000 suspected human trafficking incidents in 2007.

So this is a big challenge and a big problem, and it is not going away. According to law enforcement authorities, sex trafficking is the fastest growing business of organized crime and the third largest criminal enterprise in the world.

And here is something I really don't understand. When we talk about the criminal organizations—the transnational criminal organizations that smuggle people across the border—most recently in the context of these unaccompanied minor children who came from Central America whose parents paid human smugglers—the cartels, really—let's say \$5,000 apiece, these parents have no knowledge of what will happen to their children once they turn them over to these cartel members. Indeed, these criminal organizations are engaged in the money business, anything that will make a buck. They will traffic in children, they will smuggle immigrants, they will smuggle drugs.

With regard to these same criminal organizations, somehow, some way, we tend to compartmentalize our brains and say: Well, sex trafficking is different from illegal immigration and smuggling. But it is not. It has the same corridors funded by the same people and operated by the same transnational criminal organizations.

Now, back to sex trafficking after that parenthetical comment. This is one of those bipartisan subjects where there has been a lot of good work by Members on both sides of the aisle, and one of the things we have needed the most is to have the help of many non-governmental organizations—these are faith-based organizations, these are local community organizations—that are designed to help victims of human trafficking escape, with the aid of law enforcement, and then somehow help victims to rebuild their lives.

Earlier this month, I partnered with the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, Senator KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota, and Senator KIRK of Illinois to introduce a bill we call the Justice For Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. I have talked to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, and have urged him to give this bill an early markup in the Judiciary Committee so it will be eligible to come to the floor as soon as we can get it here, because I am going to be asking the majority leader to schedule floor action so we can have a debate and a vote on this important legislation.

What does the legislation do? It provides additional funds for human trafficking support victims, with tens of millions of dollars of additional funds each year, and it would be financed entirely by criminal fines and fees. This wouldn't be tax dollars, this would be taking basically the fines and the fees paid by people who plead or are convicted of other crimes and putting those funds into a crime victims fund that could be used to help these organizations—these human-trafficking victims support programs.

Again, this legislation would be financed entirely by fines on predators convicted of child pornography, human trafficking, child exploitation, and commercial human smuggling.

This legislation would also assure that victims would have greater access to restitution by requiring the Department of Justice to use criminally forfeited assets to compensate them through a process known as victim restoration.

It is no secret the victims of this terrible crime end up with a lot of psychological baggage and other challenges. We need to help them get on with their lives and to address the terrible things they have experienced.

This legislation would also enhance law enforcement tools to target both sophisticated criminal networks that engage in human trafficking and the predators who increase demand for sex slavery by purchasing innocent children.

This bill now has 20 bipartisan cosponsors. So don't believe the cynics who say that nothing happens up here on a bipartisan basis. It is just not true. There are some things—and this is one of them, and perhaps one of the most important things—that happen on a bipartisan basis.

The good news is the House of Representatives is voting on companion legislation today, so this legislation should be ready for Senate action, I hope, soon. I hope we can work with our House colleagues and get it to the President as soon as we possibly can.

The bottom line is we need to take a stand against this modern-day slavery and lift up the victims of these crimes whoever and wherever they may be. Again, this is obviously not a political

issue. This is something we have the power to address and we must take action to combat this human trafficking all around the world, and the place to start is in our own back yard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me first commend my colleague from Texas. We sit on opposite sides of the aisle, but there are many things that bring us together, and I certainly support what he has said about the impact of human trafficking.

In a hearing before the subcommittee on the Constitution, which he now chairs, during this session of Congress, we brought in law enforcement victims and talked about some of the outrageous things which are occurring in exploiting young people, particularly young women. One of the points which my colleague has made, and I have listened carefully, is that we should consider these human trafficking victims as victims.

Many times, sadly in the past, they have been prosecuted as if they were complicit, and many times they are children. They have no knowledge of their rights or obligations and are being exploited and, as a consequence, they are very reluctant to cooperate with law enforcement if they feel they too might end up in jail, having been victimized twice in the process.

I thank him for his leadership and I look forward to looking closely at his legislation and I hope we can work closely together on that.

AMENDMENT NO. 67

Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a pending amendment which troubles me. I don't know if there will be much time for debate should we actually consider this amendment, and I want to make my feelings a matter of public record.

This is amendment No. 67 offered by Senator SULLIVAN. This amendment would require—would require—the disarming of Federal law enforcement officers who work for the Environmental Protection Agency.

There are currently about 180 law enforcement agents working for the Environmental Protection Agency. They are trained professional officers and are tasked with investigating and enforcing our Nation's environmental laws. They conduct investigations, execute warrants, and make arrests for misdemeanors and felonies under the laws of the Environmental Protection Agency.

This is law enforcement work and it is dangerous work. Many times these officers face the same threats as all law enforcement officers face. According to the Bureau of Justice statistics, there are 73 Federal agencies with law enforcement officers, ranging from the FBI to the Food and Drug Administration and NASA.

EPA's criminal investigators were given law enforcement powers in a law signed by President Reagan in 1988. President Reagan stated his administration actively sought this authority and he was pleased to sign it into law.

The amendment No. 67 of Senator SULLIVAN would prevent these EPA law enforcement officers from being armed while they are carrying out their law enforcement responsibilities. A lot of what these EPA agents do is to investigate suspected cases of illegal dumping of hazardous materials. This can lead to dangerous confrontations. The EPA reports its agents have frequently encountered weapons and armed individuals when they have conducted their work.

I took a look at some of these cases. Many people mistakenly believe the Environmental Protection Agency is a group of government employees sitting behind desks and computers in Washington and regional offices who don't get out and about to see the actual violations that are taking place. They are mistaken.

Let me give a few examples for the record. In Marathon, FL, EPA special agents, along with local sheriff's deputies, shot and arrested Larkin Baggett, a Federal fugitive from Utah, after he pointed an assault rifle at them. Baggett was initially arrested by the EPA on pollution-related crimes in the State of Utah. During the initial arrest of Mr. Baggett, a knife and handgun were recovered off his person. Mr. Baggett was considered armed and dangerous due to the amount of firepower he had in his possession.

Firearms recovered from Mr. Baggett included an AR-10 assault rifle, a 12-gauge shotgun, several rifles and handguns, and hundreds of rounds of ammunition. Mr. Baggett was ultimately sentenced to 13 years in prison for his assault conviction and his environmental crimes conviction.

The Sullivan amendment would say the environmental officer who was trying to arrest this man had to be disarmed. In other words, the environmental law enforcement officer would have no firearm while Mr. Baggett would be holding an arsenal. That is what the Sullivan amendment would do.

During a Mississippi search warrant, seven handguns and a sawed-off pistol-grip shotgun were secured during the warrant. During that same warrant, two handguns were removed from the sweatshirt pocket and hip holster from one subject. Another handgun was removed from the purse of another subject. The sawed-off pistol-grip shotgun was found stored in the cavity of a desk where a drawer was removed and the weapon was pointed directly at the agents of the Environmental Protection Agency when they entered.

If you read the amendment offered by Senator SULLIVAN, he has removed the

ability and right of these agents to be armed to protect themselves and to enforce the law, but he continues to require them to do the most basic things under the law. He requires them—continues to require them—to execute and serve any warrant or other process unarmed. He continues to require them under the statute to make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States, including felonies. Under the Sullivan amendment they are to do so unarmed.

I can go through a lengthy list here of real-life circumstances where people working for the Environmental Protection Agency literally risked their lives, and they did it at least with the comfort of being trained professional law enforcement officers equipped with firearms to protect themselves and enforce the laws of the United States.

Senator SULLIVAN wants them to enforce the laws, but he doesn't want them to carry a firearm. That to me is ridiculous. In fact, it is dangerous. It is dangerous to send these men and women with the responsibility of doing their job into circumstances where they could literally lose their lives because of the Sullivan amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated January 24, 2015, signed by Jon Adler, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2015.

Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DURBIN: On behalf of the 27,000 members of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the misguided "Keystone" amendment put forth by Senator Sullivan that calls for the disarming of EPA Criminal Investigators.

EPA-CID currently employs approximately 180 sworn Criminal Investigators, all of whom have completed the mandatory Criminal Investigator Training Program at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. These highly trained law enforcement officers complete the same basic academy training as their counterparts at the U.S. Marshals Service, the Secret Service, NCIS, ICE and other credible federal law enforcement agencies. They receive quarterly tactical training to ensure firearms proficiency, defensive tactics capability, and enforcement operation readiness. They should not be denigrated and belittled like some Barney Fife aberration gone wild.

Unfortunately, Senator Sullivan has opted to employ inflammatory language to mischaracterize EPA-CID's execution of court-issued search warrants as stampede-styled "raids." EPA Criminal Investigators employ proper law enforcement tactics and techniques, while wearing the appropriate protective equipment during field work. They issue proper verbal commands, and do not scream "Charge!" like some reckless group of bandits. Contrary to Senator Sullivan's alarmist assertions, EPA Criminal Investigators invoke a proper command presence in order to protect their safety as well as those around them.

While Senator Sullivan seeks to minimize the law enforcement relevance of the EPA-CID mission, it is important to note that the Criminal Investigators enforce the criminal statutes of the United States Code, and investigate alleged violations of the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. If Senator Sullivan takes exception to a particular statute, he should focus on amending the law and not disarming and jeopardizing the safety of those who risk their lives to enforce it. Furthermore, he should respect the fact that there are criminals who knowingly and willfully harm our environment, and EPA Criminal Investigator's expertise is needed to investigate and apprehend these criminals.

Recent current events, both domestic and abroad, have made clear that terrorist groups are targeting law enforcement officers. In New York City, a lone-wolf terrorist assassinated two heroic NYPD Police Officers. In France, a terrorist cell brutally murdered three law enforcement officers, as well as civilians. So how does Senator Sullivan come to any rational conclusion that it's appropriate to disarm law enforcement officers who are protecting our homeland? Perhaps Senator Sullivan is unaware of terrorists' intent to deploy biological, chemical and radiological weapons to harm our citizenry and institutions? EPA Criminal Investigators are an integral, indispensable component of our homeland defense against such attacks. Does Senator Sullivan maintain in good faith that EPA Criminal Investigators should conduct their criminal investigations unarmed in support of the FBI Joint Terrorist Task Force?

Each cabinet entity has an Inspector General's office that employs highly trained Criminal Investigators to investigate allegations of excessive force or misconduct. This includes the EPA. In reaching his ill-advised conclusion to disarm EPA Criminal Investigators, did Senator Sullivan draw upon any Inspector General report to substantiate his position? While there is no evidence to suggest any widespread incidents of excessive force or misconduct by EPA Criminal Investigators, a reasonable person is left to question the rational motivation of Senator Sullivan's amendment.

In closing, I reference a statement a FLEOA member who serves honorably as a Criminal Investigator with EPA: "We conduct search warrants, arrest warrants, and interviews which brings us into contact with individuals who may be armed or have access to weapons. There is no way we can accomplish our mission safely without a means to protect ourselves."

Respectfully submitted,

JON ADLER.

Mr. DURBIN. This letter says it all. It spells out how dangerous this is if the Sullivan amendment passes. To think that, for whatever reason, a U.S. Senator is going to take a firearm away from a law enforcement officer of a Federal agency who is putting his or her life on the line every single day is just plain wrong.

If Senator SULLIVAN wants to take away the enforcement authorities of this Agency, so be it. We can argue and debate that. But to require this Agency to execute warrants and make arrests but require that their law enforcement officials be unarmed is sending them into dangerous—even deadly—situations. This Sullivan amendment is not

well-thought-out. To offer this I think is a serious mistake.

The Senator is offering it, he says, because of a 2013 incident in which EPA agents were part of a law enforcement task force that investigated a mining operation in Alaska based on allegations of environmental allegations. I don't know the particulars of that incident, but there was a review of the incident commissioned by the Governor of Alaska—a Republican Governor of Alaska—that found no evidence that these EPA agents broke any laws during the investigation.

Isn't it odd that we have reached the point where, when we try to introduce an amendment which says that you will not sell a gun, a firearm, to someone at a gun show who is on the terrorist suspect list—many argue against that, saying even terrorist suspects have Second Amendment rights—and then turn around with the Sullivan amendment, this ill-advised amendment, and say law enforcement does not have a right to carry a firearm. That is the Sullivan amendment. I hope we vote against it on a bipartisan basis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the legislation before this body, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. I wish to address three issues that have been brought up as we have continued this discussion.

I start out by thanking the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington who are leading this effort to bring forward amendments from both sides of the aisle. I think they are doing great work. They are heavily engaged in trying to make sure the people's amendments are brought forward and that we have a vote. So I thank them for that and again encourage everyone to work with both these bill managers who I believe all of us feel are doing an excellent job. So let's get going. Let's get voting on these amendments. Let's make them pending and have that vote.

This is again, after all, an effort not only to advance this legislation but also to reestablish regular order in this body and move to an open amendment process—which is so important again not just in terms of people being heard on this legislation, having votes on amendments, but for other legislation that Senators want to bring forward for the good of this country, to have the debate, to offer their ideas, to get a vote, and to get things done for the American people. That is what it is all about. We have to keep that in mind and not lose track of that. This is truly about not just this legislation but getting to regular order, which I think is so important for the work we do, to accomplish the work we need to do on behalf of the American people.

Let me touch on three aspects of the current legislation that have been brought up. One is that it is a bill for Canada rather than for the United States. It is something that is very much in the interest of the United States, so I want to address that. I also want to talk about some of the environmental aspects from the standpoint that there are hundreds of millions of dollars being invested in new technologies by major companies in the oil sands in Alberta, Canada, that are going to help deploy and develop things such as carbon capture and storage, which can be used not only to reduce the environmental footprint and the greenhouse emissions of oil produced in the Canadian oil sands, but that is technology then that will get adopted in this country and around the world because it enables us to produce more energy more cost-effectively, more dependably, and with environmental stewardship. So that is a win on both counts, and here is a place where it is being developed. So let's empower that investment that produces more energy with better environmental stewardship as we go forward into the future.

Then the third area I want to touch on for just a minute is pipeline safety because some of the recent spills have been brought up. It is so important that we have the new infrastructure to replace older infrastructure.

For example, the pipeline spill in Poplar, MO, near Glendive, MO, has been brought up. It is a pipeline that I think was originally built and put in place in the 1950s. So we are talking about a 50-year-old pipeline with 50-year-old technology. Whether it is roads or bridges or pipelines or transmission lines or any kind of infrastructure—we need infrastructure for this country, but we have to update it. Think about building a road 50 years ago and then not putting in a new one to replace and update it with the new technologies that have been developed to make it better.

When we talk about trying to get these new infrastructure projects going—again, paid for 100 percent with private dollars—this generates revenue for the taxpayer. This doesn't take one penny of taxpayer money. This is an \$8 billion state-of-the-art pipeline. It is important for all the reasons we have talked about, but it also is the kind of thing that will replace some of the older technologies and give us that updated new infrastructure we need.

So I think when we hear about a spill, wherever it may occur, we want to make sure it is taken care of and fully remediated and take precautions so it doesn't happen again. But we have to understand we have to put the new infrastructure in place if we want to reduce the number of spills we have as we continue to rely on infrastructure that is 50 years old—when we don't make or allow these new investments to be made.

So I will touch on all those for just a few minutes.

Again, I know the bill managers are hard at work. They are having great dialogue. If they come out and are ready to go, I will yield the floor right away to do that. Again, the priority is to keep the process moving and get amendments up and have them voted on.

The first issue: It is a Canadian project somehow, not a U.S. project. The first point I would make, on its face, is it is going to move domestically produced crude as well as Canadian crude. Everybody talks about the fact that it starts up in Hardisty and says it is going to move Canadian oil, and then they stop there. But it is not only going to move Canadian oil, it is going to move oil from North Dakota, Montana—light, sweet Bakken shale oil—out of this region of our country. So it is going to move both domestic crude as well as Canadian crude. So when somebody says it is just a Canadian project, that is not true. That would be akin to somebody saying it is only a U.S. project because it is moving U.S. oil.

For beginners, it is important that people understand it is not just Canadian oil, it is oil we produce in our country that needs to get to refineries as cost-effectively and safely as possible.

What is happening is because we are being blocked from getting these kind of pipelines developed because they can't get through the regulatory process, the oil production we are producing in our part of the country, in North Dakota, Montana, and the Bakken area, as well as other areas of the country is all having to move by rail.

For example, right now my State of North Dakota produces 1.2 million barrels of oil a day, second only to Texas, and that number has been growing. That growth I think will slow down right now because the price of oil has come down so much. But the point is we are having to move 700,000 barrels a day by rail because we don't have the pipelines, such as the Keystone XL Pipeline, approved.

That creates other problems as well. We produce a tremendous number of ag commodities and ag products. We actually are the leader of 14 different major ag commodities in the country—things such as wheat, for example, and many other farm commodities as well. All of those things get backed up on the rail system because we are trying to move so much oil on the rail that we can't handle all the congestion.

So it is not just an issue in terms of energy for our country, but it is affecting our other commerce, our farmers, and other goods that are trying to be shipped. It is not just goods that originate from our part of the country but all the goods that go back and forth

and are trying to go through that bottleneck.

But the biggest reason it is very much a U.S. project is because it is about getting to energy security and energy independence.

Right now the United States consumes about 18 million barrels of oil a day. We produce about 11 million barrels a day—which is up tremendously in recent years because of production on private and State lands in places such as North Dakota. That means we still import about 7 million barrels a day. We use 18 million barrels of oil a day. We produce 11 million barrels a day. We import 7 million. The amount of oil we get from Canada is increasing. We are up to more than 3 million barrels a day that we import from Canada. So if we take the 11 million we produce plus the 3 million we get from Canada, that is 14. That leaves us 4 million short of what we use on a daily basis. We get that from places such as OPEC, Venezuela, and other parts of the world that have very different interests in many cases than our own.

I think the American people very much want to get to a position where we don't have to rely on OPEC anymore for the oil we use. In fact, we are getting there. We are getting there. As I say, we are at the point now between ourselves and Canada where we have 14 million of the 18 million a day we use covered.

If we can continue to develop our energy resources and work with Canada, we can truly have North American energy security—meaning we don't have to rely on OPEC anymore for our oil. That is a national security issue. It is an energy issue. It is a jobs issue. It is an economic growth issue. It is a national security issue. Look at what is going on in the Middle East. Americans do not want to rely on OPEC for their oil anymore.

Look at the benefit. As we produce more energy in this country and work with Canada, look at what is happening at the pump. Oil prices are down more than \$1 from 1 year ago because we are producing so much more. Basic economics: More supply helps bring prices down. So it is not just about energy independence and energy security for our country, it is about lower energy costs for consumers, for small business. It is not only good for our hard-working Americans as they pull up to the pump and benefit every day from those lower gas prices, but it helps make our economy grow because energy is a foundational industry.

When we have low-cost energy produced in this country that we know we can rely on, that makes us competitive in every other industry sector in a global economy.

So when somebody says: This is just about a pipeline or it is just about a Canadian issue, it is not the case. This is very much about our energy future

in this country and how we are going to build it, both to be energy secure and to make our economy go when we have to compete globally.

The second issue—and I often show this chart because it makes the second part of that energy security point. If we don't work with Canada so that this oil comes to us and we control that oil and control our energy future, Canada is going to make other arrangements. They are going to build pipelines to their west coast, and that oil is going to China and we will continue to import oil from OPEC. That is how life works. We either take advantage of this opportunity with our closest friend and ally in the world or somebody else will.

The next one I want to touch on for just a minute is the environmental. We hear about this so much, the environmental aspects of this project. I have been on the floor and I have talked about various aspects of the project based on the science and based on the fact that there have actually been five environmental impact statements produced. The environmental impact statements produced by the Obama administration say there will be less greenhouse gas emissions with the pipeline than without it because we will be able to move that 830,000 barrels a day of oil by pipeline, rather than moving it by either 1,400 rail cars or sending it to China where the refineries have higher emissions than ours do.

But I would like to go beyond that and talk for a minute in a broader sense about our energy future and how we not only produce more energy more cost-effectively from all sources, from all kinds of energy, but how we can do it with better environmental stewardship. And the way forward there is really technology. It is the American ingenuity, the investment in technology, and the creativity of our companies and our entrepreneurs. That is the real key to success in the future in terms of producing more energy more cost-effectively, more independently, and with better environmental stewardship—by leading the way forward with technology development. We cannot export our regulations, but as we develop technologies, those, in effect, get exported around the world because other countries adopt those technologies.

So I will talk just a minute about the technology development that is going on in the oil sands. Since 1990 the greenhouse gas emissions on a per-barrel basis in the oil sands have gone down by 28 percent, almost one-third. On a per-barrel basis they have reduced their greenhouse gas emissions by 28 percent since 1990. They are engaged in major projects now to develop and deploy new technologies that will help them produce oil in the oil sands region with a smaller footprint—which is what I am showing here—through in

situ development and also through carbon capture and storage.

We talk so often about developing carbon capture and storage in this country. That is being developed and deployed in the oil sands right now. The Quest project, which is a project Shell Oil Company is undertaking—let me read from a bit of a summary on their Quest project, which is a project for carbon capture and storage they are developing right now.

This is a picture of it. It is in situ—which means drilling and using steam to bring the oil out rather than excavation, which is the old style—so it has a much smaller environmental footprint, but it also reduces greenhouse gas emissions because they capture the CO₂ and they store it.

A point of inquiry, Mr. President. I would like to ask the bill managers if they are ready to move forward or make any announcement. If we have any amendments, I would gladly yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

As we mentioned earlier, we had a very productive morning trying to discern the universe of amendments we may have before us. I think it is very clear that there is genuine interest on both sides of the aisle to find that path forward so we can come to a conclusion on S. 1 and do so in an orderly way—a way that respects the legislative process and a way that allows Members to have opportunities to advance issues they feel strongly about and issues that merit debate on this floor.

We have encouraged Members over the past couple weeks to present their amendments to us. At this point in time we have processed 24 separate amendments. We do have some amendments that are pending on the Republican side—seven to be exact. I do know that there are others that Members would like to be made pending. I have one myself, and I know the Senator from Washington will be speaking to several additional Democratic amendments which they would like to offer on their side. So I think we have discussed a process here to get us moving in that direction so that we can get the amendments pending, and then hopefully, perhaps as early as this evening—I don't want to make any promises—we can begin voting on these amendments.

What I would like to do at this time is turn to my colleague to not only speak to the gentlewoman's agreement we have in so far as a way forward but also to allow for a couple of amendments to be made pending on her side, and then we will come back and provide that opportunity on the Republican side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for her work on this process and for her legislation. As she said, she and I have a gentlemen's agreement to move forward, and we would like to do that so we can finish business on this legislation, and we are working in good faith on that process. Just as she said, we are going to work on getting the next amendment before us. I thank the Senator for her hard work.

I would like to turn to my colleague from California to call up her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank both of my colleagues for working so hard. I am trying to be a facilitator in this process as well, as the ranking member now on the Environment and Public Works Committee. I want to remind everyone that this bill deals with environmental law.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I can call up amendment No. 130.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself and Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment numbered 130 to amendment No. 2.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To preserve existing permits and the authority of the agencies issuing the permits to modify the permits if necessary)
On page 2, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

(c) PERMIT SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act shall affect the status of any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a).

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have a very simple amendment. I hope it will be unanimously accepted. I think anyone within the sound of my voice who cares about the health and safety of people would support this amendment because we know this underlying bill facilitates the building of a Canadian project, with all the benefits going to Canada, none to America. We have established that there will be 35 permanent jobs. We have established that we could have oilspills because we have already had several serious oilspills and this oil is very hard to clean up. We have established by the Republicans' votes that they will not vote to keep the oil in America, so it doesn't even help us with energy independence.

They even voted against the amendment to make sure the steel was from America. They voted against that.

So this is a Canadian bill. This is a wonderful bill for Canadian oil interests. Frankly, that is not why I was elected. I was elected to fight for California, fight for American jobs, fight for middle-class jobs, and not sit by while we see what is happening here, which is that the very first bill brought to us by this new Republican Congress turns out to be a bill for Canadian oil.

One of my colleagues—I don't know if it was Senator CANTWELL who coined this or Senator MARKEY—said it is basically a big straw that runs from Canada and has the potential to spill all the way down, and then it is refined here, and all the filth and dirt gets stored here and goes into the air, and then it goes out of the country. It doesn't do a thing to help us. So all I am asking for is a little bit of relief for the people of this Nation.

Right now, S. 1 says that all permits "shall remain in effect" for this TransCanada pipeline regardless of any actions taken in building the pipeline, even if the company violates the permits.

So we know this company had to go and get a number of permits. What this bill does is it says: Once you get a permit, TransCanada, no one can take it away from you.

Imagine. We don't do that for our companies. They have to walk the walk and talk the talk.

All we say here is, if you violate your permit, it can be revoked. You cannot willy-nilly get permits from the Commerce Department, EPA, the Corps of Engineers, or other entities and then violate them and know that the permit can never be taken away. I was stunned when I learned this.

So this would very simply say that if, in fact, there is new information that requires a permit to be changed or modified, it can be done. We do not waive protecting the health and safety of the American people.

Let me give an example. Back home I have a bridge that was built, unfortunately, with foreign parts, and those parts failed. It is a nightmare to try to fix it.

If TransCanada violates their permit and uses the wrong materials—let's say the bolts rupture—they still get to keep their permit. We are saying: No. Your permit can be revoked.

Another example: This is the handling of hazardous waste. We know this is filthy, dirty oil, and we know what is in this oil. It is toxic. Peer-reviewed research established significantly higher levels of carcinogens. We know this. We have met with the people who live in Canada who have had to breathe in that air. Data collected by the Texas Cancer Registry indicates that cancer rates among African Americans in Jefferson County, Port Arthur, TX, are 15

percent higher than for the average Texans. They live right near the refineries.

We know these permits are only as good as they are enforced. If they are enforced and we find they haven't lived up to their commitments on the handling of hazardous waste—by the way, to get their permit from Commerce, they also have to put out a plan that deals with a spill. Let's say there is a spill and they don't live up to the permit. They still get to keep the permit.

This is an extraordinary piece of legislation. I have never ever in my time here or ever in history known of any American corporation getting a free pass in terms of the health and safety and the protection of the air and water that this company is getting. They could literally avoid following any of the steps they committed to in their permit, and this legislation gives them a free pass.

My amendment simply says that we are able to revoke a permit if it is not followed.

I would ask the Senator from Washington if I could at this point yield the floor. My amendment is pending. I appreciate the work of the Senator from Alaska in allowing this amendment to be offered, and I appreciate the work of my colleague from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, before recognizing the Senator from California, I failed to say that there is no way this legislation would be where it is today, moving forward in the process, without the Senator from California. She has been a great adviser all through this process and a great protector and advocate of the issues we are interested in on the environment, on security, and on safety. I thank her for her leadership, and I look forward to supporting her on this amendment.

I would like to turn to my colleague from Michigan, if I could. We are going to offer a couple of amendments on our side and go back to the Senator from Alaska, but at this point in time I would like the Senator from Michigan, who has had a very devastating personal experience related to tar sands, to talk about his amendment and call up that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 70, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. PETERS], for himself and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 70 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require that the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration make a certification and submit to Congress the results of a study before the pipeline may be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained.)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PHMSA GREAT LAKES RESOURCES AND STUDY.

The pipeline described in section 2(a) shall not be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained until the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration—

(1) certifies to Congress that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has sufficient resources to carry out the duties of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration for pipelines in the Great Lakes; and

(2) submits to Congress the results of a study on recommendations for special conditions on pipelines in the Great Lakes, similar to the recommendations in Appendix B of the environmental impact statement described in section 2(b).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, this is a very commonsense amendment based on a simple premise. Before Congress intervenes to approve this new pipeline that is before us, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, the Federal agency which oversees pipeline safety, should certify that it has the resources required to carry out its duty.

Specifically, the amendment before the Senate requires PHMSA to confirm that it has the resources to oversee pipelines in the Great Lakes and provide recommendations for special conditions for pipelines in the Great Lakes just as it provided recommendations for special conditions for the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The people of Michigan know why it is so important that we ensure these pipelines are safe. We had a pipeline spill in Kalamazoo, MI, in 2010 that spilled over 800,000 gallons of tar sands into the Kalamazoo River. The cleanup has now taken over 4 years at a cost of over \$1.2 billion. A pipeline accident in the Great Lakes, where we have some of these pipelines located now, would be absolutely catastrophic. We have to remind folks that the Great Lakes now provide drinking water to over 40 million people and support 1.5 million jobs. It would be a disaster not just for folks in the State of Michigan, but throughout the Great Lakes region and throughout the country, if there were a pipeline break. We know it firsthand from what happened in Kalamazoo, the most expensive pipeline break in the history of this country.

We have to ensure that the pipelines that operate in the Great Lakes, par-

ticularly in the Straits of Mackinac, which connect the Upper Peninsula with the Lower Peninsula, have the protections they need.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to make sure we protect the Great Lakes, not just for today but for future generations.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield to Senator COLLINS from Maine to bring up an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may call up amendment No. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 35 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SCHOOL.—The term “school” means—

(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

(C) a school of the defense dependents’ education system under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a

review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities to support the initiation of the projects;

(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(4) develop and maintain a single online resource website with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding to me for this purpose and I commend her, as well as the Senator from Washington State, for their extraordinary management of this bill.

I am pleased to report that the amendment I have called up and made pending is actually a bipartisan initiative. It is cosponsored by my colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER, and its purpose is to help school officials to learn more easily about Federal programs and incentives that are available to improve energy efficiency and thus lower costs for our Nation's schools.

There are a number of Federal initiatives already available to schools to help them become more energy efficient, but in many cases schools are not taking full advantage of these programs. The reason for that is because they are scattered across several agencies and are difficult to access.

I want to make it clear to my colleagues that Senator WARNER and I are not proposing the creation of any new programs to help schools become more energy efficient but rather to have more coordination and to streamline those programs which already exist.

Our amendment would require the Department of Energy to be the leader of these programs and help schools identify and navigate them, and that in turn would be a great service to our Nation's schools.

As I said, by providing a streamlined coordinating structure, this amendment would help schools navigate available Federal programs and financing without authorizing new programs or funding. Decisions about how best to meet the energy needs of their schools would appropriately remain in the hands of States, school boards, and local officials.

Specifically, the amendment would establish the Department of Energy as the lead agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal energy efficiency programs and financing options available to schools for initiating, developing, and financing energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects.

The amendment would also require DOE to review existing Federal programs—scattered at the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Treasury, the IRS, and EPA—so schools know what is available.

It would also streamline communication and outreach to the States, local education agencies, and schools and the development of a mechanism for forming a peer-to-peer network to support the initiation of the projects.

Finally, the amendment would require the Department of Energy to provide technical assistance to help schools navigate the financing and development of such projects to better ensure their success.

Assisting our nation's schools in navigating and tapping into existing federal programs to lower energy usage and save money makes good common sense.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Collins-Warner amendment No. 35.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment No. 166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 166 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To release certain wilderness study areas from management for preservation as wilderness)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. RELEASE OF CERTAIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—With respect to Bureau of Land Management land identified as a wilderness study area and recommended for a wilderness designation under section 603(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(a)), if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has not designated the wilderness study area as wilderness, the area shall no longer be subject to—

(1) section 603(c) of that Act; or

(2) Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

(b) FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE LAND.—With respect to land administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service that has been recommended by the President or the Secretary of the Interior for designation as wilderness under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has not designated the land as wilderness, the land shall no longer be managed in a manner that protects the wilderness character of the land.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering this afternoon is pretty straightforward. It would effectively release wilderness study areas if, within 1 year of receiving the recommendation, Congress has not designated this study area as wilderness.

There has been a lot of discussion in the news of late with the President's announcement on Sunday that he is seeking to put an additional 12 million acres in the ANWR area—Alaska's North Slope—into wilderness status, including the 1002 area which has specifically been designated for oil and gas exploration. I want to make sure people understand this is not just an ANWR amendment. This is about the wilderness study areas that we see that are currently on the books.

According to the Congressional Research Service, as of the beginning of

this year, Congress has designated 109.8 million acres of Federal land as wilderness. Just over half of this wilderness is in my State of Alaska. We have over 57 million acres of wilderness in Alaska. Ninety percent of the wilderness under the management of the Fish and Wildlife Service is in Alaska.

As a practical matter, there is more out there. There are more acres that are proposed for wilderness designation. For example, the Bureau of Land Management manages 528 wilderness study areas containing almost 12.8 million acres located primarily in the 12 States in the West as well as Alaska.

We also have the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which has a wilderness study process through its land use planning to identify areas to be proposed as wilderness.

There is some history as to how we got to dealing with these wilderness study areas. Areas that are identified by agency officials as having certain wilderness characteristics—as identified under the 1964 Wilderness Act—were classified as wilderness study areas. BLM received specific direction in the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 to inventory and study its roadless areas for wilderness characteristics. By 1980 the BLM completed field inventories which designated about 25 million acres of wilderness study areas. Since 1980 Congress has taken a look at some of these. Some have been designated as wilderness and others have been released for nonwilderness uses. The BLM has also taken it upon itself to designate wilderness study areas through its land use process.

The point here is that once an area has been designated under the BLM or the Fish and Wildlife Service study regime, it effectively becomes *de facto* wilderness. The designation then limits and restricts the ability to do just about anything for fear that it might impair the suitability of the area for preservation as wilderness.

Until Congress makes a final determination on a wilderness study area, the BLM or the Fish and Wildlife Service manages these areas to preserve their suitability for designation as wilderness. Even if Congress has not acted—because it is Congress's purview to do so—the agencies have designated it as *de facto* wilderness.

My amendment says we are going to change this, and we have to change this. Congress needs to reassert itself into this equation. As the final arbiter of what is or is not designated as wilderness, Congress can and should make the decisions in a timely manner about the wilderness status.

What my amendment does is pretty simple. If Congress doesn't act within 1 year to designate as wilderness an area recommended for wilderness, the designation is released. It just goes back to multiple use. That way the agencies

are not managing areas to preserve a possible wilderness designation as an option for Congress. Instead, they can get on with looking at a broader range of options for how to manage that land with the local people and other interested stakeholders through the land-use planning process that applies to each of the agencies.

Some may argue that Congress needs more time on this. I would say we have had plenty of time to review these areas. Some of the wilderness study areas have been pending since the 1980s. That is plenty of time to figure out whether they should be put in wilderness status. Congress needs to make decisions.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment and take a look at what is contained and not just think about the ANWR situation but think about the applicability within their respective States.

I know that Senator SESSIONS was seeking recognition. As Members are seeking to come to the floor to get their amendments pending, we would like to allow them to have recognition.

At this point, I believe we need some clarification from the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I will wrap up in 2 minutes and will then yield the floor to the Senator from Alabama.

I have been talking about a number of different points, but right now I would like to defer. I will be back on the issues as we continue this debate. Again, I thank the bill managers, and I am very pleased to see that Senators are coming down and making these amendments pending. That is what we need do now. I thank Senators on both sides of the aisle for doing that.

With that, I yield the floor to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator HOEVEN for his hard work on this Keystone XL Pipeline bill, as well as Senator MURKOWSKI and others who have worked together on it on both sides of the aisle.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SESSIONS. We have been talking about global warming and climate change. I have been on the Environment and Public Works Committee for some time, and we have had a number of good hearings on the subject. I wish to share some thoughts on climate change because so much of what is driving our energy policies in America today is entirely dependent on a fear of the impact of global warming in the years to come.

There have been a number of votes on global warming. I was asked by a reporter today: You voted with the Whitehouse amendment; why did you do that? Well, I just have this to say. It

is true, to my understanding, and according to the best science we have, that the Earth has warmed by a degree in the last 100 years, and exactly what is causing that, we are not so sure.

If that were to accelerate, then, to a significant degree, it would be a cause for concern. It would be a cause for America and the entire world to really begin to evaluate what our future is and what action might be taken. That is what has happened.

The world has been engaged mightily in the effort to drive up the cost of electricity, drive up the cost of gasoline, drive up the cost of the production of products that use energy, and drive up the cost of transported items that you go to the grocery store and buy.

I will just say this. The scare tactics we have been hearing are not coming to fruition. Over a time period, they were predicted to come to a fruition, but they just are not. As public servants—as elected officials who represent 320 million Americans—we need to ask ourselves: Should we press down an excessive, increased burden of energy costs on the backs of working Americans to meet the fears that we have been hearing about? And if we do that, how much can we afford to do? How much can we afford to ask of them?

We are reducing CO₂ emissions in the United States and doing a pretty good job of it. But the fear is—at least the concern from so many of us—is that we are now projecting—the President is projecting massive increases in regulations that will significantly and further hammer coal and hammer the price of energy in America.

Many Members of Congress want to take drastic action that would increase the cost of electricity and gasoline from fossil fuels. It would do that. There is no doubt about that. And it would virtually end coal production in the United States, a product we have a lot of.

They claim the science of global warming is settled, but I suggest questions remain. Global climate change advocates have, over many years, relied upon a number of climate models. These models are designed to predict the temperature over time, and they have done that, and I will show my colleagues the result of these models in a minute. They predict not only increasing temperatures but increasing droughts, increasing flux—droughts and flux—increasing severe weather events such as hurricanes and tornadoes. These models have long predicted this. So we have a history of how well the models have performed over time. An easy measure, a critical measure, of the validity of any model is how well it compares to actual data. So the actual weather data, I tell my colleagues, is proving that the models have not been accurate.

There are other facts we are dealing with that give concern to those of us

who are less than certain about what the climate will do in the future.

Last week, NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies claimed that 2014 was the hottest year on record. Perhaps my colleagues heard that. It was based on their analysis of 3,000 ground-based thermometers around the world. They backtracked on that claim the very next day, however, because the increase was so small that the ground-based system fell within the margin of error.

There are other problems with those assertions. Data gathered at the Earth's surface has limitations in measuring the temperature. It is a relatively small sample influenced by human construction. Instead, the best data, I think most scientists agree, for determining warming of the atmosphere is a method that can objectively gather far more data, and that is satellites.

There are two research groups that track atmospheric data, one satellite and one balloon. They both show temperature data that has barely risen for 35 years. The balloons validate the accuracy of the satellites and the satellites tend to validate the accuracy of the balloons. So there is a wider and wider divergence over the years from what the models claim and what the actual temperature is doing. There just is.

Other evidence can be seen in the Earth's ice coverage. A few years ago former Vice President Al Gore claimed the Arctic might be ice-free in the summertime by 2014. That was last year. That was a prediction. Another study said it would be ice-free by 2029. But this past summer, the ice coverage in the Arctic Ocean was 43 percent greater than it was in 2012.

Senator MURKOWSKI, that is an increase the size of the State of Alaska, which is a pretty sizable State, for heaven's sake. It has become well-known that ice coverage in Antarctica is also at its record recorded levels.

There have been dire predictions made about extreme weather events. On the Weather Channel on our TV, they love to talk about storms, and it is exciting, and people watch it. I have had people call from Alabama and tell me, Have you gotten your food in? You are going to have a big storm. You are going to be shut in.

When temperature data stopped supporting the applicants' claims of warming, they started claiming that storms and droughts would worsen; we would have more of them. We all heard that many times. It is hard to know what to think about it when we heard that over the years.

It has now been nearly 3,400 days since the last major hurricane hit the United States. This is no little matter to me. I remember moving to Mobile in 1979, and that year we had Hurricane Frederic that slammed the city. Trees

were down everywhere. Power was off for weeks. I believe it was a category 3 hurricane. Earlier we had Hurricane Camille hit, and that was in the 1960s. Then we had Hurricane Katrina that hit New Orleans and hit my hometown of Mobile a very significant blow. But it has been nearly 3,400 days since the last major hurricane hit the United States. That is a category 3, 4, or 5. That is almost 10 years. I think that is the longest period maybe this century.

According to Dr. Roger Pielke, a professor at the University of Colorado-Boulder, who testified before our EPW Committee last year, he said hurricane seasons in the United States are 20 percent less intense and have seen 20 percent fewer landfalls than in 1900.

We have received testimony in the Environment and Public Works Committee from Dr. Roy Spencer, who said this:

There is little or no observational effort that severe weather of any type has worsened over the last 30, 50, or 100 years.

He said that in his testimony before the committee.

The IPCC, the International Panel on Climate Change, fifth climate assessment released in 2013, what did they say about these predictions? Quote:

Current data sets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the last century.

So I suppose they have acknowledged that prediction to be incorrect.

That same report talked about floods. We have been told we will have more floods.

The IPCC says:

In summary, there continues to be a lack of evidence and thus low confidence regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/or frequency of floods on a global scale.

According to the Palmer Drought Index, there is a statistically insignificant decrease in global droughts from 1982 to 2012.

So, remember, CO₂ is increasing in the atmosphere. It is a small part of the atmosphere. It is a clean gas. There is no damage to us. It is a gas that is plant food. If we understand photosynthesis, plants breathe in CO₂, grow, and create carbon stalks and emit oxygen, which is good for us. So in itself, CO₂ is not an inherently bad product.

From 1982 to 2012, when we had some of the greatest increase in CO₂—I guess the greatest increase in CO₂ in the history of the planet, unless there was some volcano or some event—we have seen actually a decrease in droughts. Small, but a decrease nonetheless.

Last July, the Budget Committee, which I was the ranking member of, had a hearing on the cost of climate change to the economy and the Democrats called that hearing. The Republican witnesses were Dr. Bjorn Lomborg and David Montgomery. Professor Lomborg, from the Copenhagen Institute in Denmark, said this:

While some warming may have occurred, it will not mean the end of the world. The

total, discounted cost of inaction—not doing anything on global climate change—over the next five centuries is about 1.2 percent of discounted GDP. The cumulative cost of inaction towards the end of the century is about 1.8 percent of GDP. While this is not trivial, it by no means supports the often apocalyptic conversation on global climate change.

It goes on:

The cost of inaction by the end of the century is equivalent to losing one year's GDP growth.

Last year we had, what, 2 percent GDP, using an average of 2.5 percent, 2 percent, 1 year's worth; not 100 years' worth, 1 year's worth, the equivalent, he said, of a moderate 1-year recession. The cost of inaction by the end of the century is equivalent to an annual loss of GDP growth on the order of .02 percent, or two-hundredths of 1 percent—not 2 percent; two-hundredths of 1 percent.

Professor Lomborg, who believes that human activity has contributed to some global warming—he said that—also pointed out that climate control policy, based on current data, will cost far more than the “benefits” it delivers.

Isn't that the question we have to ask ourselves? When we impose a cost on the American people, shouldn't that cost produce more benefit than the cost in currency?

He continues:

A slightly warmer Earth means net benefits through the first half of this century, until 2065.

So until 2065 it will benefit America, warmer temperatures. After that, these models and other projections—he is taking them from the IPCC's own data—find that costs do begin to occur.

He continues:

However, an aggressive government response to warming now can wipe out the benefits we can expect to receive.

Plus we will have higher taxes; more spending, more regulations will cut jobs, reduce incomes, hurt savings, and, thus, set us back more as a nation.

Dr. David Montgomery, who testified at the hearing, said: It is far from clear that recent weather events are anything more than normal variability in storm frequency and intensity and the nature, timing and extent of damage from climate change remains highly uncertain. This does not imply that no action is justified, but it does imply that costs and avoided risks must be balanced carefully.

I think that is what we need to do, balance the cost and the risk.

In sum, these experts before the Budget Committee highlighted that the climate change could be happening and it could be a part of human action, but its costs in the near term certainly are not great. This compares to the cost of trying to stop climate change by reducing human activity is very large indeed.

Congress considered legislation in 2009 and 2010 to put a price on carbon

through a cap-and-trade system that President Obama supported. The cost was deemed too high. Congress said no. The bill that passed the House would cost \$161 billion—it was in Democratic hands at the time—would cost \$161 billion in the first year, and it increased in additional years. How much is \$161 billion? Well, we are desperately trying to find \$10 billion, \$12 billion a year for the next 6 years to fund the highway bill. That is \$10 billion a year. This is \$160 billion a year. The amount we spend on education in America is about \$100 billion a year. This would be \$161 billion a year. Over a decade, we are talking \$2 trillion hammered onto the American economy.

This is a serious matter and, fortunately, Congress did not yield. Congress rejected the legislation. So the President decided to pursue the same results, not through the elected representatives but through the regulatory process. In 2007, the Supreme Court sided with the State of Massachusetts in a critical case. It empowered EPA—if it chose—to regulate greenhouse gases, based on the Clean Air Act of the 1970s, when global warming was never dreamed of and nobody ever considered CO₂ to be a pollutant. This was an activist Supreme Court decision, in my opinion. Congress would never pass this law. There has never been one time in the last 30 years, or certainly before that, that Congress would pass a law recommending huge regulatory powers to the EPA over CO₂.

So the Court did not require EPA to regulate gases, but the Court allowed that under the Clean Air Act. So now the EPA is developing a rulemaking called a Clean Power Plan. This regulation will cost between \$41 billion and \$73 billion annually, more than the road bill and almost as much as the educational bill according to analysts.

On top of this, consumers will have to spend hundreds of billions conserving electricity. Electricity rates are going to increase by double-digit percentages throughout most of the country. These are the costs of only one of the regulations EPA is pursuing. In total, the Heritage Action expects the President's Climate Action Plan will cost \$1.47 trillion in lost GDP by 2030. The costs of action far outweigh the cost of inaction, it seems to me. That is the basis of my concern about many of the extreme actions we are taking. The Nation is crisscrossed with pipelines. They are all over it.

In my home State of Alabama, we are not having complaints about that. This idea that we shouldn't have a pipeline to bring oil from our ally and friend Canada to drive down further, hopefully, the cost of energy in the United States is an erroneous idea. It is all driven at the bottom by this global climate change idea. I am not a climate denier. I don't know what the truth is

and what history will teach. I have assumed over the years scientists are on to something when they claim that CO₂ will be a blanket effect in our atmosphere and temperature might increase. I do know that if we burn fossil fuels, burn plants, it creates CO₂. I know that. It increases it in the atmosphere. The models which are predicted increasing temperatures from this steady rise in CO₂ that has been occurring for over 100 years as the planet's population increases have been wrong.

Let me show this chart. It is prepared by Dr. John Christy, who worked at NASA and the University of Alabama at Huntsville. The red line represents from 1975 to 2025, a projection average of all the models—and there are many of them; I think about 30 people doing modeling of the temperatures and the average shows this rise. This is an alarming rise. It was based on those predictions, those modeled effects, that people have demanded we change what we do with energy in America and we reduce fossil fuels and we pay more for energy to avoid this trend.

We are getting not too far from 2025. That is a 50-year trend. Look at the reality though. These are the numbers, satellite data, and balloon data around the world. We basically had very little increase from 1980 to 2015. For 18 years or so it is basically totally flat. So what does that mean?

I am not sure. Maybe it will start surging next year. Maybe we will see more. But at this point, as reasonable Congressmen and Senators, I don't believe we can conclude that we should burden this American economy weak as it is—high unemployment, December wages dropped 5 cents an hour. The President kept talking about how great things are. Wages dropped 5 cents an hour in 1 month alone—December. We have the lowest percentage of Americans in the working ages actually working in America today since the 1970s. Things aren't going so well. We don't need to be driving up costs for our businesses, making them less competitive in the world marketplace, making gasoline more expensive for working moms, making electricity more expensive for our elderly who are at home and cold. We just don't.

So who cares the most? I say we need to care about the people we represent. We need to care about their welfare.

Mr. Steyer, with his tens of millions of dollars in contributions, demands we don't pass Keystone Pipeline, to carry out his theory—this billionaire that he is—and he doesn't care apparently about what is happening to jobs in America, competitiveness in America, and the welfare of the citizens of this country.

Congress represents the interests of 320 million people. We need to defend their interests, not ideological activists. It is almost a religion to them. We have to be objective and realistic as we

evaluate. So there can be no doubt that this agenda will increase energy prices, it will shrink the middle class, it will eliminate jobs, it will increase costs across the board, it will reduce wages, and it will throw millions of Americans out of work. It just will if we carry out this agenda.

It is not being done in China. It is not being done in Russia. It is not being done in Brazil. So it is of utmost importance that the American people know about these claims and the effects of regulations before we go headlong into enacting them.

The blocking of Keystone Pipeline is a clear example of what has happened. We will be denying struggling Americans and businesses another source of energy that will put further downward pressure on energy prices. We can have only one effect to produce the greatest supply and to help contain the price of oil. Whatever the price of oil is, it will be less with Keystone Pipeline than if we didn't have that source from the Keystone Pipeline in Canada.

This will make us more dependent on foreign suppliers, many of which are not our friends. Canada is our friend, our best trading partner in the world, perhaps our best ally in the world. It is already causing great frustration with our friends in Canada.

I met with the Canadian parliamentarians. Last year we had a meeting. I was surprised how deeply they felt about this. They were hurt. They cannot understand why we can't get this done. It is such a commonsense thing to them.

Some of our Democratic colleagues argue our economy will not be affected by the agenda, the President's Climate Action Plan. Others acknowledge the cost but justify this as a speed bump and not significant. Congress represents most closely the people of the United States, and Congress has never voted to give unelected bureaucrats and officials the power to regulate CO₂. We are not close to doing that today. It would never pass this Congress, either House or Senate. There is zero chance it would pass if it was actually voted on.

As long as Congress has decided not to act, how can EPA act? It is acting against the wishes of the American people and the interests of the country. It takes the consensus of the American people to move large and costly legislation such as this, hundreds of billions, trillions of dollars. That consensus is not formed. It is not there.

On Keystone and other key issues, the consensus is against government excess, not for the government to do more. Talk to the American people. Look at the polling data. Someday maybe things will change, it is true, I will acknowledge. Temperatures could start to rise significantly and storms could begin to worsen. But as long as the measured data fails to match the

alarmists' climate models, I believe Congress should approve this pipeline and reject the agenda of the climate alarmists and conduct a policy that is beneficial to the people of our Nation.

I thank the Chair, and I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I know the ranking member had intended to offer an amendment on behalf of one of her colleagues, and she is off the floor right now. I want to respect the understanding we had, but I also want to respect that the Senator from Vermont is here and I believe prepared to speak to his amendment. I just want to acknowledge that Senator CANTWELL intended to offer a couple of amendments.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment, amendment No. 23, the Ten Million Solar Roofs Act, and it be made pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, proposes an amendment numbered 23 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the quantity of solar photovoltaic electricity by providing rebates for the purchase and installation of an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems by 2025)

After section 2, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REBATES FOR PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM.—The term “photovoltaic system” includes—

- (A) solar panels;
- (B) roof support structures;
- (C) inverters;

(D) an energy storage system, if the energy storage system is integrated with the photovoltaic system; and

(E) any other hardware necessary for the installation of a photovoltaic system.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) REBATES FOR PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall provide rebates to eligible individuals or entities for the purchase and installation of photovoltaic systems for residential and commercial properties in order to install, over the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, not less than an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems in

the United States (as compared to the number of photovoltaic systems installed in the United States as of the date of enactment of this Act) with a cumulative capacity of not less than 60,000 megawatts.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To be eligible for a rebate under this subsection—

(i) the recipient of the rebate shall be a homeowner, business, nonprofit entity, or State or local government that purchased and installed a photovoltaic system for a property located in the United States; and

(ii) the recipient of the rebate shall meet such other eligibility criteria as are determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(B) **OTHER ENTITIES.**—After public review and comment, the Secretary may identify other individuals or entities located in the United States that qualify for a rebate under this subsection.

(3) **AMOUNT.**—Subject to paragraph (4)(B) and the availability of appropriations under subsection (c), the amount of a rebate provided to an eligible individual or entity for the purchase and installation of a photovoltaic system for a property under this subsection shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 15 percent of the initial capital costs for purchasing and installing the photovoltaic system, including costs for hardware, permitting and other “soft costs”, and installation; or

(B) \$10,000.

(4) **INTERMEDIATE REPORT.**—As soon as practicable after the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, and publish on the website of the Department of Energy, a report that describes—

(A) the number of photovoltaic systems for residential and commercial properties purchased and installed with rebates provided under this subsection; and

(B) any steps the Secretary will take to ensure that the goal of the installation of an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems in the United States is achieved by 2025.

(5) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.**—The authority provided under this subsection shall be in addition to any other authority under which credits or other types of financial assistance are provided for installation of a photovoltaic system for a property.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, it goes without saying I disagree with my good friend from Alabama in terms of his assessment of the climate situation. To my mind, the scientific community, the overwhelming majority of scientists have made it clear that climate change is real, caused by human activity, is already causing devastating problems in our country and around the world, that we have a limited opportunity to try to transform our energy system so a bad situation does not become much worse. One of the ways we transform our energy system is by moving to such sustainable energies as wind, solar, geothermal, and others.

What this amendment does is propose to create over the next 10 years 10 million solar rooftops in this country—a massive effort to expand solar energy in this country by giving a rebate on

new solar systems. As we all know, the solar industry is booming. We are seeing significant increases in the number of people who are using solar. Today there are more than 13,000 megawatts of operating solar capacity, nearly half a million photovoltaic systems.

We have made real progress in recent years. But we have a long way to go, and that is what this legislation would do. I wanted to say a word about an article that appeared in many of the papers today which I think is pretty scary stuff.

It talks about the Koch brothers being prepared to spend almost \$1 billion in 2016 in order to bring forward their very rightwing agenda. When we hear these numbers about one family—the second wealthiest family in America, extreme rightwing family—prepared to spend almost \$1 billion in the coming elections, I think the American people have to ask whether the foundations of American democracy have been uprooted and whether in fact we are moving to an oligarchic form of society. As many people know, what oligarchy is about is when you have very wealthy and powerful people controlling what goes on.

What the history of America presumably has been about is ordinary people determining what happens in our country. Ordinary people elect Members of the House and elect Members of the Senate. Now what we have is one family worth some \$85 billion prepared to spend in the next election almost as much as Obama spent and almost as much as Romney spent in the last Presidential election.

My guess is in the coming years what we are going to see is the major and most effective and most powerful political party in America is not the Republican Party. It is not the Democratic Party. It is the Koch brothers party. They already have assembled, as I understand it, a political database which has more information than the Republican Party database.

We have to take a very hard look at what is going on and determine whether this is what we believe our democracy should be—a billionaire family with more power than either the Democratic or Republican Parties.

In the last election the Republican candidate for President, Mitt Romney, spent about \$446 million from his campaign committee—about half of what the Koch network plans to spend next year. President Obama spent \$715 million in 2012 from his campaign committee. The difference is that Obama and Romney raised significant sums of money from people all over the country, people who may have contributed 50 bucks or 100 bucks, and now we have one family preparing to spend almost as much money as either Obama or Romney spent, and that is a frightening situation. It tells me loudly and clearly that we must overturn this dis-

astrous Supreme Court decision called *Citizens United*.

REBUILD AMERICA ACT

Madam President, today I have introduced legislation that calls for a \$1 trillion investment to rebuild our collapsing infrastructure; that is, our roads, bridges, wastewater plants, water systems, dams, levees, rail, airports.

Everybody in the Senate and I hope everybody in America understands that our infrastructure is collapsing. We can't avoid dealing with this issue. We can't turn our backs on this issue. I am a former mayor, and what I can say is that infrastructure does not get better when we ignore it. It gets worse, and it becomes more expensive to fix.

For most of our history the United States proudly led the world in building innovative infrastructure, from inland canals to the transcontinental railroad. We implemented huge flood-control projects and embarked on an ambitious rural electrification program. We built modern airports and the Interstate Highway System. In terms of infrastructure, we were the envy of the world. Sadly, that is no longer the case.

Today the United States spends just 2.4 percent of GDP on infrastructure—less than at any point in the past 20 years. Europe spends twice that amount, and China spends close to four times our rate. We are falling further and further behind, and that is not where the United States of America should be.

Today we are 12th in the world in terms of the quality of our infrastructure when we used to be No. 1. One out of every nine bridges in our country is structurally deficient and nearly one-quarter are functionally obsolete. Almost one-third of our roads are in poor or mediocre condition, and more than 42 percent of urban highways are congested. Urban and suburban transit systems are struggling to address deferred maintenance even as ridership steadily increases.

No one argues about the need to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. When we do that, we get an additional bonus because if we invest \$1 trillion over a 5-year period, we can create 13 million decent-paying jobs, and that is exactly what we should be doing. Real unemployment today is not 5.6 percent, it is 11 percent. Youth unemployment is 18 percent. African-American youth unemployment is 30 percent. We need to create millions of decent-paying jobs, and the best way we can do that is by rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, in President Obama's State of the Union Address last week, he outlined an agenda focused on what he called middle-class economics, which he described as providing Americans with the "tools they needed to go as far as their effort and their dreams will take them."

Our country thrives when hard-working Americans prosper. The President was right to praise policies, such as the GI bill and Social Security, that have helped us to do just that. That is why I am perplexed at the President's proposal to tax the earnings of 529 college savings plan accounts. Rather than help American families meet the onerous cost of a college education, this new tax would greatly diminish the benefits of a law that is helping millions of parents plan for their children's futures. The President's proposal undermines the very values we should be promoting—families making sacrifices today in order to better provide for their children tomorrow. The President's plan would also lead to more student loan debt for many young people at a time when concern over the level of debt is rising.

I would also note that the President has proposed eliminating the tax deduction on interest on student loan payments.

One of the first questions new parents ask themselves is how they will be able to pay for their children's education. For the past 14 years the 529 accounts have been an important part of the answer. They have allowed parents to save for their children's education in tax-advantaged accounts. Regular, affordable contributions made with after-tax dollars from their paychecks grow over time. When college years start, those savings and the earnings from their investments can be withdrawn tax free for educational expenses. These small sacrifices made from paycheck to paycheck can have an enormous impact, making real the dream of higher education.

Parents know that receiving a college degree greatly improves their child's future earnings potential. In fact, according to data compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau in the year 2011, individuals with college degrees earn approximately \$1 million more over the course of their careers than do workers with high school diplomas. Census data also showed that people with higher levels of education are more likely to be employed full time year-round. College graduates also tend to have access to more specialized jobs that, in turn, yield higher wages.

Critics of the 529 plans assert that they disproportionately benefit very high-income families who could afford to pay for college without the tax-free growth in these dedicated savings ac-

counts. Data from the College Savings Foundation, however, counters this assertion. According to the foundation, the average value in one of these 529 accounts is \$19,774. Additionally, the average contribution to accounts that receive regular electronic contributions, such as those coming from paycheck withholding, is just \$175 a month. That is clearly more in line with hard-working families trying to make ends meet than with affluent families who enjoy significant disposable income.

My home State provides a great example of the benefits of the 529 law. After this law was passed in 2001, thousands of Maine families established these accounts, but then came a powerful extra incentive. In 2008 the Harold Alfond Foundation, which was established by one of Maine's greatest philanthropists, created the Harold Alfond College Challenge. This program now provides a \$500 contribution to the college savings account of every baby born in Maine. To date, some 23,000 Maine families have used this generous gift to begin planning for the future education of their children. As their parents' own contributions are added to the account, the future becomes even brighter for these children and for our State. As the children grow and make their own contributions from afterschool and summer jobs, so too grows their appreciation of financial responsibility and self-reliance.

The President says his proposal is driven in part by the need to simplify the Tax Code. Our Tax Code certainly needs simplification, and I hope that becomes a major accomplishment of this Congress. But the question must be asked—how does creating a difference between the 529 contributions already made, which would remain untaxed, and new contributions, which would be taxed, simplify anything? And perhaps more to the point, in addition to simplification, our Tax Code needs predictability.

Before I joined the Senate, I was employed at Husson University in Bangor, ME—an outstanding institution that has a high percentage of students who are the very first in their families to attend college. Every day, I saw how hard parents and students worked, how many sacrifices they made in order to make higher education a reality.

My experience at Husson is the chief reason why one of the very first bills I introduced in this Chamber was the College Affordability and Access Act. That bill called for creating tax-preferred education savings account—the precursor to the Coverdell savings accounts—tax incentives for employer-provided educational assistance, and a tax deduction for student loan interest. Many provisions of that bill are now law but would also be harmed by the President's proposal.

The 529 college savings plan program channels the determination that I saw

while working at Husson University and that exists throughout our great country into a tangible benefit built upon the virtues of saving and planning for the future. Changing the tax rules for the 529 accounts would break a promise to families across this country who are working hard to save for their children's educations to help them attain a brighter future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to make college more accessible and more affordable and to save the 529 college savings plan program.

I thank the sponsors and managers of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I rise and thank my colleague from Maine for bringing up this very important issue. I would like her to know that I join with her in a concern that has been raised with the President and this proposal.

As the mom of two young men who are just finishing their years in college—I have one who graduated last year and one who will graduate in May. Very early on we participated in the 529 plan that was offered in the State of Alaska.

In fact, in my early years as a State legislator, it was my legislation in the Statehouse that set up the University of Alaska 529 College Savings Plan, and our boys were direct beneficiaries of that, if you will, because it allowed us, as parents, to begin our savings in a way we knew, when it came time for them to go to schools, we would be as prepared as we could be at that point in time.

I don't think any family is ever really prepared, particularly for the extraordinary costs of higher education. We were fortunate in that our sons chose to attend schools that were not some of the most expensive schools in the country—they attended State universities—but what we paid as a family for their college education, and having two boys in college at the same time puts a stress on families that is very real. So the suggestion that somehow these 529s benefit a very limited group of families across the Nation, I think, belies the obvious.

I think we all try to do the best we can by our kids, and saving for their future when they are very young is important.

So when we have these programs that will allow and encourage families to do this, knowing there will be a tax benefit, it is important. It is important for the families, it is important for the young people looking to their opportunities in college and, hopefully, when they complete their college education, they are not bearing these incredibly crushing financial burdens.

Again, I applaud the efforts of my colleague and I look forward to working with her on this very important issue.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 174 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise to ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Merkley amendment No. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 174 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in communities in the United States while also helping to fund climate change adaptation in developing countries)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING OF CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Obama has committed \$3,000,000,000 from the United States to the Green Climate Fund, with the objective of helping developing countries deal with the impacts of climate change and advancing mitigation efforts;

(2) many communities in the United States, including many rural and indigenous communities, face social and economic challenges that rival those in developing countries and are also being impacted by climate change;

(3) these communities include indigenous and traditional communities in the Arctic region of the United States;

(4) similar opportunities for adaptation projects exist across rural and other vulnerable communities in the United States; and

(5) the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in vulnerable communities in the United States, including rural and indigenous communities, while also helping to fund climate change adaptation and mitigation in developing countries.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, in very brief format, this amendment is about recognizing that global warming is having an impact on some of the poorest countries around the world, and that the United States should work with these nations in terms of helping them address some of those consequences. But the amendment also notes that we have communities in the United States that are poor and struggling with the impacts of climate change and that we should give much attention to helping those communities address the impacts as well and that these two issues—helping poor countries around the world and helping communities within the United States—are not in conflict with each

other in that we should be doing both of these things.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Purpose: To eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and provide infrastructure funding.)

I wish to call up a second amendment, so I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 125.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 125 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of January 22, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, this amendment recognizes that construction jobs can play a key role in strengthening our economy, and not just strengthening our economy with current jobs but rebuilding infrastructure or building new infrastructure that will facilitate a very successful economy in the future.

This particular amendment proposes that we not create 4,000 construction jobs in the pipeline but that we create 400,000 jobs rebuilding key infrastructure in a variety of ways across our Nation.

I think as we wrestle with both the current economy and the strength of the future economy, this is an idea well worth considering.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for herself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 131 to amendment No. 2.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that if the Keystone XL Pipeline is built, it will be built safely and in compliance with United States environmental laws)

In section 2(a), strike the period at the end and insert the following:

, subject to—

(1) all applicable laws (including regulations);

(2) all mitigation measures that are required in permits issued by permitting agencies; and

(3) all project-specific special conditions listed in Appendix Z of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, as my colleague said, we are going back and forth on offering amendments to this bill and I hope this process will lead us toward getting this bill wrapped up. I know many of my colleagues have been talking about various aspects of this legislation, and this particular amendment focuses on making sure that if this project goes forward that we meet certain environmental standards.

I can't say how important that is because the first serious delay in the approval process came because a bad route was selected. The pipeline was originally proposed to go through an aquifer that is critically important to a large percentage of agriculture in the area. So this is very important to me, and that was a very glaring example that we need to get this right.

What was wrong then is that Congress was set to intervene and basically say the State Department was wrong and just go ahead and approve this pipeline. So I feel we are about at that same point again in saying just forget the administrative process and let us go ahead and deem this approved. So if Congress, rather than the administration, approves this pipeline, the American people will lose all the protections and conditions attached as part of the national interest determination.

Just so people understand, according to Executive Order 13337, the State Department can require permits to contain "such terms and conditions as the national interest may . . . require." So the President can decide a pipeline is in the national interest if it is constructed to meet those specific standards.

In this case, the State Department's environmental impact statement outlined hundreds of conditions that should be met to ensure the pipeline is built to the highest safety standard. To quote the environmental impact statement:

If the proposed Project is determined to serve the national interest . . . the applicant would be required to abide by certain conditions listed in this Supplemental EIS and the Presidential Permit.

So these conditions, or mitigation measures, as the report refers to them, are compiled in one section of the report and it highlights the measures TransCanada needs to take to deal with and reduce the impacts when they are operating this pipeline. These are higher standards for environmental and public safety that the company would be obligated to meet.

The problem is the bill before us would authorize the pipeline without those mechanisms and without those conditions. If TransCanada declined to meet these conditions, there would be

no legal recourse for the injured parties to take TransCanada to court.

I wish to talk about those conditions that are included in the environmental impact statement so that my colleagues understand what we are talking about when they say they would vote to bypass this process. I will give three examples of the conditions included in the environmental impact statement.

First, along the proposed pipeline there are areas where the terrain is fragile. There has been a lot of discussion of the Sand Hills region of Nebraska and how difficult it would be to site a pipeline on those very fragile sandy soils. The Sand Hills are so fragile that the current route goes around them just to compensate. However, in southern South Dakota and northern Nebraska, there are areas that, according to the environmental impact statement, "exhibit conditions similar to the Sand Hills Region and are very susceptible to wind erosion."

Let me read from the appendix about how TransCanada would be required to operate the pipeline in those areas.

This document proves site-specific reclamation plans that itemize construction, erosion control, and revegetation procedures for those fragile areas . . . To reduce the potential impacts related to severe wind and water and erosion, the following summary . . . of best management practices would be implemented during construction, reclamation and post-construction.

This document then goes on to list 16 specific bullet points outlined that TransCanada must meet. These conditions for the Sand Hills-like area along the route include: avoiding wetlands, avoiding erosion-prone areas such as ridgetops, working with landowners to build fences to prevent livestock from the construction, providing compensation to landowners who need to let pastures rest until vegetation can be reestablished.

Most people would agree TransCanada should do these things. I think the American people would say follow the rules and do the things that are required. It makes sense to do these things for the protection of our environment and vulnerable areas and for the landowners whose livelihoods depend on the land around the pipeline. But if S. 1 became law, the State Department would not have the authority to ensure the things I just mentioned—that they build the fences, they compensate the ranchers as outlined, and the conditions be required that the State Department has laid out.

So the State Department, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and TransCanada are working on a plan to ensure the protection of endangered species along the pipeline route and these important things are part of what we want to see addressed. Implementation of an agreement that is designed to avoid harm to these species is what we are trying to make sure of if the President has the authority to issue a permit.

In contrast, the bill we are considering, S. 1, exempts the pipeline from further review under the Endangered Species Act. According to the State Department, the process that is now underway to establish these implementing agreements to protect these vulnerable species would stop—would stop—if this bill became law.

Finally, the conditions would require TransCanada to improve its safety standards. And my colleagues may not know that TransCanada received a "warning letter" from the Federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration for violating pipeline safety regulations over a year and a half ago. As outlined in a September 26, 2013, letter from the administration:

TransCanada experienced a high rejection rate for welding and failed to use properly qualify welders.

So in 1 week alone, 72 percent of TransCanada's welds had to be replaced. After TransCanada's shoddy work came to light, the State Department added 2 new safety conditions to the 57 conditions that the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration had already required.

One of those conditions required TransCanada to hire a third-party contractor to monitor pipeline construction and report back to the U.S. Government whether that construction is sound.

So this new condition was that TransCanada adopt a quality management program to ensure "this pipeline is—from the beginning—built to the highest standards by both the Keystone personnel and its many contractors." But if this legislation is approved, this pipeline and all the conditions I just mentioned fall away. That is why I do believe that, with this legislation, we are acting prematurely. So I am offering this amendment.

Last week we had a very big reminder that pipeline spills do happen when 30,000 gallons of oil spilled into the Yellowstone River in Montana—not the first spill into that river, unfortunately.

So I ask my colleagues, why would we continue on a process without making sure that TransCanada follows the established safety issues on pipelines and we make sure that they comply with these environmental laws?

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this amendment. I hope my colleagues will stand with 61 percent of the American people who believe that due process is more important than special interests.

Madam President, I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, we have a number of amendments pending on both sides of the aisle and there are other Senators who are working with us to offer them tonight. We

will be working to set votes on many of these pending amendments tomorrow, with nongermane amendments set at a 60-vote threshold.

So if there are other Senators on either side who have amendments they intend to offer, they should be coming down to the floor to talk with the bill managers and get those amendments pending. We do intend to try to get to the third reading of the bill before the end of the week.

With that, I recognize the Senator from North Carolina, who is with us to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 102.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. TILLIS], for himself and Mr. BURR, proposes an amendment numbered 102 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. TILLIS. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for leasing on the outer Continental Shelf and the distribution of certain qualified revenues from such leasing)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —ATLANTIC OCS ACCESS AND REVENUE SHARE ACT OF 2015

SEC. —01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Atlantic OCS Access and Revenue Share Act of 2015".

SEC. —02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term "Mid-Atlantic Producing State" means each of the States of—

- (A) Delaware;
- (B) Maryland;
- (C) North Carolina; and
- (D) Virginia.

(2) MID-ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term "Mid-Atlantic Planning Area" means the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled "Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012-17" and dated June 2012.

(3) QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues" means all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term "qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues" does not include—

- (i) revenues from the forfeiture of a bond or other surety securing obligations other

than royalties, civil penalties, or royalties taken by the Secretary in-kind and not sold; or

(ii) revenues generated from leases subject to section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATE.—The term “South Atlantic Producing State” means each of the States of—

- (A) Florida;
- (B) Georgia; and
- (C) South Carolina.

(6) SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREA.—The term “South Atlantic Planning Area” means the South Atlantic Planning Area of the outer Continental Shelf designated in the document entitled “Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–17” and dated June 2012.

SEC. 03. OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING IN MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(1) not later than July 15, 2016, publish and submit to Congress a new proposed oil and gas leasing program prepared under section 18 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344) for the 5-year period beginning on July 15, 2017 and ending July 15, 2022; and

(2) not later than July 15, 2017, approve a final oil and gas leasing program under that section for that period.

(b) INCLUSION OF MID-ATLANTIC AND SOUTH ATLANTIC PLANNING AREAS.—The Secretary shall include in the program described in subsection (a) annual lease sales in both the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area and the South Atlantic Planning Area.

(c) PROHIBITION ON LEASING CERTAIN AREAS—

(1) PETITION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the leasing of areas within the administrative boundaries of a Mid-Atlantic Producing State or South Atlantic Producing State that are 30 miles or less off the coast of the State shall be prohibited.

SEC. 04. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM MID-ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to Mid-Atlantic Producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG MID-ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each Mid-Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective

distances between the point on the coastline of each Mid-Atlantic Producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a Mid-Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the Mid-Atlantic Planning Area.

SEC. 05. DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES FROM SOUTH ATLANTIC LEASING ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338) and subject to this section, for each applicable fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(1) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from leasing activities in the South Atlantic Planning Area in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

(A) 75 percent to South Atlantic Producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

(B) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG SOUTH ATLANTIC PRODUCING STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(A) from any lease entered into within the South Atlantic Planning Area shall be allocated to each South Atlantic producing State in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each South Atlantic Producing State that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

(2) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a South Atlantic Producing State each fiscal year under paragraph (1) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(A).

(c) TIMING.—The amounts required to be deposited under paragraph subsection (a)(2) for the applicable fiscal year shall be made

available in accordance with that paragraph during the fiscal year immediately following the applicable fiscal year.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a)(2) shall—

(1) be made available, without further appropriation, in accordance with this section;

(2) remain available until expended; and

(3) be in addition to any amounts appropriated under—

(A) the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(B) chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code; or

(C) any other provision of law.

(e) DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES SHALL BE NET OF RECEIPTS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2055, expenditures under subsection (a)(2) and shall be net of receipts from that fiscal year from qualified outer Continental shelf revenues from any area in the South Atlantic Planning Area.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, earlier this week—actually, yesterday and today—the Department of the Interior announced a plan that will allow the permitting in 2017 for offshore oil and gas drilling off the Outer Continental Shelf of our beautiful east coast.

The concern we have with this measure is not unlike the concern my friends may have in Alaska, with steps taken by the administration that actually limit the true potential of these regions. Like Alaska, we have a number of opportunities for offshore oil and natural gas drilling that have not been exploited in the past, and I am afraid that under the current course and speed of the administration's action, they will not be fully exploited to the benefit of North Carolinians and many east coast States.

That is why Senator BURR and I have sponsored an amendment that directs the administration to take more decisive and more comprehensive action so we can seize the opportunity for North Carolina and many of our neighbor States.

The main reason we are doing this is because I think North Carolina and the east coast can do their part to make our Nation an energy super power. We can also have enormously positive impact on our economy as we move forward. This slide depicts some of the initial estimates for the economic impact that we could have by simply directing the Department of the Interior to issue leases and to allow exploration and ultimately extraction off the coast.

This graphic gives us an idea, from Delaware down to Florida, of the potential jobs creation. We can see that in North Carolina that is 55,000 jobs. It is 55,000 jobs in some of the hardest hit areas of North Carolina, where people are out of work, and the unemployment rate is well above the State average. It is a jobs creation opportunity that we are just waiting to be able to provide to the States with the ultimate authority to decide whether they are going to move forward.

In terms of the economic impact, it is over \$190 billion in capital investment and nearly \$51 billion in revenue to the Federal Government and to State governments between 2017 and 2035.

This opportunity is something that I hope doesn't go without the full efforts of the State to actually determine how we can do it in an environmentally responsible way.

I was speaker of the house before I came into this great body, and we took the steps to put into place a regulatory framework to allow potential natural gas drilling within the State of North Carolina. We did it in a very responsible way, and we did it in a way that made sure stakeholders had the opportunity—environmentalists, business people, travel and tourism—so we make sure we get it right. I believe we have laid the groundwork with the State. Now we want to do the same thing for the opportunity that we have near the Outer Continental Shelf.

The process will involve the input of several stakeholders. It will involve the input of environmentalists and key stakeholders across the State to make sure we get this right. Ultimately, it gives the States the right to determine whether they want to pursue this—from Florida to Delaware.

The other thing it does is addresses a number of concerns I heard when I was a legislator and since I was speaker. It has to do with one of the greatest assets we have in North Carolina; that is North Carolina's beautiful coast.

This is a picture of a North Carolina beach today. It is beautiful. It is why we have millions of people come visit our coast every year. Based on our amendment, this is a picture of how that same beach will look after we authorize drilling and we are actually creating those jobs. It is that same beautiful beach because we have taken the steps to make sure that any drilling would be beyond the sight line of our beautiful beaches. I believe, as a result, we will have travel and tourism on our side because those jobs create additional opportunity to expand opportunities for travel and tourism.

Then, finally, I want to talk about what good the revenue to the State can do for this very same area. We desperately need increased infrastructure in the eastern part of our State. We desperately need funds to renourish our beaches, and we desperately need funds to clear our inlet and outfit our ports so that North Carolina can play a part in the new shipping patterns that will occur post-Panama Canal upgrade.

So in terms of economics, it is fairly simple. We are looking for about 50 percent of a revenue share, with 37 percent of that going to the States and for the effective regions for items such as inlet clearing and beach renourishment.

We are also looking to have 12.5 percent of the revenues dedicated to the

Land and Water Conservation Fund so we can continue the good work of setting aside irreplaceable lands and increase outdoor recreation activities.

I believe this is an opportunity for North Carolina to do its part to make America the energy super power that we need it to be, to improve our economy in North Carolina, and to contribute to improving the economy of this great Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up Markey amendment No. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] proposes an amendment numbered 178 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INCLUSION OF OIL DERIVED FROM TAR SANDS AS CRUDE OIL.

This Act shall not take effect prior to 10 days following the date that diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of section 4612(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I have a second amendment, Markey amendment No. 141. I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Markey amendment No. 141.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] proposes an amendment numbered 141 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To delay the effective date until the President determines that the pipeline will not have certain negative impacts)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding subsections (2)(a) and (2)(b), this Act shall not take effect until any

consultation, analysis or review required by the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, or any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review, is completed with respect to whether increased greenhouse gas emissions, including the indirect greenhouse gas emissions over the lifecycle of oil sands crude oil production, and transportation from the diluted bitumen and other bituminous mixtures derived from tar sands or oil sands transported through the pipeline, described in section 2(a), are likely to contribute to an increase in more extreme weather events.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, the subject matter of these two amendments is, No. 1, the Canadian oil company that wants to build a pipeline through our country right now is exempt from having to pay taxes into the oilspill liability trust fund. In other words, if there is an actual accident in the United States, if the oil pipe breaks or something happens, the Canadians will not have paid into the oilspill liability trust fund the way every American pipeline company has to do.

So my first amendment would just say that they cannot be exempt from that, and the hundreds of millions of dollars which they are responsible for would have to be put into the trust fund.

The second amendment is an extreme weather amendment. That amendment would call for a requirement and analysis of the impact that global warming would have from the tar sands pollution and would require that we have that scientific analysis just so that we can understand it and its impact on extreme weather events in the United States and across the planet.

We would need both of those amendments to be debated in order to make sure we fully understand the implications of what is being debated here.

Finally, I wish to say that I note Senator CRUZ from Texas has an amendment which would almost automatically approve any natural gas exports that were going to any WTO country in the world. I think that is a very bad stance for the Senate to take.

We have to debate what the impact of the exportation of natural gas on a mass basis is going to be on the price of natural gas here in the United States—the price that utilities are going to have to pay for natural gas to generate electricity, the speed with which we will be able to transform our automotive sector from oil over to natural gas, the impact on the petrochemical industry and other industries that are now increasingly using low-priced natural gas in our country. We also have to deal with the fact that the Energy Information Agency says that the already-approved export of natural gas will lead to a more than 50-percent increase in domestic natural gas prices for Americans at home.

I understand why the natural gas industry wants to do it, but I think we

have to have a big debate here in Congress over the impact that those natural gas imports are going to have, especially if they are approved automatically if they are heading to any WTO country in the world.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 148 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and I be allowed to call up my amendment, Whitehouse amendment No. 148.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE], for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HEINRICH, proposes an amendment numbered 148 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefitting from tar sands development)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . CAMPAIGN FINANCE DISCLOSURES BY THOSE PROFITING FROM TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) DISCLOSURE BY TAR SANDS BENEFICIARIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) INITIAL DISCLOSURE.—Every covered entity which has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during the period beginning on December 1, 2012, and ending on the date that is 165 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection shall file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT DISCLOSURES.—Every covered entity which makes covered disbursements (other than covered disbursement reported under subparagraph (A)) and received covered transfers (other than a covered transfer reported under subparagraph (A)) in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 48 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

“(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

“(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, of any person sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such

person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer.

“(B) The principal place of business of the person making the disbursement or receiving the transfer, if not an individual.

“(C) The amount of each disbursement or transfer of more than \$200 during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made or from whom the transfer was received.

“(D) The elections to which the disbursements or transfers pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates involved.

“(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated bank account which consists of funds contributed solely by individuals who are United States citizens or nationals or lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)) directly to this account for electioneering communications, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to that account during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

Nothing in this subparagraph is to be construed as a prohibition on the use of funds in such a segregated account for a purpose other than covered disbursements.

“(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement during—

“(i) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(A), during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(ii) in the case of a statement under paragraph (1)(B), the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

“(3) COVERED ENTITY.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered entity’ means—

“(i) any person who is described in subparagraph (B), and

“(ii) any person who owns 5 percent or more of any person described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PERSON DESCRIBED.—A person is described in this subparagraph if such person—

“(i) holds one or more tar sands leases, or

“(ii) has received revenues or stands to receive revenues of \$1,000,000 or greater from tar sands production, including revenues received in connection with—

“(I) exploration of tar sands;

“(II) extraction of tar sands;

“(III) processing of tar sands;

“(IV) building, maintaining, and upgrading the Keystone XL pipeline and other related pipelines used in connection with tar sands;

“(V) expanding refinery capacity or building, expanding, and retrofitting import and export terminals in connection with tar sands;

“(VI) transportation by pipeline, rail, and barge of tar sands;

“(VII) refinement of tar sands;

“(VIII) importing crude, refined oil, or byproducts derived from tar sands crude;

“(IX) exporting crude, byproducts, or refined oil derived from tar sands crude; and

“(X) use of production byproducts from tar sands, such as petroleum coke for energy generation.

“(C) TAR SANDS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘tar sands’ means bitumen from the West Canadian Sedimentary Basin.

“(4) COVERED DISBURSEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered disbursement’ means a disbursement for any of the following:

“(A) An independent expenditure.

“(B) A broadcast, cable, or satellite communication (other than a communication described in subsection (f)(3)(B)) which—

“(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

“(ii) is made—

“(I) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, during the period beginning on January 1 of the calendar year in which a general or runoff election is held and ending on the date of the general or runoff election (or in the case of a special election, during the period beginning on the date on which the announcement with respect to such election is made and ending on the date of the special election); or

“(II) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, is made in any State during the period beginning 120 days before the first primary election, caucus, or preference election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party is held in any State (or, if no such election or caucus is held in any State, the first convention or caucus of a political party which has the authority to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President) and ending on the date of the general election; and

“(iii) in the case of a communication which refers to a candidate for an office other than President or Vice President, is targeted to the relevant electorate (within the meaning of subsection (f)(3)(C)).

“(C) A transfer to another person for the purposes of making a disbursement described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(5) COVERED TRANSFER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any amount received by a covered entity for the purposes of making a covered disbursement.

“(6) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000; and

“(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made covered disbursements and received covered transfers aggregating in excess of \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

“(7) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE; COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS; ETC.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (f) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I just wish to speak briefly to this amendment, which I hope might help answer the mystery as to why the first order of business of the new majority in the Senate is S. 1, a bill that allows a foreign corporation to run a pipeline across our country, seizing American farms and ranches along the

way. That would not ordinarily seem to be our country's first and highest order of business given all of the issues that we face.

We have seen news reports just today that the legendary Koch brothers are gearing up to spend \$900 million in the coming election. We have seen news reports that compare their political operation to the Republican National Committee's political operation—favorably to the Koch brothers as having a bigger political operation.

We know that since Citizens United there has been a torrent of corporate money poured into our elections, and a great deal of it has come from the fossil fuel industry. We know also that beside that torrent of disclosed money has been another torrent of dark money that has poured into our elections. We don't know quite where that has come from, but there are plenty of reasons to suspect and to suggest that money has also come from the fossil fuel industry.

So we have a situation right now where I think reasonable people could look at the facts and draw a sensible inference that the Republican Party has been acquired by the fossil fuel industry as its political subsidiary. If that were the case, then that might be an explanation of why S. 1 does this extraordinary service to a foreign corporation at peril to all of the American farms and ranches and families whose land would be taken from them in order to give this foreign corporation this great boon.

This amendment would require that companies that will make more than \$1 million off of the Keystone Pipeline should meet the disclosure obligations that we have voted on before in the Senate. These are disclosure obligations that Republican Senators have often supported in the past.

Indeed, until 2010 and until the Citizens United decision actually showed where the money was coming from and to whom it was going, one of the most ardent and eloquent advocates for disclosure was none other than the distinguished Senator from Kentucky who is now our majority leader. So it would not seem to be out of place to ask for a little bit of disclosure, a little bit of transparency, about where the political contributions went from the corporations that are going to make so much money from this, whether it is more than \$1 million made off the pipeline or whether it is opening up the tar sands and having tar sands leases.

So I hope we will have a chance to vote on this, and if we are in favor of transparency and disclosure and voters understanding what is going on around here, this ought to be an amendment we ought to be able to support.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. First of all, I want to say how good it is to see the Presiding Officer, and also recognize that he is a member of the nascent Cory caucus, and I respect that quite a bit.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BOOKER] proposes an amendment numbered 155 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow permitting agencies to consider new circumstances and new information)

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(F) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in subsection (b) relieves any Federal agency of the obligation of the Federal agency to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the obligation of the Federal agency to prepare a supplement to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement described in subsection (b) in connection with the issuance of any permit or authorization needed to construct, connect, operate, or maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) if there are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the environmental impacts resulting from the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline and cross-border facilities, including from greenhouse gas emissions associated with the crude oil being transported by the pipeline.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I want to say that amendment No. 155 is a very important amendment. It is common sense. It is practical. The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA as it is known, is one of the most emulated statutes in the world. It is something that many people see as valuable in other countries because NEPA, in fact, by many is referred to as the modern-day environmental Magna Carta.

NEPA regulations require agencies to supplement already-issued environmental impact statements when significant new circumstances or information is found to exist relating to the environmental impact of a project. The pending Keystone bill, however—and quite surprisingly—would deem the final environmental impact statement issued last January to fully satisfy this NEPA requirement going ahead. This would remove the obligation from permitting agencies to supplement any environmental impact statements if significant new circumstances or information is discovered.

This amendment I am putting forward, No. 155, would change that and would preserve a commonsense obligation of agencies to supplement the environmental impact statement for significant new circumstances or information. In other words, if very pertinent information comes forward, it would require there be a need to supplement the environmental impact statement.

For example, if the proposed route of the pipeline were changed, it could mean that drinking water supplies or critical resources would have a higher risk of contamination from a spill. This amendment would simply require consideration of significant changes so we don't go blindly and put natural resources at greater risk without understanding the impact.

This bill is for me common sense. It says, basically, if circumstances change, we should make sure a new environmental impact study is considered.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment and not provide special treatment to a foreign company that American companies don't get that could result in harm to fellow Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 102

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to pledge my overwhelming support to Senator TILLIS on the Outer Continental Shelf amendment that has been placed on the Keystone bill, and I think it is apparent with the direction the administration is going that they finally realize this is the right thing, but I think codifying that into this bill is important.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

I also come today because many of my colleagues in this body support the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Just to remind some who might not have been here as long, the Land and Water Conservation Fund was created and funded by royalties off of this exploration explosion we have had over decades in this country.

I might say a disappointment to me is that over the life of this trust fund we created, it never received the appropriations that it accrued in a balance. It accrues a certain amount off of royalties and it was directed in statute that money goes to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Let me say to my colleagues, this is the best organization to choose where to make that investment. This is not about a land grab; this is about providing contiguous pieces of land that have restored value. But this is not about initiatives to create new national parks. It is to protect the infrastructure that is out there in their control, and we have battled for years.

I would love to come to the floor right now and say I want to offer an

amendment for full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which should be \$900 million a year, but we appropriate \$350 million to \$450 million a year to fund it.

Unfortunately I am not here to offer that amendment, although I think it would receive tremendous support in this body, primarily because I would have to find about \$8 billion worth of offsets. This is incredible, that we could have a trust fund that is funded with the royalties off of production that has an \$8 billion balance but to actually say if we are going to begin to fully fund it, you have to come up with \$8 billion worth of offsets because we spent the money on something else. We spent the money on something else, therefore we have got to find an offset.

So I am not coming to the floor today to propose we fully fund it, although I am an advocate of it, and I think many people are.

In a minute I will ask unanimous consent to have amendment No. 92 pending, which is the Burr-Bennet-Ayotte amendment. It is to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I am sure the President is aware that the program expires the end of September, and we can wait, but I don't think we should wait to reauthorize what I believe is, dollar for dollar, the most effective government program we have. We can save any kind of funding-level fights for another day. The simple truth is this program is a trust fund that is codified in law. So we are not debating whether this exists or doesn't exist. It does exist and every year \$900 million in royalties are paid by energy companies that drill for gas or oil in the Outer Continental Shelf and are put into this fund, but for some reason, that group, that conservation effort, only finds what the appropriators are willing to pass on to it.

Our amendment would reauthorize the program itself on a permanent basis, and I am going to ask all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up amendment No. 92.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina, [Mr. BURR] for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 92 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended —

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “During the period ending September 30, 2015, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “through September 30, 2015”.

(b) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditure in any fiscal year under section 200303 shall be used for projects that secure recreational public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.”.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I have spoken very briefly on this reauthorization because it is a very simple measure. I urge my colleagues, because it is now pending, when we have an opportunity to vote, and I think that will be sooner rather than later on a whole host of amendments, that you take the opportunity to permanently reauthorize a program that is clearly one that benefits this country and our National Treasury.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I can call up my amendment No. 115.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. COONS] proposes an amendment numbered 115 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. COONS. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding climate change and infrastructure)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is already impacting the safety and reliability of the critical infrastructure systems of the United States, including buildings, roads, bridges, tunnels, rail, ports, airports, levees, dams, and military installations through sea level rise, rising temperatures, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as droughts, floods, wildfires, and heat waves;

(2) significant energy, industrial and transportation infrastructure in the United States is located near the coast, in floodplains, or in other areas vulnerable to sea level rise;

(3) the impacts to infrastructure described in paragraph (1) have caused tangible economic costs that are likely to increase over time;

(4) it is fiscally prudent to prepare for and seek to mitigate the impacts described in paragraph (1), as it is estimated that every dollar spent on mitigation saves \$4 in disaster relief;

(5) the Federal Government self-insures, offers insurance programs such as crop insurance and the national flood insurance program, and, in the case of extreme weather events, also serves as the insurer of last resort for public and private infrastructure;

(6) the Federal Government has a crucial role to play as a partner in working with State, local, tribal, and territorial jurisdictions to help ensure coordinated efforts to keep communities resilient;

(7) the role of the Federal Government should include prioritizing climate resilient projects when administering Federal grants, providing technical support, and sharing of data and information in user-friendly and accessible formats, among other actions;

(8) Federal agency climate change adaptation plans that assess the risk to physical assets and missions of the Federal agencies can help create savings for taxpayers; and

(9) Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, should quantify the economic value of the physical risks of the agencies from climate change.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, this amendment recognizes that climate change is not a hoax, that climate change is a reality, and that we need to do some things together to begin to plan for and prepare for the inevitable consequences and impacts on our infrastructure.

As someone who was in local government for a long time before coming to this body—I was a county executive—I have a sense of what it means for our States, our municipalities, and our county governments to have to plan for and deal with the inevitable consequence, the impacts on our local infrastructure of the coming changes through climate change.

I happen to represent the lowest mean elevation State in America, and our Governor Jack Markell and his able folks in the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control have led a grassroots statewide effort to begin planning for the future impacts of climate change. Because of the combination of subsidence and sea level rise, Delaware will see earlier than many States impacts on vital local infrastructure. So whether it is our sewer systems, our roads, our water systems or other infrastructure, we need to begin to plan now to bake resiliency into the future of our community.

Given the unique and important role that the Federal Government plays in financing infrastructure and in responding to disasters such as Superstorm Sandy that destroyed a lot of the infrastructure in the nearby States of New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut, we need to be mindful of what these costs could be.

The U.S. Department of Defense is already preparing plans to understand how climate change will impact its infrastructure. My thinking is that the

entire Federal Government should make responsible, timely, and thoughtful plans to assess and to prepare for prudent mitigation of the future impacts of climate change on our infrastructure. So I am hopeful that this will be among the many amendments that will be taken up, debated, discussed, and passed in the coming hours and days.

I am grateful that we continue to have an open amendment process and the opportunity to discuss and debate the issues in front of us, and I very much look forward to passage of Coons amendment No. 115.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, two Senators from Delaware, back to back—a double shot.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up my amendment No. 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. HEITKAMP, proposes an amendment numbered 120 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credits for new qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and alternative fuel vehicle refueling property)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR NEW QUALIFIED FUEL CELL MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 30B(k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property purchased after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 30C, as amended by the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 5. OFFSET.

(a) 100 PERCENT CONTINUOUS LEVY ON PAYMENT TO MEDICARE PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS.—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments

made on or after the date which is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity today.

My colleague from Delaware, Senator COONS, knows that Delaware, until 4 years ago, developed and built more cars, trucks, and vans per capita than any other State in America. We lost within literally 6 months a GM plant that employed thousands of employees and a Chrysler plant that employed thousands of people. Those companies went into bankruptcy.

For a number of years before that and since then, I have gone every year in January to the North American auto show in Detroit. I remember being there half a dozen or so years ago and walking through the demonstrations—they call them the stands—where the auto companies, whether they happen to be domestic, Ford, Chrysler, GM, or companies from Europe or Asia, had on display their vehicles, in some cases the vehicles they were introducing that year for the next buying year, and in some cases concept cars that may never be built but are just interesting, exciting new technologies that are represented in those vehicles.

I have never forgotten about a half dozen years ago walking through this enormous cavernous auto show and coming across what they call the stand where a number of the Honda vehicles were being displayed. One of them was in a makeshift garage. I thought that was interesting. You don't see makeshift garages in the Detroit auto show.

I asked the Honda people, what is this about? They said, imagine a vehicle that is in a garage alongside a house. The technology in this vehicle will actually provide for the propulsion of that vehicle, propel the vehicle, and the fuel this vehicle uses will also cool the house next to this garage in the summer and warm and heat this house in the winter. I said, you are kidding. I said, what kind of technology is this? He said, this is fuel cells. I said, no kidding. Are you really serious about this? He said, yes, we are.

As it turns out, a few years after that, I was back in Delaware at Dover Downs. A lot of people think of Dover Downs now because we have musical festivals. Firefly was there, and we had 80,000 people there. We also have 80,000 people show up for a couple of Sundays every year for the auto show.

A couple of years ago, I was at Dover Downs, and I had a chance to drive around the Monster Mile when no other cars were racing. I drove a GM minivan. The thing that was unique about the GM minivan was how much it cost. I have a Chrysler Town & Country minivan that has about 386,000 miles on it. The vehicle I drove that day had less than 1,000 miles on it, and it was powered by fuel cells.

I said to the guy I was driving with, how much does this vehicle cost if I

wreck it? He said, probably \$1 million. I said, I better be careful. And right about then somebody came out of the infield and drove right in front of me and scared the guy next to me to death. I was able to avoid a crash.

GM, Chrysler, and Ford have put a lot of money into fuel cell vehicles. One of the people who helped to run GM for a number of years, a fellow named Tom Davis, a longtime friend, when he stepped down from GM several years ago ran the part of the company that dealt with light trucks and SUVs. Almost half of their revenue was generated from those sources.

Earlier this month he and I talked about the future of the auto industry and GM in particular. I said, what do you think the future is for providing propulsion for cars? Is it like the hybrid electric? He said, no, it is not. I said, is it like the diesel electric? He said, no, it is not. I said, is it pure electric? He said, no, it is not. I have said for years that the future is fuel cells. I said, no kidding. That is just like I saw at the auto show years ago and just like the fuel-cell powered minivan I drove at Dover Downs a couple of years after that. He said, that is the future.

It turns out in Japan they have a word that actually means future that they use to describe this technology, and it is called “mirai.” Honda and Toyota are betting a little bit of their money—actually quite a bit—just as some of our domestic auto companies are betting some money of their own.

The great thing about this technology is that it reduces the consumption of oil. We are still the leading consumer of oil in the world. A lot of our oil is from foreign sources, and some of it is unstable. I think some of the countries use our money to harm us. This technology has the ability to reduce our dependence on that foreign oil from unstable countries. It has the ability to further clean our air and to offer a great driving experience. I personally experienced it myself all those many years ago in Dover Downs on the Monster Mile.

What I want to do today is call up an amendment that will help us to seize the day and to take this technology, which is ready now, to be made commercial and to be introduced on both coasts and across the country in order to provide fuel cell vehicles and to help give it a little push, if you will, through the Tax Code to encourage them to be purchased by our consumers.

There are actually two parts to my amendment. One of those is to provide a \$4,000-a-year tax credit for alternative fuel vehicles. In this case I am talking about fuel cells, but it could be electric, and it could be others as well.

The second half of the amendment is to provide the infrastructure. We have heard about fueling stations. Well, these would be infrastructures that

would include fueling stations for fuel-cell-powered vehicles.

It is a two-fold amendment. It reduces our dependence on foreign oil, especially from unstable sources. It provides for new investment and for creation of jobs for that new investment. It is something that would help consumers, it would help our domestic auto industry, and it would enable us to compete with the rest of the world.

There are two parts to this amendment—a tax credit of about \$4,000 for each vehicle for 5 years, and then an investment tax credit of 30 percent to enable us to build the fueling stations. We have gas and diesel stations all across the country. We need alternative fueling stations, if you will, for these alternative vehicles if they are to realize their potential and we are to realize ours.

Later in the week, I will ask to have the opportunity to offer this amendment, and I ask that my colleagues keep these arguments in mind, and if they see fit, to support this amendment. I hope they will.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 133 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Ms. HEITKAMP], for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COONS, proposes an amendment numbered 133 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended to extend the credit with respect to facilities producing energy from certain renewable resources)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING 5-YEAR EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the energy policy of the United States is based on an all-of-the-above approach to production sources;

(2) an all-of-the-above approach reduces dependence on foreign oil, increases national security and creates jobs;

(3) smart investments in renewable resources are critical to increase the energy independence of the United States, reduce emissions, and create jobs;

(4) wind energy is a critical component of an all-of-the-above energy policy and has a proven track record of creating jobs, reducing emissions, and provides an alternative

and compatible energy resource to the existing generation infrastructure of the United States;

(5) the wind energy industry and utilities require long-term certainty regarding the Production Tax Credit for project planning in order to continue build out of this valuable natural resource; and

(6) the stop-start unpredictability of short-term Production Tax Credit extensions should be avoided, as short-term extensions have disrupted the wind industry, slowing the ability of the wind industry to cut costs, as compared to what would have occurred with a long-term, predictable policy in place.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended by striking “January 1, 2015” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2020” in—

(A) paragraph (1);

(B) paragraph (2)(A);

(C) paragraph (3)(A);

(D) paragraph (4)(B);

(E) paragraph (6);

(F) paragraph (7);

(G) paragraph (9); and

(H) paragraph (11)(B);

(2) clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) should be amended by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2020”; and

(3) the amendments that would be made by paragraphs (1) and (2) should take effect on January 1, 2015.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Keystone has been described two ways down here, an energy bill and a jobs bill—economic development offering economic opportunity. I don’t think there could be an amendment that is offered that would fit more both slots of the description of the Keystone bill than the amendment that I am proposing, amendment No. 133.

This is a bipartisan proposal that has always been supported by both sides of the aisle, and quite honestly, it has tremendous support across the country from the American people. Quite simply what the amendment does is to provide that it is the sense of the Senate that we should extend the production tax credits for the next 5 years to give certainty to alternative energy companies, particularly to wind energy companies. It would basically lay down the marker that this is an important part of our energy and jobs future. Importantly, as we have watched the ups and downs of our tax policy, or lack thereof, in the Senate and Congress, we have seen short-term extensions—or as we call them, extenders—being passed in the last moments of Congress, which does not give the certainty we need to provide the incentives that are included in those extenders.

This sense of the Senate—to the extent it becomes legislation—would, in fact, for the first time give us an opportunity to provide certainty with a glidepath out, and everyone understands that eventually this industry is going to have to stand alone.

I wish to talk about the importance of the wind energy industry, not just from the energy standpoint but from the jobs standpoint. Today the wind

energy industry sustains approximately 73,000 jobs and directs over \$17.3 billion a year in private investment to the U.S. economy, including thousands of well-paid wind manufacturing jobs at over 500 factories in 43 States that supply the United States industry.

The United States currently has over 60,000 megawatts of installed capacity, and according to the American Wind Energy Association and USDA’s Energy Information Administration, the United States produced over 167 billion kilowatts of wind power last year alone.

If my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are serious about this being a jobs bill and serious about this being an energy bill, then they you will want to vote in favor of this amendment. Wind energy and the continued buildout of additional capacity in this country is an absolute critical piece of the “all of the above” energy policy. Every person in this building and every person you talk to about what their energy policy is will say all of the above. That has to have meaning, and it has to include this important and critical infrastructure and this important and critical tax credit for wind energy.

The other benefit of this amendment is—as you have heard, we have 43 States somehow involved in the manufacture and production of equipment in this industry, but we have over 1,000 utility-scale wind projects, which represent over 62,000 megawatts and over 46 wind turbines and are installed across 39 States and Puerto Rico. There are also more than 500 wind manufacturing facilities spread across those 43 States.

I am a little bias because we in North Dakota like to say we are the Saudi Arabia of wind, and wind is a critical part—in fact 15 percent—of our capacity. We think we could do a lot more, but I will tell you the economic impact just in my State. A lot of you know the great energy renaissance that is going on in America that involves the development of fossil fuels—North Dakota being the second largest oil and gas producer with the shale development.

What you don’t know is that North Dakota truly represents all of the above. I want to talk about what we do in wind before I close out here. We have almost 1,600 megawatts of wind capacity installed and another 740 megawatts under construction. The industry has invested over \$3.4 billion in my State with annual lease payments—and these are to farmers who are grateful for that additional revenue. The towers are on their property and over \$5 million of lease payments goes back to farmers.

I talked to farmers all across North Dakota who are proud that they are part of the energy renaissance in our State and grateful for the additional revenue.

We have two educational institutions in our State that have wind energy

training centers and do tremendous jobs training the workforce for additional wind energy. The wind energy industry supports close to 3,000 jobs in North Dakota, and in a State of around 700,000 people, that is a significant factor. In 2013 wind energy was 15 percent.

These are numbers that—I saw the Presiding Officer grin when I said that North Dakota is the Saudi Arabia of wind because I think he is thinking that Colorado might be the Saudi Arabia of wind. I know that the Presiding Officer is a great supporter of wind energy as well.

But when we do these stops and starts, when we don't give a constant and predictable policy, we are living hand to mouth. Maybe we are making some decisions to deploy resources in a way that meets with the congressional schedule and doesn't meet with the business-like or orderly introduction and continuing development of this industry.

If you are looking for a germane amendment that addresses both jobs and energy, this is a perfect amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may be able to offer my amendment, amendment No. 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] proposes an amendment numbered 124 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. __. NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization, including the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, without consultation with, and the informed and express consent of, the applicable Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, my amendment states that S. 1 may not “change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States without consultation with, and the in-

formed express consent of, any affected Indian nation, Indian tribe, individual Indian, or Indian tribal organization.”

The need for this amendment becomes particularly relevant because on January 11 of this year, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association wrote to President Obama to express the association's unequivocal opposition to the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The association speaks on behalf of 16 sovereign American Indian tribes and asserts that the pipeline violates the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868.

I am not taking a legal position on whether the assertion is correct. Rather, I think it is important that the Senate go on record that our trust obligations and treaty requirements, which are with sovereign Nations, must be honored and that any changes to those obligations may only occur with consultation and their consent.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated January 11, 2015, from the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association and the Association's resolution regarding the KXL pipeline be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S
ASSOCIATION,

Rapid City, SD, January 11, 2015.

Re Veto Legislation to Approve the Keystone XL Pipeline and DO NOT Approve a Permit for the Pipeline.

HON. BARACK OBAMA,
President, United States of America,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association (GPTCA) is made up of the 16 Sovereign American Indian Tribes in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska. All of our Tribes have signed Treaties with the United States in which the United States pledged to protect Indian Tribes, guarantee the right to Self-Government and obligated itself to undertake Trust Responsibility. The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association stands in solidarity with the First Nations of Canada and with Tribal Nations in the United States in opposing the Keystone XL pipeline.

We are writing to alert you that TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP (TransCanada) is in the midst of the recertification process of its 2010 permit from the South Dakota Public Utilities (SDPUC) for the Keystone XL pipeline. While we are aware the Nebraska Supreme Court issued a decision to vacate a lower court decision that held a Nebraska statute concerning the Keystone XL pipeline unconstitutional, we write to urge you to consider the fact that TransCanada's permit to traverse South Dakota is still under review and does not authorize construction of the project in South Dakota unless and until the SD PUC grants certification.

Four Federally Recognized Tribes have signed on as Party Intervenor in the SD PUC proceedings as well as numerous Native and nonnative concerned citizens. The Tribes include the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Rosebud Sioux Tribe and the Yankton Sioux Tribe. Other Great Plains Tribes are poised to comment

and are monitoring the proceedings. The pipeline is planned to traverse through our homelands that still possess substantial treaty obligations, cultural and natural resources and water rights for all the Great Plains tribes. These are also the homelands of numerous animals, birds and fish including several endangered species.

Under South Dakota law, TransCanada must declare that the conditions under which the permit was issued in 2010 remain the same despite submitting along with its application a matrix of 30 Changed Conditions. These 30 Changed Conditions show that significant design and construction changes are planned for the pipeline that make it substantially different in our eyes. The 2010 permit was also issued with 50 Special Permit Conditions that TransCanada also must prove it still meets before it can legally commence construction of the project. While there is an evidentiary hearing currently set for May 2015, it is unclear when a final decision will be issued in that case.

We therefore urge you, consistent with your stance on the previously pending Nebraska litigation, to refrain from making any decision regarding whether the Keystone XL pipeline would be in the national interest until you have all the necessary facts before you. Tribal leaders request you deny the permit as contrary to the national interest.

It is the position of the GPTCA that your administration does in fact have incontrovertible evidence that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would be a detriment to the American public and the national interest regardless of whether the SD PUC ultimately authorizes construction under TransCanada's 2010 permit due to the risks the project poses regardless of the particular route through South Dakota. The GPTCA urges you to deny the Presidential Permit for the reasons set forth in the attached GPTCA Resolution among others. However, should you have reservations about denying the Presidential Permit at this time, please grant South Dakota the same respect you accorded Nebraska and refrain from making your decision until after the legal processes regarding the South Dakota permit have been resolved. We strongly urge you to veto any legislation passed by Congress that mandates the issuance of a presidential permit to TransCanada. We believe, consistent with federal separation of powers, that a decision to deny TransCanada a federal permit must be made by your Executive branch and it is not appropriate for legislation.

We further assert that construction of any pipeline violates the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, which impact the greater population of the Oceti Sakowin or the Seven Council Fires of the Lakota, Dakota and Nakota Tribes. We are known to many as the Great Sioux Nation and are the keepers of the sacred, cultural and natural resources located in the KXL corridor. Literally, thousands of sacred and cultural resources that are important to our life-ways and for our future generations will potentially be destroyed or compromised by the pipeline construction. Many of these sacred sites have not been surveyed by outsiders less they be looted or plundered but are known to those designated by our people considered to be sacred keepers of this knowledge. The Programmatic agreement entered into for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act acknowledges that construction of the pipeline would cause destruction to many sacred and cultural sites.

With regards to our tribal federally reserved water rights in the Great Plains Basin, the pollution risk via benzene and other carcinogens from the tar sands sludge spilling into the tributaries that lead into the Missouri River or leaching into the Ogallala Aquifer, should a pipeline break occur, is too great. The Missouri River is the source of drinking water for many communities along the Missouri River main-stem. The Ogallala Aquifer supplies drinking water throughout the Great Plains region. All of this development further impacts reserved rights of our Oceti Sakowin which were unceded by treaties, including the right to live in a safe manner and be in control of our human, cultural and natural resources as outlined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Consultation has not occurred in a manner that recognizes free, prior and informed consent for the construction of this pipeline. We believe it is our Human Right to live safely on our homelands with clean water and lands.

Very importantly, the KXL Pipeline and the continued development of the Alberta tar sands will increase the carbon footprint in our sacred lands for the enrichment of foreign countries and oil companies. As you know, climate change will impact and affect all of us including the generations to come unless we do something to stop it now. The Oceti Sakowin tribes are making important strides toward renewable energy with the Oceti Sakowin Power Project (OSPP) that recognizes fossil fuels are relics that contribute to phenomenal climate change. The OSPP leaders met with the White House representatives in our effort to turn the tide against globing warming through solar and wind development on our lands. We do not have to be held prisoners of fossil fuels but can create stories of redemption for Mother Earth through exciting renewals development, not in the future but now.

Because of the dire concerns outlined above, we request an emergency meeting with Department of Interior Secretary Sally Jewell, who as our Trustee, has a responsibility to hear directly from tribal leaders in a government-to-government meeting. We are prepared to put forth our concerns for inclusion in the forthcoming Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) regarding the impacts the Keystone XL pipeline may have on Tribal homelands as well as our sacred sites, cultural resources, natural resources and water rights protected by treaty and other agreements.

The Executive Director of the GPTCA, Ms. Gay Kingman-Wapato, is the contact for the GPTCA and is empowered to work with your administration staff to coordinate a meeting at Secretary Jewell's earliest convenience. She can be reached at Cell: 605-484-3036 or e-mail, Kingmanwapato@rushmore.com

Sincerely,

JOHN STEELE,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION No. 30-9-28-11

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION
(GPTCA)

Opposition to Keystone XL ("Keystone II") Pipeline now being considered for authorization by the United States Department of State, on the basis that construction of such pipeline is not in the national interests of the United States

Whereas, The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association (GPTCA) is composed of the elected Chairs and Presidents of the 16 Sovereign Indian Tribes and Nations recog-

nized by Treaties with the United States that are within the Great Plains Region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas, The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association was formed to promote the common interests of the Sovereign Tribes and Nations and their members of the Great Plains Region which comprises the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska; and

Whereas, The United States has obligated itself both through Treaties entered into with the sovereign Tribes and Nations of the Great Plains Region and through its own federal statutes, the Snyder Act of 1921 as amended, the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1976 as amended, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 1976 as amended; and

Whereas, Indian Tribes are governments that pre-date the United States, and through the Indian Commerce, Treaty and Apportionment Clauses and the 14th Amendment, the United States recognizes the status of Indian Tribes as sovereigns and the status of American Indians as tribal citizens; and

Whereas, In treaties, the United States pledged to protect Indian Tribes, guaranteed the right of Tribal self-government, and has undertaken a trust responsibility to promote the viability of Indian reservations and lands as permanent homelands for tribes; and,

Whereas, On September 28, 2011, the Tribal Chairmen and the Tribal Council representatives from the Tribal Nations that are members of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association, have been meeting at the GPTCA/BIA/USACE Tribal Water Management Summit, discussing issues of great importance to the Indian Tribal Nations of the Great Plains Region and their members; and

Whereas, a major oil transmission pipeline is planned to extend from northern Alberta, Canada, from areas that have sand mixed with tar and oil, called "tar sands", to refineries in the United States; and

Whereas, the route of the pipeline, called Keystone II, or Keystone XL, because it is the second oil transmission pipeline to be constructed by the same company that built the first Keystone pipeline, crosses through Indian country in northern Alberta, Saskatchewan, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska, near and potentially over, many culturally significant areas for Tribal Nations within those provinces and states; and

Whereas, based on the relatively poor environmental record of the first Keystone pipeline, which includes numerous spills, U.S. regulators shut the pipeline down in late May, 2011, and, therefore, based on the record of the first Keystone pipeline, and other factors, it is probable that further environmental disasters will occur in Indian country if the new pipeline is allowed to be constructed; and

Whereas, the First Nations of Canada, representing the vast majority of First Nations impacted by "tar sands" development, have unanimously passed resolutions supporting a moratorium on new "tar sands" development and expansion until a "cumulative effects management system" is in place, and are also in opposition to the pipeline; and

Whereas, many U.S. Tribal Nations are also in opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline, including several Tribal Nations in the Great Plains, because it would threaten, among other things, the Ogallala aquifer and other major water aquifers, rivers and water ways, public drinking water sources, including the Mni Wiconi Rural Water System, agricultural lands, animal life, cultural sites,

and other resources vital to the peoples of the region in which the pipeline is proposed to be constructed; and

Whereas, Indian tribes including the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians are also in opposition to the Exxon-Imperial "Heavy Haul" proposal to transport "tar sands" equipment through the Nez Perce Reservation and across scenic highways, and several Indian tribes have joined in litigation to stop this proposal; and

Whereas, the pipeline is unnecessary as a number of other pipelines are not at full capacity to carry oil from Canada to refineries in the U.S., and the oil is also not likely to end up on the U.S. market but will be exported to foreign countries; and

Whereas, Tribal Nations and First Nations within Indian country near the route of the proposed pipeline have already stated their opposition to the proposed route of the pipeline, and because of earlier opposition from both Tribes and environmental groups, a supplemental environmental impact statement has been required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency from the proposed operators of the pipeline, a draft of which is now available for public comment; and

Whereas, since the pipeline is designed to cross the U.S.-Canadian border, the United States Department of State is the lead U.S. agency in evaluating whether the pipeline should be allowed to be constructed in the U.S.; and

Whereas, the First Nations of Canada and Tribal Nations within the U.S. have a long history of working to ensure protection of their environment, and the Keystone XL pipeline poses grave dangers if it is constructed; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of State is continuing to accept public comments until October 7, 2011, but despite the concerns of the numerous Tribal Nations and the First Nations of Canada has recently received notice from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency of a "Finding of No Significant Impact" from the proposed pipeline; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of State did not properly consult with the Tribes along the route of the Keystone XL Pipeline and, as a result of the mechanisms used for what consultation was provided, the affected Tribal Nations were not provided the opportunity for "free and informed consent" regarding the construction of the pipeline; and

Whereas, the GPTCA hereby urges all its member Tribal Nations to submit comments to the U.S. Department of State regarding the Keystone XL project as not in the tribal nor the national interest; and

Whereas, Tribal Government Chairs and Presidents, Traditional Treaty Councils, and US property owners, met with the First Nations Chiefs of Canada, impacted by TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline and tar sands development present at the Rosebud Sioux Tribe Emergency Summit, September 15-16, 2011, on the protection of Mother Earth and Treaty Territories, developed the Mother Earth Accord for sign on by all First Nations and Tribal Nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association stands in solidarity with the First Nations of Canada and with Tribal Nations in the United States in opposing the Keystone XL pipeline and the Exxon-Imperial Heavy Haul proposal and their negative impacts on cultural sites and the environment in those portions of Indian country over and through which it is proposed to be constructed, and disagrees with the Finding

of No Significant Impact issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and agrees to file these comments regarding this opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline with the Secretary of State as soon as possible; and

Be it further resolved that the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association approves the Mother Earth Accord among the First Nations of Canada and the Tribal Nations within the United States; and

Be it further resolved that the United States is urged to reduce its reliance on the world's dirtiest and most environmentally destructive form of oil—the "tar sands"—that threatens Indian country in both Canada and the United States and the way of life of thousands of citizens of First Nations in Canada and American Indians in the U.S., and requests the U.S. government to take aggressive measures to work towards sustainable energy solutions that include clean alternative energy and improving energy efficiency; and

Be it finally resolved that the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association requests a meeting with the Tribal Leaders and Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State, and the Administration to present the Mother Earth Accord and voice the concerns of the US Tribal Nations and the First Nations of Canada opposing the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline across Treaty Lands as not in the national interest: Now, therefore be it finally

Resolved that this resolution shall be the policy of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association until otherwise amended or rescinded or until the goal of this Resolution has been accomplished.

CERTIFICATION

This resolution was enacted at a duly called meeting of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association held at Rapid City, SD on September 28, 2011 at which a quorum was present, with 10 members voting in favor, 0 members opposed, 0 members abstaining, and 6 members not present.

Dated this 28th day of September, 2011.

Mr. CARDIN. With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about President Obama's State of the Union Address last week. It was a speech that I believe laid out a positive and forceful agenda for strengthening our middle class and for accelerating our Nation's economic recovery.

Over the past year, our Nation's economic progress has become unmistakable and undeniable. In our home State of Delaware, more people are working. People spend much less time looking

for work, and job growth has been the strongest it has been since the 1990s.

Nationally, we are amidst the longest period of sustained private-sector job growth on record. Of particular interest to me is that our manufacturing sector has come back and come back strongly as manufacturers have created nearly 800,000 jobs in the last 4 years—jobs that make up the foundation of our 21st century middle class and our economy.

Our unemployment rate has dropped to its lowest level since before the great recession. Our growing private sector is not just creating jobs now. They are also laying the foundation for the jobs of the future. As test scores continue to improve, high school graduation rates reach record highs, and, as our President said, "More Americans finish college than ever before," we are laying a path that ensures that future generations of Americans can thrive as well.

But our work remains unfinished. Although we are right to turn the page on the crisis here at home, crises do remain real in the lives of far too many Americans—families I listen to who are struggling to get into and stay in our middle class. For many in the middle class, wages have remained stubbornly stagnant as incomes for the wealthy have continued to grow. At the same time, too many Americans just stopped looking for work altogether during the recession and haven't begun that job search again. So we have a lot of work to do together to ensure that the middle class experiences the benefits of this recovery.

On that note, I appreciated President Obama's call for an agenda that would do a lot to strengthen our middle class. Although this isn't what we will hear about on the news, many of these ideas should enjoy bipartisan support. I wish to spend a few minutes on some of the areas that I think are ripe for bipartisan cooperation and that would go a long way toward actually helping middle-class families and our Nation as a whole.

First, it is no secret to anyone that our country's infrastructure is badly outdated and in need of repair. From our ports and roads, to our bridges and railways, we have steadily racked up a national debt of investment that we will need to pay for. The only question is when and how we do it. Historically, infrastructure—fixing roads and bridges and ports and railways—has not been a partisan issue. It is something that has been a core value of our Federal Government from its very founding. It is in no small part what the Federal Government was created to help do.

Last Tuesday the President laid out ideas for thinking more creatively about how to make these core investments—from improving efficiency to bringing private capital off the side-

lines—and I am encouraged to hear Republican colleagues discussing infrastructure as an initiative they can work on with us. So let's get this done. Let's solve our highway trust fund challenges for good and make the long-term investments that will put people back to work and strengthen our Nation's economic backbone.

Second, the President's proposal to expand access to community colleges is an initiative that I hope will spark a broader discussion about how to make higher education more accessible and more affordable. I understand there is real disagreement here about how best to pay for it or how wide its scope should be, but that is what we can and should work on together.

We all know that higher education is necessary to ensure Americans have the skills they will need in the 21st century. We know community colleges can and should play a central role in achieving that mission. In manufacturing in particular, community colleges such as Delaware Tech in my home State play a central role in partnering with local businesses to create a talent pipeline that sustains a community and its economy. In Delaware the SEED and Inspire scholarships give students who are willing to work hard the chance to go to college and to learn the skills that will help them to contribute to Delaware's economy after they finish school. We can replicate Delaware's example across the country and find ways to work together to make community college and further higher education affordable and accessible. So let's work on this together.

Lastly, the President laid out some commonsense tax and work proposals to help give middle-class families more of a realistic leg up. Expanding the tax credits for families with children and streamlining childcare support makes sense to me. Making it easier for middle-class families to save for their kids' college education and to save for retirement at the same time would go a long way toward helping families to plan for the long term.

Around the country, too many of our work places lack family and medical leave policies that appreciate what it really takes to raise a family and live a healthy life. The President's proposal to work with States to improve their policies would be a great step and would help those communities that choose to, to create policies that suit their own local situations.

Let's work together on these ideas. Let's do something for middle-class families in our country. With a Republican Congress and a Democratic White House, we need to come together if we are going to get anything meaningful done. As President Obama made clear, we have a lot of important and difficult work to do. Our economy has come a long way from the great recession, but

there is still work to do to strengthen our middle class. There is still work to do to broaden the opportunity that has always been at the heart of the American dream. We can move forward together, and it is my sincere hope that we will rise to that occasion, that we will seize this opportunity and do the critical work of building and sustaining our vital middle class.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up on behalf of Senator GILLIBRAND amendment No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], for Mrs. GILLIBRAND, proposes an amendment numbered 48 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the definition of underground injection)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DEFINITION OF UNDERGROUND INJECTION.

Section 1421(d)(1) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) includes the underground injection of natural gas for purposes of storage.”.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, this amendment amends the Safe Drinking Water Act to protect clean drinking water sources from hydraulic fracturing, commonly known as fracking, and from underground storage of natural gas.

The Safe Drinking Water Act currently exempts underground injection of fracking fluids and underground storage of natural gas from regulation under the act. The Gillibrand amendment repeals those exemptions and makes underground injection of fracking fluids and underground storage of natural gas subject to those regulations.

I know my colleague from New York has been on the floor many times—actually three times, I think—at various times during this debate trying to offer this amendment. I am offering it on her behalf tonight. I am sure she will be looking for time to come and discuss it further.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to set aside the

pending amendment and call up amendment No. 55 on behalf of Senator PETERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington, [Ms. CANTWELL], for Mr. PETERS, for himself and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 55 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a study of the potential environmental impact of by-products of the Keystone XL pipeline)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ STUDY OF BY-PRODUCT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall complete and make publicly available on the Internet a study assessing the potential environmental impact of by-products generated from the refining of oil transported through the pipeline referred to in section (2)(a), including petroleum coke.

(b) REPORT.—On completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including a summary of best practices for the transportation, storage, and handling of petroleum coke.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Peters amendment No. 55 would require the EPA to complete a study on the environmental impacts of petcoke. My colleague has been here on the floor speaking on the tar sands issue in general because Kalamazoo had one of the worst tar sands oil spills in the Nation's history. He has been on the floor talking about the things we need to do to protect people not just in the State of Michigan but throughout the United States.

One of the aftermath effects of this issue is also petcoke, which my colleague from Illinois has been speaking to on the floor. This is a very big issue for midwest Senators who have an amount of petcoke in their communities and want to see the proper environmental treatment of it.

I am sure Senator PETERS will be back to the floor to speak in more detail on amendment No. 55, but I offer it on his behalf.

I see the Senator from New Jersey, and I think he is here to speak on another matter, but I will yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished ranking mem-

ber of the energy committee for yielding me some time this evening. I am not here for the purposes of legislation we have been debating; I am here to take time on the Senate floor on an occasion that I think is incredibly important to recollect, to commemorate, and to talk about.

Seventy years ago today a Soviet soldier, Ivan Martynushkin, arrived with his unit at the death camp at Auschwitz, and he said in an interview that he was instantly struck by the silence, the smell of ashes, and the emptiness. But as they entered the gates, Ivan and his unit were unaware of the atrocities, the war crimes that were to come to light over time.

Today I rise in memory of the 1.1 million persons who perished there, 90 percent of them Jews. I rise in recognition of 1.1 million lost dreams, lost hopes, the lost wisdom of 1.1 million that will never be shared, never be known, and the lost potential of a generation that perished in that camp between 1940 and 1945.

Ivan Martynushkin and his unit entered the camp thinking there would be a Nazi ambush, and then they noticed people behind barbed wire. “It was hard to watch them,” he said. “I remember their faces, especially their eyes, which betrayed their ordeal.” Ivan didn’t know that the Nazis had evacuated another 58,000 prisoners 10 days earlier or the 6 million who were killed in camps across Europe.

He stood witness that day to the ultimate manifestation of man’s inhumanity to their fellow man—7,000 prisoners left behind, 600 corpses born of hatred, intolerance, prejudice, bigotry, and a seething anti-Semitism that is again rearing its ugly head in Europe, the Middle East, and around the world.

There has been an alarming increase in anti-Semitic attacks and incidents in Europe that remain a challenge not only to stability and to security but to our shared morality, our mutually ethical core as human beings. Just two weeks ago, on January 9, 2015, four members of France’s Jewish community were murdered during a hostage crisis at Hyper Cacher—a kosher supermarket—following the deadly terrorist attack on the Paris offices of the newspaper Charlie Hebdo.

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights issued a 2013 report on anti-Semitism in France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Belgium, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, where 90 percent of Europe’s Jews reside, in which three-quarters of respondents said that anti-Semitism had worsened over the past 5 years where they lived.

In France, home to Europe’s largest Jewish population, it has been reported that the number of French Jews immigrating to Israel in 2014 had doubled compared to 2013. And for the first time ever, more Jews moved to Israel from France than any other country in the world.

Anti-Semitic acts in European countries in 2014 included violent attacks, death threats, and the desecration of Jewish homes, commercial property, cemeteries, and places of worship. On May 24, 2014, a gunman opened fire at the Jewish Museum of Belgium in Brussels, Belgium, and killed four people. On July 29, Molotov cocktails were thrown at the synagogue in Wuppertal, Germany, which had been burned to the ground by the Nazis during the 1938 Kristallnacht and had only been rebuilt in 2002.

We have all been shocked by the recent disturbingly stereotypical anti-Semitic utterances of President Erdogan of Turkey and those around him. He said in February of 2013, "Today the image of the Jews is no different from that of the Nazis." Speaking at a campaign rally in the Black Sea province of Ordu, he said the "terrorist State Israel has attacked Gaza once again, hitting innocent children who were playing on a beach," and the crowd chanted "Down the Israel." Erdogan said, "The world's media is under the influence of Israel." He said, "Wherever Jews settle, they make money." He claimed during the 2013 Gezi Park protests that the Europeans and what he stereotypically referred to as the "interest-rate lobby" were backing the antigovernment campaign, with the ultimate goal of dividing Turkey from within.

A Turkish writer aligned with President Erdogan called for Turkish Jews to be taxed to pay for Gaza reconstruction. He said:

The reconstruction of Gaza will be paid for by Jewish businessmen.

He went on to say:

The penalty for failing to pay the tax should be the revocation of the Jew's business license and the seizure of his property.

This is the kind of anti-Semitism we hear in Turkey today.

Around the world, the numbers are shocking. Based on the global survey, the ADL concluded that 1.09 billion people harbor anti-Semitic attitudes. Thirty-five percent never heard of the Holocaust.

If the world does not stand together in never forgetting and if our schools, teachers, parents, and communities do not join together in the fundamental principle of never forgetting, how can we prevent this from ever happening again? How can we work together to confront the anti-Semitism that enables hatred, violence, murder, and genocide around the world?

We can only ask what tomorrow might bring. We cannot know what the future will hold, but we have learned from the past. What we remember today—70 years after the liberation of Auschwitz—is that the United States and the American people will always stand shoulder to shoulder with the Israeli people and Jewish communities across the world in ensuring never

again. This means confronting modern-day anti-Semitism, whether from the world's leaders, from ivory tower academics, or from economic belligerence pushing the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement. We must fight back against any and all efforts to delegitimize the Israeli State, the Jewish people, and the Jewish religion.

As I have said many times, on many occasions, the Holocaust was the most sinister possible reminder that the Jewish population in exile has lived under constant threat. It is the definitive reminder that anti-Semitism can appear anywhere, and its horrors galvanized international support for the State of Israel.

But let's be very clear. While the Shoah has a central role in Israel's identity, it is not and never has been the reason behind Israel's founding, and it is not the main justification for its existence. The extreme characterization of this mistaken view is that Western powers established Israel in 1948 based on their own guilt, at the expense of the peoples who already lived there, and therefore the current state is illegitimate and, according to religious clerics such as Supreme Leader Khamenei, who retains his own aspirations for regional hegemony, should be wiped off the face of the map.

This flawed argument is not only in defiance of basic human dignity but in plain defiance of history, in defiance of what we remember today. It is in defiance of ancient history, as told in biblical texts and through archeological evidence. It ignores the history of the last several centuries, and it stands in stark contrast to what we remember today. Several thousand years of history lead to an undeniable conclusion: The reestablishment of the State of Israel in modern times is a political reality with roots going back to the time of Abraham and Sarah.

At the end of the day, the argument for Israel's legitimacy does not depend on what we say in speeches and what we say on an occasion like this. It has been made by the hard reality of history. It has been made by the men and women who made the desert green, by Nobel Prizes earned, by groundbreaking innovations and enviable institutions, by lives saved, democracy defended, peace made, and battles won.

There can be no denying the Jewish people's legitimate right to live in peace and security in a homeland to which they have had a connection for thousands of years. And there can be no denying the suffering, the senseless slaughter of a generation, and all that the world realized we had lost when Ivan Martynushkin and his unit walked through those gates and liberated Auschwitz-Birkenau, a reminder for all times of the racism and hatred from the most devastating genocide in human history.

As we commemorate the victims of the Holocaust, let us never forget. But let us be very clear as we look around the world today that the struggle is not over. Combating anti-Semitism is not only a Jewish issue of the past, it is a matter of basic civil and human rights today, now, in the present.

Like those Russian soldiers 70 years ago, I have personally stood at the gates of Auschwitz-Birkenau. I felt the impact, the horror, the silence, the emptiness, and I felt the lives lost. It is a moving experience that should compel all of us to collectively reflect on how we must transform the lessons we should have learned into concrete acts to prevent history from repeating itself.

Now is the time to renew the vow "never again" with even greater resolve.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE ACTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we Americans are so fortunate to enjoy the blessings of liberty. We protect our rights as individuals, and we have a legal system that demands that government officials respect those rights and respect the law.

Historically some nations have lost their freedoms in revolutions. In others a leader gradually undermined the rule of law. Once the rule of law is dismantled, the road to dictatorship is easily traveled.

In a country under the rule of law, government officials are bound by that law.

When the Framers wrote our Constitution, they feared that the Federal Government might grow too strong. They divided and limited the powers among three branches. They made sure to preserve State power to serve as a check on the Federal power, and they also provided that where the Federal Government had the authority to make uniform laws, contrary State laws gave way.

To make sure everyone would be subject to the law, they entrusted the President with the duty to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

President Obama has repeatedly failed to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. He has repeatedly violated the Constitution. His administration has not conformed its conduct to law.

His administration therefore has undermined the rule of law. Often patterns repeat. The President proposes legislation that the American people do not want, so the Congress naturally refuses to enact it.

The President then decides that he will take Executive action as if Congress had enacted that law. Another pattern is he claims the authority to take various actions but fails to produce an opinion from the Department of Justice that coherently supports his authority. That creates a terrible lack of accountability.

We have also seen the President pick and choose which laws he will enforce, claiming that the ability to make individual enforcement decisions extends to failing to enforce the laws in millions of instances, and the President has simply failed to take notice when the Supreme Court has ruled he has exceeded his powers.

I know my colleagues think these are serious charges, and they are.

I wish to outline a number of instances where the President or his administration, acting at his discretion, has failed to follow the Constitution or the laws. Regrettably I will only be able to touch on some of the examples.

The President has attempted to unconstitutionally limit the powers of States through ObamaCare. He threatened the States that did not expand Medicaid would lose their existing Medicaid funds. The Supreme Court ruled 7 to 2 for the first time that a condition on Federal spending was so coercive to the States as to be unconstitutional.

Another President might have been careful after such a rebuke by the highest Court in the land to be mindful of State power—after all, it included one of the Justices that the President himself appointed to the Supreme Court—but not this President taking notice of what the Court said.

President Obama's EPA then turned around and has not followed the rule of law. It wrongly recognizes no limit to Federal power or to its own power.

Despite the fact that Congress rejected his cap-and-trade proposal, his EPA issued greenhouse gas regulations that would require States to develop plans that meet EPA-established emission standards. Once EPA approved them, EPA would then order the States to enforce the standards.

Supporters of EPA argued that the threat from pollutants under the Clean Air Act, a category in which they erroneously include carbon dioxide, justified EPA's action, but the "end justifies the means" is an argument that is totally at odds with the concept of rule of law.

EPA's approach is unconstitutional. Just as a State cannot be coerced by Federal spending programs, it cannot be commandeered to enact Federal dictates. This is a well-established rule of

the 10th Amendment, otherwise the States would lose their sovereignty.

Responsibility and therefore accountability would be blurred as voters could not tell which level of government to blame for unpopular policies. Among those who recognize that EPA has acted unconstitutionally is the President's own liberal constitutional law professor, Laurence Tribe of Harvard.

He wrote that it was his own view that the EPA is "asserting executive power far beyond its lawful authority."

He also wrote: "Frustration with congressional inaction cannot justify throwing the Constitution overboard."

President Obama also acted unconstitutionally when he made what he said were valid recess appointments, even though the Senate was not in recess. Although Presidents had been making recess appointments for more than 200 years, the President's use of the power was once again unprecedented.

He was armed with a Justice Department opinion that laughably argued that the President could ignore when the Senate said it was in session to make such appointments.

The Supreme Court rejected the President's so-called recess appointments unanimously. That meant of course that both of the Justices President Obama appointed rejected his claim that he could determine when the Senate was in recess, even though the Constitution makes it very clear, and it also rejected the Justice Department's arguments that supposedly allowed the President to make that recess appointment in violation of the Constitution.

But the President, similar to the old French Kings, learns nothing and forgets nothing when it comes to respecting the limits of Presidential power.

Despite the lodging of the power in the Constitution to Congress alone to enact uniform laws of naturalization, the President decided to enable millions of people who entered the country without documents to remain without congressional approval.

In fact, at a recent Judiciary Committee hearing we heard testimony that the administration's misuse of parole authority under this directive would allow many individuals who are here illegally to obtain green cards without Congress changing a word of the immigration laws.

This follows the President's earlier decision when Congress would not pass the DREAM Act to give benefits to undocumented aliens, as if that bill had been enacted into law.

In both of these instances, the supposed justification for noncompliance with the law is that the need is so great. This is a siren song that supporters of the rule of law must reject.

Texas and a number of other States have already filed suit challenging the immigration order's constitutionality, as well as its violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In an unrelated case, Federal district court has already found parts of the order to be unlawful. The President also has claimed enforcement discretion in failing to enforce other Federal criminal laws.

The Controlled Substances Act prohibits marijuana possession nationwide. Under the supremacy clause of the Constitution, State laws to the contrary are unconstitutional.

Normally the Federal Government sues States that enact such laws. But when Colorado and other States legalized marijuana, the Obama administration directed Federal law enforcement to refrain from using its resources to enforce Federal law in those States. It did not make individualized prosecutorial decisions but a very blanket refusal to enforce Federal law, contrary to the oath.

Nebraska and Oklahoma, rather than the Federal Government, have sued Colorado, as those neighboring States argue they face a significant increase in marijuana and other drug-related harms as a result of the Colorado law.

To make matters worse, Attorney General Holder is expanding his refusal to apply Federal marijuana laws to Indian reservations. Those reservations depend upon Federal law enforcement.

He plans to allow tribes to petition unelected local prosecutors to decide whether the same nonenforcement of marijuana laws' policy will apply to those reservations. Apart from the rule of law question, it must be kept in mind that these reservations are in States that still want to see marijuana illegal. As a matter of policy, rates of illegal drug use are higher on Indian reservations, with all of the associated health and crime consequences.

Again, this goes to the heart of the rule of law.

Does anyone believe if a State decided dealers could sell guns without conducting the federally required background checks, that the Obama administration would ignore those States? Anyone who approves what President Obama has done under the guise of enforcement discretion will have no cause to complain about a future President's decision to allocate scarce resources.

For instance, he could decide that the ObamaCare individual mandate, which is constitutional according to the Supreme Court—only because it is a tax—will not be enforced against anyone who does not buy government-approved health insurance.

President Obama has also violated the law when he released five Taliban fighters who were detained at Guantanamo in exchange for an American sergeant. As the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office concluded, the failure to notify Congress 30 days before such transfer, and to provide a justification, was a violation of law.

I have asked the Justice Department for the justification they prepared for

this move by the President. To this day, the President refuses to produce the Justice Department's opinion that purports to legally justify this action, contrary to the law passed by Congress.

The American people can draw their own conclusions as to whether that means a well-reasoned legal argument exists that the President could legally act as he did.

The rule of law ensures that government officials and agencies obey the law. Under the Constitution, Federal agencies can only exercise the power that Congress gives them. They cannot do whatever they want. Now that is obvious to any high school government class. But in the Obama administration, where too many agencies do not believe in limited government, agencies are lawlessly exceeding their powers. This lawlessness is a major reason why polls show that Americans believe the Federal Government is overregulated.

Let's take a look at the EPA again. Not only has the EPA violated the Constitution and exceeded its powers on the Clean Air Act, that agency has violated a core Federal statute—the Administrative Procedures Act. The Administrative Procedures Act sets forth the process by which agencies can issue regulations and conduct other administrative business.

For instance, under the APA, an agency can issue a regulation that is binding on citizens with penalties for noncompliance only if that agency pursues notice-and-comment rulemaking.

This process, consistent with notions of due process and fairness, requires any agency to issue a proposed rule, seek public comment, respond to public comment, and modify the proposed rule to reflect those comments when it issues a final rule. The process is this way to assure accountability, to ensure transparency and input from regulated entities. Courts can strike down the regulation if the agency fails to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act.

They can also strike down the regulation where the agency exceeds its statutory powers or where the agency's interpretation of law that is said to justify the regulation does not reflect a legitimate reading of the statute. Courts give greater deference to an agency's interpretations of statutes that are taken after proceeding through the notice-and-comment process.

The EPA recently violated the Administrative Procedures Act in my own State of Iowa. The EPA wrote letters to Iowa municipalities setting forth specific requirements that they said must be followed to meet their obligations under the Clean Water Act. The cities challenged the EPA because the two letters effectively imposed new regulatory requirements. They argued the EPA could not impose regulatory

obligations simply by letter but needed to proceed by notice-and-comment rulemaking—the Administrative Procedures Act requirements.

They also argued that so-called informal guidance imposes subtle pressures on regulated entities to comply even if the EPA does not call its actions a regulation.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit agreed and struck down the requirements EPA imposed on those cities just by issuing letters. However, the EPA has since publicly stated, as a lot of government agencies do, that the EPA would only comply with the ruling in the Eighth Circuit.

So here we have a situation where there is a national law, the actions of the EPA are struck down in the Eighth Circuit, and now that law is going to be applied one way in the Eighth Circuit and the other way in the rest of the States. In other words, the EPA has proclaimed it intends to continue to impose these illegal requirements on municipalities in those States outside the Eighth Circuit, in clear violation of the APA.

The EPA is not alone in failing to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act. The Department of Education issued what it termed informal guidance concerning campus sexual assault last year without public input.

I hope we can see a pattern here, whether it is by letter by the EPA to Iowa municipalities or whether it is something called informal guidance by the Department of Education. These are all terms trying to get around the legal requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act to get things done faster by these agencies, because following the rule of law is kind of an encumbrance they do not want to go through.

In regard to what the Department of Education did, at a HELP Committee hearing the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights Catherine Lhamon stated that she expected colleges and universities to comply with that guidance that was not a regulation under the Administrative Procedures Act. Of course, that meant what the Department was calling informal guidance was really a regulation that could only be issued after engaging in notice-and-comment rulemaking.

When Senator ALEXANDER, who is chairman of the committee now, asked her who gave her the authority to issue the guidance, she responded, incredibly—and I emphasize incredibly—“Well, with gratitude, you did, when I was confirmed.”

So you get confirmed by 100 Members of the Senate and you can do whatever you want to regardless of law? No. This is the United States, where we operate under the rule of law and the constitution. It is not France in the age of Louis XIV where government officials say, *L'Etat c'est moi*. I am the State, in other words.

Senate confirmation means only that a person has been legally installed in a job. But once confirmed, the agency official can only act in accordance with the laws governing their agency.

I support the Department's overall goal of holding accountable those who commit campus sexual assault, but it has to be done lawfully. By issuing so-called guidance that, by her own admission, she expected colleges and universities to follow, the Department exceeded its lawful powers.

Separate from excluding the public from having any say in the rules that have governed their conduct, bureaucrats have many incentives—too many incentives—to ignore the Administrative Procedures Act.

Imagine: Formal rulemaking takes time. A formal notice of proposed rulemaking is followed by the public's comment period, then the agency responds to comments and modifies their proposed rule before it is made final. The Office of Management and Budget reviews the regulation and can block or modify it. The Office of Management and Budget makes agencies justify the costs and benefits of their rules, reduce burdens under the Paperwork Reduction Act, and also prepare a federalism impact statement for those proposed rules.

Agencies that want to regulate without oversight can subvert the whole process of issuing binding rules under the cover of “informal guidance.” It is so much faster for bureaucrats to issue dictates to whomever they want for whatever reason they want.

By avoiding the Administrative Procedures Act, these unelected agencies violate the whole separation of powers. They act legislatively in violation of the limited authority Congress provides a particular agency. Then they are free to issue even more rules, restricting the freedom of American people and increasing the role of unelected bureaucrats in telling other people what to do. Reductions in freedom are ultimately manifestations of a failure to follow the rule of law.

We are already headed in that direction. The Supreme Court has before it a case now from the Labor Department, where one of the issues discussed at oral argument was whether that agency was required to proceed by notice-and-comment rulemaking rather than through interpretive rules. We shall see, then, whether the Court addresses that issue or focuses instead on what level of deference a court gives when agencies change their position without proceeding through Administrative Procedures Act rulemaking.

But even if the issue of the necessity of engaging in notice-and-comment rulemaking is not addressed in that case, the Court, before long, will reach that question. When it does, I believe it will find that what the Obama administration has been doing is clearly illegal.

President Obama's claims of Executive power are unprecedented. He is creating a general precedent of a Presidency unrestrained by law.

When Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated in the darkest days of the Great Depression, he called on Congress to act to respond to the emergency as well as giving him powers to address it. He did issue Executive Orders, such as declaring a bank holiday, but he did not say that he had a phone and a pen and that he would do whatever he felt was necessary regardless of whether Congress acted. Rather, he said that if the powers Congress gave him to address the emergency were inadequate, he would ask Congress to provide him with the powers Congress would give a President in the event of a foreign invasion.

Those are extensive powers. But he was determined to ask Congress for power, not to act unilaterally because the ends justified the means. He wanted to use all the powers available under the Constitution, not exceed those powers.

Not only does the Constitution further government compliance with the rule of law through the separation of powers, it also sets up an executive branch that can act to check itself. Executive officials have their own legal powers that the President cannot interfere with. They can also refuse to carry out illegal Presidential orders.

We have a very good example from the dark days of Watergate. The Nixon administration exceeded its powers too. When that happened, there were administration officials who pushed back against their own President who appointed them. The appropriate Justice Department official told President Nixon he would haul him into Federal Court if there were evidence of his criminality. Attorney General Elliott Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus resigned rather than fire the Watergate special prosecutor, as the President had ordered. People of conscience do sometimes resign or threaten to do so, and that increases public pressure on the President to obey the law.

Who in the Obama administration has ever stood up against his lawlessness? No one, as far as I know. No one has resigned from the Justice Department as it has become a rubberstamp for wild claims of Presidential power that exceed the Constitution and violate the laws.

What lawyer in the EPA or any other Department has stopped her agency from acting unconstitutionally by exceeding the powers that Congress has specifically delegated under various statutes? What lawyer has stopped an agency from violating the Administrative Procedures Act by issuing binding rules on the public without public comment?

I regret to say that the Congress up to now has too often been complicit

with Presidential assaults on the rule of law. When President Obama eviscerated the core Senate prerogative of advice and consent by making unconstitutional recess appointments, not one single Democrat in this body objected. This is where the real harm of excessive partisanship manifests itself.

Time and again, the previous majority in this body refused to take action against any Presidential action that violated the law if they agreed with the policy being pursued by the President. This sort of nonactivity is not why the Constitution created the Congress. Whatever its flaws, an active Congress that defends its legislative prerogatives and conducts effective oversight of Executive illegality is vital to preserving liberty.

In one historical example, the process of transformation from democracy to dictatorship was completed when the Parliament voted itself out of existence.

The Framers did not intend a Congress to sit idly by as the President violates the Constitution and the laws. In Federalist 51, James Madison wrote that the separation of powers was vital to the preservation of liberty. He noted that checks and balances would be effective in keeping each branch within its prescribed constitutional role because each had, in his words:

... the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. . . . Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

Recently, the Senate has failed to counteract unlimited Executive ambition. That must change and, as a result of the last election, should change. Will it change? I sure hope so.

I trust that under our new leadership, the Senate will take action for the government to control itself, and to restore the rule of law that has been so badly damaged in recent years, because if we take the spirit of the Declaration of Independence—and remember, prior to that Declaration, the colonies decided they did not want one person, George III, making decisions affecting millions of people on this side of the ocean. So they were very careful, when they declared independence and they wrote a Constitution a few years later, to make sure they carried out the spirit of the Declaration of Independence that:

... they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Not by our government, but by nature or by our Creator.

So they put into this Constitution assurances so there could never be a George III again, and separated all the powers so one person didn't have all the power.

Now we see one person trying to exercise the power of several branches of government, as George III tried to do.

So we are over that hurdle. All we have to do is make sure that the checks and balances the government worked—the same checks and balances that every high school kid learns in government class, to make sure that one person doesn't do it, and that our liberties are protected by a government that operates under the rule of law. And that Constitution is our rule of law.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 245 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up amendment No. 245 on behalf of Senator BARRASSO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI], for Mr. BARRASSO, proposes an amendment numbered 245 to amendment No. 2.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation without consultation with the applicable Indian nation, as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 246 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 246.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 246 to amendment No. 2.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in improving wildlife habitat and increasing outdoor recreation opportunities on Federal and State land; and

(2) reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority for Congress and should include improvements to the structure of the program to more effectively manage existing Federal land.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, as a fifth-generation Montanan and lifelong sportsman, I have a deep appreciation for our public lands. Hunting, fishing, and hiking on our public lands are important parts of many Montanan's way of life. These are traditions I have enjoyed in my life and traditions I have also enjoyed with my kids.

It is important our State's outdoor heritage is protected for future generations. That is why protecting and increasing access to public lands is so important. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been instrumental in increasing access to our public lands, growing opportunities for outdoor recreation and protecting wildlife. There is great potential for the program to be used to improve the management of our existing Federal lands.

In fact, there is much improvement to be made to make Federal land management more effective. My amendment will express the sense of the Congress that the Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in improving wildlife habitat and increasing outdoor recreation opportunities on Federal as well as State land. It will also convey that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority for Congress and should include improvements in the structure of the program to more effectively manage existing Federal land.

Montana's outdoor heritage is of great importance to our State's economy and thousands of Montanans' way of life. We must work to improve programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund so it will work better for Montanans and all Americans.

Supporting and improving the Land and Water Conservation Fund will help us ensure this legacy is continued for future generations.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Cardin No. 75, Peters No. 70, Sanders No. 23, Cruz No. 15, Merkley No. 125, Moran No. 73, Whitehouse No. 148, Daines No. 132, Coons No. 115, Collins No. 35, Carper No. 120, Murkowski No. 166, Heitkamp No. 133, Gillibrand No. 48, Barrasso No. 245, Cardin No. 124, Daines No. 246, and Burr No. 92, as modified with the changes at the desk; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order to the amendments. I ask consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote, and that all votes after the first in the series be 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 92), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "During the period ending September 30, 2015, there" and inserting "There"; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "through September 30, 2015".

(b) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Not less than 1.5 percent of amounts made available for expenditure under section 200303 or \$10,000,000, whichever is greater, shall be available each fiscal year for projects that secure recreational public access to existing Federal public land for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes."

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARY LEAHY'S CAREER AS AN EDUCATOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have the privilege of being a lifelong

Vermont, as were my parents and my brother and sister. All Vermonters realize that in a small State like ours, it takes the dedication and hard work of very special and talented people to make our State great.

I will take a moment as a proud brother to mention one such person, my younger sister, Mary Leahy. Mary's work with adult basic education and teaching and her ability to give adults who have not had the capability to read a newfound ability is profound. It is impossible to calculate the number of lives she has dramatically improved in our State through her work. I still carry the memory of watching a grandfather with tears in his eyes, as he read a simple child's book to his grandchild. He then told me that he had never been able to read to his child, the grandchild's parent, but at least in his later years he could read to the grandchild. I thought what a gift. I thought again of Mary as I read an article printed in a number of our media in Vermont, written by Nancy Graff, about this part of Mary's career. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From VTDigger.org, Dec. 28, 2014]

IN THIS STATE: FOR MARY LEAHY, LITERACY GOES BEYOND READING
(By Nancy Graff)

Several miles up a dirt road in Marshfield, Mary Leahy's driveway swings up a modest rise on the right. In the wake of a recent snowstorm, ice, clumps of snow, ruts, and shattered branches have created endless road stubble. Traffic is infrequent. Leahy hasn't seen Camel's Hump, a breathtaking view normally framed by her house's large west-facing windows, for almost a week due to stubborn low-hanging clouds. No other structure or human being intrudes.

In this isolated spot, Leahy has spent 20 years thinking through what it means to be literate. She believes it all comes down to creating communities that welcome everyone.

Two years ago Leahy, a Montpelier native, retired from Central Vermont Adult Basic Education after 34 years as co-director and four years before that as a field tutor. Throughout her tenure, she says in her soft voice, she worked to make adult literacy programs "as inclusive as any other form of education, so that everyone could become part of the cultural community."

Leahy is sitting in her living room, her telltale shock of white hair the same color as the walls inside and the snow piled outside. She can tell hundreds of stories about people she has encountered over the past decades. One woman holds a special place in the evolution of her thinking. According to Leahy, when this woman came to be tutored in reading, Leahy asked her why she felt the need to learn now, long after she had left school. She replied that she had a big maple tree in her front yard, and a dream that one day when she finished her chores, she would take a book and sit under that tree and read it.

"That became the beacon for the rest of my work," Leahy says.

One book in particular provided more inspiration. A middle-aged man under Mary's

tutelage asked if they could read “Black Beauty” together. “Why that book?” she remembers asking. He had shown no interest in horses. He explained that “Black Beauty” had been popular when he was in school, but he could never join in the discussions about it because he couldn’t read. He wanted to know how it ends.

“I think ‘Black Beauty’ was the most formative book I read as a child. It taught me about being compassionate. I read it over and over and over,” she says.

And then there was a favorite nun at Leahy’s college, St. Catherine University, in Minneapolis. She taught Leahy that “work has to serve the world.”

After graduating and returning to Vermont, Leahy briefly tried her hand at farming before she started working in literacy.

“Literacy took up my imagination,” Leahy says. “It took up my heart, and I could see the changes in people’s lives.”

Among the mementos from her father’s shop that Mary Leahy keeps in her house is the letterpress type that once printed the “ICE” cards that people would put in their front windows when they wanted the iceman to make a delivery. Beautifully rendered in wood to begin with, the letter faces are as smooth as glass after decades of use. Beside them is a well-used brass can that contained solvent to clean the type.

Soon, however, she began to see that being able to identify a letter, being able to associate that letter with a sound, stringing letters into words, and understanding the meaning of the words were not enough. She recalls men at a local electric company who were afraid to requisition a part to fix a machine they could run with their eyes closed because they were unable to fill out the form needed to get the part. They learned the fundamentals of reading for their jobs, but until they could engage with ideas they remained outliers in the world’s cultural community.

“They needed to be included,” Leahy says. And that meant being able to help their children with schoolwork, being able to articulate their ideas and opinions, being able to teach themselves to learn.

Bringing the newly literate into the life of their families and home communities, into the community of ideas that explore our humanity and world, became Leahy’s goal.

These days CVABE serves approximately 600 clients, down from a high of 800 a few years ago. Leahy is quick to praise the people with whom she has worked over the years and other organizations that have made literacy work possible, especially the Vermont Council on the Humanities, with its emphasis on teaching reading not just as a vital skill but as a revelation of the human condition.

Each student presents unique challenges. Some are well-educated immigrants who need to learn English to work in their field. Some have learning disabilities that weren’t addressed. Others have lived in such chaotic situations that school wasn’t a priority. Still others have come from such poverty that illiteracy was a legacy passed from generations.

When she began working for CVABE, the organization stressed one-on-one in-home tutoring. ABE itself was a feature of the war on poverty that was an extension of the Department of Education. Leahy’s job was to develop tutoring programs by recruiting students and volunteers. To find students, she went door to door asking if anyone needed literacy assistance.

Being illiterate is not something people want to admit, she says. “There’s a chronic

fear of being found out that you can’t do what everyone else can. You think you’re alone in not being able to do this.”

And so she met them wherever they felt comfortable. She tutored in homes, in restaurants, in libraries, sometimes in her car.

Eventually, the Department of Education pushed the ABE program to move toward a more center-based structure. So Leahy oversaw that change, as well as many others, including gaining independence, forming a board, fundraising, starting an alternative high school program for teens, and very important, from her perspective, hosting reading and discussion programs. In 1989 she helped organize the first statewide conference for Vermont’s newly literate, ABE students who had once believed their opinions did not matter.

Leahy learned early in life what it means to be part of a community. Her father, a printer, had a shop near the Statehouse, and like her brothers (one of whom is Vermont’s U.S. Sen. Patrick Leahy), she regularly delivered printing jobs to the capitol. In the process she learned about government and politics and the obligations of citizenship. She learned about history and immigrant communities through their Irish and Italian ancestors, including one grandmother who was illiterate. These interests have carried over into her current volunteer work for the Friends of the Vermont State House, the Vermont Historical Society, and the Marshfield Historical Society. She wants everyone to have full access to communities like these that will enrich their lives.

According to Leahy, her students were a joy to teach because they were so motivated. With her eyes tearing up she tells the story of a man who wrote a letter to his first grandchild. “Things are going to be different than they were for me and your mother,” he wrote. “Your mother would bring papers home from school, and I’d keep my distance because I didn’t want her to know. But things will be different with you and me.” That change in one family’s quality of life, says Leahy, will resonate for generations. Another student was 93 when he learned to read. He had vowed to learn to read before he died.

These Vermonters and all the others whose lives Leahy has touched in her life’s work are no longer outliers.

“We all belong to a very special group of people,” she says. “We can read and write.”

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator BROWN, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

RULE 1.—REGULAR MEETING DATE FOR COMMITTEE

The regular meeting day for the Committee to transact its business shall be the last Tuesday in each month that the Senate is in Session; except that if the Committee has met at any time during the month prior to the last Tuesday of the month, the regular meeting of the Committee may be canceled at the discretion of the Chairman.

RULE 2.—COMMITTEE

[a] Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless the Senate, or the full Committee, or the Chairman and Ranking Member have specifically authorized such investigation.

[b] Hearings.—No hearing of the Committee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia except by agreement between the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

[c] Confidential testimony.—No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Committee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

[d] Interrogation of witnesses.—Committee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Committee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Committee.

[e] Prior notice of markup sessions.—No session of the Committee or a Subcommittee for marking up any measure shall be held unless [1] each member of the Committee or the Subcommittee, as the case may be, has been notified in writing via electronic mail or paper mail of the date, time, and place of such session and has been furnished a copy of the measure to be considered, in a searchable electronic format, at least 3 business days prior to the commencement of such session, or [2] the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee determines that exigent circumstances exist requiring that the session be held sooner.

[f] Prior notice of first degree amendments.—It shall not be in order for the Committee or a Subcommittee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee unless fifty written copies of such amendment have been delivered to the office of the Committee at least 2 business days prior to the meeting. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Senator to offer a motion to strike a single section of any measure under consideration. Such a motion to strike a section of the measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee shall not be amendable. This section may be waived by a majority of the members of the Committee or Subcommittee voting, or by agreement of the Chairman and Ranking Member. This subsection shall apply only when the conditions of subsection [e][1] have been met.

[g] Cordon rule.—Whenever a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall be before the Committee or Subcommittee, from initial consideration in hearings through final consideration, the Clerk shall place before each

member of the Committee or Subcommittee a print of the statute or the part or section thereof to be amended or repealed showing by stricken-through type, the part or parts to be omitted, and in italics, the matter proposed to be added. In addition, whenever a member of the Committee or Subcommittee offers an amendment to a bill or joint resolution under consideration, those amendments shall be presented to the Committee or Subcommittee in a like form, showing by typographical devices the effect of the proposed amendment on existing law. The requirements of this subsection may be waived when, in the opinion of the Committee or Subcommittee Chairman, it is necessary to expedite the business of the Committee or Subcommittee.

RULE 3.—SUBCOMMITTEES

[a] Authorization for.—A Subcommittee of the Committee may be authorized only by the action of a majority of the Committee.

[b] Membership.—No member may be a member of more than three Subcommittees and no member may chair more than one Subcommittee. No member will receive assignment to a second Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members of the Committee have chosen assignments to one Subcommittee, and no member shall receive assignment to a third Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members have chosen assignments to two Subcommittees.

[c] Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee unless the Senate or the full Committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

[d] Hearings.—No hearing of a Subcommittee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia without prior consultation with the Chairman and then only by agreement between the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[e] Confidential testimony.—No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Subcommittee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[f] Interrogation of witnesses.—Subcommittee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Subcommittee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee.

[g] Special meetings.—If at least three members of a Subcommittee desire that a special meeting of the Subcommittee be called by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman of the Subcommittee for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the Subcommittee of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman of the Subcommittee does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Subcommittee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Subcommittee will be held, specifying the date and hour of that special meeting. The Subcommittee shall meet on that date and hour. Imme-

diately upon the filing of the notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Subcommittee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chairman of the Subcommittee is not present at any regular or special meeting of the Subcommittee, the Ranking Member of the majority party on the Subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

[h] Voting.—No measure or matter shall be recommended from a Subcommittee to the Committee unless a majority of the Subcommittee are actually present. The vote of the Subcommittee to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Subcommittee voting. On Subcommittee matters other than a vote to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the Subcommittee is actually present. Any absent member of a Subcommittee may affirmatively request that his or her vote to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee or his vote on any such other matters on which a record vote is taken, be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter and to inform the Subcommittee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman of the Subcommittee any time before the record vote on the measure or matter concerned is taken, the member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee.

RULE 4.—WITNESSES

[a] Filing of statements.—Any witness appearing before the Committee or Subcommittee [including any witness representing a Government agency] must file with the Committee or Subcommittee [24 hours preceding his or her appearance] 75 copies of his or her statement to the Committee or Subcommittee, and the statement must include a brief summary of the testimony. In the event that the witness fails to file a written statement and brief summary in accordance with this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee has the discretion to deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee or Subcommittee until the witness has properly complied with the rule.

[b] Length of statements.—Written statements properly filed with the Committee or Subcommittee may be as lengthy as the witness desires and may contain such documents or other addenda as the witness feels is necessary to present properly his or her views to the Committee or Subcommittee. The brief summary included in the statement must be no more than 3 pages long. It shall be left to the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee as to what portion of the documents presented to the Committee or Subcommittee shall be published in the printed transcript of the hearings.

[c] Ten-minute duration.—Oral statements of witnesses shall be based upon their filed statements but shall be limited to 10 minutes duration. This period may be limited or extended at the discretion of the Chairman presiding at the hearings.

[d] Subpoena of witnesses.—Witnesses may be subpoenaed by the Chairman of the Committee or a Subcommittee with the agreement of the Ranking Member of the Committee or Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

[e] Counsel permitted.—Any witness subpoenaed by the Committee or Subcommittee

to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his or her own choosing who shall be permitted, while the witness is testifying, to advise him or her of his or her legal rights.

[f] Expenses of witnesses.—No witness shall be reimbursed for his or her appearance at a public or executive hearing before the Committee or Subcommittee unless such reimbursement is agreed to by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee.

[g] Limits of questions.—Questioning of a witness by members shall be limited to 5 minutes duration when 5 or more members are present and 10 minutes duration when less than 5 members are present, except that if a member is unable to finish his or her questioning in this period, he or she may be permitted further questions of the witness after all members have been given an opportunity to question the witness.

Additional opportunity to question a witness shall be limited to a duration of 5 minutes until all members have been given the opportunity of questioning the witness for a second time. This 5-minute period per member will be continued until all members have exhausted their questions of the witness.

RULE 5.—VOTING

[a] Vote to report a measure or matter.—No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. The vote of the Committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Committee who are present.

Any absent member may affirmatively request that his or her vote to report a matter be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the record vote on the measure or matter concerned is taken, any member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee, along with the record of the rollcall vote of the members present and voting, as an official record of the vote on the measure or matter.

[b] Vote on matters other than to report a measure or matter.—On Committee matters other than a vote to report a measure or matter, no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the Committee are actually present. On any such other matter, a member of the Committee may request that his or her vote may be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the vote on such other matter is taken, the member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies relating to such other matters shall be kept in the files of the Committee.

RULE 6.—QUORUM

No executive session of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be called to order unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, are actually present. Unless the Committee otherwise provides or is required by the Rules of the Senate, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing in of witnesses, and the taking of testimony.

RULE 7.—STAFF PRESENT ON DAIS

Only members and the Clerk of the Committee shall be permitted on the dais during

public or executive hearings, except that a member may have one staff person accompany him or her during such public or executive hearing on the dais. If a member desires a second staff person to accompany him or her on the dais he or she must make a request to the Chairman for that purpose.

RULE 8.—COINAGE LEGISLATION

At least 67 Senators must cosponsor any gold medal or commemorative coin bill or resolution before consideration by the Committee.

EXTRACTS FROM THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

RULE XXV, STANDING COMMITTEES

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * * * *

[d][1] Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Banks, banking, and financial institutions.
2. Control of prices of commodities, rents, and services.
3. Deposit insurance.
4. Economic stabilization and defense production.
5. Export and foreign trade promotion.
6. Export controls.
7. Federal monetary policy, including Federal Reserve System.
8. Financial aid to commerce and industry.
9. Issuance and redemption of notes.
10. Money and credit, including currency and coinage.
11. Nursing home construction.
12. Public and private housing [including veterans' housing].
13. Renegotiation of Government contracts.
14. Urban development and urban mass transit.

[2] Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to international economic policy as it affects United States monetary affairs, credit, and financial institutions; economic growth, urban affairs, and credit, and report thereon from time to time.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURES FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Procedures formally adopted by the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, February 4, 1981, establish a uniform questionnaire for all Presidential nominees whose confirmation hearings come before this Committee.

In addition, the procedures establish that:

[1] A confirmation hearing shall normally be held at least 5 days after receipt of the completed questionnaire by the Committee unless waived by a majority vote of the Committee.

[2] The Committee shall vote on the confirmation not less than 24 hours after the Committee has received transcripts of the hearing unless waived by unanimous consent.

[3] All nominees routinely shall testify under oath at their confirmation hearings.

This questionnaire shall be made a part of the public record except for financial information, which shall be kept confidential.

Nominees are requested to answer all questions, and to add additional pages where necessary.

DEFENDING THE JONES ACT

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the Jones Act, an important law for our Nation's maritime industry and for our national security. Senator MCCAIN has filed an amendment to repeal the Jones Act, and I urge its defeat.

In Louisiana, we know how important the maritime industry and Jones Act-related jobs are to our State and our economy. According to the American Maritime Partnership, Louisiana leads the Nation in maritime jobs by a number of measurements of the domestic maritime economy. For domestic maritime employment, Louisiana has more jobs than any other State—55,000 jobs out of close to 500,000 nationwide. Louisiana also leads the Nation in per capita maritime jobs, with 1 in 83 jobs being tied to our domestic maritime industries, nearly twice that of any other State. For total economic output from domestic maritime activity, Louisiana again leads the nation with more than \$11 billion per year.

Louisiana's 2,800 miles of navigable waterways handle more waterborne commerce than any other State. Tugboats based in Louisiana facilitate entry of cargo into the Mississippi River and then up the river and throughout the Nation on our inland waterways. This vast infrastructure and the maritime operators using it directly benefit the entire Nation. For example, 60 percent of export grain travels to the Gulf of Mexico through Louisiana. Also, one-fifth of our domestic energy is produced off the coast of Louisiana with support from the domestic fleet of offshore workboats.

The Jones Act helps ensure the strength and stability of our domestic maritime industry, and it will help ensure that it continues to flourish. These jobs and the economic benefits from them would be at risk if the Jones Act were repealed. I have no doubt that our industries can and will compete effectively against their counterparts around the world. However, they cannot compete fairly against the heavy subsidization that foreign governments give to their industries. Also, there cannot be fair competition when foreign vessels are not subjected to the same requirements for safety, fuel containers, labor standards, training, incidental vessel discharges, other environmental regulations, taxes, and more that our industries have to follow.

Also, the Jones Act is vital to the military as it protects our national security. In order to ensure our Navy remains the best equipped and most powerful Navy in the world, we must have a domestic skills base and shipbuilding capacity. Also, we need to have an adequate domestic fleet to ensure the fast and secure delivery of vital military cargoes around the world.

For our homeland security, the Jones Act helps keep our ports and water-

ways safer from attack. Imagine if our inland waterways and ports were fully open to foreign vessels. The Coast Guard and our other law enforcement agencies would have no real, effective way to know if vessels are safe as they travel through our river communities, if the crews are properly licensed for the vessel's operation, or if anyone or anything on the vessels pose a risk. The Jones Act helps our first responders and law enforcement better know any potential threats and allows them to be better prepared to act in an emergency.

In short, any legislation to repeal or lessen the protections of the Jones Act would threaten jobs, economic growth, military strength, and homeland security. I will continue working to support the U.S. maritime industry.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD GEORGE HITCHENS

• Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to honor Howard George Hitchens and highlight his service to the Slaughter Beach community and the State of Delaware.

Howard George Hitchens is a charter member of the Memorial Volunteer Fire Company of Slaughter Beach, DE, which he and several others established in 1954. Howard previously served as fire chief, assistant chief engineer, and director of the fire company. He also started its Santa Claus show for children, which still occurs each year during the holiday season. Howard has served the fire company for more than 60 years and is the only living charter member.

On February 14, 2015, the Memorial Volunteer Fire Company will honor Howard for his service. Howard is a true Delawarean and a model community leader. I would like to honor Howard and his more than six decades of service to his family, friends, community, and the State of Delaware. •

REMEMBERING JAMES ALLEN

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life and legacy of Rogers Police Chief James Allen, who passed away on Thursday after a long battle with cancer.

After more than three decades of public service, Chief Allen was well respected in the law enforcement community across Arkansas. He was a dedicated leader who devoted his life to law enforcement.

Chief Allen graduated from Arkansas State University with a degree in criminal justice. Following graduation he joined the Jacksonville Police Department and within a few short years was named the captain of the Pulaski County Sheriff's Office. Chief Allen was

the youngest police chief to serve on the Bentonville Police Force, a position which he held for 22 years. During his time at the helm of the Bentonville Police Department, Chief Allen graduated from the FBI National Academy. In 2011, he became the Rogers police chief.

I am greatly appreciative for Chief Allen's continued service over the years to Arkansas and Rogers, the community I call home. Chief Allen was a man of the law, and he was always looking for opportunities to improve the resources for his staff and the community by applying for grants. I was happy to help support his endeavors.

I pray for his family and friends during this trying time, and I hope they find comfort knowing that Chief Allen touched so many lives in the State. He will be missed but leaves a lasting legacy.●

TRIBUTE TO TOM GRADY

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Assemblyman Tom Grady, of Yerington, on his retirement. After serving 12 years in the Nevada Legislature, Assemblyman Grady is retiring from public service. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate him not only as a colleague but also as a friend on his retirement after more than 36 years of hard work and dedication to the Silver State.

A devoted husband and proud father of three, Assemblyman Grady stands as a shining example of someone who has dedicated his life to serving his community. Upon graduating from the University of Nevada, Reno, Assemblyman Grady went on to attend the Washington State Bankers School. After moving back to Nevada, he served as the secretary-treasurer of the Truckee Carson Irrigation District before advancing to vice president of Pioneer Citizens Bank of Nevada. After leaving the bank, Assemblyman Grady reentered public service after winning a seat on the Yerington City Council. After 3 years of service on the Yerington City Council, Assemblyman Grady was elected mayor, a position he held for 12 years.

Assemblyman Grady's experience as a local government leader qualified him for a seat in the Nevada Assembly, where he dutifully served his constituents for 12 years. During his time in the legislature, Assemblyman Grady served on the Taxation, Ways and Means, and Government Affairs Committee. Although I missed him by a few years in the assembly, I am proud to have served with Assemblyman Grady in Nevada State government as secretary of state.

His service to his community goes far beyond the many positions he has held in the Silver State over the years. Assemblyman Grady also served his coun-

try in the U.S. Army Reserve. I extend my deepest gratitude to him for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication to his family and community earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve America but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home.

I am grateful for his dedication and commitment to the people of Yerington. He personifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Assemblyman Grady on his retirement, and I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada an even better place. I offer my best wishes to Assemblyman Grady, his wife Patricia, and their three children and seven grandchildren for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:11 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 357. An act to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes.

H.R. 468. An act to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking.

H.R. 514. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 357. An act to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to expand the training for Federal Government personnel related to trafficking in persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 468. An act to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to increase knowledge concerning, and improve services for, runaway and homeless youth who are victims of trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 514. An act to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 272. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 42. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 256. A bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 257. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 258. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 259. A bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 260. A bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to recommend temporary duty suspensions and reductions to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 261. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 262. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISH):

S. 263. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 264. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 265. A bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 267. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar

Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 268. A bill to improve the infrastructure of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COATS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BURR, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 269. A bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 270. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of spouse for purposes of veterans benefits in recognition of new State definitions of spouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 271. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 272. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. Res. 42. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 33

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 38

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 38, a bill to ensure that long-term unemployed individuals are not taken into account for purposes of the employer health care coverage mandate.

S. 143

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes.

S. 144

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 144, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or making financial support conditioned upon a State, local educational agency, or school's adoption of specific instructional content, academic standards, or curriculum, or on the administration of assessments or tests, and for other purposes.

S. 155

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 155, a bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to

serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 201

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 201, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 234

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or

restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

S. 247

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, and for other purposes.

S. 255

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 255, a bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 35

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 35, a resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 15 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 92

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 92 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 156

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 156 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 256. A bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce bipartisan legislation with my colleague Senator PORTMAN that would expand the definition of "homeless" used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, to ensure all homeless children and families are considered eligible for existing Federal homeless assistance programs. This change in the definition would be in alignment with what is already currently used by the U.S. Department of Education.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, approximately 1.2 million children were homeless during the 2012–2013 school year, which accounts for a 6 percent increase from the 1,166,436 homeless students enrolled in the 2011–2012 school year.

In California, 259,656 children experienced homelessness last year. This increase is nearly four times the 65,000 homeless children that were reported in California in 2003.

Unfortunately, the numbers reported by the HUD "Point-in-Time Count" fail to accurately reflect the upward trend in homeless families.

According to the 2013 HUD "Point-in-Time Count," there were only 222,197 people counted as homeless in households that included children, a fraction of the number reported by the Department of Education.

This issue is important because only those children and their families counted by HUD are eligible for vital homeless assistance programs. The rest of these children and families are simply out of luck and are turned away by providers that do not want to be reprimanded for not following HUD regulations.

The Homeless Children and Youth Act of 2015 would expand the homeless definition to allow HUD funded homeless assistance programs to serve extremely vulnerable children and families, specifically those staying in self-paid motels or in doubled up situations because they have nowhere else to go.

These families are especially susceptible to physical and sexual abuse, trafficking, and neglect because they are often not served by a case manager, and thus remain hidden from potential social service providers.

As a result of the current narrow HUD definition, communities that receive federal funding through the discretionary grant process are unable to prioritize or direct resources to help these children and families.

This bill would provide communities with the flexibility to use federal funds to meet local priorities.

I would also like to note that this legislation comes at no additional cost to taxpayers and does not impose any new mandates on service providers.

Finally, this legislation improves data collection transparency by requiring HUD to report data on homeless individuals and families currently recorded under the existing Homeless Management Information System survey.

I am pleased that Senator ROB PORTMAN (R-OH) has joined me as an original cosponsor on this bill.

Homelessness continues to plague our Nation. If we fail to address the needs of these children and families today, they will remain invisible and stuck in a cycle of poverty and chronic homelessness.

It is our responsibility to ensure that we do not erect more barriers for these children and families to access services when they are experiencing extreme hardship. I believe this bill is a commonsense solution that will ensure that homeless families and children can receive the help they need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Homeless Children and Youth Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

- (1) in section 103—
 - (A) in subsection (a)—
 - (i) in paragraph (5)(A)—
 - (I) by striking “are sharing” and all that follows through “charitable organizations.”;
 - (II) by striking “14 days” each place that term appears and inserting “30 days”;
 - (III) in clause (i), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;
 - (IV) by striking clause (ii); and
 - (V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and
 - (ii) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:
 - “(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—
 - “(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or
 - “(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which shall include—
 - “(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or
 - “(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.”;

“(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—

“(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or

“(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which shall include—

“(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or

“(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘other Federal statute’ has the meaning given that term in section 401; and

“(2) the term ‘public housing agency’ means an agency described in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)).”;

(2) in section 401—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) by striking clause (iv); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi);

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking “Federal statute other than this subtitle” and inserting “other Federal statute”; and

(ii) by inserting “of” before “this Act”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term ‘other Federal statute’ includes—

“(A) the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

“(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(C) subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.);

“(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h));

“(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

“(F) the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

“(G) subtitle B of title VII of this Act.”;

(3) by inserting after section 408 the following:

“SEC. 409. AVAILABILITY OF HMIS REPORT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The information provided to the Secretary under section 402(f)(3) shall be made publicly available on the Internet website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in aggregate, non-personally identifying reports.

“(b) REQUIRED DATA.—Each report made publicly available under subsection (a) shall be updated on at least an annual basis and shall include—

“(1) a cumulative count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness;

“(2) a cumulative assessment of the patterns of assistance provided under subtitles B and C for the each geographic area involved; and

“(3) a count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness that are documented through the HMIS by each collaborative applicant.”;

(4) in section 422—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RESTRICTION.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not consider or prioritize the specific homeless populations intended to be served by the applicant if the applicant demonstrates that the project—

“(A) would meet the priorities identified in the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B); and

“(B) is cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives identified in that plan.”; and

(B) by striking subsection (j);

(5) in section 424(d), by striking paragraph (5);

(6) in section 427(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (viii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (iv)(VI), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (v);

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by adding “and” at the end;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by amending section 433 to read as follows:

“SEC. 433. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report, which shall—

“(1) summarize the activities carried out under this subtitle and set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the activities; and

“(2) include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

“(A) data required to be made publicly available in the report under section 409; and

“(B) data on programs funded under any other Federal statute, as such term is defined in section 401.

“(b) TIMING.—A report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 4 months after the end of each fiscal year.”.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 261. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to name the Federal courthouse serving the Western District of Oklahoma after the late Judge William J. Holloway.

This legislation has the support of the judges on the Western District, retired Judge Ralph Thompson who served on the bench in the Western District for from 1975 to 2007, and many in the legal community in the Western District of Oklahoma.

Judge Holloway was born in Hugo, OK, and his father was the eighth governor of the State of Oklahoma. He served in the U.S. Army during the height of World War II, received his law degree from Harvard University in 1950, and worked in private practice with a 2-year stint for the Department of Justice. President Lyndon Johnson nominated Judge Holloway to the 10th Circuit in August 1968, and the Senate confirmed him on September 13, 1968, where he served as chief judge from 1984 to 1991. Judge Holloway assumed senior status in May 1992 and passed away April 25, 2014, in Oklahoma City.

Judge Holloway was the longest serving judge on the 10th Circuit, and during his service, he authored over 900

opinions. He was well regarded by all who worked with him, appeared before him, and knew him. I have not found a person knowledgeable of Judge Holloway or his service who could not unequivocally tell you that Judge Holloway adhered to precedent when deciding cases. He did not proclaim any type of philosophy. As new 10th Circuit Judge Robert Bacharach described Judge Holloway, "He simply decided cases by asking 'What does the statute say? What does the Constitution say? What are the facts of this case?'" We know that is a high standard, and a standard lost sometimes in our judiciary.

When he passed away last year, 10th Circuit Judge Jerome Holmes said of Judge Holloway, "The nation has lost a thoughtful, dedicated, and compassionate jurist, and, as a former law clerk of Judge Holloway, I have lost a mentor, dear friend, and colleague. I know that Judge Holloway was very honored to serve his nation as a judge on the Tenth Circuit, and he served with great distinction."

On behalf of Judge Holloway and his family, I introduce this bill in his honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 261

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WILLIAM J. HOLLOWAY, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the "William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse".

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA,

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, August 14, 2014.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: We are writing to respectfully request that the United States Courthouse in Oklahoma City be named the "William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse." Judge Holloway died on April 25, 2014, at the age of 90. At that time, he was the longest serving judge in the history of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, having served for over 45 years. During his remarkable tenure on the court, Judge Holloway authored over 900 opinions and participated in the decision of thousands more.

Judge Holloway was a kind, compassionate man who quietly and diligently spent his lifetime working for justice. He did so without fanfare, seeking only to fulfill the great

responsibility given to him. Though Judge Holloway is deceased, we can think of no more noble name for our courthouse than the "William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse." He embodied every trait that all federal judges should strive to achieve.

This request is made by every federal judge in Oklahoma City. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you have any questions about our request.

Yours very truly,

Jerome A. Holmes, U.S. Circuit Judge;
Vicki Miles-LaGrange, Chief U.S. District Judge; Robert E. Bacharach, U.S. Circuit Judge; Robin J. Cauthron, U.S. District Judge; Stephen P. Friot, U.S. District Judge; Timothy D. DeGiusti, U.S. District Judge; David L. Russell, Senior U.S. District Judge; Gary M. Purcell, Chief U.S. Magistrate Judge; Suzanne Mitchell, U.S. Magistrate Judge; Sarah Hall, Chief U.S. Bankruptcy Judge; Joe Heaton, U.S. District Judge; Lee R. West, Senior U.S. District Judge; Tim Leonard, Senior U.S. District Judge; Shon T. Erwin, U.S. Magistrate Judge; Charles B. Goodwin, U.S. Magistrate Judge; Niles L. Jackson, U.S. Bankruptcy Judge.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 262. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud today to introduce the Leahy-Collins Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. It is deplorable that in the wealthiest country in the world, 1.6 million teenagers live on the streets because they have no home. We know that those who do not have a safe place to sleep at night are particularly vulnerable to being exploited and trafficked. A recent study found that nearly one in four homeless young people have been victims of trafficking or sexual exploitation. We often talk about human trafficking as an international problem, but the sad truth is that it is a major problem right here at home. It is time we provide the resources to help protect our children from this very real threat.

The Runaway Youth Act, first signed into law in 1974, has proven essential to providing the basic services and resources that runaway and homeless youth need, and our continued support is vital. Thirty-nine percent of the homeless population is under the age of 18, and the average age at which a teen becomes homeless is 14.7 years old. Think about that. The average teen living on the streets is not even old enough to drive. These young people represent our country's future and its optimism, and as a father and a grandfather, I believe that we must do more to address the needs of the 1.6 million homeless youth in our country.

Teens run away and become homeless for myriad reasons. A U.S. Department of Health and Human Services study found that 46 percent of homeless youth had run away because of phys-

ical abuse and 17 percent because of sexual abuse. Nearly 40 percent of homeless youth identify as LGBT and report leaving home because of a lack of acceptance. By including a new provision that prohibits grantees from denying services based on the sexual orientation or gender identity of the homeless youth, this bill takes important new steps to make sure that we are meeting the needs of this growing and particularly vulnerable population. No young person should be turned away from these essential services.

We have made great strides in recent years in our efforts to combat human trafficking. Most recently, we reauthorized the comprehensive Trafficking Victims Protection Act, a bipartisan bill I introduced and was proud to see enacted as part of the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. And last year, we saw historic levels of funding for victims of trafficking, an urgently needed increase that I was proud to support as the most senior member of the Appropriations Committee. But we must not forget the importance of investing in prevention efforts as well, and I was disappointed that Congress failed to pass the bipartisan Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. If we are to make a real difference to end modern day slavery, we must protect those who are most vulnerable and prevent the exploitation in the first place. We cannot simply focus on ending demand and arrest our way out of this problem; we must eliminate the conditions that make these children so vulnerable. That means investing in stable housing and support services for more kids in need; we are not doing enough. I hope that we can finally enact this meaningful bill in 2015.

In addition to the dangers of human trafficking, homeless youth are at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. They are less likely to finish school, more likely to enter our juvenile justice system, and are often ill-equipped to find a job. The services authorized by this bill are designed to intervene early and encourage the development of successful, productive young adults.

I have heard from dozens of service providers from across the country, including in my home state of Vermont, that these programs work. I am proud to say that last year, 95 percent of youth receiving services from the Vermont Coalition for Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs were able to exit to a safe living situation upon their completion of programming. Without the programs funded through the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, hundreds of thousands of children would be left on the street and vulnerable to exploitation. Congress has an opportunity to respond in a meaningful and historic way.

I thank Senators COLLINS, BOOKER, and AYOTTE for working with me on

this legislation and for joining me as original cosponsors. We have the chance to make a real difference by passing the Runway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. Every day we wait is another night too many children are sleeping on the streets.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 271. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of our Nation's veterans to once again discuss the unjust and outdated policy of failing to give our veterans the full military retirement and veterans disability compensation benefits that they have earned in their service to the Nation. Full payment of retirement and disability benefits, together known as "concurrent receipt," is an issue that I have strongly advocated for more than a decade.

In the past, veterans were prevented from receiving the full pay and benefits they earned in dedicated service to our country. The law required that military retirement pay be reduced dollar-for-dollar by the amount of any disability compensation a veteran received. I am pleased to say that many Senators have joined me in fighting this policy, and we have made some progress on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

In 2003, Congress passed legislation that allowed disabled retired veterans with at least a 50 percent disability rating to become eligible for full concurrent receipt benefits by 2013. In 2004, the 10-year phase-in period was eliminated for veterans with 100 percent service-related disability. With the phase-in period now complete, I am deeply gratified that all those veterans with over 50 percent disability ratings are now receiving the full benefits they earned from their service. These are significant victories that put hundreds of thousands of veterans on track to receive both their retirement and disability benefits. However, many more of our veterans remain unjustly impacted by the denial of concurrent receipt.

For me, this is a simple matter of fairness. There is no reason to deny a veteran who has served their country honorably the right to the full value of their retirement pay simply because their service also resulted in a disability that affects them each and every day for the rest of their lives.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what the current law does. This legislation will bring that indefensible practice to an end.

This is not a partisan issue. Our Nation has been at war for over a decade, through both Republican and Democratic administrations, and our service members have performed with unmatched valor around the world. Our utmost duty as lawmakers should be to ensure that the brave men and women who served in the United States Armed Forces receive the benefits they have earned.

So once again, I rise on behalf of our Nation's veterans. Today, I introduce legislation that will eliminate all limitations to concurrent receipt. We must take action now to support our veterans who have never faltered in their unwavering service to this grateful Nation. This is the right thing to do.

I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 271

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF CONCURRENT RECEIPT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT.—

(1) REPEAL OF 50 PERCENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(2) COMPUTATION.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans' disability compensation for a disability rated as 40 percent or less or has a service-connected disability rated as zero percent, \$0."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation"

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2016, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—

(1) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2(a), is amended—

(A) by striking "a member or" and all that follows through "retiree)" and inserting "a qualified retiree"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—For purposes of this section, a qualified retiree, with respect to any month, is a member or former member of the uniformed services who—

"(A) is entitled to retired pay (other than by reason of section 1273b of this title); and

"(B) is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation."

(2) DISABILITY RETIREES.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2016, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 42—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SHELBY submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 42

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable

basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,119,153, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$8,370 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$503 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,347,119, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$14,348 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$861 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,227,966, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$5,978 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$358 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Inves-

tigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 243. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 73 proposed by Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 244. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 245. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

SA 246. Mr. DAINES proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 243. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 73 proposed by Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) to the amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. —. PROHIBITION ON LISTING THE NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall not list the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 244. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr.

BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. PROHIBITION ON LISTING THE NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall not list the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SA 245. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. NO EFFECT ON INDIAN TREATIES.

Nothing in this Act may change, suspend, supersede, or abrogate any trust obligation or treaty requirement of the United States with respect to any Indian nation without consultation with the applicable Indian nation, as required under Executive Order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

SA 246. Mr. DAINES proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REAUTHORIZATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in improving wildlife habitat and increasing outdoor recreation opportunities on Federal and State land; and

(2) reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority for Congress and should include improvements to the structure of the program to more effectively manage existing Federal land.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Perspectives on the Strategic Necessity of Iran Sanctions."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "President Obama's 2015 Trade Policy Agenda."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Fixing No Child Left Behind: Supporting Teachers and School Leaders."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 27, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mary Future

and Carter Burwell, detailees from the Department of Justice, be given the privileges of the floor during the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 272

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand that S. 272, introduced earlier today by Senator SHAHEEN, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 272) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I now ask for its second reading, and I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the Senate then be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS

Ms. CANTWELL. If I could, I want to say to our colleagues who may have been following this process that we encourage people who haven't spoken or who plan on speaking to come down to the floor and do so.

I appreciate the Senator from Alaska working with us on this amendment process today.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it has been a long day and we are at the end, but as Members can see, we have a path forward tomorrow, and I think that is good.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

RICHARD T. JULIUS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 14, 2019, VICE RAYMOND T. WAGNER, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ALBERT STANLEY MEIBURG, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE ROBERT PERCIASEPE, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STUART F. DELERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE DEREK ANTHONY WEST, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to recognize the 100th anniversary of Kiwanis International. Annually, Kiwanis clubs in 80 countries raise more than \$100 million and dedicate more than 18 million volunteer hours to strengthen communities and serve children.

Meeting the needs of children has always been one of Kiwanis members' foremost priorities. Under their new motto, "Serving the Children of the World," Kiwanis members have helped to establish programs that ensure the health and education of young children. In Central Florida, Kiwanis members generously give their time and resources to provide scholarships and community-building opportunities for local students, as well as care for the underprivileged.

Kiwanis members' commitment to serving their neighbors and the self-sacrifice that entails represents what is good and noble in our nation. There are children and others whose lives have been permanently impacted for good by the work of Kiwanis members.

I am truly grateful for the Kiwanis Club members of Central Florida. Our community is stronger, and the future of our youth is brighter because of their service.

COMBATTING HUMAN TRAFFICKING IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is considering 12 bills designed to fight the growing problem of human trafficking in the United States. These bipartisan bills will provide support and services to the victims of trafficking crimes and boost resources for law enforcement.

According to the FBI, sex trafficking is the fastest-growing business of organized crime and the third-largest criminal enterprise in the world. More than 300,000 American children are at risk of becoming victims of sex trafficking annually in what is estimated to be a \$9.8 billion industry.

Human trafficking is modern day slavery that preys on vulnerable individuals, and this epidemic is not isolated to far-off places. It is happening every day in the places we call home.

As we take steps at the federal level to end this despicable and horrifying practice, there

are many organizations dedicated to helping victims and preventing even more people from being mistreated.

Earlier this month in Rowan County, North Carolina, nearly 200 supporters gathered to hear testimonies from human trafficking survivors as well as discuss ways to increase awareness and assist victims in the local community at the Triad Ladder of Hope's First Annual Human Trafficking Awareness Gala.

And today I'm wearing a bracelet made from recycled soda tabs that was designed by Monarch, a Christian ministry that creates accessories as a unique way to engage in the fight against human trafficking.

As the charm on this bracelet reminds us, there is hope that lives discarded can be reclaimed.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the National Federation of the Blind.

For 75 years NFB has served as the voice of the blind in Washington and through their affiliate organizations in every state across the country. I congratulate them on this milestone of service, their advocacy efforts on behalf of blind Americans, and their continued work to make our communities more just, equal, and safe for blind individuals.

As the largest organization of blind and low-vision people in the country, NFB works day in and day out to change what it means to be blind and to help realize the complete integration of blind individuals into society.

On this 75th anniversary, I join in celebrating the National Federation of the Blind's long-list of achievements and look forward to their continued success representing the million-plus blind individuals in the United States.

IN HONOR OF SPECIALIST JOSHUA FERNANDEZ

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the House of Representatives to the remarkable performance of one of my constituents, Specialist Joshua Fernandez, proudly serving in the California National Guard. A native of Soledad, California, Specialist Fernandez was selected as the 2015

California National Guard Soldier of the Year. This title is only bestowed to those soldiers who emerge victorious from the Guard's Best Warrior Competition; a grueling, four-day contest that includes a 6-mile road march, a chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear knowledge report, and a series of physical fitness and rifle and pistol competitions.

SPC Joshua Fernandez serves as a Team Leader with Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry Regiment. He served three years active duty service at Fort Stewart, Georgia with the 3rd Infantry Division prior to enlisting in the California Army National Guard. He has served in one combat deployment during Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan attached to a Special Operations Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Specialist Joshua Fernandez for his steadfast commitment to service to our great Nation on behalf of the House of Representatives. He is a shining example of the dedication and sacrifices made by the men and women who serve in United States Armed Forces.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,086,335,602,055.12. We've added \$7,459,458,553,142.04 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MR. CUB, ERNIE BANKS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life and accomplishments of Ernie Banks—known by Chicagoans as "Mr. Cub."

Chicago lost a true hero and friend when Ernie Banks passed away on Friday, January 23. His baseball accomplishments are legendary. During his playing days, cheers would always erupt at Wrigley Field when Banks would make a clutch hit or a spectacular diving catch. His greatness was well acknowledged: Banks was voted into the National

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Baseball Hall of Fame in 1977—the very first year he was eligible.

While Banks excelled on the field, he also blazed a trail off of it. As the first African-American player for the Chicago Cubs, he was a pioneer in our community and across the country. Banks treated people well, got along with most everyone and stood for justice even as he faced discrimination. During road trips, hotels and restaurants open to his white teammates were often closed to him and other African-Americans. I am happy to see how far we have come as a country throughout the course of his career and his lifetime.

Banks founded the Ernie Banks Live Above and Beyond Foundation, which helps promote social welfare and assist youth and seniors who may need assistance. I know he was very proud of the young players on Chicago's own Jackie Robinson West team who won the Little League championship last year.

According to Fox Chicago, Jackie Robinson West player Lawrence Noble said, 'I met [Ernie Banks] during the summer and he was such an inspirational person to me, it was just very sad hearing that he passed away.'

It's clear that the next generation appreciates the impact of Mr. Cub. We can honor the legacy of Mr. Cub by doing our own part to break down barriers and build a better community. We will miss you, Ernie.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET AUTONOMY ACT OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, District of Columbia residents raise billions of dollars annually for their local budget, and, like Americans everywhere, claim the right to control the funds they themselves raise to support their city as fundamental to their American citizenship. Therefore, today I introduce the District of Columbia Budget Autonomy Act of 2015, the second bill I introduce this Congress, to allow the District's local-taxpayer-raised budget to take effect immediately when passed by the city, without being subject to congressional approval.

Control over the dollars raised by local taxpayers is central to local control, the oldest American government principle. Beyond this core principle, permitting the city's local budget to become law without a redundant congressional approval would have multiple practical benefits for both the city and Congress. For the city, a timely budget means eliminating the uncertainty of the congressional approval process, which has a significant negative effect on the city's bond rating, adding unnecessary interest costs for local taxpayers; improving the District's ability to make accurate revenue forecasts; and reducing the countless operational problems that result when the city's budget cannot be implemented until Congress approves it (even when it is not delayed, which rarely occurs). Also of major importance, the bill would permit the District to use the typical state and local government fis-

cal year (July 1–June 30), which is used to provide ample time to prepare for the opening of schools in September, instead of the current federal fiscal year (October 1–September 30), used for the convenience of Members of Congress, not the needs of the city. Moreover, the D.C. local budget consumes valuable subcommittee, committee, and floor time in both houses of Congress, the most inefficient and redundant annual process in the Congress. Yet the D.C. budget is of interest only to those members who use it to promote their own issues, violating a principle of local self-government that they value for their own districts and states.

Increasing recognition of the hardships and delays caused by the congressional approval process has led Congress to begin freeing the city from many congressional constraints. We made significant progress in the last Congress on a major element of budget autonomy. There is unprecedented bipartisan and bicameral support for preventing D.C. shutdowns, which have been constantly threatened as the Congress now almost always fails to pass appropriations bills. Under the fiscal year 2014 D.C. Appropriations bill, D.C. was, for the first time ever, exempt from shutdowns for an entire fiscal year—2015. The fiscal year 2015 D.C. Appropriations bill also exempts D.C. from shutdowns for all of fiscal year 2016. In addition, the president's budgets last Congress and the Senate's D.C. appropriations bills would have granted D.C. budget autonomy. This progress from both Congress and the Executive invites the inevitable next step—a permanent shutdown exemption bill.

The importance of eliminating shutdown threats to the District was definitively shown recently. The three leading bond rating agencies favorably cited the fiscal year 2014 D.C. Appropriations bill provision exempting D.C. from a shutdown in fiscal year 2015. In upgrading their ratings on the District's outstanding general obligation bonds, Standard & Poor's Rating Services and Fitch Ratings both favorably cited the provision, and Moody's Investors Service favorably cited the provision while maintaining D.C.'s rating.

Several years ago, we negotiated an agreement with a Republican-led appropriations committee that ensures that the city's local budget is approved in the first continuing resolution (CR) if the D.C. Appropriations bill has not been approved by the start of the fiscal year, another important step that responded to practical realities. This approach ended the annual nightmares of lengthy delays of approval of the local budget of a big city until a national appropriations bill was passed, often months after the start of the fiscal year. As a result, under CRs, the city has been able to spend its local funds at the next year's funding level, even though federal agencies must spend at the prior year's funding level. We are deeply appreciative that this process, which eliminated serious problems for the functioning of the D.C. government, has continued.

We nearly secured budget autonomy for the District in the last days of the lame-duck session in the 111th Congress, when Democrats were in control. We got the House authorizers to include budget autonomy in the fiscal year 2011 D.C. Appropriations bill, which was passed by the subcommittee. Unfortunately,

the Democratic Senate did not include budget autonomy in its appropriations bill, and Congress passed a CR instead of regular appropriations bills in the lame duck.

Most important, we gained critical support for D.C. budget autonomy in the 112th and 113th Congresses. In an Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing in May 2011, Chairman DARRELL ISSA (R-CA) endorsed budget autonomy. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) and Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell (R) during that year both indicated their support for budget autonomy. Last Congress, Majority Leader Cantor and Chairman ISSA both continued in their support for budget autonomy. The President's fiscal year 2015 budget, for the second time, will have granted D.C. budget autonomy. The Senate's fiscal year 2015 D.C. Appropriations bill granted the District budget autonomy, which was the first ever appropriations bill to grant it. We also got budget autonomy introduced as a stand-alone bill in the Senate.

We kept the budget autonomy referendum from being overturned in Congress. However, a federal district court struck it down and an appeal is pending before a federal appeals court.

Even if the District of Columbia Budget Autonomy Act of 2015 were enacted, Congress would still retain jurisdiction over the District of Columbia under article I, section 8, clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution until statehood is achieved. This authority allows Congress to make changes to the District's budget at any time, as we saw last week when the House voted to permanently ban the District from spending its local funds on abortion services for low-income women. Therefore, it is unnecessary to require the District to incur the costs and delays of transmitting its local budget for congressional approval. The time is overdue to permit the city to enact its local budget, the single most immediate step Congress could take to help the District better manage itself.

Members of Congress were sent to Washington to do the business of the nation, not a local jurisdiction. Members have no reason to be interested in or to become knowledgeable about the local budget of a single city or jurisdiction far from their own. In the past, the House and Senate have more often than not passed the District's budget as is. Our budget autonomy bill takes the Congress in the direction it is already moving.

INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAID PARENTAL LEAVE ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in his State of Union President Obama spoke about restoring the link between hard work and growing opportunity for every American. That link is at the very core of what made America great. And he spoke about the need to ensure that working families have a fair shot and a level playing field.

One of the places that the United States continues to lag behind the entire rest of the

world is in providing paid parental leave. The U.S. is the only industrialized nation with no paid parental leave. It is only us and Papua New Guinea in the whole world that have no statutory maternity leave. This is embarrassing and it hurts hardworking American families.

It is way past time to drag at least our federal workplace policies into the 21st century. That is why I am introducing the Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act to provide six weeks of paid parental leave to federal employees for the birth, adoption, or foster placement of a child.

The federal government is our nation's largest employer and it should be setting an example—and leading the march into the modern era. Paid parental leave would be a big boost for the almost two million people who work for the federal government. And this won't just affect our nation's capital—86 percent of federal workers live and work outside the metro Washington, DC area. In fact, the metro region of my home city of New York City has the second highest number of federal employees of any region in the country.

For these working families in New York and elsewhere around the country, paid leave is an economic lifeline. The growing costs of caring for a new child—the expensive diapers, bottles, baby carriers—they all add up very quickly. The U.S. Department of Agriculture found that in the first two years a new child can cost families an average of nearly \$13,000. Who can forego weeks of pay on top of those new expenses. It is both crippling and cruel to ask families to choose between a paycheck and caring for a new child when costs continue to mount.

Providing paid leave helps pay for itself with the broad benefits it produces. It gives parents the time to bond with their child in those critical first weeks of life and research shows the critical nature of the first few months of life on the health and intellectual development over the lifetime of the child.

To those who would push back on this legislation, I refer you to the Congressional Budget Office findings that this legislation is budget neutral. It costs nothing—but it means everything. It requires no new money but would immeasurably enrich the lives of federal employees by allowing them to maintain their salary during the course of FMLA-permitted parental leave.

I urge my Republican colleagues to support the bill. It passed the House twice before—with great bipartisan support. Now is the moment to bring this legislation forward and in so doing, bring America forward.

WINTER STORM JUNO

HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the state and local leaders and emergency responders in Rhode Island who, as I speak, are working tirelessly to manage the impact of Winter Storm Juno that struck Rhode Island last night.

This storm is still hitting Rhode Island with heavy snow, high winds and coastal flooding.

As a former Mayor, I understand the devastating impact this type of snowfall can have on individuals and families, and the painstaking efforts it will take to restore services to Rhode Island's communities.

Yesterday our entire delegation sent a letter to President Obama, Senator JACK REED, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN, and I, urging the President to make federal assistance available to Rhode Island to support emergency operations and recovery due to the blizzard conditions.

I stand ready to assist my home state in any way I can, and applaud the tremendous efforts of our Governor Gina Raimondo, Mayor Jorge Elorza and all the dedicated local leaders and emergency responders who are working around the clock to ensure Rhode Island makes a speedy recovery.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I voted against the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill for the remainder of Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (H.R. 240), due to House Republicans' irresponsible attempt to hijack this must-pass legislation.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is at the forefront of protecting our nation from terrorist threats. The women and men on the frontline of securing America's borders deserve a clean appropriations bill that provides them with the funding and resources they need to keep our families, communities, and our nation safe. Instead of bringing a bipartisan bill to the Floor, House Republicans opted to pick a political fight with the President, jeopardizing our country's security needs.

Republicans voted to add five poison pill amendments targeting the President's executive actions on immigration to this critical funding bill. One of the most offensive and dangerous of these amendments is the DeSantis/Roby amendment. The National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women strongly opposes this and other amendments, which they describe as "overly broad, sweep large numbers of victims into their scope and ignore the best interests of victims and their children." In addition, the Task Force urges Congress "to prioritize the needs of immigrant victims of domestic and sexual violence, and reject these amendments."

Other amendments proposed by House Republicans would further derail the Administration's progress on immigration reform. The Aderholt amendment would block the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) program and expansions to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. In addition, the amendment would block measures to strengthen border security, facilitate legal immigration, promote citizenship and immigrant integration, and spur innovation and entrepreneurship. The Blackburn amendment

would terminate the existing DACA program and prevent hundreds of thousands of young people (DREAMers) who already have come forward, passed background checks, obtained protection, and followed the rules from renewing DACA. The Salmon amendment is based on the false premise that the president's recent executive actions create an incentive under the Affordable Care Act for employers to hire deferred action recipients. Finally, the Schock amendment also is premised on the false notion that deferred action applications unfairly delay the adjudication of all applications.

Jeopardizing this must-pass legislation, critical to our national security, is unacceptable. I urge my Republican colleagues to bring a clean bill for the remainder of FY2015 for DHS, without further delay and without the distraction of partisan politics.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp.

It is fitting today to remember those who experienced the depth of human cruelty in that camp and all other Nazi concentration camps.

It is estimated that over one million prisoners perished at the Auschwitz concentration camp over the five years that it was operational.

I grieve for those lost souls, but I give thanks for the 7,500 prisoners who were liberated 70 years ago today.

The stories of those survivors ensure that we remain vigilant and dedicated to combating hatred and oppression in all its forms.

For that reason, I would also like to bring attention to the ongoing massacres and human rights violations being carried out by the militant terrorist organization Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Just like the actions of the Nazis during World War II, the actions of Boko Haram today are an affront to human life and dignity.

From their first violent uprising in 2009, to the massacre in Baga less than one month ago, Boko Haram has been waging a war that has cost an estimated 10,000 lives, and displaced more than one million people.

I thank Secretary Kerry for his active role in supporting the Nigerians in their efforts to combat Boko Haram.

I also thank the United States military, for providing the Nigerian military with trainers and specialists to aid them.

But there needs to be more.

These atrocities must not be permitted to continue, and we must do everything within our power to stop the kidnapping and killing of innocent men, women, and children across Nigeria.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF
DELANO'S CENTENNIAL

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Delano, California in honor of its centennial.

After its founding by the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1873, Delano was incorporated on April 13, 1915. It is an extremely culturally diverse community, with residents who have ties to Mexico, Spain, China, France, Japan, Yugoslavia, the Philippines, Russia, and India.

Delano is also an area with rich history. During World War II, a prisoner of war camp was located in Delano. Additionally, a squadron of Northrop P-61 Black Widow planes that protected the Pacific coast from invasion during the war was based there. Delano played an important role in ensuring the safety of the homeland throughout this conflict.

Located in the Central Valley, Delano plays a substantial role in our nation's agricultural industry. The local farmers in Delano are known for the grapes, oranges, almonds, pistachios, and cotton they farm. Without the hard work of Delano's farmers, the economy of the Central Valley and the food reserves in the United States would be dramatically compromised.

In honor of Delano's centennial, the city will be hosting a 100th Year Gala Celebration on January 31, 2015. The celebration will provide the people of Delano with the opportunity to look back on their city's past with pride and look forward to its bright future with excitement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the City of Delano on their centennial and honoring the city for its immense contributions to our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 41, I was present on the House Floor and attempted to vote "YES" via my electronic voting card. However, it has been brought to my attention that my vote was not recorded.

Had I been present, I would have voted YES.

HONORING MS. ABHA PANDYA

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Abha Pandya, who is retiring at the end of this month from the position of Chief Executive Officer of Asian Human Services, Inc. (AHS) after 20 years in leadership at

the organization. AHS is Chicago's largest social service agency serving the needs of the pan-Asian and other immigrant and underserved communities residing in metropolitan Chicago. Ms. Pandya joined AHS in June 1994 as the Executive Director, and in 2004 she became the Chief Executive Officer. In 1994, AHS had a staff of six employees and a budget of \$294,000. Under Ms. Pandya's leadership, AHS has grown nearly 40 fold—having a budget of approximately \$15 million in fiscal year 2015, and a staff of 115 full-time employees.

Ms. Pandya is a truly remarkable leader. She always completed what she set out to do, including big projects that are important to the community, such as opening several Federally Qualified Health Care Clinics, providing dental services to the community, and opening education and job training centers. I attended many wonderful ribbon cuttings of AHS projects under Ms. Pandya's leadership.

AHS is a multilingual, functionally diverse, not-for-profit social service agency that provides direct services to over 27,000 clients a year. Its excellent staff speaks 24 languages and includes people of different ages, genders, ethnicities and races.

Under Ms. Pandya's leadership, AHS opened Illinois' first federally-funded primary care and dental clinic to provide linguistically and culturally appropriate clinical services to Asian immigrants and others; a comprehensive mental health program, the only state-funded program for the Asian community in Illinois; a large community health education and prevention program; an extensive family literacy program; and a job training and placement program. In 2011, AHS received \$2.8 million in capital funds from the state and federal governments to start an expanded primary care and dental clinic, and the new clinic became fully operational on September 3, 2013. In 2014 AHS received federal funding to establish an additional primary care clinic in my district, in Skokie, Illinois.

AHS will be naming one of their clinics the "Abha Pandya's Family Health Center" to honor her contributions. It is an extremely well-deserved honor.

Ms. Pandya has advocated extensively at the federal, state and city levels on behalf of Asian and other immigrant and refugee communities in Chicago for a more equitable distribution of resources, greater access, and linguistically appropriate services. She has served on the Governor's Multicultural Services Committee, and on the Board of Directors of the Chicago Council on Urban Affairs, the Coalition of Limited English Speaking Elderly, the metropolitan Board of the United Way of Chicago and the Chicago Council of the United Way.

Ms. Pandya received a B.A. with honors from Elphinstone College, University of Bombay, and a master's degree with distinction from the University of Delhi, and an M.S. in journalism from Boston University. She will be spending time with her family, including her grandchildren, in California. I thank Ms. Pandya for her leadership and service. I will miss working with her in her leadership role at AHS, but I know she will continue to look for ways to serve our community.

HONORING THE EXTRAORDINARY
LIFE OF WILLIAM 'BILL' MAYS

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a beloved member of the Indianapolis community, Bill Mays. Sadly he unexpectedly passed away on December 4, 2014, his 69th birthday. Bill was a businessman, a family man, a leader of the community, and a philanthropist. He built an economic dream in his business and used his fortune to help others. His dedication to the Hoosier community will forever be remembered.

A lifelong Hoosier, Bill was born in Evansville on December 4, 1945. He graduated as the number one male academically from Evansville Central High School, where he was also a member of the football team. He later received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Chemistry and a Master of Business Administration from Indiana University in Bloomington. He later went on to receive four Honorary Doctorates from universities and colleges in Indiana.

In 1980, Bill launched Mays Chemical Company, Inc. and grew it into one of the largest chemical distribution companies in North America. During the first year of business he doubled his \$1 million sales objective. From there his business grew exponentially and it is now ranked the 20th largest chemical distributor in the United States. He was regarded as one of the most successful businessmen in Indiana, not just because of Mays Chemical, but also because of other ventures he undertook. In addition to starting Mays Chemical, he also owned The Indianapolis Recorder. In 1990 Mays purchased The Recorder, saving the newspaper. His niece, and a dear friend of mine, Carolene Mays, became general manager of The Recorder in 1998. Under Bill and Carolene's leadership The Recorder grew in readership, prominence, and credibility. The Recorder is still in circulation today. Mays also was the former majority owner of the Hoosier Radio and Television Properties, which include WAV-TV53, HOT 96.3 FM, WGGR 106.7 FM and WIRE.

His business savvy was impressive, but his dedication to the community set him apart. He served on a wide variety of for-profit and non-profit boards and held many chairmanships. His list of community service honors and awards is lengthy. Just to name a few, he received the National Society of Black Engineers Golden Torch Award (2003), Indiana University's Herman B. Wells Visionaries Award (2000); Wheeler Boys & Girls Club Man and Youth Award (1998); Madame C.J. Walker Lifetime Achievement Award (1998); was inducted into the Junior Achievement Central Indiana Business Hall of Fame (1998); and had the honor of carrying the Olympic flame during its trip through Indianapolis in 1996.

Mays is survived by his wife, Dr. Rose Mays, retired Associate Dean of Community Affairs at Indiana University's School of Nursing, daughters Kristin Mays-Corbitt, President of Mays Chemical, and Heather Mays-Woods, an educator. Bill was a mentor and a leader

of the business community, but most importantly he was a husband and father. On many occasions Mays had said that his true passion was his family. Please join me in thanking Bill's family and friends for sharing such a wonderful man with the Hoosier community.

TRIBUTE TO ELISE JONES MARTIN

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful woman and South Carolinian who is turning 100 years old on February 7th. Elise Jones Martin has been a stalwart of her community in Columbia, South Carolina for decades, and is very deserving of this recognition she is receiving from people all across the State of South Carolina.

Ms. Martin was born in Hartsville, South Carolina and arrived in Columbia in the 1930s following cosmetology training in New Jersey. She later attended South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, SC where she received her teaching certification. She taught for many years at Booker T. Washington High School and was very active in her trade's professional organizations.

Ms. Martin became the first African American woman to own a business on Main Street in Columbia when she opened a wig shop called Accent Elise. She became a dedicated and trustworthy member of the community. She worked with the Columbia Housing Authority on its Hope VI program and served as a poll worker for over three decades. In 2008 she served as the poll manager to her polling location at the youthful age of 94. She has also served as a member of the Columbia Zoning board and a member of the America Beautiful Committee of the Midlands.

She believes that citizens must take part in the change they seek and has been a tireless worker through the City of Columbia. Ms. Martin has been extremely dedicated to Bethel A.M.E. Church, where she's been a member for more than 70 years and has held many leadership positions. Her deep and lasting commitment to her church and her community have made her a valuable asset. She has always been very approachable. Her wisdom, friendship and compassion are often sought and highly valued by her family and fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in congratulating Ms. Elise Jones Martin on this tremendous milestone. It is very fitting that her valuable contributions and this celebration of 100 years of life are being recognized by her family and friends for all she has done to give back to those with whom she has shared a century of blessed experiences.

EXTRAORDINARY ACT OF VALOR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Deputy John McCord of the Fort Bend County Precinct 3 Constable's Office for being selected by the Houston 100 Club for the Officer of the Year Award. This award recognizes his extraordinary act of valor to protect the lives of residents of Fort Bend County.

On June 27, 2014, Deputy McCord responded to a call reporting a child drowning in the Weston Lakes subdivision in Fulshear, Texas. Deputy McCord rescued the unconscious boy from the bottom of the lake and performed lifesaving CPR before a medical helicopter arrived to bring the child to the hospital. Thanks to officers like Deputy McCord, residents of Fort Bend County can rest assured that our police officers are dedicated to serving our community and keeping us safe.

I thank Deputy John McCord for his courage and readiness to act in the line of duty. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional of Texas, thank you and congratulations again to John for being selected to receive the Houston 100 Club's Officer of the Year Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit my vote preference for Speaker of the House. I was unavoidably detained at the time of voting. However, had I been present in person, I would have cast my vote in support of Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI for Speaker of the House.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGETTE BROWN

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Georgette Brown, a dedicated public servant and a very good friend of mine who passed away earlier this month. For 25 years, Georgette served the people of Josephine County, Oregon, as the longest serving County Clerk in county history. Along the way, she implemented local vote-by-mail and published the first local voters' pamphlet. Today, I honor her commitment and lifetime of community service.

Georgette understood the importance of participating in our democracy. Whether at a town hall, rotary speech or business roundtable, Georgette was always present, actively listening, asking pertinent questions and showing genuine support. She believed the best way to make her voice heard in Washington, DC was by being present and engaged.

For Georgette, the core duty of a citizen was voting. She worked hard to make sure every vote counted. When Oregon moved to a vote-by-mail system, Georgette appeared before the Oregon Legislature to advocate for ballot deadline announcements in the media. In her own county, she took it upon herself as Clerk to make sure as many people as possible voted, telling anyone who would listen that they better vote!

Georgette Brown's belief and dedication paid off. Voter turnout in Josephine County peaked at nearly 90 percent in the 1996 general election and averaged nearly 70 percent during much of Georgette's tenure. She served as president of the Oregon Association of County Clerks. I am sure more than a few of the fellow clerks with whom Georgette served are grateful for having so many helpful things from her along the way.

Georgette had the distinction of being Josephine County's first clerk to perform marriages, and she performed hundreds of them during and after her tenure. She even once traveled on her own time to New Zealand to perform a wedding for a Grants Pass resident, quickly making new friends along the way.

If someone had a question, Georgette usually had an answer. Often, she would even rattle off the appropriate Oregon statute from memory. Georgette believed it was important to be fiscally responsible in running her office. She ran it like a business, looking for ways to save money. Sometimes, when times were tight, she'd pay her own expenses when traveling to a conference, sharing a room when necessary.

Georgette had great respect for the office of Clerk, and those who worked there. After her retirement in 2008, she would stop by the county courthouse to say hello. Her last visit was in May when she hand delivered her ballot to make sure the county clerk knew her signature had changed—and likely to see how the turnout was looking to see how many people she still needed to remind.

In addition to her official duties, Georgette was generous, donating to parks and 4-H programs. She was very community-minded, working on Rotary projects and serving as Rotary president. She was a member of St. Anne's parish for more than 40 years, serving as a reader during Saturday evening mass. One of her favorite retirement roles was reading with students at Allen Dale Elementary School. Always fun to be around, Georgette brightened every activity she was involved in and she never spoke ill of others.

Born in Hoboken, New Jersey, Georgette attended school at St. Mary's in New York. She and Larry moved to Grants Pass in 1972. When Larry died of cancer in 2002, Georgette missed him terribly. Georgette was deeply loved and will be dearly missed by her daughters, Martie and Monique, her 7-year-old grandson, Taylor, her many, many friends and the countless people whose lives she positively touched through her service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in honoring Georgette Brown for her many years of exemplary service in Josephine County and caring leadership of her community.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT
OF JADE STAWASZ

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Jade Stawasz. On January 27, 2015, she closes out 47 years of incredible service to the U.S. Army and begins the next exciting chapter of her life.

Jade is a valued member of the Army's Civilian Service. More than 330,000 strong, Army civilians serve as an integral part of the Army team. This global family is devoted to ensuring our warriors are prepared to shoulder any challenge that comes their way.

Widely admired and respected for her leadership and work ethic, Jade excelled at numerous responsibilities over the years. From her work as Director of Executive Services for III Corps and Fort Hood to her efforts on behalf of Army leadership ranging from Kansas to Hawaii, she's long been someone both her supervisors and colleagues could rely upon.

Jade's great work has not gone unnoticed. For her efforts she was awarded a Superior Civilian Service Award, Commander's Award for Civilian Service, and a Commander's Award for Public Service. The United States Armor Association honored her with the Order of St. Joan D'Arc Medallion for her contributions to the morale, welfare, and spirit of armor and cavalry families during their spouse's absence. Her commitment to service doesn't end when she leaves the office. As a member of the Harker Heights and Killeen Chambers of Commerce, she works tirelessly to strengthen bonds between Fort Hood and the surrounding communities.

I commend Jade Stawasz's selfless service to the United States Army. Her patriotism, citizenship, and commitment to excellence reflect the very best values of Central Texas. I join Jade's friends, family, and colleagues in wishing her all the best in her much-deserved retirement.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS SLAVERY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in my other life, I was a prosecutor and Judge. I saw the worst of the worst criminals in my courtroom, but it wasn't until I visited the Ukraine, when I first came to Congress, that I learned about the scourge of human trafficking. It is slavery. Soon I became aware that this crime wasn't just happening in far off places but right here in the United States, in our own backyards.

Unfortunately, my hometown of Houston is one of the hubs for human trafficking because of its proximity to the border, major interstates, airports, and ports.

As cofounder and co-chair of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus with my friend JIM COSTA from California, I have made fighting human trafficking a priority.

Human trafficking is a hidden crime.

These victims are not willing participants in prostitution. These women, men, girls, and boys are being held against their will, caught in a life of drug addiction, physical abuse, and sexual assault. Children cannot be prostitutes. Children cannot consent to sex. They get forced into the crime of human trafficking, they are victims not criminals.

It is estimated that at least 100,000 children are at risk for human trafficking every year in the U.S. The real number of trafficking victims is unknown.

Even if they are identified, they are constantly moved around by their traffickers, whether that's across our borders and/or around the country. Many are runaways, throwaways, or stowaways. Imagine a child being considered a throwaway or a child that no one is looking for. This is reality for many in our country. We must be the ones to give them hope.

Victims may be afraid to come forward. They may be arrested and jailed because they are mistaken for criminal. Forgiven immigrants kidnapped and brought to the US are told their families will be harmed if they seek help.

Many victims may be suffering from Stockholm Syndrome and actually believe they are in a loving relationship with their trafficker.

Education and awareness for law enforcement and the public will help prevent trafficking and identify the victim.

Rescuing and Restoring victims must be a top priority. Trafficking victims have unique needs, different than the needs of other crime victims. They must receive specialized, trauma-informed care from those that understand this crime.

Trafficking victims are not easy victims to help. They've been through extremely terrible situations. Many have come from a life of hardship, from abusive families, and moved around from family to family in foster care. Anyone they've trusted in the past has used them and betrayed them. So, many times after they've been rescued, they run because that's what they know.

We cannot give up on these girls. They deserve to know love and trust. As a society, we must embrace them.

I've introduced the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act with Congresswoman MALONEY. This bill will ensure funding for the rescue and restoration of trafficking victims. It will ensure specialized training and care, and training for law enforcement. These services will be paid for by fines on the perpetrators. The bad guys literally pay for the crimes they have committed. What a concept!

Our bill also addresses the cause of this dastardly deed: the demand. Gone are the days of boys being boys. Those that buy sex from children are child abusers, not Johns. John is in the Bible. He's a good guy. These criminals must be punished like the child abusers that they are. They are child rapists.

During January, National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month, we recognize that we have a long road ahead of us in order to eradicate our country and our world of modern day slavery. If we have the help and work of local, state, and federal governments, wonderful anti-trafficking organizations, and just people with good hearts, I think we can put a stop to this despicable crime.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING GEORGE STEVENS,
JR. AS THE FOUNDER OF THE
KENNEDY CENTER HONORS AND
FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO
AMERICAN FILM MAKING

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize George Stevens, Jr., an American writer, director, producer, playwright, author and founder of the American Film Institute and the Kennedy Center Honors. With an impressive, creative and innovative career spanning nearly 65 years, Stevens has contributed greatly to American filmmaking and diplomacy, and has elevated artistic standards and appreciation to new heights. It is therefore with profound gratitude for his dedication to the arts and yet sadness that December 2014 marked Stevens' last year as producer of the esteemed Kennedy Center Honors that I am speaking today.

In 1978, Stevens founded the Kennedy Center Honors, which is an annual TV special that recognizes a wide cross-section of artists who have contributed to American culture through dance, the theater, music, film and television. The Kennedy Center Honors, however, is more than just a TV special. It is the brainchild of George Stevens and it was influenced by his hero and friend, President John F. Kennedy, who said, "I look forward to an America that will honor achievement in the arts the way we honor achievement in business and statecraft." Through personal dedication and a labor of love, Stevens committed much of his adult life to the Honors, which is a significant part of his legacy and contribution to the arts.

For thirty-six years, Stevens produced the Honors and made it the premier show of American arts appreciation. In 2008, his son Michael joined him as a producer of the show and it remains one of the most highly anticipated events of the year, showcasing some of the best talents America has to offer. Last year's Honors recipients included Tom Hanks, Sting, Lily Tomlin, Patricia McBride and singer/songwriter Al Green from my home of Memphis, Tennessee. The show was an amazing celebration of these artists and a testament to Stevens' love for the arts. I was glad to be among the attendees at the historic 2014 Honors.

In 1962, former CBS Newsman and head of the United States Information Agency (USIA) under the Kennedy Administration Edward R. Murrow reached out to Stevens to join the Agency to help inform the world about the U.S. through film. It was during this time that he formed a lasting relationship with President John F. Kennedy and his family, and began laying the foundation that transformed how American films and the arts are recognized and appreciated today. After creating nearly 300 short films for the USIA and following the President's assassination, Stevens produced the heartfelt and well-received documentary

about the life of President Kennedy entitled *Years of Lightning, Day of Drums*. At the time, the National Board of Review named the documentary "one of the ten best films of the year" and in 2013, Stevens worked with Warner Bros to restore the film and release it on DVD.

George Stevens, Jr. was born no stranger to Hollywood and American filmmaking. His grandmothers and grandfather were all actors, having starred alongside Charlie Chaplin and in silent films. His father, George Stevens, Sr., was a legendary Hollywood director who made more than 50 films and earned an Oscar for directing the 1951 motion picture, *A Place in the Sun*. At age 17, the younger Stevens began working with his father reading scripts and stories for potential films, including the 1953 Western classic *Shane*, which received five Academy Award nominations, and the 1959 film version of the Pulitzer Prize winning play, *The Diary of Anne Frank*. Between 1959 and 1961, Stevens directed episodes for the television series *Peter Gunn* and *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*. In 1967, he, along with Sidney Poitier and Gregory Peck, founded the American Film Institute, which serves to preserve original prints of American films.

Stevens continues to produce some of the most important works in American culture. In 2013, he produced American editorial cartoonist Herbert Block's documentary entitled *Herblock: The Black & the White*, and in 2011, he adapted *Thurgood*, his 2006 one-man stage play about the first African-American Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, into a feature film. In 2009, he was the executive producer of the TV special *We Are One: The Obama Inaugural Celebration at the Lincoln Memorial*.

Stevens is an American icon whose dedication to the arts is unwavering. He has won 13 Emmys, two Peabody Awards for Meritorious Service to Broadcasting, eight Writers Guild of America awards, the Christopher Award and The Writers Guild of America's Paul Selvin award for his writings on civil rights and liberties. In 2011, President Barack Obama appointed him Co-chairman of the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

George Stevens continues to serve and represent the arts community well. Because of his steadfast efforts to celebrate and promote American art, the Kennedy Center Honors is always at the top of TV ratings. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on more than 65 years of dedication to the arts and thirty-six years of producing the Kennedy Center Honors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, last week I was unable to cast my vote for two important pieces of legislation. Had I been in the chamber, I would have voted YES on H.R. 161, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act and YES on H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Dis-

closure Act. I voted to pass H.R. 7 in the 113th Congress. This crucial bill will establish a government-wide, permanent prohibition on the funding of abortion, ensuring that no program or agency is exempt from this safeguard. I believe that life—even in its earliest stages—deserves respect and protection. I am and always have been pro-life, and throughout my tenure in Congress will continue to be a strong advocate for the unborn.

JAMES KRAMER TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. James Kramer. Mr. Kramer is the Pueblo County Coroner and will be retiring this month after a remarkable 37-year career, making him one of the longest serving public officials in Colorado history.

Mr. Kramer was elected as Pueblo County coroner on November 1, 1977 and has investigated around 21,000 cases during his career. He has been a tireless servant to the people of Pueblo County and has remained on-call 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the better-half of four decades. He has compassionately delivered tragic news on thousands of occasions and has served with his team nationally both at ground zero after the September 11th attacks and in Louisiana after the devastation of Hurricane Katrina.

Prior to Mr. Kramer's service to the county of Pueblo, he served this nation in the U.S. Air Force from 1968–1977, and worked as a physician's assistant at Touchstone Family Practice.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kramer's dogged work ethic and dedication to serving both his country and community is truly admirable. I stand with the residents of Pueblo County and the citizens of the United States in thanking Mr. Kramer and congratulating him on a lifetime of public and selfless service. Although he is retiring from the Coroner's role, he will stay on as a physician's assistant at the Touchstone Family Practice and I look forward to seeing him continue his dedicated work as a leader in the Pueblo County community.

THANKING DIANE ENOS AND WELCOMING PRESIDENT DELBERT RAY, SR.

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the steady leadership of Diane Enos who recently ended her term as 23rd President of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in my hometown of Scottsdale. Additionally, I would like to share my personal gratitude for Diane's friendship. Diane has spent her lifetime working to make Arizona better, and she has done so with incredible grace. Furthermore, it is with goodwill

and faith that I welcome President Delbert Ray, Sr. to his post as the 24th President of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. I look forward to working on the many issues that are of vital importance to our community and the future of Arizona.

PROTECTING THE VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support a number of bills this week that will improve identification of, and services for, children who are victims of sex trafficking, including runaway and homeless kids.

Every year, as many as 300,000 young people become the victims of sex trafficking, while others are forced into a life of virtual slavery in hard labor and the drug trade. In particular, homeless young people are at risk of falling into this tragic life.

Unfortunately, many of our young that fall prey to the dark characters who run these trades have already been involved in the child welfare system at one government level or another. What this screams to us is that the welfare system has failed these children. It seems clear that the evils of trafficking are not something our child welfare workers are sufficiently prepared to deal with.

We must improve the ability of child welfare workers to identify and assess child victims of trafficking—including runaway and homeless youth—and the services they need. We must engage in a coordinated effort at the federal, state, and local levels to collect and share information that will help analyze and identify youth trafficking. We must also identify state efforts that successfully serve youth trafficking victims in order to spread best practices to other states.

These are commonsense solutions to better identify and serve victims of youth trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these important bills.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT (H.R. 37)

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act. This bill undermines vital consumer protections and regulations afforded by Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203). On January 7, 2015, the House voted on this new bill under suspension of the rules where it failed. I did not support this recrafted bill and I do not support it now.

While many of the provisions within H.R. 37 have passed the House in a bi-partisan fashion during prior Congresses, this year House

Republicans have added a new, political provision to weaken consumer protections that I cannot support. Undermining the Volcker Rule by delaying its implementation until 2019 will again put middle-class and working families at financial risk just as our economy has recovered. The Volcker Rule prohibits financial institutions from conducting speculative investment activities that do not benefit their customers. This federal regulation is necessary to safeguard the American people from the financial instability and damage caused by risky trading by Wall Street that contributed to the Great Recession.

This bill is unnecessarily being rushed to the House floor. Neither the Financial Services Committee nor the Agricultural Committee has had an opportunity to review this bill in this new Congress and assess the impacts it would have on our banks and our farmers. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act and instead bring a bill to the House floor that protects all Americans not just Wall Street.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HONORING
OUR WWII MERCHANT MARINE
ACT OF 2015

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, millions of Americans in uniform fought

bravely to secure freedom and peace throughout the world. We honored their sacrifices by ensuring we took care of them at home, through initiatives such as the G.I. Bill and other services meant to support our veterans.

During the war, U.S. Merchant Mariners were responsible for transporting troops and delivering supplies for the military. Hundreds of ships and thousands of men were lost to enemy submarines and aircraft, including dangerous missions ferrying supplies to Western Europe and even Russia. It was one of the most critical roles played during the early part of the war.

Unfortunately, those who served this nation so valiantly during that time, were not eligible for the G.I. Bill that helped millions of veterans go to college, secure a home and transition seamlessly into civilian life. The fact that we did not provide similar benefits to those who risked their lives for this country is simply unfathomable.

That's why I am proud to join with my colleague Rep. JOHN DUNCAN in introducing the bipartisan "Honoring Our WWII Merchant Marine Act of 2015." This bill would provide a one-time benefit of \$25,000 to the surviving 5,000 World War II Mariners. In just two years since I last introduced this act, the number of surviving Merchant Mariners has been cut in half, and if we fail to act now none will see the promise fulfilled. By providing this modest benefit, we will finally be giving our brave merchant mariners the recognition they rightfully deserve.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MS. LAURA
L. HAMPTON

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Ms. Laura L. Hampton on the celebration of her Tremendous Community Service and Attainment of her 80th Birthday.

Being publicly involved provides one and has provided me with the opportunity to meet and interact with some of the most wonderful and most delightful people. One such person has been, and continues to be Mrs. Laura L. Hampton, whom I met during the 1980s while serving as Alderman of the 29th ward, which was more than twenty years ago. Mrs. Hampton was a community leader and her family lived in the West Garfield Park community on West Wilcox Street. She has played every role that one can play in a community; a wife, a mother, a grandmother, an organizer, a leader, a treasurer, a President and whatever it takes to make a community function.

Mrs. Hampton has been and continues to be what is called a "Community Activist", that is, one who is actively involved in the affairs of community life, block, neighborhood, church, school, electoral process, and all that takes place in a community.

I congratulate Mrs. Hampton on the occasion of her 80th birthday, wish her well, and thank her for all that she has done for the community including helping to elect me to Congress and President Barack Obama as President of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 28, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

As You make available to Your people the grace and knowledge to meet the needs of the day, we pray that Your spirit will be upon the Members of this people's House, giving them the richness of Your wisdom.

Bless the members of the minority party as they gather these next days. May they, with those who accompany them, travel safely and meet in peace.

Bless also the majority party as they return to their constituencies. Give them hearts and ears to listen well to all those whom they represent.

May the power of Your truth and our faith in Your providence give them all the confidence they must have to do the good work required for service to our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BENISHEK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RESTORING LOCAL CONTROL OVER EDUCATION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the quality of our children's education is too important to rely on a one-size-fits-all approach.

I have introduced the Local Control of Education Act to return control of education to the States by prohibiting the Federal Government from using grants or waivers to coerce States into adopting the Common Core State Standards. I am grateful to work with Senator DAVID VITTER of Louisiana on these efforts with companion legislation.

South Carolina-elected school board members and administrators, such as Lexington District Two Superintendent Venus Holland, working together with teachers and parents—such as Kathy Maness of the Palmetto State Teachers Association—are best suited to promote our State's education system. I have full faith in State Superintendent of Education Molly Spearman, who is continuing the effort for education excellence as supported by her predecessor, Dr. Mick Zais.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CONGRATULATING MADISON KEYS

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rock Island's own Madison Keys on her outstanding performance at the Australian Open.

Madison is the daughter of attorneys Christine and Rick Keys of Rock Island, Illinois, and at the close of this tournament, Madison will be the world's highest ranking teenage tennis player. The 19-year-old defeated the reigning Wimbledon champion, Petra

Kvitova, in the third round of the tournament. And yesterday, she played in the quarterfinals against the woman who inspired her to play tennis, Venus Williams—and Madison won.

Madison remembers watching Wimbledon when she was just 4 years old and being inspired to play tennis when she saw Venus' fancy tennis dress. Last night's match in a way represents the passing of the torch between generations on the U.S. women's tennis team as Madison now advances to the next round. Tomorrow she plays Serena Williams.

I am confident Madison has a long tennis career in front of her, and I look forward to seeing where she goes. I hope that, just as Venus Williams inspired her, she inspires another generation of young girls to get involved in sports and follow their dreams.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National School Choice Week. I have traveled all across northern Michigan, and I have been blessed to visit all kinds of schools in my district. I have met with hard-working kids, parents, and teachers who are trying to achieve a better future.

Our education system should not be a one-size-fits-all model. School choice programs provide a way for parents to help their children succeed. Choice promotes competition in our educational system, which will improve the educational outcome for all students.

While many students are able to prosper by attending their local public school, many others are bogged down by outdated rules that prevent parents from choosing the best educational fit for their children. In order to succeed, parents need options and flexibility, not more regulations.

Michigan has enacted the popular Schools of Choice program, which allows parents to send their children to any school in a participating district. These are the types of programs that empower parents and students instead of teachers' unions and bureaucrats.

School choice will help to ensure that every child has a chance to flourish, and that is why I am a proud supporter of National School Choice Week.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call this House to action. In the opening weeks of the 114th Congress, this Chamber has voted to deport DREAMers and the parents of American citizens. And the House majority continues to put our national security at risk by threatening to shut down the Department of Homeland Security just because they object to the administration's efforts to keep immigrant families together and to deport violent criminals.

No matter how you feel about the administration's efforts, we should all recognize that it is time to set aside these partisan games and take substantive action to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill. It is not just the moral thing to do for so many of our friends and neighbors; it is the right thing to do for our economy, for our public safety, and for our country.

I will urge House leadership to bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor for a vote. It is the right thing to do.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance of the legislation that we passed this week on human trafficking.

Sadly, my district is no stranger to this despicable crime. In both Lake and Cook Counties, we seem to have too many cases of human trafficking. In the Chicagoland area, up to 25,000 women and girls are victims of commercial sexual exploitation.

According to the Justice Department, as many as 300,000 American youths are at risk of becoming victims of sexual trafficking. The average age for girls that first become victims is between 12 and 14 years of age.

This legislation will protect our youth by establishing programs to help runaways and homeless children who are at the highest risk for becoming victims. The bills will also help address the issue by giving tools to health care professionals and law enforcement to identify and help victims of human trafficking, and to create programs to deter and prevent human trafficking in the first place.

Human trafficking for sexual exploitation is an epidemic that needs to be stopped. This is a first step, and we must remain focused to end human trafficking altogether.

PASS LEGISLATION THAT MATTERS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that the Republican leadership begin to bring legislation to the floor that would actually make a difference for America, certainly addressing the economy and job creation and increasing wages, which are so important to my constituents and, I believe, to all Americans.

It just seems like all the Republican leadership is doing here is rehashing the same old legislation that is going nowhere either because it won't pass the Senate or because the President won't sign it.

Today, after the 1-minute speeches, we are going to have the third pipeline bill that essentially tries to strait-jacket Federal agencies—again, not going anywhere. It is pretty likely the President would veto any of them if they come to his desk.

I understand that on Tuesday the leadership is going to bring up another Affordable Care Act repeal. This will be like the 56th or 57th effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which is actually working well. More Americans than ever have signed up during this second enrollment period. We had another effort to weaken the Affordable Care Act just a couple of weeks ago.

It is time to do the things that people want, talk about the economy, and bring legislation that matters to the American people.

REVERSE SEQUESTRATION CUTS

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to join me in stopping the sequester's impact on our military.

I want Members to hear what General Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, had to say. He directly advises the President and Congress, and these are his words:

The combination of the Budget Control Act and the sequestration mechanism will make it impossible for us to meet our global responsibilities.

Again from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs:

The readiness hole is still the readiness hole. The global security environment is more dangerous and sequestration is still on the books as the law. It's absolutely crazy for this country.

Since the President promised the sequestration would not happen but then he said he would veto changes to it, some Members of this House seem to have accepted that the sequestration must go into effect.

National security is an essential part of our job, and with growing threats both domestic and abroad, Members of this House must come together to end the sequester cuts that reduce the capabilities of our armed services.

We—the Members of Congress, the President, and General Dempsey—all swore the same oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We as Members of Congress have a duty to provide a military to protect the American people.

These challenges hit close to home for me. As a Georgia Republican on the Armed Services Committee, I am going to continue to fight on behalf of the men and women at Robins and Moody Air Force Bases and the warfighters of this country who protect us.

FEDERAL SPENDING AND THE SAVE ACT

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Federal spending.

In my home State of Nebraska, we are mandated by the State constitution to balance the budget. This is something that we are sorely in need of here in Washington.

The Congressional Budget Office just released a report that indicated that deficits are projected to balloon over the next several years, topping \$1 trillion by 2025. The national debt will grow to over \$21 trillion by the same year.

Mr. Speaker, we all know these are unsustainable trends. That is why I am very proud to be a cosponsor of the Savings Accountability Value and Efficiency Act, or SAVE Act. This bill, introduced by my good friend and colleague Congressman PATRICK MURPHY, would save the Federal Government nearly \$480 billion over the next 10 years.

I applaud my colleague for his efforts in working to put our country on a more sustainable fiscal path. I hope that we can come together in a bipartisan manner towards that end.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans from all 50 States will gather at over 11,000 events nationwide to celebrate National School Choice Week. These are not partisan gatherings focused on a particular piece of legislation, nor are the attendees advocating for one type of school over another; rather, these gatherings will highlight the importance of providing parents with diverse choices when it comes to the education of their children.

Far too often America's children are given educational opportunities dictated by what best serves someone else's economic interest or is focused on their own economic status or where they live. This is inappropriate. We need a better way.

I have supported legislation to expand charter schools. That is a bipartisanship thing that we can all agree on. That empowers parents. At the State level, Republican legislators and Governors have passed open enrollment laws and funding portability for education.

National School Choice Week is a great reminder that we must continue to pursue these vital reforms, ensuring all parents have freedom when deciding how to educate their children.

□ 0915

LNG PERMITTING CERTAINTY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 48, I call up the bill (H.R. 351) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 351

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.

(a) **DECISION DEADLINE.**—For proposals that must also obtain authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the United States Maritime Administration to site, construct, expand, or operate LNG export facilities, the Department of Energy shall issue a final decision on any application for the authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) not later than 30 days after the later of—

(1) the conclusion of the review to site, construct, expand, or operate the LNG facilities required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(2) the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **CONCLUSION OF REVIEW.**—For purposes of subsection (a), review required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall be considered concluded—

(1) for a project requiring an Environmental Impact Statement, 30 days after publication of a Final Environmental Impact Statement;

(2) for a project for which an Environmental Assessment has been prepared, 30 days after publication by the Department of Energy of a Finding of No Significant Impact; and

(3) upon a determination by the lead agency that an application is eligible for a categorical exclusion pursuant National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 implementing regulations.

(c) **JUDICIAL ACTION.**—(1) The United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the

export facility will be located pursuant to an application described in subsection (a) shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of—

(A) an order issued by the Department of Energy with respect to such application; or

(B) the Department of Energy's failure to issue a final decision on such application.

(2) If the Court in a civil action described in paragraph (1) finds that the Department of Energy has failed to issue a final decision on the application as required under subsection (a), the Court shall order the Department of Energy to issue such final decision not later than 30 days after the Court's order.

(3) The Court shall set any civil action brought under this subsection for expedited consideration and shall set the matter on the docket as soon as practical after the filing date of the initial pleading.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF EXPORT DESTINATIONS.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF LNG EXPORT DESTINATIONS.**—As a condition for approval of any authorization to export LNG, the Secretary of Energy shall require the applicant to publicly disclose the specific destination or destinations of any such authorized LNG exports."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 351.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act sponsored by Congressman BILL JOHNSON of Ohio.

All of us recognize that the economy in the U.S. has been sputtering. We have had great advancements in technology, however, and innovation in hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have led America to become the number one natural gas producing nation in the world.

Our natural gas output has rapidly increased since 2005 and is expected to continue rising in the decades ahead in response to growing demand. Plentiful natural gas is helping many domestic energy producers and manufacturers and is spurring new investment and job growth here in America.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has held multiple hearings and forums to discuss the domestic growth in natural gas production and its potential impact on trade, geopolitics,

and energy production and consumption in America.

We now have the opportunity to bring more of this critical energy resource to other parts of the world while stimulating our energy security, economic growth, and foreign policy.

I might add that over the last year, many of us have been really surprised by the number of representatives from other countries in Europe and around the world who are pleading with America to export their natural gas so that those countries are not as dependent upon countries like Russia and others.

I might also add that, in 2012, the Department of Energy commissioned a report by NERA Economic Consulting to assess the economic impacts of LNG exports. NERA recently updated this study to include the most current projections from the Energy Information Administration.

Like the 2012 study, the update found that U.S. LNG exports will bring widespread economic benefits, touching many parts of our economy, and that those benefits would consistently increase as exports increase.

The NERA study also found that the construction of new LNG export projects is estimated to put up to 45,000 unemployed Americans back to work. I might also add that this legislation does not in any way change anything that FERC has responsibility for in approving siting of these natural gas pipelines and facilities for export, so we are not affecting in any way any environmental aspects of it.

I might also say that the reason this bill is being introduced is because we think that the Department of Energy has been dragging its feet a little bit. They have responsibility over the commodity of the natural gas, and they have to go through a process. This legislation also applies only to non-free trade agreements that the U.S. deals with.

Since 2010, the Department of Energy has issued a final decision on five of the 37 applications to export LNG to countries where the U.S. does not have a free trade agreement.

Now, DOE's authority to regulate the export of natural gas arises under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act. This provision creates a rebuttable presumption that a proposed export of natural gas is in the public interest. DOE must grant the application unless opponents of the application overcome the presumption, and there are 18 countries where we have these free trade agreements.

DOE's process to review applications to export LNG to non-free trade agreement countries is much more complex and unpredictable, and this legislation would help clarify that and create some certainty. It amends section 3 of the Natural Gas Act to give DOE 30 days to issue a final decision on an

LNG export application after a complete NEPA environmental review on the facility.

Additionally, H.R. 351 provides for expedited judicial reviews by the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the export facility will be located, and this is important as well. It requires public disclosure of export destinations, so we know where it is going as a condition of approval of authorization to export LNG.

This is a very important piece of legislation. I want to commend Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio for introducing this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which is simply unnecessary. The Department of Energy currently conducts a public interest review of all applications to export liquefied natural gas to a country without a free trade agreement with the United States.

To date, DOE has approved four such applications to export LNG and has issued conditional approvals to four additional applications. DOE has approved all applications that have completed their required NEPA review, and so there is no backlog or delay at the DOE to speak of.

With these permits alone, we have the ability to become one of the largest exporters of natural gas in the world, and so legislation to impose an arbitrary 30-day deadline on DOE, as suggested by the underlying bill, is simply unnecessary.

With regard to exporting natural gas, we should keep in mind that low domestic natural gas prices can provide an important competitive advantage to U.S. manufacturing, and simple economics tells us that additional demand due to unrestricted exports can raise domestic natural gas prices, so we should think twice about giving away this advantage for short-term export profits when we are trying hard to rebuild our long-term manufacturing base.

We should also remember that the bill will not result in LNG exports to Europe for some time, if at all. Although one LNG export terminal is set to begin full operation later this year, all other terminals remain under construction or are in the planning process.

DOE's conditional approval for those facilities allows them to continue moving forward, but this legislation won't help speed up their construction or affect how quickly they can actually operate, so passing this bill today will not magically send LNG from the proposed terminals tomorrow.

When the United States actually begins to export significant quantities of LNG, it will most likely go to Asia, not Europe. The export terminals most

likely to get constructed have already signed long-term contracts to supply LNG to various customers, and those destinations are primarily in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because I don't believe the phantom LNG export backlog is one of the pressing issues facing ordinary Americans, and I don't believe that expediting this type of infrastructure is what our country needs most.

I believe our country should be encouraging the use of renewable energy resources like wind and solar power. We should be investing in increased energy efficiency and a smart grid. We should be trying to find ways to make our energy infrastructure more resilient and capable of withstanding extreme weather events, like Hurricane Sandy.

These are the types of clean energy solutions that America should be investing in, the type that will enhance our energy security, reduce carbon emissions, and lower overall energy costs to customers.

Unfortunately, this bill doesn't achieve any of these goals. In fact, the 30-day deadline in the bill could have counterproductive results. If DOE is forced to make a decision before they have determined if the project is in the public interest, it may have no choice but to deny the application, and that outcome certainly doesn't benefit anyone, especially the applicants.

This is the third time this month that the Republican majority has brought secondhand energy legislation to the floor, legislation that passed the House last Congress. Like the two bills before it, H.R. 351 would also serve no real purpose.

I just hope that we can begin soon to look at new energy legislation that will move America forward in developing a clean energy infrastructure. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the author of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act. This important legislation will bring certainty to the Department of Energy's review process for LNG export applications, create American jobs, continue spurring America's manufacturing comeback, and provide a stable source of energy to our allies in Europe and around the world.

Thanks to the energy renaissance occurring throughout eastern and southeastern Ohio and across the United States, America is able to produce large quantities of natural gas like never before, enough to meet our domestic natural gas demands and export excess LNG to the global marketplace.

Through the abundance of natural gas, we have an opportunity to significantly affect geopolitics and to create American jobs, but only if we enact smart policies like H.R. 351.

The window of opportunity for LNG exports will not remain open indefinitely, so it is important that Congress act immediately. If Congress fails to act, companies will continue to face regulatory uncertainty, which creates hesitancy in securing financing for constructing LNG terminals, plus nations with near-term energy needs will look elsewhere.

Potential geopolitical benefits such as reducing the oppressive influence of other exporters like Russia and Iran, while simultaneously strengthening ties with our allies, could be ultimately jeopardized.

Some of my colleagues are concerned that increased LNG exports will not really help our allies in Europe, but that is simply not true. Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is sent, increasing the supply and competition in the international market will provide global consumers with greater choice and, most importantly, increased leverage when negotiating LNG pricing contracts.

In fact, by no longer importing such large amounts of LNG, the U.S. has already indirectly helped our European allies. With the passage of this legislation, even more LNG will be free to go to places that need it most.

Equally important, if we delay, domestic economic benefits may also fail to materialize, specifically the opportunity to create some 45,000 jobs by 2018 and increase hardworking taxpayer salaries by \$1 billion over 6 years. This is a win for manufacturing, especially those who make drilling equipment pipeline components, not to mention the refining, petrochemicals, and chemicals sectors.

For these reasons, Congress must pass H.R. 351. To date, DOE has issued a final decision on only five of the 38 pending LNG export applications received since 2010. This is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to help bring certainty to DOE's approval process, create jobs, help maximize American energy production, and help our allies abroad by voting for this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. PALLONE, for his leadership and for his positive contributions to this entire institution.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to oppose H.R. 351 because, once again, it is a proposed solution to a problem that we can't find, a problem that we have searched high and low for. This problem, Mr. Speaker, simply doesn't exist.

Here we are, here we go once again, coming up with solutions to a problem that doesn't even exist. When will my colleagues on the other side do something productively in this Congress and come up with real solutions to problems that do exist for the American people?

Mr. Speaker, currently, the Department of Energy, as we speak today, has already approved not one, not two, not three, not even four, but five applications—five—for existing LNG, and there are four more conditional approvals pending.

□ 0930

Altogether, Mr. Speaker, the approved applications authorize the export of over 10 million cubic feet per day of LNG. The pending applications collectively seek an additional 27.5 billion cubic feet of LNG exported each and every day—27.5.

Where is the problem? Show me the problem. Show me the way. Point out the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this 30-day deadline that arbitrarily mandates the DOE application process would short-circuit the public interest review—short circuit—cut it short. The public doesn't have any input. No review by the public.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. This arbitrary mandatory 30-day deadline would unnecessarily fast-track the DOE to hastily make a decision on export applications, regardless of how complex the application may be. The result of this ambiguous 30-day deadline may negatively affect DOE's ability to soberly and thoroughly assess the impact that cumulative exports may have on natural gas prices.

What would be the effect of gas at the station, at the pump, on the American people, and we all of a sudden, without any study, without any conversation, without any consideration, just force the DOE to arbitrarily meet this 30-day deadline? What is going to be the effect on the consumer in terms of these gas prices at the pump? Are they going to skyrocket as a result of this hasty, irresponsible action? Tell me, do you have answers to that?

It may even result in the unintended consequence of actually denying applications if the agency does not have the time to complete its due diligence. This is insane. This is the utmost of insanity.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this bill because at the end of the day when you skim away all of the rhetoric and all the hyperbole around this bill, it will not speed up energy exports to Europe and it will not speed up exports to our other allies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Elvis Presley: let this body return this bill to sender, return it to sender, address unknown, no such problem, no such home.

Mr. Speaker, let's send this bill back to committee where it can go through regular order, and we can have a thorough discussion on these important issues before voting on such a consequential bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), who has been a real leader in helping America become energy independent.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill because this is simply a commonsense bill.

As you know, the U.S. is now the largest producer of natural gas in the world and has proven gas resources to supply our needs for decades to come. This is an achievement that we have reached despite roadblocks and delays from the executive branch. The latest delay is the Department of Energy's rule from last summer to hold up export terminal applications.

This important bill streamlines the review process for LNG exports by requiring a timeline for making a decision and making agencies work together on the review. This is commonsense change, Mr. Speaker.

Innovations in the harvesting and production of natural gas have cut energy bills for families across the country. Those are the same innovations that have also made it affordable to ship LNG around the globe.

The responsible and safe development of our natural resources through new technologies, such as horizontal drilling, have begun an energy and manufacturing renaissance in America.

And who is feeling the benefits? American families and businesses with an affordable and reliable energy supply. But that could all end unless we let the free market work.

Let's end the administration's de facto ban on new exports and bring market stability to the global gas market. Let's get the government out of the way, and let's give our American innovators a chance to work.

Mr. Speaker, my district, the State of Ohio, and the entire Nation will reap the benefits of more jobs, increased pay, and lower energy costs if we pass this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 351 and end the self-imposed restrictions on LNG exports.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 21 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who is the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me explain the problem we have and the need for this bill today.

The bill is the exact same language that passed this House last Congress, and it came through our committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Now, what this bill does is give the Department of Energy some deadlines to make a decision on our national interests—that is what it does—so we can do it. They have held those permits sometimes up to 2 years to make that determination.

If you have a free trade agreement with the United States, we can export natural gas to you. But they need to decide the national interests. I want the DOE to do that, but I also want to make a decision in very quick time.

We know who our friends are, we know who our adversaries are. We don't really want to send it to our adversaries, we want to send it to our friends. So that is DOE's job.

The reason we need this bill is that right now today, or yesterday, gas is \$2.88 per million cubic feet. It was up about \$4, which is still not great for a producer. But what we have been doing in south Texas is flaring natural gas. It is bad for the environment. It is bad for the people who produce it because they don't have a customer. And what we need to do is be able to export what we can't use.

In Texas we are very proud of Blue Bell ice cream. In fact, their advertising slogan is: "We eat all we can and we sell the rest."

I have a chemical industry, I have a utility industry that uses natural gas. They are using it. But we still have a lot of production. So why would we not use all we can in our country and sell the rest and make somebody else pay for those jobs that we have in our community? And that is the problem.

We know the price of oil is going down. But oil and natural gas sometimes come out of the same well. So that is why we need to make sure that we have the right, on a reasonable timeframe, to export natural gas to countries that we want to be friendly with. I would love to have a natural gas export right now to Ukraine. The infrastructure over there is not there. It could get there with some reversing pipelines.

H.R. 351 represents a bipartisan effort to legislate and warrant its approval. We worked together on this bill, and it represents that hard work.

The bill is good for the economy, the climate, and the U.S. security interests. The United States has natural resources to become the largest exporter of LNG in the world. Our natural gas reserves can meet all our domestic natural gas needs and still have an excess capacity of 3 trillion cubic feet.

Before we discuss H.R. 351 it is important we clarify the LNG permitting process, just so there is no confusion. A project applicant must submit two separate applications: the first to the Department of Energy and the second to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC.

In the Department of Energy, there are two complete separate processes. First, the project must submit an application to export. If the project sends LNG to a country with which the U.S. has a free trade agreement, the application is automatically approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member. I appreciate it.

If the project sends the LNG to a country without a free trade agreement, then the DOE must issue a permit based on the public interest. These are very important determinations. However, LNG will not leave the United States with DOE approval only.

For a project to actually export LNG, in either case, the applicant must receive a FERC permit. FERC reviews the environmental impacts of the actual LNG facility. FERC conducts and reviews all environmental impacts to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. No company will export a single cubic foot of LNG without FERC approval. FERC's process takes 12 to 18 months and costs approximately \$100 million.

We have worked extremely hard to protect the environment. It is the DOE non-FTA process that is the problem. The DOE currently has approximately 30 non-FTA permits awaiting decision. The DOE has held most of these permits almost 4 years. Even the DOE recognized this huge problem and tried to address the backlog last summer by changing the approval process. Unfortunately, the changes failed to expedite approval or provide any certainty to companies who are investing \$100 million, and these are U.S. companies.

H.R. 351 resolved this issue only after it receives all environmental permits.

H.R. 351 would place a 30-day timeline for the DOE to issue a decision after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission completes its environmental reviews.

Once again, we have protected the environmental review process. We have protected the public interest. And DOE, which held some of these applications 4 years—we cannot allow DOE to sit on these permits any longer. They must do their job and do it in a timely fashion.

Opponents of H.R. 351 say if all permits are approved, we will export more than 35 trillion cubic feet. Opponents say exports will double or triple domestic natural gas prices. Opponents say exports of that size will endanger our domestic industry, raise electricity prices, and have ruinous effects on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I represent enormous petrochemical facilities, power generators, and workers.

I remember when domestic natural gas prices caused companies in my district to move jobs overseas.

If what opponents of H.R. 351 say were even remotely possible, I would be the first one to oppose this bill.

My constituents work at those facilities.

Those facilities pay taxes and fund the hospitals and schools in my district.

There are dozens of applications pending at DOE.

No more than a handful of projects will be constructed and ultimately export LNG.

But each project deserves a fair opportunity at review.

Each company deserves the opportunity to pursue financing in the capital markets.

The government should not make those decisions.

Each LNG facility costs billions, not to mention the jobs associated with pipeline construction, electric transmission, local services, etc.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 351 and support this bipartisan effort.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), who has been a real leader on helping America become energy independent.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. natural gas exports will create American jobs and will bolster our strategic partnerships.

I serve as president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and many foreign leaders and officials have expressed to me their need for energy diversification. As you know, Russia, the largest supplier of natural gas to Europe, has repeatedly used natural gas pricing to draw governments closer to its orbit and punished West-leaning governments with higher prices.

U.S. natural gas exports will foster a more dynamic and competitive world energy market, helping to curb the use of energy as a political weapon. And regardless of where natural gas from the United States is shipped, increasing supply in the global market will help international customers with greater choice and leverage to negotiate prices.

In fact, the Obama administration has made this exact same argument. The State Department's energy envoy recently stated:

Now where the gas will go doesn't matter. The fact that we have approved exports of natural gas has already had an impact on Europe. And where the molecule actually ends up going also doesn't matter.

Now, I understand there have been questions about whether or not European countries, such as Ukraine, are prepared to receive U.S. natural gas. Many of our European allies are implementing infrastructure projects to diversify their natural gas resources.

For example, Poland and Lithuania are opening LNG import terminals to reduce their dependence on Russian gas. Just last week, Poland and Ukraine announced an agreement to construct a pipeline that will allow Ukraine to access natural gas from two LNG import terminals, potentially from the United States. England and Spain already have contracts in place to receive U.S. natural gas.

These are just a few examples of how these infrastructure projects will help Europe diversify its natural gas resources.

Mr. Speaker, last year, President Obama, in a joint statement with European leaders, welcomed U.S. natural gas exports to help our European allies and our strategic partners.

I am encouraged by the President's statements. These words must be followed by action. The President must work with Congress to enact H.R. 351.

I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

□ 0945

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have heard my colleagues suggest that there is a delay in the DOE's approval of LNG export applications.

For instance, on Monday night at the Rules Committee, Mr. JOHNSON indicated that the DOE has approved only five out of 38 applications since 2010. Even if the gentleman from Ohio is correct in his assertion, the fact is that the five applications approved by the Obama administration since 2010 are five more than were approved by the Reagan administration or by either Bush administration. In fact, it is five more than were approved by the Clinton, Carter, Ford, or Nixon administration. In 2011, the DOE approved the first LNG export application for the Cheniere Sabine Pass facility. That facility is set to become operational at the end of this year. That was the DOE's first approval to export LNG since the 1960s.

The dramatic growth of natural gas production and supply in the United States was considered impossible a decade ago, so the DOE commissioned a study to help it decide how to address additional applications. After establishing a transparent and systematic system for reviewing and authorizing LNG export applications, the DOE began to rapidly issue decisions. The record demonstrates that the DOE has moved aggressively to authorize LNG exports, granting three additional final authorizations and four conditional approvals since August of 2013.

To date, the DOE has approved the export of enough LNG to make the United States the world leader in LNG exports. All other pending applications are still under review at FERC, not at the DOE, so it is important to understand that this bill does not change the FERC review process—the site approvals, the environmental approvals. I would also remind my colleagues that the DOE automatically deems LNG exports to free trade agreement countries to be in the public interest.

Before the DOE can issue a decision on the pending applications, both FERC approval and construction will need to be completed. That could take months or, more likely, years, but this bill will not affect that timeline, which will be the critical factor in how much more gas can be exported. That is why I want to emphasize that this bill is unnecessary and will not materially change the LNG export situation anytime soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, they say that you can't have too much of a good thing, but with our impressive natural gas production, that is exactly what we have today. We now have so much natural gas that we cannot only meet our own energy needs and still have extra to sell, but our natural gas boom can be used as a force for good here at home as a source for jobs and across the globe as a source of stable energy.

There is no question that the whole shale revolution helped break the fever of the Great Recession. Thanks to innovation and technological advancement, energy production remained a welcome bright spot in our national economy, but we aren't out of the woods yet. We all know that. Millions of folks, certainly in Michigan and across the country, still find themselves unemployed, underemployed, or facing stagnant paychecks. This bill, this legislation, will help accelerate their return to full employment.

At the request of the Department of Energy, NERA Economic Consulting evaluated the economic impacts of U.S. LNG exports. The NERA study showed a net positive impact to the United States economy and estimated that LNG exports would actually reduce the average number of unemployed workers by as much as 45,000 people by 2018. We will also see tens of thousands of additional jobs created in the supply chain. I am talking about good-paying jobs that will help families achieve a better life.

The bill will also advance our foreign policy goals. U.S. LNG exports can provide our allies with a secure and affordable supply of energy and can reduce the influence of hostile exporting nations like Russia, which continues to

threaten Ukraine and, really, all of Europe's natural gas supply. Passing this bill will send the welcome signal to our allies in Eastern Europe that, yes, an alternative source of energy is on its way.

The domestic and geopolitical benefits make increasing U.S. LNG exports a win-win, but the Department of Energy continues to hold up the process. Since 2010, the DOE has only issued a final decision on five applications to export LNG to countries with which we don't share a free trade agreement. This bill would help jump-start approvals so that we can start creating jobs and sending our surplus gas to those countries that need it the most. It would give the DOE 30 days to issue a decision following the completion of the environmental review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. UPTON. The U.S. is now a global energy superpower, and with that power, we have a chance to do some real good. Saying "yes" to energy is good for workers here at home and is good for global allies.

I thank Representative BILL JOHNSON for his leadership on this issue, and I would hope that everybody would support this bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under the current approval process for LNG exports, the Department of Energy has a tool to protect American consumers, and that tool is the public interest determination. The DOE has the ability to weigh the benefits and costs of additional LNG exports, including the impact of increased domestic natural gas prices on consumers, who use gas to heat and cool their homes and to turn on the lights. Rigid deadlines, as suggested in this legislation, could prevent the DOE from conducting a meaningful public interest review, and that means that the DOE might not be able to ensure that high levels of LNG exports do not harm American consumers by raising the costs of electricity or home heating or cooling.

I think consumers, Mr. Speaker, have reason to be concerned. Experts at the nonpartisan U.S. Energy Information Administration examined this issue, and here is what they found:

In the scenarios with additional gas exports, consumers will consume less and pay more on both their natural gas and electricity bills.

Furthermore, the EIA calculated that high levels of LNG exports could mean increased residential, commercial, and industrial consumer energy costs of \$7 billion to \$14 billion per year between 2020 and 2040.

Make no mistake. American consumers will foot that bill. Recent expe-

rience with gasoline and propane exports also offers cautionary tales. The Midwest and Northeast experienced sharp propane price spikes and shortages last winter. Significant increases in propane exports were a key factor in the skyrocketing prices that hurt consumers.

Just yesterday, the Center for American Progress released an analysis on the potential impact of expanded LNG exports on consumers. They found that, in 2020, residential consumers would pay 4.3 percent more for natural gas per year, and those in the Midwest—in States like Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas—would be the hardest hit by price increases. By 2040, consumers in the mid-Atlantic States would pay 10 percent more for natural gas per year.

These figures are not insignificant. We need to make sure that LNG exports do not hurt consumers. Right now, the DOE has the ability to do that. So, before we disregard any meaningful public interest review and allow the unrestricted exporting of LNG, let's be sure that our constituents won't be left footing the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act.

America's energy producers and the tens of thousands of Americans they employ stand ready to meet the demand for a reliable and secure source of natural gas from America and the world.

They have completed their reviews, have passed their tests, and are ready to get to work, but there is one big problem—the Obama administration is standing in the way. The President and his anti-American energy agenda have placed a de facto ban on LNG exports by logjamming their requests and using bureaucratic red tape to block America's progress.

This bill breaks the bureaucratic gridlock and expedites the approval of LNG exports. I have seen firsthand the jobs and the opportunities that an LNG facility has created for the people of east Texas, in my district. Let's help the American worker by approving H.R. 351.

Mr. PALLONE. Again, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time that remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are beginning the 114th Congress the way we ended the previous one—with legislation that is more about message than about solving real problems.

The message of H.R. 351 is that we are interested in elevating the interests of the oil and gas industry above any others. Consumers will not benefit from this policy, and manufacturers will not benefit from this policy. Eliminating the public interest determination sends that message clearly.

In spite of the assertions by its supporters, H.R. 351 won't do much for our allies either, especially those in Europe or Ukraine. The bill fixes no problem. There is no backlog of applications at the Department of Energy. Japan, our ally and the world's largest purchaser of LNG, has three importers who signed contracts in 2013 with three approved LNG export facilities, those being Freeport, Cameron, and Cove Point.

Because natural gas is such an important and strategic resource, we should, if anything, be questioning the administration about the wisdom of issuing so many approvals. Why? They are relying on assumptions, models, and estimates of recoverable domestic gas reserves that are very uncertain and that have been decreasing as new information becomes available.

Exporters sign these contracts to guarantee deliveries for some 10 to 20 years. I am not willing to risk price spikes for consumers, families, and small businesses or to risk the benefits of lower gas prices for our manufacturing sector for a slightly improved trade balance. I am unwilling to repeal the requirement for a consideration of the public interest before more export facilities are approved, not for a resource that is so strategic and widely used.

H.R. 351 does not fix any real problems, but it could, indeed, help to create some. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the President likes to talk about infrastructure. In his State of the Union Address, he said that there is bipartisan support for infrastructure legislation and that Republicans and Democrats need to "set our sights higher than a single oil pipeline."

We have listened, and we have done that.

After passing a bill to approve Keystone, this House passed another bill last week to reform the natural gas permitting process. Now the House is

on its third energy infrastructure bill with Representative BILL JOHNSON's LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act. I know the President doesn't pay much attention to what goes on here on Capitol Hill, but three infrastructure bills in 3 weeks is hard to miss.

Here are some other numbers, Mr. Speaker, that I think the President really should remember: though the Department of Energy has received 37 permits in the past 5 years, it has only approved five permits in that time. That is one a year. If the President cared about infrastructure as much as he says, I think he would get his administration to process the rest of them now.

Passing this bill would also lead to the creation of an estimated 45,000 jobs. More permit approvals mean more opportunity. More opportunity requires more infrastructure. More infrastructure means more jobs. Delay has become a hallmark of this Presidency, but Americans are done delaying job creation by ignoring America's energy abundance.

□ 1000

American energy supports American jobs. It supports a strong economy. It also gives our friends—like Ukraine, our allies—an alternative source of energy, diluting the power countries like Russia and Iran who use their oil to coerce and even oppress.

Mr. Speaker, the President should know that here in the House we have set our sights very high; but, Mr. Speaker, the question is: Will the President set his sights higher than his veto pen?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, again, I wanted to return to the floor because the thought occurs to me, as it should to all of the American people, that we should consider the impact of this bill, the impact of LNG exports, and the impact that it would have on U.S. manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, let us protect, by all means, American jobs. Let us protect American manufacturing. Cheap domestic natural gas prices are providing a big boost and competitive advantage to U.S. manufacturing. We can all agree on that on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the disagreement occurs when the other side, the Republicans, are asking us in this Congress to make a hasty decision that could undermine the advantage that we are now experiencing in the rapid increase in manufacturing.

This bill runs the risk of reducing our competitive advantage that we have now in the manufacturing sector. It requires DOE to rush its process and make final decisions on pending appli-

cations to export a huge quantity of LNG.

If all of the pending applications are granted, DOE will authorize the export of approximately 38 million cubic feet per day of LNG. That is more than half of the total U.S. natural gas consumption. It is more than the world's largest LNG exporter, Qatar, currently makes each and every day.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, in my mind or in the minds of the American people that exports of that magnitude will increase the domestic price of natural gas. It just makes common sense, and it is what the EIA found when it studied the economic impact of increased LNG imports.

Where is your study? How do you answer the conclusions of the EIA when it found again that the economic impact of increased influence will increase the domestic price of natural gas? What amount of American manufacturing? What amount of American jobs? Let's protect American manufacturing. Let's protect American jobs.

Because this bill truncates DOE's public interest review, the Department may not even be able to fully analyze the impacts of the very high level of LNG exports on American consumers, on American jobs, and on American manufacturing.

My friends on the other side—and they are indeed my friends—always want to talk about American manufacturing, how we have to support American manufacturing, how we have to raise the level of American manufacturing, how we have to increase the American manufacturing sector, how we have to increase the American manufacturing jobs. This very bill could undermine all that sense of goodwill and all those pronouncements from the other side.

What about American manufacturing and what about American manufacturing jobs? Don't abandon American manufacturing. Don't abandon American manufacturing jobs. Don't abandon the American people. Let's slow this process down.

All we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is jeopardizing American manufacturing and American manufacturing jobs.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I am committed to developing sound energy policy, and that policy surely includes consideration of the role that natural gas can play in our energy mix.

Our energy picture is changing every year. The latest development is low oil prices, but we have other developments in recent years, including rapidly increasing domestic production of oil and natural gas and a welcomed increase in wind and solar electricity production.

We are becoming more efficient, but our energy infrastructure is becoming outdated. We need to look at the ways we produce and use energy, but we also need to look at the ways that we move, transmit, and store energy.

We need to innovate in the energy space, but we also need to maintain reliability and lower energy bills. We need to look at all our energy issues through the lens of climate change and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are legitimate questions about whether we want to send our natural gas to other countries. That might help our trade balance, but it would have negative impacts on our domestic manufacturing sector.

I don't claim that I have all the answers. I know that we looked at some of these issues last Congress, but I don't agree that a clear consensus emerged. In any event, this is a new Congress with scores of new Members who have never looked at this issue before.

I think we should take these issues back to the Energy and Commerce Committee and let the committee and its 12 new members do its job. Let us look at the facts again as they are today, not last year or last Congress. I think if we were to do that, we would see that even if this legislation was once necessary, it isn't anymore.

DOE has modernized its process and any backlog that once existed isn't an issue at this point. DOE and the administration have opened the way for LNG exports, but I think it continues to be necessary for us to assess whether approving an application for additional export is in the public interest because becoming the world's largest exporter of natural gas is not something we should do lightly, unadvisedly, or without the latest facts.

This January, we have spent much of our time bringing bills from last Congress to the floor and rushing them through to the Senate, which is still considering the Keystone legislation we passed the first week of this year.

I think we might well have served ourselves and the American people better by sitting down together in the Energy and Commerce Committee and working carefully on an energy policy aimed at the future rather than at an energy policy aimed at the past.

I am going to vote "no" on this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The former speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, talked a lot about the impact on the manufacturing base in America this legislation might have. I would like to point out that the National Association of Manufacturers, which is the

largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing manufacturers in every industrial sector in all 50 States, in a letter dated yesterday, urges Members to support H.R. 351.

They go on to say that it is important to ensure that "market forces, rather than bureaucratic inertia, govern international trade." That is really what this legislation is all about; it is about market forces.

Representatives from countries around the world are coming to us and asking for this product. We are fortunate in America that we have an abundance of natural gas. In fact, the Energy Information Agency reported today that it is so abundant that natural gas prices have dropped to their lowest level since September 2012.

Earlier, there was an expression of concern about increased natural gas prices. We understand that prices go up and prices go down, but right now, they are at their lowest level since September 2012, and when natural gas prices go down too low, you see less production. That increases prices as well.

We didn't just wake up one day and decide to introduce this legislation. Concerned groups involved in this business came to Congress and said: We need some help.

When we started having hearings on this a year and 2 years ago, the Department of Energy started trying to speed up the process a little bit, but we are not dictating what their decision should be on allowing the export to non-free trade agreement countries. We are just saying: You need to make the decision sooner, and we want some transparency. That is all this legislation is about.

Now, we understand that any time you talk in today's world about exporting a fossil fuel, one of the undercurrents is climate change, and I would remind everyone that CO₂ emissions in America are the lowest that they have been in 20 years.

This country does not have to take a backseat to any country in the world, and so we want the market to play its role. This is a good, commonsense piece of legislation that will create jobs in America, will encourage the expansion of more natural gas production at a time when the world needs it and we need it.

I would urge every Member of this House to vote in favor of H.R. 351, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 351, the "LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act."

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-energy exploration. I am not anti-trade. I am, however strongly "pro-jobs," "pro-economic growth," and "pro-sustainable environment."

As a Member of Congress from Houston I have always been mindful of the importance of, and have strongly advocated for, national

energy policies that will make our nation energy independent, preserve and create jobs, and keep our nation's economy strong.

That is why I carefully consider each energy legislative proposal brought to the floor on its individual merits and support them when they are sound, balanced, fair, and promote the national interest.

Where they fall short, I believe in working across the aisle to improve them if possible by offering constructive amendments.

Although I believe the nation would benefit by increased exports of natural gas, the legislation before contains several provisions that are of great concern to me.

Pursuant to Section 2, subsection (a) of the bill, an application for authorization to export LNG is "deemed" approved if the Department of Energy (DOE) or other federal agencies do not approve or deny the application within 30 days of the conclusion of the site review.

I have three concerns with this regulatory scheme.

First, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have a problem with "deeming" something done that has not been done in fact.

Thus, the provision is unwise.

Second, this provision is a remedy in search of a problem. There is no lengthy or intolerable backlog of neglected natural gas export authority applications awaiting action by DOE.

The provision is unnecessary because DOE has to date authorized the export of over 10 billion cubic feet per day of LNG to non-Free Trade Agreement countries.

Together with exports to FTA countries, this level of LNG exports that would transform the United States into one of the world's largest exporters.

Third, the provision is irresponsible because it would require DOE and other agencies to make decisions based on incomplete information or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

Supporters of this bill argue that it is vital, in the face of Russian aggression and restrictions, to provide our allies in Europe with additional exports of LNG.

However, because actual exports through approved terminals are not expected to begin until late 2015, this legislation will have no impact on current exports.

And, limiting the time for review would prevent DOE from properly analyzing the domestic impact that of exporting large amounts of LNG.

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimates that increased exports could result in an increase of as much as 8 percent in domestic LNG prices.

Given the inherent delicacy involved in assessing the impact of trade authorizations, both domestically and abroad, this state of affairs is likely to lead to DOE erring on the side of caution and denying applications that may otherwise have been approved if it had more time and more resources to carry out its responsibilities.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to oppose the bill before us and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 351—the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act.

H.R. 351 eliminates the ability for Washington bureaucrats to needlessly block the construction of liquefied natural gas (LNG) export facilities. Once the Department of Energy receives an application and environmental reviews have been completed, this legislation will place a thirty day deadline on the DOE in order to expedite permitting. One month is plenty of time for a determination to be made once all studies have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, for the past five years this process has been painfully slow. Since 2010, the DOE has only fully processed five of the 37 applications received for LNG export to countries where a Free Trade Agreement is not in place. These delays have inhibited our ability to reach our potential as a global energy producer, and the bill we have before us will remove some of the burdensome regulations that currently exist.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 351 will help put hardworking Americans back to work. A NERA Economic Consulting report informs us that making the needed investment to construct LNG export facilities will put 45,000 of our nation's unemployed back to work.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also has the ability to be used as a strong economic foreign policy tool. Less than a year ago, Vladimir Putin attempted to increase his power through force with the acquisition of Crimea and the prolonged stand-off in Eastern Ukraine. As a result, a number of our allies in Europe were placed in a tough spot because Russia is such a significant natural gas producer across the continent.

Despite the current economic woes that plague the Russian Federation, in order for us to prevent future aggressive posturing by Putin, we must undercut his ability to hold the region hostage because of energy. H.R. 351 will allow us to build our domestic infrastructure, which will give our European allies a place to turn in the event of future Russian aggression.

Mr. Speaker, for our own economic benefit, as well as the economic diplomacy that expanded LNG exports will provide, I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 351.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 351, which would create arbitrary and rigid deadlines for Department of Energy (DOE) approval of LNG exports. Rather than speeding up the approval process, this unnecessary legislation would likely force the Department to deny projects because they will not have the time to fully consider their impacts.

The Department of Energy is one of two agencies that must approve LNG export terminals. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission must first approve the terminal infrastructure, and then DOE must consider whether or not each facility's exports are in the national interest. That DOE review encompasses a number of considerations, including the environmental and domestic energy price impacts.

DOE has been working to refine this process and has approved several terminals, dramatically increasing the amount of LNG that will be exported from the United States. This shift in U.S. energy policy, from import to export, requires a complete review of the cumulative impact. For example, we should carefully monitor and control methane leakage

along the natural gas supply chain, which has a potent impact on climate change. And a number of domestic manufacturers have expressed concern about the impact of exports on energy prices here at home.

I am not opposed to some responsible expansion of LNG exports, but it must be done in a way that protects the environment and American taxpayers. The Department of Energy has been charged, rightly, with protecting the public interest in this process. We should not arbitrarily short-circuit that critical effort. I urge a no vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 351, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND CREATING AMERICAN JOBS.

In reviewing an application for authorization to export natural gas under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b), the Department of Energy—

(1) shall deny such application if the natural gas would be exported to any nation that is a state sponsor of terrorism or otherwise threatens America's national security, or to any nation or corporation that steals America's military technology or intellectual property through cyber-attacks; and

(2) shall require, as a condition for approval of any such authorization, the applicant to ensure that United States-flagged and built ships and shipping containers are used to export the LNG as such vessels become available for charter.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, this final amendment to the bill will not kill the bill. Frankly, it will substantially improve it. It won't send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will come to the floor for a vote later this morning.

We have heard a lot of discussion here about jobs in the Rules Committee, and I thank the chair, Mr. WHITFIELD, for his interest in this particular proposal and for the Rules Committee listening to the debate very carefully about how we can significantly advance America's national interest.

□ 1015

Natural gas is a strategic asset. It has allowed us to substantially reduce our energy costs in the United States; replace, re-power many of our power plants; bring down the cost; and, frankly, lead to an increased manufacturing sector.

Shipbuilding is also a strategic national asset. Our Navy depends upon it. However, 107,000 Americans work in the shipbuilding industry in our ports and ship yards. It is a strategic asset, as are the mariners. American mariners are also a strategic asset.

What we are trying to do with this amendment is to bring together these three strategic assets of America and advance the American economy and our national security at the same time.

This amendment would simply require that if we are going to export liquefied natural gas, a strategic asset, then we should do it in a way that advances our national security and our economy by requiring that those ships be manned and "womanned" by American mariners, the captains, the engineers, the sailors, that they be American.

This is a safety issue. Natural gas is a very volatile issue, and, under current law, when it is imported, it has to have American mariners on board.

Similarly, by requiring that the ships be American-built, we will be able to employ several hundred thousand new men and women in our shipyards. If it is about jobs—and we all claim this bill is about jobs—then let's take it another step. Let's take it another step, so that we really rebuild the American shipping industry, that we put American mariners to work, that we revitalize our shipyards, so that our U.S. Navy will be able to have a robust competition for their ships.

There are 117 shipyards in the United States that build ships. None of them, yet, build these tankers. They could if we pass this amendment.

Let's build it in America. Let's make it in America. This is a strategy that is employed by India, which has a tender out to buy gas from the United States. That tender requires that three of the ships used to transport that be built in India.

I say let's build the other seven in the United States. They want American natural gas; build the ships in America.

We know that this is a big industry. Cheniere needs 100 ships when they begin to ship natural gas, LNG, from

their new terminal in Texas—100 ships. Are those American ships?

No, not without this amendment. Those ships will be Chinese ships in Chinese shipyards built by Chinese.

How about America? How about building it in America?

That is what this amendment is about. We can all agree that we want American jobs. Is there one among the 435 of us who wants the jobs to be in China or Korea or Japan? I don't think so.

Let's do it in America. This is an American-made amendment. This is an amendment for American workers, American shipyards.

This is not going to kill the bill. This is going to make this bill into a real "Make It In America," a real American jobs bill with hundreds of thousands of jobs spread throughout this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, work with us. Make this into a real, robust American jobs bill. Adopt this amendment. Put aside the normal game we play with MTRs, which is just kind of a Kabuki dance here.

Let's do it for the American workers, for the American shipyards all across this Nation. That is what this is about.

This is an unexpected opportunity that has come about because of our great natural gas industry here. Take advantage of it. Think about the national security. Think about our shipyards, the U.S. Navy, the mariners. Make it in America. Adopt this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California for offering this motion to recommit. It has two basic parts to it. The first part relates to denying applications of natural gas that would be exported to any nation that is a state-sponsored terrorist.

We feel quite confident that, under the existing law and under H.R. 351, the Department of Energy is not going to approve the export of natural gas that is going to be in the public interest to any terrorist state.

The second question, which is a very important question—and as I said in the Rules Committee and say on the floor, I am delighted that Mr. GARAMENDI has raised this issue about U.S.-flagged ships being involved in the export.

As you know, his amendment goes to the Jones Act, and the Jones Act, as we all know, requires U.S.-flagged ships between ports here in the United States, but it does not expand to export and the use in other countries, and that raises a much broader issue than this very narrow-focused bill.

I do think that that discussion needs to take place at some point in time, but, at this time, I am going to respectfully request the Members to reject the motion to recommit.

I, and others, would look forward to talking to Mr. GARAMENDI in more detail about a broader debate on what impact expanding the Jones Act would have on our international trade.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Speaker will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 237, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—175

Adams	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Agullar	DeBene	Kennedy
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Bass	Deutch	Kilmer
Beatty	Dingell	Kind
Becerra	Doggett	Kirkpatrick
Bera	Doyle (PA)	Kuster
Beyer	Duncan (TN)	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Blumenauer	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lawrence
Boyle (PA)	Esty	Levin
Brown (FL)	Farr	Lewis
Brownley (CA)	Fattah	Lipinski
Bustos	Foster	Loeb sack
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren
Capps	Fudge	Lowenthal
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Lowey
Carney	Gallego	Lujan Grisham
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	(NM)
Cartwright	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray
Castor (FL)	Grayson	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Lynch
Chu (CA)	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Ciulline	Grijalva	Carolyn
Clark (MA)	Hahn	Maloney, Sean
Clarke (NY)	Hastings	Matsui
Cleaver	Heck (WA)	McCollum
Clyburn	Higgins	McDermott
Cohen	Himes	McGovern
Connolly	Hinojosa	McNerney
Conyers	Honda	Meng
Cooper	Hoyer	Moore
Costa	Huffman	Moulton
Courtney	Israel	Murphy (FL)
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Cummings	Jeffries	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Norcross
DeGette	Kaptur	O'Rourke
Delaney	Keating	Pallone

Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.

Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—237

Abraham	Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Gosar	Mullin
Allen	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Amash	Granger	Murphy (PA)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer
Babin	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Noem
Barr	Griffith	Nugent
Barton	Grothman	Nunes
Benishek	Guinta	Olson
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Palazzo
Bishop (MI)	Hanna	Palmer
Bishop (UT)	Hardy	Paulsen
Black	Harper	Pearce
Blackburn	Harris	Perry
Blum	Hartzler	Pittenger
Bost	Hensarling	Pitts
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hice (GA)	Poliquin
Brat	Hill	Pompeo
Bridenstine	Holding	Posey
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Price (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Buck	Hultgren	Reichert
Bucshon	Hunter	Renacci
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Ribble
Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Issa	Rigell
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Clawson (FL)	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Coffman	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Joyce	Roskam
Collins (GA)	Katko	Ross
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Comstock	King (IA)	Rouzer
Conaway	King (NY)	Royce
Cook	Kinzing (IL)	Russell
Costello (PA)	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Knight	Salmon
Crawford	Labrador	Sanford
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Scalise
Culberson	Lamborn	Schock
Curbelo (FL)	Lance	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Scott, Austin
Denham	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Long	Sessions
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Love	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Simpson
Dold	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Ellmers	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Emmer	Massie	Stefanik
Farenthold	McCarthy	Stewart
Fincher	McCaul	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McKinley	Thornberry
Flores	McMorris	Tiberi
Forbes	Rodgers	Tipton
Fortenberry	McSally	Trott
Fox	Meadows	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Valadao
Garrett	Mica	Wagner
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Walker

Walorski Whitfield Yoho
Walters, Mimi Williams
Weber (TX) Wilson (SC)
Webster (FL) Wittman
Wenstrup Womack
Westerman Woodall
Westmoreland Yoder

NOT VOTING—21

Brady (PA) Gutiérrez Neal
Capuano Heck (NV) Nunnelee
Clay Jones Perlmutter
Crowley Lee Roe (TN)
DeFazio Lieu (CA) Rohrabacher
Duckworth Marino Slaughter
Engel Meeks Young (AK)

□ 1050

Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, MARCHANT, BUCK, CRENSHAW, PALMER, JORDAN, HANNA, and NUNES changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WELCH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Messrs. POLIS, TAKAI, JOHNSON of Georgia, and TONKO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 133, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—277

Abraham Coffman Fortenberry
Aderholt Cole Foxx
Aguilar Collins (GA) Franks (AZ)
Allen Collins (NY) Frelinghuysen
Amash Comstock Garrett
Ashford Conaway Gibbs
Babin Connolly Gohmert
Barletta Cook Goodlatte
Barr Cooper Gosar
Barton Costa Gowdy
Benishek Costello (PA) Graham
Bera Cramer Granger
Bilirakis Crawford Graves (GA)
Bishop (MI) Crenshaw Graves (LA)
Bishop (UT) Cuellar Graves (MO)
Black Culberson Green, Al
Blackburn Curbelo (FL) Green, Gene
Blum Davis, Rodney Griffith
Bost Delaney Grothman
Boustany DelBene Guinta
Brady (TX) Denham Guthrie
Brat Dent Hanna
Bridenstine DeSantis Hardy
Brooks (AL) DesJarlais Harper
Brooks (IN) Diaz-Balart Harris
Buchanan Dold Hartzler
Buck Doyle (PA) Heck (WA)
Bucshon Duffy Hensarling
Burgess Duncan (SC) Herrera Beutler
Butterfield Duncan (TN) Hice (GA)
Byrne Ellmers Hill
Calvert Emmer Himes
Cárdenas Farenthold Hinojosa
Carter (GA) Fincher Holding
Carter (TX) Fitzpatrick Hoyer
Castro (TX) Fleischmann Hudson
Chabot Fleming Huelskamp
Chaffetz Flores Huizenga (MI)
Clawson (FL) Forbes Hultgren

Hunter Miller (FL)
Hurd (TX) Miller (MI)
Hurt (VA) Moolenaar
Israel Mooney (WV)
Issa Mullin
Jenkins (KS) Mulvaney
Jenkins (WV) Murphy (FL)
Johnson (OH) Murphy (PA)
Johnson, Sam Neugebauer
Jolly Newhouse
Jordan Noem
Joyce Norcross
Katko Nugent
Kelly (PA) Nunes
Kilmer Olson
King (IA) Palazzo
King (NY) Palmer
Kinzinger (IL) Paulsen
Kirkpatrick Pearce
Kline Perry
Knight Peters
Labrador Peterson
LaMalfa Pittenger
Lamborn Pitts
Lance Poe (TX)
Larsen (WA) Poliquin
Latta Pompeo
Lipinski Posey
LoBiondo Price (GA)
Long Ratcliffe
Loudermilk Reed
Love Reichert
Lucas Renacci
Luetkemeyer Ribble
Lujan Grisham Rice (SC)
(NM) Richmond
Luján, Ben Ray Rigell
(NM) Roby
Lummis Rogers (AL)
MacArthur Rogers (KY)
Maloney, Sean Rokita
Marchant Rooney (FL)
Massie Ros-Lehtinen
McCarthy Roskam
McCaul Ross
McClintock Rothfus
McHenry Rouzer
McKinley Royce
McMorris Ruppersberger
Rodgers Russell
McSally Ryan (OH)
Meadows Ryan (WI)
Meehan Salmon
Messer Sanford
Mica Scalise

NAYS—133

Adams Farr
Bass Fattah
Beatty Poster
Becerra Frankel (FL)
Beyer Fudge
Bishop (GA) Gabbard
Blumenauer Gallego
Bonamici Garamendi
Boyle (PA) Gibson
Brown (FL) Grayson
Brownley (CA) Grijalva
Bustos Hahn
Capps Hastings
Carney Higgins
Carson (IN) Honda
Cartwright Huffman
Castor (FL) Jackson Lee
Chu (CA) Jeffries
Cicilline Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA) Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY) Kaptur
Cleaver Keating
Clyburn Kelly (IL)
Cohen Kennedy
Conyers Kildee
Courtney Kind
Cummings Kuster
Davis (CA) Langevin
Davis, Danny Larson (CT)
DeGette Lawrence
DeLauro Levin
Deutch Lewis
Dingell Loeb sack
Doggett Lofgren
Edwards Lowenthal
Ellison Lowey
Eshoo Lynch
Esty

Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise

Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Walz

NOT VOTING—23

Amodei Engel Neal
Brady (PA) Gutiérrez Nunnelee
Capuano Heck (NV) Perlmutter
Clay Jones Roe (TN)
Crowley Lee Rohrabacher
DeFazio Lieu (CA) Slaughter
DeSaulnier Marino Young (AK)
Duckworth Meeks

□ 1057

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed Roll Call vote numbers 49 and 50. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on Roll Call vote number 49, and no on Roll Call vote number 50.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 2015 I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:

On Roll Call vote 49, on Agreeing to the Motion to Recombine With Instructions to H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act, I would have voted AYE.

On Roll Call vote 50, on Passage of H.R. 351, the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act, I would have voted NO.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2015; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 2015, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2015

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, January 30, 2015; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 2, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HEALTHCARE.GOV

(Mrs. BLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, more than a year after its launch, healthcare.gov remains just as flawed as the underlying ObamaCare law itself.

Most recently, we learned that the Obama administration was sharing users' personal data with numerous third party vendors. When the administration was caught with their hand in the cookie jar, they quickly scaled

back, but many unanswered questions remain.

That is why I have led a letter with Congressman PAT MEEHAN demanding answers regarding healthcare.gov data security and privacy policies. While we wait for their reply, we have also re-introduced the Federal Exchange Data Breach Notification Act, legislation simply requiring that the government notify consumers if their personal information is breached on the health care exchanges.

It defies all logic that this basic requirement isn't already law. It is time that we change that.

COMMON GROUND TO BE FOUND ON TRADE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the State of the Union Address, the President outlined some areas where common ground can be found to work with Congress. One important area is trade.

I agree with the President that we should move forward on trade agreements to create jobs for our workers as we expand exports to help our manufacturers, our ranchers, and our farmers. With the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, we will allow American companies to sell our goods and services in the emerging markets of Asia and create jobs here at home. A new trade agreement with Europe to help streamline and modernize standards and regulations will level the playing field for American companies.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States, and these trade agreements will give us the opportunity to build on the success that we already enjoy. In Minnesota, 750,000 jobs are directly connected to international trade. It is time for the President and the Congress to move forward on a robust trade agenda to help create a healthier economy.

CELEBRATING LIFE OF JIM NYSTROM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Jim Nystrom of Titusville, Pennsylvania, who passed away last weekend.

After serving in the military, raising a family, and building a successful practice as a CPA, Jim still answered the call of his community each and every time it was raised. Over the years, he served as president of the school board, as a city council member, as mayor of the city of Titusville, and

on almost every board and organization that needed volunteer help to fulfill their mission. When local businesses found themselves in trouble, Jim was always there, lending his advice and expertise that saved countless jobs in the process, never with the expectation of credit or recognition.

Please join me in celebrating the life of Jim Nystrom and in sending the sympathy of this institution to Jim's family and to the many friends who survive him.

You will long be remembered, Jim, for your drive, your generosity, and for a life well lived.

THANKING SAN DIEGO FIRE DEPARTMENT AND CHIEF BRIAN FENNESSY

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight San Diegoan Brian Fennessy, assistant fire chief of the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, who is here in D.C. sharing his expertise fighting wildfires so that communities across the country can be better prepared.

This morning, Chief Fennessy testified before the House Transportation Committee's Economic Development Subcommittee on ways to speed up disaster recovery and save taxpayer dollars by lessening the harm of disasters.

In San Diego, we have learned many lessons from the numerous firestorms of the last decade, including the importance of increasing preparedness and emergency planning, and the need for coordination among various levels of government.

As extreme weather becomes more prevalent, sharing information from local experiences on what does work and doesn't work will only become more important.

So thank you to Chief Fennessy for sharing your experience, and I thank all of the brave men and women of the San Diego Fire Department.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been blessed with children in the back of our minds always fear for their health and their safety. Maine is one of the safest States in America. Even so, our families have not been immune to the horror of child kidnapping, rape, and sex trafficking.

Two years ago, Maine State legislator Amy Volk had the courage to lead a very painful public discussion about the risk of human trafficking in Maine. Her persistence resulted in the

awareness of this horrific violence waged against our children living in Maine and those being brought to our State.

Yesterday, I was proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with my Republican and Democrat colleagues in the House to unanimously pass the first of a dozen bills to fight the scourge of human trafficking in America.

As parents and as public officials, we owe it to our families to help our States and our local communities with stronger law enforcement and tougher criminal penalties for those who prey upon our children.

I ask our colleagues in the Senate to now do the same and to help rid this land of the unthinkable horrors of human trafficking.

RAISING SHASTA DAM

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service brought up a possible concern on salmon habitat on a water storage project in California. This would be above Shasta Dam. There is a proposal to possibly raise the dam.

But what really gets me is that the concern more is about a fictional problem with salmon habitat that really doesn't exist above a possible raise of the dam, and not much more attention focused on what the effects would be on the people that live around the lake and the need they would have for infrastructure, their resorts, marinas, the things that they do there.

So it is really disconcerting that U.S. Fish & Wildlife is creating a fictional problem on an environmental side and not looking at the human impact of what a possible raise—it may be a good thing; it may be not a good thing—the raise of Shasta Dam could be. I implore them to take a look at what the needs are of the people around that lake.

COMBATING TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON).

NO NUCLEAR IRAN

Mr. CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOHMERT for yielding to me.

Already a grave and growing existential threat to Israel, a nuclear armed Iran would be a colossal, horrific game changer. It would launch a nuclear arms race in what is already the world's most dangerous neighborhood.

We all know that this must not be allowed to happen.

The Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear ambitions are made more dire when considering that they are the world's most dangerous state supporter of Islamic extremist terrorism, with a destabilizing presence in Lebanon, in Syria, and in Iraq. And Iran's financial and military support for the Houthi rebels in Yemen has led to the collapse of the Hadi government.

Thus, Iran today exerts major influence, not just in rebel territories, but in four Middle East capitals—Beirut, Baghdad, Damascus and Sana'a.

The crisis in Yemen threatens to launch yet another civil war in the region, and this severely handicaps U.S. counterterrorism operations against AQAP. Islamists in Iran and elsewhere repeatedly threaten to slaughter all standing in their way—with their ultimate targets being Israel and the United States—us, their great Satan. They must never be allowed nuclear weapons capabilities. Does anyone really doubt whether they would use these capabilities someday? Well, there must be some reason why Iran is developing ICBMs.

Last week, Iran's Channel 2 broadcast satellite imagery showing recently constructed missile-related sites. Those sites included a launch pad capable of firing an ICBM, and on that launch pad was a never-seen-before missile measuring 27 meters in length. While we negotiate, the Iran story gets worse.

We have been extending deadlines and softening sanctions on Iran, while they fail to meet their end of the bargain.

□ 1115

It is bizarre to me that we are debating with the Iranians the numbers of their centrifuges but leaving off the table their support for terrorism, their ICBMs, and their continued human rights violations.

Is it the right thing to do to sit across the table, remain silent about the costs we and our allies have paid and are paying because of their financial and military support of our enemies? Does this make sense? Shouldn't we insist on adding to the agenda Iran's destabilizing actions in the region and also their ICBM program that puts us all at risk?

Merely delaying some of the potential horror for a decade or so is not a good option in my view. A bad deal where we declare victory by kicking this can down the road is far worse than no deal at all.

Iran now threatens to end nuclear talks if Congress increases sanctions against their regime. I say we must never yield to threats from Iran or any other nation.

We must stand strong, continue sanctions, and even strengthen them until

Iran gets the message. I believe that strengthening sanctions will get us a better deal. Leverage produces a better deal.

We must remain unwavering in our support for Israel. We must listen carefully to the concerns of Prime Minister Netanyahu on this subject. I hope we unite with our Arab partners and do all that is possible to prevent Iran from going nuclear.

We must lead the civilized world in this crucial mission. I think this is our destiny.

We urge President Obama to join with Congress in this resolve.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal going on, and I think the first thing that needs to be addressed is the 70th anniversary of something that should never have happened in civilized society. This is the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz death camp.

As a schoolboy growing up in east Texas, later attending Texas A&M, and especially in my time, my 4 years in the United States Army, as we discussed and looked at World War II, things that had occurred then—I was a history major and was with the Army for 4 years and majored in history.

It was just always amazing. How could people who said they were civilized kill 6 million of any race, gender, national origin? How could that happen?

But it did happen. On learning that Eisenhower required people from the surrounding villages to be brought in to help clean up concentration camps, death camps—as I understood the reason—was so no one could ever deny that the death camps occurred.

I thought that seemed ridiculous. How could anybody deny the Holocaust? There aren't all that many survivors, but there are enough, and the evidence is there, and it clearly happened. But just as Hitler showed, if any lie is told often enough, people begin to believe it, especially if it is even printed.

Here is something that was in print yesterday from a man named Martin Greenfield from foxnews.com, and these are Martin Greenfield's words. Mr. Greenfield said:

Seventy years ago, I was in a Nazi concentration camp. Since then, I have seen tyrants and dictators enter and exit the global stage; yet as the world prepares to mark the 70th anniversary of the Auschwitz liberation, it is perhaps well and right that we reflect on how the Holocaust shocked the moral imagination on a scale the world could scarcely fathom.

Why ponder such things? Because for far too many, the Holocaust remains a mystery. A major poll taken last year of 53,000 people found that just 54 percent had ever heard of the Holocaust. Knowledge of Auschwitz is likely even more limited, particularly among young people. Past surveys have shown that nearly half of Britons had never heard of Auschwitz. Some schoolchildren even thought Auschwitz was a type of beer.

Here at home in America, a debate erupted last year when a teenager posted a smiling selfie at Auschwitz. Whatever your opinion on the appropriateness of her actions, I was at least pleased to be reminded that some young Americans still visit the Nazi concentration camp to learn history up close.

I, too, visited Auschwitz as a teenager. In 1944, my family and I stood in line before Dr. Josef Mengele—the Nazi physician known as the “Angel of Death”—as my mother, grandparents, two sisters, and baby brother were all sent to the left to be burned in Hitler's ovens. My father and I were sent to the right.

The first night inside Auschwitz, my father said we must separate because, together, we would suffer double.

He quoted his father, “On your own, you will survive,” his father told him. “You are young and strong, and I know you will survive. If you survive by yourself, you must honor us by living, by not feeling sorry for us. This is what you must do.”

That was the last time I ever saw my father. I am grateful for my father's words of grace and guidance. They echo in my heart even still. It is a cruel thing, feeling guilty for surviving, but my father erased any future guilt and replaced it with purpose. It was a gift only a father's wisdom could give. It gave me a reason to go forward, a reason to be. It does still.

Part of heeding my father's words involved replacing the horrors of my Holocaust past with a life spent creating beauty in the form of hand-tailored suits for U.S. Presidents, Hollywood films, and the world's most influential men.

In fact, my first sewing lesson took place in the Auschwitz concentration camp laundry when I accidentally ripped the collar of a Nazi soldier's shirt. A guard beat me before a kind, older inmate taught me how to sew a simple stitch to repair the torn shirt. It was hardly the ideal tailoring apprenticeship, but it was my first lesson in the skill that became my livelihood.

But at 86, another part of honoring my father's wishes requires being a voice for the voiceless. Indeed, as parents, educators, and citizens, we must all do our part to help ensure that “Never Forget” remains much more than a threadbare catchphrase that gathers dust and loses meaning with each passing year.

For example, many people are surprised to learn that Auschwitz was actually a complex comprised of three main camps and dozens of satellites. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's statistics estimate that between 1940 and 1945, at least 1.1 million Jews and 200,000 of Hitler's undesirables were sent to the Auschwitz complex. Of those, 1.1 million were murdered.

As I have noted elsewhere, that number would have been far greater were it not for the courage of the American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who traveled around the world to defeat a moral darkness that consumed at least 6 million Jewish souls.

That is a lesson worthy of remembrance. The 70th anniversary of the liberation marks that moment when freedom conquered barbarism through sureness of virtue and strength of will. Sadly, as recent events reveal, that remains a lesson humanity must learn and relearn from generation to generation.

The word “Holocaust” means sacrifice by fire. May the memory of the millions who were engulfed in the flames like my family never be forgotten.

That is Martin Greenfield, 70 years after being liberated from Auschwitz death camp.

There is another article from CBC News. Aleksandra Sagan includes this regarding Mordechai Ronen, 82, born with the family name Markovits. He would be making a second visit to Auschwitz for the commemoration ceremonies.

At nearly 12, Ronen saw Auschwitz for the first time as a prisoner after soldiers forced all the Jews in his Hungarian town into a ghetto and, 2 weeks later, shipped them in cattle cars to the camp.

Dr. Josef Mengele, the Nazis' Angel of Death, sent Ronen's mother and two sisters to the gas chambers on arrival. Young Ronen made a lifesaving decision when he held on to his father's hand and joined the line of men.

He spent about 2 weeks at Auschwitz, where he witnessed soldiers using an infant for target practice and slept on piles of corpses to avoid selection for the gas chamber.

He and his father were moved to a nearby labor camp where the brutality continued. One day, his father told Ronen he could no longer get up to work for the cement brigade. Ronen last saw his father as soldiers took him away. It is the only day he remembers crying and the day he decided to survive.

Ronen was liberated from a third camp, Gunsckirchen, and remembers walking to a nearby town, knocking on a resident's door and asking if he could take a shower.

Ronen, who prefers to be called a "victor" rather than a survivor, first returned to Auschwitz in 1999, when he guided then-Prime Minister Jean Chretien around the grounds.

It is important to Ronen to show the world he is alive and to share the history of the Holocaust.

"Maybe the world will realize what we went through, and it will be the end, and we are going to have peace and quiet in the world," he explains.

Unfortunately, it is not the end of horrors. Tragically, Christians now are being killed, persecuted, and tortured in greater numbers than ever in the history of the world.

□ 1130

Anti-Semitism, hatred against Jews, is growing like I couldn't have imagined. In college, when I studied in history, I couldn't have imagined the kind of anti-Jewish hatred, the kind of anti-Semitism that would be growing as it has, and the United States of America would be doing precious little about it instead of standing up for the Jewish people and calling out anti-Semitism where it exists and where it grows and proliferates, as it does in the United Nations, for example, as it has in Europe, as it has in England, as it has right here in America.

It is unconscionable that at a time in world history when the United States is said to be the true superpower of the world—even as that power has been seen as diminishing by people around the world, as polling indicates around the world, but still to be seen as the

great superpower—as anti-Jewish hatred grows and we do precious little about it, and even at times stoke those flames, even in our universities, who are so proud of accepting massive amounts of money from people who are part of organizations that hate Jews and fund such courses or seminars on things like Islamophobia, not a liberated mental process of recognizing anti-Semitism, recognizing Jewish hatred—no, stoking those flames against the Jewish people. It is unbelievable that it is happening here in America as well.

And it is even more unbelievable that it is happening among what some would refer to as the intelligentsia, those who are supposed to be more enlightened than the rest of a nation, who see things as they truly are. And yet, in America, some of those supposed enlightened intelligentsia are growing to be some of the most anti-Semitic people in the country.

How did all this happen? Money for one thing, political power for another. But it has to stop. Money and initially power in Nazi Germany stoked the flames of anti-Jewish hatred. But there is anti-Christian hatred growing as well. Radical Islam has proliferated around the world. Violent radical Islam has grown. They aren't junior varsities. These are literal cutthroats who have to be stopped.

It is not enough for the United States administration to beg radical Islamists, Jew- and Christian-hating leaders to sit at the table or offer to let their murderers go free if they will just sit down and visit with us, reminiscent of what Jimmy Carter wanted to do after an act of war was committed against our Embassy, and in the 36 years that have followed, what appeared to radical Islamists as a weak, paper tiger, toothless America did nothing but beg to sit down and talk and try to encourage Iran to let our prisoners go. It was not until Ronald Reagan took office they were released. They never wanted to fight the United States superpower.

That has been changed over the years. Since '79, when they committed an act of war, attacked our Embassy, around the world people have been shown: Oh, you can do that against the United States and get away with it. The good thing is they may end up leaving your country and then they may offer to give you money. They may offer to release murderers from prison so they can come back and help kill more Americans. You know, they are not very smart over there in the United States. That has been going on since 1979.

It is tragic when we encourage radical Islamist holocausts, which is what they would like to do, they said they were going to do, by letting the murderers go. How could this administration for months now think that Yemen

was a great example of moderate Islam working out? I have known since a constituent months ago was in jeopardy, and we were able to get special ops people to help get them out.

According to them, the Embassy was attacked many months ago. Back at the time Embassy personnel officially said: "No, it was a nearby attack, but it wasn't us." When the Iranian-backed Houthis, the radical Islamists in Yemen, were taking over the capital and taking over the country—and instead of standing up firmly against them and protecting our American interests we were releasing murderers, radical Islamic murderers—we were talking about how wonderful things were in Yemen. That is exactly how the kind of anti-Jewish, anti-Christian sentiment could grow to the point of having a holocaust.

It is literally breathtaking for an administration not to understand that while it is trying to placate radical Islamic leaders in Iran and telling them: "We just want to talk. As long as you will keep talking to us, we will keep Israel from protecting themselves to their own detriment. Just keep talking to us and you keep those centrifuges spinning, that is fine with us."

Now we know, we have been informed, that the administration has taken complete dismantlement of the centrifuges and their equipment to help them create nuclear weapons off the table. It is not even something they are demanding anymore. In other words, the word is out that this administration is apparently okay with Iran getting nukes but just would prefer that it wait until after this President leaves office. It doesn't matter when a President leaves office. If an administration gives bloodthirsty zealots the ability to create a holocaust, history does not forgive them simply because they had already left office when the holocaust actually started.

Nigeria doesn't need us to send troops to stop the radical Islamists there, but they need help. Boko Haram continues to kill, rape, torture. There it is about going after Christians. The small-scale holocausts that Boko Haram is creating don't get so much as a whimper these days from this administration. They may say a few words, but they are hollow and they do not affect Boko Haram as they continue to be emboldened.

Just like when the IRS was caught redhanded being weaponized and used as a Democratic political tool, which appears to have violated criminal law—yes, we have had hearings, but we haven't held them accountable. And, therefore, it seems to have encouraged even more impropriety by people within the IRS.

When people get caught in impropriety and don't pay a cost, then you see what we are seeing in Nigeria, you see what we are seeing in Afghanistan,

in Pakistan, in Syria, in Iran, in Iraq, and in Libya.

Oh, I know the President, his administration, bragged about the Arab Spring and about taking out Qadhafi, who had become an ally after he gave up any efforts for nuclear weapons, completely opened his defenses to the United States. This administration and the prior administration had agreements with Qadhafi. But this administration never lets agreements get in the way of helping radical Islamists.

Because this administration did help radical Islam turn Libya into a smoking country where people die, where our own people were not protected, because of the fantasy of those who thought that somehow the name, the United States, would be adequate to keep Chris Stevens and the other Americans safe in Benghazi. We didn't need to give them added security like they asked for, we didn't even need to respond when Chris Stevens called and said they were under attack—never said anything about a video because it was not.

But that smokescreen worked. The President got reelected. He didn't have to account for that before the election, still hasn't had to account for where he was and why help was not forthcoming.

I mean, even after 20 hours this administration that had planes—we know for sure within 3½ hours—after 20 hours they get a private plane there, that is it. David Ubben, with most of his leg, right leg, blown off, no painkillers, no morphine, they don't have a C-130 that they land to take him up in on a gurney. They get a private plane from somebody who wasn't even American, and they have to knock David up against the door, turning the gurney every which way trying to get him in, without painkillers, causing more pain, more suffering, because this administration, apparently they were thinking that if they sent more help than just a private plane like that, a military plane, if that were sent, it might look like Libya were not the wonderful country that this administration helped create by bombing Qadhafi out of existence.

And, yes, it was not, it is true, it was not a U.S. bomb that took Qadhafi out. But our bombs put him on the run, our bombs stopped his caravan. Our President wouldn't respond for 3 days after Qadhafi offered to leave in exile and avoid any bloodshed before it all started. This administration didn't respond. Obviously, they were okay with having bloodshed and Qadhafi being wiped out. So they got what they were hoping for, obviously.

□ 1145

But what do we have now?

We have a country in Libya that is in absolute turmoil. By the way, because Libya is in turmoil due to this administration, they are helping turn Egypt

into as much turmoil as they can. Thank God for President el-Sisi. In having met with him on more than one occasion, I was impressed by the man. Before he was President, he asked that we bring back a message to this administration since this administration—this President—froze the helicopters that were being sent, the Apaches. The question was: Does this administration—does this President—not understand that we use the Apache helicopters to keep the Suez Canal open?

Although there were some that bought Morsi's lies that he was dewatering the Sinai—supposedly to diminish the threat to Israel from the Sinai—and after Morsi was removed for his unconstitutional actions, not in a coup but in an uprising, which was a peaceful revolution by reportedly over 30 million of their 90 million people, they found that the Sinai had been dramatically weaponized and had been contributing weapons equipment to Gaza to help threaten and cause terror to Israel.

Once again, whether it is the Sinai, Gaza, northern Israel that was given to Lebanon, it seems going back to the very inception of Israel—back when Israel was first brought, according to the Bible, into the Promised Land—we know of Canaan. The Canaanites no longer exist, so other people claim it who are not Canaanites. Actually, the Israelis had claim to it after the Canaanites. Others who occupied the land back over 3,000 years ago don't exist. This land, according to the Bible, was given to the children of Israel. It seems to be true that there has never been a time when Israel gave away land when trying to buy peace that that land that they gave away was not used as a staging area from which to attack it.

Gaza, what a noble thing to do by the Israelis. They took an area that was prosperous, self-sustaining, with greenhouses growing vegetables that would feed the people who lived there. An amazing place was the Gaza Strip. Then some noble Israeli leaders thought, Do you know what? It is not required. We are getting absolutely nothing in return, but we are going to do the unilateral act that will be so noble, that will be so full of grace that the world, even those who don't like us, will go, Wow. Those Israelis, they are okay. They are nice folks.

Look, they didn't get anything in return; yet they still gave away the Gaza Strip. What a wonderful group of people. I mean, that just doesn't happen. The United States never gave back its land to England or to Spain or to France or to other countries that initially had claims here. Other countries don't do that, but Israel did. They gave away the Gaza Strip. Previous to that, they had given away what northern Israel now calls southern Lebanon. Southern Lebanon, people will recall, has been the site of attacks on Israelis—war.

So how was this grace, this beneficence of Israel's giving the Gaza Strip to the Palestinians, rewarded? It has been rewarded by their giving back to Israel thousands upon thousands upon thousands of rockets. Some kill. All terrorize. All cost money to Israel.

The most important problem they have created is the threat to life, the threat to their existence; and we still have people in this country who say, well, if you just keep giving away land, eventually, they will be satisfied, when the very materials that are being promoted by the people this administration supports among the Islamists—they made very clear the reason we name holidays, streets, areas, parks after suicide bombers who kill innocent children, women, men is that we, ultimately, are going to destroy Israel and wipe it off the map. We hate Jews that much; and this administration thinks, somehow, they will bring radical Islam around to really being this group of peace.

Now, there is a document that was an exhibit in the United States v. the Holy Land Foundation in which there were many individuals and groups named as coconspirators. They were not indicted, but they were named as coconspirators. It includes the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, which has a nice office building just up the street here, and the Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, the leader of which is Imam Magid, who goes to the White House, who goes to the State Department, who advises the President and let's him know when somebody is criticizing Islam, so the administration steps in and goes after him.

In this exhibit from the Holy Land Foundation trial—it was the biggest funding of terrorism case ever in U.S. history, and people who were involved originally had indicated the goal was to convict these first five, to name all of these coconspirators, and if we get convictions of those first five, like we think we should, then we proceed and go after the remainder. They were convicted in late 2008. President Obama took office a month or two later, and this administration would under no circumstances go after these people who had been alleged in the documents of funding radical Islamic terrorism even after the U.S. District Court in Dallas and the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans confirmed that there was plenty of evidence to support that someone like ISNA or CAIR was a legitimate coconspirator named in the indictment and that their names would not be removed.

I have asked for years now of the Justice Department to make available the documents that were provided to the convicted terrorists—those funding terrorism or terrorists—and this administration now, for years, has drug their feet and has refused to provide all of the documents that were provided to the terrorists.

On one occasion, the Attorney General basically said there are issues here of privilege, and my point was—and is—you gave them to the terrorists; surely, you can give them to Members of Congress. But the answer is, no, they can't. They are going to keep obfuscating. They don't want us to see all of the documents that they had in their possession that they gave to the terrorists. I have a feeling, if we saw all of the documents, it would be very, very clear in the purging that this administration has done of our training materials of the FBI's, of the intelligence agency's, of the State Department's, and the Justice Department's that, if there is anything that might bother a radical Islamist who wants to kill us, then it has to be removed. They removed it.

In the document from a 1991 meeting, in what is called an "Explanatory Memorandum," it spells out their goals. It was written in 1991 by a member of the board of directors of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America and by a senior Hamas leader named Mohamed Akram. It had been approved by the Muslim Brotherhood's Shura Council and Organizational Conference, and it was meant for internal review by the Muslim Brotherhood leadership in Egypt. It was not intended for public consumption. These are the words from the introduction that is part of this document from the Center for Security Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from the document, itself, prepared by the Muslim Brotherhood in 1991, setting their goals for America:

One: The Memorandum is Derived from:

One, the general strategic goal of the group in America, which was approved by the Shura Council and the Organizational Conference for the year 1987, is: "Enablement of Islam in North America, meaning: establishing an effective and stable Islamic movement led by the Muslim Brotherhood which adopts Muslims' causes domestically and globally and which works to expand the observant Muslim base; aims at unifying and directing Muslims' efforts; presents Islam as a civilization alternative; and supports the global Islamic state—if that name sounds familiar—wherever it is."

Two, the priority that is approved by the Shura Council for the work of the group in its current and former session, which is "settlement."

Skipping down to "Two: An Introduction to the Explanatory Memorandum," it says:

The question we are facing is: "How do you like to see the Islam movement in North America in 10 years?" or "taking along" the following sentence when planning and working "Islamic Work in North America in the year 2000: A strategic vision."

It goes on:

Also, we must summon and take along elements of the general strategic goal of the group in North America.

For those large numbers of people in college who may not realize, North America is where we live.

The document says:

I will intentionally repeat them in numbers. They are:

One, establishing an effective and stable Islamic movement led by the Muslim Brotherhood.

Two, adopting Muslims' causes domestically and globally.

Three, expanding the observant Muslim base.

Four, unifying and directing Muslim efforts.

Five, presenting Islam as a civilization alternative.

Six, supporting the establishment of the global Islamic state, wherever it is.

□ 1200

The document says:

It must be stressed that it has become clear and emphatically known that all is in agreement that we must "settle" or "enable" Islam and its movement in this part of the world.

Three: The Concept of Settlement:

The term was mentioned in the group's "dictionary" and documents with various meanings in spite of the fact that everyone meant one thing with it. We believe that the understanding of the essence is the same, and we will attempt here to give the word and its "meanings" a practical explanation with a practical movement tone and not a philosophical linguistic explanation, while stressing that this explanation of ours is not complete until our explanation of "the process" of settlement itself is understood which is mentioned in the following paragraph. We briefly say the following:

Settlement: "That Islam and its movement become a part of the homeland it lives in."

Establishment: "That Islam turns into firmly rooted organizations on whose bases civilization, structure, and testimony are built."

Further down, it goes on, "That Islam is stable in the land."

Rooting: "That Islam is resident and not a passing thing or rooted 'entrenched' in the soil of the spot where it moves and not a strange plant to it."

Four: The Process of Settlement:

In order for Islam and its movement to become "a part of the homeland" in which it lives—

Talking about North America.

—"stable" in its land, "rooted" in the spirits and minds of its people, "enabled" in the life of its society and has firmly established "organizations" on which the Islamic structure is built and with which the testimony of civilization is achieved, the movement must plan and struggle to obtain "the keys" and the tools of this process in carrying out this grand mission as a "civilization jihadist" responsibility which lies on the shoulders of Muslims and—on top of them—the Muslim Brotherhood in this country.

Talking about here in the United States, North America.

"Among these keys and tools are the following." It goes on to talk about the settlement concept and the fundamental shift toward settlement of this country.

Number four:

Understanding the Role of the Muslim Brother in North America:

The process of settlement is a "civilization jihadist process," with all the word means.

Anyway, it goes on.

Another place here, it says:

There is a conviction—with which this memorandum disagrees—that our focus in attempting to settle Islam in this country will lead to negligence in our duty towards the global Islamic movement in supporting its project to establish the state.

We believe that the reply is in two segments. One, the success of the movement in America—

Talking about the United States of America.

One, the success of the movement in America in establishing an observant Islamic base with power and effectiveness will be the best support and aid to the global movement project.

And the second is the global movement has not succeeded yet in "distributing roles" to its branches, stating what is needed from them as one of the participants or contributors to the project to establish the global Islamic state. The day this happens, the children of the American Ikhwan branch will have far-reaching impact and positions that make the ancestors proud.

It is a great document goal for taking over the United States, which brings another story to the surface. It is from Bob Price from breitbart.com. "Islamic Tribunal Confirmed in Texas; Attorney Claims 'It's Voluntary,'" and it talks about the new Islamic tribunal in Texas that has been confirmed now by Breitbart Texas.

The tribunal is operating as a non-profit organization in Dallas. Because when you understand the goals, if there is a major defeat or a major success, Muslim Brotherhood requires a mosque be built there and a presence there.

Naturally, they would want one at Ground Zero in New York; further, they would want a mosque and a strong presence in Dallas which was, they believe, the place of their big defeat when the Holy Land Foundation principals were convicted and sent to prison.

I did want to point out, as we finish up here today, that the President was giving an excellent speech in India about the importance of stopping the global war on women. He didn't call it that. He only calls it that for Republicans, but there is a war on women, and it is not by Republicans. It is radical Islam and even some moderate Islamists.

He is giving this talk about the importance of recognizing the importance and the equality of women—or some of us might say they are more equal than we are—but as he was doing that, this picture was on Saudi television.

We have our United States President depicted here, and this is the First Lady of the United States of America being blurred out by this country's allies because she wasn't covered. Michelle Obama should never need to be covered if she doesn't want to be; yet at the very time our President is talking about equality of women, he fails to notice that people that he considers allies are treating his own wife like this.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we stand up against radical Islam or any

Islam that wants a settlement civilization jihad in America. Anything and anybody who disagrees with the United States Constitution and wants to destroy it, tear it down, is an enemy to the United States and needs to be recognized as such and not welcomed with open arms at the State Department and the White House.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 30, 2015, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

235. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance From the U.S. Department of Agriculture (RIN: 0503-AA57) received January 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

236. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's sixth interim and final report on a national study of credit report accuracy, entitled "Report to Congress Under Section 319 of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003 (January 2015)"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

237. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Direct Grant Programs and Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations [Docket ID: ED-2014-OI-0116] (RIN: 1855-AA10) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

238. A letter from the Acting Director, Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Proximity Detection Systems for Continuous Mining Machines in Underground Coal Mines [Docket No. MSHA-2010-0001] (RIN: 1219-AB65) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

239. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Steamboat Springs

[EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0814; FRL-9921-54-Region 8] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

240. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan Approved by EPA through Letter Notice Actions [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0494; FRL-9921-71-Region 3] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

241. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0772; FRL-9921-83-Region 4] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

242. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0446; FRL-9921-69-Region 10] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

243. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of New Mexico; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; General Definitions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0033; FRL-9921-79-Region 6] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

244. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flupyradifurone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0226; FRL-9914-77] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

245. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fosetyl-Al; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0540; FRL-9920-54] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

246. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2014-0710; FRL-9921-90-Region 4] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

247. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0781; FRL-9920-52-Region 9] received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

248. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Com-

merce, transmitting a report on Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine, pursuant to the Export Administration Act, section 6(f)(2), under the authority conferred by Executive Order 13222, as amended and extended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

249. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of FS, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Straight-Horned Markhor as Threatened With a Rule Under Section 4(d) of the ESA [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0003; FXES111309F2460-145-FF09E22000] (RIN: 1018-AY42) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

250. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the Western Distinct Population Segment of the Yellow-billed Cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*) [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2013-0104; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY53) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

251. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision to the Regulations for the Nonessential Experimental Population of the Mexican Wolf [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0056; FXES11130900000-156-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-AY46) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

252. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Mexican Wolf [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2013-0073; FXES11130900000-156-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-AY00) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LONG, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 578. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 579. A bill to provide for incentives for agencies and the judiciary to increase operating efficiency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BARTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 580. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 581. A bill to authorize a National Heritage Area Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 582. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 583. A bill to provide for sanctions on countries that have refused or unreasonably delayed repatriation of an alien who is a national of that country, or that have an excessive repatriation failure rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 584. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of certain retirement benefits for Members of Congress, except the right to continue participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 585. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consider-

ation of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. COOPER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 586. A bill to establish the Independent Government Waste Reduction Board to make recommendations to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 587. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to improve early education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 588. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding the Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities repealed by section 3204(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BLUM, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 589. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 590. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 591. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research program to ensure contin-

ued United States leadership in engineering biology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 592. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 593. A bill to extend the authorization for the construction of the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Aurora, Colorado, and to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers to manage such construction; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BARR, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BOST, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DENT, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HARDY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 594. A bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FARR, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 595. A bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 596. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, Rules, House Administration, Appropriations, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COLE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. REED, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BOST, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 597. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOST, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 598. A bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 599. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the taxation of hard cider; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 601. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual privacy notice requirement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 602. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. NUNNELEE):

H.R. 603. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in the Account until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Fund in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security surplus in the Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 604. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes related to family-sponsored immigrants and to reduce the number of such immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HARPER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 605. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 606. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 607. A bill to amend the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 to extend the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 608. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 609. A bill to establish the Food Safety Administration to protect the public health by preventing foodborne illness, ensuring the safety of food, improving research on contaminants leading to foodborne illness, and improving security of food from intentional contamination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 610. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to audit States to determine if such States used Medicaid funds in violation of the Hyde Amendment and other Federal prohibitions on funding for abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 611. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 relating to determinations with respect to efforts of foreign countries to reduce demand for commercial sex acts under the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr.

MARCHANT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BUCHSHON):

H.R. 612. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 613. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize veterans' treatment courts and encourage services for veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MULVANEY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 614. A bill to provide for savings, accountability, value, and efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Appropriations, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Financial Services, House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 615. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 616. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for reforms to the EB-5 immigrant investor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 617. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the clinical trial registry data bank reporting requirements and enforcement measures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 618. A bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Govern-

ment Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 619. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEYER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants with minority serving institutions for the purpose of establishing verified delivery systems to address social and academic problems facing veterans enrolled at such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of January 2015 as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 59. A resolution recognizing the National Construction Equipment Museum established, operated and maintained by the Historical Construction Equipment Association located in Bowling Green, Ohio, as the National Construction Equipment Museum; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H. Res. 60. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Small Business in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 61. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Stalking Awareness Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HONDA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H. Res. 62. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding sexually exploited and trafficked girls in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 63. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on House Administration in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H. Res. 64. A resolution recognizing January 2015 as "National Mentoring Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and the Second Amendment, which states: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. WEBSTER of Florida:

H.R. 579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 which provides that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes"

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution: The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for the Senior Citizens Tax Elimination Act is found in Article I, Section 8, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

The purpose of the bill is to provide assistance to the VA for their construction activities so that the veteran population has access to healthcare facilities. In order for the U.S. Government to support and regulate our land and naval forces for future engagements, it is necessary and proper for the Congress to legislate the construction of facilities so the current and future veteran population is provided adequate healthcare.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power to regulate inter-state commerce is set forth Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Power to "regulate commerce among the several states" If the matter in question is not a purely local matter (intra-state) or if it has an impact on inter-state commerce, it falls within the Congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius* (2012).

Also Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2; Article 6, Clause 2; and the 10th Amendment, which grants states all authority not explicitly given to the federal government, pursuant to which this bill seeks to return to the states authority previously and erroneously claimed by the federal government.

Finally, Article I, section 8, clause 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution; (2) to make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Act repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010, which included several specific provisions that extend beyond the enumerated powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, including, in particular, the Commerce, Taxing, and the Spending Clauses of Article I, Section 8, as well as the Necessary and Proper Clauses contained therein, and that otherwise improperly extend authority to Federal agencies in a manner inconsistent with the Vesting Clause of Article I, Section 1.

The general repeal of this legislation is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 states, "The Congress shall have Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress has the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof . . ."

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—to regulate commerce with foreign nations

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act erases the forced-dues clauses in the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and Railway Labor Act (RLA). As such, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: to provide for the common defense and general welfare.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, impost and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) (1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 24: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MESSER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 25: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 114: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 154: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 167: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 169: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 173: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 188: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 204: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 210: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 235: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 237: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 284: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 290: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 310: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 315: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 340: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 353: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 361: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 365: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 370: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 400: Mr. EMMER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 402: Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 413: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 417: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 424: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 427: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 430: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 431: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr.

SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HILL, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LANCE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. DENT, Mr. YODER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 432: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 438: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 448: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 449: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 451: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. WEST-MORELAND.

H.R. 456: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 478: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 485: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 529: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COOK, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 532: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 546: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Res. 12: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. JOLLY.

H. Res. 24: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H. Res. 28: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. DELBENE.

H. Res. 32: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 49: Mr. JOYCE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. RICHMOND.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

3. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota, relative to Resolution No. 2014R-530, supporting the President's historic executive order on immigration; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, January 28, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Answer us, O God, when we call. Be gracious to us and hear our prayers. Look on our Nation with favor, for Your promises are sure. We thank You that so many of our Nation's Founders put their trust in You. Lord, make us worthy of this godly heritage.

May Your presence on Capitol Hill today so influence our Senators that the thoughts they think and the words they speak will honor You.

Don't be far from us, Lord, but continue to be our hope for years to come. Help us to remember how You have sustained us in the past as You provide for our daily needs.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thank you, Dr. Black. Your prayers are wonderful.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Today the Senate will resume consideration of the Keystone bill. There are up to 18 rollcall votes scheduled this afternoon on pending amendments to the bill. I want to commend Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL for working with our colleagues to get literally dozens and dozens of amendments up and voted on in the 3 weeks we have been working on this bill.

Now it is time to get through the remaining amendments and vote up or down on passage of this bill before we leave for the week.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 272

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 272) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings on this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

KEYSTONE ENERGY DEBATE AND 529S

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, thanks to the bill managers' efforts that I just referred to, along with the years-long work undertaken by Members on both sides—Senator HOEVEN in particular—we expect this bipartisan bill to finally pass the Senate.

We expect the filibuster of good American jobs to soon come to an end. That is good news for the Senate. It is even better news for the people we represent. It would show their Congress is capable of defying the powerful special interests that oppose Keystone so we can get things done for the middle class.

Constructing this infrastructure project would pump literally billions of dollars into our economy. It would support thousands of jobs, and it would do it all with minimal environmental impact. That is according to what we have heard from the President's own State Department. So it makes sense to get this bipartisan legislation to the President for his signature. We hope he will sign the Keystone jobs bill into law. The President should expect more good ideas to head his way.

That is the goal of this new Congress. We want to get Washington functioning again, and we want to pass commonsense ideas. The Keystone debate is showing how we can do both.

One other issue. I am certainly glad to see President Obama dropped his plan to make it harder for the middle class to save for college with 529s. I fought to ensure these plans were tax-free at the Federal level. Thanks to this incentive to save, literally millions of Americans use 529s to help prepare for college expenses. These are good plans that promote responsible savings. I am not sure why President Obama would have sought to under-

mine them in the first place, but it certainly is good to see the President coming around to Republicans' pro-middle-class view on this matter.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 30 days from today, on February 27, the Department of Homeland Security, the lead agency in protecting America from terrorism, will run out of money. The only way to prevent this important government agency from shutting down is for Congress to pass legislation to fund the Department and to do it quickly.

This morning, we moved to the second reading, what is known as a clean appropriations bill, which will provide resources for this critical Department. I hope the Senate can take that up quickly and pass it quickly as well.

We should not even be debating the funding for the Homeland Security Department. Every other government agency has been funded through the end of the fiscal year, the end of September, but not the Department of Homeland Security. The House Republicans insisted on separating this critical agency from the rest of the Federal Government and treating it differently, giving it temporary funding—what is known as a continuing resolution—and making it extremely difficult for the Department of Homeland Security to do its job to keep America safe.

Why did the Republicans insist that this one agency be treated differently, funded in a way that it can't do its job effectively? They are using the deadline, the end of February, on this Department's funding in an attempt to force the Senate to accept extreme anti-immigrant amendments that have been attached to the homeland security bill in the House. The House Republicans' message to the Senate is very straightforward: Accept our controversial immigration amendments or we will shut down the Homeland Security Department. That is the height of irresponsibility. Now is not the time to play politics with homeland security.

Just this weekend the world witnessed another horrible terrorist act, the beheading of a Japanese hostage by the terrorist group ISIS. In light of the

terrorist threat we currently face, it would be the height of irresponsibility to shut down the Department of Homeland Security as threatened by the House Republicans. That is one of the key government agencies charged with protecting Americans.

Today I am calling on the Senate majority leader for a clean appropriations bill that we moved forward on the calendar this morning. Let's pass this bill. Let's make sure we do it in a timely way. Let's fund this Department.

Some Republican leaders are arguing, well, it is not such a big deal, giving temporary funding to the Department of Homeland Security, playing roulette with the prospects of whether it will be funded for the rest of this fiscal year.

Last week the Republican chairman of the Senate homeland security committee here in the Senate reportedly said, and I quote, that he "isn't that concerned about the potential shutdown of the Homeland Security Department."

Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, has a much different view. He says our homeland security is already at risk because the Department is operating under a short-term funding bill known as a continuing resolution. Listen to what Secretary Johnson said: "As long as this Department continues to operate on a [continuing resolution], we are prevented from funding key homeland security initiatives [including] new grants to state and local law enforcement [and] additional border security resources."

How many times have we heard from the other side of the aisle the highest priority in America is our border security? Many of us agreed and voted for a comprehensive immigration reform that folded more resources than ever into protecting the border. Now the same people, the same elected officials, who have been arguing for a strong border are underfunding the Department with that responsibility. The Secretary reminds us their approach to this is going to jeopardize investments in border security.

What are these amendments the House Republicans feel so strongly about that they are willing to risk the funding of this critical agency? The bill the House passed would defund President Obama's immigration policies, including the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program known as DACA.

A quick history about how we reached the point we are at today. It was 14 years ago when I introduced the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act was designed to take care of children brought to America by their parents, children who were undocumented, and to give those children a chance, if they led a good life and finished school, if they were prepared to go to college or join our military, to have a path to legal status. Over the years this has been de-

bated widely. Even many Republican leaders have stepped up and said, well, it is fundamentally just. Why would you hold the children responsible for a decision made by their parents to come to this country? Why would you jeopardize the future of a child because the parents came here, overstayed their visa, or failed to file the necessary papers for their child? Even former Arkansas Governor Huckabee, interviewed this Sunday on television, made that very point. You don't arrest a parent for speeding in the front seat and then arrest the baby sitting in the back seat for speeding. He made that point in light of his decisions as the Governor of Arkansas.

Over time this concept of the DREAM Act has been moving toward acceptance by both political parties but moving very slowly. For 14 years we have been debating this one simple idea, that children should not be held responsible for the wrongdoing of their parents, that young people brought to this country and undocumented should be given a chance. And, of course, 2½ years ago, President Obama did something. He did it at the request of many Senators, including myself. We wrote to him and said, Mr. President, while the Senate and Congress debate the future of the DREAM Act, there are literally thousands of these young people who have no future in America. They don't know which way to turn. They can't get drivers licenses. They can't go to school with any government assistance. They don't have any basic idea what their future is going to be.

The President said, here is what I will do. I will create this Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, the DACA Program. If these young people will come forward, if they will submit a filing fee to cover the cost of the program, if they will submit themselves to background checks, then we will give them temporary status in America—temporary status in America. We are not making them citizens or declaring them legal forever. We are saying they can go to school and work without the fear of deportation.

We estimate there are 2 million young people in our Nation of 350 million-plus who would qualify for this DACA treatment. Six hundred thousand have in fact registered in the 2½ years since the President's decision. DACA put on hold deportation so these young people who grow up in this country would have a chance. These are the DREAMers. They are the ones we have referred to over and over on the floor and tell their stories.

Think about it. America is already invested in these young people. We paid for their education. We sent them to the classrooms in the schools. They stood there every morning by their desk, hand over their heart, pledging allegiance to the same flag we pledged allegiance to this morning. They sang

the only national anthem they have ever known. They are just asking for a chance.

Over the years I have come to the floor to tell their stories because leaving the explanation at this point really doesn't touch on the reality of who these DREAMers are. I am going to tell another story this morning, and I want the record to show this young man I am about to speak about, Juan Rios. He is a person whom the House Republicans want to deport. They have said by their vote—by the amendment they put on this appropriations bill—they want Juan Rios to leave the United States of America. That is their goal, deport the DREAMers, all of those who have signed up for DACA and those who might sign up. That is just part of what they are trying to achieve. But that to me is the starting point that ought to be our starting point for debate.

Juan Rios was brought to the United States when he was 10 years old. In high school Juan decided what his calling was. It was military service. He became a leader in the Air Force Junior ROTC in his high school, group commander, and armed drill team captain, and he rose to the rank of cadet lieutenant colonel.

This photo is of Juan in uniform in high school. His dream was to attend the Air Force Academy. Of course, it is a dream that couldn't happen. He is undocumented. Instead, he enrolled in Arizona State University.

In 2010 Juan Rios graduated from Arizona State University. What course did he study? It was a degree in aeronautical engineering. He is some student.

This is a picture of him at his graduation. But after he graduated with his degree in engineering, he didn't know which way to turn. He couldn't enlist in the military like he wanted to. He couldn't work as an engineer because he was undocumented. His talents were wasted. He sent me a letter at that time and said:

The United States of America is the country I want to live my life in, where I want to flourish as a productive citizen, where I want to grow old among my lifelong friends and where I want to one day fall in love and raise a family.

So what happened to Juan after DACA, when the Executive order gave him the opportunity to have temporary protection and not be deported? In February 2013, after signing up for DACA, he interviewed for his first engineering job. Today Juan is working as a mechanical engineer in the semiconductor industry.

At the age of 27 he learned how to drive and bought his first car. After living in Arizona for 17 years, he was finally able to visit the Grand Canyon for the first time.

Juan sent a letter to me last week and said:

I am fortunate to have found the opportunity to prove myself as a professional and

to work in a place where I feel my contributions are valued and recognized. The past two years have changed my life in every way imaginable. I think DACA is a responsibility, a privilege, and an opportunity for everyone who receives it to demonstrate that we as a community of Dreamers have so much to contribute to society.

Juan Rios is trying to prove to everyone that he is worth this investment, that he is worth this trust. He has done it. He will continue to do it.

So why in the world do the House Republicans want to deport Juan Rios? Why do they want to give up on this young man, with his idealism, his determination, and his record of accomplishment? Why do they want him to leave the United States of America?

Well, it is because he was brought here as a 5-year-old—undocumented. For that decision by his parents, the House Republicans would say: We have no use for Juan Rios. We don't want him to stay.

There are so many other stories similar to this one. It is clear that DACA works for America. I have been to Chicago so many times and met with these DREAMers. I know these young men and women. I believe in them, and I believe they are going to make a difference in this country.

I also want to remind my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that America is a nation of immigrants. Our diversity is our strength. We come to this great country from so many different places, and we bring so many different cultures, languages, religions, ethnic backgrounds, and cuisines. We bring it all here, and we make it part of America's future.

I know a little bit about this story because my mother was an immigrant herself. She was brought here at the age of 2. Today I stand on the floor of the Senate representing the great State of Illinois. That is my story. That is my family story. That is America's story.

There is something else I would say to the critics of immigrants. Immigrants bring something special to America. Each one of these immigrant families took the greatest risk of their lives to come to America. Some of them literally risked their lives to do it. Others came to this country where they didn't speak the language, knew very few people, and didn't have any idea what their future would be. But they had heard about this America place, and they believed this was a better opportunity for them and for their kids. I am sure that is what brought my family to this country—my mother to this country—and I am sure that is what has brought a lot of people.

That is part of our DNA. Those immigrants, their courage, and their determination to be part of America and its future really bring to this country an energy that just can't be matched in many other places in the world.

House Republicans would kill that dream, and they have showed us that

by this horrible amendment they have attached to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations.

They think America is stronger if we tell Juan Rios to leave. I don't. It is shameful to play politics with the life of this young man and hundreds of thousands of others. It is just shameful to put homeland security funding at risk, to punish Juan Rios for having been brought to this country as a child.

The House Republicans feel so strongly about deporting DREAMers they are willing to hold up the homeland security funding bill. The House Republicans are telling the Senate and the President: Deport the DREAMers or we are going to shut down the agency responsible for protecting America from terrorism.

I hope the Senate majority leader will reject this blackmail, and I hope that in the spirit of the Senate, where we came together on a bipartisan basis to pass immigration reform almost 2 years ago, we will reject this hate-filled message from the House Republicans.

For our part, Senate Democrats will insist that the Department of Homeland Security be funded and that the President have the authority—which every President has had—to establish his own immigration policies.

I see there is another colleague on the floor. I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half.

The Senator from Wyoming.

WORKING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last November the American people sent an unmistakable message to Washington, DC. Voters across the country said they were tired of the gridlock and they were tired of the lack of action by the Democratic-led Senate.

Well, we are now working again for the American people because voters said it was time for a new majority—the Republican majority—to get the Senate working again and to get America on a better course. Republicans heard the message. We heard it loud and clear, and we have been doing exactly what the American people have sent us here to do.

Under Republican leadership the Senate is working again for the American people, and the best example of that is the bill we are considering now in the Senate on the Keystone XL Pipeline project. The Obama administration has blocked and delayed this job-creating project for 6 years. Now Republicans are moving forward. We are moving it forward as well. We have had an open debate on the bill, and we have allowed amendments to the bill.

Imagine that. We are actually debating legislation on the floor of the Senate, and Senators are actually offering amendments to that bill.

We are all familiar with the milestone the Senate reached last week. Last year, under the Democratic leadership, there were a total of 15 up-or-down votes on amendments—15 for the entire year under HARRY REID. That is all the Democratic leader allowed.

But by the end of the day last Thursday, we completed our 25th amendment vote. Just 22 days into the year, the Senate had already been more productive on amendments than it was on 365 days under Democratic leadership.

We didn't stop there. Today the Senate will vote on up to 18 more amendments to the Keystone jobs bill and then another 12 after that.

Several Democratic Senators complained the other day about what they said was a lack of amendment votes on this bill. Well, where were they last year when the Democratic leader allowed only 15 votes to get an up-or-down vote on an amendment for an entire year?

Senator SCHATZ and Senator MARKEY, two Democrats, had never had a vote on one of their amendments in the Senate before Republicans gave them a vote last week. Senator COONS will get his first vote on an amendment today.

All of these amendments aren't the only way again the Senate is working for the American people. Another is going to happen on Thursday. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee is going to hold a hearing on a bill that I introduced earlier this month.

We have four Republican sponsors on that bill and four Democratic sponsors: Senators HEINRICH, BENNET, HEITKAMP, and Kaine. It is the LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act. Now Senator TOOMEY, a Republican, was added as cosponsor, and Senator UDALL, a Democrat, was added as cosponsor. So there are five Republican and five Democratic cosponsors.

This is an idea that the House considered last year, and it passed with bipartisan support. Forty-six Democrats voted in favor of increasing America's exports of liquefied natural gas. The House is expected to vote again and pass a bill like this one this week. This is an idea that has bipartisan support in the Senate as well. So it should be a no-brainer. Plans to send American energy overseas are wrapped up in Washington redtape, and Americans who are

eager for the jobs on these projects continue to wait.

This bipartisan bill will do a lot to fix that problem. It would set clear deadlines for Washington to make timely decisions on these import permits—export permits, important permits to export liquefied natural gas.

Once there has been an agreement and an appropriate environmental review, the Secretary of Energy will have only 45 days to act on a permit application. Increasing American natural gas exports would do three important things.

No. 1, it would create jobs. That is, of course, most important. These are American jobs, jobs for Americans. The private sector wants to create these jobs—not government jobs but private sector jobs.

No. 2, it would help to reduce our Nation's trade deficit. The trade deficit currently stands at \$39 billion.

No. 3, these exports would support our American allies. Last year Russia invaded Ukraine and seized control of Crimea. Why? Largely because of the natural gas facilities there.

There was a group of Senators who were actually in Ukraine. I was one of them the day the Russian helicopters landed just north of the gas plants there. This was about the gas. Well, we could help reduce the threat Russia poses to Europe by offering more options for our allies to buy American natural gas.

There is no good reason for the endless delays on these export permits. Our bill would speed up the process. These export projects are job creators with bipartisan support. They have been stuck in Washington's bureaucrat gridlock.

The Senate is going to be acting to get these projects moving. That is why the American people sent us to the Senate. It is how the Senate is supposed to work. Committees consider the ideas on both sides, the bills get debated in committee and on the floor, and every Senator has a chance to talk about it and then to offer amendments that might improve legislation. That is how it has always worked before. It is a slow process. It was meant to produce consensus.

The majority leader, HARRY REID, changed all of that. The Democratic majority leader did everything he could to block amendments and to bypass and to skip committees. Did he do it to make better laws? No, not at all. Did he do it to speed up action so the Senate could be more productive? Of course not.

It was a transparent campaign tactic to keep vulnerable Democratic Senators from having to take tough votes. Even Democrats couldn't get votes on their amendments. Well, that gimmick by HARRY REID—the campaign tricks—failed, and the American people were not fooled.

That is one of the reasons voters across the country chose Republicans to lead both Houses of Congress. The American people said they deserve better, and the American people are absolutely right. The American people want Democrats to start working with Republicans to get things done.

That is what Senator HEINRICH and I—and others who are cosponsoring this measure today—are doing with our bill. The American people want an honest debate on important issues such as the Keystone jobs bill, as well. The American people want their representatives in the Senate to be able to offer amendments to bills such as this one.

That is how the Senate should work. That is how the Senate is working under Republican leadership, and that is how it is going to continue to work.

So I am pleased to see the votes are going to be held on these amendments. I am pleased to stand and cast my vote on behalf of the people of Wyoming. I look forward to more votes, more debate, and more consideration of ideas from both sides of the aisle.

It is interesting that President Obama has threatened to veto eight separate pieces of legislation so far this year. It is interesting to the point that it has a headline in today's USA Today, page 2A: "Obama veto threats are at record high." Veto threats are at a record high.

The President has said he will veto another two bills that haven't even been introduced yet. If they haven't even been introduced, how does he know what they are going to say? How does he know what they are going to say once they go through the process of being amended, passed in the House, passed in the Senate, and get to his desk?

The President should reconsider each and every one of these veto threats.

The Senate is moving forward. The White House is putting up roadblocks. That is not what the American people were asking for in November. The American people want us to work together to get things done, to make their lives better. It is about them. It is not about the people who sit in this body, it is about the American people—their quality of life, people living paycheck to paycheck, day to day, what their lives are about.

The Republican Congress and this Senate continue to listen to the American people. The President of the United States continues to ignore them.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAIR TAX ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, we have had a lot of talk—certainly in the last year or so and certainly as this new session of Congress begins—on the importance of tax reform. Our country is at a point in time where we certainly are no longer competitive globally. The economy now is one that works against us because of our Tax Code. I think there is general consensus in the Senate that reforming the Tax Code is of significant importance, something that must be done.

I am often asked not only when I am back in Kansas but here in Washington, DC: Do you expect there to be broad-based tax reform? And we keep guessing about the likelihood of that happening.

I think it is typical of elected officials, politicians, to always talk about the need for comprehensive tax reform. We talk about lowering rates, making the tax system more fair, less bureaucratic, less paperwork. I certainly join in those sentiments and believe that the current circumstance we have in regard to our Tax Code is such that it limits the freedom of Americans—American business men and women, individuals, and their families. We make way too many decisions based upon the consequences of those decisions and how they are affected by the Tax Code.

So I am all on board on tax reform, but I wish to talk about what I believe is the best solution toward tax reform. And it is not tinkering with the current system; it is an overhaul of the current Tax Code.

I have joined my colleague from Georgia, Senator PERDUE, in once again introducing the fair tax plan. I started a long time ago in Congress, knowing that we needed to make significant changes in our Tax Code, with the belief that most Americans ought to be able to file a tax return without the need of professional help, that we ought to be able to make decisions that are in the best interests of ourselves, our families, and our businesses without always going to the Tax Code to see what the consequences of those decisions were. I looked at a variety of proposals that were being considered at the time and continue to be considered today and ultimately reached the conclusion that the Fair Tax is the best option for significant reform. I wish to speak for just a minute about why I think that is the case.

As I said, Senator PERDUE and I introduced S. 25, the Fair Tax Act of 2015. I have been a cosponsor of that legislation. It was originally introduced in the Senate by the former Senator from Georgia, Mr. Saxby Chambliss, and I am pleased to now succeed him in his efforts to see that not only is this topic discussed in Congress but ultimately that the Fair Tax Act becomes law. It is a significant step in the direction of individual freedom.

I would highlight for my colleagues—and I have said this on the Senate floor before—I think the greatest responsibility we have as American citizens is to pass on to the next generation of Americans the freedoms and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution and the opportunity for every American to live the American dream. The Fair Tax, in my view, brings both of those goals front and center. Greater freedom and protection of individual liberties is certainly a component of the Fair Tax, and the opportunity for every American to pursue the American dream is a result that comes from the Fair Tax. It is that Fair Tax direction and individual freedom that caught my attention. It is the concept our Founding Fathers knew so well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent for additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, the Fair Tax repeals all Federal, corporate, and individual taxes, payroll taxes, capital gains taxes, and estate and gift taxes and replaces them with a revenue-neutral personal consumption tax. The Fair Tax allows Americans to keep the entirety of their income, putting individuals in charge of their own finances, not the government—or, more specifically, not the Internal Revenue Service.

All Americans should be able to trust the IRS, which exercises great authority over the lives of Americans in this country, but we know from past experiences that expectation is no longer founded. So getting rid of the Internal Revenue Service is a significant benefit that comes from the passage of the Fair Tax.

I recognize that consumption taxes can be regressive, meaning they are harmful to those at lower income levels. So the Fair Tax takes that into account by providing a pre-rebate for those who fall below certain poverty income levels so that the basics—the things we by necessity need to buy in our individual daily lives—are not covered by a tax, therefore creating greater progressivity to what otherwise would be a more regressive tax and something that I think is still important in this country to make certain we don't overtax those at the lowest income levels in the United States.

Certainly, our current Tax Code has significant complexities with all the paperwork. By some estimates, U.S. companies are currently holding over \$20 trillion overseas. With the passage of the Fair Tax, foreign investments would no longer continue to sit on the sidelines when they could be brought back to America to drive economic growth and create jobs. For international businesses looking to relocate

to the United States, the Fair Tax would be a welcomed sign. But the Fair Tax also benefits the consumer. It also benefits the everyday citizen, as I said, because of the pre-rebate.

With my time being short, I look forward to having a dialogue on the Senate floor and in the committees over the next few months, and I ask my colleagues to seriously take a look at S. 25 and to join the Senator from Georgia, Mr. PERDUE, and me and others in promotion of a program that reduces the complexity of the Tax Code in our lives, rids us of the Internal Revenue Service, protects the progressivity of the tax circumstance we find today, and most importantly, allows us to continue to pursue the American dream and promotes our individual freedoms and liberties.

The Fair Tax is worthy of people's consideration. It ought to be more than just a talking point. It deserves a debate, a discussion, a vote, and consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be here today to speak to my colleagues about funding for the Department of Homeland Security and to be followed by one of my most valued colleagues, Senator MENENDEZ, whose leadership on this issue has been extraordinarily important. I am also pleased to work with him on a letter he sent yesterday to the President concerning Iran sanctions, where his statesmanship-like path to a reasonable solution on this very complex and crucial issue will be enormously important to the future.

The Department of Homeland Security is one of the most significant departments in the U.S. Government. It has a mandate that is as complex and crucial as any in keeping American citizens and communities and capabilities safe and secure in a dangerous, complex, and threatening world.

In my family, when I was growing up, we had a saying: Don't cut off your nose to spite your face. Unfortunately, that path is exactly what some of my colleagues are choosing to follow in threatening to stop funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

We are reminded of the importance of this Department not only as terrorism raises its ugly head repeatedly abroad

but also as perhaps more benign threats exist at home—the most recent of them, the snowstorm that hit the Northeast within the past couple of days. The Department of Homeland Security is not only engaged in a fight against terrorism, not only engaged in keeping America safe from threats abroad but is engaged in a wide variety of other tasks that have to do with the Nation's security. That is the key word in its title—"security."

Americans fear more deeply than ever before that their security is threatened—economic security by stagnating incomes, foreign security as the world becomes more volatile and unpredictable and more threatening, and domestic security as threats abroad metastasize within our own borders.

Many people equate the concept of security at home or homeland security with protection against extreme violence from abroad, violent extremism spawning from abroad and in fact stopping those threats. Finding the wrongdoers and stopping them is one of the major tasks the Department of Homeland Security has, but it has a myriad of additional responsibilities that include aiding the victims of natural disasters and extreme weather, citizenship and immigration, routinely handling matters that involve legitimate applications for visas for entry into the United States, and it fights the scourge of human trafficking. I am privileged to have a Caucus on Human Trafficking with my colleague Senator ROB PORTMAN. So I know it forms a diverse collection of responsibilities that are crucial to security.

In fact, the Department of Homeland Security's responsibilities are comprehensive—so much so that it is simply unacceptable to play politics with its crucial mission. It is irresponsible to hold its funding hostage in a dangerous game of fiscal chicken and threaten daily activities that are vital to America's present and future security.

That is why we are here, because some of my friends across the aisle believe stopping the President from exercising discretion on certain immigration issues affecting specific individuals in this country is worth hamstringing and undercutting the entire Department of Homeland Security and forcing an enormous amount of its vital work to grind to a halt. That is the game of chicken we have. The President is expected to relent if the Department of Homeland Security is stopped from functioning, but it is a game that has no place in this Chamber or in this government.

We can agree or disagree with the President, and I disagree with the Department of Homeland Security on certain of its policies; for example, on detaining children which it has done routinely on a grandiose scale. I have included an amendment in the measure

for immigration reform that passed the Senate. It would stop it from detaining children—a practice I consider shameful and unacceptable—and I have a long list of other changes I would like to see made in DHS policies. But the way to effectuate those changes in my view is not to withhold funding to stop DHS in its tracks of providing security for the American people, it is to amend the laws to persuade our colleagues to undertake the legislative process and to appeal ultimately to the court of public opinion which can render a verdict far more powerful than the tactics involved here. Chipping away at the President's authority by not only undercutting him but stopping one of his departments is reprehensible. So I urge my colleagues to cease this tactic.

The President needs discretion. In fact, I know as a prosecutor, as a former attorney general, and as a one-time U.S. attorney for Connecticut that discretion is essential. There is no way any authority can prosecute every crime. So prosecutors need to select cases based on severity of offense and most important the danger to the public because ultimately protecting the public is what security requires. That is true as well for the Department of Homeland Security.

The President has exercised his discretion in a way I find laudable. The exigencies of the present immigration system require the exercise of discretion. The President has done it in a way that is responsible and upholds his duties as Commander in Chief. But even if I disagree with the President on that exercise of discretion with respect to immigration, I would never use this tactic of withholding funding for an entire department, affecting all of its activities and implicating and undercutting security in so dangerous a way.

My hope is we will debate immigration policy, that we will approve an immigration reform bill, that it will be on a bipartisan basis just as it was during the last session, that there will be a lot of good-faith disagreement on the floor of this Chamber about those policies and about the President's actions but that we will keep the lights on at the Department of Homeland Security, that we will shine the light on threats to our security that need to be exposed and pursued, that we will further the security of this Nation and protect the public by making sure the DHS funding as a clean bill is approved right away and that we move forward to make sure DHS continues its vital service to the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, as we approach the near end—I think—of the votes and legislation on the Keystone Pipeline—I know we are having a series of votes later today—I know what is likely to be next up is the question of Department of Homeland Security funding. I hope we can come collectively together to fund the Department of Homeland Security, the Department that keeps us safe in an unsafe world, the Department we created after September 11 to bring together disparate government agencies, all charged with keeping our cities, our ports, our airports, our railways, highways, bridges, and neighborhoods safe from the threat of global terrorism. I particularly understand that as a Member of this body who represents, according to the FBI, the most dangerous 2 miles in America, the chemical coastway, airports, seaports along the Hudson waterfront. This is the Department that funds emergency management in our communities. It protects the President. It is engaged in all domestic counterterrorism efforts.

But what are we doing instead? We are being asked, as one of the new Republican majority's first acts of this Congress, to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. Why? Because some of our friends on the other side are willing to take a gamble and put politics ahead of national security, a thinly veiled political stunt in response to the lawful actions of the President of the United States to do something to fix our broken immigration system. Their message is pretty simple: repeal the President's lawful Executive actions on immigration or shut down the Department of Homeland Security. Make no mistake, that is the textbook definition of pure politics: not caring what its impact might be, not caring whom it might hurt, not caring about the families whom it will tear apart, and the fact that it will put our Nation's security at risk.

I have been in this Chamber and in the other Chamber for over 20 years, and I don't think I have ever seen such a cavalier political recklessness played with our national security. Why? To prevent the President from taking lawful action to help DREAMers and immigrant families to come out of the shadows after they pass a criminal background check, register with the government, and get right with the law in exchange for being allowed to temporarily stay in the country and obtain a work permit.

The bottom line is clear: Republicans are doing all of this just to prevent a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill from being sent to the President, a critical funding bill that the President has rightfully promised to veto should it include their anti-immigration amendments, a veto which

Congress will not override. It is a fool's political errand that is neither good policy nor particularly humane.

Our friends on the other side have accepted these anti-immigrant poison pill amendments, knowing full well they will sink the Department of Homeland Security funding bill because they have allowed extremists, such as STEVE KING, to dictate the party's strategy on immigration.

Let's not continuously go down this dark path of partisanship instead of funding national security programs to keep our families and our communities safe. In my view it is shamefully and woefully irresponsible for Republicans to hold up funding for operations that protect every American against terrorism in the wake of what happened in France and against cyber attacks at a time when North Korea just carried out a dramatic attack against a major American corporation.

This is not a time to hold up funding to help the Department of Homeland Security investigate cyber crime that could cripple America's electronic infrastructure or when the world is a tinderbox of jihadists and would-be homegrown terrorists willing to die for a perceived version of Islam.

If Republican colleagues want to seriously consider this ill-conceived approach, they will be forcing a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security—a shutdown of our national security infrastructure to pursue their agenda of mass deportations that will tear families apart, an agenda that embraces a system that doesn't distinguish between deporting a working mother with U.S. citizen children and a convicted felon.

Instead, I urge my friends on the other side to join us and pass a balanced and comprehensive bill. Let's talk. Let's sit down again and find common ground, as we did in the last Congress where this Senate came together on a bipartisan basis with over 67 votes to send a bill to the House of Representatives that dealt with our broken immigration system, provided for our national security, promoted our national economy, and at the same time made sure our legacy and history as a nation of immigrants was preserved. The answer is not holding up national security funding at a critical time, not turning our backs on the hard-working men and women at the Department of Homeland Security in law enforcement who are protecting our borders, our airports, and our coastlines. It is not about trying to score political points by conflating national security and immigration reform, which will only make it harder to address security issues at home and almost impossible to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform.

Let's look at what my Republican colleagues are so opposed to. They are opposed to new DHS directives that include a rigorous application process

that will ironically help eliminate national security threats. They seem to be opposed to the fact that applicants will have to come forward and register with the government. They will have to pass criminal background checks before they can receive a temporary reprieve from deportation and a work permit. No violent criminals, gang members, or terrorists will be able to take advantage of the program. They seem to be opposed to allowing immigrants who are not a public safety or national security threat to come forward and request deferred action, meaning there will be fewer people living in the shadows, beyond the reach of law enforcement.

These directives identify moms and dads who have a U.S. citizen or a legal permanent resident son or daughter and take them out of the deportation queue. They also take DREAMers out of the deportation queue.

The House amendment to the Department of Homeland Security funding bill would effectively end the new Deferred Action for Parental Accountability Program and the expanded DACA Program for DREAMers. They would also defund every other aspect of the President's November 20 Executive action that would promote border security, public safety, military service, legal immigration, citizenship, immigration integration, entrepreneurship, civil immigration enforcement priorities, including the prioritization of individuals with convicted felonies and gang activity and terrorist ties for deportation.

I will repeat that. It includes a prioritization. I would think the Senate would want to support a prioritization of individuals who are here illegally and are convicted felons and part of gang activities or who have terrorist ties for deportation and any future similar Executive actions.

The only directive our Republican colleagues found acceptable, which is interesting—in my mind, you say: Well, none of it can happen by Executive action. But it seems that the only thing that did happen by Executive action that our colleagues found acceptable pertains to pay increases for Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, which I believe they certainly deserve.

These amendments would break apart more families and destroy communities by ensuring that we continue to deport the parents of U.S. citizen and lawful permanent resident children. One of the most mean-spirited amendments would prohibit the use of Federal funds or resources to consider or adjudicate any new, renewed, or previously denied application for deferred action for childhood arrivals.

Let's call this amendment what it is: It is an amendment to deport DREAMers and targets all of those young people who came forward and signed up in

good faith. I will give an example of whom these amendments attack.

I wish to remind my colleagues of who the DREAMers are. DREAMers are young people who came to this country through no choice of their own. The only flag they have ever pledged allegiance to is that of the United States of America. The only national anthem they know is the "Star-Spangled Banner." Their country is this country.

I was fortunate to speak with people like the Morales-Cano family 2 weeks ago in New Jersey. They are a family of six, including 13-year-old, U.S.-born Rebecca Morales. Their lives have drastically improved thanks to the program Republicans are hoping to dismantle. If the Republicans are successful, Rebecca would be left alone in the United States without her parents or sisters—an American citizen left alone, perhaps in foster care, because Republicans don't care about prioritizing the deportation of convicted criminals over her mom, dad, and sisters.

The story of the Morales-Cano family is a clear example of thousands of deep-rooted families who have waited too long in the shadows for immigration reform.

Three years ago, after attending a deferred action for childhood arrivals workshop that my office organized in New Jersey, all three of Rebecca's older sisters—Ingrid, Evelyn, and Lesly—were given an opportunity to begin a new chapter of their lives after qualifying for the President's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, joining thousands of others who had been granted relief.

Today, look at what this family is doing. Ingrid cares for New Jerseyans' health at her job at the Ocean Medical Center. Evelyn moved to Illinois to attend the West Coast Bible College and Seminary. Lesly was able to enroll in Brookdale Community College to pursue her dream of becoming a nurse. Ingrid, Evelyn, and Lesly represent the hundreds of thousands of young individuals who, because of the deferred action for childhood arrivals, can actively contribute to our economy without fear of losing everything they have worked to gain.

Romeo Morales and Mrs. Magda Cano de Morales did not qualify for deportation deferrals under DACA and have continued to live with the constant fear of having their family abruptly separated. But thanks to the deferred action for parents program, recently announced by President Obama, both parents will likely qualify to come out of the shadows, register with the government, pass a background check, and join their daughters in their pursuit of the American dream—unless, of course, the Republicans get their way.

We cannot let that happen, and I will do everything to ensure that we will not let that happen. These are the real faces of our broken immigration sys-

tem. There are many families like the Morales-Cano family who have been and remain an economic resource we cannot afford to waste. They are hard-working families who simply want to be full participants in American life, full contributors to the American family, and they want to remain united as a family. We should want them to remain united.

I have listened to so many speeches here about family values. Well, the core of a family value is a family being able to stay together, integrated and helping each other and driving each other to success and supporting each other. Ripping families apart is not a family value.

We must see through the smoke and mirrors and do what is right for America. Let's stop playing political games. Let's defeat these poison-pill amendments and pass a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. Let's not play politics with national security. Let's remember the people behind the policies. Let's remember the Morales-Cano family and the fate of Rebecca if we allow these amendments to pass.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Murkowski amendment No. 2, in the nature of a substitute.

Vitter/Cassidy modified amendment No. 80 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf.

Murkowski (for Sullivan) amendment No. 67 (to amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel.

Cardin amendment No. 75 (to amendment No. 2), to provide communities that rely on drinking water from a source that may be affected by a tar sands spill from the Keystone XL pipeline an analysis of the potential risks to public health and the environment from a leak or rupture of the pipeline.

Murkowski amendment No. 98 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress

relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities.

Flake amendment No. 103 (to amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs.

Cruz amendment No. 15 (to amendment No. 2), to promote economic growth and job creation by increasing exports.

Moran/Cruz amendment No. 73 (to amendment No. 2), to delist the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Daines amendment No. 132 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding the designation of National Monuments.

Boxer amendment No. 130 (to amendment No. 2), to preserve existing permits and the authority of the agencies issuing the permits to modify the permits if necessary.

Peters/Stabenow amendment No. 70 (to amendment No. 2), to require that the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration make a certification and submit to Congress the results of a study before the pipeline may be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained.

Collins/Warner amendment No. 35 (to amendment No. 2), to coordinate the provision of energy retrofit assistance to schools.

Murkowski amendment No. 166 (to amendment No. 2), to release certain wilderness study areas from management for preservation as wilderness.

Sanders amendment No. 23 (to amendment No. 2), to increase the quantity of solar photovoltaic electricity by providing rebates for the purchase and installation of an additional 10,000,000 photovoltaic systems by 2025.

Merkley amendment No. 174 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in communities in the United States while also helping to fund climate change adaptation in developing countries.

Merkley amendment No. 125 (to Amendment No. 2), to eliminate unnecessary tax subsidies and provide infrastructure funding.

Cantwell/Boxer amendment No. 131 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that if the Keystone XL Pipeline is built, it will be built safely and in compliance with United States environmental laws.

Tillis/Burr amendment No. 102 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for leasing on the outer Continental Shelf and the distribution of certain qualified revenues from such leasing.

Markey amendment No. 178 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

Markey amendment No. 141 (to amendment No. 2), to delay the effective date until the President determines that the pipeline will not have certain negative impacts.

Whitehouse amendment No. 148 (to amendment No. 2), to require campaign finance disclosures for certain persons benefitting from tar sands development.

Booker amendment No. 155 (to amendment No. 2), to allow permitting agencies to consider new circumstances and new information.

Burr modified amendment No. 92 (to amendment No. 2), to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Coons amendment No. 115 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress regarding climate change and infrastructure.

Carper amendment No. 120 (to amendment No. 2), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credits for new qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and alternative fuel vehicle refueling property.

Heitkamp amendment No. 133 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 should be amended to extend the credit with respect to facilities producing energy from certain renewable resources.

Cardin amendment No. 124 (to amendment No. 2), to clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect.

Cantwell (for Gillibrand) amendment No. 48 (to amendment No. 2), to modify the definition of underground injection.

Cantwell (for Peters/Stabenow) amendment No. 55 (to amendment No. 2), to require a study of the potential environmental impact of by-products of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Murkowski (for Barrasso) amendment No. 245 (to amendment No. 2), to clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect.

Daines amendment No. 246 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am ready to go this morning. I have comfortable shoes on. I am ready for a good, long day and to process a bunch of amendments. I see the Senate doing its work. I know we have important business before the Senate. I know the Judiciary Committee is holding the hearing to listen to the comments from Loretta Lynch, who has been nominated to be Attorney General.

Obviously these are very important issues the committee is discussing today. Interspersed with all of that, we are going to be having a relatively long series of votes this afternoon, which makes it a little bit choppy and a little bit chaotic, but we have business to do in the Senate.

I am pleased we are at this point where I think we can honestly say we are looking at the final stretch in this discussion on the bipartisan, 60-sponsored bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline after more than 2,320 days of delay.

At this point we are past that last call for amendments on the bill. We have spent a lot of time over the past couple of days negotiating which of the roughly 200 first-degree amendments that have been filed would come up for votes. We have a pretty good list. Again, we have 18 of them that will be before us beginning this afternoon. There will be more we will be dealing with at a later point.

But I do think this is significant. I was reading the newspaper this morning, and there is no shortage of critics out there, folks who would say the Senate is broken and can't possibly be fixed.

There was an article from an opinion writer which stated: Within the midst of the Keystone debate, MCCONNELL has had to retreat "on his promise to allow freewheeling amendments."

The article then goes on to state that yesterday not much of anything happened on the Senate floor where the pipeline debate had stalled.

In fairness, maybe the debate, in terms of processing amendments on the floor, had stalled out yesterday, but that did not mean there were not significant and serious negotiations going on between the majority and the minority about how we would proceed. Sometimes when someone tunes in and the Senate is in a quorum call, they think nothing is happening. They think the business of the Senate is not being conducted. I need to assure not only colleagues but those who watch this process on C-SPAN that in fact there is still good business being done.

I think that is what has resulted in our opportunity this afternoon to take up some 18 different amendments. There are amendments that are all across the board; 10 of the 18 pending amendments are from colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I think we are certainly being very generous in terms of what is out there. We are trying to ensure that Members who want a vote can have them.

Again, keep in mind, with a couple hundred amendments that come forward, we are going to have a lot of duplication. We are going to have issues people may want to make a statement about but might not necessarily want to ask for a vote on. But those that we have in front of us today—everything from issues relating to solar energy to LNG exports, to further discussion about climate change, wilderness, wind tax credits, the Land and Water Conservation Fund—are truly all over the map.

When it is suggested that somehow or other Senator MCCONNELL as the majority leader is moving back from his commitment to allow for an open amendment process, so-called free-wheeling amendments, I don't think a whole picture of what is happening on the Senate floor is being painted. In fact it is a very open and considerable process.

I made mention last week that we broke the records. We blew the top off in terms of the number of amendments we were actually able to process on the Senate floor. We moved through 24 amendments on this bill since the time we started it. Twenty-four amendments is pretty considerable, considering that in all of 2014 there were just 15 amendments that were considered the entire year. In fact, on Thursday alone we processed 15. If we do 18, as is on the roster today, that is pretty significant. I feel good about the point we are at. It is not just because we are churning through amendments, it is because of what the ranking member and I have been able to do as the floor managers on this bill, kind of working back and forth. Yes, sometimes it is tedious. Yes, sometimes it is frustrating.

Yes, sometimes Members wish they had more time to talk or there were more hours in our day to process all of this, but at some point in time I think we have to recognize when we spend 3 weeks on a bill, that is pretty considerable. When we are able to move 50 amendments—close to 50 amendments is where we may be at the end of this legislation and processing—that is of note.

What I appreciate is we are here this morning getting ready to kick off a long afternoon of votes and go back and forth with Members and disruption of their schedules and committee meetings and the inconvenience that causes. But again this is part of what happens around here. It is not a very tightly scheduled environment because we just have so much that is going on. But being able to move forward on this important legislation is good and necessary.

I think we are setting the stage for the balance of this Congress—under the leadership of the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, a commitment to have wholesome debate—to have the opportunity for a process that is not only good for Republicans, it is good for Democrats. It is good for the Senate and for the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 166

I want to quickly mention an amendment I will have up later this afternoon. This is amendment No. 166. I spoke very briefly to it yesterday when I called it up. But it would require wilderness study areas to be released if Congress has not officially designated them as wilderness within one calendar year. Right now what happens is that when a wilderness study area is designated, it can sit out there on the books almost indefinitely. There have been areas that have been sitting out there without congressional action for a couple of decades.

I don't think this was the point of the process. But I would suggest the amendment I have advanced is a critical one to our Western States, certainly to my State of Alaska.

Again, the news on Sunday of the President moving toward a wilderness designation of all of ANWR—with the exception of a very small slice but all of ANWR—all 19 million acres in addition to the 1002 area, the 1.57 million acres that have been specifically designated by Congress for further review and study.

Right now there are 528 wilderness study areas throughout Alaska and the other 11 Western States. Again, these designations have been made by over time by one administration or another. The next step forward in this process is that Congress needs to act, but Congress hasn't acted. We have had some of these that have been pending since the 1980s.

Again, as I suggested yesterday, if we have had something pending for 20, 30

years, I think that is plenty of time to say that Congress has had to review those areas. Even though we have not turned these into wilderness—in other words, even though Congress has not acted to designate these areas as wilderness, what happens to them?

They are treated and managed as if they are wilderness. Effectively, we have de facto wilderness. The law requires that only Congress determines whether an area is designated as wilderness. But what has happened is just kind of a lag, a lull, if you will, so they don't even need the congressional designation if in fact it is already being managed as wilderness.

We look at the intent behind this. It is clear it was never intended to be this way. We were never supposed to have millions of acres of de facto Agency-decided wilderness around the Western United States. We routinely pass public lands legislation into law. I would like to know we could do it a little more often. As recently as last month, it actually has included new wilderness. So we are not saying that in other areas these wilderness study areas don't get officially designated. There is that process, and we demonstrated that just during the lameduck here. But in the instances where Congress has decided not to act on wilderness study areas, agencies need to start looking at what that broader array of options is for managing the land, whatever that multiple use designation might be. They need to be looking at this critically with the local people in the area and with the other stakeholders who are involved in the planning process, but clearly they are not doing that on their own.

So what my amendment would do is essentially provide a 1-year timeframe for wilderness designations to be made. I think, again, that is more than enough time for Congress to consider debate and approve legislation for any area with wide support for a wilderness designation, so we will see that amendment this afternoon.

I know the Senator from Washington was on her way, coming from a committee meeting this morning, and had intended to speak. I see Senator UDALL is also on the floor.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico if he wishes to speak at this time before Senator CANTWELL comes to the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 55

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my amendment that

was made pending by my friend and the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL.

The amendment I have offered, amendment No. 55, is a simple, commonsense amendment. It requires the Environmental Protection Agency to complete a study on the potential environmental and health impact of by-products from tar sands oil that would be transported across our country by the Keystone XL Pipeline.

One of these byproducts of tar sands oil is a black, powdery substance known as petroleum coke or petcoke. It is a residual from this tar sands oil and large amounts of it are produced in the refining process.

In fact, it is estimated basically for every barrel of oil we get from tar sands, one-third of the material is this dark substance called petcoke. If we are transporting an awful lot of oil through the Keystone Pipeline, it naturally follows that we are going to get massive amounts of this petcoke.

I have had an experience with this petcoke in my previous House district in the city of Detroit, where we had petcoke from the refining process of this tar sands oil being piled up along the Detroit River. We had a pile there that was at some times several stories high, a city block long. It was stored along the river in an uncontained fashion. It was blowing into people's homes, it was blowing into businesses, and it was also draining into the Great Lakes watershed.

It caused all sorts of problems. I had complaints from constituents who talked about this substance going into their homes. I had businesses talking about—for example, restaurants in the area—their wait staff getting respiratory problems as a result of breathing this in.

In fact, we had a video to explain how problematic it can be. I had a video taken by a Canadian resident across the Detroit River that showed the petcoke piles. With some wind blowing, a massive black dust cloud was blowing off of these petcoke piles. In the distance you could see the Ambassador Bridge, which is the bridge that connects Canada to the United States. The dust was so thick and so black it obscured the bridge as it was blowing into the neighborhoods, into the river, and then into Canada.

It is a completely unacceptable situation, which is why I believe it is important as we move forward with this legislation that we have a couple of studies.

One, we need to understand what are those environmental and health risks associated with petcoke. It is clear this is particulate matter, and if it is not contained, it gets into people's lungs and creates a dust layer throughout communities.

It is very important as well in the study not only to study the environmental and health impacts, but what are the best practices to handle this material.

With the massive amount of tar sands oil that will come through the Keystone, we will also get massive amounts of petcoke, a substance that has been problematic not only in Detroit, but it has been problematic in the city of Chicago and other places across the country.

So I believe it is very important that we get these kinds of information as this project moves forward, and it is certainly my hope that we can assure that what happened in Detroit, what is happening in Chicago and other places across this country doesn't happen, that we understand what this substance is, and we understand what those best practices are to handle and to transport this material safely.

I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 55.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 166

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am glad the junior Senator from Alaska is in the Chair because I am going to be discussing things that are of great concern to Alaskans and really to those who care about the rule of law here and how it applies throughout all 50 States fairly and evenly. As I mentioned just a bit ago, I have offered an amendment that would deal with how wilderness study areas are treated. My proposal is one that would put a time limitation on these study areas.

I mentioned the amendment was precipitated by the President's announcement this weekend about additional areas of wilderness to be designated in Alaska. I have cited two. The 1980 lands bill, ANILCA—I think it is good for us to have a little bit of a refresher on what ANILCA actually did. In one fell swoop ANILCA designated nearly 60 million acres of wilderness in the State of Alaska. That is pretty substantial. It was more than any other President had ever designated at any other time prior to that.

What we have seen since then, with the designation of wilderness, is there has been this fight going back and forth. There have been areas that have been requested for wilderness study areas. But this administration has really taken it a major step forward. On Sunday the President recommended that an additional 12.3 million acres within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge be designated as wilderness—so

an additional 12.3 million acres on top of the 60 million acres that we already have as wilderness in Alaska after ANILCA.

This action by the President means that these 12.3 million acres will immediately be managed as wilderness. As I have mentioned, right now there is no deadline or expiration for this designation. Even if Congress fails to act—and I am going to make darn certain we do not act on this wilderness proposal the President has advanced—these acres are being managed as wilderness.

Let me just show colleagues what it means for us right now. The small map of Alaska is up there in the corner. It is kind of unfair because it needs to be a much bigger map to get the context. Effectively, what the President is proposing is that in addition to the 7.16 million acres of wilderness that currently exist in the ANWR area—and the ANWR area is a big refuge, a big designation. A little over 7 million acres have already been designated as wilderness. That was done back in 1980. But what he is proposing now is effectively taking the whole balance of the refuge area and making wilderness out of that as well—so 12.3 million acres.

Now, keep in mind this also includes the 1002 area up on the northern part of ANWR. That is the area right, which was specifically designated by Congress for further study of its oil and gas potential. Back in 1980, when the wilderness designation was made for the one area—7 million acres of it—it was determined that refuge status would be afforded the balance of the area, and then the 1002 would be reserved—reserved deliberately for study of its oil and gas potential.

That 1980 act was pretty clear in terms of the bargain that had taken place. I am going to read for the record the provision in the law that we refer to as the “no more” clause. It states:

This Act provides sufficient protection for the national interest in the scenic, natural, cultural and environmental values on the public lands in Alaska, and at the same time provides adequate opportunity for satisfaction of the economic and social needs of the State of Alaska and its people; accordingly, the designation and disposition of the public lands in Alaska pursuant to this Act are found to represent a proper balance between the reservation of national conservation system units and those public lands necessary and appropriate for more intensive use and disposition, and thus Congress believes that the need for future legislation designating new conservation system units, new national conservation areas, or new national recreation areas, has been obviated thereby.

The act goes on to state that “no further studies of Federal lands in the State of Alaska for the single purpose of considering the establishment of a conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conservation area, or for related or similar purposes shall be conducted unless authorized by the Congress.”

So the President is basically choosing to ignore the law as set out in

ANILCA—the agreement that Alaska has contributed mightily with its share of wilderness.

I remind my colleagues that more than one-half of the wilderness in the entire United States of America is in the State of Alaska. Thus we wrote the law back in 1980 that says no more out of Alaska. They found that balance. Well, this President is tipping that balance.

The coastal plain holds an estimated 10.4 billion barrels of oil. I mentioned yesterday that if we can tap into these resources, we could see 1 million barrels a day coming down our Trans-Alaska Pipeline for nearly 30 years.

Think about what that would mean, Mr. President—1 million barrels a day filling up that Trans-Alaska Pipeline that is now less than half full, an additional 1 million barrels a day coming into this country. Right now, Americans are enjoying the lower prices of oil. But the President said: Don't get used to these low prices because they may go up. Well, they do not have to go up if we can provide more. If we can increase production in this country, we can theoretically decrease that cost. But we have to be allowed to access that.

Think about the source of good-paying jobs, energy security, billions of dollars in new Federal revenues. The energy security part of it is keenly important, but let us also think about the positive national security implications of energy produced in the United States. When we are producing more energy in this country and relying less on others, we are less vulnerable. We have greater ability to deal with hostile nations. Sanctions work better when we don't need to rely on that same oil that some of these nations would like to free up for other countries.

From a national security perspective, this is huge. This is where the intersection with the Keystone Pipeline is so interesting: that at the same time this administration has issued this wilderness study it is also fighting so hard to keep us from building the Keystone XL Pipeline, which would allow us to get crude from our friend and neighbor to the north and utilize it to our benefit. The President is saying: No, I don't want to do that.

I guess he would much rather receive it from Venezuela or wherever. He says he wants Brazil to be our big trading partner when it comes to oil.

Hello. Canada—they share a border. They are our friend. They are our closest friend, our strongest trading partner. Are we going to shut down such an opportunity as that?

And: Oh, by the way, that same week let's just go ahead and take off the table permanently one of the greatest reservoirs of crude we have here in the United States next. Let's just take that off the table, too.

What does that say? What does that say to other countries? That we don't care about our own energy security? I care about our energy security, and I care about our national security.

Again, it stuns me to think that what the President is proposing here is a measure that would take off limits permanently our ability as a nation to access the 1002 area to safely develop this enormous potential.

Keep in mind, we are not talking about accessing the full 1.5 million acres in the 1002. The legislation that has been before this Senate, back in 1995 and 2005, asked to open up 2,000 acres—2,000 acres—out of 19.5 million acres in the whole refuge.

The Presiding Officer knows Alaskans can do this safely. We have set and met the highest environmental standards in the world. We do it every day. Our pipeline, our amazing 800-mile pipeline, has a decades-long record of responsible production. It has carried nearly 17 billion barrels of oil safely across our State, over 2 mountain ranges, multiple rivers, in areas where we are known to have a few earthquakes. It is an engineering marvel. It has served our State and our country well.

But instead of recognizing this unparalleled opportunity that we have, we are now facing a mounting lockdown of our resource potential. And the Presiding Officer knows the worst part is, it is not just ANWR we are talking about. Our offshore oil reserves are now also going to be restricted.

Just yesterday the President announced he was indefinitely withdrawing 9.8 million acres in the Beaufort and the Chukchi Seas from leasing. So now ANWR is going to be locked up, as well as the Beaufort and Chukchi seas. I don't have a map of these areas that have been taken off limits, but I can tell you that it is an area of roughly 9.8 million acres. There is some real question that I have in my mind. After reading the Interior's press release, I don't have any real comfort that the two sales that are being proposed—one in the Beaufort and one in the Chukchi—will actually stay on schedule.

The Secretary of the Interior is quoted saying that: Interior will continue to consider oil and gas exploration in the Arctic. It is not a very firm commitment, as far as I can see.

But when we look at it altogether—between the ANWR wilderness designation and the Arctic offshore withdrawal—Alaska has lost more than 22 million acres of land and water where energy could be produced for the good of this country, and it has happened in less than 1 week. It has happened over a span of 3 days—22 million acres.

So what is 22 million acres? It is an area about 563 times larger than where we are here in the District of Colum-

bia. It is about 28 Rhode Islands. I know Rhode Island is a small State by comparison, but 28 of them adds up. It is about 4.5 times the size of the State of Massachusetts. Again, this is just to give you an idea of what was taken off limits, indefinitely, by this administration since Sunday.

My reaction to all this has been pretty strong. I think it is pretty obvious to anybody who would take a moment to think about it, but I am amazed our President can look at Alaska and think, this is what we need most right now.

We are facing a pretty significant budget shortfall. I know our Governor has spoken to the President and the Secretary of Interior about Alaska's situation. Then this is what he gets as a "we will work with you"? I don't think so. This is not an indication of a Federal Government that wants to work with the State to develop its resources.

The Governor asked the Secretary of the Interior for an address, because he said he needed to send an invoice for the lack of any economy Alaska would be able to generate with these actions.

The one thing—the one thing more than anything else that could help our State—is to be able to access our Federal lands and our waters so that we can fill up the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, so that we can not only help Alaska but we can help the rest of the country. But that seems to be the one thing this President is intent on denying, whether it is in ANWR, whether it is in our offshore, or whether it is in our National Petroleum Reserve, where this President basically unilaterally took off about half of that in terms of availability of access.

I noted that when the President made his announcement on Sunday, the video that went out showed beautiful pictures of the refuge area. Again, this is a big area. This whole refuge is about the size of the State of South Carolina. It is big and there are some amazing spaces—I am the first one to admit it, amazing spaces—just as there are all over Alaska.

But I watched that video as he was flying in his airplane to go to India, and I thought to myself: The President hasn't been to Alaska, even though he says he only has three States left to see and Alaska is not included. So I actually asked my staff to find out. By my count, the President has been to Alaska three times during his administration. And he told me, before he was President, he had never been to Alaska. So three times during his administration. All three times were basically to get fuel. And granted, to give him credit, on one of those times he did meet with the troops at Elmendorf, but he never went off the base. The other two times were in the middle of the night for as long as it took to get fuel.

In my mind, that is not visiting Alaska. That is not trying to understand

who we are. We have some pretty beautiful, wide-open skies. But when you are flying at 35,000, 45,000 feet looking down, that is not how you get a view of Alaska.

So outside of this short meet-and-greet, outside of a bargaining chip to gain support from national constituencies, he is basically viewing Alaska as a refueling stop—which is no shortage of irony here in the fact that he is happy to refuel Air Force One in Alaska, but he doesn't seem to want fuel produced in Alaska.

I can get pretty frustrated and upset about this. Part of it is because so much of this comes without consultation with us, without listening to the vast majority of Alaskans—as if, once again, we are nothing but a territory and the promises that were made to us at statehood mean nothing.

I was born in the territory. It was not that long ago that Alaskans knew what it meant to be kind of kicked around by folks on the outside. We didn't have a voice. We thought statehood was going to change that. We thought that statehood compact—the promises made that Alaska would be able to deliver to its citizens based on the amazing resource wealth that we had—we thought that was going to count for something. Apparently, not enough.

I was a little bit surprised to read that the White House counselor, Mr. Podesta, thinks I have overreacted to these announcements and to others that I have been told may be coming—more to come—and he suggested my reaction is not warranted.

I would ask any one of the other 99 Senators here: Think about how you would respond if the citizens of your State woke up to a message that we are going to take 12 million acres away from you and your potential to develop in your State; and then on Tuesday, we are going to take away 9.8 million acres. But don't worry, we are the Federal Government, we are here to help. Alaskans want to help themselves. We want to be able to exercise that independence, that free spirit that so many of us in Alaska identify with. We want to help our neighbors, help our families. But this kind of help we don't need. Don't lock us up. Don't shut us out.

It was suggested in Mr. Podesta's comments, and I saw it in other press reports, that somehow or other the Interior Department felt compelled to move forward with the timing of these announcements because we were ratcheting up on ANWR. They suggested I had introduced a bill. I haven't introduced a bill. I do intend to introduce a bill. But to somehow suggest this was precipitated because the delegation is making a charge on ANWR is, at this time, unwarranted.

It did kind of make me wonder, maybe the White House isn't aware of how Alaskans feel about this. So in the

few minutes I want to take this morning I want to read a few of the quotes from our State leaders who have come out against this decision since they were announced, particularly as they relate to ANWR.

We have a new, Independent Governor. As I mentioned, he has already had the opportunity to meet with the President and talk about Alaska's issues. Again, he has also met with the Secretary of Interior to talk similarly. Governor Walker says he is "angry, very angry, that this is happening."

Our State senate president, Kevin Meyer, said the following:

The impact of this decision, if allowed to stand, will harm the future of our Great State and will deal a devastating blow to our economy.

I spoke with our house speaker, a gentleman by the name of Mike Chenault from the Kenai Peninsula, an area where we have oil and gas potential in the Cook Inlet. They know about oil and gas. The speaker said:

The president just doesn't get it, or he does get it and doesn't care about the will and voice of Alaskans. That's beyond offensive.

In response to the President's ANWR announcement, Speaker Chenault also had some pretty choice words. He said:

Alaska's not a territory anymore and it's high time our federal overlords stopped trying to treat us like one.

The Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, whose shareholders, people who actually live on the North Slope, issued a press release stating that:

We are staunchly opposed to this relentless and coordinated effort to designate the Coastal Plain of ANWR as Wilderness. This administration has deliberately ignored the input provided by the most affected people within ANWR.

Colleagues, remember that when this President is suggesting that this area needs to be named or designated as wilderness, the 1002 area, people live there. People live their lives there—children go to school and people work there. They fly in and out. They have a little grocery store. They try to make an honest living there. They subsist, absolutely; but people live there. To quote from the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, the corporation's shareholders who live there say, "this administration has deliberately ignored the input provided by the most affected people within ANWR."

I think the reason they have ignored it is because they forget people actually live there. How can people live in a wilderness?

Democratic State Representative Ben Nageak of Barrow, who is an Inupiat and born in Kaktovik, who lives in the affected area, wrote this:

President Barack Obama and his lieutenants at the Interior Department will permanently harm our people and all Alaskans with his colonial attitude and decision making . . . It's terrifying to see the extent by which our pleas for time and a fair hearing of our views fall on deaf ears 5,000 miles away.

That is a State representative born and raised in this area, an Inupiat, who is saying 5,000 miles from here you are making decisions without listening to us, without listening to our people.

Our North Slope Borough Mayor Charlotte Brower didn't mince any words, either. She said that "these types of paternalistic, executive fiat seem to be more appropriate for Andrew Jackson's administration than Barack Obama's."

Pretty tough words. I am starting to think my words were pretty mild based on what I read from the mayor of the North Slope Borough and the Democratic State representative from Barrow.

Mayor Brower has invited President Obama and Secretary Jewell to visit the North Slope, and she asked them to meet with the people who actually live there before proposing these types of sweeping land designations. If the President and the Secretary actually accept that invitation, Mayor Brower concluded:

They might learn that the Inupiat people who have lived on and cared for these lands for millennia have no interest in living like relics in a giant open air museum. Rather, they hope to have the same rights and privileges enjoyed by people across the rest of the country.

That seems like a pretty fair request to me.

Even the New York Times interviewed a few Alaskans who didn't hide their feelings. One woman who said she had voted for the President twice said, "He has just alienated an entire state." She described herself as being "on the fence" about ANWR before the proposal, but she added, "without talking to any of us, just doing it by fiat—that's not how you lead."

I think she summed it up pretty well. What the President has done, the way he has done it—it is unfair, uncalled for, and it is unwarranted. So for it to be suggested by the counselor from the White House that my response is somehow overreacting or unwarranted, I think they should start listening to all of the people of Alaska. The presiding officer and myself were sent here to represent them and I think we are expressing pretty clearly where Alaskans are coming from on this.

This is wrong. It should not be tolerated. And we will not just sit back while this administration locks up our State and the potential of our people.

We have a lot more we will be discussing about this. Again, I mentioned on Monday that there was a trifecta with what we see coming out of this administration. I have been told by the Secretary that we would see his ANWR designation and that we would then see the 5-year lease sale that would take areas that had been in deferred status and completely withdraw them for an indefinite period of time, and that there would be a third announcement

coming relating to the National Petroleum Reserve—the area where folks who said don't go to ANWR, go to NPRA, go to the National Petroleum Reserve. So the first company that tried to do so is trying to make it happen. What this administration is doing with the mitigation costs they are laying in front of them, the company will determine whether it is going to be economic. But my fear is that will be the third kick to Alaska.

So it has been a bad week, a bad week for Alaska. But you know what, we are not people who are deterred by bad news, by bad weather. We have a way to roll with it.

I was looking at the front page of the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner yesterday. They had a little recap of what is going on with the weather. It is about 52 below zero in Fort Yukon and 51 below in Fort Greely where we base our ground-based missile defense system. We are pretty proud of what we do. We can still provide for the defense and protection of this country and do it in some pretty cold weather.

In Fairbanks, where I went to high school, I think the weather this morning was 47 degrees below zero, but the kids still go to school in this kind of weather. We are doing what we do up north. It is not easy, but it is an amazing place and the people there are pretty resilient. We have been kicked this week, but that doesn't mean we are down. It means we are just getting started.

With that, I will have more to say about the process in front of us this afternoon, where we are with Keystone; but again, I am pleased that we have a good series of votes to keep us busy this afternoon, and I appreciate the indulgence of colleagues as we go through a process that can be very disruptive as they are trying to meet with constituents and pursue committee business. But I think we recognize that we want to be on a path toward completion of this bill, and I thank them for their cooperation.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, last week my colleague Senator LANKFORD and I introduced the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act—a bill to enhance transparency about the true costs of burdensome Federal regulations affecting our States and localities.

Twenty years ago the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, otherwise known as UMRA, was signed into law to reduce the burden of Federal mandates on State and local governments, as well as the private sector. The statute was intended to fix a simple problem while promoting informed decisions by this Congress. But since UMRA's enactment in 1995, many remain concerned that the law has fallen short. In Nebraska and all across America, our constituents continue to face a growing mountain of redtape that stifles economic growth and holds back progress on a number of fronts.

In 2011 alone the Government Accountability Office identified 14 different loopholes that would allow government agencies to avoid conducting the UMRA analysis. In other words, redtape has survived and prospered. By their very nature, Federal mandates are both complex and vague, which is why I have introduced a new bill to fix these shortcomings and increase accountability. My bill, known as the Unfunded Mandates and Information Transparency Act, would address UMRA's loopholes by mandating stricter agency requirements, enhance stakeholder input, and strengthen enforcement mechanisms.

Furthermore, this bill has the power to get the job done. It would allow judges to place a stay on a regulation or invalidate a rule if a Federal agency fails to complete the required UMRA analysis. It would also close a glaring loophole used by agencies to skirt UMRA requirements.

Last but not least, my bill would expand the scope of reporting requirements to include regulations imposed by independent regulatory agencies, such as the EPA. I know many Nebraskans are deeply concerned about the effects of new EPA requirements, such as the proposed water rule—a rule I have forcefully fought since it was first proposed. Nebraskans already go to great lengths to protect and preserve water resources within our State, but now the EPA is going overboard with this new proposal—one that represents a massive Federal power grab and clear disconnect with Main Street America.

I share the belief of many Nebraskans that the Federal Government should be held responsible for the rules it puts into place. By clearly notifying taxpayers of the costs of each mandate, which the bill I introduced would require, we can better hold the Federal Government accountable for the economic impact of its costly regulations.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this simple, commonsense legislation to help bring greater accountability and transparency to Washington.

I thank the Presiding Officer and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I return to the floor today to discuss the legislation under consideration. As I did yesterday, I wish to begin by again thanking both the Senator from Alaska on our side of the aisle and the Senator from Washington on the other side of the aisle, who are the bill managers—the legislation managers in this case—of the Keystone XL Pipeline approval legislation that I put forward along with Senator MANCHIN. I wish to begin by thanking both of the managers for their diligence and for their bipartisanship and for working together to advance this legislation, but I also want to make sure all of the Members of this body get a chance to bring their amendments forward, debate those amendments, and have a vote.

This afternoon we have scheduled 18 votes, and that is great. Some of those amendments I support; some I oppose. But we are going to do what this body is supposed to do and what the American people elected us to do, and that is to have this discussion and then vote.

We are working to advance energy policy for this country that can not only truly help create more energy, jobs, and economic growth but also really address the national security implications of making our country energy secure. By that, I mean producing more energy than we consume and working with Canada, our friend and ally, to do that so that we don't have to depend on OPEC to do that and on parts of the world where there is great instability and where our interests are not aligned with the interests of some of those countries.

Also, it enables us to actually weaken some of our opponents that are petro-dependent, countries such as Iran, which is now trying to build a nuclear weapon, as well as, right now, Russia, which is invading its neighbor Ukraine, one of our allies, where we are trying to stop the adventurism of President Putin.

By truly becoming energy secure, by providing more supply of energy, we not only benefit every American at the pump—Americans are saving billions of dollars when they pull up to the pump. That is not only good for American consumers, it is good for our small businesses.

Energy is a foundational industry that strengthens every other industry out there. It makes us more competitive in the global economy across the board. As I say, it weakens some of our opponents. So that is really the debate in which we are engaged.

Yesterday I started to respond to some of the critics who oppose this leg-

islation on the basis of saying this is a project for Canada and not for the United States, and that is not true at all. This pipeline would not only move crude from Canada to our refineries, it would also move crude from production in the United States, including in my State of North Dakota, which now produces 1.2 million barrels of oil a day—second only to Texas—as well as Montana. So it also moves domestic crude to our refineries as well.

Furthermore, it really is about making our Nation energy secure, working with Canada to become energy secure so we don't have to depend on OPEC. That is very much a national interest issue for this country, for this Nation, and for all Americans. I spoke about that a little bit yesterday.

The second issue I would like to address is some of the environmental issues. I started to do that yesterday, but I deferred at that time because anytime we can get people to come to the floor to offer their amendments and make them pending, that is what we want to do. At that point we started getting people to come offer their amendments, and the bill managers, through their hard work, were able to get agreement, and we now have 18 amendments pending on a precloture basis. So we have made real progress in getting everyone involved and hopefully building more bipartisan consensus and getting on the energy debate the American people want and getting to a result where we can actually produce legislation that will help our Nation.

So I started to get into the second point I wanted to discuss, which is some of the environmental aspects of the oil sands development and how technology is being deployed, with hundreds of millions of private dollars invested in new technologies that are not only producing more energy but doing it with a smaller environmental footprint. That helps to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions of oil that is produced in the oil sands.

There are two projects I wish to speak about to give examples of how, if we continue to work to empower this kind of investment in new technologies, we get not only more energy more cost-effectively and more dependably but we also get it with environmental stewardship.

The first project I will speak about is a project that has been undertaken in the oil sands in Alberta, Canada. Going back to this earlier chart, we can see that it is up in the Hardisty area, and this second chart is a picture of the project. It is one that is undertaken by the Shell Oil Company. It is called their Quest project. I will read a little bit about the project.

Shell Canada will this year complete the world's first oil sands carbon capture and storage project.

This is CCS—carbon capture and storage—something we have been

working to develop in this country and apply to fossil fuels, not only things such as oil and gas but also coal. This is the new carbon capture technology. They will complete the world's first project. Continuing:

The project, called Quest, will begin permanently storing CO₂ by the end of the year and will permanently store more than 1 million tons per year.

Let me read that again.

The project, called Quest, will begin permanently storing CO₂ by the end of the year and will permanently store more than 1 million tons per year. Quest reduces the emissions from Shell's upgrader by 35 percent—that's the equivalent of taking 175,000 cars off the road each year. Shell will transport the CO₂ 50 miles north via pipeline and permanently store it more than a mile below ground under impermeable rock formations.

My point is that here is an example of where a private company is working with the Province of Alberta on this project to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in carbon capture and storage technology that will not only apply to the oil sands, but—think about it—this is also technology that is not only being developed but deployed on a commercial scale in production that we can now take advantage of and use in this country to produce more energy from multiple sources—again, smaller footprint, lower greenhouse gas.

Isn't that the solution to better environmental stewardship where we get more energy that we produce here with our closest friends and allies, with better stewardship through investment by private companies in these new technologies and, in this case, working with Alberta? Alberta is also investing in this technology, but this is the innovation of our country, of our companies. This is the kind of ingenuity and innovation that helps us build the kind of future we want. In this case, it is a secure energy future by deploying these new technologies.

The other point I will make as we look at this chart is that under the old system of oil sand production—remember, it is excavation, so they would be digging up this area and then extracting the oil from the oil sands. But under this new system of development, which is called in situ, they are actually drilling wells, and then they put steam down the hole to bring the oil up, and then they capture the CO₂ and store it underground, so smaller environmental footprint and lower greenhouse gas emissions.

Since 1990 the greenhouse gas emissions on a per-barrel basis for oil sands production has gone down by 28 percent. So they have reduced it by almost a third. These new technologies will reduce it further going forward.

This is about finding good solutions to create jobs and economic activity and energy security and take us into the future. That is why I wanted to discuss that project for just a minute.

A second project I will reference is Exxon's Kearn project, spelled K-E-A-R-

L. Just by way of preface, Exxon currently produces over 100,000 barrels of oil a day in the Canadian oil sands. They are going to increase that amount this year to 345,000 barrels a day. Their objective is to get to half a million barrels a day of oil produced in the Canadian oil sands. They are investing \$10 billion in this project. That is their investment in this project and these new, better drilling techniques.

Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about their project. Exxon is doing it differently than Shell and Quest. They are employing different technologies but investing \$10 billion to reduce the environmental footprint, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but produce a lot of energy for Canada and for our country.

Exxon's Kearn project will use cogeneration for steam, which is a low-energy extraction process to recover oil, and heat integration between the extraction and treatment facilities to minimize energy consumption. As a result, oil produced from Kearn will have about the same life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions as many other crude oils refined in the United States as a result of technologies which significantly enhance environmental performance—again, smaller environmental footprint, lower greenhouse gas emissions.

This is how we work to address the challenges we face, whether it is producing energy or anything else. We deploy these new technologies that enable us to do it better.

Other environmental innovations for Kearn include onsite water storage to eliminate river withdrawals in low-flow periods and progressive land reclamation, which will return the land to the boreal forest.

I wish to emphasize that for a minute. What we see around this site, which is actually the Shell site—this is the boreal forest. I have been to Hardisty, and I have seen the oil sands production. I was also taken out to areas where they had reclaimed land that had been formerly used to produce oil sands. Now we can't tell the difference between the land that has been reclaimed and the land that hadn't ever been used in terms of oil production. I was there and I looked at both and I couldn't tell the difference. Of course, that is subjective. You want to return it to the state it was in before it was tapped. With this newer production, there is a much smaller area that we would ultimately have to return to its original state.

I wanted to touch on those two projects for a few minutes as well as point out that the Alberta Government actually requires that all land used in the development of oil sands has to be returned to the same or equivalent condition when it is no longer in use.

The final point I wish to touch on for just a minute or two is another issue that has been brought up, which is

pipeline safety. There have been some references to recent pipeline spills—one in Poplar, MT, actually not too far from where I live in western North Dakota. But the spill is from what is called the Poplar Pipeline, which I believe is owned by the Bridger Company. It is a pipeline that goes underneath the Yellowstone River. It was built in the 1950s, so we are talking about a pipeline that is over 50 years old. Isn't that just the point, that whether it is roads or bridges or buildings or pipelines or transmission lines or anything else, we have to make the investment in new facilities rather than just continuing to rely on old facilities?

That is what I want to emphasize about the Keystone XL Pipeline project. This is an investment of \$8 billion, not a penny of government investment but \$8 billion in private investment in new steel and new technologies.

Also, the Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration—PHMSA—the division of the Department of Transportation that oversees pipeline safety, has required 57 special conditions for this pipeline to make sure it is as safe as possible. I am going to touch on some of those to give a sense of what they are.

The whole point is that here we are trying to create a business climate, a business environment where companies can put billions of dollars into these new technologies and this new infrastructure so that we can have energy as safely as possible, with the best stewardship possible, so we aren't relying on pipelines or other infrastructure that is more than 50 years old.

We are trying to get that upgrade. We are not doing it at taxpayer expense. We are getting tax revenues. We will get hundreds of millions of tax revenues that will come back in from private sector projects where we are trying to empower that investment. At the same time, the PHMSA, the Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, has all these requirements that they are making part of the approval process—57 different special safety conditions for the Keystone XL Pipeline. They are conditions such as puncture resistance. For example, TransCanada is required by PHMSA in the environmental impact statement to ensure that the steel used in the pipeline can withstand impact from a 65-ton excavator with 3½-inch teeth.

There is corrosion resistance coating, making sure it has a coating on it that is resistant to corrosion. There is cathodic protection. Cathodic protection is applied to a pipe so where it connects to other—it could be structures such as a bridge. It could be any place where the pipes are connected to make sure those other connections don't rust through into the pipe.

For maintenance, TransCanada must submit certification that demonstrates compliance with all 57 conditions before they commence operation of the pipe.

Airplanes will patrol the right of away at least 26 times a year. They will send cleaning and inspection tools through the pipeline once a year to collect and analyze basic sediment and water.

Compare all of this to a pipeline that was built 50 years ago and laid on the floor of a river—versus a pipeline now, where if they have to cross a river, they use directional drilling. So they go down 25 feet below the river and put the pipe 25 feet down in the rock below the river, versus older pipelines that were just laid in there. Again, this is the new technology—the new safeguards.

In horizontal drilling and directional drilling the pipe will be buried approximately 25 feet below riverbeds. So if there are riverbeds that cross, that is 25 feet below using directional drilling.

There are automatic shutoff valves. So they will have automatic shutoff valves and they will be placed every 20 miles along the pipeline route. Extra miles will also be placed where there are protected water crossing and other areas of higher consequence. They can be closed remotely on either side of the line, isolating a damaged area within minutes of detection.

Again, it is about making sure if there is an issue of any kind, that you can minimize and mitigate any kind of spill.

With 100 percent weld inspections, there is a requirement that 100 percent of welds are inspected rather than just some of the welds under a test basis.

With satellite monitoring and leak detection, Keystone XL will have more than 13,500 sensors feeding constant and detailed information about flow rates to the control center 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. That is so that if any kind of a leak is detected, it is immediately shut down so you minimize the amount of product that would leak.

Those are the kinds of safety features—and there are 57 of them—required by the administration's Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration. When we talk about pipeline safety and somebody comes in and says there is this pipe that broke so we should never have another pipe, we need to talk about that and address that in a sensible way.

We have over 2 million miles of pipe in this country. The point is we do need to build new pipelines and upgrade them and take other steps to make sure the system is safe. But you don't do that by blocking investment in the new technologies and the new pipeline that will help us move product more safely, more cost-effectively, and more dependably.

Those are the three issues I wanted to address. Again, I covered some of

them yesterday, but I wanted to make sure that any time we had somebody coming down to offer amendments, we deferred to those individuals. I am pleased now we have 18 amendments pending on a whole gamut of issues related to this project, to this energy discussion, and to our efforts to advance a better energy future for our country.

Again, I look forward to the debate this afternoon, to voting on these amendments, and to continuing to advance this legislation on behalf of the American people.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to talk about the latest attempt by the Republicans in the House of Representatives—and a few Republicans in the Senate as well—to hold hostage the basic operation of our government, once again, over politics.

While I have several issues with the Department of Homeland Security funding bill that the House has sent to us, I will first discuss this strategy we are seeing from Republicans, as the former chair of the Budget Committee and as someone who has worked across the aisle to break through gridlock in Congress.

Two years ago our country was moving constantly from one manufactured crisis to the next. We had debt limit scares that were rattling our businesses and the markets, we were headed toward an absurd and unnecessary government shutdown, and people across the country were losing faith that their elected officials could get anything done when it came to the budget and to our economy.

But by working together, Congressman PAUL RYAN and I were able to reach a budget deal that prevented another government shutdown and showed the American people that Congress could work together to get things done.

Because of that deal we were able to then pass bipartisan spending bills for the past 2 fiscal years, including 11 of the 12 appropriations bills from last year. Although we have a lot of work to do, it is clear that stability in the Federal budget makes a difference for our economy. We have to work to-

gether to build on that growth, to continue that certainty, and to make sure our economy is working for all families, not only the wealthiest few.

Across the country, businesses have added more than 11 million new jobs—over 58 straight months of job growth. The unemployment rate is now under 6 percent and trending downward, and we have reduced the Federal budget deficit by over two-thirds since 2009.

So when I look at the Homeland Security funding bill that the House of Representatives has now sent to us, I see a few things. I see a bill—the way it is drafted and was sent to us will tear apart families who are working hard to make it in America. I see a bill that will put our security at risk, and I see a bill that seriously threatens all of the work we have done recently, Republicans and Democrats, to keep our government functioning because the bill the House has sent over is simply unacceptable.

It will not pass the Senate. Republicans know that. Let's be clear about what this bill is, it is a calculated, political gamble from our Republican colleagues.

This looming showdown over funding the Department of Homeland Security is no accident. In fact, it is actually a risk they have been planning since last year all because of political pressure from the extreme anti-immigration right wing of their party.

If Republicans are willing to risk funding for the Department of Homeland Security for political reasons, I believe the American people deserve to know exactly what that does mean because funding the Department of Homeland Security doesn't only keep the lights on the DHS headquarters, that funding protects our country from terrorist attacks at a time when the world is as dangerous and volatile as ever.

It protects our country and American businesses from cyber attacks, a threat that is all too real as we have now seen in recent months. It supports basic security measures at our airports, at our seaports, and along the border. It even supports our Federal emergency management resources that are on call for every community in America.

In my home State of Washington, this funding supports the Coast Guard, which protects shippers and sailors throughout Puget Sound, and Customs and Border Protection, which helps facilitate billions in international trade moving through my State, the most trade-dependent State in the country.

Not funding these programs is a risk we cannot afford to take. It is reckless and irresponsible and, more than anything else, simply counterproductive for Republicans to put all of this on the line just to score some political points with the tea party and the far right. Unfortunately that appears exactly to be what they are doing.

Once again Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans have decided they are willing to break up millions of families and deport millions of DREAMers who are victims themselves of a broken system.

They have decided they are willing to stop the President's policy of focusing our law enforcement on national security threats, gang members, and violent criminals. Once again they have decided they are willing to make bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform that much more difficult to achieve.

This is much more than only an annual funding bill. This legislation is a message which has been sent to us loud and clear from House Republicans and Speaker BOEHNER that they are willing to continue pushing us from crisis to crisis. They are willing to play politics with our national security, and they are willing to turn their backs on millions and millions of children and families.

For years now we have seen that strategy doesn't work—it doesn't work. It holds us back.

But I have to say I was encouraged when Majority Leader MCCONNELL said that at the end of the day the Senate will fund the Department of Homeland Security.

It is clear the House bill will not pass the Senate, so I truly believe it is time for the majority leader to show, as he has promised, that he will let the Senate and Congress work efficiently.

It is time for the majority leader to bring a clean DHS appropriations bill to the floor. Let's get it done, passed, and move on to the work that is so important to us.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to urge my Republican colleagues to pass a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of the fiscal year.

We are now only 1 month away from a shutdown of the principal Federal agency charged with keeping Americans safe from terrorism and prepared for natural disasters.

The President has said he will veto any funding bill that repeals or rolls back his Executive order on immigration, so anything but a clean bill to fund DHS means one thing and one thing alone. Republicans are unilaterally shutting down the agency.

No matter what your grievance is, we shouldn't be playing politics with national security. It is alarming that

even as we can now count the days, 30, until a Republican security shutdown, so many on the hard right are ready to just dismiss the consequences.

Compared to their obsession with President Obama's immigration action and their desire to appease the tea party with radical and practical ideas that would not fix our system, to Republicans shutting down DHS is "not the end of the world."

So I will use my time to spell out what a DHS shutdown would mean for our country in the hopes that our Republican colleagues will be jolted back to reality and to common sense. Since this isn't the first time Republicans have put us through a shutdown, we actually have a very good idea as to what a DHS shutdown would look like.

Here are just some of the functions that would cease if Republicans failed to put a clean bill on the floor: The bulk of DHS management and headquarter administrative support activities would cease, including much of the homeland security infrastructure that was built during the 9/11 terrorist attacks to improve command, control, and coordination of disparate frontline activities. Securing the Cities, a critical post-9/11 funding program that helps pay for nuclear detection capabilities in New York City, Los Angeles, and Washington, DC, could not be awarded in fiscal year 2015. The DHS Nuclear Detection Office, which since 9/11 coordinates on a daily or weekly basis with local law enforcement, will stop operating.

FEMA's disaster preparedness unit would cease coordinating regular training activities for law enforcement for weapons of mass destruction events. FEMA employees in Washington and across the country who provide critical preparedness resources to local first responders would be sent home. Twenty-five percent of FEMA's headquarters and regional staff would be furloughed.

FEMA personnel working on grants programs, such as funds for intelligence analysts or firefighter needs, would be furloughed, and even those personnel deemed essential would be denied paychecks until a funding bill is passed. This means we are not paying the Coast Guard, we are not paying the TSA, we are not paying the Border Patrol, the Secret Service or FEMA aid workers.

So make no mistake, a DHS shutdown would hamstring our ability to combat threats to the homeland and to keep our citizens safe. The irony of course is that one of the programs that shutdown would close completely is E-Verify, which stops unscrupulous employers from hiring undocumented workers and cutting everyone's wages.

So in order to make a point on immigration, our Republican colleagues are actually going to stop the program which prevents employers from hiring undocumented workers. Essentially to

make a point about needing more immigration enforcement, Republicans are willing to shut down immigration enforcement.

In short, I am perplexed as to why Republicans are playing this game of chicken with DHS funding because the only possible outcome that could come from withholding of a clean DHS bill is the shutdown of several critical post-9/11 programs within the DHS and the furlough of thousands of workers paramount to our Nation's security and disaster preparedness.

At a time when we need all hands on deck to keep America safe, Republican efforts to politicize our security would tie DHS's hands behind their back. So I urge my Republican colleagues in the House and Senate to drop this fool's errand and put a clean DHS funding bill on the floor as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here this afternoon to discuss the two concerns I have about the bill currently before the Senate—the regulation that would grant immediate approval of the Presidential permit necessary to construct and operate the Keystone XL Pipeline.

First and foremost, I believe a thorough regulatory review process is critical for any major infrastructure project, particularly one that will cross our country's border. Regulatory review enables the identification of economic impacts from a major project and, more importantly, environmental impacts that infrastructure projects such as the Keystone Pipeline may bring.

We shouldn't trade transparency for expediency when it comes to the construction of an international project that has such scope. I can't support a bill that sacrifices these important protections. That is why I voted in the past against legislation to allow the Keystone XL Pipeline to circumvent the normal review process, and that is why I intend to again vote against this bill.

I also have a number of concerns about the impact of the Keystone Pipeline on our environment. In the past 2 weeks, we have had a spirited debate on this floor, and a number of my colleagues have come to the floor to talk about the pipeline oilspills we have seen in this country.

Just a few days ago, an oil pipeline burst, leaking 50,000 gallons of crude oil into the Yellowstone River in Montana. Yet this spill pales in comparison

to the 2010 Kalamazoo River oil spill where over 1 million gallons of oil sands poured into Talmadge Creek in Michigan. The cleanup has already cost more than \$1 billion and taken over 4 years to complete. In fact, to date there has been no authoritative study on how the spills of oil sands crude may differ from those of conventional crude oil. This means we have no idea about the spill's long-term effects on the health of wildlife in that river.

The other issue that has been raced onto the floor is the fact that right now, because of the way we define crude oil, TransCanada—supporting and planning to build the Keystone Pipeline—is not required to pay into the federal oil spill liability trust fund, which would ensure taxpayers against any spills. So we have this out-of-state, out-of-country foreign company that is coming in to build this pipeline, and yet they are not required to pay, as any American company would be, into the oil spill liability trust fund. That, to me, doesn't make sense. Circumventing the regulatory process for Keystone prevents us from understanding the health hazards that we would face should another spill occur.

I am also concerned that construction of the Keystone Pipeline will increase carbon emissions and undermine some of the most critical climate policies that we have in place. The pipeline poses threats to our environment that have already been identified. Tar sands greenhouse gas emissions are 81 percent greater than those of conventional oil. That is because the production of oil sands crude is more energy intensive, or more greenhouse gas intensive, than conventional crude production. Additional processes are required to extract the oil, remove the sand, and dilute the oil so that it can flow in a pipeline.

In addition, if the pipeline is approved, much of the boreal wetlands in Alberta, Canada, which act as a carbon sink, would be destroyed, releasing 11 million to 47 million metric tons of CO₂ into the atmosphere.

One of the reasons I am concerned about circumventing the regulatory process is because I believe this could set a precedent for a rushed approval of infrastructure projects currently under consideration in New Hampshire.

In New Hampshire, we have two projects that really merit careful consideration and thorough review that could be affected by a precedent that says we should ignore the regulatory process. In New Hampshire, the Northern Pass transmission proposal, which proposes to deliver hydropower from Quebec into the New England energy markets and goes through northern New Hampshire, would bring power to southern New England, but New Hampshire wouldn't benefit. And any suggestion that we would circumvent the process is a real concern to people in

New Hampshire who would be affected by that project.

The other project is the potential reversal of the Portland-Montreal pipeline, which, if the determination were made to do this, would send oil sands through many New Hampshire communities, and that oil would then be shipped to foreign countries.

So if we set the precedent of trading transparency for expediency with Keystone, without requiring the completion of a comprehensive approval process, local communities in New Hampshire may not have a meaningful voice in the process that deals with Northern Pass or reversing the Portland-Montreal pipeline. I think that is unacceptable.

These three projects—Keystone, Northern Pass, and Portland-Montreal—have one important thing in common: They should undergo the comprehensive environmental and safety approval process required by existing law, and that should be done independent of politics.

Circumventing the Presidential permitting process for cross-border pipelines and electric transmission facilities avoids the due process that is needed to determine whether these projects are in the best interests of the country.

In New Hampshire, Northern Pass and the Portland-Montreal pipeline have raised serious concerns for people who live in areas impacted by these projects. That is why I worked with the entire New Hampshire congressional delegation in a bipartisan way to ensure that both projects undergo a transparent, thorough, and comprehensive review process. That allows the input of local communities who will be affected by these projects.

Like people in New Hampshire and across the country, I share concerns about our Nation's energy future. Throughout my career I have fought for smart policies that will reduce energy costs in New Hampshire and across the country, that will help create jobs, and will protect our air and water from pollution.

But I don't believe mandating a project that bypasses the approval process is a smart policy. We need to be smart and thoughtful about our energy future. I think it would set a dangerous precedent for other projects that could have serious consequences in New Hampshire and in other States around the country.

I appreciate the debate we have had here on the Senate floor about the Keystone Pipeline, but I will be opposing this bill.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UKRAINE AND SYRIA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to speak to the Senate about Ukraine and also about Syria. These are two parts of the world that are of particular critical importance to the United States foreign policy today because of what they portend for the future. The fact that our relationship is so rocky with the President of Russia, President Putin, who right up to just a few days after the Olympics suddenly shows his true colors when he invades Crimea, a part of Ukraine, despite all of the agreements when the Soviet Union broke up in the late eighties, early nineties, the agreements that in exchange for moving all of the nuclear weapons out of Ukraine back into Russia, that Russia would forever recognize and respect the sovereignty of Ukraine—well, that went out the window right after the Olympics, and Mr. Putin showed his true colors.

He could couch it in all kinds of terms, that there is a Russian naval base that was there, but the fact is the whole world knows what he did, and no one could do anything about it. Then he started to move on the eastern part of Ukraine, and that, of course, is going on as we speak. The so-called rebels aren't really rebels. They are a front for the Russian military propped up with actual troops of the Russian military, sometimes disguised as being free and independent players simply because they don't have on their Russian uniforms; but in fact they have taken them off and put on uniforms that are not Russian uniforms to say that they are part of the rebel force. It is a ruse and everybody knows it is a ruse.

I went last August to Ukraine, spoke with almost all of the top-level members of the government and asked what it was they needed. To my surprise, at the time they did not say they needed lethal equipment. They needed up-to-date, up-to-the-minute intelligence, and they needed training.

I have urged the U.S. Government to provide that, and we are providing a number of things. This Senator thinks it is clearly in the interest of the United States that we provide more assistance to the Government of Ukraine so their military can have the equipment, including lethal assistance, to hold off Putin's aggression in Eastern Ukraine.

This is a particularly critical time. I was there last summer, but what has happened in the meantime is over the course of the past year oil has gone from \$100 to \$46 a barrel. I remember asking someone when I was there and in the Baltic States what did oil need to get to and below in order for Mr. Putin to start really feeling the pinch, and they said anything under \$85 a barrel. It is now around \$46 a barrel. Although Russia has significant reserves

as of a few months ago, about \$450 billion of cash in reserves, that is lower now. Those reserves will hold them for a while because of the price they are getting for their oil. They don't have high production costs in Russia, but because the price is so much lower—half of what they were getting—their revenue is significantly down and therefore all of the money that was being supplied by the Russian Government for so many things, a plethora of different social programs—guess who is feeling the pinch. The people of Russia. So the aggressiveness of Mr. Putin internationally is an attempt to try to take his people's eye off of their own financial depravity and, in fact, get it on the international scene where the President of Russia is quite adept at pounding his chest and banging his fist.

The Ukrainians are once again fighting right now as we speak for their territory. The Ukrainian Government took back the Donetsk airport in Eastern Ukraine. Then the rebels came back. And I say "rebels" with a wry smile. I mean this is the Russian Army. They came back and they took it again. Last week those Russian-backed rebels broke a shaky ceasefire agreement and they renewed the fighting with the Ukrainian Government military. This Senator feels that we have got to do more to help these people who are trying to protect their independence. If you recall, last year we passed the Ukraine Freedom Support Act which provides further sanctions and lethal aid such as antitank and anti-armor weapons, counter-artillery radars, secure communications equipment, and tactical surveillance drones. All of that was needed.

The fighting that is following appears to be a steady buildup of Russian support for the rebels. General Hodges, the U.S. Army commander in Europe, said last week that since December Russia had doubled its support for the rebels. General Breedlove, the NATO Supreme Commander, said that Russian electronic warfare and defense systems have been detected in the conflict areas. So let's not fool ourselves, the Russian Army is in there and we have to do more to help them.

On Syria, this Senator feels where we are having success right now in Iraq against ISIS with the multiple strikes from the air, with training up the Iraqi Army as the boots on the ground, including some American boots on the ground that are advisers and trainers—at the end of the day we are going to have to do this in Syria if we are going to be successful. It is a lot more complicated in Syria because of the Assad government. The Free Syrian Army we are now starting to train—it is almost an impossible task. We train them, they go in, they try to attack ISIS. ISIS attacks them, but so does the Assad regime. That is not a recipe for success.

We are working with the vetted opposition fighters to go after ISIS in Syria. We have to supply support. We have to supply lethal support in addition to the training and equipment in order for them to be successful. And for them to be successful, it is absolutely in the interest of the United States. Congress has approved the training and equipping of vetted elements of the Syrian opposition, and the Department of Defense recently announced it will deploy 400 personnel in that effort. We are going to have to do a lot more.

The American people are tired of war, and yet we have a new kind of enemy, and we are going to have to take it right to them where they are.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 295 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about some of the amendments we will be voting on later this afternoon—three of them in particular. The amendments I am referring to are the Merkley amendment No. 125, the Carper amendment No. 120, and the Heitkamp amendment No. 133. All three of these amendments address sensitive tax issues that fall squarely into the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee, and all of them address issues that are likely to be litigated as the Finance Committee continues its efforts toward comprehensive tax reform.

The Finance Committee is going to be very active in this Congress. We had our first bipartisan markup this morning. We already had two hearings, with more scheduled for next week, and perhaps more importantly—at least in the context of these three votes we will be having today—we have taken concrete steps in a process we believe will end in the introduction of bipartisan tax reform legislation. We have appointed five tax reform working groups to address the various areas of reform. Our hope is that over the next few months these working groups will study the issues and provide ideas we can use as we develop a comprehensive tax reform proposal.

Ranking Member WYDEN is on board with this effort. We are working together every step of the way. If we start singling out individual tax issues here on the floor—even issues Members may feel passionately about—we are going to undermine this bipartisan process. Virtually everyone in both parties agrees that we need to fix our broken, inefficient Tax Code. Sure, there are disagreements on what the substance of tax reform should look like, but there is a growing consensus on the need for reform, which is encouraging. If we are going to be suc-

cessful in tax reform, we need to make sure these issues are addressed in the tax-writing committees.

I think it is safe to say that all of the issues my colleagues are trying to address with their amendments are going to be litigated one way or another in the Finance Committee's efforts this year. That being the case, raising these issues as floor amendments on an unrelated bill is, in my view, very counter-productive.

Finally, I would like to note that these amendments would all be subject to a constitutional point of order as they all deal with revenue and would need to be passed first by the House of Representatives. I am not going to raise that point of order at this time; I just want to make note of it for the record.

Given all of these concerns, I hope my colleagues—Senators MERKLEY, CARPER, and HEITKAMP—will withdraw these amendments so these issues can be addressed in the proper forum. If they do not withdraw their amendments, I plan to vote against all three of them and urge all of my colleagues—particularly those who have an interest in a successful tax reform effort—to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I congratulate the Presiding Officer, and I also congratulate Chairman HATCH for the unanimous vote he got in today's markup in the Finance Committee. It was a great bipartisan start to our work, as he said. I hope we will continue to have these discussions in that manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 92, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about the Burr-Bennet amendment No. 92, which we are slated to vote on later today. I will be brief because it is pretty straightforward.

The amendment simply reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund and ensures that a dedicated portion of LWCF funds go to provide new access for our Nation's sports men and women.

As many in this body know, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of the country's best and most important conservation programs. It is authorized to provide \$900 million annually for efforts to preserve and increase access to our public lands and waterways. These resources historically have been used for projects that range from building city parks, to purchasing small parcels of isolated land from willing sellers, all the way to preserving the Nation's historic battlefields.

This past summer in Colorado, we completed a huge LWCF project that retired several old mining claims on the San Juan National Forest near the town of Ophir.

Over the Fourth of July weekend, the town invited me and my family to join

them in a celebration of the accomplishment, and we took them up on that offer without a moment's hesitation.

Ophir sits at 9,600 feet above sea level. It is the kind of place that has a sign on its main road—clearly painted by the kids who live in the town—indicating that their population totals 163 people, including, according to the sign, 55 kids, 30 dogs, and 15 cats. When we pulled in on the morning of the celebration, it seemed to me that the entire town was there. Over the course of that day—which included a hike, a picnic, and a formal program—it was amazing to hear from the community about the importance of this LWCF project and how many years so many people in the town devoted themselves to getting it done.

Many of our mountain communities get huge portions of their revenue and business through recreation and tourism, and it is for some of these reasons that the town felt LWCF literally helped cement its economic future.

I was an LWCF supporter before that visit, but that day really drove home the value of the program to me. That is only one of countless stories from Colorado. I know it can be replicated thousands of times across the country in all 50 States. Those stories and accomplishments alone make this amendment worth supporting.

Let's also remember that when we are talking about LWCF, we are not talking about taxpayer dollars. When Congress crafted the measure back in 1965, they had a very innovative solution for how to pay for their concept. Instead of using taxpayer dollars from the Treasury, they decided to dedicate a portion of the revenue the government collects from offshore oil drilling to fund LWCF. This argument was very simple and elegant.

As we deplete our natural resources—offshore reserves of oil and gas in this case—we ought to support the conservation of another natural resource: our lands and waterways. As I mentioned, Congress passed a law in 1965, and now it is time to reauthorize it. I thank Senator BURR, who has shown great leadership in crafting the amendment to do just that.

This amendment is thoroughly bipartisan and enjoys cosponsors such as Senator AYOTTE, Senator ALEXANDER, and Senator TILLIS, just to name a few. In fact, I am told there are 246 amendments that have been filed on this bill, and not one amendment has the number of cosponsors that this amendment does. This amendment has more cosponsors than any of the remaining 245 amendments.

Before I close and urge my colleagues to vote yes, I want to paraphrase something I said on the floor last week about another amendment. Conservation policies such as LWCF are important to the American people. Pro-

tecting our land and water is mom-and-apple-pie stuff in Colorado, and I know our State is not the only one. Conserved lands and wide-open spaces are a huge economic driver across our country, and it is part of who we are in the West.

We are not only talking about backcountry parcels, such as the one I visited in Ophir, we are talking about building new parks in inner cities and providing new access to hunters and anglers. The LWCF does all of these things and more.

I say to my colleagues, if you are for city kids getting a new playground or making sure we protect gold medal trout streams or any number of benefits in between, then you need to be for amendment No. 92 from Senator BURR. I urge all of my colleagues to support the measure when it comes time for a vote later this evening. I think we would make a very meaningful statement about where the Senate is headed if we could supply the votes necessary to actually adopt this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 75

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that in about a minute we are going to be voting on the first of a series of amendments. The first amendment is the amendment I have offered which I talked about before. I want to remind my colleagues what this amendment does.

First, it would require a notification to Governors and to county officials of risks to their drinking water supplies that may be caused by the Keystone Pipeline.

Second, the local officials would have the right to bring that information back to the Federal Government so that action could be taken in order to protect their drinking water supplies.

Third, it provides a right of action for property owners for damages caused to their wells and drinking water as a direct result of the Keystone Pipeline construction.

This is a pretty straightforward amendment. It provides States rights in knowing what is happening with regard to their drinking water, and it provides property owners rights for the damages that could be caused as a result of Keystone.

I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would urge colleagues to oppose the Cardin amendment.

In review, it appears that it is designed to halt the construction of this pipeline before it even begins. The amendment tells the President to provide this analysis of the potential risks to public health and environment from a leak or rupture and to provide that to every municipality and every county along the route, as well as to the Governors. Then the Governor can petition the President to effectively locate the pipeline somewhere else, at which point, again, construction could never commence.

The Governors of Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska have already approved the pipeline route through their States. So this amendment is an effort, I think, to build that opposition over contamination fears and in turn, pressure those Governors to reverse their positions and halt the pipeline's construction.

I think it is important for colleagues to understand the risks to the water supplies along the pipeline path were examined by the State Department's final SEIS. They were found to be not significant. Again, I will vote no on this amendment and strongly encourage my colleagues to join me with this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 75.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Shaheen
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—62

Alexander	Burr	Collins
Ayotte	Capito	Corker
Barrasso	Carper	Cornyn
Bennet	Cassidy	Cotton
Blunt	Coats	Crapo
Boozman	Cochran	Cruz

Daines	Johnson	Roberts
Donnelly	Kirk	Rounds
Enzi	Klobuchar	Sasse
Ernst	Lankford	Scott
Fischer	Lee	Sessions
Flake	Manchin	Shelby
Gardner	McCain	Sullivan
Graham	McCaskill	Tester
Grassley	McConnell	Thune
Hatch	Moran	Tillis
Heitkamp	Murkowski	Toomey
Heller	Paul	Vitter
Hoeven	Perdue	Warner
Inhofe	Portman	Wicker
Isakson	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Reid	Rubio
------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, on rollcall No. 31, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote, since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WICKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 70, offered by the Senator from Michigan, Mr. PETERS.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, as Michiganders, Senator STABENOW and I know firsthand how important the Great Lakes are. The lakes are a vital natural resource and an economic engine for our State, region, and the entire country. Unfortunately, Michiganders also know firsthand the environmental dangers and risks when it comes to pipeline leaks.

We had the worst inland pipeline leak in our Nation's history near Kalamazoo, MI. Cleanup has taken over 4 years and has cost \$1.2 billion. There is a 60-year-old pipeline under the Straits of Mackinac where Lake Michigan and Lake Huron come together. I cannot even fathom what would happen if there were an accident that contaminated the Great Lakes. The results would be catastrophic not only for the Great Lakes but also the entire country.

That is why we need to act now and act quickly, and I urge my colleagues to support the Peters-Stabenow amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am not entirely certain I like this

amendment. This is the first I have heard PHMSA may not have the resources to do its job. It does seem fair to have PHMSA come tell us if they do not have adequate resources.

What I most strongly oppose with this amendment is its attempt to tie the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to an unrelated pipeline in a different State. There is no limit for the PHMSA study and certification included here, so we could be looking, in addition to the already 2,300-some-odd days this delay has been in place, at further delays.

If my colleagues from Michigan are interested in a PHMSA study, I recommend they introduce their effort as a stand-alone bill so it can be considered by the committee of jurisdiction. If it is needed, we can move it through the regular order and certainly consider it in the future.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I remind colleagues that we are on 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Peters amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 32 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NAYS—58

Alexander	Cornyn	Heller
Ayotte	Cotton	Hoeven
Barrasso	Crapo	Inhofe
Bennet	Cruz	Isakson
Blunt	Daines	Johnson
Boozman	Enzi	Lankford
Burr	Ernst	Lee
Capito	Fischer	Manchin
Carper	Flake	McCain
Cassidy	Gardner	McCaskill
Coats	Graham	McConnell
Cochran	Grassley	Moran
Collins	Hatch	Murkowski
Corker	Heitkamp	Paul

Perdue	Scott	Tillis
Portman	Sessions	Toomey
Risch	Shelby	Vitter
Roberts	Sullivan	Wicker
Rounds	Tester	
Sasse	Thune	

NOT VOTING—2

Reid	Rubio
------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 23, offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the scientific community tells us very clearly that if we are going to reverse climate change and the great dangers it poses for our country and the planet, we must move aggressively to transform our energy system away from fossil fuels to energy efficiency and sustainable energy.

This amendment would provide a 15-percent rebate to homeowners so that we could install 10 million new solar rooftops across the country within 10 years. This would result in enough new electrical generation to retire nearly 20 percent of our dirty coal-fired plants and create a significant number of new jobs.

So if we are interested in reversing the dangers of climate change and creating jobs, I would urge Senators to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, the sponsor of this bill knows that I, too, am a supporter of solar, and I think we all are, but it is important to recognize what this measure would do. When we are talking about the benefits to this country and how much it will cost, it is important to understand this.

When this was first introduced in the 110th Congress, the goal of 10 million solar roofs legislation was too costly, but we have since seen decreased costs and growth in the solar industry that have made this Federal assistance unnecessary. We have seen the residential solar market grow, we have seen the costs drop. The cost of the solar systems have dropped about 60 percent in the last 4 years. Despite these trends, we are not close to reaching that 1 million mark let alone the 10 million installations. So the real question is, How much is this going to cost us to achieve?

The proposed rebate per system is the lesser of 15 percent of the initial

capital cost. This puts the Federal Government on the hook for up to \$100 billion to pay for these installations.

We can debate the merits of jobs and job creation, but I again urge my colleagues to oppose the Sanders amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Sanders amendment.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Franken	Nelson	

NAYS—58

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Ernst	Moran	

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes

of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 15, offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this amendment would expedite the export of liquid natural gas and would provide countries that are members of the WTO the same expedited process that is currently available to free-trade agreement countries.

There are now in the Department of Energy some 28 applications pending to export liquid natural gas. This should be an amendment that would bring together Republicans and Democrats. A recent study showed that allowing us to export LNG could create as many as 450,000 new jobs by 2035 that could produce GDP growth of up to an additional \$73.6 billion and produce 76,000 more manufacturing jobs. It would aid our allies such as Ukraine, the Baltics, and Europe, and would weaken countries such as Russia that would use natural gas for economic blackmail.

I would urge all Senators to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is drafted so broadly that it allows just about every nation which is a member of the World Trade Organization to automatically receive natural gas exported from the United States of America. The process is just eliminated—automatic.

What will that do? No. 1, it will increase prices to American consumers. The Energy Information Agency has already determined that the LNG export facilities already approved are going to lead to a 50-percent increase in the price of natural gas here in America. It would jeopardize American manufacturing which has seen 700,000 new jobs created in the last 5 years in America largely because of low-priced natural gas. It is going to increase carbon pollution because it is going to slow the pace of change from coal over to natural gas in the generation of electricity. It is going to undermine our trade negotiations because it is all going to be given away here on the Senate floor. And, finally, it is going to harm our national security, because if we converted one-third of our trucks and buses, it backs out all the oil that we import from the Persian Gulf by using natural gas in American vehicles. We are going to ship jobs along with that gas going overseas. I urge a “no” vote on the Cruz amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 15 offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 125

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 125, offered by the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY.

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 WITHDRAWN

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Merkley amendment No. 125 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 73

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 73, offered by the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that the lesser prairie chicken should be listed in a number of States, including Kansas, as a threatened species. The lesser prairie chicken has had a significant history in our State and a significant population of birds, but as a result of a drought, the habitat for the lesser prairie chicken and other wildlife has been diminished and the number of birds has decreased.

The consequences of listing the lesser prairie chicken that results from a drought is so dramatic and so damaging to the Kansas economy and to the farmers and ranchers and the use of their lands, to the oil and gas industry and the exploration of oil and gas, and to the utility industry in regard to the production and transmission of electricity that this amendment is necessary to set aside that listing as a threatened species and to allow interest holders in Kansas to come together and find a commonsense solution based upon sound science to protect the habitat of this bird.

This is not just a Kansas issue, and in fact, this species is only the precursor to problems others will have in their States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the Moran amendment, which would delist the lesser prairie chicken as a threatened species.

To be clear, I appreciate some of the concerns about this listing by farmers, ranchers, and industry. I am concerned about any unintended consequences this listing may have on rural New Mexicans. I strongly support and I assume the Senator from Kansas supports the bipartisan five-State effort for a thorough review.

The Fish and Wildlife Service took numerous steps in this process to respond to all stakeholders and to enable habitat conservation and economic growth. New Mexico has been and continues to be a leader in cooperative conservation in places where the prairie chicken is found. Ranchers and oil and gas industries deserve their praise for their efforts. So it is working and the sky is not falling, but we should not take this top-down political approach. Listing and delisting of the species by Congress goes against the intent of the law, which requires the government to make these decisions based on science, not politics.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Moran amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRASSO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Reid	Rubio
------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 148

Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 148, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the underlying measure benefits specific investors, specific corporations, and pushes regulatory approval of a specific project. In that sense, it has all the earmarks of the biggest earmark ever.

We have learned from other history with earmarks that when you have a project that benefits specific investors and specific corporations and specific entities, there is a valuable premium on having the public know about the campaign contributions relative to that project.

This bill requires the disclosure of over \$10,000 in campaign contributions from entities that will make more than \$1 million off this project. It is the type of transparency that many of my Republican colleagues had been for before they were against it.

I urge an "aye" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this amendment is virtually identical to the text of what we saw last year. It was tabled by a vote of 52 to 43. This amendment is not relevant to this debate. It is as unnecessary now as it was the first time we voted on it.

To the extent it is legal for a person or a company to make a campaign contribution, Federal and State election laws require public disclosure of those campaign contributions. Any other more general political activities a company or a person may choose to engage in are governed by existing laws and regulations as well. For that reason, I am going to be opposing this amendment for a second time and would encourage my colleagues to do as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 148.

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Baldwin	Donnelly	Manchin
Bennet	Durbin	Markey
Blumenthal	Feinstein	McCaskill
Booker	Franken	Menendez
Boxer	Gillibrand	Merkley
Brown	Heinrich	Mikulski
Cantwell	Hirono	Murphy
Cardin	Kaine	Murray
Carper	King	Nelson
Casey	Klobuchar	Peters
Coons	Leahy	Reed

Sanders	Stabenow	Warren
Schatz	Tester	Whitehouse
Schumer	Udall	Wyden
Shaheen	Warner	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Isakson	Sullivan
Corker	Johnson	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Ernst	Moran	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Rubio
Reid	Sessions

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. VITTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 132

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 132, offered by the Senator from Montana, Mr. DAINES.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, my amendment simply expresses the sense of Congress that all future national monument designations should be subject to consultation with local governments and the approval of the Governor and legislature of the States in which such designation would occur. This amendment ensures that the people affected most by these designations have a seat at the table and their voices are heard.

The current administration, as well as past administrations—both Republican and Democratic—have made efforts to stretch the intent of the Antiquities Act, threatening Montanans' ability to manage our State's resources.

It is a trend we are seeing. Any bill designation that impacts land management should be locally driven, not spearheaded in Washington.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, speaking in opposition to this amendment, there is a reason why they call it a national monument. That is because it is a national process, and it is a national decision.

Yes, Presidents of the United States consult with Governors and consult

with State legislators, but they are not required to have a bill or the authority of the Governor before they make a national monument.

Nearly half of our national parks, including the Grand Canyon and Olympic National Park, were designated under this Antiquities Act. Sixteen Presidents—eight Republicans and eight Democrats—have designated over 130 national monuments since Teddy Roosevelt signed this act in 1906.

I think it has worked well for the United States of America. Please turn down this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 132, the Daines amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kirk	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—47

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Ayotte	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Manchin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	McCaskill	Warner
Cooms	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—3

Cornyn	Reid	Rubio
--------	------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRUZ. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 115

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 115, offered by the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, we need to take steps now to prepare for the coming impact of climate change on our Nation's infrastructure.

The Federal Government plays a crucial role in protecting our infrastructure and partnering with State and Federal, tribal, and local governments to prepare.

The Federal Government, including our Pentagon and the highway administration, is already planning and preparing for these impacts. Many States are as well. From my home State of Delaware to Alaska to Florida, all are already planning responsibly for the future impacts of climate change. Preparing now is only responsible, because every dollar invested in planning and preparing is projected to save us up to \$4 in future disaster relief.

This amendment is supported by a number of organizations—the American Society of Civil Engineers, the National Wildlife Federation, the Union of Concerned Scientists, and others.

This amendment does not speak to the human role in climate change or emissions. It simply acknowledges that climate change is having an impact on our infrastructure and suggests that planning is responsible.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I had a conversation with our colleague from Delaware, and I told him I think this is an area where we might be able to work together.

I had actually introduced an amendment that deals with the adaptation that helps to assist those communities that have been affected by climate. We see that up in the coastline of Alaska. Senator MERKLEY has an amendment that also deals with adaptation. This is about resilience.

I am going to oppose the sense-of-the-Senate at this time because of some of the language. I get a little confused or am not certain we are stating it in the right manner. But I do think this process has been healthy in the sense that by having an opportunity to have amendments come forward, we find out where there might be areas where we can work to develop future initiatives that we all might be able to support on a bipartisan basis. I look

forward to working with the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Collins	McCaskill	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kirk	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Reid	Rubio
------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 35, offered by the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, and I are offering an amendment that would help school officials to learn about existing Federal programs to improve energy efficiency in order to reduce school energy costs. It would not authorize any new programs or any new funding. It would simply require a review of existing Federal programs and require the Department of Energy to establish a coordinating structure so that schools can more easily navigate the many programs that are scattered across the Federal Government.

I know of no opposition to the amendment. To try to make life easier for my colleagues, if it is acceptable to the managers, I would be happy to accept a voice vote.

I don't know if my colleague from Virginia has any comments he would like to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Maine, and I would urge a voice vote as well.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank both Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote affirmative threshold on the Collins amendment be vitiated, and I urge its adoption by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there any further debate on the Collins amendment No. 35?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 35) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 120

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 120, offered by the Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER.

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 WITHDRAWN

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Carper amendment No. 120 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 166

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 166, offered by the Senator from Alaska, Ms. MURKOWSKI.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to speak on this amendment several different times. Effectively, what we are doing is releasing wilderness study areas if within 1 year of receiving the rec-

ommendation Congress has not yet designated the study area as wilderness.

Effectively, what is happening is designations will come from the administration. Congress is the entity that is to approve them. But in the interim these areas are managed as de facto wilderness. In fact, many areas have been managed as de facto wilderness for decades because the Congress has not acted.

So simply, what we do in this amendment is to put a time period. Until the Congress makes a final determination on the wilderness study area, these areas will be determined not to be wilderness and not managed as such. But they are putting a time parameter on that so that they are not managed as wilderness areas indefinitely.

I would urge a "yes" vote from my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, this is a sweeping attack on millions of acres of land recommended for wilderness. This would nullify much of the Obama administration's plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and would also immediately abolish wilderness studies on BLM lands in 12 Western States. It would also abolish protection for 2.3 million acres in national wildlife refuges. These lands have been refuges, and they should be managed accordingly. So I would ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Murkowski Amendment No. 166.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Enzi	Lee
Blunt	Ernst	Manchin
Boozman	Fischer	McCain
Burr	Flake	McConnell
Capito	Graham	Moran
Cassidy	Grassley	Murkowski
Coats	Hatch	Paul
Cochran	Heller	Perdue
Corker	Hoeven	Portman
Cornyn	Inhofe	Risch
Cotton	Isakson	Roberts
Crapo	Johnson	Rounds
Cruz	Kirk	Sasse
Daines	Lankford	Scott

Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan

Thune
Tillis
Toomey

Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—48

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Collins
Coons
Donnelly
Durbin

Feinstein
Franken
Gardner
Gillibrand
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski

Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Reid
Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 133

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 133, offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Ms. HEITKAMP.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, this amendment will provide a sense of the Senate that we will provide some certainty to the American wind and other renewable industries by taking a look at the production tax credits and actually having a forward progress report so that they know exactly what the rules will be in the future, however short or long that may be. Every year, as we do the tax extenders, there are people waiting to find out if they still have a job. People in my State are waiting to know whether they are going to be put to work the next day or even the next week based on what this Congress does. It is so critical that we actually have predictability in this industry.

This is a jobs bill, and it is an energy bill. I can't imagine anything more germane to the Keystone XL Pipeline than a bill that provides both jobs and certainty to an "all of the above" essential, which is wind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I believe we do need more certainty, and the certainty ought to be that it is time for this tax credit—particularly the wind PTC—to expire. This was enacted 23 years ago as a temporary tax measure. There has been a lot of wind that has blown since that time, and we have a mature industry. In fact, the

other day the President said we are No. 1 in the world in wind power.

We ought to have more certainty, and the certainty that needs to be there is that the tax credit is going to end and that we stop picking winners and losers in the energy economy.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak on Amendment No. 133, offered by Senator HEITKAMP of North Dakota. The amendment is a sense of Congress that the renewable electricity tax credit should be extended for 5 years. While I supported the amendment, I would like to express my concerns regarding the consideration of this amendment at this time.

I have been an outspoken supporter of renewable energy for many years. In fact, I first authored the wind production tax credit in 1992 to drive this renewable energy technology. I have worked for many years to provide as much certainty as possible to grow the domestic wind industry. Iowa has seen an enormous investment in wind energy manufacturing and wind farm development. I know firsthand the boom-and-bust cycle that exists for renewable energy producers when Congress fails to extend these critically important tax incentives.

But I also know this credit won't go on forever. It was never meant to, and it shouldn't. In 2012 the wind industry was the only industry to put forward a phaseout plan. A number of my colleagues here in the Senate have been working to construct a responsible, multiyear phaseout of the wind tax credit. That is why I am somewhat puzzled by an amendment that suggests a 5-year extension of this credit. It seems disconnected with reality.

I would remind my colleagues on the other side that in November of 2014, the House offer on tax extenders included a multiyear extension of the wind production tax credit that would have provided the certainty and soft landing that most of us and the industry support, but President Obama issued a veto threat before the ink was dry, and as a result the wind incentive expired.

Again, I strongly support wind energy, but I support a prudent way forward on an extension of the production tax credit. This amendment fails terribly in that regard. That is why I am disappointed that the Senator from North Dakota insisted on going forward with a 5-year extension on this bill. This is not a real effort to extend the wind incentive. I am afraid this was simply a politically motivated effort designed to score political points. It is unfortunate that in this case, politicking has trumped efforts to achieve sound, responsible policy.

Rather than offer "gotcha" amendments on an unrelated bill, we should be working together to craft an extension of these important tax incentives that work for the wind industry, that

are realistic politically, and that make sense for the American taxpayer. That effort requires regular order, working through the Finance Committee, to determine the most prudent path forward. It should be done in the context of comprehensive tax reform, where all energy tax provisions are on the table, rather than as a sense of the Congress on the unrelated Keystone XL bill.

I hope that with this political exercise behind us, those of us who seek to ensure a responsible transition for the wind production tax credit can get to work and achieve a sensible policy for those who depend on it. It is too bad that this ill-timed, ill-conceived amendment may have actually harmed those efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 40 Leg.)

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Grassley	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murphy	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Reid
Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes

for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 48 offered by the Senator from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. As it stands now, gas companies in this country do not have to comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act—the law that keeps our tapwater clear, safe, and clean.

For decades now, this loophole has exempted hydrofracking and gas storage companies from this law, even though every other energy industry, including oil and coal industries, is legally obligated to comply. If big coal can comply with this law, so can gas companies.

This special exemption is unfair, it is unnecessary, and it is unsafe. My amendment would finally remove it from the law. I urge my colleagues not to let this chance pass us by.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, claiming the 1 minute in opposition. As the Senator from New York has described, this would apply to the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act to underground ejection of natural gas. Currently the Safe Drinking Water Act expressly prohibits this application.

This amendment to add the requirements to the Safe Drinking Water Act is beyond the scope of the immediate Keystone debate. We are debating the approval of a pipeline that is going to carry oil, not gas. If the Senator from New York wants to debate the issues of fracking—most certainly those issues are before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and the Safe Drinking Water Act—I would welcome a stand-alone bill. We will have those discussions, but on this measure I would oppose and encourage Members to vote against the Gillibrand amendment.

I would remind Members we are so close to wrapping up this series of amendments. If we can ask the folks to stick around for these final few and keep to the 10-minute line. I know Sen-

ator FEINSTEIN is looking to encourage the women of the Senate to gather for a meal later on, and that would be important for us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Gillibrand amendment No. 48.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Shaheen
Carper	Menendez	Stabenow
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Coons	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	

NAYS—63

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kaine	Tester
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McCaskill	Warner
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. CANTWELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Murkowski substitute, as amended, be considered original text for the purposes of further amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 1 tomorrow, Thursday, January 29,

there be 15 minutes equally divided in the usual form and the Senate proceed to vote on the following amendments in the order listed: Barrasso No. 245; Cardin No. 124; Burr No. 92, as modified; Daines No. 246; Vitter No. 80, as further modified with the changes at the desk; Udall No. 77; further, that all amendments on this list be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption and that no second-degrees be in order to any of the pending amendments to this bill. I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between each vote and that all votes after the first in this series be 10-minute votes.

I further ask that once these amendments have been disposed of, the Senate agree to proceed to the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on S. 1; that the motion to reconsider be agreed to and the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill, upon reconsideration. I ask consent that if cloture is invoked on the bill, as amended, all time postcloture be considered expired at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 80), as further modified, is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE —OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASING REVENUE

SEC. —01. REVENUE SHARING FROM OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF WIND ENERGY PRODUCTION FACILITIES.

The first sentence of section 8(p)(2)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(p)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting after “27 percent” the following: “, or, beginning in fiscal year 2016, in the case of projects for offshore wind energy production facilities, 37.5 percent”.

SEC. —02. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING PROGRAM REFORMS.

Section 18(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1344(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) In each oil and gas leasing program under this section, the Secretary shall make available for leasing and conduct lease sales including at least 50 percent of the available unleased acreage within each outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) considered to have the largest undiscovered, technically recoverable oil and gas resources (on a total btu basis) based on the most recent national geologic assessment of the outer Continental Shelf, with an emphasis on offering the most geologically prospective parts of the planning area.

“(B) The Secretary shall include in each proposed oil and gas leasing program under this section any State subdivision of an outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that the Governor of the State that represents that subdivision requests be made available for leasing. The Secretary may not remove such a subdivision from the program until publication of the final program, and shall include and consider all such subdivisions in

any environmental review conducted and statement prepared for such program under section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘available unleased acreage’ means that portion of the outer Continental Shelf that is not under lease at the time of a proposed lease sale, and that has not otherwise been made unavailable for leasing by law.

“(6)(A) In the 5-year oil and gas leasing program, the Secretary shall make available for leasing any outer Continental Shelf planning area (other than the North Aleutian Basin planning area or the North Atlantic planning area) that—

“(i) is estimated to contain more than 2,500,000,000 barrels of oil; or

“(ii) is estimated to contain more than 7,500,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas.

“(B) To determine the planning areas described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the document entitled ‘Minerals Management Service Assessment of Undiscovered Technically Recoverable Oil and Gas Resources of the Nation’s Outer Continental Shelf, 2006’.”.

SEC. 103. DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 102 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (11) as paragraphs (6) through (12), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) COASTAL STATE.—The term ‘coastal State’ means—

“(A) each of the Gulf producing States; and

“(B) effective for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter—

“(i) the State of Alaska; and

“(ii) for leasing in the Atlantic planning areas, each of the States of Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.”;

(3) in paragraph (10) (as so redesignated), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues’ means—

“(i) with respect to the Gulf producing States, in the case of fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States received on or after October 1, 2016, from leases entered into on or after December 20, 2006;

“(ii) with respect to each of the coastal States described in paragraph (5)(B)(ii), all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States from leases entered into in the Atlantic planning areas on or after October 1, 2015; and

“(iii) with respect to the State of Alaska, in the case of fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States received on or after October 1, 2021, from leases entered into on or after March 1, 2005.”; and

(4) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated), by striking “Gulf producing State” each place it appears and inserting “coastal State”.

(b) DISPOSITION OF REVENUES.—Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “FROM 181 AREA, 181 SOUTH AREA, AND 2002-2007 PLANNING AREAS OF GULF OF MEXICO”;

(2) by striking “Gulf producing State” each place it appears (other than paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)) and inserting “coastal State”;

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) 50 percent of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues in a special account in the Treasury from which the Secretary shall disburse—

“(A) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to Gulf producing States—

“(i) 75 percent to Gulf producing States in accordance with subsection (b); and

“(ii) 25 percent to provide financial assistance to States in accordance with section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, which shall be considered income to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for purposes of section 200302 of that title; and

“(B) in the case of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues generated from outer Continental Shelf areas adjacent to coastal States described in section 102(5)(B), 100 percent to the coastal States in accordance with subsection (b).”;

(4) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “GULF PRODUCING STATES” and inserting “COASTAL STATES”;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) ALLOCATION AMONG CERTAIN ATLANTIC STATES AND THE STATE OF ALASKA FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THEREAFTER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), effective for fiscal years 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount made available under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be allocated to each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) in amounts (based on a formula established by the Secretary by regulation) that are inversely proportional to the respective distances between the point on the coastline of each coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) that is closest to the geographic center of the applicable leased tract and the geographic center of the leased tract.

“(B) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—The amount allocated to a coastal State described in section 102(5)(B) each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall be at least 10 percent of the amounts available under subsection (a)(2)(B).”;

(D) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)), by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)”;

(5) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the total amount of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues made available to coastal States under subsection (a)(2) shall not exceed—

“(A) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(A)—

“(i) \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(ii) \$520,000,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(iii) \$525,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020;

“(iv) \$575,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025; and

“(v) \$699,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2055;

“(B) in the case of the coastal States described in section 102(5)(B)(ii)—

“(i) \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2020;

“(ii) \$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025;

“(iii) \$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2055; and

“(iv) \$300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2056 through 2065; and

“(C) in the case of the State of Alaska—

“(i) \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025;

“(ii) \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2055; and

“(iii) \$199,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2056 through 2065.”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think Members have been given the outline for tomorrow morning that will take us through a final vote on cloture so that we can get to final passage of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I appreciate the consideration and the courtesy of all Members. It has been a long day. We have worked through about a dozen additional amendments, if my count is correct, and we have done it in pretty good order. We have done it while there have been a number of committee meetings going on, which can be very disruptive, but I think with the level of cooperation we have had, we will be able to conclude our business at a relatively civilized hour this evening.

I appreciate the good work of my partner and ranking member Senator CANTWELL in getting us to this place. I am hopeful that with the number of amendments we have outlined for the morning and then the handful of germane amendments we will have in the afternoon, we will be able to move on to other business before the Senate. But I thank my colleagues for all of the effort and cooperation we have had to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from Alaska for her hard work in getting us through this process. I think our colleagues can see the daylight to finishing this up tomorrow, hopefully. I know Members have worked across the aisle on some of these remaining issues, and we are still trying to work a few of them out. So hopefully tomorrow will go as smoothly as today has.

I would like to turn now to my colleague from New Mexico to call up his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 77

(Purpose: To establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. UDALL], for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 77.

Mr. UDALL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of January 20, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me just say to the two leaders on the floor who have participated in this open amendment process that I really appreciate the way Chairwoman Murkowski and Ranking Member CANTWELL have worked through this bill. I really appreciate all their help.

I have heard, at least on our side of the aisle, over and over that this is the way the Senate should be moving, this is the way we should be working. So I think all of us are very appreciative of how the two managers of the bill have worked together.

I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank our colleague for his kind comments. We do have one more consent request here very briefly.

I ask unanimous consent that the order of votes on the Burr and the Daines amendments be reversed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. With that, Mr. President, I again thank Members for their cooperation today and look forward to yet another productive day tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the bill managers for their hard work today and for their efforts in the work that was done in a bipartisan way on this legislation. I know both the bill managers have spent an awful lot of time putting together these amendments, and I think they have really bent over backward to make sure Members on both sides of the aisle have had an opportunity to file their amendments, to make those amendments pending, and to get votes on the amendments. So I would like to express my appreciation to both of them for all the work they have done and for the process today in voting on amendments.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, yesterday the Congressional Budget Office—the CBO—released its budget and economic outlook showing the forecast through 2025. It should strike fear in the heart

of anybody who is concerned about this country's financial future.

The very short-term news is good. The deficit is projected to fall—but only for another 2 years. In 2017 the deficit is projected to start rising again to \$1.1 trillion in 10 years. That is the annual deficit. By 2025 the deficit will be 4 percent of our overall economy.

Right now the country's debt in cumulative deficits over the years—the cumulative debt—is \$18 trillion. This year we will pay about \$277 billion just servicing that debt. That amount might seem low, but it is because of artificially low interest rates. In 10 years we will pay about \$827 billion a year just to service the debt. That is 3 percent of our economy just to pay interest on the debt. That is unsustainable.

Don't take my word for it, though. You can take CBO's. They said:

Such large and growing Federal debt would have serious negative consequences, including increasing Federal spending for interest payments; restraining economic growth in the long term; giving policymakers less flexibility to respond to unexpected challenges; and eventually heightening the risk of a financial crisis.

I have been working on these issues—this issue in particular—for a long time, and I have to admit that sometimes it is tough to get people to focus on this topic. But we shouldn't be fooled and patting ourselves on the back just because we have done things such as getting rid of earmarks. That is a good thing, but it is certainly insufficient to address our spending.

The culture in Washington is still the culture of runaway spending, not just in earmarks, as I said, not just in wasteful spending. For example, spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid will nearly double over the next decade alone. This is not a revenue problem that we are having. Projected revenues will exceed their 50-year historical average of 17 percent of GDP this year and will grow to over 18 percent of the economy in this decade.

The culture of spending in Washington is something that defies logic, defies math and an honest assessment of who we are as a country. As a result, the United States is fast becoming a once-prosperous nation. We don't want that designation. It is truly a frightening distinction. Yet too few in Washington are motivated to get this country's fiscal house in order. One has to wonder how bad it is going to have to get to prod those who are not yet motivated.

Some will argue that we need to take baby steps to address our fiscal crisis. I think we are well past that time, but whatever kinds of steps we take, we need to take them now. We need to turn this culture of spending in Washington to one that will fully repair our economy. That will give the private sector the stability and confidence to create jobs. We also need to reform our cumbersome Tax Code. Most of all, we

need to relieve future generations of the burden of our financial mess.

In short, it is well past time to start climbing our way out of this fiscal hole we are in.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here now for the 87th consecutive week the Senate has been in session to urge action on climate change.

We have had an interesting couple of weeks on the Keystone Pipeline, but from a climate change and carbon pollution point of view, this would obviously not be helpful. Indeed, it would be a disaster leading to as much as 27 million—27 million—metric tons of additional carbon dioxide emitted per year. To put that number into some perspective, that is the equivalent of adding 6 million cars and trucks to our roads for 50 years. So it is a very considerable carbon price to pay.

We have seen a poster used on the Senate Floor that says it will have no environmental effect. That is not precisely true. Indeed, precisely the opposite is true. This is the environmental effect it will have, and it is considerable. The report referred to went on to say that it would be offset by the fact that this fuel would go out by rail anyway. But that offset was conditioned on a fuel price above \$75 per barrel of oil, and we are at \$50. So there is no way that conclusion can stand, and the underlying fact is what prevails—27 million metric tons of additional carbon dioxide.

It is obviously very bad from an environmental perspective. It is a lot of "not much" from a jobs perspective. Every 4 days we add more jobs than the construction of this pipeline just through the economic recovery that is taking place.

This is a little bit hard to explain, particularly when you think that this bill is going to be dead on arrival at the White House. We have known from the beginning that this is going to be vetoed. But it has allowed the oil and the fossil fuel industry to show their hands. This is all being done on behalf of a foreign oil company and on behalf of the fossil fuel industry.

When we look at what we have been through in the past couple of days, there are some interesting choices the Senate has made if you are a foreign oil company. If you are a foreign oil company, we will let you use eminent domain to extinguish the property rights of farmers and ranchers and take their farms and ranches away. If you are a foreign oil company, we will exempt you from the oilspill recovery fund—the Federal excise tax on petroleum—so you don't have to pay the taxes American companies have to pay. If you are a foreign oil company, we will not require you to use American

steel in a pipeline being built across America being touted as a source of American jobs. If you are a foreign oil company, we won't require you to sell it in the American market even though it is touted as a product that will help balance America's energy portfolio.

So, so far, not much good to show for all of this but one thing, and that is that this exercise has at last brought the issue of climate change to the floor of the Senate.

We have not had much debate about climate change since the Citizens United decision back in 2010 allowed the fossil fuel industry to cast a very long shadow of intimidation across this body. They spend a huge amount of the money that has been freed up by Citizens United. They spend a huge amount of dark money that flows post Citizens United. And since then, the Republican Party has been virtually muzzled on that subject. So having Republicans talk about climate change on the Senate floor was something of a revelation, and I don't think we should underestimate the importance of that or undervalue what was said.

The senior Senator from South Carolina came to the floor and said this:

The concept that climate change is real, I completely understand and accept. To the point of how much man is contributing, I don't know, but it does make sense that man-made emissions are contributing.

... the greenhouse gas effect seems to me scientifically sound. The problem is that how you fix this globally is going to require more than just the U.S. being involved.

Which I think we all agree with.

The senior Senator from Alaska, who is our chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the floor manager on this very bill, agreed, stating that she hopes we can all, quoting her, get beyond the discussion as to whether or not climate change is real and talk about what do we do.

I look forward to that discussion about what do we do. It is not enough just to say, OK, we finally concede that climate change is really happening. We really do have to get on to what do we do.

Even if you disagree with me that climate change is real and very significant and consequential for our country, if you will spot me that there is just a 10-percent chance that I am right—even just a 2-percent chance that I am right—when we consider the possible harms, it is something that grownup adults and responsible people ought to take a look at and come together and decide what to do.

We have been through some very notable benchmarks. We hit for the first time last year 400 parts per million of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere for more than 3 months. They have been tracking this in Hawaii, at the top of the mountain at the Mauna Loa laboratory for decades now, and 400 parts per million for more than 3 months is a new record.

To put that in context: For as long as human beings have been on this planet, all the way back to when we were living in caves, the range of carbon in the atmosphere has been 170 to 300 parts per million. So we are well outside the range that has been our comfortable safe range for human habitation of this planet during our entire human experience, and 400 is a big move when our entire range is only 130 points and now we are 100 parts per million out of that.

Some of this lands in the oceans. The oceans have absorbed about a quarter of all our carbon emissions. We can measure their pH level. This isn't complicated. This isn't something we have to do with elaborate computer models.

What we see is that the pH level of the oceans is changing rapidly. The oceans are acidifying rapidly. When I say rapidly, they are acidifying at a rate that we have not seen in 25 to perhaps 30 or 50 million years. Indeed, some studies say nothing like this has been seen on the face of the Earth for as long as 300 million years. When we consider that our species has been around for about 200,000 years, that is a pretty long window to be launching new and dramatic changes in our oceans.

There is nothing new about the science that supports this. John Tyndall wrote the first report about the greenhouse gas effect to the British Academy of Sciences in 1861. The pages who are here and have studied history will know that 1861 was the year President Lincoln took office. So the scientific community has been aware of the greenhouse gas phenomenon since Abraham Lincoln was driving up and down Pennsylvania Avenue in a carriage with his top hat on.

There is not much new that is there, and the latest data is clearer and clearer that we just continue apace to warm the planet.

Professor Jonathan Overpeck is at the University of Arizona, and Arizona is certainly feeling the heat. Professor Overpeck said:

The global warmth of 2014 is just another reminder that the planet is warming and warming fast. . . . Humans, and their burning of fossil fuels, are dominating the Earth's climate system like never before.

It is equally clear, when we look at the oceans, they not only absorb a lot of the carbon dioxide and acidify as a result—they absorb most of the heat. In fact, they absorb 90 percent of the excess heat that has been trapped by the greenhouse gases that we have flooded our atmosphere with.

I certainly see that in Rhode Island, where Narragansett Bay's mean winter water temperature is up 3 to 4 degrees Fahrenheit since we had our big hurricane of 1938. That is significant, because it means more likely storms. It is associated with sea level rise. We have 10 more inches of sea level at the Newport Naval Station. So if the 1938

hurricane were to repeat itself now, it would have 10 more inches of sea to hammer against our shores. And that is not a complicated measure, either. We do that with thermometers.

So since the Industrial Revolution, human beings have dumped 2 trillion metric tons of carbon dioxide into the air and into the atmosphere. Said another way, that is 2,000 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide.

The notion that has no effect, when we have known since Abraham Lincoln's day that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas, and when we put that much in and when we can measure that it is at 400 for the first time in human history—connect the dots. How much does it take? It is really pretty obvious.

Folks who remain skeptical—well, I know, I am not a scientist. I get that. So ask one. That is all I request. And I don't think that is too much to ask of colleagues. And, by the way, do me one favor. You can ask the scientist that you please, but please don't ask a scientist who is in the pay of the fossil fuel and the denial industry. There are a bunch of them who are out there. They turn up at all the usual denial conferences. They write in the denial journals. They take money from the denial organizations that all have fossil fuel industry funding behind them. Go to someplace neutral.

For instance, go to your own State university, like the University of Arizona or the University of Oklahoma. The dean of the relevant department at the University of Oklahoma signed the IPCC report and started Climate Central. Ask your own university. Ask any major scientific organization. All the major recognized scientific organizations in the United States of America are on board, agree that this is real, agree that this is important, agree that it is vital, and believe that we are actually near the tipping point that may make the damage irrecoverable.

If you don't want to go to your home State university and if you don't want to go to America's major scientific societies, try NOAA and NASA.

Think about NASA for a moment. As I give this speech, there is a Rover that is the size of an SUV being driven around on the surface of Mars. We built a Rover, shot it to Mars, landed it safely, and are now driving it around. Do we think those scientists might actually know something? Do we think they might know what they are talking about? Do we think they might merit our confidence? So ask them and see what they say.

Or, if you want, ask some of America's leading corporations. If you are from Arkansas, go and ask Walmart. They will tell you. If you are from Georgia, go and ask Coca-Cola. They will tell you. This is not hard to discover once you get away from that little stable of denial scientists who are

so closely affiliated with the fossil fuel industry.

I do this every week because we have the arrogance so often here to think how much our laws—the laws that we pass—matter. But the laws that we pass are passing things. They come and they go. They have their time. They are repealed, they are replaced, they fall into desuetude.

But some laws last, and those are the laws that God laid down upon this Earth that guide its operations. Those are the laws of physics, the laws of chemistry, the laws of biology, the law of gravity. We cannot repeal those laws. We must face their consequences. And we know the consequences of continuing to emit gigatons of carbon dioxide into our planet is going to launch us into an environment in which the habitability of Earth as we have known it will be put into question.

History makes its judgments about every generation. If we do not take calm and reasonable and sensible precautions about this obvious known and admitted risk, then when that risk comes home to roost, we will be duly shamed.

So let us avoid that. Let us get to work. Let us take advantage of the opening that the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska and the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina have opened for us, and let us do what is right by our country and by the judgment that we can anticipate from history.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator STABENOW, I ask unanimous con-

sent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY

RULE 1—MEETINGS

1.1 Regular Meetings.—Regular meetings shall be held on the first and third Wednesday of each month when Congress is in session.

1.2 Additional Meetings.—The Chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, may call such additional meetings as he deems necessary.

1.3 Notification.—In the case of any meeting of the committee, other than a regularly scheduled meeting, the clerk of the committee shall notify every member of the committee of the time and place of the meeting and shall give reasonable notice which, except in extraordinary circumstances, shall be at least 24 hours in advance of any meeting held in Washington, DC, and at least 48 hours in the case of any meeting held outside Washington, DC.

1.4 Called Meeting.—If three members of the committee have made a request in writing to the Chairman to call a meeting of the committee, and the Chairman fails to call such a meeting within 7 calendar days thereafter, including the day on which the written notice is submitted, a majority of the members may call a meeting by filing a written notice with the clerk of the committee who shall promptly notify each member of the committee in writing of the date and time of the meeting.

1.5 Adjournment of Meetings.—The Chairman of the committee or a subcommittee shall be empowered to adjourn any meeting of the committee or a subcommittee if a quorum is not present within 15 minutes of the time scheduled for such meeting.

RULE 2—MEETINGS AND HEARINGS IN GENERAL

2.1 Open Sessions.—Business meetings and hearings held by the committee or any subcommittee shall be open to the public except as otherwise provided for in Senate Rule XXVI, paragraph 5.

2.2 Transcripts.—A transcript shall be kept of each business meeting and hearing of the committee or any subcommittee unless a majority of the committee or the subcommittee agrees that some other form of permanent record is preferable.

2.3 Reports.—An appropriate opportunity shall be given the Minority to examine the proposed text of committee reports prior to their filing or publication. In the event there are supplemental, minority, or additional views, an appropriate opportunity shall be given the Majority to examine the proposed text prior to filing or publication.

2.4 Attendance.—(a) Meetings. Official attendance of all markups and executive sessions of the committee shall be kept by the committee clerk. Official attendance of all subcommittee markups and executive sessions shall be kept by the subcommittee clerk.

(b) Hearings. Official attendance of all hearings shall be kept, provided that, Senators are notified by the committee Chairman and ranking minority member, in the case of committee hearings, and by the subcommittee Chairman and ranking minority member, in the case of subcommittee hearings, 48 hours in advance of the hearing that attendance will be taken. Otherwise, no attendance will be taken. Attendance at all hearings is encouraged.

RULE 3—HEARING PROCEDURES

3.1 Notice.—Public notice shall be given of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be held by the committee or any subcommittee at least 1 week in advance of such hearing unless the Chairman of the full committee or the subcommittee determines that the hearing is noncontroversial or that special circumstances require expedited procedures and a majority of the committee or the subcommittee involved concurs. In no case shall a hearing be conducted with less than 24 hours notice.

3.2 Witness Statements.—Each witness who is to appear before the committee or any subcommittee shall file with the committee or subcommittee, at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing, a written statement of his or her testimony and as many copies as the Chairman of the committee or subcommittee prescribes.

3.3 Minority Witnesses.—In any hearing conducted by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, the minority members of the committee or subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee to call witnesses of their selection during at least 1 day of such hearing pertaining to the matter or matters heard by the committee or subcommittee.

3.4 Swearing in of Witnesses.—Witnesses in committee or subcommittee hearings may be required to give testimony under oath whenever the Chairman or ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee deems such to be necessary.

3.5 Limitation.—Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the questioning of any witness until such time as all members who so desire have had an opportunity to question a witness. Questions from members shall rotate from majority to minority members in order of seniority or in order of arrival at the hearing.

RULE 4—NOMINATIONS

4.1 Assignment.—All nominations shall be considered by the full committee.

4.2 Standards.—In considering a nomination, the committee shall inquire into the nominee's experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated.

4.3 Information.—Each nominee shall submit in response to questions prepared by the committee the following information:

(1) A detailed biographical resume which contains information relating to education, employment, and achievements;

(2) Financial information, including a financial statement which lists assets and liabilities of the nominee; and

(3) Copies of other relevant documents requested by the committee. Information received pursuant to this subsection shall be available for public inspection except as specifically designated confidential by the committee.

4.4 Hearings.—The committee shall conduct a public hearing during which the nominee shall be called to testify under oath on all matters relating to his or her suitability for office. No hearing shall be held until at least 48 hours after the nominee has responded to a prehearing questionnaire submitted by the committee.

4.5 Action on Confirmation.—A business meeting to consider a nomination shall not occur on the same day that the hearing on the nominee is held. The Chairman, with the agreement of the ranking minority member, may waive this requirement.

RULE 5—QUORUMS

5.1 Testimony.—For the purpose of receiving evidence, the swearing of witnesses, and

the taking of sworn or unsworn testimony at any duly scheduled hearing, a quorum of the committee and the subcommittee thereof shall consist of one member.

5.2 Business.—A quorum for the transaction of committee or subcommittee business, other than for reporting a measure or recommendation to the Senate or the taking of testimony, shall consist of one-third of the members of the committee or subcommittee, including at least one member from each party.

5.3 Reporting.—A majority of the membership of the committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting bills, nominations, matters, or recommendations to the Senate. No measure or recommendation shall be ordered reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee members are physically present. The vote of the committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of those members who are physically present at the time the vote is taken.

RULE 6—VOTING

6.1 Rollcalls.—A roll call vote of the members shall be taken upon the request of any member.

6.2 Proxies.—Voting by proxy as authorized by the Senate rules for specific bills or subjects shall be allowed whenever a quorum of the committee is actually present.

6.3 Polling.—The committee may poll any matters of committee business, other than a vote on reporting to the Senate any measures, matters or recommendations or a vote on closing a meeting or hearing to the public, provided that every member is polled and every poll consists of the following two questions:

(1) Do you agree or disagree to poll the proposal; and

(2) Do you favor or oppose the proposal.

If any member requests, any matter to be polled shall be held for meeting rather than being polled. The chief clerk of the committee shall keep a record of all polls.

RULE 7—SUBCOMMITTEES

7.1 Assignments.—To assure the equitable assignment of members to subcommittees, no member of the committee will receive assignment to a second subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members of the committee have chosen assignments to one subcommittee, and no member shall receive assignment to a third subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members have chosen assignments to two subcommittees.

7.2 Attendance.—Any member of the committee may sit with any subcommittee during a hearing or meeting but shall not have the authority to vote on any matter before the subcommittee unless he or she is a member of such subcommittee.

7.3 Ex Officio Members.—The Chairman and ranking minority member shall serve as nonvoting ex officio members of the subcommittees on which they do not serve as voting members. The Chairman and ranking minority member may not be counted toward a quorum.

7.4 Scheduling.—No subcommittee may schedule a meeting or hearing at a time designated for a hearing or meeting of the full committee. No more than one subcommittee business meeting may be held at the same time.

7.5 Discharge.—Should a subcommittee fail to report back to the full committee on any measure within a reasonable time, the Chairman may withdraw the measure from such subcommittee and report that fact to the full committee for further disposition. The

full committee may at any time, by majority vote of those members present, discharge a subcommittee from further consideration of a specific piece of legislation.

7.6 Application of Committee Rules to Subcommittees.—The proceedings of each subcommittee shall be governed by the rules of the full committee, subject to such authorizations or limitations as the committee may from time to time prescribe.

RULE 8—INVESTIGATIONS, SUBPOENAS AND DEPOSITIONS

8.1 Investigations.—Any investigation undertaken by the committee or a subcommittee in which depositions are taken or subpoenas issued, must be authorized by a majority of the members of the committee voting for approval to conduct such investigation at a business meeting of the committee convened in accordance with Rule 1.

8.2 Subpoenas.—The Chairman, with the approval of the ranking minority member of the committee, is delegated the authority to subpoena the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing of the committee or a subcommittee or in connection with the conduct of an investigation authorized in accordance with paragraph 8.1. The Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the ranking minority member when the Chairman has not received notification from the ranking minority member of disapproval of the subpoena within 72 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the ranking minority member as provided in this paragraph the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the members of the committee. When the committee or Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other member of the committee designated by the Chairman.

8.3 Notice for Taking Depositions.—Notices for the taking of depositions, in an investigation authorized by the committee, shall be authorized and be issued by the Chairman or by a staff officer designated by him. Such notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the Senator, staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private. The committee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness' failure to appear unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a committee subpoena.

8.4 Procedure for Taking Depositions.—Witnesses shall be examined upon oath administered by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. The Chairman will rule, by telephone or otherwise, on any objection by a witness. The transcript of a deposition shall be filed with the committee clerk.

RULE 9—AMENDING THE RULES

These rules shall become effective upon publication in the Congressional Record. These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the committee, provided that all members are present or provide proxies or if a notice in writing of the proposed changes has been given to each member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken. The changes shall become effective immediately upon publication of the changed rule or rules in the Congressional Record, or immediately upon approval of the changes if so resolved by the committee as long as any witnesses who may be

affected by the change in rules are provided with them.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit for publication the Rules of Procedure for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, as unanimously adopted by the committee on January 28, 2015.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Rules of Procedure be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS UNITED STATES SENATE RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 1.—Subject to the provisions of rule XXVI, paragraph 5, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month, at 10:00 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building. The chairman may, upon proper notice, call such additional meetings as he may deem necessary.

Rule 2.—The chairman of the committee or of a subcommittee, or if the chairman is not present, the ranking majority member present, shall preside at all meetings. The chairman may designate the ranking minority member to preside at hearings of the committee or subcommittee.

Rule 3.—Meetings of the committee or a subcommittee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public except as otherwise specifically provided in subsections (b) and (d) of rule 26.5 of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Rule 4.—(a) Subject to paragraph (b), one-third of the membership of the committee, actually present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. Any quorum of the committee which is composed of less than a majority of the members of the committee shall include at least one member of the majority and one member of the minority.

(b) A majority of the members of a subcommittee, actually present, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business; provided, no measure or matter shall be ordered reported unless such majority shall include at least one member of the minority who is a member of the subcommittee. If, at any subcommittee meeting, a measure or matter cannot be ordered reported because of the absence of such a minority member, the measure or matter shall lay over for a day. If the presence of a member of the minority is not then obtained, a majority of the members of the subcommittee, actually present, may order such measure or matter reported.

(c) No measure or matter shall be ordered reported from the committee or a subcommittee unless a majority of the committee or subcommittee is physically present.

Rule 5.—With the approval of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, one

member thereof may conduct public hearings other than taking sworn testimony.

Rule 6.—Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee or a subcommittee if the absent member has been informed of the matter on which he is being recorded and has affirmatively requested that he be so recorded. While proxies may be voted on a motion to report a measure or matter from the committee, such a motion shall also require the concurrence of a majority of the members who are actually present at the time such action is taken.

The committee may poll any matters of committee business as a matter of unanimous consent; provided that every member is polled and every poll consists of the following two questions:

(1) Do you agree or disagree to poll the proposal; and

(2) Do you favor or oppose the proposal.

Rule 7.—There shall be prepared and kept a complete transcript or electronic recording adequate to fully record the proceedings of each committee or subcommittee meeting or conference whether or not such meetings or any part thereof is closed pursuant to the specific provisions of subsections (b) and (d) of rule 26.5 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, unless a majority of said members vote to forgo such a record. Such records shall contain the vote cast by each member of the committee or subcommittee on any question on which a “yea and nay” vote is demanded, and shall be available for inspection by any committee member. The clerk of the committee, or the clerk’s designee, shall have the responsibility to make appropriate arrangements to implement this rule.

Rule 8.—The committee and each subcommittee shall undertake, consistent with the provisions of rule XXVI, paragraph 4, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to issue public announcement of any hearing or executive session it intends to hold at least one week prior to the commencement of such hearing or executive session. In the case of an executive session, the text of any bill or joint resolution to be considered must be provided to the chairman for prompt electronic distribution to the members of the committee.

Rule 9.—The committee or a subcommittee shall require all witnesses heard before it to file written statements of their proposed testimony at least 24 hours before a hearing, unless the chairman and the ranking minority member determine that there is good cause for failure to so file, and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their arguments. Testimony may be filed electronically. The presiding officer at any hearing is authorized to limit the time of each witness appearing before the committee or a subcommittee. The committee or a subcommittee shall, as far as practicable, utilize testimony previously taken on bills and measures similar to those before it for consideration.

Rule 10.—Should a subcommittee fail to report back to the full committee on any measure within a reasonable time, the chairman may withdraw the measure from such subcommittee and report that fact to the full committee for further disposition.

Rule 11.—No subcommittee may schedule a meeting or hearing at a time designated for a hearing or meeting of the full committee. No more than one subcommittee executive meeting may be held at the same time.

Rule 12.—It shall be the duty of the chairman in accordance with section 133(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as

amended, to report or cause to be reported to the Senate, any measure or recommendation approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken, necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote in the Senate.

Rule 13.—Whenever a meeting of the committee or subcommittee is closed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) or (d) of rule 26.5 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no person other than members of the committee, members of the staff of the committee, and designated assistants to members of the committee shall be permitted to attend such closed session, except by special dispensation of the committee or subcommittee or the chairman thereof.

Rule 14.—The chairman of the committee or a subcommittee shall be empowered to adjourn any meeting of the committee or a subcommittee if a quorum is not present within fifteen minutes of the time schedule for such meeting.

Rule 15.—Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be before the committee or a subcommittee for final consideration, the clerk shall distribute to each member of the committee or subcommittee a document, prepared by the sponsor of the bill or joint resolution. If the bill or joint resolution has no underlying statutory language, the document shall consist of a detailed summary of the purpose and impact of each section. If the bill or joint resolution repeals or amends any statute or part thereof, the document shall consist of a detailed summary of the underlying statute and the proposed changes in each section of the underlying law and either a print of the statute or the part or section thereof to be amended or replaced showing by stricken-through type, the part or parts to be omitted and, in italics, the matter proposed to be added, along with a summary of the proposed changes; or a side-by-side document showing a comparison of current law, the proposed legislative changes, and a detailed description of the proposed changes.

Rule 16.—An appropriate opportunity shall be given the minority to examine the proposed text of committee reports prior to their filing or publication. In the event there are supplemental, minority, or additional views, an appropriate opportunity shall be given the majority to examine the proposed text prior to filing or publication. Unless the chairman and ranking minority member agree on a shorter period of time, the minority shall have no fewer than three business days to prepare supplemental, minority or additional views for inclusion in a committee report from the time the majority makes the proposed text of the committee report available to the minority.

Rule 17.—(a) The committee, or any subcommittee, may issue subpoenas, or hold hearings to take sworn testimony or hear subpoenaed witnesses, only if such investigative activity has been authorized by majority vote of the committee.

(b) For the purpose of holding a hearing to take sworn testimony or hear subpoenaed witnesses, three members of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum: provided, with the concurrence of the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee, a single member may hear subpoenaed witnesses or take sworn testimony.

(c) The committee may, by a majority vote, delegate the authority to issue subpoenas to the chairman of the committee or a subcommittee, or to any member designated by such chairman. Prior to the issuance of each subpoena, the ranking mi-

nority member of the committee or subcommittee, and any other member so requesting, shall be notified regarding the identity of the person to whom it will be issued and the nature of the information sought and its relationship to the authorized investigative activity, except where the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, in consultation with the ranking minority member, determines that such notice would unduly impede the investigation. All information obtained pursuant to such investigative activity shall be made available as promptly as possible to each member of the committee requesting same, or to any assistant to a member of the committee designated by such member in writing, but the use of any such information is subject to restrictions imposed by the rules of the Senate. Such information, to the extent that it is relevant to the investigation shall, if requested by a member, be summarized in writing as soon as practicable. Upon the request of any member, the chairman of the committee or subcommittee shall call an executive session to discuss such investigative activity or the issuance of any subpoena in connection therewith.

(d) Any witness summoned to testify at a hearing, or any witness giving sworn testimony, may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing who shall be permitted, while the witness is testifying, to advise him of his legal rights.

(e) No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented in an executive hearing, or any report of the proceedings of such an executive hearing, shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee.

Rule 18.—Presidential nominees shall submit a statement of their background and financial interests, including the financial interests of their spouse and children living in their household, on a form approved by the committee which shall be sworn to as to its completeness and accuracy. The committee form shall be in two parts—

(I) information relating to employment, education and background of the nominee relating to the position to which the individual is nominated, and which is to be made public; and,

(II) information relating to financial and other background of the nominee, to be made public when the committee determines that such information bears directly on the nominee’s qualifications to hold the position to which the individual is nominated.

Information relating to background and financial interests (parts I and II) shall not be required of nominees for less than full-time appointments to councils, commissions or boards when the committee determines that some or all of the information is not relevant to the nature of the position. Information relating to other background and financial interests (part II) shall not be required of any nominee when the committee determines that it is not relevant to the nature of the position.

Committee action on a nomination, including hearings or meetings to consider a motion to recommend confirmation, shall not be initiated until at least five days after the nominee submits the form required by this rule unless the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, waives this waiting period.

Rule 19.—Subject to statutory requirements imposed on the committee with respect to procedure, the rules of the committee may be changed, modified, amended

or suspended at any time; provided, not less than a majority of the entire membership so determine at a regular meeting with due notice, or at a meeting specifically called for that purpose.

Rule 20.—When the ratio of members on the committee is even, the term “majority” as used in the committee’s rules and guidelines shall refer to the party of the chairman for purposes of party identification. Numerical requirements for quorums, votes and the like shall be unaffected.

Rule 21.—First degree amendments must be filed with the chairman at least 24 hours before an executive session. The chairman shall promptly distribute all filed amendments electronically to the members of the committee. The chairman may modify the filing requirements to meet special circumstances with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

Rule 22.—In addition to the foregoing, the proceedings of the committee shall be governed by the Standing Rules of the Senate and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

* * * *

GUIDELINES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON
HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS
WITH RESPECT TO HEARINGS, MARKUP SES-
SIONS, AND RELATED MATTERS

HEARINGS

Section 133A(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act requires each committee of the Senate to publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing at least one week prior to the commencement of such hearing.

The spirit of this requirement is to assure adequate notice to the public and other Members of the Senate as to the time and subject matter of proposed hearings. In the spirit of section 133A(a) and in order to assure that members of the committee are themselves fully informed and involved in the development of hearings:

1. Public notice of the date, place, and subject matter of each committee or subcommittee hearing should be inserted in the Congressional Record seven days prior to the commencement of such hearing.

2. At least seven days prior to public notice of each committee or subcommittee hearing, the majority should provide notice to the minority of the time, place and specific subject matter of such hearing.

3. At least three days prior to the date of such hearing, the committee or subcommittee should provide to each member a list of witnesses who have been or are proposed to be invited to appear.

4. The committee and its subcommittee should, to the maximum feasible extent, enforce the provisions of rule 9 of the committee rules as it relates to the submission of written statements of witnesses twenty-four hours in advance of a hearing. Witnesses will be urged to submit testimony even earlier whenever possible. When statements are received in advance of a hearing, the committee or subcommittee (as appropriate) should distribute copies of such statements to each of its members. Witness testimony may be submitted and distributed electronically.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS FOR THE PURPOSE OF
MARKING UP BILLS

In order to expedite the process of marking up bills and to assist each member of the committee so that there may be full and fair consideration of each bill which the committee or a subcommittee is marking up the following procedures should be followed:

1. Seven days prior to the proposed date for an executive session for the purpose of marking up bills the committee or subcommittee (as appropriate) should provide written notice to each of its members as to the time, place, and specific subject matter of such session, including an agenda listing each bill or other matters to be considered and including:

(a) a copy of each bill, joint resolution, or other legislative matter (or committee print thereof) to be considered at such executive session; and

(b) a copy of a summary of the provisions of each bill, joint resolution, or other legislative matter to be considered at such executive session including, whenever possible, an explanation of changes to existing law proposed to be made.

2. Insofar as practical, prior to the scheduled date for an executive session for the purpose of marking up bills, the committee or a subcommittee (as appropriate) should provide each member with a copy of the printed record or a summary of any hearings conducted by the committee or a subcommittee with respect to each bill, joint resolution, or other legislative matter to be considered at such executive session.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging, having adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress, have a copy of their rules printed in the RECORD pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY

*S. Res. 4, 104, 95th Congress, 1st Session (1977)*¹

(a)(1) There is established a Special Committee on Aging (hereafter in this section referred to as the “special committee”) which shall consist of nineteen Members. The Members and chairman of the special committee shall be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the Members and chairman of a standing committee of the Senate. After the date on which the majority and minority Members of the special committee are initially appointed on or affect the effective date of title I of the Committee System Reorganization Amendments of 1977, each time a vacancy occurs in the Membership of the special committee, the number of Members of the special committee shall be reduced by one until the number of Members of the special committee consists of nine Senators.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph 1 of rule XXV; paragraphs 1, 7(a)(1)–(2), 9, and 10(a) of rule XXVI; and paragraphs 1(a)–(d), and 2(a) and (d) of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate; and the purposes of section 202(I) and (j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the special committee shall be treated as a standing committee of the Senate.

(b)(1) It shall be the duty of the special committee to conduct a continuing study of any and all matters pertaining to problems

and opportunities of older people, including, but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

(2) The special committee shall, from time to time (but not less than once year), report to the Senate the results of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), together with such recommendation as it considers appropriate.

(c)(1) For the purposes of this section, the special committee is authorized, in its discretion, (A) to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, (B) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (C) to employ personnel, (D) to hold hearings, (E) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (F) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence books, papers, and documents, (G) to take depositions and other testimony, (H) to procure the serve of individual consultants or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(I) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) and (I) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(2) The chairman of the special committee or any Member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(3) Subpoenas authorized by the special committee may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or any Member of the special committee designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or the Member signing the subpoena.

(d) All records and papers of the temporary Special Committee on Aging established by Senate Resolution 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, are transferred to the special committee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

159 Cong. Rec S1002 (daily ed. Feb. 28, 2013)

I. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1. MEETINGS. The Committee shall meet to conduct Committee business at the call of the Chairman. The Members of the Committee may call additional meetings as provided in Senate Rule XXVI (3).

2. NOTICE AND AGENDA:

(a) WRITTEN OR ELECTRONIC NOTICE. The Chairman shall give the Members written or electronic notice of any Committee meeting, accompanied by an agenda enumerating the items of business to be considered, at least 5 days in advance of such meeting.

(b) SHORTENED NOTICE. A meeting may be called on not less than 24 hours notice if the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the meeting on shortened notice. An agenda will be furnished prior to such a meeting.

3. PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chairman shall preside when present. If the Chairman is not present at any meeting, the Ranking Majority Member present shall preside.

II. CONVENING OF HEARINGS

1. NOTICE. The Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing at least one week

before its commencement. A hearing may be called on not less than 24 hours notice if the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing on shortened notice.

2. **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chairman shall preside over the conduct of a hearing when present, or, whether present or not, may delegate authority to preside to any Member of the Committee.

3. **WITNESSES.** Witnesses called before the Committee shall be given, absent extraordinary circumstances, at least 48 hours notice, and all witnesses called shall be furnished with a copy of these rules upon request.

4. **OATH.** All witnesses who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn unless the Committee waives the oath. The Chairman, or any Member, may request and administer the oath.

5. **TESTIMONY.** At least 48 hours in advance of a hearing, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall submit his or her testimony by way of electronic mail, in a format determined by the Committee and sent to an electronic mail address specified by the Committee, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member determine that there is good cause for a witness's failure to do so. A witness shall be allowed no more than five minutes to orally summarize his or her prepared statement. Officials of the federal government shall file 40 copies of such statement with the clerk of the Committee 48 hours in advance of their appearance, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member determine there is good cause for noncompliance.

6. **COUNSEL.** A witness's counsel shall be permitted to be present during his testimony at any public or closed hearing or depositions or staff interview to advise such witness of his or her rights, provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the Chairman may rule that representation by counsel from the government, corporation, or association creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness shall be represented by personal counsel not from the government, corporation, or association.

7. **TRANSCRIPT.** An accurate electronic or stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in closed sessions and public hearings. Any witness shall be afforded, upon request, the right to review that portion of such record, and for this purpose, a copy of a witness's testimony in public or closed session shall be provided to the witness. Upon inspecting his or her transcript, within a time limit set by the committee clerk, a witness may request changes in testimony to correct errors of transcription, grammatical errors, and obvious errors of fact. The Chairman or a staff officer designated by him shall rule on such request.

8. **IMPUGNED PERSONS.** Any person who believes that evidence presented, or comment made by a Member or staff, at a public hearing or at a closed hearing concerning which there have been public reports, tends to impugn his or her character or adversely affect his or her reputation may:

(a) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the evidence or comment, which shall be placed in the hearing record; and

(b) request the opportunity to appear personally before the Committee to testify in his or her own behalf.

9. **MINORITY WITNESSES.** Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee, the

Ranking Member shall be entitled to call at least one witness to testify or produce documents with respect to the measure or matter under consideration at the hearing. Such request must be made before the completion of the hearing or, if subpoenas are required to call the minority witnesses, no later than three days before the hearing.

10. **CONDUCT OF WITNESSES, COUNSEL AND MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE.** If, during public or executive sessions, a witness, his or her counsel, or any spectator conducts him or herself in such a manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of such hearing the Chairman or presiding Member of the Committee present during such hearing may request the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, his representative or any law enforcement official to eject said person from the hearing room.

III. CLOSED SESSIONS AND CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS

1. **PROCEDURE.** All meetings and hearings shall be open to the public unless closed. To close a meeting or hearing or portion thereof, a motion shall be made and seconded to go into closed discussion of whether the meeting or hearing will concern Committee investigations or matters enumerated in Senate Rule XXVI(5)(b). Immediately after such discussion, the meeting or hearing or portion thereof may be closed by a vote in open session of a majority of the Members of the Committee present.

2. **WITNESS REQUEST.** Any witness called for a hearing may submit a written or an electronic request to the Chairman no later than twenty-four hours in advance for his or her examination to be in closed or open session. The Chairman shall inform the Committee of any such request.

3. **CONFIDENTIAL MATTER.** No record made of a closed session, or material declared confidential by a majority of the Committee, or report of the proceedings of a closed session, shall be made public, in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

IV. BROADCASTING

1. **CONTROL.** Any meeting or hearing open to the public may be covered by television, radio, or still photography. Such coverage must be conducted in an orderly and unobtrusive manner, and the Chairman may for good cause terminate such coverage in whole or in part, or take such other action to control it as the circumstances may warrant.

2. **REQUEST.** A witness may request of the Chairman, on grounds of distraction, harassment, personal safety, or physical discomfort, that during his or her testimony cameras, media microphones, and lights shall not be directed at him or her.

V. QUORUMS AND VOTING

1. **REPORTING.** A majority shall constitute a quorum for reporting a resolution, recommendation or report to the Senate.

2. **COMMITTEE BUSINESS.** A third shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of Committee business, other than a final vote on reporting, providing a minority Member is present.

3. **HEARINGS.** One Member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing of witnesses, and the taking of testimony at hearings.

4. POLLING:

(a) **SUBJECTS.** The Committee may poll (1) internal Committee matters including those concerning the Committee's staff, records, and budget; (2) Committee rules changes and

(3) other Committee business which has been designated for polling at a meeting.

(b) **PROCEDURE.** The Chairman shall circulate polling sheets to each Member specifying the matter being polled and the time limit for completion of the poll. If any Member so requests in advance of the meeting, the matter shall be held for meeting rather than being polled. The clerk shall keep a record of polls. If the Chairman determines that the polled matter is one of the areas enumerated in Rule III(1), the record of the poll shall be confidential. Any Member may request a Committee meeting following a poll for a vote on the polled decision.

VI. INVESTIGATIONS

1. **AUTHORIZATION FOR INVESTIGATIONS.** All investigations shall be conducted on a bipartisan basis by Committee staff. Investigations may be initiated by the Committee staff upon the approval of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member. Staff shall keep the Committee fully informed of the progress of continuing investigations, except where the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member agree that there exists temporary cause for more limited knowledge.

2. **SUBPOENAS.** The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, acting together, shall authorize a subpoena. Subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials shall be issued by the Chairman, or by any other Member of the Committee designated by him. Prior to the issuance of each subpoena, the Ranking Minority Member, and any other Member so requesting, shall be notified regarding the identity of the person to whom the subpoena will be issued and the nature of the information sought, and its relationship to the investigation.

3. **INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS.** All reports containing findings or recommendations stemming from Committee investigations shall be printed only with the approval of a majority of the Members of the Committee.

VII. DEPOSITIONS AND COMMISSIONS

1. **NOTICE.** Notices for the taking of depositions in an investigation authorized by the Committee shall be authorized and issued by the Chairman or by a staff officer designated by him. Such notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private. The Committee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness's failure to appear unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a Committee subpoena.

2. **COUNSEL.** Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their rights, subject to the provisions of Rule II(6).

3. **PROCEDURE.** Witnesses shall be examined upon oath administered by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. Questions shall be propounded orally by Committee staff. Objections by the witnesses as to the form of questions shall be noted by the record. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify on the basis of relevance or privilege, the Committee staff may proceed with the deposition, or may at that time or at a subsequent time, seek a ruling by telephone or otherwise on the objection from a Member of the Committee. If the Member overrules the objection, he or she may refer the matter to the Committee or the Member may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Committee shall not initiate the procedures leading to civil or criminal enforcement unless

the witness refuses to testify after he or she has been ordered and directed to answer by a Member of the Committee.

4. **FILING.** The Committee staff shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded.

5. **COMMISSIONS.** The Committee may authorize the staff, by issuance of commissions, to fill in prepared subpoenas, conduct field hearings, inspect locations, facilities, or systems of records, or otherwise act on behalf of the Committee. Commissions shall be accompanied by instructions from the Committee regulating their use.

VIII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. **ESTABLISHMENT.** The Committee will operate as a Committee of the Whole, reserving to itself the right to establish temporary subcommittees at any time by majority vote. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member shall be ex officio Members of all subcommittees.

2. **JURISDICTION.** Within its jurisdiction as described in the Standing Rules of the Senate, each subcommittee is authorized to conduct investigations, including use of subpoenas, depositions, and commissions.

3. **RULES.** A subcommittee shall be governed by the Committee rules, except that its quorum for all business shall be one-third of the subcommittee Membership, and for hearings shall be one Member.

IX. REPORTS

Committee reports incorporating Committee findings and recommendations shall be printed only with the prior approval of a majority of the Committee, after an adequate period for review and comment. The printing, as Committee documents, of materials prepared by staff for informational purposes, or the printing of materials not originating with the Committee or staff, shall require prior consultation with the minority staff; these publications shall have the following language printed on the cover of the document: "Note: This document has been printed for informational purposes. It does not represent either findings or recommendations formally adopted by the Committee."

X. AMENDMENT OF RULES

The rules of the Committee may be amended or revised at any time, provided that not less than a majority of the Committee present so determine at a Committee meeting preceded by at least 3 days notice of the amendments or revisions proposed or via polling, subject to Rule V (4).

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship today adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying rules adopted by the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES FOR THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

JURISDICTION (ESTABLISHED IN THE SENATE STANDING RULES)

Per Rule XXV(1) of the Standing Rules of the Senate:

(1) Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the Small Business Administration;

(2) Any proposed legislation reported by such committee which relates to matters other than the functions of the Small Business Administration shall, at the request of the chairman of any standing committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter extraneous to the functions of the Small Business Administration, be considered and reported by such standing committee prior to its consideration by the Senate; and likewise measures reported by other committees directly relating to the Small Business Administration shall, at the request of the Chair of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, be referred to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship for its consideration of any portion of the measure dealing with the Small Business Administration and be reported by this committee prior to its consideration by the Senate.

(3) Such committee shall also study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small business enterprises, and report thereon from time to time.

GENERAL SECTION

All applicable provisions of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senate Resolutions, and the Legislative Reorganization Acts of 1946 and 1970 (as amended), shall govern the Committee.

MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Thursday of each month unless otherwise directed by the Chair. All other meetings may be called by the Chair as he or she deems necessary, on 3 business days notice where practicable. If at least three Members of the Committee desire the Chair to call a special meeting, they may file in the office of the Committee a written request therefore, addressed to the Chair. Immediately thereafter, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chair of such request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chair fails to call the requested special meeting, which is to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the Office of the Committee their written notice that a special Committee meeting will be held, specifying the date, hour and place thereof, and the Committee shall meet at that time and place. Immediately upon the filing of such notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date, hour and place. If the Chair is not present at any regular, additional or special meeting, such member of the Committee as the Chair shall designate shall preside. For any meeting or hearing of the Committee, the Ranking Member may delegate to any Minority Member the authority to serve as Ranking Member, and that Minority Member shall be afforded all the rights and responsibilities of the Ranking Member for the duration of that meeting or hearing. Notice of

any designation shall be provided to the Chief Clerk as early as practicable.

(b) It shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless thirty written copies and an electronic copy, with a summary page attached, of such amendment has been delivered to the Clerk of the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Following receipt of all amendments, the Clerk shall disseminate the amendments to all Members of the Committee. This subsection may be waived by agreement of the Chair and Ranking Member or by a majority vote of the members of the Committee.

QUORUMS

(a)(1) A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting any legislative measure or nomination.

(2) One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Minority Member is present. The term "routine business" includes, but is not limited to, the consideration of legislation pending before the Committee and any amendments thereto, and voting on such amendments, and steps in an investigation including, but not limited to, authorizing the issuance of a subpoena.

(3) In hearings, whether in public or closed session, a quorum for the asking of testimony, including sworn testimony, shall consist of one Member of the Committee.

(b) Proxies will be permitted in voting upon the business of the Committee. A Member who is unable to attend a business meeting may submit a proxy vote on any matter, in writing, or through oral or written personal instructions to a Member of the Committee or staff. Proxies shall in no case be counted for establishing a quorum.

NOMINATIONS

In considering a nomination, the Committee shall conduct an investigation or review of the nominee's experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. In any hearings on the nomination, the nominee shall be called to testify under oath on all matters relating to his or her nomination for office. To aid in such investigation or review, each nominee may be required to submit a sworn detailed statement including biographical, financial, policy, and other information which the Committee may request. The Committee may specify which items in such statement are to be received on a confidential basis.

HEARINGS

(a)(1) The Chair of the Committee may initiate a hearing of the Committee on his or her authority or upon his or her approval of a request by any Member of the Committee. If such request is by the Ranking Member, a decision shall be communicated to the Ranking Member within 7 business days. Written notice of all hearings, including the title, a description of the hearing, and a tentative witness list shall be given at least 5 business days in advance, where practicable, to all Members of the Committee.

(2) Hearings of the Committee shall not be scheduled outside the District of Columbia unless specifically authorized by the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member or by consent of a majority of the Committee. Such consent may be given informally, without a meeting, but must be in writing.

(b)(1) Any Member of the Committee shall be empowered to administer the oath to any witness testifying as to fact.

(2) The Chair and Ranking Member will negotiate the number of witnesses for each hearing, but in the absence of an agreement between the Chair and the Ranking Member the ratio between the majority and minority witnesses will be no less than 3-2 or 2-1 when a smaller panel is justified. Interrogation of witnesses at hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the Committee by Members of the Committee or such Committee staff as is authorized by the Chair or Ranking Minority Member.

(3) Witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee a written statement of the prepared testimony at least two business days in advance of the hearing at which the witness is to appear unless this requirement is waived by the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member.

(c) Any witness summoned to a public or closed hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his or her own choosing, who shall be permitted while the witness is testifying to advise the witness of his or her legal rights. Failure to obtain counsel will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(d) Subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, and other materials may be authorized by the Chair with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member or by the consent of a majority of the Members of the Committee. Such consent may be given informally, without a meeting, but must be in writing. The Chair may subpoena attendance or production without the consent of the Ranking Minority Member when the Chair has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member of disapproval of the subpoena within 72 hours of being notified of the intended subpoena, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Subpoenas shall be issued by the Chair or by the Member of the Committee designated by him or her. A subpoena for the attendance of a witness shall state briefly the purpose of the hearing and the matter or matters to which the witness is expected to testify. A subpoena for the production of memoranda, documents, records, and other materials shall identify the papers or materials required to be produced with as much particularity as is practicable.

(e) The Chair shall rule on any objections or assertions of privilege as to testimony or evidence in response to subpoenas or questions of Committee Members and staff in hearings.

(f) Testimony may be submitted to the formal record for a period not less than two weeks following a hearing or roundtable, unless otherwise agreed to by Chair and Ranking Member.

DEPOSITIONS

At the direction of the Chair, with notification to the ranking minority member of not less than 72 hours, the staff is authorized to take depositions from witnesses. Such notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the Senator, staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Any Committee member, or a member of the Committee staff designated by the Chair or ranking minority member, shall be given the opportunity to attend and participate in the taking of any deposition. Witnesses at depositions shall be examined under oath administered by an individual authorized by law to administer oaths, or administered by any member of the Committee if one is present. The transcript of a deposition shall be filed with the committee clerk. The transcript or any portion of the tran-

script shall only be made public either by vote of the majority or at the direction of the Chair after notifying the ranking minority member.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

(a) No confidential testimony taken by, or confidential material presented to, the Committee in executive session, or any report of the proceedings of a closed hearing, or confidential testimony or material submitted pursuant to a subpoena, shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the Members. Other confidential material or testimony submitted to the Committee may be disclosed if authorized by the Chair with the consent of the Ranking Member.

(b) Persons asserting confidentiality of documents or materials submitted to the Committee offices shall clearly designate them as such on their face. Designation of submissions as confidential does not prevent their use in furtherance of Committee business.

MEDIA & BROADCASTING

(a) At the discretion of the Chair, public meetings of the Committee may be televised, broadcasted, or recorded in whole or in part by a member of the Senate Press Gallery or an employee of the Senate. Any such person wishing to televise, broadcast, or record a Committee meeting must request approval of the Chair by submitting a written request to the Committee Office by 5 p.m. the day before the meeting. Notice of televised or broadcasted hearings shall be provided to the Ranking Minority Member as soon as practicable.

(b) During public meetings of the Committee, any person using a camera, microphone, or other electronic equipment may not position or use the equipment in a way that interferes with the seating, vision, or hearing of Committee members or staff on the dais, or with the orderly process of the meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEES

The Committee shall not have standing subcommittees.

AMENDMENT OF RULES

The foregoing rules may be added to, modified or amended; provided, however, that not less than a majority of the entire Membership so determined at a regular meeting with due notice, or at a meeting specifically called for that purpose.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Committee on Indian Affairs has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RULES FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 1. The Standing Rules of the Senate, Senate Resolution 4, and the provisions of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as supplemented by these rules, are adopted as the rules of the Committee to the extent the provisions of such Rules, Resolution, and Acts are applicable to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 2. The Committee shall meet on Wednesday/Thursday while the Congress is in session for the purpose of conducting business, unless for the convenience of the Members, the Chairman shall set some other day for a meeting. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary.

OPEN HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Rule 3(a). Hearings and business meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Chairman by a majority vote orders a closed hearing or meeting.

(b). Except as otherwise provided in the Rules of the Senate, a transcript or electronic recording shall be kept of each hearing and business meeting of the Committee.

HEARING PROCEDURE

Rule 4(a). Public notice, including notice to Members of the Committee, shall be given of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be held by the Committee at least one week in advance of such hearing unless the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Vice Chairman, determines that holding the hearing would be non-controversial or that special circumstances require expedited procedures and a majority of the Committee Members attending concurs. In no case shall a hearing be conducted with less than 24 hours' notice.

(b). Each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall submit his or her testimony by way of electronic mail, at least 48 hours in advance of a hearing, in a format determined by the Committee and sent to an electronic mail address specified by the Committee.

(c). Each Member shall be limited to five (5) minutes of questioning of any witness until such time as all Members attending who so desire have had an opportunity to question the witness unless the Committee shall decide otherwise.

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Rule 5(a). A legislative measure or subject shall be included in the agenda of the next following business meeting of the Committee if a written request by a Member for consideration of such measure or subject has been filed with the Chairman of the Committee at least one week prior to such meeting. Nothing in this rule shall be construed to limit the authority of the Chairman of the Committee to include legislative measures or subjects on the Committee agenda in the absence of such request.

(b). Any bill, resolution, or other matter to be considered by the Committee at a business meeting shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee. Notice of, and the agenda for, any business meeting of the Committee, and a copy of any bill, resolution, or other matter to be considered at the meeting, shall be provided to each Member and made available to the public at least three days prior to such meeting, and no new items may be added after the agenda is published except by the approval of a majority of the Members of the Committee. The notice and agenda of any business meeting may be provided to the Members by electronic mail, provided that a paper copy will be provided to any Member upon request. The Clerk shall promptly notify absent Members of any action taken by

the Committee on matters not included in the published agenda.

(c). Any amendment(s) to any bill or resolution to be considered shall be filed with the Clerk not less than 48 hours in advance. This rule may be waived by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Vice Chairman.

QUORUM

Rule 6(a). Except as provided in subsection (b), a majority of the Members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Committee. Except as provided in Senate Rule XXVI 7(a), a quorum is presumed to be present unless the absence of a quorum is noted by a Member.

(b). One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing or taking testimony on any measure or matter before the Committee.

VOTING

Rule 7(a). A recorded vote of the Members shall be taken upon the request of any Member.

(b). A measure may be reported without a recorded vote from the Committee unless an objection is made by a Member, in which case a recorded vote by the Members shall be required. A Member shall have the right to have his or her additional views included in the Committee report in accordance with Senate Rule XXVI 10.

(c). A Committee vote to report a measure to the Senate shall also authorize the staff of the Committee to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the measure.

(d). Proxy voting shall be permitted on all matters, except that proxies may not be counted for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum. Unless further limited, a proxy shall be exercised only for the date for which it is given and upon the terms published in the agenda for that date.

SWORN TESTIMONY AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Rule 8(a). Witnesses in Committee hearings may be required to give testimony under oath whenever the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee deems it to be necessary.

(b). At any hearing to confirm a Presidential nomination, the testimony of the nominee, and at the request of any Member, any other witness shall be under oath. Every nominee shall submit a financial statement, on forms to be perfected by the Committee, which shall be sworn to by the nominee as to its completeness and accuracy. All such statements shall be made public by the Committee unless the Committee, in executive session, determines that special circumstances require a full or partial exception to this rule.

(c). Members of the Committee are urged to make public a complete disclosure of their financial interests on forms to be perfected by the Committee in the manner required in the case of Presidential nominees.

CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY

Rule 9. No confidential testimony taken by, or confidential material presented to the Committee or any report of the proceedings of a closed Committee hearing or business meeting shall be made public in whole or in part, or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee at a business meeting called for the purpose of making such a determination.

DEFAMATORY STATEMENTS

Rule 10. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified in, or who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at, an open Committee hearing tends to defame him or her or otherwise

adversely affect his or her reputation may file with the Committee for its consideration and action a sworn statement of facts relevant to such testimony of evidence.

BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS OR MEETINGS

Rule 11. Any meeting or hearing by the Committee which is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by television, Internet, radio broadcast, or still photography. Photographers and reporters using mechanical recording, filming, or broadcasting devices shall position their equipment so as not to interfere with the sight, vision, and hearing of Members and staff on the dais or with the orderly process of the meeting or hearing.

AUTHORIZING SUBPOENAS

Rule 12. The Chairman may, with the agreement of the Vice Chairman, or the Committee may, by majority vote, authorize the issuance of subpoenas.

AMENDING THE RULES

Rule 13. These rules may be amended only by a vote of a majority of all the Members of the Committee in a business meeting of the Committee: Provided, that no vote may be taken on any proposed amendment unless such amendment is reproduced in full in the Committee agenda for such meeting at least seven (7) days in advance of such meeting.

RECOGNIZING THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today I honor the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Coast Guard, officially established on this day, January 28, 1915, when President Woodrow Wilson signed legislation merging the Revenue Cutter Service and the U.S. Life-Saving Service into one organization.

The Coast Guard has a long and noble history, dating back to 1790, of defending the shores of our Nation. It remains a vital component of our national security infrastructure—performing law enforcement, lifesaving, and military duties. Whether it is intercepting drug smugglers in the Gulf of Mexico or rescuing stranded fishermen off the coast of Alaska, the Coast Guard always answers the call and performs its mission bravely. Our Nation is safer thanks to the work done by the brave men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard.

I am honored that my home State of Alabama has a significant Coast Guard presence in the city of Mobile. U.S. Coast Guard Sector Mobile is home to over 200 Active-Duty military and civilian personnel who play a crucial role in enforcing our Nation's laws and providing maritime security along the gulf coast of Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida. Mobile is also home to one of the Coast Guard's largest units, the U.S. Coast Guard Aviation Training Center. The Aviation Training Center is home to roughly 600 Active-Duty military and civilian personnel, and it serves as the Coast Guard's aviation and capabilities development center—responsible for training Coast Guard pilots. It also serves as an operational Coast Guard air station, performing

traditional Coast Guard aviation missions such as search and rescue, homeland security, and environmental protection in an area encompassing the Gulf of Mexico from the Louisiana-Texas border to the Florida panhandle.

I am proud of what these Coast Guard installations do to protect the people of the gulf coast and the Nation as a whole. I would like to thank the U.S. Coast Guard for everything it does to enhance and ensure the national security of the United States, and I congratulate and honor the Coast Guard on its 100th anniversary.

SUPPORTING TEACHERS AND SCHOOL LEADERS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing yesterday be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTING TEACHERS AND SCHOOL LEADERS

Today's hearing is all about better teaching—how we can create an environment so teachers, principals, and other leaders can succeed.

Governors around the country are focused on one issue: better jobs for the citizens in their states. And it doesn't take very long for a governor, which I once was, to come to the conclusion that better schools mean better jobs and a better life.

Since no one has figured out how to pass a better parents law, it doesn't take long to realize how important a great teacher is.

I certainly came to that conclusion quickly in 1984, when I was governor of Tennessee and I considered the holy grail of K-12 education to be finding a fair way to encourage and reward outstanding teaching.

I spent a year and a half, devoting 70 percent of my time, persuading the legislature to establish a career ladder—a master teacher program that 10,000 teachers voluntarily climbed. They were paid more and had the opportunity for 10- and 11-month contracts.

Tennessee became the first state in the nation to pay teachers more for teaching well. Rarely a week goes by that a teacher doesn't stop me and say, "Thank you for the master teacher program."

It was not easy. A year before I'd been in a meeting of southern governors and one of them said, "Who's gonna be brave enough to take on the teachers union?"

I had a year and a half brawl with the National Education Association before I could pass our teacher evaluation program.

Since then, there's been an explosion of efforts to answer these questions a great number of states and school districts are tackling: How do we determine who is an effective teacher? How do we relate student achievement to teacher effectiveness? And, having decided that, how do we reward and support outstanding teaching so we don't lose our best teachers?

In 1987, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards began to strengthen standards in teaching and professionalize the teaching workforce. To date, more than 110,000 teachers in all 50 states and DC have achieved National Board Certification.

In 2006, the Teacher Incentive Fund was created to help states and districts create performance-based compensation system for teachers based on evaluation results.

According to the National Center on Teacher Quality, in 2014:

27 states required annual evaluations for all teachers

44 states required annual evaluations for new teachers

35 states required student achievement and/or student growth to be a significant or the most significant measure of teacher performance.

So when I came to Washington as a United States Senator in 2003, everyone expected—since I thought rewarding outstanding teaching was the Holy Grail—that I would make everyone do it. To the surprise of some, my answer was no—you can't do it from Washington. Nevertheless, over the last 10 years, Washington has tried.

Here is how: No Child Left Behind told states that all teachers of core academic subjects needed to be "Highly Qualified" by 2006, and it prescribed that definition in a very bureaucratic manner. That hasn't worked. I don't know of many people who really want to keep that outdated definition—even Secretary Duncan waived the requirements related to highly qualified teachers when he granted waivers to 43 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Unfortunately, the Secretary replaced those requirements with a new mandate requiring teacher evaluation systems—first in Race to the Top, which gave nearly \$4.4 billion to states, and second, in the waivers.

To get a waiver from No Child Left Behind, a state and each local school district must develop a teacher and principal evaluation system with seven required elements—such as that it will use at least three performance levels; and will use multiple measures, including student growth; and will include guidelines and supports for implementation—and each element must be approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

The problem is that, after 30 years, we are still figuring out how to do this.

Our research work on measuring growth in student achievement and relating it fairly to teacher effectiveness was started in 1984, but former Institute of Education Science Director Russ Whitehurst told the New York Times in 2012 that states "are racing ahead based on promises made to Washington or local political imperatives that prioritize an unwavering commitment to unproven approaches. There's a lot we don't know about how to evaluate teachers reliably and how to use that information to improve instruction and learning."

The second problem is that some states haven't been willing or able to implement the systems the way the U.S. Department of Education wants them to.

California, Iowa, and Washington state had their waiver requests denied or revoked over the issue of teacher evaluations.

In Iowa's case, it was because the state legislature wouldn't pass a law that satisfied the requirement that allowed for teachers and principals to be placed into at least three performance levels—not effective, effective, and highly effective.

California simply ignored the Administration's conditions when they applied for a waiver, particularly the requirement that teacher evaluation systems be based significantly on the results of state standardized tests.

In April, Washington state's waiver was revoked by Secretary Duncan because their

state legislature would not pass legislation requiring standardized test results to be used in teacher and principal evaluation systems—instead the law in Washington allows local school districts to decide which tests they use.

Whether or not this federal interference with state education law offends your sense of federalism, like it does mine, it has proved impractical.

The federal government in its well-intentioned way, trying to say, "We want better teachers, and we're going to tell you exactly how to do it, and you must do it now" has created an enormous backlash. It's made even harder something that was already hard.

Even in Tennessee, despite 30 years of experience and nearly \$500 million in Race to the Top funding, the implementation of a new teacher evaluation system has been described in an article in my hometown newspaper as "contentious."

Given all of the great progress that states and local school districts have made on standards, accountability, tests, and teacher evaluation over the last 30 years—you'll get a lot more progress with a lot less opposition if you leave those decisions there.

I think we should return to states and local school districts decisions for measuring the progress of our schools and for evaluating and measuring the effectiveness of teachers.

I know it is tempting to try to improve teachers from Washington. I also hear from governors and school superintendents who say that if "Washington doesn't make us do it, the teachers unions and opponents from the right will make it impossible to have good evaluation systems and better teachers."

And I understand what they're saying. After I left office, the NEA watered down Tennessee's Master Teacher program.

Nevertheless, the Chairman's Staff Discussion draft eliminates the Highly Qualified Teacher requirements and definition, and allows states to decide the licenses and credentials that they are going to require their teachers to have.

And despite my personal support for teacher evaluation, the draft doesn't mandate teacher and principal evaluations.

Rather, it enables States to use the more than \$2.5 billion under Title II to develop, implement, or improve these evaluation systems.

In a state like Tennessee, that would mean \$39 million potentially available for continuing the work Tennessee has well underway for evaluating teachers, including linking performance and student achievement.

In addition, it would expand one of the provisions in No Child Left Behind—the Teacher Incentive Fund that Secretary Spellings recommended putting into law and that Secretary Duncan said, in testimony before the HELP Committee in January 2009, was "One of the best things I think Secretary Spellings has done . . . the more we can reward excellence, the more we can incentivize excellence, the more we can get our best teachers to work in those hard-to-staff schools and communities, the better our students are going to do."

And third, it would emphasize the idea of a Secretary's report card—calling considerable attention to the bully pulpit a secretary or president has to call attention to states that are succeeding or failing.

For example, I remember President Reagan visited Farragut High School in Knoxville in 1984 to call attention to our

Master Teacher program. It caused the Democratic speaker of our House of Representatives to say, "This is the American way," and come up with an amendment to my proposal that was critical to its passage. President Reagan didn't order every other state to do what Tennessee was doing, but the president's bully pulpit made a real difference.

Thomas Friedman recently told a group of senators that one of his two rules of life is that he's never met anyone who washed a rented car.

In other words, people take care of what they own.

My experience is that finding a way to fairly reward better teaching is the holy grail of K-12 education—but Washington will get the best long-term result by creating an environment in which states and communities are encouraged, not ordered, to evaluate teachers.

Let's not mandate it from Washington if we want them to own it and make it work.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:24 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 159. An act to stop exploitation through trafficking.

H.R. 181. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

H.R. 246. An act to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking.

H.R. 285. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for knowingly selling advertising that offers certain commercial sex acts.

H.R. 350. An act to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 398. An act to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes.

H.R. 460. An act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 469. An act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 515. An act to protect children from exploitation, especially sex trafficking in tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered child-sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child-sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 246. An act to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 350. An act to direct the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to identify strategies to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking and review trafficking prevention efforts, to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 398. An act to provide for the development and dissemination of evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking and respond to such individuals appropriately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 460. An act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 469. An act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 272. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-390. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-462, "License to Carry a Pistol Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-391. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-463, "Zion Baptist Church Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-392. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-464, "Bishop Iola B. Cunningham Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-393. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-467, "Civil Marriage Dissolution Equality Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-394. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-468, "Nap Turner Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-395. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-469, "Stroke System of Care Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-396. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-471, "N Street Village Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-397. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-472, "Solid Waste Facility Permit Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-398. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-473, "Repeal of Prostitution Free Zones and Drug Free Zones Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-399. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-474, "Medical Marijuana Expansion Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-400. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-475, "H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Incentive Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-401. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-482, "Affordable Homeownership Preservation and Equity Accumulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-402. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-483, "Food Policy Council and Director Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-403. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-484, "Commission on Health Disparities Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-404. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-485, "Disposition of District Land for Affordable Housing Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-405. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-486, "Special Education Student Rights Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-406. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-487, "Enhanced Special Education Services Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-407. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-488, "Special Education Quality Improvement Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-408. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-489, "Vehicle-for-Hire Innovation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-409. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-490, "Grocery Store Restrictive Covenant Prohibition Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-410. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-491, "Retirement Technical Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-411. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-493, "Truth in Affordability Reporting Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-412. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-494, "St. Matthews Evangelical Lutheran Church Community Garden Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-413. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-495, "Transaction Modernization Electronic Delivery or Posting Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-414. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-496, "Closing of a Portion of the Public Alley System Square 368, S.O. 13-09586, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-415. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-497, "Captive Insurance Company Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-416. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-498, "Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System Conformity Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-417. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-499, "Metropolitan Police Department Commencement of Discipline and Command Staff Appointment Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-418. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-500, "Douglas Knoll, Golden Rule, 1728 W Street, and Wagner Gainesville Real Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-419. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-502, "Plan for Comprehensive Services for Homeless Individuals at 425 2nd Street, N.W., Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-420. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-503, "Public Space Enforcement Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-421. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-506, "District Government Certificate of Good Standing Filing Requirement Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-422. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-511, "Housing Production Trust Fund Baseline Funding Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-423. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-512, "SeVerna, LLC, Real Property Tax Exemption and Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-424. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-514, "Promoting Economic Growth and Job Creation Through Technology Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-425. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-515, "Winter Sidewalk Safety Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-426. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-516, "Dignity for Homeless Families Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-427. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-517, "Lawrence Guyot Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-428. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-518, "Percy Battle Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-429. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-519, "Uniform Certificate of Title for Vessels Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-430. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-520, "Department of Parks and Recreation Fee-based Use Permit Authority Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-431. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-521, "Cashell Alley Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-432. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-522, "Standard Deduction Withholding Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-433. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-530, "Conversion Therapy for Minors Prohibition Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-434. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-531, "Wage Transparency Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-435. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-532, "DC Rocks, So We Need One Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-436. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-533, "D.C. No Taxation Without Representation Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-437. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-534, "Criminalization of Non-Consensual Pornography Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-438. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-535, "Dedication of a Public Alley in Square 752, S.O. 14-15491, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-439. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-536, "Grandparent Caregivers Program Subsidy Transfer Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-440. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-537, "Pepco Cost-Sharing Fund for DC PLUG Establishment Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-441. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-538, "Trash Compactor Tax Incentive Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-442. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-539, "Behavioral Health System of Care Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-443. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-540, "Copper Intrauterine Device Access Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-444. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-548, "Community Development Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-445. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-549, "Youth Tanning Safety Regulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-446. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-550, "Public-Private Partnership Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-447. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-551, "N Street Village, Inc. Tax and TOPA Exemption Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-448. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-552, "Guardianship Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-449. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-553, "Closing of a Portion of Manchester Lane, N.W., adjacent to Square 2742, S.O. 08-3083, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-450. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-554, "Turkey Bowl Revenue Generation and Sponsorship Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-451. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-555, "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-452. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-556, "Soccer Stadium Development Amendment Act of 2014"; to the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-453. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-558, "Small and Certified Business Enterprise Waiver and Recertification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-454. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-559, "Insurance Holding Company and Credit for Reinsurance Modernization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-455. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-560, "Sex Trafficking of Children Prevention Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-456. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-561, "Firefighter Retirement While Under Disciplinary Investigation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-457. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-562, "Inspector General Qualifications Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-458. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-588, "Trauma Technologists Licensure Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with a preamble:

S. Res. 35. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. Res. 44. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. Res. 45. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. COLLINS, from the Special Committee on Aging, without amendment:

S. Res. 46. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 47. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. Res. 48. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 49. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nominations beginning with Colonel Tony D. Bauernfeind and ending with Colonel William P. West, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 7, 2015.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Rodrick A. Koch, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of James F. Richey, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Morris A. Desimone III and ending with Andrew R. Strauss, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Steven P. Hulse and ending with Anthony C. Lyons, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015.

Marine Corps nomination of Brian L. White, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Steven R. Lucas and ending with James N. Shelstad, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015.

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Allison Beck, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

*Adri Davin Jayaratne, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*Mary Lucille Jordan, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2020.

*Michael Young, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2020.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 273. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the intentional discrimination of a person or organization by an employee of the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 274. A bill to prohibit the Department of the Treasury from assigning tax statuses to organizations based on their political beliefs and activities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 275. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 276. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 277. A bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 278. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephone interactions by executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 280. A bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 281. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 282. A bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas

of duplication among them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BURR, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LEE, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 283. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 284. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 285. A bill to authorize the construction of a replacement medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Aurora, Colorado, and to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into an agreement with the Chief of Engineers to act as the construction agent with respect to such construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 286. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 287. A bill to establish the Food Safety Administration to protect the public health by preventing foodborne illness, ensuring the safety of food, improving research on contaminants leading to foodborne illness, and improving security of food from international contamination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 288. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 289. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 290. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 291. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for extensions of detention of certain aliens ordered removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRUZ, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 292. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 293. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. Kaine, Mr. MORAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 294. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 295. A bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 296. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 297. A bill to revive and expand the Intermediate Care Technician Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 298. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States

with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 43. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that children trafficked in the United States should be treated as victims, and not criminals, especially during the upcoming Super Bowl, an event around which many children are at risk for being trafficked for sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. Res. 44. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. Res. 45. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. Res. 46. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging; from the Special Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CORKER:

S. Res. 47. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. Res. 48. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. Res. 49. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs; from the Committee on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. CARPER):

S. Res. 50. A resolution congratulating The Ohio State University football team for winning the 2015 College Football Playoff national championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 51. A resolution recognizing the goals of Catholic Schools Week and honoring the valuable contributions of Catholic schools in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 52. A resolution calling for the release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya

Savchenko, who was captured by Russian forces in Eastern Ukraine and has been held illegally in a Russian prison since July 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 33

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 37

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for State accountability in the provision of access to the core resources for learning, and for other purposes.

S. 48

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 48, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex or gender, and for other purposes.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 50, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities.

S. 51

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 233

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 233, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

S. 248

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 248, a bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 265, a bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 35

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 35, a resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 15 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 35

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 35 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 70

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cospon-

sor of amendment No. 70 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 73

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 73 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 115

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 115 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 120

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 120 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 124

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 124 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 132

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 132 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

AMENDMENT NO. 148

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 148 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 286. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that would further advance the goals of Indian self-governance and self-determination. The legislation is entitled, the Department of the Interior Self-Governance Act of 2015. I thank my colleagues who have joined me as original cosponsors of this legislation, including Indian Affairs Committee Vice Chairman Senator TESTER and Senator MURKOWSKI.

One of the cornerstones of Federal Indian policy is the concept of tribal self-determination and self-governance.

In 1975, Congress passed the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. The Act, Public Law No. 93-638 authorizes Indian tribes to carry out certain Federal Indian programs, activities, and functions within the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Health and Human Services.

Self-governance is both a policy and procedure whereby, pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Indian tribes administer Federal programs for Indians. Tribal administration of these programs promotes local control and decision-making for these important programs that affect the local tribal community.

Tribal administration through these processes also serves to reduce Federal bureaucracy. This legislation promotes accountability by maintaining requirements that Indian tribes must demonstrate a higher level of responsible governance and administration. Good governance is vital for continuing this policy.

The act gives authority to the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services to enter into 638 contracts and self-governance compacts with Indian tribes. Each 638 contact or self-governance compact identifies functions and activities to be carried out by the tribe, as well as any administrative, reporting, or other requirements that must be followed.

Despite the increased flexibility in the tribal self-governance program, Indian tribes have stated to Congress that the Department of the Interior has, for many years, resisted the efforts by tribes to carry out Interior programs. Without additional reforms, the success of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act cannot reach its full potential.

The bill intends to clarify and expand the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. This legislation will give tribes a better opportunity to advance the policy of tribal self-governance by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to select up to 50 new Indian tribes to participate in the tribal self-governance program. In addition, the bill clarifies that provisions of water settlements and their authorizing legislation will not be affected by the self-governance amendments. Furthermore, nothing in this will expand or limit programs eligible for self-governance compacts beyond those already authorized under current law.

This bipartisan bill is supported by Indian tribes across the country. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 287. A bill to establish the Food Safety Administration to protect the

public health by preventing foodborne illness, ensuring the safety of food, improving research on contaminants leading to foodborne illness, and improving security of food from international contamination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 287

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Safe Food Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings; purposes.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 101. Establishment of food safety administration.

Sec. 102. Consolidation of separate food safety and inspection services and agencies.

Sec. 103. Additional duties of the administration.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION OF FOOD SAFETY PROGRAM

Sec. 201. Administration of national program.

Sec. 202. Registration of food facilities.

Sec. 203. Preventive process controls to reduce adulteration of food.

Sec. 204. Performance standards for contaminants in food.

Sec. 205. Inspections of food facilities.

Sec. 206. Food production establishments.

Sec. 207. Federal and State cooperation.

Sec. 208. Foreign supplier verification program.

Sec. 209. Imports.

Sec. 210. Traceback.

Sec. 211. Food safety technology.

TITLE III—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Sec. 301. Public health assessment system.

Sec. 302. Public education and advisory system.

Sec. 303. Research.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Prohibited acts.

Sec. 402. Mandatory recall authority.

Sec. 403. Injunction proceedings.

Sec. 404. Civil and criminal penalties.

Sec. 405. Presumption.

Sec. 406. Whistleblower protection.

Sec. 407. Administration and enforcement.

Sec. 408. Citizen civil actions.

TITLE V—IMPLEMENTATION

Sec. 501. Definition.

Sec. 502. Reorganization plan.

Sec. 503. Transitional authorities.

Sec. 504. Savings provisions.

Sec. 505. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 506. Additional technical and conforming amendments.

Sec. 507. Regulations.

Sec. 508. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 509. Limitation on authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 510. Effective date.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the safety of the food supply of the United States is vital to the public health, to public confidence in the food supply, and to the success of the food sector of the Nation's economy;

(2) lapses in the protection of the food supply and loss of public confidence in food safety are damaging to consumers and the food industry, and place a burden on interstate commerce;

(3) the safety and security of the food supply requires an integrated, systemwide approach to preventing foodborne illness, a thorough and broad-based approach to basic and applied research, and intensive, effective, and efficient management of the Nation's food safety program;

(4) the task of preserving the safety of the food supply of the United States faces tremendous pressures with regard to—

(A) emerging pathogens and other contaminants and the ability to detect all forms of contamination;

(B) an aging and immune-compromised population, with a growing number of people at high risk for foodborne illnesses, including infants and children;

(C) a concern regarding food fraud for economic gain, especially with mislabeling and intentionally misleading claims;

(D) an increasing volume of imported food, without adequate monitoring and inspection; and

(E) maintenance of rigorous inspection of the domestic food processing and food service industries;

(5) Federal food safety standard setting, inspection, enforcement, and research efforts should be based on the best available science and public health considerations and food safety resources should be systematically deployed in ways that most effectively prevent foodborne illness;

(6) the Federal food safety system is fragmented, with at least 15 Federal agencies sharing responsibility for food safety, and operates under laws that do not reflect current conditions in the food system or current scientific knowledge about the cause and prevention of foodborne illness;

(7) the fragmented Federal food safety system and outdated laws preclude an integrated, systemwide approach to preventing foodborne illness, to the effective and efficient operation of the Nation's food safety program, and to the most beneficial deployment of food safety resources;

(8) the National Academy of Sciences recommended in the report “Ensuring Safe Food from Production to Consumption” that Congress establish by statute a unified and central framework for managing Federal food safety programs, and recommended modifying Federal statutes so that inspection, enforcement, and research efforts are based on scientifically supportable assessments of risks to public health; and

(9) the lack of a single focal point for food safety leadership in the United States undercuts the ability of the United States to exert food safety leadership internationally, which is detrimental to the public health and the international trade interests of the United States.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish a single agency to be known as the “Food Safety Administration” to—

(A) regulate food safety and related labeling to strengthen the protection of the public health;

(B) ensure that food facilities fulfill their responsibility to produce food in a manner that protects the public health of all people in the United States;

(C) lead an integrated, systemwide approach to food safety and to make more effective and efficient use of resources to prevent foodborne illness;

(D) provide a single focal point for food safety leadership, both nationally and internationally; and

(E) provide an integrated food safety research capability, utilizing internally-generated, scientifically and statistically valid studies, in cooperation with academic institutions and other scientific entities of the Federal and State governments, to achieve the continuous improvement of research on foodborne illness and contaminants;

(2) to transfer to the Food Safety Administration the food safety, labeling, inspection, and enforcement functions that, as of the day before the effective date of this Act, are performed by other Federal agencies; and

(3) to modernize and strengthen the Federal food safety laws to achieve more effective application and efficient management of the laws for the protection and improvement of public health.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The term “Administration” means the Food Safety Administration established under section 101(a)(1).

(2) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of Food Safety appointed under section 101(a)(3).

(3) **ADULTERATED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “adulterated” has the meaning given such term in—

(i) section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 342) for food regulated under such Act;

(ii) section 1(m) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601(m)) for food regulated under such Act;

(iii) section 4(g) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453(g)) for food regulated under such Act; and

(iv) section 4(a) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1033(a)) for food regulated under such Act.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—In applying the definitions cited in subparagraph (A), poisonous or deleterious substances in food shall be treated as an added substance if the poisonous or deleterious substances are known to cause serious illness or death in persons, including in sensitive populations.

(4) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) **CATEGORY 1 FOOD FACILITY.**—The term “category 1 food facility” means a facility that slaughters animals for food.

(6) **CATEGORY 2 FOOD FACILITY.**—The term “category 2 food facility” means a facility that processes—

(A) raw meat, poultry, or seafood in a manner that may reduce but is not validated to destroy contaminants; or

(B) other products that the Administrator determines by regulation to be at high risk of contamination.

(7) **CATEGORY 3 FOOD FACILITY.**—The term “category 3 food facility” means a facility—

(A) that processes meat, poultry, or seafood, or other products that the Administrator determines by regulation to be at high risk of contamination; and

(B) whose processes include one or more steps validated to destroy contaminants.

(8) **CATEGORY 4 FOOD FACILITY.**—The term “category 4 food facility” means a facility

that processes food but is not a category 1, 2, or 3 food facility.

(9) **CATEGORY 5 FOOD FACILITY.**—The term “category 5 food facility” means a facility that stores, holds, or transports food prior to delivery for retail sale.

(10) **CONTAMINANT.**—The term “contaminant” includes biological, chemical, physical, or radiological hazards, natural toxins, pesticides, drug residues, decomposition, parasites, allergens, and unapproved food or color additives.

(11) **CONTAMINATION.**—The term “contamination” refers to a presence of a contaminant in food, which may occur naturally or be introduced into a food.

(12) **FEED FACILITY.**—The term “feed facility” means a domestic or foreign feed manufacturer, processor, packer, warehouse, or other facility that—

(A) if operating in the United States, manufactures, slaughters, processes, or holds animal feed or feed ingredients; or

(B) if operating elsewhere, manufactures, slaughters, processes, or holds animal feed or feed ingredients intended for consumption in the United States.

(13) **FOOD.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “food” means a product intended to be used for food or drink for a human or an animal.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “food” includes any product (including a meat food product, as defined in section 1(j) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601(j))), capable for use as human and animal food that is made in whole or in part from any animal, including cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or poultry (as defined in section 4 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453)), and animal feed.

(14) **FOOD FACILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “food facility” means a domestic or foreign food manufacturer, slaughterhouse, processor, packer, warehouse, or other facility that—

(i) if operating in the United States, manufactures, slaughters, processes, or holds food or food ingredients; or

(ii) if operating outside the United States, manufactures, slaughters, processes, or holds food intended for consumption in the United States.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—For the purposes of registration, the term “food facility” does not include—

(i) a farm, restaurant, other retail food establishment, nonprofit food establishment in which food is prepared for or served directly to the consumer; or

(ii) a fishing vessel (other than a fishing vessel engaged in processing, as that term is defined in section 123.3(k) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations).

(15) **FOOD PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENT.**—The term “food production establishment” means any farm, ranch, orchard, vineyard, aquaculture facility, or confined animal-feeding operation.

(16) **FOOD SAFETY LAW.**—The term “food safety law” means—

(A) the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) related to and requiring the safety, labeling, and inspection of food, infant formulas, food additives, pesticide residues, and other substances present in food under that Act;

(B) the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) and of any other Act that are administered by the Center for Veterinary Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration;

(C) the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.);

(D) the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);

(E) the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111-353);

(F) the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.);

(G) the Sanitary Food Transportation Act of 1990 (49 U.S.C. App. 2801 et seq.);

(H) chapter 57 of title 49, United States Code;

(I) Public Law 85-765 (commonly known as the “Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1958”) (7 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.);

(J) the provisions of this Act; and

(K) such other provisions of law related to and requiring food safety, labeling, inspection, and enforcement as the President designates by Executive order as appropriate to include within the jurisdiction of the Administration.

(17) **INTERSTATE COMMERCE.**—The term “interstate commerce” has the meaning given that term in section 201(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(b)).

(18) **MISBRANDED.**—The term “misbranded” has the meaning given to it in—

(A) section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) for food regulated under such Act;

(B) section 1(n) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601(n)) for food regulated under such Act;

(C) section 4(h) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453(h)) for food regulated under such Act; and

(D) section 4(l) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1033(l)) for food regulated under such Act.

(19) **PROCESS.**—The term “process” or “processing” means the commercial slaughter, packing, preparation, or manufacture of food.

(20) **SAFE.**—The term “safe” refers to human and animal health.

(21) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(22) **VALIDATION.**—The term “validation” means the act of obtaining evidence that the process control measure or measures selected to control a contaminant in food is capable of effectively and consistently controlling the contaminant.

(23) **STATISTICALLY VALID.**—The term “statistically valid” means evaluated and conducted under standards set by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the executive branch an agency to be known as the “Food Safety Administration”.

(2) **STATUS.**—The Administration shall be an independent establishment (as defined in section 104 of title 5, United States Code).

(3) **HEAD OF ADMINISTRATION.**—The Administration shall be headed by the Administrator of Food Safety, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) **DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) administer and enforce the food safety law;

(2) serve as a representative to international food safety bodies and discussions;

(3) promulgate regulations to ensure the security of the food supply from all forms of contamination, including intentional contamination; and

(4) oversee—

(A) implementation of Federal food safety inspection, labeling, enforcement, and research efforts to protect the public health;

(B) development of consistent and science-based standards for safe food;

(C) coordination and prioritization of food safety research and education programs with other Federal agencies;

(D) prioritization of Federal food safety efforts and deployment of Federal food safety resources to achieve the greatest benefit in reducing foodborne illness;

(E) coordination of the Federal response to foodborne illness outbreaks with other Federal and State agencies; and

(F) integration of Federal food safety activities with State and local agencies.

SEC. 102. CONSOLIDATION OF SEPARATE FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICES AND AGENCIES.

(a) **TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.**—For each Federal agency specified in subsection (b), there are transferred to the Administration all functions that the head of the Federal agency exercised on the day before the effective date of this Act (including all related functions of any officer or employee of the Federal agency) that relate to administration or enforcement of the food safety law, as determined by the President.

(b) **TRANSFERRED AGENCIES.**—The Federal agencies referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture;

(2) the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition of the Food and Drug Administration;

(3) the part of the Agriculture Marketing Service that administers shell egg surveillance services established under the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.);

(4) the resources and facilities of the Office of Regulatory Affairs of the Food and Drug Administration that administer and conduct inspections of food and feed facilities and imports;

(5) the Center for Veterinary Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration;

(6) the resources and facilities of the Office of the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, known as the Office of Food and Veterinary Medicine, that support—

(A) the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition;

(B) the Center for Veterinary Medicine; and

(C) the Office of Regulatory Affairs facilities and resources described in paragraph (4);

(7) the part of the Research, Education, and Economics mission area of the Department of Agriculture related to food and feed safety;

(8) the part of the National Marine Fisheries Service of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce that administers the seafood inspection program;

(9) the part of the Animal and Plant Inspection Health Service of the Department of Agriculture related to the management of animals going into the food supply; and

(10) such other offices, services, or agencies as the President designates by Executive order to carry out this Act.

SEC. 103. ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.**—The Administrator may—

(1) appoint officers and employees for the Administration in accordance with the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to appointment in the competitive service; and

(2) fix the compensation of those officers and employees in accordance with chapter 51 and with subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—The Administrator may—

(1) procure the services of temporary or intermittent experts and consultants as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) pay in connection with those services the travel expenses of the experts and consultants, including transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from the homes or regular places of business of the individuals, as authorized by section 5703 of that title.

(c) **BUREAUS, OFFICES, AND DIVISIONS.**—The Administrator may establish within the Administration such bureaus, offices, and divisions as the Administrator determines are necessary to perform the duties of the Administrator.

(d) **ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish advisory committees that consist of representatives of scientific expert bodies, academics, industry specialists, and consumers.

(2) **DUTIES.**—The duties of an advisory committee established under paragraph (1) may include developing recommendations with respect to the development of regulatory science and processes, research, communications, performance standards, and inspection.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION OF FOOD SAFETY PROGRAM

SEC. 201. ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) administer a national food safety program (referred to in this section as the “program”) to protect public health; and

(2) ensure that persons who produce or process food meet their responsibility to prevent or minimize food safety hazards related to their products.

(b) **COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS.**—The program shall be based on a comprehensive analysis of the hazards associated with different food and with the processing of different food, including the identification and evaluation of—

(1) the severity of the health risks;

(2) the sources and specific points of potential contamination extending from the farm or ranch to the consumer that may render food unsafe;

(3) the potential for persistence, multiplication, or concentration of naturally occurring or added contaminants in food;

(4) opportunities across the food production, processing, distribution, and retail system to manage and reduce potential health risks; and

(5) opportunities for intentional contamination.

(c) **PROGRAM ELEMENTS.**—In carrying out the program, the Administrator shall—

(1) adopt and implement a national system for the registration of food facilities and regular unannounced inspection of food facilities;

(2) verify and enforce the adoption of preventive process controls in food facilities, based on the best available scientific and

public health considerations and best available technologies;

(3) establish and enforce science-based standards for—

(A) substances that may contaminate food; and

(B) safety and sanitation in the processing and handling of food;

(4) implement a statistically valid sampling program to ensure that industry programs and procedures that prevent food contamination are effective on an ongoing basis and that food meets the performance standards established under this Act;

(5) implement procedures and requirements to ensure the safety and security of imported food;

(6) coordinate with other agencies and State or local governments in carrying out inspection, enforcement, research, and monitoring;

(7) access the surveillance data of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and other Federal Government agencies, in order to develop and implement a national surveillance system to assess the health risks associated with the human consumption of food or to create surveillance data and studies;

(8) partner with relevant agencies to identify and prevent terrorist threats to food;

(9) establish a process for providing a single point of contact to assist impacted consumers in navigating Federal, State, and local agencies involved in responding to or monitoring a foodborne outbreak;

(10) develop public education risk communication and advisory programs;

(11) implement a basic and applied research program to further the purposes of this Act; and

(12) coordinate and prioritize food safety research and educational programs with other agencies, including State or local agencies.

SEC. 202. REGISTRATION OF FOOD FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall require that all food and feed facilities register before the facility can operate in the United States or import food, feed, or ingredients into the United States.

(b) **REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To be registered under subsection (a)—

(A) all food facilities covered under this Act shall comply with registration requirements in section 415 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d);

(B) for food facilities that have not registered under such section 415 prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the requirement in subparagraph (A) applies beginning on the day that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) for food facilities that have registered under such section 415 prior to the date of enactment of this Act, such facilities shall file an amended registration within 180 days of such date of enactment to deliver the information required by paragraph (2).

(2) **CATEGORIES.**—In addition to the information required under section 415 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d) to be included in registration, a food facility shall—

(A) list the facility’s primary purpose and business activity, including the dates of operation if the food facility is operating seasonally; and

(B) list the types of food handled at the facility and identify the activities conducted in the facility, that are relevant to determining whether the facility is a category 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 facility.

(3) **PROCEDURE.**—Upon receipt of a completed or amended registration described in

paragraph (1), the Administrator shall notify the registrant of the receipt of the registration, review the activities identified in the registration, designate the facility as a category 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 food facility for the purposes of inspection, and assign a registration number to each food facility.

(4) **LIST.**—The Administrator—

(A) shall compile and maintain an up-to-date list of food facilities that are registered under this section, in accordance with section 415(a)(5) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d(a)(5)); and

(B) may establish regulations on how the list may be shared with other governmental authorities.

SEC. 203. PREVENTIVE PROCESS CONTROLS TO REDUCE ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall review existing regulations on hazard analysis and process controls and amend existing regulations as appropriate, upon the basis of best available public health, scientific, and technological information, to ensure that those regulations are working effectively to—

(1) ensure food facilities operate in a sanitary manner so that food is not adulterated;

(2) limit the presence of contaminants in food;

(3) meet the performance standards established under section 204;

(4) ensure fully processed or ready-to-eat foods are processed using reasonably available techniques and technologies to eliminate contaminants;

(5) label food intended for final processing outside commercial food facilities with instructions for handling and preparation for consumption that will destroy contaminants;

(6) require sampling and testing at a frequency and in a manner sufficient to ensure that process controls are effective on an ongoing basis and that performance standards are being met; and

(7) provide for agency access to records kept by food facilities and submission of copies of the records to the Administrator, as the Administrator determines appropriate.

(b) **PROCESSING CONTROLS.**—The Administrator may require any person with responsibility for or control over food or food ingredients to adopt process controls, if the process controls are needed to ensure the protection of the public health.

SEC. 204. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR CONTAMINANTS IN FOOD.

(a) **PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.**—Whenever the Administrator determines that a foodborne contaminant presents the risk of serious adverse health consequences or death to consumers, causes food to be adulterated, or could promote the spread of communicable disease described in section 361 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 264), the Administrator shall issue a performance standard (in the form of guidance, action levels, or regulations) to prevent or control the contaminant.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the promulgation of a performance standard under this section, the Administrator shall implement a statistically significant sampling program to determine whether food facilities are complying with the standards promulgated under this section.

(2) **ACTIONS.**—If the Administrator determines that a food facility fails to meet a standard promulgated under this section, and such facility fails to take appropriate corrective action as determined by the Administrator, the Administrator shall, as appropriate—

(A) detain, seize, or condemn food from the food facility under section 209(i);

(B) order a recall of food from the food facility under section 402;

(C) increase the inspection frequency for the food facility;

(D) withdraw the mark of inspection from the food facility, if in use; or

(E) take other appropriate enforcement action concerning the food facility, including suspension of registration.

(c) **NEWLY IDENTIFIED CONTAMINANTS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Administrator shall promulgate interim performance standards for newly identified contaminants as necessary to protect the public health.

(d) **REVOCATION BY ADMINISTRATOR.**—All performance standards, tolerances, action levels, or other similar standards with respect to food in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall remain in effect until revised or revoked by the Administrator.

SEC. 205. INSPECTIONS OF FOOD FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish an inspection program, which shall include sampling and testing of food and food facilities, to determine if each food facility—

(1) is operating in a sanitary manner;

(2) has continuous systems, interventions, and processes in place to minimize or eliminate contaminants in food;

(3) uses validated process controls and ongoing verification;

(4) is in compliance with applicable performance standards established under section 204, process control regulations, and other requirements;

(5) is processing food that is safe and not adulterated or misbranded;

(6) maintains records of process control plans under section 203, and other records related to the processing, sampling, and handling of food; and

(7) is in compliance with the requirements of the applicable food safety law.

(b) **FACILITY CATEGORIES AND INSPECTION FREQUENCIES.**—Inspections of food facilities under this Act shall be based on the following categories and inspection frequencies, subject to subsections (c), (d), and (e):

(1) **CATEGORY 1 FOOD FACILITIES.**—A category 1 food facility shall be subject to ante-mortem, postmortem, and continuous inspection of each slaughter line during all operating hours, and other inspection on a daily basis, sufficient to verify that—

(A) diseased animals are not offered for slaughter;

(B) the food facility has successfully identified and removed from the slaughter line visibly defective or contaminated carcasses, has avoided cross-contamination, and destroyed or reprocessed contaminated carcasses in a manner acceptable to the Administrator; and

(C) that applicable performance standards and other provisions of the food safety law, including those intended to eliminate or reduce pathogens, have been satisfied.

(2) **CATEGORY 2 FOOD FACILITIES.**—A category 2 food facility shall be randomly inspected at least daily.

(3) **CATEGORY 3 FOOD FACILITIES.**—A category 3 food facility shall—

(A) provide documentation to the Administrator on request that ongoing verification shows that its processes are controlled; and

(B) be randomly inspected at least monthly.

(4) **CATEGORY 4 FOOD FACILITIES.**—A category 4 food facility shall be randomly inspected at least quarterly.

(5) **CATEGORY 5 FOOD FACILITIES.**—A category 5 food facility shall be randomly inspected at least annually.

(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF INSPECTION PROCEDURES.**—The Administrator shall establish procedures under which inspectors or safety officers inspect food facilities, which shall allow the taking of random samples, photographs, and copies of records in food facilities.

(d) **ALTERNATIVE INSPECTION FREQUENCIES.**—With respect to a category 2, 3, 4, or 5 food facility, the Administrator may establish alternative increased or decreased inspection frequencies for subcategories of food facilities or for individual facilities, to foster risk-based allocation of resources, subject to the following criteria and procedures:

(1) Subcategories of food facilities and their alternative inspection frequencies shall be defined by regulation, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3).

(2) Alternative inspection frequencies for subcategories of food facilities under paragraph (1) and for a specific food facility under paragraph (4) shall provide that—

(A) category 2 food facilities shall be inspected at least monthly; and

(B) category 3 and 4 food facilities shall be inspected at least annually.

(3) In defining subcategories of food facilities and their alternative inspection frequencies under paragraphs (1) and (2), the Administrator shall consider—

(A) the nature of the foods being processed, stored, or transported;

(B) the manner in which foods are processed, stored, or transported;

(C) the inherent likelihood that the foods will contribute to the risk of foodborne illness;

(D) the best available evidence concerning reported illnesses associated with the foods produced in the proposed subcategory of facilities; and

(E) the overall record of compliance with the food safety law among facilities in the proposed subcategory, including compliance with applicable performance standards and the frequency of recalls.

(4) The Administrator may adopt alternative inspection frequencies for increased or decreased inspection for a specific facility, subject to paragraphs (2) and (5), and shall annually publish a list of facilities subject to alternative inspections.

(5) In adopting alternative inspection frequencies for a specific facility, the Administrator shall consider—

(A) the supporting evidence that an individual food facility shall submit related to whether an alternative inspection frequency should be established for such facility by the Administrator;

(B) whether products from the specific facility have been associated with a case or an outbreak of foodborne illness;

(C) the record of the facility of compliance with the food safety law, including compliance with applicable performance standards and the frequency of recalls; and

(D) the criteria in paragraph (3).

(6) Before establishing decreased alternative inspection frequencies for subcategories of facilities or individual facilities, the Administrator shall—

(A) describe the alternative uses of resources in general terms when issuing the regulation or order that establishes the alternative inspection frequency; and

(B) determine, based on the best available evidence, that the alternative uses of the resources required to carry out the inspection

activity would make a greater contribution to protecting the public health and reducing the risk of foodborne illness.

(e) **INSPECTION TRANSITION.**—The Administrator shall manage the transition to the inspection system described in this Act as follows:

(1) **REGULATIONS.**—The Administrator shall promulgate regulations to implement this section no later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **LIMIT ON REDUCTION IN INSPECTION FREQUENCY.**—For any food facility, the Administrator shall not reduce the inspection frequency from the frequency required pursuant to the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.), and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) until the food facility has demonstrated that sufficient changes in facilities, procedures, personnel, or other aspects of the process control system have been made such that the Administrator determines that compliance with the food safety law is achieved.

(f) **OFFICIAL MARK.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Before the completion of the transition process under subsection (e), the Administrator shall by regulation establish an official mark that can be affixed to a food produced in a category 1, 2, or 3 food facility if—

(i) the facility is in compliance with the food safety law; and

(ii) has been inspected in accordance with the inspection frequencies under this section.

(B) **REMOVAL OF OFFICIAL MARK.**—The Administrator shall promulgate regulations that provide for the removal of the official mark under this subsection if—

(i) the Administrator makes a finding that the facility is not in compliance with the food safety law; or

(ii) the Administrator suspends the registration of the facility.

(2) **CATEGORY 1, 2, OR 3 FOOD FACILITIES.**—In the case of products manufactured, slaughtered, processed, or held in a category 1, 2, or 3 food facility—

(A) products subject to Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.), the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.), and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall remain subject to the requirement under those Acts that they bear the mark of inspection pending completion of the transition process under subsection (e);

(B) the Administrator shall publicly certify on a monthly basis that the inspection frequencies required under this section have been achieved; and

(C) a product from an facility that has not been inspected in accordance with the required frequencies under this section shall not bear the official mark and shall not be shipped in interstate commerce.

(3) **CATEGORY 4 AND 5 FOOD FACILITIES.**—In the case of a product manufactured, slaughtered, processed, or held in a category 4 or 5 food facility, the Administrator shall provide by regulation for the voluntary use of the official mark established under paragraph (1), subject to—

(A) such minimum inspection frequencies as determined appropriate by the Administrator;

(B) compliance with applicable performance standards and other provisions of the food safety law; and

(C) such other requirements as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(g) **MAINTENANCE AND INSPECTION OF RECORDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **RECORDS.**—A food facility shall—

(i) maintain such records as the Administrator requires by regulation, including all records relating to the processing, distributing, receipt, or importation of any food; and

(ii) permit the Administrator, in addition to any authority of the food safety agencies in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, upon presentation of appropriate credentials and at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner, to have access to and copy all records maintained by or on behalf of such food facility representative in any format (including paper or electronic) and at any location, that are necessary to assist the Administrator to determine whether the food is contaminated or not in compliance with the food safety law.

(B) **REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.**—A food facility shall have an affirmative obligation to disclose to the Administrator the results of testing or sampling of food, equipment, or material in contact with food, that is positive for any contaminant.

(2) **MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.**—The records required by paragraph (1) shall be maintained for a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Administrator.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The records required by paragraph (1) shall include records describing—

(A) the origin, receipt, delivery, sale, movement, holding, and disposition of food or ingredients;

(B) the identity and quantity of ingredients used in the food;

(C) the processing of the food;

(D) the results of laboratory, sanitation, or other tests performed on the food or in the food facility;

(E) consumer complaints concerning the food or packaging of the food;

(F) the production codes, open date codes, and locations of food production; and

(G) other matters reasonably related to whether food is unsafe, is adulterated or misbranded, or otherwise fails to meet the requirements of this Act.

(h) **PROTECTION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall develop and maintain procedures to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any trade secret or confidential information obtained by the Administrator.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The requirement under this subsection does not—

(A) limit the authority of the Administrator to inspect or copy records or to require the facility or maintenance of records under this Act;

(B) have any legal effect on section 1905 of title 18, United States Code;

(C) extend to any food recipe, financial data, pricing data, personnel data, or sales data (other than shipment dates relating to sales);

(D) limit the public disclosure of distribution records or other records related to food subject to a voluntary or mandatory recall under section 402; or

(E) limit the authority of the Administrator to promulgate regulations to permit the sharing of data with other governmental authorities.

(i) **BRIBERY OF OR GIFTS TO INSPECTOR OR OTHER OFFICERS AND ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.**—Section 22 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 622) shall apply under this Act.

SEC. 206. FOOD PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENTS.

In carrying out the duties of the Administrator and the purposes of this Act, the Administrator shall have the authority, with respect to food production establishments, to—

(1) visit and inspect food production establishments in the United States and in foreign countries for food safety purposes;

(2) review food safety records as needed to carry out traceback and for other food safety purposes;

(3) set good practice standards to protect the public and promote food safety;

(4) partner with appropriate agencies to monitor animals, plants, products, or the environment, as appropriate; and

(5) collect and maintain information relevant to public health and farm practices.

SEC. 207. FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall work with the States to carry out activities and programs that create a national food safety program so that Federal and State programs function in a coordinated and cost-effective manner.

(b) **STATE ACTION.**—The Administrator shall work with States to—

(1) continue, strengthen, or establish State food safety programs, especially with respect to the regulation of retail commercial food establishments, transportation, harvesting, and fresh markets;

(2) continue, strengthen, or establish inspection programs and requirements to ensure that food under the jurisdiction of the State is safe; and

(3) support recall authorities at the State and local levels.

(c) **ASSISTANCE.**—To assist in planning, developing, and implementing a food safety program, the Administrator may provide to a State—

(1) advisory assistance;

(2) technical and laboratory assistance and training (including necessary materials and equipment); and

(3) financial assistance, in kind, and other aid.

(d) **SERVICE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may, under agreements entered into with Federal, State, or local agencies, use on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, the personnel and services of those agencies in carrying out this Act.

(2) **TRAINING.**—Agreements with a State under this subsection may provide for training of State employees.

(3) **MAINTENANCE OF AGREEMENTS.**—The Administrator shall maintain any agreement that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act until the Administrator evaluates such agreement and determines whether to maintain or substitute such agreement.

(e) **AUDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall annually conduct a comprehensive review of each State program that provides services to the Administrator in carrying out the responsibilities under this Act, including mandated inspections under section 205.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The review shall—

(A) include a determination of the effectiveness of the State program; and

(B) identify any changes necessary to ensure enforcement of Federal requirements under this Act.

(f) **NO FEDERAL PREEMPTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preempt the enforcement of State food safety laws and standards that are at least as stringent as those under this Act.

SEC. 208. FOREIGN SUPPLIER VERIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall require that each importer of products from a feed facility, food facility, or food producer establishment be in compliance with the foreign supplier verification program requirements under section 805 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384a).

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—In applying subsection (a) with respect to products subject to the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.), or the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.), references in section 805 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384a) to sections 402, 403(w), 418, and 419 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 342, 343(w), 350g, and 350h) shall be construed to be references to the corresponding provisions of the food safety law, if any, that apply to such products, as determined by the Administrator.

(c) **REPEAL OF EXEMPTIONS.**—Subsection (e) of section 805 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 384a) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 209. IMPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the effective date of this Act, the Administrator shall establish a system under which a foreign government seeking to certify food for importation into the United States shall submit a request for accreditation to the Administrator.

(b) **ACCREDITATION STANDARD.**—A foreign government requesting to be accredited to certify food for importation into the United States shall demonstrate, in a manner determined appropriate by the Administrator, that the foreign government (or an agency thereof) is capable of adequately ensuring that eligible entities or foods certified by such government (or agency) meet the requirements of the food safety law.

(c) **REQUEST BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.**—Prior to granting accreditation to a foreign government under this section, the Administrator shall review and audit the food safety program of the requesting foreign government and certify that such program (including all statutes, regulations, and inspection authority) meets the standard specified in subsection (b).

(d) **LIMITATIONS.**—Any accreditation of a foreign government under this section shall—

(1) specify the foods covered by the accreditation; and

(2) be limited to a period not to exceed 5 years.

(e) **WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION.**—The Administrator may withdraw accreditation fully or partially from a foreign government if the Administrator finds that—

(1) food covered by the accreditation is linked to an outbreak of human illness;

(2) the programs or procedures of the foreign government no longer meet the standards of the food safety programs and procedures of the United States; or

(3) the foreign government refuses to allow United States officials to conduct such audits and investigations as may be necessary to fulfill the requirements under this section.

(f) **RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION.**—The Administrator shall audit foreign governments accredited under this section at least every 5 years to ensure the continued compliance by such governments with the standard set forth in subsection (b).

(g) **REQUIRED ROUTINE INSPECTION.**—The Administrator shall routinely inspect food or

food animals by physical examination before the food or food animals enter the United States to ensure that the food or food animals—

(1) are safe;

(2) are labeled as required for food produced in the United States; and

(3) otherwise meet the requirements of the food safety law.

(h) **ENFORCEMENT.**—The Administrator may—

(1) deny importation of food from any country if the country's government does not permit United States officials to enter the country to conduct such audits and inspections as may be necessary to fulfill the requirements under this section;

(2) deny importation of food from any country or foreign facility that does not consent to an investigation by the Administrator when food from that country or foreign facility is linked to a foodborne illness outbreak or is otherwise found to be adulterated or mislabeled; and

(3) promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including setting terms and conditions for the destruction of products that fail to meet the standards of the food safety law.

(i) **DETENTION AND SEIZURE.**—Any food imported for consumption in the United States that fails to meet the standards of the food safety law may be detained, seized, or condemned.

SEC. 210. TRACEBACK.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator, in order to protect the public health, shall establish requirements for a national system for tracing food, animals, or ingredients from point of origin to retail sale, subject to subsection (b).

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—Traceability requirements shall—

(1) be established in accordance with regulations and guidelines issued by the Administrator; and

(2) apply to food production establishments and food facilities.

SEC. 211. FOOD SAFETY TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish and implement a program, to be known as the Food Safety Technology Program, to foster innovation in food technologies and foods that have the potential to improve food safety at the point of production, processing, transport, storage, or final preparation.

(b) **PROGRAM DESCRIBED.**—The program under this section shall consist of technical guidance to and consultation with technology developers to assist them in meeting requirements for approval of technologies and products described in subsection (a).

TITLE III—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION**SEC. 301. PUBLIC HEALTH ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator, acting in coordination with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and with the Research Education and Economics mission area of the Department of Agriculture, shall—

(1) have access to the applicable data systems of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and to the databases made available by a State;

(2) partner with relevant agencies to maintain or access an active surveillance system of food and epidemiological evidence submitted by States to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention based on a representative proportion of the population of the United States;

(3) assess the frequency and sources of human illness in the United States associated with the consumption of food;

(4) partner with relevant agencies to maintain or access a state-of-the-art partial or full genome sequencing system and epidemiological system dedicated to foodborne illness identification, outbreaks, and containment; and

(5) have access to the surveillance data created via monitoring and statistical studies conducted as part of its own inspection.

(b) **PUBLIC HEALTH SAMPLING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of this Act, the Administrator shall establish guidelines for a sampling system under which the Administrator shall take and analyze samples of food—

(A) to assist the Administrator in carrying out this Act; and

(B) to assess the nature, frequency of occurrence, and quantities of contaminants in food.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The sampling system described in paragraph (1) shall provide—

(A) statistically valid monitoring, including market-based studies, on the nature, frequency of occurrence, and quantities of contaminants in food available to consumers; and

(B) at the request of the Administrator, such other information, including analysis of monitoring and verification samples, as the Administrator determines may be useful in assessing the occurrence of contaminants in food.

(c) **ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH HAZARDS.**—Through the surveillance system referred to in subsection (a), the sampling system described in subsection (b), and other available data, the Administrator shall—

(1) rank food categories based on the hazard to human health presented by the food category;

(2) identify appropriate industry and regulatory approaches to minimize hazards in the food supply; and

(3) assess the public health environment for emerging diseases, including zoonosis, for their risk of appearance in the United States food supply.

SEC. 302. PUBLIC EDUCATION AND ADVISORY SYSTEM.

(a) **PUBLIC EDUCATION.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) in cooperation with private and public organizations, including the cooperative extension services and building on the efforts of appropriate State and local entities, establish a national public education program on food safety; and

(2) coordinate with other Federal departments and agencies to integrate food safety messaging into all food-related agricultural, nutrition, and health promotion programs.

(b) **HEALTH ADVISORIES.**—The Administrator, in consultation with such other Federal departments and agencies as the Administrator determines necessary, shall work with the States and other appropriate entities—

(1) to develop and distribute regional and national advisories concerning food safety;

(2) to develop standardized formats for written and broadcast advisories;

(3) to incorporate State and local advisories into the national public education program established under subsection (a); and

(4) to present prompt, specific information regarding foods found to pose a threat to the public health.

SEC. 303. RESEARCH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall conduct research to carry out this Act, including studies to—

(1) improve sanitation and food safety practices in the processing of food;

(2) develop improved techniques to monitor and inspect food;

(3) develop efficient, rapid, and sensitive methods to detect contaminants in food;

(4) determine the sources of contamination of contaminated food;

(5) develop food consumption data;

(6) identify ways that animal production techniques could improve the safety of the food supply;

(7) draw upon research and educational programs that exist at the State and local level;

(8) determine the food safety education needs of vulnerable populations, including children less than 10 years of age, pregnant women, adults 65 years of age and older, and individuals with compromised immune systems;

(9) utilize the partial or full genome sequencing system and other processes to identify and control pathogens;

(10) address common and emerging zoonotic diseases;

(11) develop methods to reduce or destroy harmful pathogens before, during, and after processing;

(12) analyze the incidence of antibiotic resistance as it pertains to the food supply and develop new methods to reduce infection by antibiotic resistant bacteria in humans and animals; and

(13) conduct other research that supports the purposes of this Act.

(b) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—The Administrator may enter into contracts and agreements with any State, university, Federal Government agency, or person to carry out this section.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. PROHIBITED ACTS.

It is prohibited—

(1) to manufacture, introduce, deliver for introduction, or receive into interstate commerce any food that is adulterated, misbranded, or otherwise unsafe;

(2) to adulterate or misbrand any food in interstate commerce;

(3) for a food facility or foreign food facility to fail to register under section 202, or to operate without a valid registration;

(4) to refuse to permit access to a food facility for the inspection and copying of a record as required under section 205(g);

(5) to fail to establish or maintain any record or to make any report as required under section 205(g);

(6) to refuse to permit entry to or inspection of a food facility as required under section 205;

(7) to fail to provide to the Administrator the results of a testing or sampling of a food, equipment, or material in contact with contaminated food under section 205(g)(1)(B);

(8) to fail to comply with an applicable provision of, or a regulation or order of the Administrator under, section 202, 204, or 208;

(9) to slaughter an animal that is capable for use in whole or in part as human food at a food facility processing any such food for commerce, except in compliance with the food safety law;

(10) to fail to comply with a recall or other order under section 402; or

(11) to otherwise violate the food safety law.

SEC. 402. MANDATORY RECALL AUTHORITY.

(a) **VOLUNTARY PROCEDURES.**—If the Administrator determines that there is a reasonable probability that an article of food (other than infant formula) is adulterated or misbranded and the use of or exposure to such article will cause serious adverse health consequences or death to humans or animals,

the Administrator shall provide the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the facility that created, caused, or was otherwise responsible for such food with an opportunity to cease distribution and recall such article.

(b) **PREHEARING ORDER TO CEASE DISTRIBUTION AND GIVE NOTICE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the facility refuses to or does not voluntarily cease distribution or recall such article within the time and in the manner prescribed by the Administrator (if so prescribed), the Administrator may by order require, as the Administrator deems necessary, such person to—

(A) immediately cease distribution of such article;

(B) as applicable, immediately notify all persons manufacturing, processing, packing, transporting, distributing, receiving, holding, or importing and selling such article; and

(C) to which such article has been distributed, transported, or sold, immediately cease distribution of such article.

(2) **REQUIRED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If an article of food covered by a recall order issued under paragraph (1)(B) has been distributed to a warehouse-based, third-party logistics provider without providing such provider sufficient information to know or reasonably determine the precise identity of the article of food covered by a recall order that is in its possession, the notice provided by the responsible party subject to the order issued under paragraph (1)(B) shall include such information as is necessary for the warehouse-based, third-party logistics provider to identify the food.

(B) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed—

(i) to exempt a warehouse-based, third-party logistics provider from the requirements of food safety law; or

(ii) to exempt a warehouse-based, third-party logistics provider from being the subject of a mandatory recall order.

(3) **DETERMINATION TO LIMIT AREAS AFFECTED.**—If the Administrator requires an owner, operator, or agent in charge of the facility to cease distribution under paragraph (1)(A) of an article of food identified in subsection (a), the Administrator may limit the size of the geographic area and the markets affected by such cessation if such limitation would not compromise the public health.

(c) **HEARING ON ORDER.**—The Administrator shall provide the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the facility subject to an order under subsection (b) with an opportunity for an informal hearing, to be held as soon as possible, but not later than 2 days after the issuance of the order, on the actions required by the order and on why the article that is the subject of the order should not be recalled.

(d) **POST-HEARING RECALL ORDER AND MODIFICATION OF ORDER.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT OF ORDER.**—If, after providing opportunity for an informal hearing under subsection (c), the Administrator determines that removal of the article from commerce is necessary, the Administrator shall, as appropriate—

(A) amend the order to require recall of such article or other appropriate action;

(B) specify a timetable in which the recall shall occur;

(C) require periodic reports to the Administrator describing the progress of the recall; and

(D) provide notice to consumers to whom such article was, or may have been, distributed.

(2) **VACATING OF ORDER.**—If, after such hearing, the Administrator determines that adequate grounds do not exist to continue the actions required by the order, or that such actions should be modified, the Administrator shall vacate the order or modify the order.

(e) **RULE REGARDING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES.**—The Administrator shall not initiate a mandatory recall or take any other action under this section with respect to any alcohol beverage until the Administrator has provided the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau with a reasonable opportunity to cease distribution and recall such article under the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau's authority.

(f) **COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION.**—The Administrator shall work with State and local public health officials in carrying out this section, as appropriate.

(g) **PUBLIC NOTIFICATION.**—In conducting a recall under this section, the Administrator shall—

(1) ensure that a press release is published regarding the recall, as well as alerts and public notices, as appropriate, in order to provide notification—

(A) of the recall to consumers and retailers to whom such article was, or may have been, distributed; and

(B) that includes, at a minimum—

(i) the name of the article of food subject to the recall;

(ii) a description of the risk associated with such article; and

(iii) to the extent practicable, information for consumers about similar articles of food that are not affected by the recall;

(2) provide to the public a list of retail consignees receiving products for which there is determined to be a reasonable probability that eating the food will cause serious adverse health consequences or death to humans or animals; and

(3) if available, publish on the Internet website of the Administration an image of the article that is the subject of the press release described in paragraph (1).

(h) **NO DELEGATION.**—The authority conferred by this section to order a recall or vacate a recall order shall not be delegated to any officer or employee other than the Administrator.

(i) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the Administrator to request or participate in a voluntary recall, or to issue an order to cease distribution or to recall under any other provision of the food safety law or under the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

(j) **COORDINATED COMMUNICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To assist in carrying out the requirements of this subsection, the Administrator shall establish an incident command operation or a similar operation that will operate not later than 24 hours after the initiation of a mandatory recall or the recall of an article of food for which the use of, or exposure to, such article will cause serious adverse health consequences or death to humans or animals.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To reduce the potential for miscommunication during recalls or regarding investigations of a foodborne illness outbreak associated with a food that is subject to a recall, each incident command operation or similar operation under paragraph (1) shall use regular staff and resources of the Administration to—

(A) ensure timely and coordinated communication within the Administration, including enhanced communication and coordination between different agencies and organizations within the Administration;

(B) ensure timely and coordinated communication from the Administration, including public statements, throughout the duration of the investigation and related foodborne illness outbreak;

(C) identify a single point of contact within the Administration for public inquiries regarding any actions by the Administrator related to a recall;

(D) coordinate with Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities, as appropriate, that have responsibilities related to the recall of a food or a foodborne illness outbreak associated with a food that is subject to the recall, including notification of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Education in the event such recalled food is a commodity intended for use in a child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f(b))); and

(E) conclude operations at such time as the Administrator determines appropriate.

(3) **MULTIPLE RECALLS.**—The Administrator may establish multiple or concurrent incident command operations or similar operations in the event of multiple recalls or foodborne illness outbreaks.

(4) **FEEs APPLICABLE TO ALL FACILITIES.**—Fees described in section 743 of Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-31) for not complying with a recall order are applicable to all food facilities under this Act as if—

(A) the term “responsible party” means “owner, operator, or agent in charge of the facility”; and

(B) references to section 423 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350l) are references to section 402 of this Act.

SEC. 403. INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS.

(a) **JURISDICTION.**—The district courts of the United States, and the United States courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain a violation of section 202, 203, 204, 207, or 401 (or a regulation promulgated under that section).

(b) **TRIAL.**—In a case in which violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section also constitutes a violation of the food safety law, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury.

SEC. 404. CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

(a) **CIVIL SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person that commits an act that violates the food safety law may be assessed a civil penalty by the Administrator of not more than \$10,000 for each such act.

(B) **SEPARATE OFFENSE.**—Each act described in subparagraph (A) and each day during which that act continues shall be considered a separate offense.

(2) **OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **WRITTEN ORDER.**—The civil penalty described in paragraph (1) shall be assessed by the Administrator by a written order, which shall specify the amount of the penalty and the basis for the penalty under subparagraph (B) considered by the Administrator.

(B) **AMOUNT OF PENALTY.**—Subject to paragraph (1)(A), the amount of the civil penalty shall be determined by the Administrator, after considering—

- (i) the gravity of the violation;
- (ii) the degree of culpability of the person;
- (iii) the size and type of the business of the person; and
- (iv) any history of prior offenses by the person under the food safety law.

(C) **REVIEW OF ORDER.**—The order may be reviewed only in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) **CRIMINAL SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), a person that knowingly produces or introduces into commerce food that is unsafe or otherwise adulterated or misbranded shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year or fined not more than \$10,000, or both.

(2) **SEVERE VIOLATIONS.**—A person that commits a violation described in paragraph (1) after a conviction of that person under this section has become final, or commits such a violation with the intent to defraud or mislead, shall be imprisoned for not more than 3 years or fined not more than \$100,000, or both.

(3) **EXCEPTION.**—No person shall be subject to the penalties of this subsection—

(A) for having received, proffered, or delivered in interstate commerce any food, if the receipt, proffer, or delivery was made in good faith, unless that person refuses to furnish (on request of an officer or employee designated by the Administrator)—

(i) the name, address, and contact information of the person from whom that person purchased or received the food;

(ii) copies of all documents relating to the person from whom that person purchased or received the food; and

(iii) copies of all documents pertaining to the delivery of the food to that person; or

(B) if that person establishes a guaranty signed by, and containing the name and address of, the person from whom that person received in good faith the food, stating that the food is not adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this Act.

(c) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An order assessing a civil penalty under subsection (a) shall be a final order unless the person—

(A) not later than 30 days after the effective date of the order, files a petition for judicial review of the order in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which that person resides or has its principal place of business or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; and

(B) simultaneously serves a copy of the petition by certified mail to the Administrator.

(2) **FILING OF RECORD.**—Not later than 45 days after the service of a copy of the petition under paragraph (1)(B), the Administrator shall file in the court a certified copy of the administrative record upon which the order was issued.

(3) **STANDARD OF REVIEW.**—The findings of the Administrator relating to the order shall be set aside only if found to be unsupported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole.

(d) **COLLECTION ACTIONS FOR FAILURE TO PAY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If any person fails to pay a civil penalty assessed under subsection (a) after the order assessing the penalty has become a final order, or after the court of appeals described in subsection (b) has entered final judgment in favor of the Administrator, the Administrator shall refer the matter to the Attorney General, who shall institute in a United States district court of competent jurisdiction a civil action to recover the amount assessed.

(2) **LIMITATION ON REVIEW.**—In a civil action under paragraph (1), the validity and appropriateness of the order of the Administrator assessing the civil penalty shall not be subject to judicial review.

(e) **PENALTIES PAID INTO ACCOUNT.**—The Administrator—

(1) shall deposit penalties collected under this section in an account in the Treasury; and

(2) may use the funds in the account, without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation—

(A) to carry out enforcement activities under food safety law; or

(B) to provide assistance to States to inspect retail commercial food establishments or other food or firms under the jurisdiction of State food safety programs.

(f) **DISCRETION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO PROSECUTE.**—Nothing in this Act requires the Administrator to report for prosecution, or for the commencement of an action, the violation of the food safety law in a case in which the Administrator finds that the public interest will be adequately served by the assessment of a civil penalty under this section.

(g) **REMEDIES NOT EXCLUSIVE.**—The remedies provided in this section may be in addition to, and not exclusive of, other remedies that may be available.

SEC. 405. PRESUMPTION.

In any action to enforce the requirements of the food safety law, the connection with interstate commerce required for jurisdiction shall be presumed to exist.

SEC. 406. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.

Section 1012 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 399d) shall apply with respect to any violation of, or any act or omission an employee reasonably believes to be a violation of, any provision of this Act to the same extent and in the same manner as such section 1012 applies with respect to a violation of, or any act or omission an employee reasonably believes to be a violation of, any provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

SEC. 407. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For the efficient administration and enforcement of the food safety law, the provisions (including provisions relating to penalties) of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 46, 48, 49, and 50) (except subsections (c) through (h) of section 6 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 46)), relating to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General to administer and enforce that Act, and to the rights and duties of persons with respect to whom the powers are exercised, shall apply to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Administrator and the Attorney General in administering and enforcing the provisions of the food safety law and to the rights and duties of persons with respect to whom the powers are exercised, respectively.

(b) **INQUIRIES AND ACTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator, in person or by such agents as the Administrator may designate, may prosecute any inquiry necessary to carry out the duties of the Administrator under the food safety law in any part of the United States.

(2) **POWERS.**—The powers conferred by sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 49, 50) on the United States district courts may be exercised for the purposes of this chapter by any United States district court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 408. CITIZEN CIVIL ACTIONS.

(a) **CIVIL ACTIONS.**—A person may commence a civil action against—

(1) a person that violates a regulation (including a regulation establishing a performance standard), order, or other action of the

Administrator to ensure the safety of food; or

(2) the Administrator (in his or her capacity as the Administrator), if the Administrator fails to perform an act or duty to ensure the safety of food that is not discretionary under the food safety law.

(b) COURT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The action shall be commenced in the United States district court for the district in which the defendant resides, is found, or has an agent.

(2) JURISDICTION.—The court shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties, to enforce a regulation (including a regulation establishing a performance standard), order, or other action of the Administrator, or to order the Administrator to perform the act or duty.

(3) DAMAGES.—The court may—

(A) award damages, in the amount of damages actually sustained; and

(B) if the court determines it to be in the interest of justice, award the plaintiff the costs of suit, including reasonable attorney's fees, reasonable expert witness fees, and penalties.

(c) REMEDIES NOT EXCLUSIVE.—The remedies provided for in this section shall be in addition to, and not exclusive of, other remedies that may be available.

TITLE V—IMPLEMENTATION

SEC. 501. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this title, the term “transition period” means the 12-month period beginning on the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 502. REORGANIZATION PLAN.

(a) SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this Act, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a reorganization plan regarding the following:

(1) The transfer of agencies, personnel, assets, and obligations to the Administration pursuant to this Act.

(2) Any consolidation, reorganization, or streamlining of agencies transferred to the Administration pursuant to this Act.

(b) PLAN ELEMENTS.—The plan transmitted under subsection (a) shall contain, consistent with this Act, such elements as the President determines appropriate, including the following:

(1) Identification of any functions of agencies designated to be transferred to the Administration pursuant to this Act that will not be transferred to the Administration under the plan.

(2) Specification of the steps to be taken by the Administrator to organize the Administration, including the delegation or assignment of functions transferred to the Administration among the officers of the Administration in order to permit the Administration to carry out the functions transferred under the plan.

(3) Specification of the funds available to each agency that will be transferred to the Administration as a result of transfers under the plan.

(4) Specification of the proposed allocations within the Administration of unexpended funds transferred in connection with transfers under the plan.

(5) Specification of any proposed disposition of property, facilities, contracts, records, and other assets and obligations of agencies transferred under the plan.

(6) Specification of the proposed allocations within the Administration of the functions of the agencies and subdivisions that are not related directly to ensuring the safety of food.

(c) MODIFICATION OF PLAN.—The President may, on the basis of consultations with the appropriate congressional committees, modify or revise any part of the plan until that part of the plan becomes effective in accordance with subsection (d).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The reorganization plan described in this section, including any modifications or revisions of the plan under subsection (c), shall become effective for an agency on the earlier of—

(A) the date specified in the plan (or the plan as modified pursuant to subsection (c)), except that such date may not be earlier than 90 days after the date the President has transmitted the reorganization plan to the appropriate congressional committees pursuant to subsection (a); or

(B) the end of the transition period.

(2) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to require the transfer of functions, personnel, records, balances of appropriations, or other assets of an agency on a single date.

(3) SUPERCEDES EXISTING LAW.—Paragraph (1) shall apply notwithstanding section 905(b) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 503. TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITIES.

(a) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE BY OFFICIALS.—Until the transfer of an agency to the Administration, any official having authority over or function relating to the agency immediately before the effective date of this Act shall provide the Administrator such assistance, including the use of personnel and assets, as the Administrator may request in preparing for the transfer and integration of the agency to the Administration.

(b) SERVICES AND PERSONNEL.—During the transition period, upon the request of the Administrator, the head of any Executive agency may, on a reimbursable basis, provide services or detail personnel to assist with the transition.

(c) ACTING OFFICIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the transition period, pending the advice and consent of the Senate to the appointment of an officer required by this Act to be appointed by and with such advice and consent, the President may designate any officer whose appointment was required to be made by and with such advice and consent and who was such an officer immediately before the effective date of this Act (and who continues to be in office) or immediately before such designation, to act in such office until the same is filled as provided in this Act.

(2) COMPENSATION.—While acting pursuant to paragraph (1), such officers shall receive compensation at the higher of—

(A) the rates provided by this Act for the respective offices in which they act; or

(B) the rates provided for the offices held at the time of designation.

(3) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the advice and consent of the Senate to the appointment by the President to a position in the Administration of any officer whose agency is transferred to the Administration pursuant to this Act and whose duties following such transfer are germane to those performed before such transfer.

(d) TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL, ASSETS, OBLIGATIONS, AND FUNCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with section 1531 of title 31, United States Code, the personnel, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds that relate to the functions

transferred under subsection (a) from a Federal agency shall be transferred to the Administration.

(2) UNEXPENDED FUNDS.—Unexpended funds transferred under this subsection shall be used by the Administration only for the purposes for which the funds were originally authorized and appropriated.

SEC. 504. SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

(a) COMPLETED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—The enactment of this Act or the transfer of functions under this Act shall not affect any order, determination, rule, regulation, permit, personnel action, agreement, grant, contract, certificate, license, registration, privilege, or other administrative action issued, made, granted, or otherwise in effect or final with respect to that agency on the day before the transfer date with respect to the transferred functions.

(b) PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—Subject to the authority of the Administrator under this Act—

(1) pending proceedings in an agency, including notices of proposed rulemaking, and applications for licenses, permits, certificates, grants, and financial assistance, shall continue notwithstanding the enactment of this Act or the transfer of the agency to the Administration, unless discontinued or modified under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such discontinuance could have occurred if such enactment or transfer had not occurred; and

(2) orders issued in such proceedings, and appeals from those orders, and payments made pursuant to such orders, shall be issued in the same manner on the same terms as if this Act had not been enacted or the agency had not been transferred, and any such order shall continue in effect until amended, modified, superceded, terminated, set aside, or revoked by an officer of the United States or a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(c) PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.—Subject to the authority of the Administrator under this Act, any civil action commenced with regard to that agency pending before that agency on the day before the transfer date with respect to the transferred functions shall continue notwithstanding the enactment of this Act or the transfer of an agency to the Administration.

(d) REFERENCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the transfer of functions from a Federal agency under this Act, any reference in any other Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, directive, document, or other material to that Federal agency or the head of that agency in connection with the administration or enforcement of the food safety laws shall be deemed to be a reference to the Administration or the Administrator, respectively.

(2) STATUTORY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Statutory reporting requirements that applied in relation to such an agency immediately before the effective date of this Act shall continue to apply following such transfer if the reporting requirements refer to the agency by name.

SEC. 505. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Administrator of Food Safety.”.

SEC. 506. ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Not later than 60 days after the submission of the reorganization plan under section 502,

the President shall prepare and submit proposed legislation to Congress containing necessary and appropriate technical and conforming amendments to any food safety law to reflect the changes made by this Act.

SEC. 507. REGULATIONS.

The Administrator may promulgate such regulations as the Administrator determines are necessary or appropriate to perform the duties of the Administrator.

SEC. 508. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 509. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For the fiscal year that includes the effective date of this Act, the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act shall not exceed—

(1) the amount appropriated for that fiscal year for the Federal agencies identified in section 102(b) for the purpose of administering or enforcing the food safety law; or

(2) the amount appropriated for those agencies for that purpose for the preceding fiscal year, if, as of the effective date of this Act, appropriations for those agencies for the fiscal year that includes the effective date have not yet been made.

SEC. 510. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 288. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the NLRB Reform Act with Senator MCCONNELL.

Our legislation will change the National Labor Relations Board from an advocate to an umpire.

The board was created 80 years ago to act as an impartial umpire in labor disputes that threaten the free flow of commerce.

The board's decisions affect about 85 million private-sector workers and 5.7 million private-sector employers.

But over time, the board has become an advocate for one interest group over the other—changing positions with each new administration.

There are three significant problems the board faces today:

First, the biggest problem is partisan advocacy. Today, the majority of the 5-member board is made up of appointees who follow the president's political leanings. President Obama has appointed 3 labor union lawyers to the board.

Second, the board has a freewheeling advocate for a general counsel. The board's most recent general counsels have been exceeding their statutory authority and bringing questionable cases that threaten American jobs.

Third, it is too slow to resolve disputes. Right now, 145 cases, that is 32 percent of the board's caseload, have been pending for more than a year.

Our bill provides three fixes.

First, it ends partisan advocacy. A 6-member board of 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats and a majority of 4 will require both sides to find a middle ground.

Second, it reins in the general counsel. Businesses and unions would be able to challenge complaints filed by the General Counsel in Federal district court, and they will have greater transparency about the basis and legal reasoning of charges brought by the General Counsel.

Third, it encourages timely decisions in two ways. First, either party in a case before the board may appeal to a Federal Court of Appeals if the board fails to reach a decision in their case within one year.

Second, funding for the entire NLRB would be reduced by 20 percent if the board is not able to decide 90 percent of its cases within one year over the first 2-year period post-reform.

Our bill would offer these solutions without taking away rights or remedies for any employee, business, or union.

While the increasing partisanship at the board has occurred in Republican administrations as well as Democrat administrations, it has reached a climax in this administration.

Three of President Obama's recent nominees came to the board from a major labor union's leadership.

One labor law professor at a major university recently said that she can't even use the most recent textbook, instead she has to resort to handing out NLRB decisions. The decisions are coming out so rapidly and this NLRB is venturing into new territory with efforts at rulemaking.

This is no way to maintain a national labor law policy.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 289. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 289

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Cures Act".

SEC. 2. CAP ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit

Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

“(D) BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.—

“(i) NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the National Institutes of Health at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$1,741,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$3,422,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$5,167,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$7,085,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$9,149,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$11,435,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(ii) CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$716,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,287,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$1,503,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,980,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$2,298,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$2,884,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(iii) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the Department of Defense health program, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$57,402,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$139,213,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$226,460,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$322,742,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$425,700,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$540,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(iv) MEDICAL AND PROSTHETICS RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the medical and prosthetics research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$25,201,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$52,945,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$80,866,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$112,189,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$146,157,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$184,027,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(v) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subparagraph:

“(I) ADDITIONAL NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The term ‘additional new budget authority’ means—

“(aa) with respect to the National Institutes of Health, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the National Institutes of Health;

“(bb) with respect to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

“(cc) with respect to the Department of Defense health program, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the Department of Defense health program; and

“(dd) with respect to the medical and prosthetics research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the medical and prosthetics research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(II) CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—The term ‘Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

“(III) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.—The term ‘Department of Defense health program’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the Department of Defense health program.

“(IV) MEDICAL AND PROSTHETICS RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—The term ‘medical and prosthetics research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the medical and prosthetics research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(V) NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.—The term ‘National Institutes of Health’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the National Institutes of Health.”.

(b) FUNDING.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

(1) for the National Institutes of Health, the amounts provided for under clause (i) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year;

(2) for the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the amounts provided for under clause (ii) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year;

(3) for the Department of Defense health program, the amounts provided for under clause (iii) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year; and

(4) for the Medical and prosthetics research program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the amounts provided for under clause (iv) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.

(c) MINIMUM CONTINUED FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—Amounts appropriated for each of the programs and agencies described in section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as added by subsection (a)) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and each subsequent fiscal year, shall not be less than the amounts appropriated for such programs and agencies for fiscal year 2015.

(d) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds (16-0327-0-1-600).” the following:

“Appropriations under the American Cures Act.”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRUZ, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 292. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 292

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “21st Century Endangered Species Transparency Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT TO PUBLISH ON INTERNET BASIS FOR LISTINGS.

Section 4(b) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) PUBLICATION ON INTERNET OF BASIS FOR LISTINGS.—The Secretary shall make publicly available on the Internet the best scientific and commercial data available that are the basis for each regulation, including each proposed regulation, promulgated under subsection (a)(1), except that, at the request of a Governor or legislature of a State, the Secretary shall not make available under

this paragraph information regarding which the State has determined public disclosure is prohibited by a law of that State relating to the protection of personal information.”.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VITTER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 293. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532) is amended—

(1) by redesignating—

(A) paragraphs (1) through (4) as paragraphs (2) through (5), respectively;

(B) paragraphs (5) through (10) as paragraphs (7) through (12), respectively; and

(C) paragraphs (12) through (21) as paragraphs (13) through (22), respectively;

(2) by adding before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) AFFECTED PARTIES.—The term ‘affected party’ means any person, including a business entity, or any State, tribal government, or local subdivision the rights of which may be affected by a determination made under section 4(a) in a suit brought under section 11(g)(1)(C).”; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(6) COVERED SETTLEMENT.—The term ‘covered settlement’ means a consent decree or a settlement agreement in an action brought under section 11(g)(1)(C).”.

SEC. 2. INTERVENTION; APPROVAL OF COVERED SETTLEMENT.

Section 11(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PUBLISHING COMPLAINT; INTERVENTION.—

“(i) PUBLISHING COMPLAINT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the plaintiff serves the defendant with the complaint in an action brought under paragraph (1)(C) in accordance with Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish the complaint in a readily accessible manner, including electronically.

“(II) FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINE.—The failure of the Secretary to meet the 30-day deadline described in subclause (I) shall not be the basis for an action under paragraph (1)(C).

“(ii) INTERVENTION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—After the end of the 30-day period described in clause (i), each affected party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to move to intervene in the action described in clause (i), until the end of which a party may not file a motion for a consent

decree or to dismiss the case pursuant to a settlement agreement.

“(II) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—In considering a motion to intervene by any affected party, the court shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that the interests of that party would not be represented adequately by the parties to the action described in clause (i).

“(III) REFERRAL TO ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—If the court grants a motion to intervene in the action, the court shall refer the action to facilitate settlement discussions to—

“(AA) the mediation program of the court; or

“(BB) a magistrate judge.

“(bb) PARTIES INCLUDED IN SETTLEMENT DISCUSSIONS.—The settlement discussions described in item (aa) shall include each—

“(AA) plaintiff;

“(BB) defendant agency; and

“(CC) intervenor.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) LITIGATION COSTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the court, in issuing any final order in any suit brought under paragraph (1), may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such award is appropriate.

“(B) COVERED SETTLEMENT.—

“(i) CONSENT DECREES.—The court shall not award costs of litigation in any proposed covered settlement that is a consent decree.

“(ii) OTHER COVERED SETTLEMENTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For a proposed covered settlement other than a consent decree, the court shall ensure that the covered settlement does not include payment to any plaintiff for the costs of litigation.

“(II) MOTIONS.—The court shall not grant any motion, including a motion to dismiss, based on the proposed covered settlement described in subclause (I) if the covered settlement includes payment to any plaintiff for the costs of litigation.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) APPROVAL OF COVERED SETTLEMENT.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF SPECIES.—In this paragraph, the term ‘species’ means a species that is the subject of an action brought under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) CONSENT DECREES.—The court shall not approve a proposed covered settlement that is a consent decree unless each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs approves the covered settlement.

“(ii) OTHER COVERED SETTLEMENTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For a proposed covered settlement other than a consent decree, the court shall ensure that the covered settlement is approved by each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

“(II) MOTIONS.—The court shall not grant any motion, including a motion to dismiss, based on the proposed covered settlement described in subclause (I) unless the covered settlement is approved by each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

“(C) NOTICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall provide each State and county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs notice of a proposed covered settlement.

“(ii) DETERMINATION OF RELEVANT STATES AND COUNTIES.—The defendant in a covered

settlement shall consult with each State described in clause (i) to determine each county in which the Secretary of the Interior believes a species occurs.

“(D) FAILURE TO RESPOND.—The court may approve a covered settlement or grant a motion described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) if, not later than 45 days after the date on which a State or county is notified under subparagraph (C)—

“(i)(I) a State or county fails to respond; and

“(II) of the States or counties that respond, each State or county approves the covered settlement; or

“(ii) all of the States and counties fail to respond.

“(E) PROOF OF APPROVAL.—The defendant in a covered settlement shall prove any State or county approval described in this paragraph in a form—

“(i) acceptable to the State or county, as applicable; and

“(ii) signed by the State or county official authorized to approve the covered settlement.”.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 295. A bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help victims of child pornography, one of society's most heinous crimes. I am joined by 34 Senators on both sides of the aisle. I hope this legislation will soon become law.

Sexually exploiting a child distorts her life and leaves scars long after the abuse itself ends and the abuser has been prosecuted. For this reason, the Violence Against Women Act includes a provision requiring that in such cases a defendant must pay restitution to cover all of the victim's losses. Those losses can include future lost income as well as medical care, mental health counseling, and therapy.

Child pornography isn't merely the record of a child's sexual abuse, it is itself an instance of abuse. The ongoing trafficking and those images pile harm upon harm. As a result, it becomes even more difficult for a victim to put together a life that was shattered before it had barely begun.

As the Supreme Court has recognized, “every viewing of child pornography is a repetition of the victim's abuse.” The current restitution statute

was enacted in 1994, before the Internet became prime real estate for trafficking of child pornography.

It puts victims in an impossible bind. In a case decided last spring, the Supreme Court said the current restitution statute requires the victim to prove how much of her losses were specifically caused by a single defendant's possession of her images. With a burden like that, it is no wonder that under this statute victims receive no restitution at all in more than three-quarters of child pornography cases.

The cruel irony today is that the more individuals who participate in harming a victim, the less any of them is financially responsible, and the less timely help the victim will receive. Perpetrators are easily lost in a crowd.

The bill I introduce today will amend the restitution statute so that it works for child pornography victims. It is named for Amy and Vicky, brave women who are the victims of two of the most widely viewed child pornography series in the world. Amy's case went before the Supreme Court last year, and my staff worked with the legal team for these women in developing this bill.

I want to mention in particular James Marsh, whose legal practice in New York focuses exclusively on helping victims; Professor Paul Cassell at the University of Utah, who argued Amy's case before the Supreme Court; and Carol Hepburn, who practices law in Seattle on behalf of Vicky and many other victims.

This bill changes the current restitution statute in three important ways so that it works for child pornography victims. First, it gives judges options for determining a victim's losses and calculating restitution. Second, it gives judges the ability to impose restitution on defendants in different kinds of cases to ensure that victims actually receive meaningful restitution. Third, it shifts the burden of chasing defendants all over the country from victims to defendants who can share the restitution costs with other defendants.

Both Amy and Vicky personally support this bill. I am also pleased that many national victim advocacy groups support this bill, including the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the National Organization for Victim Assistance, the National Crime Victim Law Institute, the National Center for Victims of Crime, and the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women.

Last October I received a letter endorsing this bill signed by the attorneys general of 43 States, 22 Republicans and 21 Democrats.

I want to share with my colleagues the story of a young man, a Utah resident, who uses the name Andy.

Between the ages of 7 and 12, he was sexually abused by a trusted adult and

family friend. Dr. David Corwin, the University of Utah child psychologist who examined him, said that based on 30 years of experience with child sexual abuse victims, the images and videos of Andy's abuse were the most disturbing he had ever seen.

According to the FBI, the images and videos created from Andy's abuse are one of the most widely distributed boy series in the country. The FBI says that as of last month Andy is a named victim in 726 cases. He has been granted restitution in 24 of the 101 cases in which he requested it and has collected anything at all in only 2 cases.

Andy wrote to support the bill I am introducing today. He addresses letters to the Members of the Congress, which means that he is writing to each Member of this body. Andy says this legislation will prevent him from having to spend decades trying to recover minuscule amounts of restitution from hundreds, if not thousands of defendants all over the country. I want my colleagues to hear his words:

My images may never be taken off the Internet and may always be circulating around the country. At least with this congressional change, I can start to heal, learn how to handle my circumstances, and rebuild my life.

There are many more Amys, Vickys, and Andys than any of us want to admit, and they need our help. In our system of government, we have the responsibility to pass or change legislation to address issues and problems Americans face. All the courts could do was confirm that the current restitution statute is no longer suited to help child pornography victims. It is now up to us to do our duty and enact a statute that will. Amy, Vicky, and Andy are counting on us, and we must not let them down.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 43—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CHILDREN TRAFFICKED IN THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE TREATED AS VICTIMS, AND NOT CRIMINALS, ESPECIALLY DURING THE UPCOMING SUPER BOWL, AN EVENT AROUND WHICH MANY CHILDREN ARE AT RISK FOR BEING TRAFFICKED FOR SEX

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 43

Whereas according to the Department of Justice, there are currently an estimated 293,000 children in the United States at risk of commercial sexual exploitation;

Whereas the victims of child sex trafficking are often hidden in plain view, and may be found standing around bus stops, staying in runaway youth shelters, or advertised for commercial sex online;

Whereas the average age of entry into sex trafficking is between just 12 and 14 years old;

Whereas child victims of trafficking are often abducted or lured into running away by traffickers and then routinely raped, drugged, and beaten into submission, and sometimes even branded;

Whereas it is widely recognized that the beloved American tradition of the Super Bowl, an event that draws tens of thousands of fans to the host city, like other major sporting events, leads to a surge in the sex trafficking of underage girls and boys in the host city; and

Whereas traffickers aggressively advertise and sell sex trafficking victims on sites like backpage.com during the Super Bowl in order to meet the increased demand from those flocking to the host city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate agrees that—

(1) law enforcement, the juvenile justice system, and social services should treat all children trafficked for sex as victims; and

(2) Federal and State law enforcement agencies should make every effort to arrest and prosecute both traffickers and buyers of children for sex, in accordance with the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and State child protection laws against abuse and statutory rape, and should take all necessary measures to protect the children of the United States from harm.

SENATE RESOLUTION 44—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 44

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,105,487, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$8,752,264, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,646,777, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 45—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. VITTER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 45

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,520,944, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$2,607,332, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$1,086,388, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 46—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Ms. COLLINS submitted the following resolution; from the Special Committee on Aging; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 46

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions imposed by section 104 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section, the Special Committee on Aging (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,399,763, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$3,055 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,399,594, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$6,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$6,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$999,831, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$2,500 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 47—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORKER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 47

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

- (1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
- (2) employ personnel; and
- (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,889,028, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$58,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$11,600 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$6,666,904, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,777,877, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$42,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$8,400 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

- (A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;
- (B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;
- (C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;
- (D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;
- (E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;
- (F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or
- (G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

- (1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;
- (2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and
- (3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 48—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. ROBERTS submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 48

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

- (1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
- (2) employ personnel; and
- (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,463,834, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$4,223,716, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,759,882, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$40,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

- (1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;
- (2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and
- (3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

- (A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;
- (B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;
- (C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;
- (D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;
- (E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;
- (F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or
- (G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 49—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BARRASSO submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 49

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties and functions imposed by section 105 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by that section, the Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015; October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or non-reimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,184,317.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,030,258.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$845,941.00, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$20,000 may be expended for the training of professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations

for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of the salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015; October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and October 1, 2016, through February 28, 2017, to be paid from the Appropriations account for Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 50—CONGRATULATING THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2015 COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 50

Whereas on January 12, 2015, The Ohio State University Buckeyes won the first-ever College Football Playoff national championship with a 42-20 victory over the second-ranked University of Oregon Ducks;

Whereas the head coach of the Ohio State Buckeyes led the Buckeyes to a national championship win in his third year as head coach, bringing the total of national championships in collegiate football by The Ohio State University to 8;

Whereas the head coach of the Ohio State Buckeyes became only the second coach to lead 2 separate Football Bowl Subdivision programs to a national championship;

Whereas the quarterback of the Ohio State Buckeyes, number 12, completed 18 passes for 242 yards, scoring 1 rushing touchdown and 1 passing touchdown in just his third start as a collegiate quarterback;

Whereas the running back of the Ohio State Buckeyes, number 15, rushed for 246 yards, scoring 4 touchdowns and earning the title of Offensive Most Valuable Player;

Whereas the safety of the Ohio State Buckeyes, number 23, recorded 9 tackles, earning the title of Defensive Most Valuable Player;

Whereas the Ohio State Buckeyes finished the 2014 season with a record of 14 wins and 1 loss, winning 13 straight games on the road to a national championship;

Whereas in the 2014 season, the Ohio State Buckeyes tied school and National Collegiate Athletic Association records for the most victories in 1 season, including a 42-28

triumph over rival school, the University of Michigan;

Whereas the Ohio State Buckeyes won the Big Ten Conference championship, which was the first conference championship for The Ohio State University under their current head coach and the 35th since joining the conference in 1912, with a 59-0 win over the Wisconsin Badgers;

Whereas the Ohio State Buckeyes defeated the first-ranked University of Alabama Crimson Tide by a score of 42 to 35 to win the Allstate Sugar Bowl and advance to the national championship game;

Whereas, The Ohio State University celebrated the 125th anniversary of the football program during the 2014 season;

Whereas the sophomore defensive end of the Ohio State Buckeyes, number 97, was recognized as a 2014 unanimous All-American selection, just the 27th player to receive such an honor in the history of the football program of The Ohio State University;

Whereas the quarterback of the Ohio State Buckeyes, number 16, was named the Big Ten Conference Griese-Brees Quarterback of the year;

Whereas the star defensive end of the Ohio State Buckeyes, number 97, was named the Big Ten Conference Smith-Brown Defensive Lineman of the year;

Whereas 8 football players from The Ohio State University were named to all-conference teams by Big Ten Conference coaches;

Whereas the junior center of the Ohio State Buckeyes and Horticulture and Crop Science student, number 50, was 1 of 6 Big Ten Conference student-athletes to be named an Academic All American in football;

Whereas 12 student-athletes on the championship team were named Fall 2014 Academic All-Big Ten Honorees;

Whereas The Ohio State University President, Interim President, and director of athletics have fostered a continuing tradition of athletic and academic excellence at the institution;

Whereas The Ohio State University is 1 of the largest and most comprehensive universities in the United States, and has proven to be a perennial championship contender in National Collegiate Athletic Association football; and

Whereas The Ohio State University Marching Band, cheerleaders, students, faculty, alumni, and fans worldwide have supported the football team through a season filled with adversity and triumph; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates The Ohio State University Buckeyes football team for winning the 2015 College Football Playoff national championship;

(2) recognizes the players, coaches, staff, and fans whose hard work led to the championship; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the President of The Ohio State University;

(B) the director of athletics at The Ohio State University; and

(C) the head coach of The Ohio State University football team.

SENATE RESOLUTION 51—RECOGNIZING THE GOALS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 51

Whereas Catholic schools in the United States are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence and provide students with more than an exceptional scholastic education;

Whereas Catholic schools instill a broad, values-based education, emphasizing the lifelong development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in young people in the United States;

Whereas Catholic schools provide a high level of service to the United States by providing a strong academic and moral foundation to a diverse student population from all regions of the country and all socioeconomic backgrounds;

Whereas Catholic schools are an affordable option for parents, particularly in underserved urban areas;

Whereas Catholic schools produce students who are strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities, by providing an intellectually stimulating environment that is rich in spiritual, character, and moral development;

Whereas Catholic schools are committed to community service, producing graduates who hold "helping others" as a core value;

Whereas the total student enrollment in Catholic schools in the United States for the 2014-2015 academic year is almost 2,000,000 and the student-to-teacher ratio is 13.1 to 1;

Whereas Catholic schools in the United States educate a diverse population of students, of which 20.4 percent belong to racial minorities, 15.9 percent are of Hispanic or Latino origin, and 16.9 percent are non-Catholics;

Whereas the Catholic high school graduation rate in the United States is 99 percent, with 87 percent of graduates attending a 4-year college;

Whereas in the 1972 pastoral message concerning Catholic education, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops stated, "Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives.";

Whereas the week of January 25, 2015, to January 31, 2015, has been designated as "National Catholic Schools Week" by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops;

Whereas the National Catholic Schools Week was first established in 1974 and has been celebrated annually for the past 41 years; and

Whereas the theme for National Catholic Schools Week 2015 is "Catholic Schools: Communities of Faith, Knowledge, and Service"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of National Catholic Schools Week, an event cosponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and established to recognize the vital contributions of the thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States; and

(2) commends Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the United States for ongoing contributions to education and for playing a vital role in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 52—CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF UKRAINIAN FIGHTER PILOT NADIYA SAVCHENKO, WHO WAS CAPTURED BY RUSSIAN FORCES IN EASTERN UKRAINE AND HAS BEEN HELD ILLEGALLY IN A RUSSIAN PRISON SINCE JULY 2014

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 52

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is the first-ever female fighter pilot in Ukraine's Armed Forces and is an Iraqi war veteran;

Whereas, in the ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine, Nadiya Savchenko volunteered her services to the Ukrainian Aidar battalion;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko was elected in absentia from the Batkivshchyna Party to Ukraine's Parliament in October 2014, and appointed to the Parliament Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) as a representative from Ukraine;

Whereas, as a member of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, Lieutenant Nadiya Savchenko was conducting operations in eastern Ukraine against pro-Russian forces in the summer of 2014 when she was captured and taken into captivity;

Whereas, during her mission in Eastern Ukraine, she was captured by the Donbas People's Militia, detained on Ukrainian territory, deprived of rights to due process, and illegally transferred to the Russian Federation to stand trial on unsubstantiated charges of terrorism;

Whereas, since July 2014, Nadiya Savchenko has endured involuntary psychiatric evaluations and solitary confinement;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is currently entering her sixth week of a hunger strike as a symbol of her protest;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is denied access to urgently needed medical attention and access to legal counsel;

Whereas the Minsk Protocol of September 2014, signed by Ukraine and the Russian Federation, calls for the "immediate release of all hostages and illegally held persons";

Whereas appeals have been made to the United Nations Human Rights Council and the International Red Cross to secure Nadiya Savchenko's release;

Whereas the international community, including representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and of the United States, have urged her immediate release;

Whereas, on January 26, 2015, the opening day of the Parliamentary Assembly, the global community embarks on a public cam-

paign to bring attention to the plight of Nadiya Savchenko and demand her immediate release; and

Whereas the Government and people of the United States express concern about the deteriorating health of detained pilot Nadiya Savchenko and her continued illegal imprisonment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of the Russian Federation for its illegal imprisonment of Nadiya Savchenko;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately release Nadiya Savchenko;

(3) calls on the United States, its European allies, and the international community to aggressively support efforts to release Nadiya Savchenko and other illegally detained persons; and

(4) expresses solidarity with the Ukrainian people.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 247. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 247. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY ON RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ENSURE SAFE TRANSPORTATION BY PIPELINE AND RAIL OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Administrator of Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) shall conduct a study on the resources necessary to ensure the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products, including by rail and pipeline. The study shall focus on the following priorities:

(A) Ensuring the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(B) Ensuring PHMSA has the necessary personnel and other resources, including access to new and emerging technologies, to properly monitor and regulate the transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(2) SCOPE.—The study required under this subsection shall include the following elements:

(A) An examination of the current and projected resources and personnel at the Department of Transportation and PHMSA that are or will be dedicated to regulating, monitoring, and ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(B) A determination of the appropriate manpower personnel, resources, and funding requirements for all Department and Administration elements that do or are expected to

play a significant role in regulating, monitoring, and ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(C) An assessment and description of the personnel, resources, and funding needs for each State, and a description of the State, local, and tribal resources and personnel that are dedicated to performing the tasks described in subparagraph (B).

(D) The development and use of technology for each of the Department and Administration elements involved in regulating, monitoring, or otherwise ensuring the overall safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline, including whether the elements need additional technological assets and how best to acquire needed additional technological assets.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation and the PHMSA Administrator, in conjunction with the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) The findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(B) Input from other Federal agencies that have any significant role in the safe transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(C) A description of any impending changes to regulations or policy that may have an effect on personnel, resources, or funding or that would otherwise impact the ability of the Department and the Administration to meet the basic standards necessary to properly monitor and regulate the transportation of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline.

(D) Recommendations for enhancing safety for the transport of crude oil, petroleum products, natural gas, natural gas liquids, and related products by rail and pipeline, and what resources, personnel, and funding would be required to implement such recommendations.

(E) An explanation of why the Department or the Administration is not already implementing any of such recommendations.

(F) Recommendations for additional legislation necessary to implement recommendations contained in the report.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 4 p.m., in room SR-216 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, “Freight Rail Transportation: Enhancing Safety, Efficiency, and Commerce.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “The Importance of MAP-21 Reauthorization: Federal and State Perspectives.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 11 a.m. in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 9:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session on January 28, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Protecting America from Cyber Attacks: The Importance of Information Sharing.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:05 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Indian Country Priorities for the 114th Congress.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Attorney General Nomination.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., in room SR-428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 28, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room S-211 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ariel Marshall and Kelley Sparrow, fellows in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the first session of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kayla Dolan, a staff member on the staff of Senator TILLIS, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2015 COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 50, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 50) congratulating The Ohio State University football team for winning the 2015 College Football Playoff national championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HOEVEN. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 50) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE GOALS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 51, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 51) recognizing the goals of Catholic Schools Week and honoring the valuable contributions of Catholic schools in the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Catholic schools across our Nation who provide our children with an outstanding education while preparing them to lead lives in the example of Jesus Christ. This year, we mark the 41st year of celebrating Catholic Schools Week, shedding light on the extraordinary contributions these schools and their students make to communities across the country.

This year's theme, "Catholic Schools: Communities of Faith, Knowledge, and Service," provides a solid representation of the mission of these schools in educating the whole person and forming our children into responsible stewards ready to take on the challenges of the future. Today, more than 2 million children are educated in Catholic schools in the United States. Ninety-nine percent of them graduate from high school and 85 percent pursue post-secondary education. Such a rate of success is a great testament to the quality of our Catholic schools and their educators.

As an alumnus of a Catholic school in New Orleans, I have firsthand experience of the benefits of receiving a Catholic education. These schools are devoted to nurturing the young minds that pass through their halls each year, instilling in them the values necessary to become active and caring members of their communities, cities, and Nation. In the words of Pope Francis, "[o]ur generation will show that it can rise to the promise found in each young person when we know how to give them space. This means that we have to create the material and spiritual conditions for their full development; to give them a solid basis on which to build their lives; to guarantee their safety and their education to be everything they can be."

During the week of January 25 to January 31, let us recognize the steadfast commitment of the administrators, teachers, students, and families, who support Catholic schools across the United States, and appreciate their efforts to educate the youth of our Nation. In that respect, I am hopeful that the Senate will pass this resolution celebrating Catholic Schools Week.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 51) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 2015

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., tomorrow, Thursday, January 29. I ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that the Senate then be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 1 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. HOEVEN. Tomorrow there will be two stacks of votes on the Keystone bill. Senators should expect up to seven votes shortly after 11 a.m., and then an additional four or five votes at 2:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:01 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 29, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF SENATOR
WENDELL FORD

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Wendell Hampton Ford. A dedicated public servant, Senator Ford held many roles in state and federal politics, including Governor of the Commonwealth and U.S. Senator.

A Daviess County native, Senator Ford always held his hometown close to his heart. It was his starting point in government and his final resting place. Holding elected office for more than three decades, Senator Ford is the only Kentuckian to seek and win election to consecutive terms as lieutenant governor, governor and U.S. senator.

Throughout his long tenure in state and federal government, Senator Ford was known and will be remembered for being an advocate for his fellow Kentuckians. A friend of the farmers, Senator Ford has been recognized for his work on agricultural issues, particularly tobacco. Senator Ford understood the vital role tobacco played—and still plays—in Kentucky's economy.

In tackling these big issues, Senator Ford quickly rose through the ranks. He was elected the whip of his party in 1990, a position he held until he left the U.S. Senate. He once described himself to the New York Times as "being a workhorse and not a show horse." It's that same attitude that led him to be a behind-the-scenes dealmaker, who strived to achieve solutions to our policy woes.

That desire to better his community and country did not stop when Senator Ford left public service. After serving four terms in the U.S. Senate, Senator Ford created the Wendell H. Ford Government Education Center, located in Owensboro, KY. Designed to educate young people about civics and public policy, Senator Ford continued teaching those lessons until the end of his life. It is a fantastic facility with a wonderful mission, and the center is just one of the many lasting legacies his leadership has left on the region.

I join with Kentucky's Second District in sending prayers to Senator Ford's family. We will miss him and are grateful for his service to the Commonwealth and our nation.

RECOGNIZING THE BIRTH OF THE
MODERN UNITED STATES COAST
GUARD

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an important occasion, the creation of

the modern-day United States Coast Guard (USCG). The important designation was made official by President Woodrow Wilson on January 28, 1915, when he signed into law the "Act to Create the Coast Guard," merging the Revenue Cutter Service with the U.S. Life-Saving Service.

The origins of the present-day Coast Guard can be traced back to August 4, 1790, when President George Washington signed the Tariff Act to empower ten United States ships to enforce trade laws and reduce smuggling. The USCG is one of the oldest organizations of the federal government and was the only armed force patrolling the seas until the Navy Department was established in 1798.

Over its long and storied history, the USCG has acquired various responsibilities from maintaining the country's tools for maritime navigation to handling merchant marine licensing and merchant vessel safety. Additionally, the USCG is the nation's frontline of defense from threats at sea and is dedicated to saving lives, one of its most important functions.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an area that truly understands the important work the Coast Guard does on a daily basis. Mobile, Alabama, located in my Congressional district, is home to the Guard Aviation Training Center and also the USCG Sector Mobile Base. The Aviation Center acts as the Coast Guard's aviation and capabilities development center and also conducts traditional Coast Guard air station missions including search and rescue, homeland security, and environmental protection.

I am proud of all the brave men and women who serve in this essential organization, and I encourage all Americans to take some time to reflect on the sacrifices these people have made for our great country.

MICHIGAN STATE SENATOR JUDY
EMMONS

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michigan State Senator Judy Emmons in recognition of her leadership in combating human trafficking.

This week in Congress, we have taken steps to fight the scourge of human trafficking in our country and around the world. In my home state, we are continuing to work on this critical issue, and one state legislator in particular has been at the forefront of this effort.

In Michigan, State Senator Judy Emmons has led the fight against human trafficking. Through her work, Michigan instituted new laws that fight this heinous crime. These laws, including life imprisonment for perpetrators, send a clear message that Michigan will not

tolerate human trafficking. Further, Senator Emmons' legislative work and activism has made Michigan a national leader in understanding the plight of victims, and is providing them with the resources they need to recover. Because of Senator Emmons' efforts, victims of this crime will find safe refuge in Michigan, and be able to make a complete recovery.

State Senator Judy Emmons has done outstanding work to help combat human trafficking and is worthy of recognition from this Congress. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Michigan State Senator Judy Emmons in gratitude for her strong conviction to prosecute traffickers, rescue victims, and assist survivors.

HONORING KEN DAVIS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Yonkers community is filled with heroes that have gone above and beyond the call of duty to their neighborhood. One of those heroes, Ken Davis, has a particularly noteworthy list of achievements as a Yonkers resident and public servant.

Ken is a graduate of Yonkers Public Schools and received an AAS Degree from Sullivan Community College. Later, he received a BS Degree in Fine Arts Education from the College of Mount Saint Vincent and an MS Degree in Human Resources from Mercy College.

After school, Ken joined the United States Marine Corps Reserves and became an officer in the Yonkers police force. Currently a Detective assigned to the Gang/Narcotics Program, he has worked on several high profile assignments, including the department's Re-Entry Program, Third Precinct Task Force, Housing Unit, and has also served as a School Resource Officer, an Instructor at the Westchester Police Academy, and a Community Affairs Officer. In his time on the force, Ken has received several awards, certificates and honors for his work through the department.

As a Graffiti and Gang Specialist, Ken has made presentations at the National Gang Crime Research Center in Chicago, and Canada's Anti-Graffiti Symposium about methods of gang prevention.

In his private time, Ken serves the Yonkers community with volunteer work for the scholarship committee and in 2005 served as worshipful Master of James H. Farrell Lodge #34, Prince Hall Free and Accepted Masons of Yonkers.

For both his private and professional commitment to bettering the Yonkers community, the Luther V. Garrison Sr. Masonic Foundation

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Inc. Scholarship Committee has named Ken Davis their 2014 Community Volunteer Service Award winner. He is most deserving of this distinguished honor and I wish to congratulate and thank him for all he has done for the people and city of Yonkers.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RESEARCHERS INDUCTED INTO THE LAWRENCE LIVERMORE LABORATORY'S ENTREPRENEURS' HALL OF FAME

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor four former Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) scientists and engineers who were inducted into the Laboratory's Entrepreneurs' Hall of Fame on January 20, 2015.

The group of former LLNL researchers, who represent the second class of inductees into the Laboratory's Entrepreneurs' Hall of Fame, were honored for developing technologies during or after their laboratory careers that created major economic impacts and spawned important new companies.

This year's inductees are Martin Casado, Bill Colston, Fred Milanovich, and David Tuckerman. Between them, these inductees initially started three different companies—an Internet security company, a biomedical company that advanced personalized medicine and a microchip firm.

Computer scientist Martin Casado revolutionized the information technology world when he developed software-defined networking (SDN). Casado is currently continuing efforts to upgrade computer networking security, not only for the computer industry, but for banking, retail, health care and homeland security.

Bill Colston and Fred Milanovich left LLNL to found QuantaLife Inc. based in Pleasanton which is in my district. In collaboration with Milanovich and other experts, Colston developed QuantaLife's hallmark product, an anti-bioterrorism technology that was converted into medical applications.

David Tuckerman co-founded nCHIP Inc., a technology company that developed enhanced microchips and multi-chip module systems. Tuckerman then went on to found Tuckerman & Associates Inc.—an independent technical consultancy firm that helps venture capitalists and industrial clients advance their ideas into reality.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me celebrating these entrepreneurs and honoring Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for supporting their employees' entrepreneurial ambitions.

HONORING ROBERT OLIVIERI,
PAST PRESIDENT OF SDAR

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert Olivieri, the outgoing President of the Pacific Southwest Association of REALTORS®, for his outstanding leadership in the South Bay region of San Diego County.

Robert Olivieri was born in Providence, Rhode Island and has been a resident of Chula Vista and Bonita for the past 30 years. Robert graduated from the University of Michigan with a B.S. in Engineering and went on to earn an MBA in Finance from the University of Phoenix. Robert holds a California Real Estate Broker's License, a California Insurance Broker's License, a Series 7 Securities License, and has been in the real estate business for over 29 years.

Robert has been an active broker and manager for several real estate offices in South San Diego County. Robert served the Pacific Southwest Association of REALTORS® (PSAR) as their 2014 President. During his tenure, he focused on membership recruitment and retention, while also providing useful resources for members' professional and personal growth. Robert has also served PSAR on their Board of Directors, as a California Association of REALTORS® State Director, and as a member of the Community Involvement Committee and the Merger Steering Committee. Robert has been ranked by real estate tracking agencies as one of the top house selling agents and in the top 7 percent of agents who sell homes for top dollar.

Robert and his wife, Marcia, are very involved in their community and help support Bonita Vista High School and Corpus Christi Parish.

HONORING ROBYN L. CLASS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ORANGE CHILDREN & PARENTS TOGETHER

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments and contributions of Robyn L. Class, the Executive Director of Orange Children & Parents Together.

As an alumna of Head Start, I know the impact that early childhood education can have on a child's future. Every day Robyn works to make that impact on as many children as possible.

At Orange Children & Parents Together, Robyn ensures that the most vulnerable children and families receive high quality early childhood education programs and family support services.

Robyn's work has earned her the well-deserved honor of being named the California Head Start Association's Administrator of the Year.

I couldn't be prouder of and thankful for Robyn and Orange Children & Parents Together and I congratulate their exemplary service to the families of Orange County.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REFORM EXPORTS AND EXPAND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ACT

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the Reform Exports and Expand the American Economy Act. My legislation makes 31 significant reforms to promote much needed transparency and accountability of the Export-Import Bank while fostering job-growth.

Ex-Im Bank has been a job-creator since its inception, yet it is in dire need of major reforms. In reforming the Ex-Im Bank, we'll make the bank more accountable and transparent while requiring the Bank to be more solvent and self-sufficient in order to reduce the burden to the taxpayer.

People in my District, and across the country, are demanding more economic opportunities and expansion of the job-market. We can meet their demands, by taking action now and supporting these reforms to the Ex-Im Bank that will make the bank more solvent and reduces risk to hard-working taxpayers immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the Ex-Im Bank Reform Act, in order to ensure accountability, transparency and job-growth.

HONORING ELIZABETH GILL

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, some community members have the unique ability to shape their entire neighborhood for the better. For the Bronx's 47th Precinct community, that person who has shaped and improved the neighborhood for the better has been Elizabeth Gill.

Elizabeth was born and raised by her Caribbean parents in the Bronx. She has been a lifelong community advocate who has worked with a wide variety of civic organizations, both as a member and volunteer. She currently serves at the New York City Police Department 47th Precinct Community Council President, a post she has held for over 20 years. Other organizations that she has done work for include the 47th Precinct Crisis Intervention Team; North Bronx Williamsbridge Branch of the NAACP; Mount Vernon Police Department Community Board; St. Mary's Hospital for Children With Special Needs; the 47th Precinct annual fellowship Breakfast Planning Committee; The Selective Service Board; and the Co-op City Public Committee. Elizabeth has also worked to procure many grants for the entire 47th Precinct community, with funding

going towards community affairs vans, auxiliary vests, bicycles for police officers, and a command center bus.

As a result of her accomplishments, Elizabeth has received a host of community service awards. She has been honored by the Korean Merchants Association of the Northeast Bronx, the Police Reserve association of the City of New York, and the New York State association of Black and Puerto Rican Legislators, just to name a few.

This year Elizabeth is celebrating her 85th birthday, and on the occasion I wish to congratulate her for all of her wonderful accomplishments. I am truly proud to be able to say I represent such a fine community member in the United States House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 2015 I missed recorded votes #46–48 as I was part of the presidential delegation to India to support this important partnership between our two countries.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here:

On Roll Call #46 I would have voted no; on Roll Call #47 I would have voted yes; on Roll Call #48 I would have voted yes.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,087,727,352,703.72. We've added \$7,460,850,303,790.64 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.4 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING DR. J. ROBERT BEYSTER

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great respect to mourn the passing of one of San Diego's greatest innovators, businessmen, educators and humanitarians, Dr. J. Robert Beyster. Dr. Beyster was born in Detroit, MI on July 26, 1924, to his parents John F. and Lillian E. Beyster. He attended Dlocum Truax High School in Trenton, Michigan and graduated as Salutatorian. Just as the United

States entered World War II, he enlisted in the Navy. He was sent by the Navy to the University of Michigan and later commissioned an Ensign.

Dr. Beyster's impressive biography describes a World War II Veteran, a nuclear engineer whose research propelled the Department of Defense's weapons systems and submarines into the future of war fighting, but most notably, he founded Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), an employee-owned multi-billion dollar corporation. His selfless vision built SAIC from the ground up. He believed in the simple principle that wealth should be distributed among those who contribute to the growth of the company.

Dr. Beyster was the recipient of multiple distinguished awards, to include a Lifetime Achievement Award from Ernst & Young and the Spirit of San Diego Award from the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce. We remember him for his high standards of excellence and influence at the University of California's Sulpizio Cardiovascular Center. Furthermore, he founded the Foundation for Enterprise Development, which launched the Beyster Institute at the University of California San Diego's Rady School of Management for technologists, entrepreneurs, executives and educators.

San Diego was fortunate to have someone like Dr. Beyster in our community. We see his altruistic contributions in the success of the students who've been given incredible opportunities from his charitable donations. Our community employs those who have been educated through his generous grants, scholarships and fellowships. We grow from those who will undoubtedly give back to the community in the same ways in which they have, themselves, benefited from his generosity. His efforts have provided our next generation of scientists, doctors and intellectual leaders.

He was an author, educator, philanthropist, veteran, a family man of integrity, values and of charitable contributions, who will be sorely missed by his family, friends and colleagues. We are fortunate to have constant reminders of his giving nature and his brilliant mind. Thank you Dr. Beyster, for giving San Diego so much of your incredible life. You will never be forgotten.

SURVIVORS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING EMPOWERMENT ACT

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, we recognize January as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. In fact, Santa Clara County of my Silicon Valley district also proclaimed this month as Human Trafficking Awareness Month.

In the fight against this modern-day slavery, I am proud to introduce the vital bipartisan legislation—Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act—alongside my colleagues, Congressman TED POE, KAREN BASS, and RODNEY DAVIS.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a disease upon our humanity, and it remains the world's

fastest growing criminal enterprise. According to the International Labor Organization, trafficking is an estimated \$150 billion industry worldwide, which exploits nearly 21 million victims around the world.

Sadly, my home state of California is near the top in reported trafficking cases. Furthermore, it is estimated that 40 percent of the human trafficking activity on the West Coast comes through the three Bay Area airports of San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland.

My legislation will turn back the tide of human trafficking, as it allows those survivors who were impacted by this cruel system to voice their experiences and educate policymakers. Specifically, this bill will create a survivors-led U.S. Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to review federal government policy and programs on human trafficking. This council will advise, formulate assessments and recommendations, and submit reports to the Senior Policy Operating Group and the President's Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking Persons.

Directly hearing and learning from those who fell victim to this heinous crime is the best tool to eliminate human trafficking. Ultimately, this legislation values survivors, beyond just their stories. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this crucial bill, so that we may finally rid of human trafficking—once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, be it labor or sex trafficking, human trafficking is the worst kind of atrocity. Each day, this scourge continues to endanger, exploit, and enslave lives. Even as we bring further awareness to this crime this month of January, we must sustain the fight each and every day.

HONORING ELLIOT FORCHHEIMER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, community partners who are truly dedicated to serving the public good are an invaluable asset to any elected official in government. As the Representative of New York's 16th district I have had the pleasure of working with some truly remarkable community leaders, none more remarkable than my dear friend, Westchester Jewish Council Executive Director Elliot Forchheimer.

Raised in Kew Gardens, Queens, Elliot's love affair with Jewish communal life started at the legendary Cejwin Camps, where he was inspired to pursue a career in the Jewish community. He became an Administrator at Camp Ramah and went on to join the Young Israel of Scarsdale, where he was a Youth Director for six years under the mentorship of the late Rabbi Jacob Rubenstein.

In 1996 Elliot joined the UJA-Federation of New York in the Program Services department, serving in a position focused on camps and JCC's. Shortly thereafter he became the very first Director of Westchester Program Services and Agency Relations for UJA-Federation's Westchester Office. After a stint at Synagogue 2000, Elliot returned to UJA-Federation's Commission on Jewish Identity and Renewal, focusing on synagogue relations.

Elliot's greatest professional privilege however has been serving for the last 10 years as the Executive Director of the Westchester Jewish Council. In this role he has steered the proverbial ship at WJC, working with elected officials, community groups, and over 150 Jewish organizations that span the breadth of Jewish expression. Elliot has helped ensure that Westchester remains a bastion of mutual respect and cooperation amongst all community members.

In addition to his phenomenal career achievements, Elliot has created an incredible legacy at home, with his beloved wife, Joan, and their two children, Ilana and Jacob. They are his true pride and joy.

This year, the WJC is honoring Elliot at their 39th Anniversary Gala for all he has done to better the Westchester community. I am honored to be able to congratulate Elliot on this incredible achievement, and I am even more honored to be able to call this incredible community partner my friend.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. BLAISE ALAN DENTE, RECIPIENT OF THE SCRANTON CHAPTER UNICO'S UNICAN OF THE YEAR AWARD FOR 2014

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Blaise Alan Dente, who has been named the 2014 UNICAN of the Year for the Scranton Chapter of UNICO. UNICO is the largest Italian American service and volunteer organization in the United States, and many of my constituents, especially those living in the Wyoming Valley, have come to know Mr. Dente well through the Scranton Chapter.

Mr. Dente is a lifelong resident of Pittston, PA, having graduated from Seton Catholic High School before matriculating to East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania. There, he earned a Bachelor of Science in Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism Management; a degree that he has put to commendable use in his ownership and operation of Dente's Catering and Rental.

As a member of the American Culinary Federation (ACF), Mr. Dente obtained his certification as a Certified Chef de Cuisine, and in 2011, was inducted as an "honorary fellow" in the American Academy of Chefs, a prestigious subset within the ACF. Mr. Dente has earned a slew of other esteemed decorations, including medals, ribbons, and certificates for his work in both hot and cold food competitions. He was subsequently named the ACF Chapter Chef of the Year in 2008.

As an active member of the Scranton Chapter of UNICO since 2004, Mr. Dente and his staff host an annual dinner meeting for the chapter's membership. However, his service to the community extends beyond the kitchen. Mr. Dente is a member of both the Wilkes-Barre and Greater Scranton Chambers of Commerce. Additionally, he actively volunteers for the Pittston Tomato Festival Committee and is a Fourth Degree Knight of Columbus

Council 372 & Assembly 948. Such diverse and committed involvement certainly contributed to Mr. Dente being named one of the "Top 40 under 40" Business Professionals in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Blaise Alan Dente for his proven commitment to bettering the lives of those within the Scranton Chapter of UNICO, as well as the lives of those individuals within my own district. I congratulate him for the distinguished honor in being named the 2014 UNICAN of the Year, and know that he will continue to pursue bright endeavors in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday marked the seventieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz concentration camp on January 27, 1945. An estimated 1.1 million people, mostly of Jewish descent, lost their lives there between 1940–1945.

The seventieth anniversary occurs at a pivotal time. The recent terrorist attacks carried out in France demonstrated that anti-Semitism still exists as the world witnessed the senseless killing of people solely based on their religion. The senseless attacks in France remind us of the dark days of World War II when so many lost their lives because of their religion or ethnicity.

We must never forget the atrocities that occurred at Auschwitz and elsewhere during the Holocaust. The human race must never again let such unspeakable events take place. Racism, prejudice, and anti-Semitism must not be allowed in our societies and must be stopped wherever they occur.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembrance of the lives lost at Auschwitz. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the magnitude of this anniversary and the significance that it plays in our world today.

THE REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO HUMANITARIAN AND SPORTING LEGEND MUHAMMAD ALI

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to reintroduce legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his contributions to our nation. I believe it is long past time to recognize and honor an American civil rights activist and sporting legend with Congress' highest honor. Over the course of his illustrious career, Muhammad Ali has produced some of our nation's most lasting sports memories. From win-

ning a Gold Medal at the 1960 Summer Olympics to lighting the Olympic torch at the 1996 Summer Olympics, his influence as an athlete and a humanitarian has spanned over fifty years.

Despite having been diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in the 1980s, Ali has devoted his life to charitable organizations. Ali and his wife, Lonnie, are founding directors of the Muhammad Ali Parkinson Center and Movement Disorders Clinic in Phoenix, AZ and have helped raise over \$50 million for Parkinson's research. In addition to helping families cope with illness, Ali has led efforts to provide meals for the hungry and has helped countless organizations such as the Make-A-Wish Foundation and the Special Olympics.

Muhammad Ali's humanitarian efforts go beyond his charitable activities in the United States. In 1990 Muhammad Ali travelled to the Middle East to seek the release of American and British hostages that were being held as human shields in the first Gulf War. After his intervention, 15 hostages were freed. Thanks to his devotion to diplomatic causes and racial harmony, Ali is the recipient of many accolades, including being chosen as a "U.N. Messenger of Peace" in 1998 and receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2005.

Through his unyielding dedication to his sport and to struggling populations around the world, Muhammad Ali serves as an example of service and self-sacrifice for generations of Americans. The Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting commemoration of his life and work, for which he is deservedly known as "the Greatest."

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing one of our nation's most lasting and influential figures by signing on to this important legislation.

HONORING HADASSAH LIEBERMAN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a life dedicated to serving the public good is not only noble, it is inspirational. Hadassah Lieberman's life, spent working on everything from health issues to educational improvement, is one of those tremendous inspirations.

Hadassah's reach and influence has extended from the Riverdale neighborhood all the way out to the international community. Born in the Czech Republic, Hadassah and her family left Eastern Europe in 1949 for Massachusetts. A graduate of Boston University, Hadassah earned a degree in Government and Dramatics and later received a Masters Degree in International Relations and American Government at Northeastern University.

Her studies and interests steered her to a host of organizations dedicated to serving the public good. Currently, Hadassah is on the board of Open University and is a former Global Ambassador with Susan G. Komen for the Cure, the world's largest network of breast cancer survivors and activists. She developed an Advisory Network for Women's Health to

promote awareness and prevention of heart disease, and is a former Director of HFL & Associates, a firm dedicated to expanding domestic and international awareness of non-profit organizations.

Hadassah has also dedicated a tremendous amount of time to community service through her work with Meridian House, the Auschwitz Jewish Center Foundation, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

Hadassah's true pride and joy though is her family; her husband, former Senator Joe Lieberman, their four children, and ten grandchildren. Since returning to Riverdale with Joe, Hadassah has experienced the great warmth of the Chabad community, and has had an active role in its growth and promotion. I am proud to not only count Hadassah and Joe as constituents but to also call them friends.

Chabad of Riverdale is honoring Hadassah at this year's celebration dinner. I want to congratulate her on this wonderful honor.

HONORING GOVERNOR EDMUND
"JERRY" BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues from California to recognize and honor Governor Brown. Governor Brown is the first governor in the history of California to be elected to four terms.

Governor Brown's unprecedented four gubernatorial terms reflect the high level of trust and confidence Californians have in him to lead our state. Throughout his illustrious three terms in office, Governor Brown has proven to be an effective leader committed to ensuring economic vitality and fiscal responsibility as well as reducing crime, investing in education and protecting our environment.

During his first two terms in office, Governor Brown built a prudent budget surplus and in his recent third term, has carefully balanced the state's budget and established a strong rainy day fund. During his first two terms he enacted multiple pieces of legislation aimed at reducing crime and keeping our streets safe. Also during his first two terms, Governor Brown significantly increased state funding levels for higher education and established educational standards high school students must meet to be eligible to graduate. Governor Brown has long been an advocate for protecting our environment; in fact, during his first two terms California became the first state to establish energy efficiency standards. Governor Brown has continued to build on this legacy in his recent third term by raising our state's clean energy goal. Governor Brown's fourth term promises more positive changes for California, including continued efforts to improve and increase transportation options within our state.

In addition to his service as Governor of California, Governor Brown has served the people of California as Secretary of State and Attorney General. In these roles, Governor Brown worked to protect California's working

families and consumers by cracking down on crime, uncovering mortgage fraud and real estate scams, and working to prevent the abuse of campaign laws. Outside of statewide office, Governor Brown served as the Mayor of Oakland, California, where he worked to revitalize the downtown area by attracting new restaurants, businesses, and art galleries. He also worked to improve education opportunities in the city and reduce the rate of serious crime.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Edmund "Jerry" Brown leads our state with integrity and with the best interests of all Californians in mind. Along with my colleagues, I thank him for his years of service and look forward to seeing all that he will accomplish for our state throughout his fourth term.

THE CIDER ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the CIDER Act, legislation that will support the growing number of craft and entrepreneurial cider makers across the country. The cider industry has tripled in size since 2007 and there has been tremendous growth in Oregon. As these businesses get off the ground, I am working with them to ensure a strong federal partnership and to break down arbitrary barriers that prevent this industry from realizing its potential.

During the fermentation process, a variety of factors can lead to small changes in the composition of a cider's alcohol content and carbonation. Because of the narrow way that hard cider is currently defined in the tax code, these small variations can lead to cider being taxed at a rate fifteen times higher than what the statute clearly intended. The legislation will better tailor IRS rules to reflect variations in craft ciders. This legislation will update the tax definitions to reflect the growing diversity of the U.S. cider market, better match international rules and strengthen U.S. export opportunities, and broaden the definition to include both pear and apple ciders.

Production nationally has been robust, more than tripling from 9.4 million gallons in 2011 to 32 million gallons in 2013. Cider revenues in the U.S. have been just as impressive, tripling from \$178 million in 2007 to \$601 million in 2012. Providing clear regulations and a tax structure that mirrors the real world for this agricultural product will allow this industry to continue its expansion while making ciders that people want to drink.

Cider making is sometimes closer to an art than a science. As the American apple and pear hard cider industry becomes more prominent on the world stage, and cider becomes a beverage choice for more Americans' developing palettes, we need to ensure that ciders have every opportunity to expand and meet the needs of this growing market without an unfair tax burden.

HONORING CHABAD LUBAVITCH OF
RIVERDALE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the great 16th Congressional District of New York I have the pleasure and honor of representing many wonderful groups. One of those wonderful organizations, Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale, is hosting their "Celebrating 23 Years of Kindness" dinner on January 24th, and I couldn't be more thrilled to recognize them on this occasion.

Founded in 1992 under the guidance of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale seeks to strengthen the cultural bonds of Jewish identity through spiritual outreach, adult education, childhood education, daycare, day camps, Sabbath and Festival services and hospital visitation.

As one of 2,700 centers in 70 different countries, Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale embraces the Chabad Lubavitch philosophy, teaching understanding and recognition of the Creator as a means of reinforcing and nurturing Jewish culture. For the entire Chabad Lubavitch community, refining and governing one's actions through wisdom, comprehension, and knowledge is the true key to a fulfilled life, and it is in this vein that Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale has worked to improve the lives of the Jewish population in the community.

As community centers go, Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale has always shown a great deal of warmth as they embrace the very young to the old and everyone in between that live in the neighborhood.

By utilizing contemporary approaches to traditional values they have gone a long way toward reinvigorating the Jewish community. I want to thank my friend Rabbi Levi Shemtov, the entire leadership team and members of Chabad for all they have done and continue to do for our community. Congratulations again to Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale on 23 great years of service.

NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN
TRAFFICKING PREVENTION
MONTH

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to mark January as National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Millions of people are subjected to sex trafficking or forced labor every year.

Each January we take time to recognize the continuing scourge of human trafficking, but it is never easy to accept or believe that this horrible practice still continues in the 21st Century.

And this is not a problem only in far off foreign lands—it is happening right here, in our own country. We know this in the East Bay,

which I represent, in which there is a significant problem with human trafficking and sex exploitation.

That is why we are so fortunate to have Alameda County District Attorney Nancy O'Malley fighting back hard against these traffickers and standing up for victims.

Earlier this month Nancy announced her office's latest public relations campaign to help raise awareness about the tragedy of sex trafficking and make sure victims know how they can obtain help. She even has a special division within her office, called the Human Exploitation and Trafficking (H.E.A.T.) Unit, to fight trafficking.

I want to thank Nancy and everyone in the H.E.A.T. Unit for the work they do to help and protect the women and children of the East Bay. It is this kind of diligence and dedication that will hopefully, one day, bring an end to human trafficking and sexual exploitation once and for all.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LUKE
WAGNER ADAMS

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and service of Luke Wagner Adams. Luke was a beloved member of the Queens community, who recently passed away at 76 years of age.

A longtime Queens resident, Luke settled in Sunnyside as a young man and quickly became one of the community's most well-known activists. One of Luke's enduring legacies was his leadership at the helm of the Gateway Restoration Project, which led to the creation of Sunnyside's most iconic symbol, the Sunnyside Arch. Luke led the charge on a number of additional projects to improve Sunnyside as a prominent member of the Sunnyside Chamber of Commerce, Sunnyside/Woodside Lions Club, Sunnyside Kiwanis Club, and Sunnyside Artists. In recognition of his long list of accomplishments, the Sunnyside Chamber's annual 'Sunnysider of the Year' award was named in his honor.

Luke will forever be known not only for his love for his community, but also for his generosity and selflessness. Luke's loyalty to his friends and community was unmatched, and he was willing to go above and beyond for those who asked him for help. Whether it was raising money for the hungry, being the first to welcome a newcomer to the neighborhood, or ensuring that others who joined him in his civic engagement received proper recognition, Luke was the most humble and genuine person one could come across.

Luke was immensely proud of his community, and dedicated his life to making his neighborhood a better place. Mr. Speaker, Luke's commitment to Queens is, and will continue to be, an inspiration to all of us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Luke Wagner Adams. May he rest in peace.

HONORING DR. EDMUND FRANCIS
LA GAMMA

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Edmund Francis La Gamma for his receipt of the "Mentor of the Year" Award from the Eastern Society for Pediatric Research in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the care and treatment of our most vulnerable citizens—our newborns.

For almost four decades, Dr. La Gamma has committed himself to improving our understanding of diseases which affect premature babies and advancing their care. He has served as a Professor of Pediatrics, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at New York Medical College and Director of both the Division of Newborn Medicine and the Neonatal-Perinatal Fellowship Program at Maria Fareri Children's Hospital. In these roles, he has been responsible for the care of infants at over 10 regional affiliate hospitals which span an area the size of the state of Delaware. In that time, he has transformed neonatal intensive care at Westchester Medical Center into one of the state's most recognized neonatal intensive care units, earning New York's highest designation of care and national admiration.

In addition, his work as a scientist has contributed greatly to the field of neonatology. Working with some of the most prominent doctors in his field, Dr. La Gamma has expanded our understanding of neonatal development and improved our ability to treat deadly diseases in newborn infants. Moreover, throughout his career he has remained focused on ensuring his research be shared with the scientific community to advance neonatal care, and has published over 150 peer-reviewed research articles, including 25 book chapters. From this work, neonatologists across the country have benefitted from his insights on caring for premature and critically-ill newborns.

As head of one of the largest neonatal fellowship programs in the nation, he has helped shape the future of pediatric and neonatology through his mentorship of students, junior pediatricians, junior neonatologists and academic faculty. He has directly mentored almost 100 fellows in his career, and he has also shared his knowledge in hundreds of invited lectures around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. La Gamma for his lifelong dedication to newborn health, his over 15 years of dedication to neonatal intensive care in my district, New York State, and the nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him for his well-deserved "Mentor of the Year" award, and applaud his tremendous accomplishments.

HONORING ANNE HUTCHINSON
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, protecting the environment and our natural resources are vital, and when a school is committed to furthering those goals it deserves a great deal of praise and admiration. That is why I am proud to acknowledge the Anne Hutchinson Elementary School in Eastchester, New York which has been designated as one of the 2014 U.S. Department of Education Green Ribbon School Honorees.

The prestigious Green Ribbon School program recognizes schools where staff, students, officials and communities have worked together to produce energy efficient, sustainable and healthy school environments and to ensure the environmental literacy of graduates.

The Anne Hutchinson Elementary School was the only New York State School nominated for the Green Ribbons School program during the 2013–2014 school year. The school's commitments to reducing its overall environmental impact, cut utility costs, and promote awareness by incorporating a wide variety of environmentally conscious practices into learning made it one of only 48 schools across the country to be honored as a Green Ribbon School.

As a senior member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee I am keenly aware of the need to pursue smarter, greener energy practices in order to achieve true energy independence and face the challenges of climate change. Schools like the Anne Hutchinson Elementary School are laying the foundation for a more sustainable future and I am so proud to be able to represent such an environmentally conscious school as a Member of Congress.

Congratulations to the students, faculty and administrators of the Anne Hutchinson Elementary School on receiving this incredible honor and recognition.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MEDICARE
HOME INFUSION SITE OF CARE
ACT OF 2015

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Fee-for-Service program stands virtually alone among health care payers in the United States in not fully recognizing the clinical and cost benefits of providing infusion therapy to patients in their homes. Infusion therapy is fully covered by Medicare in hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, hospital outpatient departments, and physician offices, but coverage in patients' homes is very limited. As a result, Medicare beneficiaries in need of infusion therapy usually receive their treatments in health care facilities rather than in their homes, which is the

setting that is the most desirable, convenient, and by far the most cost-effective.

This is unfortunate and unnecessary. In the private sector, the accepted standard of care and practice for over 30 years is to provide infusion therapy at home where medically indicated and when requested by the attending physician. Ironically, patients who have access to this benefit under their private plans lose this coverage when they enroll in Medicare.

Medicare's lack of coverage for infusion therapy in the home setting can lead to substantial patient and family lifestyle disruptions and costs. Because Medicare only covers infusion services in institutional and limited outpatient settings, the beneficiary either has to travel to a health care facility to receive infusion treatments, sometimes multiple times a day, or remain in a facility for the duration of the therapy.

Today, Representative ELIOT ENGEL and I are introducing The Medicare Home Infusion Site of Care Act of 2015 so patients can receive the same infusion treatments that they currently receive in facility-based environments in their homes at a lower cost to Medicare. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support our bill to give patients better quality care at lower costs.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 29, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 3

- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the findings of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. SD-G50
- 10 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016. SD-608
- Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere and Global Narcotics Affairs
To hold hearings to examine understanding the impact of United States policy changes on human rights and democracy in Cuba. SD-419
- Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on innovation to meet the needs of students. SH-216

- 10:30 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the Internal Revenue Service Operations and the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016. SD-215

FEBRUARY 4

- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Ashton B. Carter, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Defense. SD-G50
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine private sector experience with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) framework, focusing on building a more secure cyber future. SR-253
- Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Transportation and In-

frastructure to examine impacts of the proposed waters of the United States rule on state and local governments.

HVC-210

- Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016. SD-215

- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine deferred action on immigration, focusing on implications and unanswered questions. SD-342

- 2:15 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine combating financial exploitation of vulnerable seniors. SD-562

- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine the impacts of vessel discharge regulations on shipping and fishing industries. SR-253

- Committee on Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 184, to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to require background checks before foster care placements are ordered in tribal court proceedings, S. 209, to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, S. 246, to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and an original bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine loan leveraging in Indian country. SD-628

FEBRUARY 11

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the Internet. SR-253

SENATE—Thursday, January 29, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Lord of our life, You are a shield for America. Because of Your mercy and power, we lift our heads with optimism. When we cry aloud to You during our moments of exasperation, You answer us from Your Holy mountain. We remain unafraid of what the future holds because You continue to sustain us.

Lord, pour Your blessings upon our lawmakers so they will do Your will. Begin a spiritual awakening in our Nation and let it begin with us. Help us to know You better that we might love You more and thus be more useful to the advancement of Your Kingdom on Earth.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will have two stacks of votes culminating in passage of S. 1, the Keystone bill. Senators should be expected to stay close to the floor as these will be 10-minute votes. We will have five or six votes at 11 a.m. and four or five votes kicking off at 2:30 p.m.

The Senate will be in session tomorrow morning but no votes are expected. The first vote of next week will be at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

KEYSTONE ENERGY DEBATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in the past few weeks we had a whirlwind, but the Keystone jobs debate has been important for the Senate and for our country. We took about one dozen more rollcall votes on amendments

yesterday. That means the Senate has now taken more than twice as many of these amendment votes on this bill alone than were offered or allowed all of last year.

We obviously had a busy afternoon yesterday, and we will continue it again today. It has been an instructive exercise, too, because we learned about more than just the lesser prairie-chicken. We also discovered something about this body. We learned that open floor debates and open amendment processes require hard work, they require dedicated Members, and they require constructive cooperation from across the aisle.

I thanked Senators HOEVEN and MURKOWSKI for their work before. I thank them again now. I note the efforts, once again, of colleagues such as Senator CANTWELL.

The debate over these American jobs has shown that with bipartisan cooperation, it is possible to get Washington functioning again. This debate is also proving the new Congress is ready to work and work hard for the middle class, even in the teeth of opposition from powerful special interests.

Let's notch one more win for the middle class by passing this important infrastructure project. Constructing Keystone would pump literally billions into our economy. It would support thousands of good American jobs. As the President's own State Department has indicated, it would do this with minimal environmental impact.

The Keystone infrastructure project has been studied endlessly—endlessly—from almost every possible angle. The same general conclusion keeps becoming clear, build it. We need to build it.

Let's make some progress for the American people by voting to pass the Keystone jobs and infrastructure bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting minority leader is recognized.

A CONSTRUCTIVE RELATIONSHIP

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset while the majority leader is still on the floor, it is true we have had a constructive relationship during the last several weeks as we have considered this bill. Although those of us on the Democratic side don't want to get comfortable in our minority status, we are determined to make sure it is, as described, a constructive relationship.

To that end we have not used some of the tactics we have seen in past years.

We have not insisted on burning 30 hours and 60 hours at a time, causing people who subscribe to C-SPAN to call their cable operators and say why am I paying for the Senate; nothing is happening. Instead, we have tried to use that time to put together packages, bipartisan packages of amendments and we have been successful.

I hope we can continue with that. As long as there is mutual respect, good faith, and cooperation, I look forward to in my role—as soon as Senator REID returns—as the whip on the Democratic side to do our best to continue this constructive relationship.

I have said it before and I will say it again. What we have seen over the last several weeks is the Senate I remember, the Senate I was elected to, the Senate where there was active debate, deliberation, amendments. For some Members, it is a new experience. I hope in our role as the minority we can work with the Senators with a feeling of mutual respect to achieve at least debate on the floor, if not some significant legislation.

Mr. McCONNELL. If the Senator would yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his comments. I agree, this has been good for the Senate, good for both parties, and good for America. We are getting back to normal, and I thank the Senator for his comments and for his cooperation.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the majority leader.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, 29 days from today, on February 27, the Department of Homeland Security of the United States of America will run out of money. The only way to prevent this is for Congress to pass legislation to fund this Department. We should not even be debating whether we are going to fund the Department that protects America from terrorism threats, but that is fact.

Republicans in the House, when we did the budget bill, insisted that we would fund the entire Federal Government through September 30, except for the Department of Homeland Security. The reason they withheld regular budget funding for that Department was they wanted to make a political point. They are angered at President Obama for stepping forward with Executive orders on the issue of immigration, even though the same House Republicans

have refused for over a year and a half to call the comprehensive immigration reform bill that passed this Senate on a bipartisan basis and refused for over a year and a half to address any aspect of immigration. In a fit of pique they said: We are so angry President Obama is going to do something by way of Executive order, we are going to withhold regular funding from the Department that protects America from terrorism.

What were they thinking? Look at the world we live in: a world of Charlie Hebdo, a world of beheading of Japanese journalists, a world that is in danger of terrorist threat, and the United States has felt that danger. We will never forget what happened on 9/11. After that experience, we made the Department of Homeland Security a critical, viable part of America's defense against terrorism.

The Republicans have said: No, before we fund this agency, we have to have five riders on the appropriations bill that attack President Obama. Then we might consider giving regular funding to this Department. One aspect of those riders is particularly troubling.

It was 14 years ago that I introduced the DREAM Act, a simple concept. Children brought to the United States by their parents who are undocumented should be given a chance—simple. Children who were brought to the United States as infants and toddlers and had no voice in the decision of their family and end up here undocumented should be given a chance—a chance to complete school, to be good citizens, to go on to college, to serve in the military, and then a path to legal status. It is not a radical idea.

At times many Republicans have openly supported the DREAM Act. When we couldn't pass it I appealed to the President, at least protect these DREAMers from being deported. These kids did nothing wrong. They were brought here by their parents. Why hold these children accountable? The President agreed and 2½ years ago created DACA.

DACA is an Executive order that says to these young people who would otherwise qualify for the DREAM Act, you come forward, you identify yourself, you let us make sure you have no criminal record that would be of worry to anyone, pay your fee, and we will allow you to temporarily stay in the United States as a student or a worker without being deported. It is just that simple.

We estimate 2 million young children are eligible for the DREAM Act—2 million—and 600,000 have already registered under DACA, the President's Executive order.

What did the House Republicans say? They said, before we will fund the Department of Homeland Security protecting America against terrorism, you have to deport the DREAMers, refuse to renew the DACA protection for

600,000 who have signed up, and refuse to allow any new young person to sign up for this protection.

I have come to the floor for a long period of time and I will continue to be because I want people to know what the DREAM Act means. It is something, I guess, of significance to stand and give a speech, but it truly doesn't touch people until they hear actual stories.

The story I wish to tell today is of a young woman whom I know. I was just with her in Chicago. Her name is Karen Villagomez. She was brought to the United States at the age of 2. Incidentally, that was the same age my mother was brought to the United States as an immigrant.

Karen was brought here at the age of 2 from Mexico. She grew up in Chicago. She was an outstanding student, and she always had an interest in public service. In May of 2012 she graduated from the University of Rochester in New York with a major in political science. She was not only the first person in her family to graduate from a 4-year college—because Karen Villagomez is undocumented, she didn't receive one penny of government assistance. She made it through college on her own without any help because as an undocumented young woman that was the only chance she had.

Just 1 month after she graduated, President Obama created the DACA Program. After she applied and cleared and received DACA protection from deportation, she found a job as a paralegal in a law firm in Chicago, where she has been working for the last 2 years.

I saw her 1 week ago Friday. She was in Chicago, and she is amazing. She served as an intern in my office. She is one of the brightest, most engaging people one could meet. She looked me in the eye and said: Senator, I am going to law school. I have just been accepted. She is supposed to start this fall. But if the House Republicans have their way, this fall she will find herself being deported from the United States of America.

Think about it. All we have invested in her, all we have put into her life in terms of education, not only K-12 but a college degree now, and the House Republicans would say to Karen Villagomez: Thank you for being part of America, but no thanks, leave. Take whatever skills you have, whatever determination you have to make a difference and take it someplace else. America doesn't need your idealism, the House Republicans say.

I couldn't disagree with them more. If they have their way, Karen would never attend law school. She will never be an attorney. She will be deported back to Mexico, a country she hasn't lived in since she was 2 years old.

Karen got up every morning in the classroom—just as we do on the Senate floor—and pledged allegiance to that

flag. That is the only flag she knows. When she sings the national anthem, it is not the national anthem of Mexico, it is the national anthem of the United States of America. Karen wants to be part of the future of this country.

Two weeks ago when she joined me at Erie House in Chicago for a press conference, this is what she said:

DACA represents the values and heritage of this country of immigrants; it was the right thing to do and it has changed my life by replacing fear with hope. This executive action gave me an overwhelming sense of relief and hope. It lifted me from the shadows.

Karen's is one of 2 million stories of eligible young people who want to be part of the future of America.

It is time for the Senate to say no to the House on a bipartisan basis. It is time for us to reject this hate-filled amendment process they engaged in that put five riders on this appropriations bill to penalize young people such as Karen Villagomez.

Is that the face of the Republican Party of America—deporting Karen Villagomez and saying to her and others: You are not welcome in America. Leave.

I don't think so. There are many Republicans who come to me and say: I support the DREAM Act. So let's support the DREAM Act. This is their chance. Step up and defeat these horrible riders that were attached to this appropriations bill by the House Republicans. Step up and give us a chance as a nation to renew our commitment to our diversity, to our heritage as a nation of immigrants, and to renew our commitment to young people such as Karen, whom we have told: If you work hard against the odds and succeed, we want you to be part of our future.

CUBA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, earlier this month I had a chance to visit Cuba with a delegation of Senators and House Members. We met with Cuban Archbishop Jaime Ortega, who shared the wonderful story of Pope Francis's efforts to improve relations between the United States and Cuba and to secure the release of American prisoner Alan Gross.

We met with many Cuban reformers and activists, Cuban Foreign Minister Bruno Rodríguez, foreign ambassadors from many countries, various ministry officials, agriculture, telecommunications, science and technology, and the environment—all areas of considerable potential for the greater U.S.-Cuban cooperation.

Our visit came 1 month after President Obama secured the release of Alan Gross and made the historic decision to restore full diplomatic relations with Cuba and begin rolling back over 50 years of failed policies toward that island.

As I have said many times, I am not a fan of the Castro regime. It has a

troubling history of human rights abuse and suppressing peaceful political dissent. It has squandered the talents of so many of its own people with a frozen economic and political system, and it has refused to provide a full accounting of the tragic death of Cuban activist and patriot Oswaldo Paya.

But I have also argued that our policy toward Cuba, which has spanned 11 different U.S. Presidents, has failed—and failed miserably—to bring reform and change in Cuba. Our policy toward Cuba has also hurt the United States and our diplomatic standing in the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean, where many—fairly or unfairly—regard U.S.-Cuban policy as an outdated relic of the Cold War.

So I was delighted and fully supportive when President Obama took this bold move. During my visit I could already see the dividends, most notably in the expressions of hope by the Cuban people. If you go down the streets of Havana, on their pedicabs there are American flags. That would have been unthinkable 2 months ago. Now it is part of their statement that it is time for a new relationship between Cuba and the United States.

As one Cuban activist starkly told me, her talks with others around the island highlighted something she thought had been lost to the Cuban people—a sense of hope.

We need to do all we can to fulfill the hopes of the Cuban people, and one easy way is to provide greater engagement with America, with ideas, with energy, with the vibrancy that our Nation can offer.

I am going to join today with my colleagues: Republican Senators FLAKE, ENZI, MORAN, and BOOZMAN, as well as Democratic Senators LEAHY, UDALL, and WHITEHOUSE, to introduce legislation that will lift the remaining travel restrictions on American travel to Cuba. Representatives SANFORD and MCGOVERN will have a similar bill in the House.

President Obama recently eased these restrictions, but we need to do our part in Congress. It is not only the right thing for the Cuban people; it is the right thing for America. Americans shouldn't have restrictions on their freedom to travel. We don't restrict Americans from traveling to nations with whom we fought wars such as Vietnam, and we don't restrict Americans from traveling to countries with troubling regimes—North Korea, Iran, and Uzbekistan.

During the height of the Cold War, Americans were allowed to travel to the Soviet Union. So why not Cuba? Why do we still isolate this country? Some say that this is a repressive regime, and we don't want to show recognition to this regime.

It is just within this week that our President visited Saudi Arabia to attend the memorial service for the late

King of that country. I would daresay there are aspects of the human rights policy of Saudi Arabia which aren't even close to American standards, and yet we consider them a valuable ally.

There is also a lesson in history. When the Soviet Union started to come down, it was cracking on the edges, in the Baltics, and in the Warsaw Pact. As the other republics saw the outside world, they saw the opportunity and the need for change.

We have not prevailed with isolation. Let's engage the Cuban people. Let's engage their economy. Let's engage their minds in thinking about a 21st century far different than the dark days of communism which they have lived under for so many decades.

I know that several of my colleagues here—particularly those of Cuban descent—have strong, strong personal and family feelings about our relationship with Cuba. I don't diminish that one bit. There is real suffering that has taken place by their families and many others.

But I hope we can look to the future, look to the next generation, and look to the possibility that we can engage Cuba in a positive way. Ultimately, it will be this new flow of American engagement and ideas that will help open Cuba and improve the lives of their people.

Certainly, we ought to try something different. There have been 50 years of isolation, and those 50 years have not worked. Today we are taking the first few steps on a path which I strongly support.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Delaware.

CUBA

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, while Senator DURBIN is still on the floor, I wish to say very briefly that we came to the House of Representatives a few years ago in 1983, and we didn't get a lot of time to speak on the House floor—maybe 1 minute a day if we were lucky. We would say when we were debating, when we agreed with somebody: I would like to be associated with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

I would very much like to be associated with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

I served three tours in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam war. We have most-favored-nation trading status, and they enjoy most-favored-nation trading status with us today.

I like to work out and run. I like to run in the mornings. The mornings I stay here, I run down to the Lincoln Memorial, come back by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and I am reminded of the 55,000 lives that we lost in that war. Yet we enjoy normal diplomatic relations with that country, and they enjoy most-favored-nation status with us. If we can come to this point with Vietnam—after all the loss of life and cost—we should certainly be able to move things along with Cuba. So I applaud what the Senator has said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to S. 299.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to bring a clean fiscal year 2015 bill for the Department of Homeland Security to the Senate floor as soon as possible.

Earlier this month the world watched in horror as terrorists massacred journalists and other innocent civilians in and around Paris. In December we were stunned as computers at a major corporation, Sony Entertainment, were attacked by North Korea. Over the past year, as recently as last week, in fact, we witnessed brutal executions at the hands of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

These events illustrate all too well that the threats faced today by America and by our allies are real. As a former chairman and now ranking member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I know this to be the case.

Nearly 12 years ago, in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 9/11, Congress created the Department of Homeland Security—we call it DHS—to help secure our Nation and to help ensure that our Nation is protected against these continuing and evolving threats.

Given the origins of the Department, the work the men and women do there every day to keep us safe, and the grave nature of the threats our country faces, it is shocking to me and disappointing to me that we are here today having this debate.

We are now discussing ways we can make the Department and its employees more effective. We are not discussing how we can enable them to work better. Senator Coburn and those with whom we served in the last Congress did that throughout the year.

Senator JOHNSON and I did that just yesterday with our first hearing on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee this year. Unbelievably, as we focused on cyber security attacks, we are debating whether to give this key national security agency funding for the remainder of the fiscal year.

In order for that Department to efficiently and effectively carry out its critical role, it needs adequate and reliable funding. They need it. Another short-term budget—or even worse, another shutdown—would be bad for the Department and bad for employee morale—very bad. More importantly, though, it would pose a grave threat to our security.

Instead of sending us a straightforward clean funding bill for the Department, the House has unfortunately sent us a bill that includes a number of amendments aimed at undermining the President's immigration policies.

Many of our colleagues on both sides have significant concerns with these amendments, and the President has indicated that he would veto the funding bill if the amendments stay attached to it. Thus, these amendments jeopardize passage of the bill, and they threaten to prolong the crippling budget uncertainty the Department of Homeland Security has operated under.

The Department of Homeland Security already has a lot to say grace over. We do them no favor by playing games with their budget.

I understand why some of our colleagues are upset about the President's immigration policies, and we should have a debate about those concerns. But first we should be doing what we have been asked to do by giving the Department of Homeland Security the resources that it needs to keep Americans safe in an ever more dangerous world.

Two of our colleagues, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN and BARBARA MIKULSKI, have introduced a clean appropriations bill that mirrors funding provisions of the House bill. Overall, funding provisions in their bill, S. 272—which I understand both Democrats and Republicans on the Appropriations Committee agreed to last year, last December—in fact, provides for \$39.6 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of Homeland Security. That is an increase of \$400 million above last year's funding, but this measure is more than just a funding bill.

To my colleagues who want to do what we can now to protect our country from the kinds of attacks we have been seeing around the world of late, I say: Support a clean DHS funding bill.

To our colleagues who want reforms at the U.S. Secret Service, I say: Support a clean DHS funding bill. A clean bill would provide the resources the Secret Service needs to carry out much-needed reforms in the wake of the most

recent White House fence-jumper incident and other security lapses.

To my colleagues whose States need to recover from this week's blizzards or to prepare for the next storm, let me just say: Support a clean DHS funding bill.

We need to ensure that FEMA and our States have access to nearly \$2.6 billion in grants to respond to future disasters—both natural and manmade.

To my colleagues who want stronger border security and immigration enforcement, a clean DHS funding bill is what we ought to be rallying around. The clean bill put forward by Senator SHAHEEN and MIKULSKI would take additional measures to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws, something I know is a priority to me and, I think, to all of our colleagues. In fact, most of the funding increase in the Shaheen-Mikulski bill would go to border security and immigration enforcement.

The bill our colleagues have put forward contains a little more than \$10 billion for Customs and Border Protection, an increase of approximately \$118 million above last year's enacted level. This funding level would support the largest operational force level for the Agency in its history—maintaining over 21,000 Border Patrol agents and supporting the new funding level for nearly 24,000 officers.

The Shaheen-Mikulski bill would also enable Customs and Border Protection to fly more patrols along our maritime and land borders and to continue purchasing new force-multiplying gear and equipment. It would also increase funding for critical surveillance technologies along our border, especially along areas such as the Rio Grande Valley, by some \$20 million.

As our colleagues will recall, last year our Nation saw tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors and families from Central America come to our southern border. This clean full-year funding bill would provide Immigration and Customs Enforcement \$689 million more than last year's funding to help address the additional needs associated with that surge. Specifically, it includes \$3.4 billion for immigration detention and funds 34,000 adult detention beds.

The Shaheen-Mikulski bill would also fully fund the employment eligibility verification system, known as E-Verify, which helps businesses to ensure they are hiring legal employees.

Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson recently said—and I fully agree with him—that to deny his Department full-year funding would actually hurt our border security.

We cannot continue to default to short-term continuing resolutions and force the Department to cut corners and scramble to fund its highest priorities. As we have learned over these

years, stopgap crisis budgeting is an egregious waste of money. Let me say that again—an egregious waste of money. By shutting down the Department or keeping it on a continuing resolution, we will waste tens of millions of taxpayer dollars, including the cost of renegotiating contracts, lost employee and contractor productivity, and lost training. For example, it would delay the award of a \$600 million contract to build a national security cutter that the Coast Guard needs.

But there is more than just a financial impact. The dramatic consequences of failing to provide full-year funding for the Department will be felt throughout our country. While most of the Department's workforce will continue to perform essential functions in the event of a shutdown, the bulk of its management and administrative support activities would cease and front-line personnel would not receive the support they need. It would be like trying to fight a war without planners, without logistics, and without supplies. It would be like us here in the Senate working without our staffs. We might be able to find a way to get our work done, but we wouldn't be as effective. And those at DHS who are required to come to work if a shutdown were to occur would not be paid until Congress restores funding. Essentially, a large part of our Federal homeland security efforts would be operating under an IOU.

A stopgap budget or a shutdown would also further degrade employee morale at the Department of Homeland Security. As many of us know, the Department continues to rank dead last—dead last—among all other large Federal agencies when it comes to workforce morale.

While Secretary Johnson, Deputy Secretary Mayorkas, and their team are taking important steps to make the agency a better place to work—and we are helping them—the Department still lacks a strong sense of cohesion and a sense of team. But Congress too has a responsibility. Providing this large and complex agency the funding it needs would be a terrific next step.

If my colleagues and I expect the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal agencies to show improved outcomes, we cannot continue to play games with their budgets and expect them to not feel the negative consequences. No business owner or manager could be expected to be effective and efficient under these conditions. The leadership of the Department of Homeland Security is no exception.

A clean Homeland Security funding bill for the rest of the fiscal year is the fiscally responsible step to take. If we deny them that funding, we will not be punishing the President. In a sense, we

will be punishing a number of the employees. But most of all we will be punishing taxpayers because we are wasting their money and we are diminishing and reducing the kind of security they need in this country today.

Let me just say, don't take my word for this. Our good friend Tom Ridge, the first Secretary of Homeland Security and a former Republican Governor, with whom I served, said:

I would be very, very disappointed if I were Secretary, and the Democrats did it to me . . . It's pretty difficult to plan long term when you don't know exactly how much you're going to have available and what strings might be attached to it. Give them the funding they need.

And I would say to our Republican colleagues, give them the funding they need.

For these reasons, I urge our colleagues in the Senate to join me in doing the right thing in supporting passage of a clean full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security and rejecting the amendments approved by the House. It would be irresponsible for us to continue kicking the can down the road when it comes to national security, and we certainly cannot afford to let this vital agency's funding run out.

I ask my colleagues to think about what we are trying to accomplish by failing to provide the Department of Homeland Security with the funds they need to operate. The American voters sent Congress a clear message on election day. This is what they said: They want us to work together. They want us to get things done. And they especially want us to enhance our economic recovery. Given recent events around the world, they also want us to do all we can to keep them and their families safe. We need to show Americans through our actions here in Washington that we have heard them.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me first thank Senator CARPER for his comments on the need for us to pass a homeland security appropriations bill.

I think our constituents would be surprised to learn that we have not passed an appropriations bill that funds for this fiscal year the Department of Homeland Security, a critically important agency that keeps us safe.

We know the challenges around the world. We know the challenges to our homeland. Yet we haven't passed a full-year Homeland Security bill. Instead, we have legislation that has come over from the House that is more interested in picking political fights on immigration policy—when we should be together on immigration policy—and holding up the funding for Homeland Security.

I thank Senator CARPER, who is the ranking Democrat on that committee,

for bringing to our attention that the best thing for us to do is to take up the Shaheen-Mikulski bill, which is a clean reauthorization of the appropriations for this year, so we can get through this year, and then we can debate immigration on an immigration bill, debate next year's budget on a budget bill, and not have the politics of the House interfere with the funding for Homeland Security.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ AND BIRKENAU

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to bring to my colleagues' attention that January 27 represented the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and Birkenau—Auschwitz, the concentration camp that became a death camp; and Birkenau, a death camp, located in Poland, that was liberated by the Allied Forces on January 27, 1945.

There were 1.3 million Jews, Poles, and other minorities who were deported to Auschwitz and Birkenau between 1940 and 1945. Of that 1.3 million, 1.1 million died in these camps.

I had a chance in 2004 to visit both Auschwitz and Birkenau, and it was emotionally draining. It was a site that is hard to imagine, to see the cruelty and the barbaric activities of humans against other humans. From looking at the rooms in which medical experiments were done on human beings, who ultimately died, to seeing the gas chambers, it very much affected my perspective on humanity and life.

In the United States we are blessed. I can practice my religion and don't have to fear losing my head. I can disagree with my government and know I am not going to be locked up for doing it. We should never take those liberties for granted. I think our freedoms give us a special responsibility to make sure that when we say never again, that it becomes a reality, that it becomes real.

We also have a responsibility to remember the victims of the Holocaust. In the Jewish religion, we have Yom Hashoah, a separate day set aside to recognize that. We need to learn from the survivors. I will always remember the times I had a chance to talk to Leo Bretholz. He was a constituent of mine who escaped the trains taking him to Auschwitz. He was an inspiration to all of us who learned more about the circumstances surrounding the Holocaust. Unfortunately, he passed away last year. Leo advocated for the repatriation of victims, particularly from the French railway SNCF, and we were ultimately successful in getting those funds.

This all underscores the importance of Holocaust education. When we say never again, let's always remember what happened over 70 years ago under Nazi rule. Let's have Holocaust edu-

cation so young people understand the consequences of the cruelty and the consequences of not getting engaged.

Let's also help the survivors. I very much want to acknowledge that in the United States we have many survivors from the Holocaust, and over half of them live under the Federal poverty line. They are so fearful of being institutionalized, and we can understand that. I thank Senator MIKULSKI and the appropriators for putting money in the omnibus appropriations bill last year to help provide assistance so these survivors can get the services they are entitled to under our law. Sometimes they can't work their way through it. I was proud to help in those efforts.

I also thank Vice President BIDEN for his leadership in the Obama administration.

I thank those on the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee in the Older Americans Act reauthorization that was acted on this week because they include services for Holocaust survivors so that they will have easier access to government services.

Lastly, let me thank Senators MIKULSKI and KIRK. I joined both of them in a Senate resolution to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and Birkenau. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee that I serve on unanimously approved that resolution for consideration on the Senate floor, and I thank Senators CORKER and MENENDEZ for their help.

As I think most Members of this body know, I have been an active participant in the Helsinki Commission. I am the democratic leader, working with Senator WICKER. The Helsinki Commission is known for its participation in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, but I think it is best known because we put a spotlight on human rights issues. We try to live up to that motto "never again." We try to say we will not let violations of basic human rights go unchallenged.

So on this 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and Birkenau, which are the iconic symbols today of the Holocaust, let's rededicate ourselves to making sure that "never again" becomes a reality.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise first to thank my colleague from Maryland for his eloquent words on the Holocaust and the survivors of the Holocaust and the compelling voices that came out of those death camps.

In addition, my colleague has always been a champion for human rights, whether it is on the Helsinki Commission, whether it is his advocacy to let Soviet Jews get out of the Soviet Union. Where people are repressed or facing attacks or persecution, he has always been on their side, and also actually meeting with the Holocaust survivors in our own community to bring

a lot of attention to what we can do and to actually putting money in the Federal checkbook.

With all that effort at survival and making it to the United States, the survivors of the Holocaust, who were children then and would now be in their eighties and nineties—imagine that—should not live in poverty, they should not fear institutionalization, and they should not fear destitution. So I thank my colleague for his advocacy, and I look forward to working with him on this and also say “never again.”

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor as the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and I come to ask my colleagues to bring to the floor and pass a clean Homeland Security appropriations bill for fiscal year 2015.

This isn't just Senator BARB MIKULSKI calling for this but also the former heads of Homeland Security under President Bush and also under President Obama. The very first head of that agency, Gov. Tom Ridge, along with Mr. Chertoff and Janet Napolitano, have written to HARRY REID and MITCH MCCONNELL and said: Please, as former Secretaries of Homeland Security, we write to you today to respectfully request that you consider decoupling critical legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2015 from a legislative response to President Obama's actions on immigration.

They feel that:

... by tethering a bill to fund DHS in FY 2015 to a legislative response to the President's executive actions on immigration ...

—it could lead to a shutdown of Homeland Security.

We don't want a shutdown.

I won't go through the entire letter. They conclude with:

It is imperative that we ensure that DHS is ready, willing, and able to protect the American people. To that end, we urge you not to risk the funding for the operations that protect every American and to pass a clean DHS funding bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

As former U.S. Secretaries of Homeland Security, we write to you today to respectfully request that you consider decoupling critical legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 from a legislative response to President Obama's executive actions on immigration.

As the recent terrorist attacks in Paris and the cyber-attacks on a major American corporation and on the U.S. Military's Central Command remind us, the threats facing the U.S. are very real. The national security role that DHS plays, and by extension the funding that allows it to carry out its vital national security mission, is critical to ensuring that our nation is safe from harm. Funding for the DHS is used to protect our ports and our borders; to secure our air travel and cargo; to protect the federal government and our nation's information, technology, and infrastructure from cyber-attacks; to fund essential law enforcement activities; to guard against violent extremists; to mobilize response networks after emergencies; and to ensure the safety of the president and national leaders.

Moreover, we appreciate that Congress possesses the authority to authorize and appropriate funds expended by the federal government. We do not question your desire to have a larger debate about the nation's immigration laws. However, we cannot emphasize enough that the DHS's responsibilities are much broader than its responsibility to oversee the federal immigration agencies and to protect our borders. And funding for the entire agency should not be put in jeopardy by the debate about immigration. The President has said very publicly that he will “oppose any legislative effort to undermine the executive actions that he” has taken on immigration. Therefore, by tethering a bill to fund DHS in FY 2015 to a legislative response to the President's executive actions on immigration, the likelihood of a Department of Homeland Security shutdown increases.

It is imperative that we ensure that DHS is ready, willing, and able to protect the American people. To that end, we urge you not to risk funding for the operations that protect every American and to pass a clean DHS funding bill.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL CHERTOFF.

TOM RIDGE.

JANET NAPOLITANO.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, the Department of Homeland Security was established right after the terrible attack on the United States of America on September 11, 2001.

The Department of Homeland Security is a big agency, but protecting the homeland is a big job, and DHS employees are on the job every day: the Coast Guard safeguarding our waterways; Secret Service, not only protecting the President, the First Family, the Vice President, but also doing other important tasks; the Border Patrol and ICE—Immigration and Customs Enforcement—securing our borders against smugglers, traffickers, and other illegal immigrants; cyber warriors—people protecting us against bio and nuclear threats, and then also working with the first responders; FEMA—everything to protecting us in the event of an attack on the homeland, to having readiness and response and shelters and so on, to helping us now in hurricanes and blizzards such as we are facing in the northeast. It all helps State and local responders to have the resources they need to be able to respond at the local level.

The Firefighters Grant Program is so beloved in our communities where,

through competitive exercise, they can go for grants to buy respiratory equipment, the new firetrucks and so on that they need. In my community, they can't come up with this equipment on just fish fries and pancake breakfasts. We need a government on our side. Unfortunately, the Department of Homeland Security funding runs out on February 27.

Now let me give the background.

When we came back in September, facing the fact we had to have a continuing resolution to get us through the fiscal year and the election cycle, the Congress passed legislation, and then on December 13 when we did the omnibus, we passed an omnibus bill for every single agency with the exception of Homeland Security. So every single agency, from the Department of Defense to the Department of Health and Human Services, Education, the weather services, all of these important programs, NIH, were funded through the fiscal year. But we put Homeland Security on a CR because there was an intense and actually very prickly concern over the President's Executive action on immigration. So rather than hold up the whole funding of the United States of America over tantrum politics over Obama's Executive action on immigration, we went to a CR, a continuing resolution, on Homeland Security. The Homeland Security was to take us to February 27, where wiser heads—and now complete control by the Republican Party—would be able to move this for full funding.

So where are we? Well, during that time in December, as the chair of the Committee on Appropriations, with my vice chairman Senator RICHARD SHELBY, Senator DAN COATS, and the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, Senator DAN COATS and Senator Mary Landrieu, we came up with a fiscal framework. So did the House. They came up with it. So the very money that we put into the CR and the clean bill that Senator SHAHEEN—now the ranking member—and I had, has the funding for Homeland Security that Homeland Security says it needs and we have arrived at on a bipartisan basis.

If in fact we are allowed to bring up a clean bill, we have agreed on the money. There is no dispute over the money. We have looked very carefully at it. We worked on a bipartisan basis. We worked on a bicameral basis. We are ready to go. What will slow us down is if we get into an intense debate on immigration and riders to try to stop the activities of President Obama.

I strongly recommend to my colleagues: Do not play politics with the security of the United States of America. We were all horror stricken at what happened in Paris. We are pulsed at what is going on with ISIL. We are very concerned about lone-wolf

attacks. We worry—and the chair of the authorizing committee on Homeland Security in the House has said: They are coming here, they are coming here, they are on their way. We have got to be ready. Well, one of the ways we have got to be ready is to make sure the resources in Homeland Security are funded and that they are not worried about a shutdown, showdown, slamdown politics over a fight on immigration.

Should we have a discussion on immigration? You bet. Should we even have an outright robust debate on it? I am all for it. But leave Homeland Security alone. Pass the money bill. If you disagree with the money, argue over that. But if you want to fight over immigration policy, that is another debate for another day in another way.

The Nation faces growing threats where Americans are endangered at home and abroad. Terrorists are threatening us with bombs and guns, and lone wolves in Ottawa, organized radicals in Paris, cyber criminals with backing from nation states and organized crime.

In terms of the Secret Service, we have the need to reform the Secret Service. We have fence jumpers at the White House, drones landing on the White House lawn.

In the face of these threats, the Republican majority's response is to hold the funding of Homeland Security up to pick a fight with the President over immigration. Uncertainty undermines security. Let's give the Agency certainty of funding.

We are 4 months into the fiscal year. Another continuing funding resolution would be the fifth continuing resolution. That is no way to run an agency so big, so complicated.

Senator COATS and Senator Landrieu and our House colleagues worked so well to come up with the bill. They provide resources for DHS, with the total funding of \$39.7 billion, an increase of over \$400 million above the fiscal year 2014. We could pass that today. We could pass it on Monday, we could pass it on Tuesday.

All of my Democratic colleagues and I wrote a letter to Senator McCONNELL asking him to schedule an immediate vote on a clean vote on Homeland Security. Well, let's see where we go on that.

What we have here, the clean bill offered by Senator SHAHEEN—now the ranking member on the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations—and I have a compromise funding bill that gives certainty to the people who work on the front lines to secure the Nation, whether it is securing the border, whether it is building capacity to meet agricultural and biological threats, whether it is replacing aging nuclear detection equipment, also helping our Coast Guard build their national security cutter so the

Coast Guard can protect us against drug runners, pirates, terrorists.

More than any other specific increase, enacting a clean Homeland Security bill shows the Congress and the Nation value. We do value security, and we value the men and women who work every day to provide us with that security. Uncertainty jeopardizes security. We value them.

I urge my colleagues to put their money where their mouths are to enact a clean homeland security bill, and not to get into this whole debate with immigration.

I look forward—as we wrap up the debate on the Keystone Pipeline, we then take up Homeland Security and we take up a clean bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BOOZMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Arkansas, my time was delayed. I hope I have not slowed the Senator down this morning. I didn't realize you were here.

Mr. BOOZMAN. No, No. I thank the Senator. Everything is fine. We appreciate the Senator, as always.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL STEVE GRAY, RETIRED

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to honor a true champion of veterans, retired Lt. Col. Steve Gray, who is set to retire from public service at the end of this month after nearly 16 years of helping his fellow veterans in Arkansas.

Since I came to Washington 13 years ago, Steve has served on my staff advocating for the needs of servicemembers and veterans across the Nation.

He has been a trusted aide whose reputation in Arkansas's veterans community is second to none. His passion and advocacy has resulted in better service offerings at veterans facilities across Arkansas. It is reflected in the lives that he has helped make better by solving an individual's problems at the VA.

If Steve was able to track down military medals a veteran earned but never received, those medals weren't just dropped in the mail. Steve would criss-cross the State, personally delivering them, dressed in his Air Force blues, and present them with the stories of the veteran's time in service.

A veteran himself, Steve served honorably in the Air Force as a tactical air controller, with assignments as director of operations and commander in Virginia, Vietnam, California, Utah, Florida, Colorado, Kansas, and Iceland.

He also served as national director for the National Guard recruiting, retention, and advertising at the Pentagon. His final assignment before re-

tiring with the rank of lieutenant colonel was in Germany where he served as an adviser to the commander and chief of the Air Force in Europe.

Along with the work he does in an official capacity, Steve is active in a number of veterans service organizations, including the American Legion and the Wounded Warrior Program.

He has served as vice president of the Arkansas Council of Military Officers Association of America.

I am excited for Steve as he embarks on the next chapter of his life, but we are losing a fantastic advocate for Arkansas veterans. However, I know that my staff will continue to provide the best possible service to Arkansas's veterans as we have the blueprint on how to do it right, thanks to Steve. He has literally set the gold standard on how to deliver for veterans.

I know also that in retirement Steve does not mean to fade from sight. Steve is not the slowing-down type of personality. Certainly he will take some time to travel with his wife Sharon in their retired life. But along with the relaxation, Steve has grand plans to travel the country singing at veterans retirement homes, and he intends to stay active with the Arkansas Veterans Coalition. This is his calling, his passion, and I am quite certain Steve will continue to work with the veterans community for years to come.

Thank you, Steve, for your service in uniform, your dedication to your fellow veterans, and most of all thank you for your friendship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The senior Senator from South Dakota.

HELPING THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week President Obama came over to Congress to deliver his annual State of the Union Address. His speech focused heavily on something Republicans have been talking about for the last 6 years: helping the middle class. Occasionally the President even sounded as if he had stolen a line from Republicans, which I can assure you Republicans were happy to provide.

Seriously, Republicans were glad to hear the President pivoting back to the middle class. Providing relief for the middle class is the Republican priority in the new Congress and we are eager to work with the President to get things done for American families.

Unfortunately the President's speech didn't show the same willingness to work together. In fact, Wolf Blitzer from CNN said: "I don't remember a State of the Union Address where I heard a President issue so many veto threats to the opposite party in the United States Congress."

While it was good to hear the President focus on the middle class, his actual proposals for helping them left

much to be desired, because unfortunately they were more of the same top-down, big government policies that have failed to help Americans over the past 6 years. For example, the President proposed a new tax on middle-class families' college savings accounts—the last thing families need when they want to save for their children to go to college. Fortunately, the President because he received so much pressure has been forced to withdraw this particular proposal, but his speech contained a lot of other proposals that would not provide the help American families need.

If there is anything the past 6 years have shown, it is that big government is not the solution to our economic challenges. In fact, it is the cause of many of our economic problems.

Take a look at ObamaCare. A Gallup poll released last week found that health care costs are one of American families' top two concerns. It is no wonder. ObamaCare was supposed to help our Nation's health care problems. It was supposed to drive down premiums and make health care more affordable. Instead, it has generally done the opposite.

Since ObamaCare became law in 2010, health care premiums have risen. Millions of Americans have lost their health insurance plans. Others have lost access to doctors or to convenient hospitals. Still others are stuck in insurance plans paying more for less coverage. Then of course there are all the problems the law has created for workers and businesses and the pain millions of Americans will be feeling this tax season when they discover they owe the government money from their ObamaCare subsidies or that they must pay a tax penalty for failing to have government-approved health insurance.

The American Action Forum recently ran the numbers and estimated that 6,000 people in South Dakota will have to pay the ObamaCare tax penalty for not having government-approved health insurance. According to a calculator on the Wall Street Journal's Web site, the average individual in South Dakota will pay a \$394 penalty this year, while the average family of four in South Dakota will pay a \$650 penalty. Now that is a lot of money. That is a lot of money for a family in South Dakota, and it is only going to go up because the tax penalty will rise in 2016.

As we can see on this chart, South Dakotans could be spending that tax money on a number of essential items if they didn't have to pay the penalty. In fact, for \$394 in South Dakota you can buy 201 gallons of gas at current South Dakota prices, buy 6 weeks of groceries or make 1.1 car payments with that amount of money. That is for an individual and the amount they can be basically hit with in terms of the tax penalty.

If we look at how this impacts a typical South Dakota family—and the distinguished Chair knows exactly what I am talking about—if they didn't have to pay that \$650 tax penalty, it could be used for 332 gallons of gas in South Dakota at South Dakota prices, 3 weeks of groceries or almost two car payments. If we think about 332 gallons of gas in South Dakota, that would cover a lot of trips to school or to football practice or to dance practice. These are real-world impacts on real people. As ObamaCare has demonstrated, big government is not the answer.

While it is great the President wants to focus on helping the middle class who suffered for years under his policies, he cannot help them if he insists on pushing more of the same failed top-down, big government policies. The last few years have involved laying a lot of burden on American workers and on the American economy to fund big government programs and the President's pet projects.

Take the ObamaCare tax on life-saving medical devices such as pacemakers and insulin pumps. This tax was put in place to help pay for the President's health care law, but it has ended up negatively affecting jobs in this industry. Even Democrats who voted for the President's health care law are pushing to get rid of this tax.

Take the Obama Interior Department's recent decision to push for closing off large swaths of Alaska to energy development that would create jobs and benefit Alaska's economy, as well as strengthen America's energy independence or take the crippling new energy rules the President's EPA has proposed, such as a new tax on coal-fired powerplants that could result in the loss of tens of thousands of jobs and devastate entire communities; likewise, the EPA proposal to lower the ozone standard that would be the most expensive EPA regulation in history.

I intend to reintroduce my bill, the bipartisan CASE Act, to make sure we tackle places with the worst smog in the country before forcing cleaner areas to meet what is an impossible standard.

If we want to fix the economy, we have to stop weighing it down with taxes and regulations. We have to reject yesterday's stale policies with their focus on taxing, spending, and regulating. Instead of pushing big government solutions, we need to rebuild our economy from the bottom up.

Republicans are focused on the future that embraces and fights for the potential of the people, not government. That means passing legislation to free businesses to create jobs. It means reforming our Tax Code to put more money in the pockets of American families and to make it easier for American businesses to compete around the globe. It means eliminating the kind of

heavy Washington spending that is weakening the economy and piling up debt on the backs of the next generation of Americans. It means getting rid of redtape and regulations that are stifling energy development and the jobs that go along with it and preventing more American businesses from growing and hiring new workers. It means opening new markets abroad for American manufacturing and American farm products.

The past 6 years have not been kind to American families. A recent Reuters story opened by saying, "Barack Obama enters the final 2 years of his legacy with a blemish on his legacy that looks impossible to erase: the decline of the middle class he has promised to rescue."

Household income has fallen by more than \$2,000 on the President's watch, according to Sentier Research. Meanwhile, prices have gone up. Millions of Americans are unemployed while millions more are stuck with part-time jobs because they cannot find more work. Millions of other Americans are so discouraged with not finding work over the past 6 years that they gave up looking and dropped out of the labor force entirely. Wage growth has remained stagnant during the Obama Presidency. As a CNN headline put it after the President's State of the Union Address, "Obama says wages are growing. They're not."

It is no surprise middle-class families aren't feeling an economic recovery or that Americans list lack of money and low wages as one of their top financial concerns.

A New York Times headline from Sunday read "Middle Class Shrinks Further As More Fall Out Instead of Climbing Up."

It doesn't have to stay this way. Republicans don't believe in a permanent middle-class decline. If we stop government from weighing down our economy with taxes and regulations and start freeing businesses to create new jobs and opportunities for American workers, our economy will rebound and the middle class will feel the effects.

Republicans are already working on legislation to help the middle class and we will be sending our first job-creating bill with legislation to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline and the 42,000 jobs it will support during construction to the President very shortly. We hope the President will sign it.

American families have had to spend 6 years in this economy. They shouldn't have to wait any longer for relief.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Senator THUNE, for his very comprehensive review of where we are with

the economy and the need for the Keystone Pipeline to pass. As always, Senator THUNE in a very articulate manner made the case for our country to become more energy independent and also touched on national security and the stagnant situation we face with our economy.

I thank the Senator for his remarks.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, in this new Congress we have an opportunity and a responsibility to address an issue of utmost importance to every American: the current dysfunction at the Internal Revenue Service.

I do not use the word “dysfunction” lightly, but I reach that conclusion when I see the agency systematically suppress the political activity and free speech rights of American citizens. I also reach that judgment when I see the agency unable to effectively police its personnel, as seen in the tax delinquency levels of the agency’s staff, when bonuses have been awarded to these same employees. These are critical issues we must address, particularly as we in Congress face our obligation to reform our tax system.

The IRS targeting of conservative and other groups that came to light way back in May 2013 is neither a trivial issue, nor one we can ignore—no more back burner. This is a front-burner issue.

We have hit many roadblocks in this investigation, and it is certainly premature for us to reach any conclusions or to make concrete recommendations on how to address the IRS targeting. That being said, we have a pretty clear sense of what happened. In my view, this egregious conduct and the condescending response by the top IRS officials should come to a screeching halt. For over 2 years the IRS targeted conservative and many other groups applying for tax-exempt status with inappropriately intrusive information requests. The IRS also delayed processing these applications, and according to recent reports has continued to delay processing applications. It hasn’t stopped—amazing, simply amazing.

When the targeting came to light, senior members of the agency tried to cover up the IRS’ actions by providing incomplete and misleading information to Congress about what was being done. Very recently we learned the agency has found tens of thousands of pages of information relating to the targeting. The review of these documents has not yet begun.

The good news is that the inspector general for the IRS has these records now. The bad news is that there are technical difficulties processing those records. The Senate Finance Committee has yet to receive this information as the investigation continues. There is no doubt the review will lead

to further interviews with officials in the IRS and other government agencies.

The actions of the IRS and its leadership have profound implications for reform of our overly complex and antiquated Federal tax system. Let me quote from the Internal Revenue Service mission statement: The IRS tries to provide America’s taxpayers “top quality service” by helping them understand and meet their tax responsibilities. They are meant to do all this—this is the underlying, this is the one statement the IRS should remember every day—“with integrity and fairness to all.” With integrity and fairness to all.

Now in the targeting scandal, I believe the IRS is no longer the neutral tax collector its mission states it to be and that the IRS is inappropriately open to a partisan political agenda of the White House and its allies, if not to working as a direct tool or means of suppression to the right of free speech.

The other issue with the IRS also showing its dysfunction relates to the tax compliance of IRS employees and in fact the compliance level of Federal employees all across our government. As of September 2013, Federal employees were delinquent on \$3.4 billion in taxes. Yes, that is right—1,500 Treasury employees were delinquent, owing close to \$10 million. While in the grand scheme of Federal finances it is a very small amount, it is tremendously galling and sends a terrible message to taxpayers to know that many of these employees were awarded bonuses—they were awarded bonuses—even though they owed back taxes.

Let me be perfectly clear. Any employee who deliberately ignores the process and procedures for fulfilling their tax obligations like every other American must be held accountable. This is a basic principle upon which I think we can all agree. When these public employees serve at the IRS, their lack of willingness to pay their tax obligations calls into question the integrity of the agency. It is unconscionable that there are tax delinquents working as tax collectors.

In these two matters, it is very clear that the IRS is again not conducting itself with integrity and fairness—far from it. The crux of the issue is that neither the Congress nor the tax-paying public can have any confidence that the agency acts in an evenhanded manner or with the best interest of the taxpayer at heart.

This is a very troubling at a time when the IRS’s role in the economy and in people’s lives has been greatly expanded by ObamaCare. From the very first, the idea of using the IRS to implement and enforce ObamaCare is an anathema to common sense.

It is bad enough now when taxpayers are audited. Nobody likes to hear that knock on the door or receive a tele-

phone call or email after being targeted for their political beliefs and blocked from exercising their free speech rights. But to expand the role of this agency into everyone’s health care decisions is just plain wrong. That is a box canyon we should not ride into.

Tax reform presents us with the opportunity to look at these issues much more closely. When we have completed these investigations and have issued reports, I will review the results very carefully to see what legislative fixes to the IRS and the Tax Code may be necessary. Make no mistake about it, I am not going to let this slip from the radar, and we should not let this slip from the radar with regard to the Senate Finance Committee. There are too many blips on the screen—large blips.

I hear from Kansans every day who are fed up with the IRS. I think most Members in this body feel the same way. There is a lot of discontent with the tax system and its enforcement, and there are regular calls for even scrapping the whole collection apparatus. I agree we need to take a hard look at tax reform in the agency.

Of course we have an immediate obligation to take up tax reform, and the Finance Committee will do so, but the question remains: If we are successful in reforming the Tax Code—truly climbing that mountain—how can we turn a reformed code over to an IRS that is so rife with scandal?

The other action we must take immediately is to block the IRS from taking any further steps to restrict constitutional free speech rights. This is why just yesterday I joined with my colleague from Arizona Senator FLAKE to again introduce legislation to prevent the IRS from moving forward with a regulation project on the political activities of social welfare groups, the 501(c)(4) regulations.

It is completely inappropriate for the agency to move forward with this project until we understand what went on and what structural and procedural changes are needed at the Internal Revenue Service to prevent the targeting of political opponents from ever happening again. Senator FLAKE and I have proposed a very straightforward and commonsense approach to this challenge. We simply halt further action on the proposed regulations until the congressional investigations into the IRS actions are completed.

The bill we have introduced freezes further IRS actions for 2 years and would make it clear the IRS can only enforce the regulations that were in place before all the targeting began.

I also wish to make it clear that we can no longer tolerate rewarding government workers who cannot be bothered to comply with our tax laws.

So today I am offering legislation to block Federal employees who are delinquent on their Federal taxes—here is the key—and making no effort to pay

their tax liability; we will block them from receiving a bonus or award from the Federal Government. If someone is a Federal employee, they should not be receiving a bonus if they are not making an effort to pay back taxes.

I think the purpose of my bill is very simple. If someone is a Federal worker, they should be making a good-faith effort to pay their taxes like everybody else or at least work with the IRS to pay down their debt. Holding Federal employees accountable for their tax debt may even foster public confidence again in our tax system.

Amazingly there are Federal employees at almost every agency, including the Internal Revenue Service, who are significantly delinquent in their taxes and not working to pay their debts. That is wrong. That is not fair. It is not good government practice. That is an understatement. My bill will put a stop to this practice.

It is no wonder, given the IRS's behavior and the behavior of these Federal tax delinquents, that Kansans and virtually every American doubt that the government can administer the tax laws in good faith. The lack of faith in the Internal Revenue Service is an important reason why Congress must rewrite the Tax Code, simplify how we pay taxes, and reduce the government's intrusion into economic and other affairs of the public.

We don't need the IRS regulating constitutionally guaranteed free speech and muzzling lawful political activity. We also do not need to reward Federal employees who do not even make the most minimal effort to pay their tax debt and then give them bonuses. The hypocrisy of IRS agents getting bonuses when they don't pay their taxes has to stop.

Finally, there are other issues at the Internal Revenue Service. There was a recent statement by the IRS Commissioner warning—threatening—the tax-paying public, during tax-filing season no less, that the agency is drastically cutting taxpayer service functions. I am talking about answering calls, tax return help, and other programs that assist the average American to fulfill their tax obligation.

The Commissioner blames the budget sequester. I understand that. Every Federal agency is now upset about the sequester. I am upset about the sequester with regard to our national security and the spending caps setting these cuts. The IRS Commissioner is upset about that as well. That is beyond amazing when we have learned that the agency has made so many poor decisions, such as entering into a contract with the IT company that was just fired by Massachusetts, Vermont, and the Department of Health and Human Services for its failure in implementing the healthcare.gov Web site. The historic rollout was a total disaster. I expect we will get into this

in detail next week when the Commissioner comes before the Finance Committee. I am going to be asking him questions about the same topics I brought up in these remarks.

In the meantime, just a suggestion to the IRS—from the Commissioner on down—take a hard look at the mission statement, concentrate on serving the taxpayer, stop threatening the American public with the loss of service, and try to do the best you can in a most difficult budget environment.

We have an obligation to have the IRS serve with integrity and fairness to the American public, and that is not happening now. Let's work together to make sure it does happen.

I yield the floor, and after careful inspection, it appears to me we do not have a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business. I know the managers will be here shortly, and when they arrive I will obviously yield the floor to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY STANDARD

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today we are voting in the 11 o'clock series on the renewable electricity standard—a bill to promote 25 percent of our electricity to come by renewable sources by 2025.

From what we have heard these past few weeks, we are either on the floor debating an energy bill or a jobs bill. This is what my Republican friends and colleagues have been saying.

The Keystone Pipeline fits neither one of these descriptions. The Keystone Pipeline is not an energy bill. The bill lacks a comprehensive energy policy; it lacks even trying to set one. This is not a "do it all, do it right" energy bill. It isn't even a "drill, baby, drill" bill. This is the "drill, Canada" bill.

If we are going to debate energy policy, we need to debate and adopt a renewable electricity standard. The Keystone Pipeline is an investment in doing things the old way—importing foreign oil. Instead of doubling down on foreign oil, we should be talking about how we can move America forward by investing in homegrown energy for the future. The renewable electricity standard is such a bill.

I wish to point out that States already recognize this fact significantly.

Colorado has a 30-percent target by 2020. Nevada has a 25-percent target by 2025. Oregon has a 25-percent target by 2025. A number of other States have renewable electricity targets. Twenty-nine States, in fact, are developing a national market. There are many States that are meeting these goals and moving forward aggressively.

In 2013, the State of Iowa produced 27 percent of its electricity alone with wind power.

I see the chairwoman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee on the floor. I promise to yield. I only have a couple of more minutes. I thank the chairwoman.

This amendment—the renewable electricity standard—is a start to a comprehensive energy policy for the United States.

We are told the Keystone Pipeline is a jobs bill. We are told Keystone will create jobs. Of course, we are all for that. But how many jobs? We are talking about 2,000, 3,000 construction jobs, but the permanent jobs are in the range of 50. How about a renewable electricity standard that promotes long-lasting manufacturing and installation jobs—American jobs, permanent jobs—jobs that can't be outsourced?

The renewable electricity standard could create an additional 274,000 to 297,000 jobs in the United States in such areas as construction, operations, and engineering. Over 50 percent of these jobs would be created in the manufacturing sector. These are hundreds of thousands of 21st century American jobs in my State and across the country. We owe it to all Americans to consider this and other amendments that would improve the bill.

Right now, we are losing out to other countries in both solar and wind. China has the largest market share. A national renewable electricity standard would help us move forward aggressively to get our market share in those two areas.

It is clear to me a national renewable electricity standard would combat global warming while creating hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country. It will help maximize our energy potential while strengthening our economy and our energy security.

Let's vote on that. Let's move forward to meet the real energy needs of American families.

I thank the chairwoman for being so gracious and for her courtesy.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Pending:

Vitter/Cassidy further modified amendment No. 80, to provide for the distribution of revenues from certain areas of the outer Continental Shelf.

Murkowski (for Sullivan) amendment No. 67 (to amendment No. 2), to restrict the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency to arm agency personnel.

Murkowski amendment No. 98 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress relating to adaptation projects in the United States Arctic region and rural communities.

Flake amendment No. 103 (to amendment No. 2), to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs.

Boxer amendment No. 130 (to amendment No. 2), to preserve existing permits and the authority of the agencies issuing the permits to modify the permits if necessary.

Merkley amendment No. 174 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize and fund adaptation projects in communities in the United States while also helping to fund climate change adaptation in developing countries.

Cantwell/Boxer amendment No. 131 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that if the Keystone XL Pipeline is built, it will be built safely and in compliance with United States environmental laws.

Tillis/Burr amendment No. 102 (to amendment No. 2), to provide for leasing on the outer Continental Shelf and the distribution of certain qualified revenues from such leasing.

Markey amendment No. 178 (to amendment No. 2), to ensure that products derived from tar sands are treated as crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum.

Markey amendment No. 141 (to amendment No. 2), to delay the effective date until the President determines that the pipeline will not have certain negative impacts.

Booker amendment No. 155 (to amendment No. 2), to allow permitting agencies to consider new circumstances and new information.

Burr modified amendment No. 92 (to amendment No. 2), to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Cardin amendment No. 124 (to amendment No. 2), to clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect.

Cantwell (for Peters/Stabenow) amendment No. 55 (to amendment No. 2), to require a study of the potential environmental impact of by-products of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Murkowski (for Barrasso) amendment No. 245 (to amendment No. 2), to clarify that treaties with Indian tribes remain in effect.

Daines amendment No. 246 (to amendment No. 2), to express the sense of Congress that reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority.

Udall amendment No. 77, to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 15 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as we just heard, the House has sent over legislation they have moved through that body that would allow for export

of LNG. As we speak, in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee downstairs, the committee is considering a bipartisan LNG measure. Five Republicans and five Democrats are coming together with an LNG export proposal that they have not only worked with the administration on, but the administration is actually carrying out, without the law being in place. Certainly we are getting to a place with our LNG and our natural gas opportunities where there are good, substantive developments being made in our laws and in how we can provide for not only certainty through the regulatory process—efficiency, expediency—but assurance to the public—to families, to businesses, to manufacturers—that pricing issues will be addressed and the opportunity for jobs in this country is put first and foremost. So I think there is good news going on today.

There is further good news as we begin the glidepath toward passage of the Keystone XL Pipeline. We have had a host of measures come before us in the form of some 35 amendments that we have considered as a body over the course of these several weeks. I think it has been good debate. I think it has been a good process. We are now getting to the final closeout.

AMENDMENT NO. 80, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Some very important issues have been raised in this debate. I wish to thank Senator VITTER for bringing the very important issue of revenue sharing to the attention of the Senate. He offered an amendment that has been before us for consideration. He has been very steadfast in ensuring that there is a continued commitment to America's energy security and increasing offshore energy production.

The American energy revolution has provided us with high-paying jobs for millions of workers. It has led to lower gas prices. It has provided a real stimulus to the pocketbooks of just about every American. It is fundamentally changing our role on the international stage, which is so important.

The amendment Senator VITTER has offered to the underlying bill, which would increase access to our offshore energy resources and provide revenue sharing for coastal producing States, is a very important one. Again, I thank him for that.

One of my top priorities as chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee is to help ensure the exploration and the development of Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf—OCS—which holds an estimated 236 billion barrels of offshore oil and 132 trillion cubic feet of offshore natural gas. This is clearly an amazing resource base. It is going to take a while—more than a decade—to develop, but it will provide substantial government revenues for generations to come.

With the benefits that come with this resource development, there are also

impacts. There will be impacts both to the State of Alaska and to coastal communities. It will require major investment in new infrastructure, whether it be ports or pipelines or roads. That just comes with this kind of resource production.

I look forward to working with Senator VITTER to address the revenue sharing not only for my State but for the gulf States and other States that host energy development off of their coastline in legislation that the energy committee will consider later this year.

I appreciate the continued support of my colleague from Louisiana and for providing a fair share of the revenue from offshore oil and gas activity to the States that are most affected. His State most clearly has experienced the benefits of offshore activity. I have seen this for myself when I have gone down to visit.

He is also working hard to ensure that others enjoy those benefits as well. Again, we are having a great debate over energy policy. We are seeing many good amendments with ideas that could be included in future bills, and I certainly look forward to working on revenue sharing with my colleagues from Louisiana, Senator VITTER and Senator CASSIDY, and with other Members of the Senate as we go forward in this Congress.

I will now yield to my colleague from Louisiana for any comments he may choose to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to thank the Senator for her kind words and continuing commitment to work on revenue-sharing measures. As her new role as the Chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, that is going to happen this year, which is exciting.

As the Senator mentioned, I filed an amendment to this bill with regard to revenue sharing and worked very closely with my new Senate colleague, BILL CASSIDY, and others. This is important now more than ever, particularly in light, unfortunately, of the Obama administration's recently announced 5-year OCS plan. That plan is grossly inadequate. It really chops up and goes down even lower than we have been with regard to the development of our Outer Continental Shelf.

Revenue sharing is one key way to reverse that trend and produce more American energy in a safe and environmentally sensitive way and have all of this benefit, including, by the way, the Federal Treasury. My revenue-sharing amendment and other revenue-sharing ideas—certainly including those Senator MURKOWSKI is working on—would do just that. We have three fundamental goals in mind.

First of all, we need to expand production activity on our U.S. Outer Continental Shelf.

Secondly, we need to treat host States right. They have benefits like the economic benefits we enjoy in Louisiana, but there are also costs and burdens. There are absolutely impacts to coastal communities. That requires that some portion of that revenue from that production stay in the host States. That is what revenue sharing is all about. We need that in Alaska. We need that in the gulf. We need that when we start production on the east coast.

Finally, we need that revenue sharing because it is the most powerful incentive tool out there to significantly boost production, to get more States into the act, to get more production online working toward American energy independence and an economic renaissance. Revenue sharing, properly formulated, will do all of that.

I really do appreciate Senator MURKOWSKI's focus on this issue and commitment to proceeding with this issue in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in legislation this year.

AMENDMENT NO. 80, AS FURTHER MODIFIED
WITHDRAWN

With that having been said, I will withdraw my Vitter amendment No. 80 on this bill and certainly will actively partner with Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator CASSIDY, and others to advance revenue sharing this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Louisiana.

I do think this is an area where those of us from coastal States can sit down together to truly map out a proposal that is fair and equitable, truly taking advantage of the benefits of accessing our offshore resources while recognizing those States that bear the responsibility of these production and development activities should share in some of the benefit there as well. I am looking forward to working with him as well as members of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the votes on the Barrasso amendment No. 245 and the Cardin amendment No. 124 occur after the disposition of the Udall amendment No. 77, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect, and there be 2 minutes equally divided before the vote on the Daines amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Just for Members' information, we will be prepared very shortly to commence votes. The good news for Members is the list of amendments that we had scheduled prior to the lunchtime has actually been win-

nowed down somewhat. Some Members, such as we have just seen from the Senator from Louisiana, have chosen to withdraw. We may be in a position to take some by voice. We will be having votes commencing here very quickly. But the good news is there will be fewer than there were when we started out this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I assume there is a little bit of time to make a couple of comments as we are waiting.

I would commend the chairwoman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, for she and the ranking Member have done an excellent job of moving us through. I think we all appreciate it when we hear the words "an amendment has been withdrawn" in terms of being able to move the process forward.

I did want to mention a couple of things. One, just to remind everyone, when we talk about this Canadian oil company bringing a pipeline through the United States down to the Gulf—putting it on a ship and sending it to China—they are not paying into the oilspill liability trust fund. Our amendment to say the oil should stay here if Americans are taking all the risk was voted down. The amendment that would require American steel was voted down. Any commitment to make sure these were all American jobs has also been voted down.

I did also—because the distinguished Chair of the committee mentioned a bill that came over from the House—want to take a moment to say as we look at energy policy in the energy committee today we are, in fact, considering what I consider to be one of the most fundamental questions for us moving forward with this new energy source in abundance called natural gas.

It is incredibly important we get this right. As opposed to the pipeline going through the middle of our country, this is something that can greatly increase our ability to have manufacturing jobs across the country, to continue to lower and keep down the prices of heating and other energy costs for our citizens. If it is done right—the committee, I believe, dramatically does it the wrong way. The bill that came from the House is very much, in my judgment, a China-first policy and not an America-first policy. I say that because right now China is willing to pay more than three times for natural gas than we are. I understand that the gas and oil industry wants to rush it on ships over to China. But to add insult to injury for us, they were willing to pay, last year, \$16 and then turn around and subsidize their industry that is competing with us and only give it to them for I believe it was \$1.78. Our folks who are forced to pay \$16 because we don't have a prudent ex-

port policy—they just throw open the doors to send it to China. Our folks pay \$16. The folks competing with us for our jobs are paying \$1.78.

I realize we have a lot more discussion on that at a later point. I do want to say there will be a great debate on what I believe is one of the most important issues in front of us in terms of continuing to having manufacturing renaissance and the ability to create good middle-class jobs in this country. I am hopeful in the end we will have an America-first policy, not a China-first policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are just about ready to begin our votes. Again, it was a very productive day processing amendments yesterday, and we have some good provisions included in the bill. We were able to adopt by voice the provision of the Senator from Maine to better coordinate energy retrofitting assistance for schools. That was good for us. I think we have been available to reach agreement on several of the measures that will allow the process to go quickly this morning.

I am certainly prepared to yield back any time here so we can commence with the voting, although I want to recognize my ranking member and partner in this weeks-long effort if she wants to make any comments before the vote.

Ms. CANTWELL. I know originally we pushed the bill back, so I am happy to move it back to reclaim some of that time and help us. I know there are a few things which have been worked out, and we very much appreciate that.

I yield back our time.

AMENDMENT NO. 246

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 246, offered by the Senator from Montana, Mr. DAINES.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Daines amendment. While I respect the perspective of my colleague from Montana, this amendment does nothing to support the Land and Water Conservation Fund. If you really want to support LWCF, you ought to support the bipartisan Burr amendment which we will consider in a few minutes. Instead of actually solving the problem, the Daines measure creates more delay for delay's sake and says LWCF should be a priority but undermines the very notion by suggesting there is something wrong with the program.

For once we have a program where there actually is nothing wrong with it. It has been one of our Nation's most successful conservation programs for 50 years, funding projects in every State and literally every single county in the

United States. These are projects that range from creating new parks for inner city kids, to providing new access to sportsmen, to protecting the Nation's historic battlefields. We don't need to overhaul LWCF, we just need to reauthorize it and let the program's proven track record of success continue.

I would urge my colleagues to vote no on the Daines amendment before us now, but vote yes on the bipartisan Burr amendment to follow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I believe Senator DAINES is still in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee so I will attempt to speak on his behalf in support of his amendment.

Reauthorizing the LWCF is something that I have said we plan to take up in the energy committee. We are going to make it a priority. But I agree the sense-of-the-Senate, in order to ensure that this program can be an effective tool for management structural improvements to the program, is going to be needed.

For example, I know the LWCF has been used to acquire inholdings in existing national parks, our national forests, and wildlife refuges. Acquiring inholdings can improve management. We should do more of these kinds of targeted land acquisitions.

Another structural change I know some are interested in making is setting aside some of the LWCF funding to address the maintenance backlog facing our Federal land management agencies. We have combined maintenance backlogs, as much as \$22 billion, according to CRS reports. We have issues. We have to do that.

I will support the Daines amendment.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been instrumental in increasing access to our public lands, growing opportunities for outdoor recreation, and protecting wildlife. And there is great potential for the program to be used to increase access to our existing Federal lands.

My amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the Land and Water Conservation Fund serves an important role in improving wildlife habitat, increasing outdoor recreation opportunities, and facilitating economic development on our public lands.

It will also convey that funding and reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be a priority for Congress and as we consider its reauthorization, we should also look for improvements to the structure of the program. The benefits and opportunities for improvement to the Land and Water Conservation Fund should be thoroughly evaluated in a transparent legislative process.

My amendment would support authorization through the legislative

process and allow for oversight and transparency in improving the program. My amendment is not intended to undermine the integrity of the program.

Montana's outdoors heritage is of great importance to our State's economy and thousands of Montanans' way of life. Supporting and improving the Land and Water Conservation Fund will help us ensure that this legacy is continued for future generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Daines amendment, No. 246.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. ERNST). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Donnelly	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—51

Ayotte	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Graham	Paul
Booker	Heinrich	Peters
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Burr	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lee	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Cruz	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. VITTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 92, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 92, as modified, offered by the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I will be brief, but I would like my colleagues' attention because we have an opportunity today to take a program that functions well, that this body designed, funded from royalties off of exploration of energy, that has never been fully funded at what the statute said we would do, and every so often it comes up for reauthorization. That is sort of stupid.

What this amendment does is it makes permanent the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I say to my friends and colleagues, if you want to change the makeup of the fund—what it does, how it works—that still exists, but let's not have the debate as to whether this is going to continue. Let's continue it permanently, and let's make sure that what they do in their work, where they leverage a few Federal dollars with a lot of private dollars, not to acquire massive amounts of lands or create parks but to put adjoining lands together that stops encroachment on some very sensitive areas—this is a smart investment, and it is an investment we make off of the production of energy in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 92.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I would suggest that legislative proposals such as reauthorizing the LWCF should be considered under regular order, beginning with hearings in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Obviously, this is an issue in which many of us are interested. We have just had a measure before this which spoke to some of the proposed policy changes that might be considered.

So whether we are seeking to reauthorize permanently or considering different set-asides of funds that come in for different programs, I would like to think we could do it through regular order. But I certainly understand where the Senator from North Carolina is coming from, and I look forward to working with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 92, as modified.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Boxer	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Burr	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kirk	Stabenow
Capito	Klobuchar	Tester
Cardin	Leahy	Thune
Carper	Manchin	Tillis
Casey	Markey	Udall
Collins	McCain	Warner
Coons	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Corker	Menendez	Wyden
Donnelly	Merkley	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Perdue
Cassidy	Hatch	Risch
Coats	Heller	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Rounds
Cornyn	Inhofe	Sasse
Cotton	Isakson	Scott
Crapo	Johnson	Sessions
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Sullivan
Enzi	McConnell	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Vitter
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment, as modified, is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 77

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 77, offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. UDALL.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, this amendment creates a national market for renewable energy. A bill similar to this has passed the Senate three times and also passed the House once. These are the jobs of the future—renewable energy jobs. More than half of the new generation of energy in the world is in

renewables, and this amendment—it is estimated by the people who have studied it and the experts—would create about 300,000 new jobs.

So I ask my colleagues to support it. It is a good complement to the bill we are on, and it would create a lot of new jobs.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this amendment is an issue that Congress has considered many times over the past 16 years, but we declined to impose a renewable electricity standard.

We called it several different names. We called it a renewable portfolio standard. Then it moved to renewable electricity standard. It was later rebranded the clean energy standard. Now it is back to the RES. But this latest proposal that 25 percent of electricity supplied by a retail provider be generated by certain renewable resources by 2025 is really no different than the EPA's move to impose a 30-percent reduction in greenhouse gases from existing powerplants by 2030 under this proposed CPP regulation.

I would encourage Members to oppose this amendment.

Further, I would note to colleagues that we are very close to finishing up these amendments. If we move quickly, if we stay on the floor and stick to 10-minute votes, we can finish them all before lunch. I think that would be good, but it is going to require the cooperation of all Members.

With that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to Udall amendment No. 77.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Ayotte	Collins	Kirk
Baldwin	Coons	Klobuchar
Bennet	Durbin	Leahy
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Markey
Booker	Franken	McCaskill
Boxer	Gillibrand	Menendez
Brown	Heinrich	Merkley
Cantwell	Heller	Mikulski
Cardin	Hirono	Murphy
Carper	Kaine	Murray
Casey	King	Peters

Reed	Shaheen	Warner
Sanders	Stabenow	Warren
Schatz	Tester	Whitehouse
Schumer	Udall	Wyden

NAYS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Nelson
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Donnelly	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. PORTMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 245

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 245, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this is an amendment Senator BARRASSO and Senator CARDIN have been working on together. This amendment provides that the Federal Government must consult with the relevant Indian nations before modifying or breaking any trust or treaty obligation. This obligation is already required by Executive order. The Federal Government has been fulfilling its government-to-government consultation responsibilities on the Keystone XL Pipeline project for over 6 years.

I think it is important for colleagues to recognize that this amendment does not create any new law; it is merely an additional guarantee that the Federal Government will live up to its existing obligations to consult with the Indian nations, which is a matter I think we should all be able to agree on.

This is an issue Senator BARRASSO has been working on with the Senator from Maryland, and they have indicated that they will accept a voice vote on this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 245, AS MODIFIED

I ask unanimous consent that Barrasso amendment No. 245 be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Nothing in this Act relieves the United States of its responsibility to consult with Indian nations as required under executive order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote affirmative threshold be vitiated, and I urge its adoption by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further debate on this amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 245), as modified, was agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BARRASSO. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 124

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I take a few minutes to debate the next amendment and save a little bit of time at the end by withdrawing the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, as we consider both the Barrasso and Cardin amendments, I wish to remind my colleagues of the unique history the United States has with Indian nations. This history includes over 300 treaties that were negotiated with individual tribes and nations which remain in effect today.

For over two centuries our Nation disregarded the concerns of tribal nations with respect to expansion and development that affected their communities. This often included abrogating treaty rights and disregarding trust obligations this country has to Indian nations and individual Indians. But this is no longer how we work with Indian nations in our country. We now have laws and Executive orders requiring deliberate and meaningful consultation on any actions taken by the Federal Government that affect tribal interests. We have also signed on to the United Nations Declaration Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which states that the rights of indigenous peoples cannot be abrogated without their free and informed consent.

I want to make it crystal clear that nothing in this bill is meant to abrogate the rights of any Indian nation or any individual Indian. So while I believe we could say more to affirm these policies in this bill, I am happy that at a minimum, Senator BARRASSO's amendment guarantees that Indian nations continue to have a voice through meaningful consultation on this project.

It has been necessary to have this discussion because the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association does not believe that the consultation required is occurring with respect to KXL. It is helpful to remind the executive branch agencies involved in this process just what their obligations are. I would like to quote from a letter the association recently sent to Interior Secretary Jewell, which states in part:

As our Trustee, DOI has a specific duty to insure that its comments and positions on this National Interest Determination accurately reflect the very real potential impacts that this Project may have on our historical Tribal homelands, sacred sites, cultural resources and water rights, all of which are protected by applicable federal law and our Treaties with the United States. While many of our Tribes have submitted comments on this document, the State Department's unwillingness to sit down with us on a government to government basis to discuss our concerns has led us to question whether that Department really respects our legal roles as elected officials of federally recognized sovereign tribes. These concerns are so serious that the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, and the Yankton Sioux Tribe have all become party interveners in the South Dakota Public Utility Commission's proceedings challenging its 2010 action permit for this project.

Madam Secretary, we know that you have many important demands on your schedule, but meaningful government to government consultation, especially on matters of this importance, is assured to us by President Obama's Tribal Consultation policy of November 5, 2009, as well as by Executive Order 13175. President Clinton issued that Executive Order to "establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of Federal policies that have tribal implications [and] to strengthen the United States government-to-government relationship with Indian tribes". President Obama re-committed federal agencies to this duty through a Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies issued on November 5, 2009, in which he declared: "My Administration is committed to regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in policy decisions that have tribal implications including, as an initial step, through a complete and consistent implementation of Executive Order 13175". To prepare final DOI comments on a document of this magnitude without affording us the opportunity for a meaningful face to face/government to government meeting is a flagrant violation of President Obama's directive in 2009 and of the commitments President Obama has made to us as recently as last December.

Now, what is meant by the term "consultation"? When the world community of nations, including the United States, worked with Indigenous Peoples over a 15-year period to develop the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, they used the consultative standard of "free, prior and informed consent" in Article 11, 2: which reads: "States shall provide redress through effective mechanisms, which may include restitution, developed in conjunction with indige-

nous peoples, with respect to their cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs."

This language was necessary because the Federal Government and the States once ran roughshod over the rights of Native peoples and simply took and used land and other property of Native nations and persons, and there was a need to make sure that this would not happen in the future. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, Native peoples were confined to reservations and could not leave without permission of the Federal Indian agent. Even in the 1950s and 1960s, Native delegations to Washington were not supposed to go to Capitol Hill without checking in at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, BIA. Native people tell me that they used to think BIA stood for "boss Indians around." Out of this sorry past have come new policies that give true meaning to the nation-to-nation relationship. Key to this relationship is ongoing consultation that is meaningful and worthy of trust, and agreements that are made are transparent and consensual.

There are many laws mandating consultation with Indian tribes and persons, regarding areas on tribal, individual trust and original lands, among them the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act. Unless the consultation required under these and other statutes is open and based on informed consent, it is not meaningful and cannot lead to a good end. When we refer to consultation in the modern era, we do not mean some sleight of hand; rather, we intend fair, good faith dealings that honor the high standards of the United States' treaty and trust relationship with the Native peoples.

I will close my remarks simply by including excerpts from just two recent judicial decisions regarding the nature of Federal-tribal consultation. First, from the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California ruling in the case of Quechan Tribe v. United States Department of the Interior, et al (December 15, 2010), citing the National Historic Preservation Act: "The consultation requirement is not an empty formality; rather, it 'must recognize the government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes' and is to be 'conducted in a manner sensitive to the concerns and needs of the Indian tribe.'"

Second, from the case of Comanche Nation, et al v. USA, et al (September 23, 2008), involving the Army's failure to consult with the Comanche Nation regarding a sacred place, Medicine Bluff, the U.S. District Court for the

Western District of Oklahoma found that the National Historic Protection Act, NHPA:

... requires an agency to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that may be impacted, and to identify ... issues in connection with such potential impact. ... The reasonable and good faith efforts requirement extends to consultation with Native American tribes which may attach religious and cultural significance to potentially affected property. ... It has been said that, in a general sense, the NHPA requires agencies to 'stop, look, and listen' before commencing actions which could impact historic or culturally significant properties. ... The evidence submitted during the preliminary injunction hearing substantially demonstrates Defendants' actions were contrary to the letter and the spirit of the NHPA and its implementing regulations. ... Defendants virtually ignored the concerns regarding the viewscape up to the Bluffs from the southern approach. ... Contrary to the direction of the Ft. Sill Garrison Commander ... to 'get with the tribes' about their viewscape issues, that same day the Section 106 letter was sent out without a reference to Medicine Bluffs and without mentioning the potential impact on viewscales. Instead, the details of the TSC project were buried in technical attachments, and the consulting parties were left to ferret out for themselves the adverse impact on viewscales then known by Defendants to exist. ... Moreover, the requirement of good faith consultation suggests that the consulted Native American tribes would have considered it important to know, and therefore should have been told, that the TSC warehouse was the tip of the iceberg regarding plans to build within the southern approach to the Bluffs. ... In reality, the area in question is also slated for construction of a DRMO facility (which will occupy about 20 acres), construction of a fire station, and a widening of Randolph Road on its north side. Had this cumulative impact been disclosed to the area tribes, their initial reaction may well have been different. As it was, the Comanche Nation began complaining in earnest in the fall of 2007 and early 2008. These protests, asserted after the close of the 30-day comment period announced in the August 10, 2007 Section 106 letter, were brushed off by defendants as untimely. Having concluded that they technically complied with the Section 106 process, Defendants decided to proceed with the TSC project despite the mounting objections from the Comanche Nation. ... it has been said that the NHPA requires an agency to 'stop, look and listen' Coliseum Square Ass'n, Inc., 465 F.3d at 225; the evidence in the present case suggests that Defendants merely paused, glanced, and turned a deaf ear to warnings of adverse impact. Thus, Defendants' efforts fell short of the reasonable and good faith efforts required by the law. Where a plaintiff shows that an agency failed to comply with the NHPA requirements, injunctive relief may issue.

The bottom line is that for over two centuries, our Nation disregarded the concerns of tribal nations with respect to projects affecting tribal communities. We now have laws and executive orders requiring deliberate and meaningful consultation on any actions taken by the Federal Government that affect tribal interests. This certainly applies to the Keystone pipeline.

I want to thank Senator BARRASSO for working with us on the amendment we just approved that makes it very clear that the consultation obligations must be adhered to. I also want to thank Senator HEINRICH, Senator TESTER, and Senator CANTWELL for their incredible help on this issue so we could get a compromise.

The work that Senator BARRASSO and I have done in consultation with other Members, with the amendments that have been filed, to try to find common ground exemplifies what I hope we would do more of here in the Senate: finding common ground.

So I am pleased we were able to adopt the Barrasso amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 WITHDRAWN

With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on S. 1 is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is also agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Marco Rubio, Johnny Isakson, Kelly Ayotte, Ben Sasse, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Bennet	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Carper	Heitkamp	Sasse
Casey	Heller	Scott
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Collins	Johnson	Tester
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCaIn	Warner
Daines	McCaskill	Wicker
Donnelly	McConnell	

NAYS—35

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reed
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Shaheen
Cardin	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—3

Hirono	Reid	Rubio
--------	------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 35. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, upon reconsideration, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes, and that following me, the Senator from North Carolina be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am advised by the highly competent floor staff that Senators NELSON and COLLINS will be worked in to be able to speak shortly after we have because I know they both are hoping to do that.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 67, 98, 103, 174, 102, AND 55

WITHDRAWN

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be withdrawn: Sullivan No. 67, Murkowski No. 98, Flake No. 103, Merkley No. 174, Tillis No. 102, and Peters No. 55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INNOVATION FOR HEALTHIER AMERICANS REPORT

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senator from North Carolina, Senator BURR, and I are here to speak about an important and exciting development that is about to occur in our Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. What we are talking about and we will describe in our remarks today is a report entitled "Innovation for Healthier Americans" which will launch a bipartisan effort to look at how Congress

can help to get cutting-edge treatments, drugs, and devices to America's patients more quickly while still preserving this Nation's gold standard for safety and quality. This report and the actions we hope to take will affect virtually every American.

I am especially glad today to be here with the Senator from North Carolina. While there are a number of Senators on this body who worked hard on these issues—which in our government are usually dealt with by the Food and Drug Administration and by the National Institutes of Health—no one has been more effective, no one has worked harder, and no one has had more foresight and vision on these issues than RICHARD BURR, the Senator from North Carolina. The report today is substantially his work product, and he will be deeply involved in the next year as we work with Senator MURRAY, our Democratic friends, and with President Obama to try to bring this to a result.

In 2013, Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of Health, wrote the following:

Drugs exist for only about 250 of the more than 4,400 conditions with defined molecular causes. And it takes far too long and far too much money to get a new drug into our medicine cabinets. This is an old problem that cries out for new and creative solutions.

Since Dr. Collins said that, the number of conditions with defined molecular causes has increased now to about 5,390, yet the number of new drugs approved has not kept pace with these discoveries.

The President of the United States has recognized this problem. In his State of the Union message a few days ago, President Obama said this:

21st century businesses will rely on American science, technology, research and development. I want the country that eliminated polio and mapped the human genome to lead a new era of medicine—one that delivers the right treatment at the right time. In some patients with cystic fibrosis, this approach has reversed a disease once thought unstoppable.

The President said:

Tonight, I'm launching a new Precision Medicine Initiative to bring us closer to curing diseases like cancer and diabetes—and to give all of us access to the personalized information we need to keep ourselves and our families healthier.

Senator MURRAY and I had breakfast yesterday with Secretary Burwell and talked with her about the President's statement and about Secretary Burwell's own desire to help implement that initiative.

Today Senator BURR and I released a report titled "Innovation for Healthier Americans."

Next, Senator MURRAY—who is ranking member of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions—and I will start examining the issues in this report and other issues raised in comments, through a bipartisan HELP Committee staff working group.

I emphasize that we are going to be working together, Democrats and Republicans. We are going to be working with Secretary Burwell, we are going to be working with the President of the United States, and we are going to be on a parallel track with the House of Representatives, where Chairman UPTON and his team have been working for several months on what they call 21st century cures. In our committee in the Senate we will begin hearings in March.

We are releasing the report today in order to ask for comments. Surely we missed something in the report. If someone who is listening or reading it may have an idea or solution, we would like to know about that. We have opened an email account just to hear from those outside of Washington, DC, that is: innovation@help.senate.gov.

Improving medical device and drug development is not a new topic for the HELP Committee. Legislation was passed in 1997 and different legislation was passed in 2012 to try to get at the same goal of speeding delivery of drugs and devices while ensuring they are still safe. Our goal will be to give bipartisan legislation to the President this year.

It is encouraging to have the House, the Senate, and the President working on such an important common goal that affects virtually every American during the same Congress. That greatly increases our likelihood of securing a result.

We want to improve and modernize how drugs and medical devices are discovered, developed, and approved. We will examine the work of the National Institutes of Health, which funds and enables much of the research that leads to medical breakthroughs and the Food and Drug Administration which regulates all the medical products we come in contact with.

As I mentioned, this work will touch the life of almost every single American—from a very ill patient who has run out of treatment options and is counting on the most cutting-edge drug to an active child with asthma who is hoping to run faster and farther with the aid of a new drug.

Today our scientists and researchers are making discoveries at a pace that our development process is not equipped to match. Patients wait while treatments languish in laboratories, going through our drawn out, inefficient, and outrageously expensive development process.

FDA Commissioner Dr. Margaret Hamburg has acknowledged that "we are left relying on the 20th century approaches for the review, approval and oversight of the treatments and cures of the 21st century."

There is no time to waste in solving this problem. The mapping of the human genome opened a whole new world of individualized medicine in

which a person's genetic makeup can drive the doctor's plan for disease prevention, diagnosis, and treatment.

In the words of Andrew von Eschenbach, the former Commissioner of the FDA and Director of the National Cancer Institute:

We stand on the cusp of a revolution in health care. Advances in molecular medicine will allow us to develop powerful new treatments that can cure or even prevent diseases like Alzheimer's and cancer. Tomorrow's high-tech cures can also slash health-care costs and eliminate ineffective treatments. What will it take to realize the potential of the new medicine?

Today's report is the first step of our initiative. It seeks to answer the questions: What today is driving innovation? What barriers are standing in the way? What can we improve?

The report has five main themes:

No. 1, it costs too much to bring medical products to patients; No. 2, as science and technology advance, the discovery and development process takes too long; No. 3, the Food and Drug Administration's responsibilities have grown to include many unrelated to regulating medical products; No. 4, science outside the FDA is moving at a faster pace than ever; No. 5, an effective FDA is essential to maintain the U.S. leadership in biomedical innovation.

Some of the report's key findings include that complex medical devices approved in the U.S. were available to patients in Europe on average four years earlier than in the U.S., and increased competition for NIH grants may be discouraging researchers from proposing risky projects. Further, the average cost to develop a drug is disputed—some say \$1 billion, some say \$2 billion, some more—but all agree it is rising, and unpredictable and inconsistent development requirement standards in the FDA review process drive product developers to design clinical trials that are unnecessarily expensive.

Since World War II, the U.S. has dominated the biomedical industry space. Even 20 years ago, studies suggested that the U.S. share of global biomedical research funding was as high as 70–80 percent.

However, from 2007 to 2012, the U.S. share of research and development declined from about 51 percent to 45 percent. While the U.S. continued to lead the world in public sector investment during this time, private sector investment shrank by almost \$13 billion and largely reallocated to Asia.

This is a chance to step back and look at where we are and how all the different reauthorizations have added up. We need to ensure that legislative efforts over the last 30 years are helping and not getting in the way of having the best treatment and technology available for the right patient at the right time. Our goal is simple but ambitious—to work in a bipartisan way with members of the HELP Committee

to make sure policies support medical innovation and patient access to important medicines and medical technologies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the copy of the executive summary from the report that Senator BURR and I are releasing today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"We stand on the cusp of a revolution in health care. Advances in molecular medicine will allow us to develop powerful new treatments that can cure or even prevent diseases like Alzheimer's and cancer. Tomorrow's high-tech cures can also slash health-care costs and eliminate ineffective treatments. What will it take to realize the potential of the new medicine?"

—Andrew von Eschenbach, former FDA Commissioner, 2012

The federal government has been an enthusiastic investor in biomedical research for five decades. That investment has helped drive rapid innovation and bring us to a crossroads: Will we use what we have learned to transform the discovery and development of new drugs and medical devices, or will we maintain the status quo, depriving patients of cutting-edge products?

With the release of this report, the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) Committee is beginning an inclusive and transparent process to:

Candidly assess the status quo: What works? What's not working? What can we do better?

Identify how Congress can improve public policies to promote the efficiency and effectiveness of medical product development to cut down on the total time it takes for these products to get to American patients.

Pass transformational legislation that the President can sign this year.

Every American is personally affected by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and National Institutes of Health (NIH). Anytime we take medicine, have a routine check-up, or undergo a serious procedure for a health problem, like surgery or cancer treatment, we are using medical products regulated by the FDA. In many cases, the research leading to the discovery and development of these products has been advanced, funded, or enabled in some way by the NIH.

These two agencies have an enormous influence on our economy. FDA-regulated products account for about 25 cents of every dollar spent by American consumers each year.

For generations, America has led the world in medical innovation. The dedicated professionals at the NIH and FDA have helped to instill confidence in FDA-approved products. Scientists from across the globe take seriously the findings and caliber of research that NIH funds, as well as the safety and efficacy of products FDA approves.

But our global edge is slipping.

Medical discoveries and advancements to treat and cure diseases, including new targeted drugs, could, and should, be reaching American patients more quickly and with less cost to developers, without lessening the standards of safety and efficacy. Too many patients with no treatment options wait while potential treatments languish in laboratories awaiting further development,

testing, and/or approval. At the same time, each additional \$1 billion spent on pharmaceutical research and development results in fewer drugs than in years past. The time and cost of developing medical products is increasing without a discussion of whether there is enough incremental assurance of safety and effectiveness for the additional delays and costs.

Over the past several decades, FDA's mission and regulatory reach has expanded dramatically. This has resulted in an increasingly complex bureaucracy while the science of discovery and development has evolved more rapidly than ever in academia and private industry. FDA has struggled to regulate the most cutting-edge medical products. The disparity between the pace of scientific discovery and development outside of the FDA and FDA's scientific knowledge threatens America's position as a global leader in medical innovation.

FDA Commissioner, Dr. Margaret Hamburg, has acknowledged that "... we are left relying on the 20th century approaches for the review, approval and oversight of the treatments and cures of the 21st century." While the FDA has reviewed drugs in as little as three months, and meets the timelines set for medical device reviews the majority of the time, the inability of medical product developers to predict what questions will be asked during the review forces a multi-year process simply to get an application ready for FDA consideration. This lack of predictability is driven by fast changing and complex science, inefficient and inconsistent processes, and difficulty in hiring and retaining review staff and managers. This challenge will grow as new medical products and the clinical methods used to test them continue to evolve at an exciting pace.

This report aims to examine the current process of drug and device development and identify the inefficiencies that stand in the way of a modern development and review process. We take a close and honest look at what is, and is not, working well at the NIH and FDA. We want to know what successes we can replicate, and what failures must be learned from and fixed.

This report is organized to follow the process it examines—in other words it takes us from discovery to approval. We outline key problems, partnerships, initiatives, dollars, and data involved in helping to bring promising medical products through the research, development, and regulatory review process. We identify the challenges at the NIH and FDA—inefficiencies, unnecessary regulatory burden, a lack of predictability, and ever increasing regulatory costs—that must be addressed. We identify ways to facilitate stakeholder engagement in these processes, and we intend to continue regular and responsible congressional oversight.

Our goal is simple and ambitious—to work in a bipartisan way with members of the HELP Committee to align public policies to support accelerating medical innovation and patient access to important medicines and medical technologies.

Science has never held greater potential to improve the quality of life and outcomes for America's patients. In order to fully realize this exciting potential, we must identify, candidly assess, and confront existing factors that may be stifling efforts to innovate. We have identified five guiding principles for this effort:

(1) It costs too much to bring medical products through the pipeline to patients.

(2) As science and technology advance, the discovery and development process takes too

long for medical products to make their way to patients.

(3) FDA's responsibilities have grown to include many activities unrelated to the core function of regulating medical products to advance the public health.

(4) The disparity in scientific knowledge at FDA and the fast pace of biomedical innovation are slowing, and in some cases, stifling, innovation in American medicine.

(5) A working FDA is essential to continuing biomedical innovation in the United States and maintaining America's global leadership in medical innovation.

For us to succeed, we need your help. The full spectrum of stakeholders here is incredibly large and diverse, so it may be challenging to identify specific challenges and/or best practices that would have wide-ranging impact. We wish to solicit ideas on how to address these challenges in order to inform action in the 114th Congress. This report and the feedback we receive in response to it will inform what we expect will become a bipartisan legislative package to address the challenges we identify through this process. Please send your ideas to us at Innovate@help.senate.gov not later than February 23, 2015. These comments will be shared with Ranking Member Patty Murray and all of our colleagues on the HELP Committee as we work to achieve this important goal.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I look forward to the remarks from the Senator from North Carolina. As I have said, no Senator has done more on either side of the aisle in this area of helping us think about creative new ways to move treatments, medical devices, and drugs through our safety process into the medicine cabinets and into the hands of patients who desperately need them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I am pleased to talk about an issue that as Senator ALEXANDER said is near and dear to my heart; that is, ensuring that America's patients have access to the most cutting-edge medical products in as timely a manner as possible. I look forward to the partnership that Chairman Alexander and I have in what I think is one of the most crucial studies and processes we will go through in this session of Congress.

Many of my colleagues know that holding the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration accountable for their work on behalf of America's patients is not a new area of focus for either one of us. After I was first elected to serve in the House of Representatives, I was tasked with modernizing the Food and Drug Administration, a Federal agency that controls 25 cents of every \$1 of our economy. This work culminated in the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1977, FDAMA, a total revamp of that agency.

FDAMA sought to ensure that the FDA had the tools it needed to keep pace with modern scientific advances. We modernized the agency in a way that supported regulating in the least burdensome manner, while ensuring

that innovative products would reach patients in as timely a manner as possible. As many of my colleagues remember, these reforms were adopted at a critical point in the fight against the HIV/AIDS epidemic. But while we have made great strides in certain areas, FDAMA's tools haven't been fully leveraged, and the challenges of keeping pace with the cutting-edge technologies have only increased.

Today the timely and predictable review of medical products is key to promoting and protecting the public health, just as it was 18 years ago. But the agency's mission and responsibilities have expanded dramatically over that same period of time. The size and the scope of the FDA as an organization has never been more complex than it is today. By its own admission, FDA has struggled to regulate the most cutting-edge medical products at the same time our understanding of medicine and the ability to target treatments to individualized patients has never been greater. The growth of the agency and its responsibilities presents serious management challenges.

Our report, as the chairman said, entitled "Innovation for Healthier Americans: Identifying Opportunities for Meaningful Reform to Our Nation's Medical Product Discovery and Development," takes a hard look at the current status quo and poses targeted questions that can help inform how we do things better. We need to identify how we can improve our policies to promote more efficient and effective medical product development and review processes to cut down on total time it takes for these lifesaving products to actually reach America's patients.

We have seen how regulatory burden and uncertainty results in innovation going overseas, while America's patients wait for the FDA to catch up. The day-to-day actions and in many cases inaction at the agency has a profound effect on our Nation's patients and our health care.

It also directly impacts our economy, as FDA-regulated products account for about 25 cents of every \$1 spent by American consumers. The importance of holding the agency accountable for its actions and inactions—all the way from the frontline reviewers to the Commissioner—has never been more important than now.

This is what the current landscape tells us:

No. 1, it costs too much to bring medical products through the development pipeline to patients. There is no disputing that the costs to bring medical products through the development pipeline have grown over time.

No. 2, as science and technology advance, the discovery and development process takes longer for medical products to make their ways to patients. We need to look at the total real time

it takes for medical products to reach a patient, not only the time of FDA review.

In 2004, FDA's Critical Path Report warned that:

Today's revolution in biomedical science has raised new hope for the prevention, treatment, and cure of severe illnesses. However, there is a growing concern that many of the new basic science discoveries made in recent years may not quickly yield more effective, more affordable, and safe medical products for patients. This is because the current medical product development path is becoming increasingly challenging, inefficient, and costly.

More than a decade later, these challenges continue to confront us. We must find a way to embrace our advances and to cut down on the total time it takes medical products to reach an American patient. Our report asks for feedback, as the chairman said, on how we do that.

No. 3, FDA's responsibilities have grown to include many activities unrelated to the core function of regulating medical devices to advance the public health. Today there are more than 12,000 employees at the Food and Drug Administration. This growth has exacerbated the management challenges of the agency, and the question is, How do we ensure that FDA is equipped to fulfill its mission?

No. 4, the disparity in scientific knowledge at FDA and the fast pace of biological innovation are slowing and in some cases stifling innovation in American medicine. To ensure that medical product innovation continues to benefit America's patients, our report asks how we could better leverage the regulatory science initiatives to ensure that the novel medical products are reaching America's patients in that timely fashion.

No. 5, we know that a working FDA is essential to be continuing biomedical innovation in the United States and maintaining America's global leadership in medical innovation. Therefore, we ask for feedback on how Congress and the FDA can work to align public policy and regulation to support biomedical research as a vibrant and healthy component of the U.S. economy.

We have a unique opportunity this Congress to take a hard look at what is and is not working and advance solutions that will ultimately ensure that the NIH and the FDA serve America's patients better. We have an opportunity to focus on these issues without a crisis demanding action, such as the unfortunate meningitis outbreak in 2012.

The drug and medical device user fee negotiations have not yet begun. I should add that these negotiations should not begin until everyone has the data to inform how well the agency is currently meeting what was agreed to in the last round of negotiations. It makes no sense to me why anyone

would rush to engage in a negotiation before they have the data to know what they are getting or what they are currently paying for.

It is my hope that looking at these issues without the pressure of an eminent, expiring, user fee reauthorization will help to facilitate candid dialogue among all stakeholders about where we are, where we need to go on behalf of America's patients.

While we do not have these pressures upon us today, we do bring an urgency to this work because of what is at stake. These issues impact every single one of our constituents and every single American, but they affect not only our patients but our economy and our global competitiveness.

Our goal is simple, to align public policies to support accelerated medical innovation and patient access to medicines and medical technologies, because when we advance innovation, we help America's patients be able to access the most cutting-edge, lifesaving medical devices, and products in as timely a fashion as possible.

We foster and facilitate the next generation of cutting-edge products which, in turn, help to ensure America's continued standing as the world leader of innovation.

This is good for our innovators, it is good for our patients, and it is good for North Carolina.

Dr. Paul Howard of the Manhattan Institute's Center for Medical Progress was right when he pointed out that innovation is not an option, it is a national imperative. Innovation is central to addressing our Nation's unsustainable health care costs. It is also central to improving the treatments, outcomes, and ultimately the quality of life for the American people.

Former FDA Commissioner Andrew von Eschenbach was kind enough to pen the foreword of this report. The chairman has already alluded to some of his statements, but in that foreword he writes:

Government policy can either inhibit or accelerate the next revolution in science and technology. The time has come to examine whether our nation has the right public policies in place to realize the full promise of discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century medicine.

Toward that end, I really do look forward to working with my good friend Chairman ALEXANDER, with our ranking member, Senator MURRAY, and with all the members of the HELP Committee as we begin this important process of ensuring that the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration work as well as they can for patients today and, more importantly, into the future.

I thank the chairman for the opportunity to work with him on this issue. It won't be an easy road, but it is one we are committed to tackling. I urge those who might have input for the

purposes of this study and this initiative to please visit the HELP Web site and submit feedback to innovation@help.senate.gov. I am glad to see we have put that in place.

I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, health care doesn't distinguish between parties. Health care requires us to come together and to put policies in place that drive innovation and drive quality outcomes. If we can do that, we might set a new pathway for how we cure disease, for how we bring down health care costs, and for how Americans look forward to a generation that grows up with less genetically transmitted diseases.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COTTON. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, and I be permitted to proceed for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT SECURITY ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today Senator NELSON and I rise to discuss S. 266, the Retirement Security Act, legislation we filed earlier this week and first introduced last year. Our bill would encourage more small employers to offer retirement plans that would provide incentives for employees to save more for retirement and would ensure that low-income and middle-income taxpayers are able to claim tax benefits for retirement savings that are already authorized in law.

Our bill is the product of the work that Senator NELSON and I did together on the Special Committee on Aging. In the fall of 2013, the committee conducted a hearing on retirement security where we heard from witnesses that far too many American seniors have real reason to fear they will outlive their savings. According to the nonpartisan Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, there is an estimated \$6.6 trillion gap between the savings that American households need to maintain their standard of living in retirement and what they actually have. The group that was surveyed were those Americans between ages 32 and 64.

Nationally, one in four retired Americans has no source of income beyond Social Security. In the State of Maine the number is one in three. While 4 in 10 rely on this vital program for 90 percent of their retirement income, Social Security provides an average benefit of just \$1,294 per month—less than \$16,000 per year.

It is hard to imagine stretching those dollars far enough to pay the bills. Certainly a comfortable retirement would be out of the question for most Americans.

A recent Gallup poll shows there is an increase in concern among the American people about their standard of living in retirement. This has gone up over time. Two decades ago 34 percent of Americans were concerned. Now 60 percent of Americans are worried about their standard of living in retirement.

Sadly, they are right to be concerned. Projections published in 2014 by the Employee Benefit Research Institute showed that nearly half of “early boomers”—those between ages 56 and 62 when the study was conducted—are at risk of not having enough money to pay for basic costs in retirement, including health care costs not covered by insurance.

There are many reasons for the decline in retirement security facing American seniors, including the demise of many defined-benefit pension plans in the private sector, the severity of the financial crisis we recently endured, rising health care costs, the greater and expanding need for long-term care, which is so expensive, but most of all the fact that Americans are living far longer than they did in the past. Many of us are also reaching retirement age with far more debt than retirees of previous generations.

Another contributing factor we found is that employees of small businesses are much less likely to participate in employer-based retirement plans. According to a July 2013 GAO study, more than half of the 42 million Americans who work for businesses with fewer than 100 employees lack access to a work-based plan to save for retirement. Cost and complexity are among the reasons that plans are not more widely offered by smaller employers.

These employers would very much like to offer plans, but oftentimes the cost and the complexity make the plans out of reach. Therefore, making it easier for smaller businesses to provide access to retirement plans for their workers would make a significant difference in the financial security of many retirees. That is why the bill that we reintroduced earlier this week focuses on reducing the cost and complexity of retirement plans, especially for small businesses, and on encouraging individuals to save more for retirement.

Let me now go into detail about the provisions of our bill.

First, our bill would allow small businesses to enter into multiple employer plans, MEPs, to offer retirement programs jointly to their employees. This allows small companies to share the administrative burden of a retirement plan, which helps lower costs. Current law discourages the use of

MEPs because it requires a connection, or “nexus,” between unrelated businesses in order to join a MEP, such as membership in the same trade association. Our bill would waive the nexus requirement for businesses with fewer than 500 employees. So as not to discourage growth, our bill provides a long phase-out under which businesses are not automatically disqualified from a MEP when they hire their 500th employee.

Second, our bill makes joining a MEP a more attractive option for small businesses. Under current law, if one employer in a MEP fails to meet the minimum criteria necessary for retirement plans to obtain tax benefits, all employers and their employees could lose these tax benefits, which are substantial. For employees, they include delaying the taxation of income contributed to a plan until funds are withdrawn. For employers, plan disqualification could result in limited deductions and a higher tax burden. Our bill directs Treasury to issue regulations to address this uncertainty, and protect members of a MEP from the failure of one bad apple to meet its obligations.

Third, our bill reduces the cost of maintaining a retirement plan. Current law requires that participants in a retirement plan receive a variety of notices. Our bill would direct Treasury to simplify, clarify, and consolidate these required notices, to lessen costs.

Fourth, the Retirement Security Act encourages those still in the workforce to save more for retirement. Retirement plans are often designed to comply with existing safe harbors to prevent the IRS from challenging the tax benefits that flow to employees and employers. The existing safe harbor for so-called “automatic enrollment” plans effectively caps employee contributions at 10 percent of annual pay, with the employer contributing a “matching” amount of up to 6 percent. Our bill creates an additional safe harbor for these plans that would allow employees to receive an employer match on contributions of up to 10 percent of their pay.

I recognize that businesses that choose to adopt a plan with this new optional safe harbor may face additional costs due to the increased employer match. That is why our bill helps the smallest businesses—those with fewer than 100 employees—offset this cost by providing a new tax credit equal to the increased match.

Finally, our bill ensures that current measures to encourage savings are functioning as they were intended. One such measure is the so-called “saver's credit,” which reduces the tax burden on low- and middle-income individuals who contribute to retirement plans, including IRAs and 401(k) plans. Yet the credit cannot be claimed on a form 1040EZ, which is frequently used by these individuals. A 2013 Transamerica

Center for Retirement Studies survey found that only 23 percent of people with household incomes of less than \$50,000 per year, the group most likely to qualify, were aware of the saver's credit. To address this, our bill directs Treasury to make the credit available on Form 1040 EZ.

I do want to emphasize in closing that there is nothing in our bill that would force a small business to offer a 401(k) plan. That may be impractical for some small employers. What we are trying to do is to provide incentives for them to do so, to reduce the cost, and to make it possible for them to join together with other employers to offer retirement plans. We are trying also to provide incentives for employees to save more for their retirement.

During my time on the Special Committee on Aging, I have heard countless stories of retirees whose savings did not go as far as they had anticipated. Adequate savings reduce poverty among our seniors in what should be their golden years. As the HELP Committee noted in a July 2012 report, poverty among the elderly also increases Medicare and Medicaid costs and strains our social safety net. Giving those not yet at retirement age more opportunities to save—and to save more—would help ease this additional burden on entitlement programs that are already projected to be unsustainable.

In light of the positive impacts this bill would have in strengthening retirement security for millions of Americans, I urge our colleagues to join Senator NELSON and me in supporting the Retirement Security Act of 2015. This bill has been endorsed by the Maine State Chamber of Commerce, the American Benefits Council, the American Council of Life Insurers, Fidelity Investments, Lincoln Financial Group, the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors, the Plan Sponsor Council of America, the Principal Financial Group, the Society for Human Resource Management, TransAmerica, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these as well as other letters of support.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAINE STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Augusta, ME, January 8, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: First, I want to wish you a Happy New Year. I would also like to thank you for your continued service to the state of Maine, particularly the business community. Your efforts in Washington are most appreciated!

I am writing to you today about your efforts to enable more businesses to offer retirement plans to their employees. The Maine State Chamber of Commerce fully supports your efforts on this front. As you

know, small businesses drive Maine's economy—80% of businesses here in Maine employ fewer than 20 people—and their employees are like family to them.

I regularly hear from small businesses who want to offer more retirement benefits to their employees, but are not in the financial position to do so. Coming from a small business state, you clearly understand this. Your proposed legislation can change this dynamic and make offering retirement plans a more viable option for more small businesses—not only in Maine, but across the country.

Again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of Maine's business community. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DANA F. CONNORS,
President/CEO.

AMERICAN BENEFITS COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, January 21, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS AND SENATOR NELSON: On behalf of the American Benefits Council, I am writing to applaud the introduction of the Retirement Security Act of 2015. We stand ready to assist you in working toward enactment of this important piece of legislation.

The Council is a public policy organization representing principally Fortune 500 companies and other organizations that assist employers of all sizes in providing benefits to employees. Collectively, the Council's members either sponsor directly or provide services to retirement and health plans that cover more than 100 million Americans.

The private retirement system is a great success and has helped ensure the retirement security of millions of Americans. But there is still more work to be done, especially with respect to the coverage of small business employees and with respect to benefit levels.

Your bill would take major steps forward in addressing both of these issues. We believe the bill's reforms of the multiple employer plans rules will expand opportunities for small businesses to band together to maintain plans at a lower cost. In particular, we applaud the provision that would prevent an entire multiple employer plan from being disqualified by reason of a violation of the qualification rules by one or more participating employers. This inappropriate result under current law can deter many small employers from joining a multiple employer plan.

The Council is a strong supporter of automatic enrollment, and believes that the Retirement Security Act of 2015 would substantially increase the use of automatic enrollment through the establishment of an alternative safe harbor with key incentives to adopt it. Moreover, the alternative safe harbor would set default contributions at higher levels that are better designed to achieve retirement security.

We thank you for your leadership in this important area and look forward to working toward enactment of this important bill.

Sincerely,

LYNN D. DUDLEY,
Senior Vice President, Global Retirement and Compensation Policy, American Benefits Council.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURERS,
Washington, DC, January 21, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS AND SENATOR NELSON: The American Council of Life Insurers (ACLI) would like to express our appreciation for your leadership in the field of retirement security, especially in your roles as Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. We support you for reintroducing the Retirement Security Act of 2015, a bill that would greatly expand the ability of Americans to better save for their retirement.

ACLI represents approximately 300 legal reserve life insurer and fraternal benefit society member companies operating in the United States and abroad. ACLI member companies offer insurance contracts and other investment products and services to qualified retirement plans, including defined benefit pensions, 401(k) and 403(b) arrangements, and to individuals through individual retirement accounts (IRAs) or on a non-qualified basis. Our members and their products help Americans accumulate retirement savings and turn those savings into guaranteed lifetime income.

ACLI supports proposals that will help expand coverage and encourage small businesses to sponsor retirement savings plans for their employees. The Retirement Security Act of 2015 would help facilitate the use of private multiple employer plans, encourage greater use of auto-enrollment and auto-escalation features, and allow employers to use a "stretch match" to incent employees to save even more. The bill would expand tax incentives for small businesses to offer retirement plans, an important consideration for many employers. Likewise, the bill would make it easier for more individuals to access the Savers' Credit, helping low-income workers maximize their savings. These valuable reforms will help to expand a system already important to millions of Americans.

Again, we appreciate your continued support of the current retirement security system. ACLI and its member companies look forward to working with you and your staffs to improve retirement security for all Americans.

Sincerely,

DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS,
Boston, MA, January 20, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND NELSON: On behalf of Fidelity Investments, I would like to thank you for your efforts to improve retirement security and enhance pension coverage among small employers. The private employer retirement system has been a great success, yet more can be done to improve retirement security and expand access to workplace savings plans.

Fidelity supports provisions in the Retirement Security Act of 2013 that would establish a new safe harbor from the 401(k) non-discrimination rules for plans that automatically enroll employees at a minimum contribution level equal to 6 percent of pay. One

of the key actions to boost retirement security for workers is to save at the right rates in a workplace savings plan. Automatic enrollment at a minimum of 6 percent of pay, along with annual automatic increases and investing appropriately, puts workers on a better path toward retirement security. Our data and analysis show that the average participation rate among plans with automatic enrollment is approximately 90 percent, regardless of the default contribution rate and regardless of the salary level. The 3 percent minimum contribution rate under the current safe harbor is too low and woefully inadequate to put employees on a path to reach their retirement savings goals. Due to human inertia many employees who auto-enroll at 3 percent are unlikely to take any action to increase their savings. Raising the minimum contribution level from 3 percent to 6 percent would go a long way toward increasing savings rates and improving retirement security.

Furthermore, Fidelity supports provisions in the bill to streamline and simplify regulations and reduce unnecessary burdens that serve as an obstacle to retirement plan coverage. Regulatory burdens are one of the biggest obstacles to small employers that may otherwise want to offer a retirement plan to their employees.

Fidelity applauds your leadership on retirement security and appreciates your efforts to advance these reforms. We hope to work with you as the bill moves through the legislative process to further simplify the rules and streamline duplicative or unnecessary regulations to help achieve your goal of expanding pension coverage.

Regards,

DOUGLAS B. FISHER,
Senior Vice President.

LINCOLN FINANCIAL GROUP,
Greensboro, NC, January 20, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of Lincoln Financial Group, I am writing to express our strong support for the Retirement Security Act of 2015. We thank you for your leadership in sponsoring this very important bill.

Congress has made great strides forward in enhancing retirement security, but there are many challenges still ahead. One of the key challenges is improving retirement plan coverage among small businesses. The Act would help address the small business issue by reforming the rules regarding multiple employer plans, which help small businesses achieve many of the economies of scale that large businesses have. The Act would modify the rules to make multiple employer plans more efficient and more workable for small businesses.

We also applaud the Act's new automatic enrollment safe harbor and its important enhancement of access to the saver's credit. These provisions will increase participation levels, especially among low and middle-income individuals.

We strongly support your efforts and stand ready to assist you in moving forward with this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. CORNELIO,
President, Retirement Plan Services.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL ADVISORS,
Falls Church, VA, January 7, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: The National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors (NAIFA) applauds your efforts in preserving and enhancing the voluntary employer-provided retirement system and the tax incentives that support it. These plans are helping millions of American families achieve a secure retirement.

The employer-sponsored retirement plan system has introduced tens of millions of American workers to retirement saving. Employers voluntarily establish and promote these plans to help their workers build assets for a secure retirement.

NAIFA encourages support for the Retirement Security Act of 2015 introduced by Senator Susan M. Collins. The bill would add a new more generous safe harbor for small business retirement plans, establish a tax credit for employer matches for plan sponsors using the new (optional) safe harbor, and ease the rules allowing small employers to join multiple employer pension plans.

Cost is often a factor in whether a business will offer a plan for its employees to adequately save for retirement. This bill lowers costs by waiving a requirement that there be a nexus among businesses to join multiple employer plans, thereby allowing more entities to share plan administrative burdens. The bill instructs Treasury to simplify, clarify and consolidate notice requirements for retirement plans, and instructs Treasury to provide taxpayers using a 1040EZ filing the ability to report and receive a tax credit, if eligible.

We thank you for your leadership in helping employees plan and prepare for a financially secure retirement.

Sincerely,

JULI Y. MCNEELY,
LUTCF, CFP, CLU,
NAIFA President.

PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP,
Des Moines, IA, January 9, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS AND NELSON: On behalf of Principal Financial Group, I want to thank you for your leadership in seeking to improve and enhance the existing voluntary defined contribution system through the Retirement Security Act of 2015. Employer sponsored 401(k) plans and other worksite retirement plans have helped millions of workers save trillions of dollars. These plans have proven to be resilient even in challenging times but more is needed to expand access to worksite retirement plans. Your proposal builds upon the strength of the existing system, providing main street businesses the necessary tools to address retirement savings adequacy and coverage challenges.

Principal Financial Group is a leading provider of defined contribution plans with more than 70 years' experience working with small to medium-sized employers and their employees. We currently provide retirement services to more than 41,000 retirement plans and 4.5 million employee participants.

Principal was particularly pleased with your inclusion of the enhanced automatic contribution safe harbor. We must find ways

to encourage far greater numbers of plan sponsors to adopt automatic enrollment and escalation features with substantive employer match contributions. To do this, we feel more flexibility is needed in the existing safe harbor requirements and your proposal offers a good starting point for gaining that additional flexibility.

Thank you for your leadership in this area. We look forward to working with you as the process continues. Seeking solutions to these important policy considerations to expand savings rates in the current employer based retirement system is vital to the economic wellbeing of millions of future retirees.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. BURROWS,
Senior Vice President.

SOCIETY FOR HUMAN
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT,
Alexandria, VA, January 9, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND NELSON: On behalf of more than 275,000 human resource professionals who belong to the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), I would like to thank you for your leadership on the issue of retirement security. The introduction of the Retirement Security Act of 2015, demonstrates your commitment to ensuring that all Americans are given the ability to save for retirement.

Founded in 1948, SHRM is the world's largest membership organization devoted to human resource management. Representing more than 275,000 members in over 160 countries, SHRM is the leading provider of resources to meet the evolving needs of HR professionals, while advancing the professional practice of human resource management. SHRM has more than 575 affiliated chapters throughout the United States.

As human resource professionals, it has been our members' experience that a comprehensive and flexible benefits package is an essential tool in recruiting and retaining talented employees. Regardless of an employer's size, it is vitally important that every employee be given the opportunity to save and plan for retirement and to protect his or her family's financial health. Steps the government can take to facilitate and encourage voluntary employer-sponsored retirement plans and individual savings plans are critical to achieving this goal.

Removing barriers and disincentives, especially for small businesses, is a tactic that can lead to greater participation in employer-provided defined benefit retirement plans. A variety of options including tax incentives, increased contribution limits, catch-up contributions for older workers and increased access for employees, are all elements that have proven to increase participation and contribution levels in retirement plans. SHRM believes that the Retirement Security Act of 2015 would benefit both employers and employees by expanding important tax credits to small businesses as well as expanding auto-enrollment safe harbor provisions. These elements are essential for small businesses, who comprise an important segment of our membership, to offer retirement plans that enable their employees to save for retirement.

We look forward to working with you in the future to ensure that retirement security for all Americans is preserved.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL P. AITKEN,
Vice President, Government Affairs.

TRANSAMERICA,
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2015.

Re Retirement Security Act of 2015

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
*Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of Transamerica, I would like to thank you for your leadership on retirement security issues as most recently evidenced by your introduction today of the Retirement Security Act of 2015.

Your bill addresses in a comprehensive manner problems faced by small and large employers in providing their employees the means to save for a secure retirement, as well as by individuals in trying to achieve a secure retirement through workplace savings. In particular, removing impediments to the adoption of multiple employer plans, expanding the auto enrollment safe harbor and making it easier to claim the Saver's Credit are areas in which Transamerica has been extremely active—from a policy, participant education and market development standpoint. I and others at Transamerica look forward to working with you and your staff as you move the bill forward.

The Transamerica companies market life insurance, annuities, pensions and supplemental health insurance, as well as mutual funds and related investment products throughout the U.S. and in selected countries worldwide. Transamerica Retirement Solutions provides and services workforce retirement savings plans in the small and mid-large employer markets. As of December 31, 2014, these plans held in the aggregate over \$132 billion in assets for 3.7 million participants. The Transamerica companies are ranked among the top insurance groups in the U.S., based on admitted assets, and employ approximately 11,000 people nationwide.

Please do not hesitate to contact either me if I can provide any specific information regarding our retirement plan business or market expertise to support your efforts.

Very truly yours,

JEANNE DE CERVENS,
*Vice President & Director,
Federal Government Affairs.*

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, January 21, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS AND REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, thanks you for introducing the "Retirement Security Act of 2015." Retirement security is a critical issue, and our members support all efforts to encourage voluntary participation in retirement savings plans.

The Retirement Security Act of 2015 includes key provisions that the Chamber has

set forth as important reforms to the retirement system including eliminating barriers to the use of multiple employer plans; providing optional safe harbor alternatives; and simplifying notice requirements. Overall, the Chamber believes that the Retirement Security Act of 2015 would provide important reforms to encourage participation by both plan sponsors and plan participants in the employer-provided retirement system.

The Chamber looks forward to working with you on this bill and urges Congress to take steps to further the enactment of the bill.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,
*Executive Vice President,
Government Affairs.*

PLAN SPONSOR COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, January 20, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. BILL NELSON,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND NELSON, The Plan Sponsor Council of America (PSCA) is pleased to endorse the Retirement Security Act of 2015. The Act removes several impediments that restrict the ability of small businesses to participate in multiple employer plans, or MEPs. Expanded MEP access will open another important avenue for small business owners to provide critically important retirement plans for hardworking employees.

The small business arena is the last frontier for improving access to an employer-provided retirement plan. The Retirement Security Act of 2015 will help conquer this frontier, providing a uniform, federal response. This is an especially timely endeavor as states consider enacting new legislation relating to employer-based retirement plans that could result in a problematic patchwork of disparate laws impacting plan sponsors and employees.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of American workers.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN MCCAFFREY,
*Chairman, PSCA Legal
and Legislative Committee.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this bill is borne out of the work Senator COLLINS and I did on the Special Committee on Aging. After we had a hearing on the condition of the American senior citizen, it was certainly clear that something had to be done to give them better access to retirement plans.

A lot of the situation that Senator COLLINS has just described is so true. Fewer than half of workers have access to any retirement plan at work, and those numbers are even constricted when you start talking about employees who work for smaller business. Only one quarter of small businesses with less than 100 employees offers any type of retirement plan for their employees.

The lack of a retirement plan at work means when an individual gets to be a senior citizen they are going to end up relying on Social Security, where we are talking about a benefit of

maybe \$1,300 a month, or \$15,000 a year. That is simply not enough to pay for housing and medical care and other expenses. In my State of Florida, one-third of the senior citizens rely on Social Security income to get by in retirement. We have to fix this problem. There are too many people who work too hard throughout their lives and get to be in those golden years, and then they are faced with a real crisis.

So the legislation the two of us have worked on for well over a year will offer retirement plans by encouraging small businesses to set up those retirement plans. One example would be small businesses will be able to pool together their resources and take advantage of the economies of scale. There is no reason that a very good retirement plan can't be as a result of cobbling together the resources of many small businesses and still have a retirement plan that makes sense for the individual retirement business because they are getting the economies of scale.

The bill is going to encourage the employees to save more with things such as providing automatic enrollment in retirement plans, and it is going to encourage increasing the employer match. Those things are all common sense.

I join Senator COLLINS in urging our colleagues to come together, and let's try to do this for the American senior citizens.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. WARREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 320 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 203

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, February 2, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, H.R. 203; that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the Keystone XL Pipeline. This bill will not help our economy, it will not create

permanent jobs, and it certainly is not a boon to the environment. On item after item, the Keystone pipeline just doesn't make sense for the United States.

When we last debated Keystone in November, the price for a barrel of oil was about \$75. That price was already down from a peak of \$100 in 2014, and since then the price has dropped another \$25, to less than \$50 a barrel.

In November, the average price of gas was nearly \$3 per gallon. This week, gas averages around \$2.20 per gallon—the cheapest in nearly six years—and many States are seeing gas under \$2 per gallon.

In fact, since this pipeline was first proposed in 2008, America has gone from the third largest producer of oil to the world's largest producer, surpassing both Russia and Saudi Arabia. As a result of new production and increasing fuel economy, the final months of 2014 saw the lowest net imports of crude oil since 1986.

The Keystone Pipeline is simply not necessary for America's energy independence.

Even worse, the oil that moves through the pipeline isn't necessarily for the benefit of the United States. Instead, the pipeline would be a conduit to move the oil from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, where it will be refined and sold on the global market. Some individual barrels may be kept in the United States, but much will be exported and prices will be set by international supply and demand. The State Department's review projected that building a pipeline would have "little impact on the prices U.S. consumers pay for refined products such as gasoline." I fail to see how the United States gains any economic benefit from this project.

Finally, Keystone supporters often argue that the pipeline creates large numbers of jobs. It is great that this project will create nearly 2,000 direct construction jobs over 2 years, and more indirectly. Unfortunately, those jobs are temporary. That means once the pipeline is complete in two years, operating the pipeline will support only around 50 permanent jobs.

The American economy won't benefit from this bill. American companies won't benefit, American drivers won't benefit, and American workers won't benefit. The economic policies behind the pipeline just don't make sense.

Unfortunately, the problems also don't end with the lack of economic value. This project also comes with substantial hazards for the environment. Extracting oil from these tar sands would essentially mean the destruction of huge swaths of land in Alberta. The tar sands are beneath 54,000 square miles of boreal forest and peat bog, an area the size of the state of New York.

An estimated 20 percent of the deposits require destructive surface mining,

which entails clearing huge swathes of boreal forest and top soil to get at the tar sands beneath. Already, 175,000 acres of forest have been cleared, but an additional 1 million acres of forest have already been leased for surface mining operations.

This destructive form of mining generates large volumes of toxic wastewater, which must be stored in vast tailings ponds that already cover around 70 square miles. These tailings contain high concentrations of benzene and other carcinogens, as well as lead and mercury. Significantly higher levels of these pollutants have been found downstream from tar sands refineries, leading to higher rates of cancers, including leukemia and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

The development of these tar sands will have negative effects on the environment and public health, and it has also contributed significantly to Canada's failure to fulfill its Kyoto Protocol obligations. I believe that Canada should rethink its approach to tar sands development.

Finally, I would like to address climate change. No matter how hard some of my colleagues hope climate change isn't real, it is, and we are already seeing harmful effects.

Transforming the oil from tar sands into useful gasoline is 80 percent more carbon intensive than the processing of typical crude oil. Producing, refining, and combusting the oil that Keystone would carry will release up to 168 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions every year. That is 27 million metric tons more greenhouse gas emissions than would be emitted from burning the same amount of typical crude oil. To put this in context, those additional emissions over normal processing are equivalent to the annual emissions from 5.7 million cars, 1.4 million homes or nearly 8 coal-fired power plants.

The economics of the Keystone Pipeline don't make sense, and the environmental risks could well be tragic. We are being asked to approve a project that will primarily benefit Canadian companies and foreign oil markets, while at the same time accepting the consequences of the harm the pipeline and tar sands oil would create.

If this is about jobs, let's invest in clean energy. The Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, for example, is estimated to create 190,000 jobs. If our goal is to lower fuel costs for American families, let's speed up improvements to fuel economy standards. If we want to modernize our infrastructure, let's get to work on a real transportation reauthorization bill. And if our aim is to exploit our energy resources, let's focus on wind and solar, biofuels, or the future of batteries and fuel cells.

We can do better than the Keystone Pipeline, both for our economy and for the environment. I encourage my col-

leagues to vote "no" on the Keystone Pipeline.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I wish to speak on S. 1, legislation to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan bill, which will approve construction of the pipeline that has been under review for 6 long years. By moving this project forward, we are helping to secure America's energy future, improve our national defense, and create tens of thousands of jobs for Americans.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is a commonsense jobs bill. It should never have been a political issue. It goes far beyond the labor to construct the pipeline—it will drastically increase employment across many industries as we work to develop our North American energy resources. It is disappointing that the President is threatening to veto its approval when building Keystone would create American jobs and help lower energy costs for families across the country.

The American people are still struggling in today's economy, and they expect and deserve Washington to cut red tape and unleash America's energy resources. Building the Keystone XL pipeline is an important step toward meeting these goals, will help ensure America's energy security, and reinforce relations with our largest trading partner.

Unleashing our Nation's full energy potential remains one of my top priorities in the U.S. Senate. I will work to advance serious policies that responsibly develop all of our energy resources, create good jobs, and make America more energy independent.

It is time we start putting America's issues on the President's desk. I urge the President to reconsider his threat to veto the bipartisan Keystone jobs bill and to finally take the opportunity to work with Congress to find solutions the American people want.

The Senator from Florida.

TELEPHONE TRACKING DEVICES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there is a disturbing report in the Washington Post today about a major telephone company, Verizon, putting supercookies on the phones that its customers are using which will allow those customers to be tracked, and if that information is turned over to third parties, to be utilized for purposes of advertising, even though the customer has indicated they do not want that particular cookie placed on their device.

Our staff on the commerce committee will be investigating this, and we certainly want to make sure that in this time of ubiquity of eyes prying all around in this electronic age we are living in that we preserve the rights of privacy for all individuals.

This is a matter of particular importance to the commerce committee. It

is of extreme importance to this Senator, and I will keep the Senate informed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I know we are about to bring some final votes on Keystone to the floor, but I want to take a few minutes to speak on the topic we will be focused on next week, and that is the impending crisis at the Department of Homeland Security should we not continue to fund their operations, which matters greatly to a State such as Connecticut—a State with expansive coastline, with natural disasters as part of our recent history, and with a close connection to some of the potential epicenters for terrorist activity and attacks, New York City being at the top of the list.

It was just 3 weeks ago that terrorists staged a horrific attack in downtown Paris. Before they were stopped by law enforcement, dozens of people were killed or injured and the world was given another reminder of the threats that exist all around us. Across Europe countries stepped up their alert, increasing their law enforcement presence, raiding suspected terror cells, and requesting the assistance of the United States to help track down the people who carried out the attacks.

Astoundingly, though, here at home, it seems as though there are a lot of Republicans in Congress who would rather talk about deporting children who were brought to this country without documentation rather than talk about funding the very agency that every day seems to keep our homeland safe from threats.

Even as our allies in Europe look for ways to improve their security, the House of Representatives, in particular, has told us that the only way we can fund the Department of Homeland Security—keeping this country safe—is to start deporting young boys and girls who are here trying to make it in the United States.

The United States is no stranger to the types of attacks that happened in France. An Ohio man was arrested 3 weeks ago when it was discovered he was plotting to blow up the United States Capitol. I am certain we have not already forgotten about the Boston marathon bombing or what happened before that in Oklahoma City. The threats against this country continue to evolve.

Why should we play politics with the agency that is most responsible for re-

sponding and getting this country ready for those threats? It is the height of irresponsibility to suggest, as some of my colleagues have, that shutting down the Department of Homeland Security—the Department responsible for protecting the United States from terrorist attacks—would be no big deal.

This is what the Secretary of Homeland Security has said. Last week he said:

... as long as we are on a CR, we cannot engage in new starts, new spending, new initiatives, new grants to state and local law enforcement to fund homeland security missions. We can't put in place the independent panel that recommended changes to the secret service. We can't do a lot of things for border security. Our counterterrorism efforts are limited.

In 28 days, the Department of Homeland Security, the agency charged with border security, aviation security, cyber security, Presidential security, and counterterrorism efforts, is going to run out of funding. Instead of working with the Senate, which overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan bill to fix our immigration system and secure our border, Republicans are willing to hold up this funding bill so they can deport DREAMers against the President's Executive order. It is not just irresponsible, it is dangerous.

In my State, as I said, it matters greatly. Over the past several years, we have seen, as the northeast has been battered by hurricanes and superstorms and blizzards, the indispensable nature of agencies funded in the Department of Homeland Security budget. Failing to pass this bill would delay upgrades to critical and necessary emergency communication systems for first responders in my State that are responding to emergencies and disasters. Whether we like it or not, they are happening with greater frequency.

Fortunately, thanks to the leadership of Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHAHEEN, there is a path forward. Yesterday they introduced a clean, full-year funding bill that has been endorsed by every Democratic Senator. This is the same bipartisan, bicameral bill that was negotiated by the House and the Senate last year.

This agreement includes critical assistance, critical increases in funding for our border security, cyber security, air and maritime surveillance, and biological and explosive detection at our borders. All of these things keep us safe at a time when we know that terrorism is a more real threat than ever, not just to the United States but to our partner countries all around the world.

Last week, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution I was proud to have written, declaring that we stand in solidarity with the people in France, that we mourn the loss of innocent victims and condemn the atrocity of these attacks.

I submit that just as important as our words, which we all came together

to support, are our deeds. Will our response now be to engage in a partisan fight over immigration or do we come together as Republicans and Democrats to fund the law enforcement personnel who are charged with keeping our citizens safe?

Next week when we return to this body, I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to quickly bring a clean, bipartisan Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill to the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Children's Health Insurance Program. This Congress 20 years ago passed CHIP. It was an invention of Senator Kennedy and Senator HATCH, both Senators who cared a lot about what we do to help low-income children.

I was at Mercy Health Clinic in Cincinnati late last week, and early this week I was at Dayton Children's Hospital, talking to families who have benefited from the Children's Health Insurance Program.

In the great majority of cases, the parents of these children have full-time jobs—often two jobs. They typically make significantly less than what we would call a living wage. They rarely have any kind of health insurance, although now they are entering the exchanges or perhaps Medicaid—more likely the exchanges—but their children are not getting health insurance except through CHIP. It has been around for 20 years, and there are about 10 million children in the United States who benefit from the Children's Health Insurance Program.

The Children's Health Insurance Program is law. It has been reauthorized up through 2019, but the funding for it expires this September. I have spoken with members of the Senate Finance Committee, including my colleague here, Senator NELSON from Florida, who has been a big supporter of the Children's Health Insurance Program. Senators CASEY and STABENOW have been very involved, Senator GILLIBRAND, and as I said, Senator HATCH was one of the founders of this program, along with Senator Kennedy.

It is so important that we move as quickly as possible, in part because the States need to budget these dollars—this Federal passthrough—so that it directly goes to the Children's Health Insurance Program. There are a few things we can do that are even more important than that.

In closing, I will add that it is not just the right thing to do, to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program,

it is also a smart thing to do because it means that parents will take their child who has an earache to the family doctor because they have insurance, instead of waiting a week, when the pain is unbearable, and taking that child to the emergency room and costing all of us more as taxpayers and perhaps causing that child some hearing loss.

In addition to helping these families with health insurance and saving money, it also makes a big difference in schools. The children are less likely to miss school and children will be better able to learn if, in fact, they have better health insurance.

We know that is the case for our own children. All of us here have government health insurance, if you will, as Members of the Senate, and it is important that we do what we ought to do for the Children's Health Insurance Program. It matters for so many families in North Dakota, the Presiding Officer's State, and my State of Ohio.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE and Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 304 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided after each vote and that all after the first vote in the series be 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 155

The question occurs on the Booker amendment No. 155.

Who yields time?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, my amendment No. 155 ensures that Federal agencies disclose to the public, landowners, and communities any significant new circumstances learned about the impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The National Environmental Policy Act—NEPA—is one of the most emulated statutes in the world. It is used as a model around the world. NEPA in fact is often referred to as the modern-day "environmental Magna Carta."

These are very commonsense ideas. NEPA regulations really do require agencies to actually supplement already issued environmental impact statements when significant new circumstances or information is found to exist relating to the environmental impacts of a project.

The pending Keystone bill, however, would deem the final environmental impact statement issued last January to fully satisfy NEPA. In other words, if new circumstances come up that are germane and important, they do not get a chance to alter that statement. My amendment would change that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BOOKER. I respectfully request 25 more seconds to conclude my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOKER. My amendment would change that and would preserve the applications of agencies to supplement the EIS. For example, if the proposed route of the pipeline was to change, it could mean drinking water supplies and other critical resources would have a higher risk of contamination from a spill. People should know that.

When American companies are building projects, they comply with this important NEPA safeguard. Foreign companies should not be given a shortcut. If American companies do it, foreign companies should do the same.

This amendment is supported by the Natural Resources Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, and a number of other organizations. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are here today because the Keystone Pipeline border crossing permit has been pending for years. There are no shortcuts at play.

The Booker amendment, drafted as a savings clause, would withhold the approval the bill seeks to confer if there are any new circumstances, new information relevant to environmental concerns. That is the whole point here.

The Keystone administrative record is already thousands of pages long. We have had 6 years of dos and redos. If this amendment is adopted, it begs the question as to whether there will ever be a decision.

I think the obvious strategy of pipeline opponents is to drag out the approval process until everybody gives up on it; everyone walks away. That is certainly not the intent of those of us who support this bipartisan bill. We don't want to see an endless round of further considerations. I think the majority here in the Senate believes it is time to move forward. Let's not have continued delays.

I urge a rejection of this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Booker amendment No. 155.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NAYS—56

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Sasse
Cassidy	Heller	Scott
Coats	Hoehn	Sessions
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Collins	Isakson	Sullivan
Corker	Johnson	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McCaskill	Warner
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Lee	Reid	Rubio
-----	------	-------

The amendment (No. 155) was rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COATS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 130

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I call for the regular order with respect to the Boxer amendment No. 130.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. It is my understanding that Senator BOXER is willing to forgo a rollcall vote, but she would like to speak to her amendment.

I turn to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. If I could ask for the attention of my friends.

The reason I so wanted to have this 1 minute even though I am not asking for a rollcall vote is because I want to make clear what we are doing in this underlying bill.

This is the only time in the history of the Senate that we have given such a big hug and kiss to a private company—any private company, American or foreign.

My amendment simply says that if TransCanada breaks the rules related to any permit they have—for example, there is an oilspill and they don't follow the oilspill plan or they don't handle hazardous waste in the right way—a whole list: They use the wrong steel.

It is dangerous. They are dangerous to their workers. It doesn't matter what they do, under the underlying bill, S. 1, they can never lose their permit. We don't do that for any other company, let alone a foreign special interest company that is going to take this oil and siphon it right out of America. There are 35 permanent jobs. A trail of misery follows the tar sands.

I am not going to ask for a rollcall vote because I get the writing on the wall. I would hope we would have a voice vote, and I would urge my folks to yell a "yes" if they can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think it is clear that the good Senator from California and I disagree on whether the Keystone XL Pipeline should proceed. It is apparent that we disagree on the reach of the section on permits as currently in the bill and also, more specifically, the substitute amendment we are discussing.

I am willing to agree that the permits which have already been issued should not be affected. That was the intent of the provision within the substitute. I am going to be voicing my opposition through a loud "nay" and would encourage my colleagues to do the same.

With that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 130) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 141

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided before a vote on the Markey amendment No. 141.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, my amendment is very simple. It would require that before the Keystone XL Pipeline is deemed approved, we should determine whether carbon pollution, including the carbon pollution from tar sands oil production, will contribute to an increase in more extreme weather events. We should know if carbon pollution is going to put another climate change card in a deck that is already stacked for more extreme rainfall and snowfall and for more dangerously hot summer days.

Since 2010 there have been 49 weather and climate disasters in our country that caused at least \$1 billion in damages across the United States. We should not be making energy policy decisions that increase the risk of costly, extreme weather events.

I urge an "aye" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I would suggest that this amendment is designed to further delay this pipeline. It requires

that a study be done by all Federal agencies with even a smidgen of review authority to determine whether increased greenhouse gas emissions are likely to contribute to an increase in more extreme weather events. It doesn't specify that the increased greenhouse gases that are under study are only related to the pipeline project. So, for instance, the President's deal to allow an increase in greenhouse gas emissions until 2030—if it caused the impacts listed in this amendment, it would stop the pipeline. That is not what we want to do.

I am going to be urging my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Shaheen
Carper	Menendez	Stabenow
Caspey	Merkley	Udall
Coons	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—62

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kaine	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Tester
Cotton	Klobuchar	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Enzi	McCaskill	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Reid Rubio

The amendment (No. 141) was rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WICKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 178

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to the Markey amendment No. 178.

The Senator from Massachusetts

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, right now the Canadian pipeline company is receiving a "get out of Canada free" slip. They do not have to pay taxes into the oilspill liability fund.

My colleagues may remember that last week the Republicans objected because they said the amendment of Senator WYDEN had a blue slip problem from the House because the tax has to originate in the House. You might remember that last Thursday night Senators on the Republican side objected to my amendments—late at night and, again, on procedural grounds. Well, the good news is we have been able to find a way to have a straight up-or-down vote on the substance of whether the Canadians have to pay into the oilspill liability fund. So this is going to be the vote that determines whether they are going to be able to build a pipeline right through our country—where we are running all the environmental risk—and if a spill occurs, they have not contributed to the oilspill liability fund.

This is a pure vote. It is not procedural. It is yes or no—do they contribute or not to that fund. I urge an aye vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I will be opposing this amendment. I believe it is unnecessary. We already debated and dispensed with this just last week. We voted for the sense of the Senate amendment which called for a loophole within the oilspill liability trust fund to be closed. We set us on a path to work with the House on that. That amendment is now part of this bill.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his support in making sure we did adopt that. I think most of us believe this loophole should be closed, and I am confident that we will close it well before the Keystone XL Pipeline goes into operation.

We have to remember, my friends, that before any oil flows through this pipeline which can be put into the oilspill liability trust fund, it has to be built. That is what this bill before us does. I want to make sure that we address this with the House. We will do so.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—54

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Thune	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCaill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi		

NOT VOTING—2

Rubio

The amendment was rejected.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ROUNDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 131 WITHDRAWN

Ms. CANTWELL. Given the results on other votes—given the vote on the Boxer and Booker amendments, and given everybody here, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Cantwell amendment No. 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to announce that this is the last vote of the week. The final vote on the Keystone Pipeline is the last vote of the week. The next vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on passage of S. 1, as amended.

Mr. CORKER. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

Mr. CORKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Bennet	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Carper	Heitkamp	Sasse
Casey	Heller	Scott
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Collins	Johnson	Tester
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCaill	Warner
Daines	McCaskill	Wicker
Donnelly	McConnell	

NAYS—36

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hirono	Peters
Booker	Kaine	Reed
Boxer	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Markey	Shaheen
Coons	Menendez	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Reid

Rubio

The bill (S. 1), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act”.

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

(f) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SCHOOL.—The term “school” means—

(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

(C) a school of the defense dependents’ education system under the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) **DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.**—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities to support the initiation of the projects;

(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(4) develop and maintain a single online resource website with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

SEC. 4. CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Nothing in this Act relieves the United States of its responsibility to consult with Indian nations as required under executive order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a “blue slip” from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

DIVISION B—ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015”.

TITLE I—BETTER BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Better Buildings Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) **COST-EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.**—The term “cost-effective energy efficiency measure” means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides energy savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(3) **COST-EFFECTIVE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURE.**—The term “cost-effective water efficiency measure” means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating

thereof, that provides water savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(b) MODEL PROVISIONS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES.

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and after providing the public with an opportunity for notice and comment, shall develop model commercial leasing provisions and best practices in accordance with this subsection.

(2) COMMERCIAL LEASING.

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection shall, at a minimum, align the interests of building owners and tenants with regard to investments in cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures to encourage building owners and tenants to collaborate to invest in such measures.

(B) **USE OF MODEL PROVISIONS.**—The Administrator may use the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection in any standard leasing document that designates a Federal agency (or other client of the Administrator) as a landlord or tenant.

(C) **PUBLICATION.**—The Administrator shall periodically publish the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection, along with explanatory materials, to encourage building owners and tenants in the private sector to use such provisions and materials.

(3) **REALTY SERVICES.**—The Administrator shall develop policies and practices to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures for the realty services provided by the Administrator to Federal agencies (or other clients of the Administrator), including periodic training of appropriate Federal employees and contractors on how to identify and evaluate those measures.

(4) **STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make available model commercial leasing provisions and best practices developed under this subsection to State, county, and municipal governments for use in managing owned and leased building space in accordance with the goal of encouraging investment in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures.

SEC. 103. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.**—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

“(2) **SEPARATE SPACES.**—The term ‘separate spaces’ means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

“(b) **STUDY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section,

the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

“(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

“(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) descriptions of—

“(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

“(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

“(iii) policies and best practices to achieve reductions in energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

“(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of available incentives;

“(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

“(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether such measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

“(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

“(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

“(B) case studies reporting economic and energy savings returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 423 the following new item:

“Sec. 424. Separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.”.

SEC. 104. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ‘high-performance energy efficiency measure’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term ‘separate spaces’ has the meaning given the term in section 424.

“(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as ‘Tenant Star’, to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

“(c) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

“(1) collect, through each Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

“(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by data centers, trading floors, and restaurants; and

“(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption;

“(2) with respect to the first Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey conducted after the date of enactment of this section, to the extent full compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) is not feasible, conduct activities to develop the capability to collect such data and begin to collect such data; and

“(3) make data collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public in aggregated form and provide such data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (d).

“(d) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

“(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which sufficient data is received pursuant to subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

“(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop policies and procedures to recognize tenants in commercial buildings that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

“(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (c) and any other appropriate data sources; and

“(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

“(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required by section 424(b) is completed, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 (as added by section 103(b)) the following new item:

“Sec. 425. Tenant Star program.”.

TITLE II—GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS

SEC. 201. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) in section 325(e) (42 U.S.C. 6295(e)), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) ACTIVATION LOCK.—The term ‘activation lock’ means a control mechanism (either a physical device directly on the water heater or a control system integrated into the water heater) that is locked by default and contains a physical, software, or digital communication that must be activated with an activation key to enable the product to operate at its designed specifications and capabilities and without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

“(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term ‘grid-enabled water heater’ means an electric resistance water heater that—

“(I) has a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

“(II) is manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

“(III) has—

“(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

“(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

“(BB) 0.00168; or

“(bb) an equivalent alternative standard prescribed by the Secretary and developed pursuant to paragraph (5)(E);

“(IV) is equipped at the point of manufacture with an activation lock; and

“(V) bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

“(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

“(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

“(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

“‘IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.’.”

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key for a grid-enabled water heater only to a utility or other company that operates an electric thermal storage or demand response

program that uses such a grid-enabled water heater.

“(C) REPORTS.—

“(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

“(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

“(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

“(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

“(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that—

“(I) grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement; or

“(II) sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually and procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes would not be adequate to prevent such product diversion.

“(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

“(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including any impact on energy savings, electric bills, peak load reduction, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

“(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.”;

(2) in section 332(a) (42 U.S.C. 6302(a))—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) for any person—

“(A) to activate an activation lock for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(B) to distribute an activation key for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such activation key will be used to activate a grid-enabled water heater that is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

“(C) to otherwise enable a grid-enabled water heater to operate at its designed specification and capabilities with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program; or

“(D) to knowingly remove or render illegible the label of a grid-enabled water heater described in section 325(e)(6)(A)(ii)(V).”;

(3) in section 333(a) (42 U.S.C. 6303(a))—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(B) by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (5) of section 332(a)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(4) in section 334 (42 U.S.C. 6304)—

(A) by striking “section 332(a)(5)” and inserting “paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)”;

(B) by striking “section 332(a)(6)” and inserting “section 332(a)(7)”.

TITLE III—ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

SEC. 301. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”;

(2) by striking “signing the contract,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

“signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

“(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

“(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

“(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multi-tenant building owners; and

“(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

“(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.”.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall complete a study—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and any associated building efficiency policies, for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multi-tenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and television studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure laws and data aggregation for multi-tenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

(c) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with other relevant agencies, shall maintain, and if necessary create, a database for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) information on buildings that have disclosed energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, only in an anonymous form unless the owner provides otherwise.

(2) COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS.—The database maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall complement and not duplicate the

functions of the Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Portfolio Manager tool.

(d) **INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.**—The Secretary of Energy shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am very pleased that we are at this point after three solid weeks of debate. The Presiding Officer introduced this bill on January 8, 2015, and it is now January 29. After weeks of good, solid debate, we have officially passed our bipartisan bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

This legislation was not only important to pass so we could add more jobs, have energy security, and good trade relationships with our neighbor in Canada, but also we were able to return to what we call regular order in the Chamber. The Senate has been given the title of the world's most deliberative body. I think it is fair to say that in recent years we have not really worn that title very well. We have not been able to engage in the deliberation and debate that I think Members of the Senate and the public at large expect.

What we have seen over these past few weeks was a return to regular order where a Member is free to call up an amendment, have it debated, and have it fail or succeed based on a process that has been long established in this Chamber. That is a good thing to see.

Boy, did we have our share of ideas. By last count, I believe there were close to 250 amendments that Members had offered from both sides of the aisle. That is a lot of ideas. There was a lot of pent-up demand, if you will, on energy-related legislation.

All in all, we voted on just over 40 amendments. I believe the final count was 41 amendments. We made a lot out of the statement that we have surpassed—with just this one bill in 1 month—all of the recorded votes that we had throughout 2014. In fact, we surpassed it with nearly three times more votes than we had in all of 2014.

Senator CANTWELL and I have been here in the well during this last vote, and we have received thanks from Members who said: Thank you for getting us to this point. We appreciate that. Good job.

But I think we all recognize there were some points of very clear tension around here, and that is just part of the process. Fortunately, cooler heads prevailed, and we were able to come back together. We were able to get the process moving forward and keep this bipartisan coalition in tact.

I will just point out to the Members that with the help of the ranking member on the energy committee—with the exception of one night—we did it all during daylight hours. Not to get real personal around here, but we have gotten into a habit in recent years of not taking up votes until just about the dinnertime hour. I don't know about the rest of you, but when I call the family in for dinner, we kind of expect it is dinnertime.

I am pleased that we were able to work with everyone's schedule and move through amendments in a fashion that was reasonable and structured. Yesterday was not exactly convenient with the numbers that we processed, but we did it. So I appreciate the great level of cooperation we have had. It is not easy to start out a new Congress in a new majority as the manager of the first bill brought to the floor, but I had a lot of phenomenal help.

I wish to take a brief moment to thank those who have provided counsel and assistance to us. This is kind of like the Academy Awards for the first bill coming through the Senate.

I would like to recognize my staff on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee who have done a fabulous job with every part of this process: My staff director, Karen Billups, Pat McCormick, Kellie Donnelly, Colin Hayes, Lucy Murfitt, Tristan Abbey, Kate Williams, Robert Dillon, Chelsea Thompson, Chuck Kleeschulte, Cathy Cahill, Chris Kearney, Mike Pawlowski, Chester Carson, Mike Tadeo, Isaac Edwards, Jason Huffnagle, and Brian Hughes, on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and on my personal staff as well. Our interns on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Samin Peirovi and Will Treadwell, also did a great job assisting my staff, including putting together binders, making sure we had the current amendments and the modifications that were in front of them. So they did a great job as well.

I also want to thank the members of the natural resources team in the Senate Office of the Legislative Counsel. These folks are kind of the unsung heroes. These are the ones who helped prepare the more than 240 amendments that were offered to this bill. We never see these folks, but they are churning out amendments as quickly as we can move ideas to them. Gary Endicott, Heather Burnham, Christina Jacquet, Michelle Johnson-Weider, Deanna Edwards, and Heather Lowell.

It is absolutely not possible to do what we did in moving this measure

through—or any measure—without recognizing the work our floor staff does for us. I wish to thank Laura Dove and the entire cloakroom staff, including Robert Duncan and Chris Tuck. The Parliamentarians and the clerks really worked hard.

Also I wish to recognize on the Democratic side of the aisle Gary and—everybody has just done a phenomenal job and we so appreciate it.

I truly must say the opportunity to start with this first bill and to be working with my ranking member, MARIA CANTWELL, on this effort, knowing that she was just getting her staff in line as we moved to this bill—the staff director on the ranking side I don't even think had officially been brought on—and it was full on. They have done extraordinary work, working with us.

I want to recognize Angela Becker-Dippmann and Sam Fowler and all the rest of the team because they were extraordinary.

I also want to recognize BARBARA BOXER and her staff as well. There was so much that needed to be coordinated.

I thank my ranking member for her patience, for her partnership, and for really the very good-faith efforts she has made as we have worked to get this bill to a conclusion, and offer a continued gesture of wanting to work together with her. I want her to know that I will be with her this weekend rooting for the Seahawks at the Super Bowl. So yet one more area of her operation, but a grand thanks to my ranking member and my partner on this bill.

With that, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor to Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I wish to speak also for a few minutes about what an incredible process this has been. As the Senator from Alaska stated, this was all a very unique experience, coming to a new Congress and being the very first bill up and everybody moving to that discussion. So I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Let's just say both sides of the aisle tested people on amendments and the amendment process, but I would say it was the trust we could negotiate that got us through a couple of rough spots and the fact that I could count on the Senator from Alaska for negotiating and trusting what she had to say about how we could move forward in getting those votes and getting things done. So I thank her for that and I thank her for her leadership. I certainly can't wait to work with her on broader energy policy legislation, because while I think people probably still look at us as representing the States of Washington and Alaska, what people may not realize is how intertwined Alaska's and Washington's economies are. So if there is anybody who can find commonality on energy policy, even given the difference

of our States and the differences on each side of the aisle, I think the Senator from Alaska and I will have a chance to do that. I think this process we just went through bodes well for us trying to say to both sides of our aisles that there are things we can put on the table and discuss and a process we can go through, and that process can work. So I thank her for that.

I look forward to the many initiatives—in fact, we just had a hearing this morning. I said, with two women heading up this leadership on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and two women staff directors, multitasking is front and center in the U.S. Senate. I don't think a lot of people would see either of us out in the halls making declarations. I think we just hustled our way to the floor to try to get things done. I hope that is what we can do as we move forward through this process.

I too wish to thank certainly Karen Billups on the majority side staff. I hadn't had a chance to work with her yet in this capacity and I certainly appreciated her steady hand on that. I want to thank on our side our staff director, Angela Becker-Dippmann. The very first day—like sometime in mid-January, I think—to come back to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and then have the first bill and have it right in front of us and not be totally staffed up, I certainly appreciate her leadership and her dedication to energy policy. Also, I thank Sam Fowler and David Brooks and Jared Leopold on my staff for their hard work on this.

I too have a list of staff that I wish to read quickly: Will Dempster, Clayton Allen, Renae Black, Elizabeth Weiner, Tara Billingsley, David Gillers, Al Stayman, Dan Adamson, Elizabeth Craddock, Nick Sutter, Aisha Johnson, Caroline Bruckner, Bryan Petit, Faye Matthews, and Carl Seip. There are also a couple of other people from my staff, Nicole Teutschel and Travis Lumpkin who also helped.

I really want to thank the floor staff. This is the first time I have managed a bill on the floor, so thanks to Gary Myrick and Tim Mitchell and Tricia Engle; and Reema in Senator DURBIN's office, and Emma, thanks so much for helping us through a process that, as my colleague said, for the most part didn't take us way late into the night and we got a lot of things accomplished when we could during the day.

Needless to say, I am not as excited about the passage of this legislation as my colleague on the other side of the aisle, but we did find out some things during this process. We found out that the majority of the Senate doesn't think that climate change is a hoax. We couldn't quite agree on whether it is significantly caused by man, or just caused by man in some areas, but that was a step. We saw huge enthusiasm

for energy efficiency. We saw that people were willing to accept voice votes or receive 95 votes on things that were energy efficiency items, so I think that bodes well for the Senator from Alaska and me thinking about more energy efficiency policy.

Obviously, I remain concerned about the holes in the legislation, everything from the things we didn't get to pass—the trust fund—and the fact that we still need to figure out oilspill cleanup processes on something like tar sands.

I appreciate the Senator from Alaska mentioning some of these issues as areas for continued work because we will definitely take her up on that process. And, certainly, we want to try to take up some of the issues our colleagues, such as Senator PETERS, brought up and work on them moving forward. I hope this process, as it relates to this legislation—I hope our colleagues—coming from the State of Washington where we have so many coal trains and oil trains coming through our area, I wish the pipeline would be some remedy for us, but it is not. Even according to railroad statistics and other statistics, a pipeline is not going to make one dent in the number of oil trains coming to the Pacific Northwest. So the fact that the Commandant of the Coast Guard says we don't have a solution for cleaning up tar sands is something we want to work on and push forward on.

I hope we can get our colleagues around the fact that the number of crude oil incidents has been growing since 2009. It used to be we were having a decline and now, according to the Associated Press, we are seeing an increase; at least 73 different accidents in 2014, an 87-percent increase over 2009.

We are seeing these new sources being developed and new ways of transporting them, and huge acceleration, and I hope Congress will take a deep breath and get to these issues as it relates to safety and security outlined and into law. I hope we will have a chance to do that.

I still hope the President of the United States vetoes this legislation because, frankly, I want him to be able to negotiate. I want him to be able to negotiate with this company the terms and agreements by which this pipeline is going to be built. I want him to protect the American economy, I want him to protect the American farmers, and I want him to protect the American environment.

Again, I say to my colleague from Alaska that if she and I can get through these few weeks on a bill that a lot of our colleagues were predetermined on, but have so many different amendment discussions, then, yes, maybe it bodes well for a bigger bipartisan energy bill. I will certainly look forward to working with her on that.

I thank her for her leadership during a time period where she had many

things on her plate, and this was just one of them. I hope we can get some of the issues we care about on our side of the aisle that I think really do lead to job growth, such as the energy tax credits, a focus on energy efficiency, and a focus of diversification also on the energy agenda.

With that, I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Washington for her comments. I think it is clear that we have a great deal of work in front of us, but I think we also have a better idea of where some of that common ground may be as a result of the discussions this past month. So I am looking forward to advancing an energy initiative through the committee and, hopefully, through the full process, that will speak to the attributes of affordability, abundance, a clean energy supply, diverse and secure. We have a lot of work to do.

In the comments I made, I thanked a lot of people, but I think it is important to recognize that the Senator from Washington and I would not have been able to do the job we did—managing this bill on the floor, working with other Members, working with staff on the floor and our respective staffs—if there had not been a very clear and a conscious decision that management of what was going to happen on the Senate floor was going to be a little bit different, that there would be an opportunity for debate, and some have described free-wheeling debate. What is free-wheeling debate? I think we have just kind of defined it here with the Keystone XL Pipeline. I don't know whether that is going to be the course for everything going forward, but this was a pledge that the majority leader Senator MCCONNELL made when he became the majority leader. I think we have seen that play out in a process that has been respectful, where at the end of the discussion we can still agree to disagree on the bill itself, but the process that has gotten us through final passage has been one that, again, was respectful and did allow for full and civil discourse. I think that is what the Senate should be all about and I am proud to have been a part of it.

With that, I know my good friend from North Dakota, the prime sponsor of this bill, is waiting to speak and I congratulate him for a phenomenal job. He and his staff—I should have mentioned his staff. Ryan and the others who have been working behind the Senator from North Dakota have been doing a great job. Senator HOEVEN has been articulate, persistent, and really has done a phenomenal job moving this through the process.

I congratulate the Senator from North Dakota, and I yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alaska

and the Senator from Washington as the bill managers. I think they have done an exceptional job. I know that is not just my opinion, but it is the opinion on both sides of the aisle. It is not just that they were able to do the work on this bill, but actually to facilitate the debate that really enabled us to move through an open amendment process and a return to regular order. It is not easy to do. Because, obviously, we had people who had ideas on a whole variety of issues, and, clearly, we have strong support for legislation, but there are those who oppose legislation as well. So to find a way to keep that amendment process going and with more than 40 amendments and, of course, to get to a final vote and pass the legislation is a real testament to both of the bill managers.

I thank all of the Members of this body who supported the legislation. A bipartisan vote getting more than 60 votes is no small achievement for any piece of legislation. Of course this bill already passed the House.

We are already conferring now with the House on whether we will need to go to conference or hopefully get their concurrence, but obviously our objective is to put it on the President's desk as soon as possible. This is an important step in building the kind of energy plan this country needs. We can't get to energy independence or energy security without building the infrastructure we need to move that energy from where it is produced to where it is consumed.

We have to remember that, yes, this is about working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. Some of the oil in the pipeline will be moved from oil production in Canada, but it is also about moving our domestic oil in this country from States such as mine and from the State of Montana and moving that oil as safely and as efficiently and effectively as possible and moving it in a way that actually produces less emissions than if we try to move all that oil on trains, which is what is being done now.

Moved on trains, we are talking 1,400 railcars a day instead of moving it through a pipeline. It is not only a safety issue, it is not only a cost issue, it is not only an efficiency issue, it is about producing less emissions and making sure we don't create congestion on our railroads to move all of the other goods we want to move. This is about building the kind of infrastructure plan for energy and other things we want for this country. I hope the President now will join with us. Clearly we are going to move this to his desk, and I hope he will work with us. That is what the American people want.

If we look at this legislation, if we look at this Keystone XL Pipeline project, it is about energy. It is about jobs. It is about helping to grow our

economy. It is about working to achieve national security in terms of energy security. It is about building the right kind of energy plan for the future of our country.

Here is where we are. This process was started over 6 years ago. Not only has this Congress, both the House and the Senate, now advanced this bill in a bipartisan way with strong bipartisan majorities in both Chambers, but every State on the route, all six States on the route have approved this project as well. We have the Congress that has approved it on a bipartisan basis. We have all six States that are included on the route. They have approved it through their processes. We have the supreme court in the State of Nebraska which has adjudicated, legislated in that State. That has been resolved.

Our closest friend and ally, Canada, wants us to work with them on energy security for North American energy security, but most important of all the American people want this done. In poll after poll, the American people overwhelmingly support this project. Over the last 3 years, the support has ranged from 65 percent to 75 percent. Even in the most recent poll that came out this month, 3 to 1, 65 percent to 22 percent, the people want the President to sign this bill. Again, I hope the President will join with us and work with us and support this legislation as we work with our leader on the energy committee and with our ranking member.

We don't agree on everything, obviously, but there are things we can work on together. We are working to build the right kind of energy plan for this country to get energy security. There will be more work to do, but I hope the President will join us in a bipartisan way and sign this legislation.

Again, my thanks to the bill managers, to the Members of this body who supported the legislation. I appreciate it very much.

I know the good Senator from Texas has a few words, but I will first yield the floor back to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, let me say to the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from North Dakota, congratulations, and tell them how much I admire and appreciate their tenacity. The 114th Congress had a lot to prove. Mainly what we had to prove is we weren't like the 113th Congress that was completely dysfunctional, particularly the Senate.

I have to say to our good friend, the Presiding Officer, it wasn't the House. It was the Senate that was dysfunctional. The House passed a lot of legislation that came to die in the Senate because the then-majority leader made the decision he wasn't going to move it. It is a new day in the Senate. While

I am sure the bill managers would tell us it wasn't easy, we actually have an accomplishment thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from North Dakota, and thanks to an awful lot of people. That is progress.

I hope the first efforts we have made by being able to pass legislation—hopefully the House will concur, the Senate, and the President—we will have done our job. What the President decides to do is about him doing his job, but we can't fail to do our jobs just because he refuses to do his job.

In fact, when he has announced for seven different pieces of legislation he is going to veto them, the easiest thing for us to do would be to curl up in a fetal position and say we give up, we are not even going to try. We haven't done that. Again, I think this is a great accomplishment.

I would say to my friends, the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from North Dakota, and others who have gotten us here today, well done.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S 2016 BUDGET

Madam President, I would like to turn to another topic. That seems as though it is a metaphor for life in the Senate. We finished one important piece of legislation, and we turn the page to the next topic. I would like to talk about the budget.

Next Monday the President is expected to release his 2016 budget. Budgets are a time when you talk about and deal with your priorities. This budget will reflect the President's priorities, I am sure. I hope one of those priorities is to put the country on a more sustainable path. But one of the things I am very glad about is that for the first time the President, in a long time, is actually going to propose his budget on time. The President missed so many previous deadlines over the years that people hardly ever notice anymore—but that is good, the President releasing his budget on time.

While I am happy to see he will finally meet his statutory deadline in submitting his annual budget, what I am interested in seeing is what he has in the budget, to see if he is willing to meet the challenges of our day by drafting a serious budget, including realistic priorities. That also means making tough decisions, but that is where budgets are so helpful.

I am an optimistic person, but if the President's State of the Union rhetoric is any indication as to what we will see next week, I am concerned the budget will be loaded with more taxes, more spending, and more debt. That certainly isn't a sustainable path forward for the country, but last year the President's 2015 budget would have raised taxes by more than \$1 trillion and increased our national debt by trillions more and his budget would have never balanced.

I can't think of anything worse during a time of slow economic growth

than layering on \$1 trillion of additional taxes on the people we are depending upon to create jobs and make the investment to get the economy growing again and get America back to work.

Here is another sort of sleight of hand the President has been using lately. He has been talking a little bit about deficits. Deficits, as we all know, is the difference between the money that comes in and the money that is paid out on an annual basis. The debt is a different topic. That is the long-term debt. Actually, it is the accumulated deficits which represent the biggest challenge.

The President likes to say that, well, the deficit has come down—which is true—but primarily the reason for that is because of a huge tax increase he embraced a couple of years ago along with the sequester or discretionary spending caps that were in the Budget Control Act of 2011. The combination of higher taxes the President sought and got and the spending restraint that essentially was championed on this side of the aisle resulted in lower annual deficits.

But the fact is we are still spending money we don't have. As the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee likes to say, we are still overspending. We are still spending money we don't have as long as we have any deficit. But deficits will not hold up for long as a reliable red herring. Factors contributing to lower deficits will soon change. Spending on ObamaCare and other broken entitlements will only ramp up from here. On the President's current trajectory, it is only a matter of time before those annual deficits start building again and adding even more to our national debt.

What the President is hoping is that they will be distracted by his happy talk about lower annual defenses, and we will not pay attention to the looming elephant in the room, which is our national debt which has grown more than \$7 trillion in the 6 years he has been in office. More than \$1 trillion a year. The national debt is \$18 trillion and counting. It is set to explode over the long term.

I realize most of us can't possibly conceive of what \$18 trillion is, but if we consider the fact we have 320 million people in America and we have an \$18.1 trillion national debt, each one of us—from the oldest American, most senior American, to the baby who was just born—owes \$56,500 in debt.

Earlier this week the Congressional Budget Office released its annual Budget and Economic Outlook which provides an updated economic forecast for the current fiscal year and for 10 subsequent years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, under current law the national debt is expected to grow more than \$9 trillion in the next 10 years. The President added \$7 trillion

during the 6 years he has been in office. If we don't do something quickly, we are on a trajectory to add \$9 trillion more over the next 10 years.

The Congressional Budget Office's report also shows that in 5 years the Federal Government will spend more than \$500 billion in interest on the debt alone and \$827 billion in 10 years.

Here is the ticking timebomb if you think about it. Because of slow economic growth globally, a lot of the Federal Reserve Banks essentially for the United States and other countries have done the best they can to keep interest rates low. In America they are next to zero. All we need to do is look at the return on our savings accounts to see what a meager interest rate is being offered by the bank or credit union on our savings. That is because of Federal Reserve policy. That is true of central banks throughout the world. But inevitably over time those interest rates are unsustainable, so they are going to start ticking back up. When they go from roughly zero to 4 percent or 5 percent, the amount of money we will have to pay on the current \$18.1 trillion in debt and on the additional debt that will be added over the next 10 years—unless we get hold of this problem—is going to crowd out our ability to do everything from protecting the most vulnerable in our society through our safety net programs to jeopardizing our national defense which is something we can't outsource to somebody else. This is something only the Federal Government can do.

We had an office holder in Texas a few years ago who talked about the Yellow Pages test. It always resonated with me. She used to say government should not be doing things that we can find in the Yellow Pages because that means the private sector is doing it. But the one thing you won't find in the Yellow Pages is national security, and so our ability to protect our way of life and our future is going to be jeopardized by this debt. That is why Admiral Mullen—former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff a few years ago—shocked all of us when he was asked “What is the single largest threat to our national security?” and he said “The debt.” That got a lot of us going to the books trying to figure out what he was talking about, and what he was talking about is what I have been referring to here.

Let me repeat that second part again. In 2025 we will be spending \$827 billion in interest on our debt alone. We won't be paying down the principal; we will just be paying interest on the debt by 2025—\$827 billion. That would be the third largest line item in the Federal budget, just behind Medicare and Social Security.

The Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Doug Elmendorf, has been testifying on findings from this report. On Tuesday, before the House

Budget Committee, Dr. Elmendorf stated that “such large and growing federal debt would have serious negative consequences.” He is exactly right. When we have to basically take up available credit to finance our national debt, that leaves less credit available to the private sector to make investments that will actually create jobs. It acts like a wet blanket on economic growth. Nothing but fiscal uncertainty and crisis will come from our debt continuing to spiral out of control.

The bottom line is this: Under President Obama the Federal Government has spent the past several years raising taxes. It has increased regulations. It is driving our national debt to unprecedented levels, and we have a growth rate which reflects that.

I know the President was celebrating. He was almost spiking the football at the State of the Union, saying: Well, we had a 5-percent spurt of growth in the gross domestic product last quarter.

Well, that is great, but all of the projections show that for the next year, because of all of the factors I have mentioned, growth is going to continue to bounce along the bottom at a rate of roughly 2 to 2.2 percent. That is not enough growth to get the economy moving again to create the jobs to create the prosperity and lift our economy needs to get Americans back to work.

In my opinion, the President's policies over the last year have actually made it more difficult for businesses to hire workers and for families to plan for the future. I would argue that his policies have introduced enormous uncertainty into our health care system, our tax system, and our financial system.

What our country needs now is the same thing which we have needed all along but which we haven't had over the past 6 years. We need genuine Presidential leadership, the type of leadership that is required to restore Americans' confidence in the future and to ensure better opportunities for the next generations and beyond. We don't need Presidential leadership that leads us into more debt, less opportunity, and a more dismal future.

It is my hope that the President's budget will be exactly what it should be and exactly what the American people deserve; that is, a responsible blueprint for robust, economic growth. There are not a lot of problems that face our country that couldn't be addressed in large part by robust economic growth. Our economy would grow. Revenues to the Federal Treasury would grow, thus reducing our deficits and giving us a better opportunity to address our debt. More Americans would be working again instead of the lowest percentage of people in the workforce in the past 30 years. That is what they call the labor participation rate.

I hope the President's budget will get behind some of these progrowth policies, such as progrowth tax reform—something we are eager to work with the President on—and support serious efforts to save Social Security and Medicare. The dirty little secret in Washington is that if we don't do anything to save Medicare and Social Security, they are going to fall off the fiscal cliff. So doing nothing is not an option, but we need a bipartisan commitment to save Social Security and Medicare.

I hope the President's budget will be a balanced one and finally offer a long-term plan for controlling our national debt. If it is not, well, we are not going to depend on the President alone; we are going to do our job in the Senate and the House and pass a responsible budget. If the President does not propose one, we will show the American people what one looks like because we cannot let the President continue to lead us down this path of unsustainable debt and a darker future for American people.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS. Reserving the right to object, I need more than 10 minutes. Is that all right? That was the expectation. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

INCOME INEQUALITY

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I am delighted to have heard the speech from my good friend Senator CORNYN. As the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I think we are going to have some very serious discussions about the assertion Senator CORNYN and many other Republicans made.

Let me begin by saying I am delighted that some of my Republican friends have expressed great concern about our deficit and our national debt. I ask them where they were several years ago when we went to war in Iraq and forgot to pay for that war. I happen to think the war in Iraq is not a war we should have ever gotten into, but be that as it may, I find it interesting that some of the leading deficit hawks went to war—a war which will end up costing us some \$3 to \$6 trillion. For the first time in the modern history of our country, they went to war and yet they chose not to pay for it. Then on top of that, in the midst of the war, during that period, they gave sub-

stantial tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country. In addition to that, they passed a Medicare Part D prescription drug program—much more expensive than it should be—written by the insurance companies, also not paid for. But now these same Republicans who came to the floor having voted to spend trillions of dollars on a war we should not have gotten into, having voted to give huge tax breaks to billionaires, having voted for a Medicare Part D prescription drug program that was not paid for—lo and behold, they have discovered we have a deficit problem and a national debt problem. This country would be in a lot better shape if they had expressed those concerns 7 or 8 years ago.

In my view, there is a war going on in this country. And I am not talking about the war in Afghanistan or Iraq or the instability in the Middle East; I am talking about the war being waged in America today against the American middle class, against the American standard of living, and against the American dream.

Today in the United States of America we have more income and wealth inequality than any other major country on Earth.

Today in America we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth.

Today in America we are the only major nation not to guarantee health care to all of our people as a right of citizenship.

The United States of America once led the world 40 years ago in terms of the percentage of our people who graduated from college. In short, we were the best educated people in the world. Today we are in 12th place, and millions of our young people are graduating from college deeply in debt, while others are looking at the cost of college and saying: I am not going to college. I am not going to get a higher education. I can't afford it. I don't want to leave school in debt. Our competing nations—whether it is Germany, Scandinavia, whether it is many of the European countries—are saying their kids are going to go to college regardless of the income of their families.

In terms of our infrastructure, we were once the envy of the world. Today, according to the World Economic Forum, we are in 12th place.

Today in America real unemployment is not the official unemployment rate of 5.8 percent; it is over 11 percent if we count those people who have given up looking for work and are working part time.

Youth unemployment—an issue we do not talk about—is 18 percent. We have over 5 million young people in this country who either dropped out of high school or graduated from high school. Do you know what they are doing? They are doing nothing. They are hanging out on street corners in

Vermont, Louisiana, and all over this country. There are no jobs for them. In terms of African-American youth unemployment, that number, if you can believe it, is close to 30 percent.

What the war against the middle-class and working families is about is that millions of our people are working longer hours for lower wages. In inflation-adjusted dollars, the median male worker today is earning some \$700 less than that worker made 40 years ago. The median woman worker—that woman right in the middle of the economy—made \$1,300 less last year than she earned in 2007. Since 1999, the median middle-class family has seen their income go down by about \$4,000.

The great recession, which was caused by the greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior on Wall Street, cost our country millions of good-paying jobs. It cost millions of Americans their homes and their life savings. It destroyed marriages and left people so destitute that they took their own lives. But the fact is, when people are in economic despair and economic recession, suicide rates go up. While the worst is clearly behind us, millions are still trying to claw their way back to where they were before the greed and financial abuses of Wall Street ripped the middle class apart.

The good news is that in the past 6 years our economy has made significant progress. We have created millions of jobs, and that is a good thing. Our unemployment rate is down, and we have seen a whole lot of people return to work. But when we talk about the economy, we also have to understand that the recovery we are seeing is extremely uneven. Some people—the people on top—have done remarkably, unbelievably well. A tiny slice of the population has gobbled up all of the economic gains since 2009.

Let me repeat that because it is almost impossible to believe, but it is true. All of the new income gains after 2009—not 50 percent, not 80 percent, not 90 percent—100 percent of all of the income gains after 2009 have landed in the pockets of the top 1 percent.

Today the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. Today the Walton family—six people—owns more wealth than the bottom 41 percent. Here is the Walton family, six people who are worth \$144.7 billion, and here is the bottom 41.5 percent of our population—131 million people who are worth about \$123.4 billion. I ask the American people, is this what our country is supposed to be about—one family owning more wealth than the bottom 41 percent, the bottom 131 million Americans? Our economy and our distribution of wealth and income is completely out of balance, and this imbalance is not only fundamentally immoral, it is wrong that so few have so much and so many have so little. But it is also detrimental to economic

growth, it is dangerous for our financial stability, and in fact it threatens our democracy. Our task is to rebalance this economy; to create an economy that works well for all of our people and not just wealthy campaign contributors—not just the Koch brothers but the working class of this country.

There was a time after the Great Depression when we built an economy that allowed workers to share in our Nation's prosperity. There was a time when the economy grew to help all people—the rich got richer, the middle class expanded, and poverty went down. That economy brought unparalleled prosperity and financial stability to our country and is affectionately remembered as the golden age of American capitalism. For decades wages increased alongside rising productivity, and each generation could reasonably expect to do better than the last.

My parents worked very hard so their sons could do better than they did. That was the American dream—a dream, by the way, which no longer exists.

After rising to more than \$56,000 at the start of the 21st century, real median household incomes today have fallen back to where they were in 1996, a decline in living standards of more than \$4,000 a year. Something is not right in our economy.

The good news is the economy is growing. It is much better than it was 6 years ago, and we should be delighted by that. GDP is up. We just had a very strong quarter—5-percent growth. Productivity is up, employment is up, home prices are up, and the stock market is way up.

On the other hand, average hourly earnings have barely budged, leading economists to resurrect a Depression-era term—a Depression-era term—called secular stagnation. For the first time since the Great Depression, our economy is growing in a way that is leaving most of our citizens no better off. In other words, the economy is doing well, but the people are not doing well.

In fact the distribution of wealth today is worse than at any time since 1917–1917. The share of wealth owned by the top one-tenth of 1 percent is almost the same as the bottom 90 percent.

When we talk about the budget—and I will talk about the budget as the ranking member of the Budget Committee—the budget has to be placed in a broader context of what is happening in America. What is happening in America is the people at the top are doing phenomenally well, the stock market is going off the wall, corporate profits are at an alltime high, while the middle class shrinks and we have almost more people living in poverty than at any time in our history. That is the context in which in my view the Budget Committee has to accept its challenge.

Today half of all Americans are making less than \$20 an hour, half the kids in our public schools are living in poverty, and 62 percent of Americans do not have the money to cover an unexpected emergency room visit or a \$500 car repair. In other words, all over this country people are stressed. They are worried about what would happen if their car were to break down. They are worried what would happen if they were to get sick because they have no money in the bank. They have nothing to rely upon. They are working longer hours and in many cases they have nothing in the bank.

As the recent elections in Greece demonstrate, ordinary people will not stand by and watch as their economies unravel and as their democracies unravel. Left unchecked, widening disparities in wealth and opportunity here at home can give rise to dangerous levels of social unrest. We must rebalance the economy so prosperity is enjoyed by the many—by the middle class, by working families—and not just a handful of people on top.

We must ensure that our economy continues to grow and that the benefits of a growing economy are widely enjoyed. It is not growth versus fairness but growth and fairness. In other words, we can have all the growth we want and it doesn't mean anything to the middle class. In fact, the converse is true: We can have all the fairness we want, but if there is not growth, people are not going to gain prosperity. In fact, no society has ever flourished without a large, prosperous middle class, and that is what we must fight to bring about.

My Republican friends believe the economy will grow if we just give more tax breaks to millionaires, to billionaires, and to the largest corporations in America. They refer to this top 1 percent as the job makers or the job creators. They insist if we rub their bellies just right—deregulating markets and slashing taxes and all of these nice things for the wealthy and the powerful—we can coax them into building an economy that will work for everyone. That is called trickle-down economics: bend over backward for the rich and the powerful, and when we give them their tax breaks, we deregulate and let them destroy the environment, my God, they are going to create all these jobs for working families.

That is what the first George Bush referred to as “voodoo economics.” He was right then and that expression is right today.

I am sure the Presiding Officer has seen the Kevin Costner movie “Field of Dreams.” These supply-side arguments, these trickle-down theories are the economic equivalent of the field of dreams. The Republicans tell us all we have to do is to build a friendly tax and regulatory environment and the “job creators” will come. They tell us we

just have to get the “incentives” right and the wealthy will create all the good jobs we need. They tell us that if we build the rich a better playing field, the jobs will come.

That is the mantra of supply-side economics, of the trickle-down theory: If you build it, they will come. The only problem with that theory is it has been tried and the evidence is overwhelming that it has failed.

Since 1980 we have seen the marginal income tax rate—the top marginal income tax rate—plunge from 70 to 35 percent. The wealthiest people wanted a reduction in their marginal tax rate, and they got it. The corporate income tax rate dropped from 46 to 35 percent—although, by the way, very few corporations pay 35 percent, but they did get a reduction in the corporate tax rate. Taxes on capital gains fell from 28 to 15 percent. We have deregulated the airlines, deregulated telecommunications, deregulated energy, and maybe, most significantly and most disastrously, we deregulated Wall Street.

We did all of the things the wealthy and the powerful wanted us to do, but instead of unleashing the job creators and ushering in a new golden age that benefits all people, these supply-side gimmicks brought us widening inequality and greater financial instability. In other words, these experiments failed. They failed. Our economy has become more unstable. The distribution of wealth and income has become more unequal, and it takes the system longer and longer to call back the jobs that are lost each time we suffer a recession.

I am encouraged by some of the comments I have recently heard from my Republican colleagues who recognize that income and wealth inequality in America is real. This is a step forward. However, the policies they are advocating to address income and wealth inequality will in fact make a bad situation even worse.

As the ranking member of the Budget Committee, let me tell you what the Republicans have in mind. They don't say this straightforward, so I will help them and say it straightforward. What they intend to do is to cut Social Security, and they are going to tell us all the reasons we have to cut Social Security. That is what they are going to do. That is what they are going to try to do. We are going to stop them, but that is what they are going to try to do. They are going to try to end Medicare as we know it and convert it into a voucher program. That is what the House Republicans voted to do last year. The result will be that there will be more and more out-of-pocket medical expenses for older Americans. They are going to make devastating cuts in Medicaid and throw some of the most vulnerable people in this country off of health insurance and onto the

rolls of the uninsured. They are going to try to cut taxes for millionaires, billionaires and large corporations and they are going to try to increase military spending.

That is what they are going to do. They are going to give long speeches. They are not going to say these things directly, but if you listened closely to the speech my friend and colleague Senator CORNYN gave, that is truly what they intend to do.

Einstein said it was the height of insanity to keep doing the same thing over and over again expecting different results. It is time to accept the facts. The facts are that trickle-down economics does not work. It has failed. It is time to get back to doing what does work—what works for the middle class and working families. That is what we have to get back to.

So what does work? What is a program we should be advocating that makes sense and that will work for ordinary Americans? The plan is actually pretty simple. It is the way economics was taught and practiced during the golden age of capitalism, and it flips trickle-down thinking on its head. To put it as simply as possible, our economy runs on sales, not a very difficult concept to understand. Sales create jobs.

Businesses don't hire and invest because they want to. They hire workers and invest in new machinery because they have to. They do it to keep up with consumer demand, which is 70 percent of our economy, not very complicated. When people have disposable income in their pockets, they buy products, they buy services, and when they buy those services and products, companies hire workers to make those products and deliver those services.

We hear a lot of talk about how we need to reduce spending to grow the economy, but that doesn't quite make sense. Spending isn't just the right way to grow the economy. In fact, it is the only way to grow the economy. After all, what is the economy? It is our economic pie, our GDP. What is that? It is a measure of how much we are spending as a nation to buy the goods and services we are producing. If we spend less, we don't grow our economy, we shrink it.

Contrary to what a lot of people believe, the government is not the big spender in the economy, households are. Their spending accounts for roughly 70 percent of our total GDP. That means consumers play a critical role in creating the demand that drives our economy.

It also means that when the middle class is in trouble—when people have less disposable income—the American economy is in trouble. Whether we continue to grow and create jobs depends critically on the economic well-being of the vast middle class. If the middle class is weighed down with debt and

struggling to get by, the long-term health of the United States economy is in serious trouble.

Hardworking Americans with money to spend are the real job creators. They are the customers who supply the demand of the vast majority of what our businesses are trying to sell.

This is not just BERNIE SANDERS speaking. Talk to many of the large companies out there and they say they are seeing a drying up of their customers because the economy is so bad. That is what the folks in many industries will tell us today. Our economy does well when people have income to spend. This is not a complicated theory. If people can't buy products, companies are not making products. Companies are not producing services.

Since the Wall Street crash, many of the jobs that have been added to the economy have been low-wage and part-time jobs. In fact, the jobs created during the recovery in the last few years pay 23 percent less on average than those that were lost in the recession. In his State of the Union Address, the President talked about "middle class economics," and that is an excellent way to put it. It is a powerful reminder of what drives growth and prosperity. When we understand this, we understand why our economy cannot function when those at the very top are pocketing 100 percent of the income gains.

Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent is not getting 50 percent of all new income, not getting 80 percent of all new income—they are getting 100 percent of all new income. Our most important job creator, the vast middle class, is disappearing. Squeezed by decades of rising costs and stagnant incomes, they just can't do it. When those at the very top take more and more of the gains, our job creators—i.e., the middle class—get squeezed. Debt becomes a substitute for income, and the economy becomes even more fragile.

Let me show an incredibly revelatory chart. This chart talks about distribution of average income growth during expansions and what the bottom 90 percent received versus what the top 10 percent of families receive.

We go back from the period of 1949 to 1953, 1954 to 1957, 1958 to 1960, 1961 to 1969, 1970 to 1973, 1975 to 1979, 1982 to 1990, 1991 to 2000, 2001 to 2007, 2009 to 2012. That is the last we have.

What this chart shows is that in the first three decades after World War II the vast majority of Americans did well when the economy did well.

This is the percentage of new income that went to the bottom 90 percent, and this is what the top 10 percent got. They did OK. The top 10 percent did pretty well. They got 20 percent of all new income. But the bottom 90 percent got 80 percent of the income. Then 1954 to 1957 went down a little bit, but the bottom 90 percent did pretty well.

Again, the bottom 90 percent did pretty well, and here the bottom 90 percent did pretty well. Then the bottom 90 percent begins to do less well, and again less well, but they are still getting a majority of the new income.

Whoa—what happens in 1982? Well, Ronald Reagan is President—and the good news is we are into trickle-down economics. Here it is. This chart tells it all. This is what the top 10 percent got, and this is what the bottom 90 percent got.

Here we are in the last number here, where we are today, and, lo and behold, the top 10 percent gets it all. And, frankly, this is a metaphor. This is an example of exactly what trickle-down economics is all about.

So early on, in economics, when we have a recovery, most of the new income goes to working families and to the broad middle class. Since the 1982 period, almost all of the new income goes to the top 1 percent. Today, as I mentioned—rather unbelievably—all of the new income is going to the top 1 percent.

Clearly, this is unacceptable. This trend of the rich getting richer and everybody else getting poorer is not what America is about, and it has got to be changed. We have to rethink the fundamentals of supply-side, trick-down economic theory.

The difficulty we have, to be frank, is that, especially since Citizens United and especially since the millionaires and billionaires can pour huge amounts of money into the political process, for them this is great news. This chart is fantastic news. They have won. They contribute to candidates, and candidates go out and tell us we need more tax breaks for the rich, we need more deregulation. And these are the results. So not only do we need to change our economic policies. Clearly, we need to change campaign finance so the work being done by Congress reflects the needs of working families and not just the billionaire class.

Now, let me say what I think we should do. I do not believe we should give more tax breaks to the rich because they are getting richer and their tax rates have gone down. I do not believe we should give more tax breaks to large corporations, because there are huge loopholes in our corporate tax system and we are losing about \$100 billion every single year because corporations and millionaires are stashing their money in the Cayman Islands and other tax havens.

We have a situation right now in this country in terms of our individual tax breaks where hedge fund managers who make millions of dollars a year pay an effective tax rate lower than a truck-driver or a nurse. That makes no sense to me nor do I believe it makes sense to the American people.

So I will very briefly say what I think makes sense and an agenda that

will put Americans back to work at decent wages.

No. 1, if we want to create jobs in America, we don't pass the Keystone Pipeline bill. That creates 35 permanent jobs. That creates several thousand construction jobs. And, by the way, that allows the Canadian firm to produce and transport some of the dirtiest fuel in the world, which will only exacerbate the problems of climate change—doing exactly the opposite of what the scientific community tells us we should do.

So if we want to create more than 35 permanent jobs, maybe we should be serious about rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure; that is, our roads, our bridges, our water systems, our wastewater plants, our dams, our levees, our rail system, our airports. Think of what America would look like when, instead of having a sub-par infrastructure—an infrastructure now ranked 12th in the world—we lead the world with cutting edge technology. A \$1 trillion investment could put 13 million Americans back to work at good wages. In my view, that is exactly what we should be doing.

Right now in this country we have a significant number of people working at the starvation wage—the Federal minimum wage—of \$7.25 an hour. We must raise the minimum wage to a living wage. When we do that, we provide a pay raise for some 25 million Americans who today are struggling economically. And when we do that, we not only help them, but we also help the economy because, as I mentioned earlier, when these folks have money they can then spend some money.

We have to provide pay equity for women workers. It is not acceptable that women today earn 78 percent of what male workers earn who do the same job.

We have to deal with the scandal of overtime right now, where we have workers in McDonald's who make \$25,000, \$28,000 a year and who are "supervisors" and therefore are exempt from overtime regulations. So they may be working 50 or 60 hours a week making very little money, yet because they are "supervisors," they don't get time and a half. Ending that and raising that \$23,000 threshold to something like \$56,000 would provide a huge pay increase for millions and millions of workers.

We live in a very, very competitive global economy, and it makes no sense to me that in that economy we have large numbers of young people who are giving up on the dream of getting a good education and going to college or graduate school. Others are leaving school deeply in debt. We should learn from many of our competitors who say to their young people: You want to go to college? You can go to college, regardless of your income because tuition is free.

A few months ago, one of the States in Germany was the last State in Germany to do away with tuition. What one of their political leaders said was: Look. We believe all of our people have the right to go to college, and income should not be an impediment. I agree with that.

We need finally to do what I know is very, very difficult for many of the Members of this body, and that is take on Wall Street. We have a handful of huge financial institutions that have assets equivalent to 60 percent of the GDP of the United States of America. They issue half of the mortgages in this country and two-thirds of the credit cards in this country. I believe that is just too big. I fear very much about another too-big-to-fail scenario where we have to bail them out.

As we know, Republicans recently have pushed through language to take away some of the protections that taxpayers had in Dodd-Frank and once again leave them exposed to bailing out Wall Street when they engage in dangerous derivative speculation.

Lastly—and this is not just an economic issue, although it is; it is a moral issue—we have millions of senior citizens and people with disabilities in this country who are struggling with incredible courage every single day to buy the food they need and to buy the medicine they need, and, in cold States such as mine in Vermont, to heat their homes. This is not just rhetoric. This is reality. There are—God knows how many—seniors who say: Well, I can't buy my medicine if I am going to heat the house. I can't heat the house if I am going to buy my nutrition. We know that all over the country the Meals On Wheels programs have waiting lines because it is a place for low-income seniors to get nutrition. Yet we have an effort right now on the part of Republicans to say that, well, yeah, we have millions of seniors trying to get by on \$12,000, \$13,000 a year, but we are going to cut their benefits. Well, they may make that effort, but I will do everything I can to stop it.

There are very simple remedies for the problems facing Social Security, and we should make a couple of things very clear. Despite a lot of the rhetoric that we hear, Social Security is paid for by the payroll tax and does not add to the deficit. So take that issue away.

The second issue is that Social Security is going broke. Well, the simple truth is Social Security is not going broke. Social Security has about \$2.6 trillion in its trust fund and can pay out about all the benefits owed to all eligible Americans for the next 19 years. If we want to make Social Security solvent—not for 19 years, because I think we have to extend that—if we want to make it solvent for 30 years or 40 years and if we want, as I believe we should, not to cut benefits but to expand benefits, and if we want to do the

right thing for our parents and our grandchildren, then I think we defeat every effort out there to cut Social Security. I think we lift the cap on taxable income so that millionaires contribute more into the Social Security trust fund. I think we have that moral obligation to our parents and our grandparents.

Let me conclude by saying this. I think the evidence is overwhelming that trickledown economics is a fraud. It works for the very wealthy; it does not work for working families. The job of this Congress is to protect the middle class and working class, and not just billionaire campaign contributors.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer for your indulgence, and I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO LINDA GIBBONS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to pay tribute to a wonderful staff member and dedicated public servant, Linda Gibbons. Linda will be retiring this week after 22 years of devoted service. I know I speak for everyone on my staff when I say she will be deeply missed.

As a member of my constituent services team, Linda helped thousands of Utahns who contacted my office seeking assistance. In serving constituents, she was always sympathetic to their needs and worked tirelessly to resolve their problems. Constituent casework is difficult, often requiring hours of tedious research and coordination with Federal and State agencies. But Linda was always equal to the task, and I can say without reservation that she was among the best caseworkers I have ever had.

Linda was passionate about public service. Her work ethic always impressed me, and I was grateful for her willingness to assume new responsibilities. She is tenacious, honest, and always believes in doing the right thing.

Most importantly, Linda has a deep capacity to care for and love others. Both constituents and staff know this well. She has always gone out of her way to listen to and help anyone in need.

I will always be grateful for Linda's work in helping me nominate Utah's most talented young students to military academies. Military academy nominations can be laborious and cumbersome, but Linda always saw candidates through the process with a remarkable degree of efficiency and professionalism. In doing so, she mentored some of Utah's best and brightest. She also built strong ties between our office, the students, their families, and officials from military academies.

Although Linda has achieved much in her professional life, perhaps her greatest success has been in the home. Linda has been married to her husband,

Phil, for over 40 years, and together they have three children and seven grandchildren. She loves her family dearly and looks forward to spending more time with them in her retirement. Her compassion and strength have shepherded them through some of life's most difficult challenges.

I am truly grateful for the tremendous service Linda has rendered to my staff, her community, and the great State of Utah. I will miss Linda greatly, but I know that this next chapter in her life holds many exciting and wonderful opportunities. I will be forever grateful for her dedicated service and loyal friendship.

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of subcommittee assignments for the Committee on Appropriations for the 114th Congress.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Senator Cochran, as chairman of the Committee, and Senator Mikulski, as vice chairwoman of the Committee, are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Moran,¹ Blunt, Cochran, McConnell, Collins, Hoeven, Daines, Merkley², Feinstein, Tester, Udall, Leahy, Baldwin. (7-6)

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Shelby¹, Alexander, Murkowski, Collins, Graham, Kirk, Boozman, Capito, Lankford, Mikulski², Leahy, Feinstein, Reed, Shaheen, Coons, Baldwin, Murphy. (9-8)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Senators Cochran¹, McConnell, Shelby, Alexander, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Blunt, Daines, Moran, Durbin², Leahy, Feinstein, Mikulski, Murray, Reed, Tester, Udall, Schatz. (10-9)

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Senators Alexander¹, Cochran, McConnell, Shelby, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Hoeven, Lankford, Feinstein², Murray, Tester, Durbin, Udall, Shaheen, Merkley, Coons. (9-8)

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Senators Boozman¹, Moran, Lankford, Coons², Durbin. (3-2)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Senators Hoeven¹, Cochran, Shelby, Murkowski, Graham, Cassidy, Shaheen², Leahy, Murray, Tester, Baldwin. (6-5)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Murkowski¹, Alexander, Cochran, Blunt, Hoeven, McConnell, Daines, Cassidy, Udall², Feinstein, Leahy, Reed, Tester, Merkley. (8-6)

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Blunt¹, Moran, Shelby, Cochran, Alexander, Graham, Kirk, Cassidy, Capito, Lankford, Murray², Durbin, Reed, Mikulski, Shaheen, Merkley, Schatz, Baldwin. (10-8)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senators Capito¹, Kirk, Moran, Schatz², Murphy. (3-2)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Kirk¹, McConnell, Murkowski, Hoeven, Collins, Boozman, Capito, Cassidy, Tester², Murray, Reed, Udall, Schatz, Baldwin, Murphy. (8-7)

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Senators Graham¹, McConnell, Kirk, Blunt, Boozman, Moran, Lankford, Daines, Leahy², Mikulski, Durbin, Shaheen, Coons, Merkley, Murphy. (8-7)

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Collins¹, Shelby, Alexander, Kirk, Blunt, Boozman, Capito, Cassidy, Daines, Reed², Mikulski, Murray, Durbin, Feinstein, Coons, Schatz, Murphy. (9-8)

¹Subcommittee chairman.

²Ranking minority member.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 114th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator SCHUMER, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rules of Procedure

Committee on Rules and Administration

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 1. The regular meeting dates of the Committee shall be the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month, at 10:00 a.m. in room SR-301, Russell Senate Office Building. Additional meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Rule 2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (a) through (f) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the Members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings:

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if:

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(f) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulations. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

Rule 3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all Members of the committee at least a week in advance. In addition, the committee staff will telephone or e-mail reminders of committee meetings to all Members of the committee or to the appropriate assistants in their offices.

Rule 4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of legislative business and committee business will normally be sent to all Members of the committee and released to the public at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any Member of the committee from discussing appropriate non-agenda topics.

Rule 5. After the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member, speaking order shall be based on order of arrival, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

Rule 6. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the chairman may direct, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive such requirement for good cause.

Rule 7. In general, testimony will be restricted to 5 minutes for each witness. The time may be extended by the Chairman, upon the Chair's own direction or at the request of a Member. Each round of questions by Members will also be limited to 5 minutes.

QUORUMS

Rule 8. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, a majority of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of legislative measures.

Rule 9. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, one-third

of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, including action on amendments to measures prior to voting to report the measure to the Senate.

Rule 10. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony under oath and 1 Member of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony not under oath; provided, however, that in either instance, once a quorum is established, any one Member can continue to take such testimony.

Rule 11. Under no circumstances may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

VOTING

Rule 12. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

Rule 13. If a third of the Members present so demand a roll call vote instead of a voice vote, a record vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

Rule 14. The results of roll call votes taken in any meeting upon any measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment by each Member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

Rule 15. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the Members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a Member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee Member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a) (3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

AMENDMENTS

Rule 16. Provided at least five business days' notice of the agenda is given, and the text of the proposed bill or resolution has been made available at least five business days in advance, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless such amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee and circulated via e-mail to each of the offices by at least 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting.

Rule 17. In the event the Chairman introduces a substitute amendment or a Chairman's mark, the requirements set forth in Rule 16 shall be considered waived unless such substitute amendment or Chairman's mark has been made available at least five business days in advance of the scheduled meeting.

Rule 18. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

Rule 19. This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Rule 20. The Chairman is authorized to sign himself or by delegation all necessary

vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf all routine business.

Rule 21. The Chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

Rule 22. The Chairman is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

Rule 23. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, acting jointly, are authorized to approve on behalf of the committee any rule or regulation for which the committee's approval is required, provided advance notice of their intention to do so is given to Members of the committee.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2014

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for myself as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics and for Senator BOXER as vice chairman of the committee, that the following "Annual Report for 2014—Select Committee on Ethics" be printed in the RECORD. The committee issues this report today as required by the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Annual Report of the Select Committee on Ethics

The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (the "Act") calls for the Select Committee on Ethics of the United States Senate to issue an annual report not later than January 31st of each year providing information in certain categories describing its activities for the preceding year. Reported below is the information describing the Committee's activities in 2014 in the categories set forth in the Act:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, including the number raised by a Senator or staff of the Committee: 45. (In addition, one alleged violation from the previous year was carried into 2014.)

(2) The number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) For lack of subject matter jurisdiction or in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist: 27.

(B) Because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion: 17.

(3) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry: 2. (This figure includes 1 matter from the previous calendar year carried into 2014.)

(4) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry that resulted in an adjudicatory review: 0.

(5) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee dismissed the matter for lack of substantial merit: 0.

(6) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee issued private or public letters of admonition: 0.

(7) The number of matters resulting in a disciplinary sanction: 0.

(8) Any other information deemed by the Committee to be appropriate to describe its activities in the previous year:

In 2014, the Committee staff conducted two new Member and staff ethics training sessions; 16 Member and committee office campaign briefings; 13 employee code of conduct training sessions; five public financial disclosure clinics, seminars, and webinars; 34 ethics seminars and customized briefings for Member DC offices, state offices, and Senate committees; one private sector ethics briefings; and 12 international briefings.

In 2014, the Committee staff handled approximately 9,648 telephone inquiries and 1,510 inquiries by email for ethics advice and guidance.

In 2014, the Committee wrote approximately 925 ethics advisory letters and responses including, but not limited to, 756 travel and gifts matters (Senate Rule 35) and 99 conflict of interest matters (Senate Rule 37).

In 2014, the Committee issued 3,354 letters concerning financial disclosure filings by Senators, Senate staff and Senate candidates and reviewed 1,650 reports.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING BOB MORALES

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and work of Teamsters Local 350 Secretary-Treasurer Bob Morales, who died in South San Francisco on January 26 at the age of 71. Bob was a great labor leader and a dear personal friend, and I will miss him terribly.

Born in El Salvador in 1943, Bob came to the United States with his family as a teenager. After completing his education in San Francisco, he served in the United States Army for 2 years, reaching the rank of Sergeant Fifth Class.

Bob began his extraordinary career with the Metal Polishers and Platers Union of the AFL-CIO. He joined the Teamsters Local 350 in 1973 as a business representative, quickly becoming secretary-treasurer after only 2 years. In this role, Brother Bob negotiated some of the best union contracts in the Nation, providing his members with outstanding wages and benefits. A fearless advocate for California workers, Bob held several positions within the Teamsters, serving as the first and only director of the union's Solid Waste, Recycling and Related Industries Division, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Joint Council 7, and Chairman of both the California and National Teamsters Hispanic Caucuses. As a testament of his successful leadership, Bob's colleagues named him a trustee to the Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust—the largest labor pension fund in the western United States. In 1992, Bob was honored

as Labor's Man of the Year in San Francisco.

Beyond his tireless work in the labor movement, Bob was involved with numerous charitable organizations, including the United Way of California, the Martin Luther King Jr. Society of San Francisco, the A. Philip Randolph Institute, the Hispanic Foundation, and the San Francisco Senior Centers.

On behalf of the people of California who Bob so diligently served, I send my deepest condolences to his wife Maria, son David, their extended family, and Bob's many friends, colleagues, and admirers.●

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL CHOICE

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, the Senate passed a resolution that I was proud to cosponsor recognizing this week as National School Choice Week.

As a former school board member, I understand that State and local governments are best equipped to make education decisions for their communities—not Washington. Students and parents deserve to choose the education that meets their needs. I am committed to empowering parents with the ability to choose the best education options for their children.

I asked Arkansans to share with me why school choice is important to them. Crystal Holland of Beebe wrote to me about her son, Hunter, who has high-functioning autism. She wrote that he was misdiagnosed with ADHD when he was 4 years old and diagnosed with autism when he was 11 years old. "He missed out on some very important critical skills because of all the discipline problems he was having due to anxiety," Holland wrote. "School choice allows me to homeschool him as a result and I am very thankful for the opportunity."

Bob and Mary Anne Fielder of Hot Springs included competition in their email to me. "Competition is always good. You would see a much improved public school system," they wrote.

I agree with the Fielders. Competition among schools improves the standards for everybody. This Congress we will take important steps to improve education nationwide by fixing No Child Left Behind. This is a key vehicle to providing flexibility to States and to families so they can make the choices about education opportunities for their children.

This week I skyped with students at public charter schools across Arkansas. The students said having educational options was important to them because it allows them to be better prepared for their interests beyond high school graduation.

I am proud to support National School Choice Week and the outstanding educational choices that Arkansas offers. When it comes to edu-

cation, it is important that we get the job done right. Allowing the freedom to choose between educational options for children is one way we can help parents make the best decision for their children's futures.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:09 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 351. An act to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 351. An act to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-459. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Animal Welfare; Retail Pet Stores and Licensing Exemptions; Technical Amendment" ((RIN0579-AD57) (Docket No. APHIS-2011-0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 27, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-460. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Electronic Submission of Technical Reports" ((RIN0750-AI25) (DFARS Case 2014-D001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-461. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Defense Contractors Performing Private Security Functions" ((RIN0750-AI31) (DFARS Case 2014-D008)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-462. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Updated Descriptions of Product Service Groups Subject to Trade Agreements" ((RIN0750-AI49) (DFARS Case 2015-D004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-463. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Further Implementation of Trafficking in Persons Policy" ((RIN0750-AH93) (DFARS Case 2013-D007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-464. A communication from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Foreign Policy Report on the imposition of a license requirement on exports, reexports, and transfers (in-country) to the Crimea region of Ukraine; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-465. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cuba: Providing Support for the Cuban People" (RIN0694-AG42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-466. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Assessment of Demand Response and Advanced Metering"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-467. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to Revise the Code of Federal Regulations for Species Under the Jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service; Correction" (RIN0648-XC659) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-468. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0001—2015-0003); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-469. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sulfoxaflor; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL No. 9920-45)

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-470. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Extension of the Laboratory and Analytical Use Exemption for Essential Class I Ozone-Depleting Substances" ((RIN2060-AS38) (FRL No. 9921-52-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-471. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5}, 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone, and 2010 NO₂ National Ambient Air Quality Standards; South Dakota" (FRL No. 9922-04-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-472. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Exemption of Certain Chemical Substances from Reporting Additional Chemical Data" ((RIN2070-AK01) (FRL No. 9921-56)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-473. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to New Mexico" (FRL No. 9921-77-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-474. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; Sacramento Metro Area; Attainment Plan for 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9921-99-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-475. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to Administrative Rules of Montana - Prevention of Significant Deterioration" (FRL No. 9919-42-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-476. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-137); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-477. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-127); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-478. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-106); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-479. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Respirator Certification Fees" (RIN0920-AA42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-480. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-481. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Removal of Naloxegol from Control" (Docket No. DEA-400) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 27, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-482. A communication from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Smoking/No Smoking Areas" (RIN1120-AB42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-483. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Direct Investment Surveys: BE-10, Benchmark Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad" (RIN0691-AA83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-484. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 76.1506 of the Commission's Rules" (DA 14-1892) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-485. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Cove and Daisy, Arkansas; Alamo, Georgia; Grayville, Illinois; Clayton, Louisiana; Harrison, Michigan; Alton, Missouri; Ennis, Montana; Bufalo, Erick, Haworth, Leedey, Reydon, Taloga, Thomas, and Wright City, Oklahoma; Weinert, Texas; Boscobel, Owen, and Tigerton, Wisconsin)" ((MB Docket No. 11-

147) (DA 12-513)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-486. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Silverton, Texas)" ((MB Docket No. 14-156) (DA 15-9)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-487. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Thames River, New London, CT" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0983)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-488. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Area; Sarah Mildred Long Bridge Replacement, Portsmouth, NH" ((RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0554)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-489. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulated Navigation Areas and Limited Access Areas; Waterway Management of Apra Harbor, Guam" ((RIN1625-AA00; RIN1625-AA11; and RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0935)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-490. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone: Eastport Breakwater Terminal, Eastport, Maine" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1037)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-491. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone: Blue Water Resort and Casino Southwest Showdown 4; Parker, AZ" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0990)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-492. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones: Dignitary Arrival/Departure and United Nations Meetings, New York, NY" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-1009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-493. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone: John Joseph Moakley United

States Courthouse; Boston, MA" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1055)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-494. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone: SFOBB Demolition Safety Zone, San Francisco, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0654)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-495. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Clearwater Super Boat National Championship; Gulf of Mexico, Clearwater, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0657)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-496. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0018)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-497. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Fishing Year 2014; Interim Gulf of Maine Cod Management Measures; Correction" ((RIN0648-BE56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-498. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 22, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-2. A communication from a citizen of the State of Illinois memorializing the State of Illinois's petition to the United States Congress calling for a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. Res. 53. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUNT, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 54. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. Res. 55. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. ENZI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 57. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 299. A bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 300. A bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 301. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 302. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 303. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 304. A bill to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr.

PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 305. A bill to protect American job creation by striking the Federal mandate on employers to offer health insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the use of 529 plans and Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 307. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 308. A bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. LEE):

S. 309. A bill to prohibit earmarks; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 310. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of painting portraits of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 311. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 312. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 313. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 314. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 316. A bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 317. A bill to improve early education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 318. A bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 319. A bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 320. A bill to authorize the collection of supplemental payments to increase congressional investments in medical research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 321. A bill to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. COONS):

S. 322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 323. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of official portraits of Members of Congress, heads of executive agencies, and heads of agencies and offices of the legislative branch; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. Res. 53. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Armed Services; from the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. Res. 54. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BURR:

S. Res. 55. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Select Committee on Intelligence; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 56. A resolution designating January 2015 as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. Res. 57. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the

Budget; from the Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 58. A resolution recognizing January 2015 as "National Mentoring Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 165

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 165, a bill to extend and enhance prohibitions and limitations with respect to the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, *supra*.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as co-

sponsors of S. 235, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the Pro Football Hall of Fame.

S. 295

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 295, a bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 297

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 297, a bill to revive and expand the Intermediate Care Technician Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 92

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 92 proposed to S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 302. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, throughout my career, I have been proud to stand up for equality for all Americans regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. While I have seen much progress with respect for the rights of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender, LGBT, community within the United States, the struggle for equality and justice abroad remains significant. Many countries have laws that criminalize homosexuality, prohibit public support of the LGBT community and persecute those who identify as LGBT. To adequately address the challenges posed by these discriminatory laws, the United States must make LGBT rights a priority in all of our foreign policy and there needs to be dedicated position responsible for coordinating that effort. That is why, today, I am introducing the International Human Rights Defense Act of 2015, which directs the Department of State to make international LGBT human rights a foreign policy priority and would establish a Special Envoy position in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor responsible for coordinating that effort.

Over the past few years, conditions have deteriorated for LGBT individuals in many regions of the world. Russia enacted a ban on arbitrarily-defined "homosexual propaganda," endangering the position of many LGBT individuals and their allies. Russia's law has been the basis for similar legislation threatened or introduced in countries across Eastern Europe and Central Asia, including Lithuania, Kyrgyzstan, and Belarus. In December 2013, India's Supreme Court reversed a lower court ruling and reinstated the

criminalization of homosexuality in the second most populous nation on earth. Nigeria, Uganda, and Gambia have all passed laws that make homosexuality a crime punishable with life imprisonment. While Uganda's law was overturned by its Constitutional Court, leaders have pledged to pursue similar legislation. Conditions for transgender individuals are particularly troubling in Brazil, where 113 transgender individuals were murdered in a 1-year period.

In light of these alarming developments, I am introducing the International Human Rights Defense Act of 2015. It is critical that the United States fight for LGBT equality both at home and abroad. The Obama Administration has taken great steps in affirming and strengthening the United States' commitment to LGBT equality as a critical component of our international human rights objectives. However, our government does not yet have a comprehensive strategy for addressing LGBT discrimination overseas and we lack a central individual office responsible for inter-bureau and inter-agency coordination to achieve these objectives.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 304. A bill to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last year we saw an all-time record number of motor vehicle recalls, including those by General Motors, Toyota, Honda, and others.

The commerce committee held five vehicle safety hearings, examining GM ignition switches, Takata airbags, and the related question of whether the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, or NHTSA, is up to the task of providing effective oversight of the auto industry.

What is absolutely clear, from our hearings and other media coverage, is that we need to ensure potential vehicle safety defects are identified as early as possible so we can protect consumers and hopefully prevent deaths and injuries. That is why earlier today Senator NELSON and I introduced the Motor Vehicle Safety Whistleblower Act.

I am pleased to note that Senators HELLER, MCCASKILL, KLOBUCHAR, AYOTTE, MORAN, and BLUMENTHAL have cosponsored this important legislation. Senators MORAN and BLUMENTHAL being added as original cosponsors of this legislation is important because of their respective responsibilities as the chairman and ranking member of our subcommittee on consumer protection,

which has played a large role over the years on various automobile safety efforts.

This afternoon I am pleased that Senator NELSON has joined me on the floor as a lead sponsor to discuss this important piece of legislation and our ongoing work on vehicle issues. As the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, one thing that has remained constant on our committee is the spirit of bipartisanship.

With regard to S. 304, the Motor Vehicle Whistleblower Act, this legislation will incentivize auto employees who uncover serious allegations of vehicle defects or violations of motor vehicle safety laws that could lead to death or serious bodily injury to voluntarily provide that information to the Department of Transportation.

If such information leads to the Department of Transportation or the Department of Justice enforcement action that totals more than \$1 million in penalties, the whistleblower would be eligible to share in a portion of the total penalties collected. This bill will protect the whistleblowers' identities and allow DOT to share information with the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies where appropriate.

Other agencies have similar programs, including programs that incentivize individuals to report information to the Securities and Exchange Commission and to the Internal Revenue Service. NHTSA plays a key role in ensuring the safety of vehicles that consumers drive on our roadways. Record fines have been levied against Toyota, General Motors, Honda, and other manufacturers.

In 2014, NHTSA issued more than \$126 million in civil penalties, a record amount, exceeding the total amount collected by the agency in all of its 43-year history.

Ensuring the safety of American motorists is a priority, but the public's trust has been shaken due to the record number of recalls this past year. Almost 64 million vehicles were recalled in 2014, which is about 3 times the number of vehicles recalled in 2013—and the concerns many have about problems in the industry and at NHTSA.

After my repeated calls on the President to fill what had been a lengthy vacancy regarding the Administrator position at NHTSA, which operated without a Senate-confirmed Administrator for 389 days, I am glad to say the commerce committee did its job to ensure that Dr. Mark Rosekind was confirmed as Administrator before the end of last year. However, there is much more work that needs to be done.

The defects associated with the GM ignition switch recall and the Takata airbag recalls were apparent failures with serious safety consequences that

resulted in death and serious injury. As we learned from the GM incident, delays in reporting safety-related defects to the government can cost lives.

In recent years, Congress has enacted, and NHTSA sought to implement, a robust early-reporting regime. I believe we can do more to ensure that NHTSA is informed of potential defects as early as possible. Some of the major automakers and other manufacturers have also instituted or sought to improve internal safety reporting systems that encourage employees to report safety problems.

I applaud these efforts, but reports of employees whose concerns may have been ignored, silenced, or possibly even covered up persist. If there are potential whistleblowers with important information to help NHTSA identify more defects that are not being addressed, we want them to come forward so these problems can be identified much earlier in the process.

I think we would all agree it is better to address a problem before injuries or deaths occur, if at all possible, rather than relying primarily on fines imposed after the fact. This is a common-sense, bipartisan bill that will help to prevent injuries and deaths for American drivers.

NHTSA and other stakeholders have provided input on this legislation. I look forward to working with these groups and my colleagues, and particularly with Senator NELSON, as we move forward with the committee to process and pass this legislation.

I yield the floor to Senator NELSON for his remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in light of the late hour, just before our votes, I will submit for the RECORD a statement which correlates with the chairman of our committee, and I thank the Senator for so much of his cooperation over last year and all the investigations and the hearings that we did, as well as now.

What I will say that is new is I will provide an update on the status of the committee's investigation into the defective Takata airbags. When we had the hearing last November which I had the privilege of chairing, we received testimony from several witnesses, including a senior executive from the Takata Corporation, which manufactures the airbags involved in the rupture and the explosive incidents that basically have lacerated people with pieces of metal. The airbag that is supposed to save their lives, in fact, is endangering their lives, and in some cases killing them. This has happened to two of my constituents in Florida.

While the hearing produced some basic information about the problem, many questions still remain.

Senator Rockefeller, then the chairman of the committee, other Senators,

and I sent a letter to Takata requesting information and documents related to Takata's airbag defects. In their initial response provided to the committee in early December, Takata included a list of all the incidents it was aware of that had allegedly involved a death or injury caused by a ruptured Takata airbag.

Takata's response reveals that the scope of injuries involved in the Takata airbags appears to be greater than we previously thought. In its initial response, Takata identified 5 deaths and 64 injuries. Although some of these incidents may be ultimately tied to other causes, this potential injury figure is far bigger than what had been reported in the press. Unfortunately, 1 death and 17 of these injuries occurred in my State of Florida—more than any other State. Among the alleged injuries in my State, many were serious, including lacerations and fractures to the face, burns to the neck, face, and torso, and traumatic brain injury and hearing loss.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to conclude my statement.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Sadly, I have even more bad news to report today. Through public information, we have learned that an exploding Takata airbag appears to be responsible for yet another death. Less than 2 weeks ago, a Texas man who was driving with his 11-year-old cousin was involved in a low-impact crash. When the airbag deployed, instead of protecting him, the airbag ruptured and sent a metal piece of shrapnel into the man's neck. When the police arrived, he was already dead.

We are awaiting more information from Takata and we are determined to get to the bottom of this.

I look forward to working with the chairman on this issue. We plan to continue the investigation until all of our questions have been answered. We are going to do everything possible to get to the bottom of this issue so that consumers are made whole.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 312. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I join with my colleagues Senators COCHRAN and WHITEHOUSE in introducing the Strengthening Kids' Interest in Learning and Libraries, SKILLS, Act.

Fifty years ago, when President Johnson urged Congress to enact what would become the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, he specifically

called for an investment in school libraries, decrying that school libraries were "limping along." Results from a recent National Center for Education Statistics survey show that there are still gaps in access to school libraries. Approximately 8,800 schools did not report having a library media center, and only about ⅓ of the traditional public schools that did have libraries reported having a full-time, certified librarian. One in five traditional public schools reported having no paid, State certified library staff at all.

Effective school library programs are essential supports for educational success. Multiple education and library studies have produced clear evidence that school libraries staffed by qualified librarians have a positive impact on student academic achievement. Knowing how to find and use information are essential skills for college, careers, and life in general. A good school library, staffed by a trained school librarian, is where students develop and hone these skills.

Our bipartisan legislation would reauthorize and strengthen the Improving Literacy through School Libraries program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the only federal initiative explicitly dedicated to supporting and enhancing our nation's school libraries. The key improvements to the program include ensuring that elementary, middle, and high school students are served; expanding professional development to include digital literacy instruction and reading and writing instruction across all grade levels; focusing on coordination and shared planning time between teachers and librarians; and ensuring that books and materials are appropriate for and gain the interest of students with special learning needs, including English learners.

The SKILLS Act would also strengthen Title I by requiring State and school district plans to address the development of effective school library programs to help students gain digital literacy skills, master the knowledge and skills in the challenging academic content standards adopted by the State, and graduate from high school ready for college and careers. Additionally, the legislation would broaden the focus of training, professional development, and recruitment activities under Title II to include school librarians.

Absent a clear Federal investment, the libraries in many of our high poverty schools will languish with outdated materials and technology or cease to exist at all, and in turn, students will be cut off from a vital information hub that connects them to the tools they need to develop critical thinking and research skills necessary for success. This is a true equity issue, which is why I will continue to fight to sustain our Federal investment in this

area and why renewing and strengthening the school library program is of critical importance.

I urge our colleagues to join us in co-sponsoring the bipartisan Strengthening Kids' Interest in Learning and Libraries Act, and to work together to ensure that it becomes a part of the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 318. A bill to prioritize funding for the National Institutes of Health to discover treatments and cures, to maintain global leadership in medical innovation, and to restore the purchasing power the NIH had after the historic doubling campaign that ended in fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act.

The bill allows more funding for the National Institutes of Health by allowing NIH funding to grow even while we continue to live under austere funding caps.

NIH funding has been a bipartisan effort working with Democrats—Senators Kennedy and Harkin, as well as Republicans—Senators Hatfield and Specter. We successfully fought to double NIH's budget from \$13.6 billion in 1998 to over \$30 billion today. We supported it to speed the transition of discoveries from science to treatment and maintain America's global competitiveness.

But the NIH budget hasn't kept up with inflation. Its budget has been growing, but slowly. That means the NIH budget buys 20 percent less than what it did when the doubling was completed in 2003. Which means we are missing out. Missing out on potential treatments, potential breakthroughs, potential cures. We have no shortage of ideas. Scientists have ideas but they cannot test them without funding. What is the solution?

We need to redouble our commitment to medical research. This bill creates a 6-year plan to put NIH back on stable ground. It is steady growth, it is predictable, and it is fiscally sound.

The bill allows for new spending for NIH that does not count against the strict budget caps. So we can put more money into cures without taking it away from other compelling human needs funded within the Labor-HHS Appropriations bill.

Why NIH? Why should we have new spending for NIH when other spending is stagnant or being cut? Personally, I would lift the sequester caps. I think they are doing real harm, but I recognize we do not all agree on that. I think we do all agree that NIH research is worth increasing because it both helps the economy and saves lives.

First, let me talk about how NIH helps the economy. The NIH is a world-class institution. I call it the National Institutes of Hope, serving as the foundation for U.S. medical innovation which employs 1 million U.S. citizens, including 19,000 at NIH and 14,000 NIH employees who live in Maryland. NIH generates \$84 billion in wages and salaries, exports \$90 billion in goods and services. Every dollar we invest in NIH generates \$2-\$3 in economic activity. Every patent NIH generates provides the foundation for 8 private sector patents. In 2013, products built on licensed NIH and FDA inventions reported a total of \$7 billion in sales. Investing in NIH is good for our economy.

But I do not call NIH the National Institutes of Hope because of its economic impact. NIH gives hope because of its human impact. Just look at what we have done with Federal investments in NIH, cutting the cancer death rate by 11 percent in women and 19 percent in men. HIV/AIDS is no longer a death sentence. Polio and small pox are essentially eradicated in this country.

These medical breakthroughs did not just happen. They occurred because our government supported the NIH. And because the NIH supported dedicated scientists seeking knowledge and medical breakthroughs.

And now, that support is being eroded.

I have heard the American people say, they want Congress to be frugal. But I haven't heard anyone say: "Let's delay finding a way to prevent Alzheimer's" or "Let's encourage our young scientists to work abroad" or "Let's put a hold on finding a cure for cancer" or "Let's discourage our universities from researching treatments for rare pediatric tumors".

I am for being frugal but we must not jeopardize or hamper America as the gold standard, as the worldwide leader in medical research and innovation.

I am for being frugal but not at the expense of the next generation of scientists and the health of American families.

Discovery is the genius of our country. When President Jefferson commissioned Lewis and Clark to find water route to the Pacific, the mission was called discovery. Discovery is part of our Nation's DNA. It is what makes this Nation great.

To have innovation we must have discovery. This requires: Investing in our human capital, educating our people, and funding their research. That is why I support funding for NIH. And that is why I am introducing the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act today.

I hope my colleagues will agree and support this bill.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 319. A bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount

Denali; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation which has been proposed in the past by the Alaska Congressional Delegation to officially restore the traditional name of the nation's highest peak, currently Mount McKinley, to its traditional Interior Alaska Athabascan name, 'Denali.' I am joined in sponsoring this bill by my colleague from Alaska, Senator DAN SULLIVAN.

Since passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980 the Alaska Delegation has been trying to change the name of the tallest mountain in North America back to its Alaska name. In 1980 Congress did change the name of the national park and preserve where the mountain is located to Denali National Park and Preserve, from its earlier name of Mt. McKinley National Park. But unfortunately the name of the peak itself continues to refer to a President who never set foot in Alaska.

While I have great respect for President William McKinley and great respect for the wonderful State of Ohio where he was born, the peak at 20,230 feet has always been called by Alaska's first Athabascan residents as Denali, meaning "the high one." It is simply fitting in this day and age of greater awareness of Native history that the mountain return to a name that honors its Native ancestry.

Already there are a number of towns and institutions named in honor of the 25th President. He has a monument for him at his birthplace in Niles, OH, and another on McKinley Monument Drive where the McKinley National Monument is located, not far from the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, OH. There is McKinley Heights in Ohio. There are more than 20 schools in Ohio named for him. There is a county in New Mexico named after him. There are literally hundreds of streets, libraries and other institutions and businesses named for him nationwide. There is no danger than Americans will not remember and honor the assassinated President.

But no official in the territory of Alaska actually named the nation's tallest mountain after the former President. That was done by a prospector William Dickey, who took it upon himself to name the peak in 1896. The Alaska State Place Names Board in 1975 took official state action to rename the peak, restoring its traditional name of Denali. I clearly believe that there is every reason for this Congress to follow Alaskans' desires and the desires of Native Americans and restore the name to the English translation of what it has been called for millennia, on Federal maps and documents.

I hope that this Congress will finally agree to this name change.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 320. A bill to authorize the collection of supplemental payments to increase congressional investments in medical research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to announce the introduction of the Medical Innovation Act, which is a commonsense proposal that could dramatically increase our Nation's investment in lifesaving medical research.

During much of the 20th century, America made significant investments in this area through the National Institutes of Health, and it has been a remarkable success. We have transformed medicine across America and around the world. NIH support helps train each new generation of scientists and develop each new generation of medicine. NIH-supported discoveries often get picked up by small, creative, nimble biotechnology companies, which in turn get picked up by large pharmaceutical companies, which in turn sometimes result in wildly successful blockbuster drugs. Each of these blockbuster drugs brings in more than \$1 billion a year for the drug companies, and each one transforms lives.

Nearly everyone in Congress supports increased funding for NIH, but for 10 years the NIH budget hasn't even kept up with the pace of inflation. Why? Because nobody wants to step up and find a way to pay for it.

It is time to break the stalemate. The Medical Innovation Act would increase NIH funding without raising taxes and without stealing support from other critical programs. Instead, support would come from blockbuster drug companies—only those that relied on government-supported research to generate billions in sales and only those that break the law and enter into major settlement agreements with the government. In such cases, the government settlements would go forward as they normally do, but the offending company would also be required to reinvest a relatively small portion of the profits it has generated as a result of taxpayer-supported research and put that money right back into the NIH.

We celebrate the accomplishments of our pharmaceutical industry—especially the industry's billion-dollar blockbuster drugs. These drugs have literally transformed the treatment of high cholesterol, diabetes, HIV, asthma, rheumatoid arthritis, breast cancer, colon cancer, and leukemia. They help Americans live longer, healthier lives. But we also know that blockbuster drugs don't just appear overnight as if by magic. Rarely do they result from a single giant company's individual genius.

I agree with Republican Senators ALEXANDER and BURR, who say in a report released just this morning:

[I]n many cases, the research leading to the discovery and development of these products has been advanced, funded, or enabled in some way by NIH.

Drug companies make great contributions, but so do taxpayers.

The big drug companies are making billions as a result of these investments, but over the last 10 years a few of our wealthiest drug companies have been caught making money a second way—by skirting the law. These companies are not getting swept up in minor paperwork mistakes. They are not victims of overly eager regulators. They have been caught defrauding Medicare and Medicaid, withholding critical safety information about their drugs, marketing their drugs for uses that aren't approved, and giving doctors kickbacks for writing prescriptions for their drugs.

Between 2007 and 2012 the world's largest pharmaceutical companies paid over \$13 billion in fines and settlements. Despite those numbers, it is clear that for the biggest drug companies this is simply a cost of doing business. In fact, several of the biggest drug companies have been caught breaking the law, have paid a fine, and then have broken the law again. And why not? Even the biggest pharmaceutical settlement ever—a \$3 billion penalty for withholding life-threatening safety data and engaging in illegal marketing practices—accounted for less than 10 percent of what the company made selling those drugs. In fact, the day the settlement was announced, that company's stock price actually went up.

It doesn't have to be this way. The Medical Innovation Act would serve double duty—requiring more accountability from the biggest drug companies while giving medical research the support it deserves.

This isn't a tax; it is simply a condition of settling to avoid a trial in a major case of wrongdoing. If a company never breaks the law, it will never pay. If an accused company goes to trial instead of settling out of court, it will never pay. It is more like a swear jar. Whenever a huge drug company that is generating enormous profits as a result of Federal research investments breaks the law, it has to put some money in the jar to help fund the next generation of medical research.

Since we announced this proposal, we have seen an outpouring of support from hospitals, doctors, patient groups, and research universities. All of them want to break the stalemate on NIH funding and get back to the business of saving lives.

We have also heard some grumbling from the army of lobbyists that works for some of the biggest drug companies—companies that would prefer not

to pay a bigger penalty when they break the law. If they have better ideas for ending this congressional stalemate and getting more money into NIH, I am eager to hear them.

These lobbyists have also claimed that there is "no logical basis" for asking these companies to pay up when they break the law. Well, I disagree. If a company that is making literally billions of dollars as a result of taxpayers' NIH investments turns around and engages in allegedly illegal conduct and wants to settle to make the case go away, that seems like a pretty logical basis for asking them to invest a little in the next generation of medical breakthroughs.

Lobbyists have also written that the Medical Innovation Act might create "unnecessary litigation." Well, it is illegal to defraud Medicare. It is illegal to pay kickbacks to doctors. It is illegal to hide safety data from the FDA or manufacture drugs in dirty, contaminated facilities. Our biggest and most successful drug companies make billions of dollars by inventing treatments and improving the public's health, and when they do, we applaud them for it. But if they want to avoid unnecessary litigation, then they should follow the law. If they don't want to put a dollar in the swear jar, then stop swearing.

I don't kid myself. I know how difficult it is to get things done in Washington, and I understand that a handful of powerful actors with money and power likes things just the way they are and will fight any effort to change. But even if a few of the biggest drug companies don't like it, I am hopeful that we can build support for this idea because the Medical Innovation Act is a major move toward substantially increasing Federal support for medical research in a way that doesn't raise taxes and doesn't cut other critical programs.

If this policy had been in place over the past 5 years, NIH would have had nearly \$6 billion more every year to fund thousands of new grants to scientists and universities and research centers around the country. That is almost a 20-percent increase in NIH funding.

It has been 10 years of stagnant Federal investments followed by sequester cuts, 10 years of rejecting potentially life-changing research proposals at NIH, 10 years of telling young researchers that their innovative ideas have almost no chance of getting off the ground. We are running out of time.

Today we are choking off support for projects that could lead to the next major breakthrough against cancer, heart disease, Ebola, Alzheimer's, diabetes, or other deadly conditions. We are starving projects that would transform the lives of our children on the autism spectrum. We are suffocating breakthrough ideas that would give new hope to those with ALS.

That is not who we are. We are not a nation that abandons the sick. And we are not a nation that says, "I've got mine, the rest of you are on your own." We are a nation of people who work together. We are a nation of people who invest in each other. We have done it for generations—and for generations we have led the world in medical innovation.

It is time to renew that commitment—our commitment to our children, our commitment to our parents, our commitment to ourselves, by making it a little easier for the biggest drug companies to help develop the next generation of cures and making it a little harder for them to profit from breaking the law and defrauding taxpayers. It is time to pass the Medical Innovation Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 53—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCCAIN submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Armed Services; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 53

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

- (1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
- (2) employ personnel; and
- (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,783,845, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$46,667 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$17,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the

period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$6,486,591, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$80,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$30,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,702,746, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$33,334 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$12,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

- (A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;
- (B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;
- (C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;
- (D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;
- (E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;
- (F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or
- (G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for "Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations" of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

- (1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;
- (2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and
- (3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 54—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLUNT submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 54

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration (in this resolution referred to as the "committee") is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

- (1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
- (2) employ personnel; and
- (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,375,819, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$43,750 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$7,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$2,358,546, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$12,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$982,728, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$31,250 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and
- (2) not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(d) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this section shall not exceed \$982,728, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$31,250 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

- (1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the

contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) **VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.**—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

(b) **AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.**—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 55—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BURR submitted the following resolution; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 55

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under S. Res. 400, agreed to May 19, 1976 (94th Congress), as amended by S. Res. 445, agreed to October 9, 2004 (108th Congress), in accordance with its jurisdiction under sections 3(a) and 17 of such S. Res. 400, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 5 of such S. Res. 400, the Select Committee on Intelligence (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.**—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,217,448, of which amount not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))).

(b) **EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.**—The expenses of the committee for the

period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this section shall not exceed \$5,515,626, of which amount not to exceed \$17,144 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))).

(c) **EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.**—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,298,177, of which amount not to exceed \$7,143 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) **EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) **VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.**—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) **AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.**—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

(2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 56—DESIGNATING JANUARY 2015 AS “NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH”

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 56

Whereas America’s Blood Centers, AABB, and the American Red Cross unite to designate January 2015 as “National Blood Donor Month”;

Whereas donating 1 unit of blood helps to save as many as 3 lives;

Whereas blood donors are an integral part of the health system and national public health preparedness initiatives in the United States;

Whereas blood and blood products are critical national resources and vital public health assets that must be readily available at all times;

Whereas every 2 seconds, a person in the United States needs blood for lifesaving treatment in an emergency or a disaster, a routine surgery, a blood transfusion to help treat a serious disease like cancer, or an organ or bone marrow transplant;

Whereas 1 in 7 patients who enter a hospital in the United States needs blood;

Whereas more than 20,000,000 blood components are used in transfusions every year in the United States;

Whereas more than 39,000 units of blood are needed each day in the United States to maintain a safe and adequate blood supply;

Whereas 9,200,000 donors give blood each year in the United States;

Whereas approximately 38 percent of the United States population is eligible to give blood, but less than 10 percent of the eligible population donates blood on an annual basis;

Whereas blood transfusions require generous and altruistic volunteer donors;

Whereas it is vital that the blood donation policies, including donor deferral policies, in the United States keep pace with medical science to ensure that the United States has a robust, eligible population of donors to maintain a safe and adequate blood supply; and

Whereas America’s Blood Centers, AABB, and the American Red Cross support and perform critical services collecting, processing, and distributing lifesaving blood and blood products to hospitals and health providers, and are instrumental in ensuring the safety of the blood supply and promoting the need for blood donations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates January 2015 as “National Blood Donor Month”;

(2) acknowledges the important role of volunteer blood donors in protecting the health and emergency preparedness security of the United States;

(3) recognizes the need to promote a safe, stable blood supply and to increase volunteer participation of blood donors;

(4) endorses efforts to update blood donation policies in a safe and scientifically sound manner to maintain an adequate blood supply; and

(5) recognizes the roles of America’s Blood Centers, AABB, and the American Red Cross in ensuring the safety of the blood supply in the United States and delivering lifesaving blood and blood products to health providers and patients.

SENATE RESOLUTION 57—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. ENZI submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on the Budget; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 57

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget (in this

resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2015 through February 28, 2017, in its discretion, to—

- (1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;
- (2) employ personnel; and
- (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2015.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,534,372, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$35,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

- (2) not to exceed \$21,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 under this resolution shall not exceed \$6,058,924, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$60,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

- (2) not to exceed \$36,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,524,552, of which amount—

- (1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

- (2) not to exceed \$15,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. REPORTING LEGISLATION.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2017.

SEC. 4. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

- (1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

- (2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

- (A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

- (B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

- (C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

- (D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

- (E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

- (F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

- (G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

- (1) for the period March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015;

- (2) for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; and

- (3) for the period October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 58—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 2015 AS “NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH”

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 58

Whereas in 2002, the Harvard School of Public Health and MENTOR: the National Mentoring Partnership created National Mentoring Month;

Whereas the goals of National Mentoring Month are to raise awareness of mentoring, recruit individuals to serve as mentors, and encourage organizations to engage and integrate quality in mentoring into their efforts;

Whereas a mentor is a caring, consistent presence who devotes time to a young person to help that young person discover personal strength and achieve his or her potential through a structured and trusting relationship;

Whereas quality mentoring encourages positive choices, promotes self-esteem, supports academic achievement and introduces young people to new ideas;

Whereas mentoring programs have been shown to be effective in combating school violence and discipline problems, substance abuse, incarceration and truancy;

Whereas research shows that young people who were at risk for not completing high school but who had a mentor were 55 percent more likely to be enrolled in college, 81 percent more likely to report participating regularly in sports or extracurricular activities, more than twice as likely to say they held a leadership position in a club or sports team, and 78 percent more likely to volunteer regularly in their communities than young people who were at risk for not completing high school and who did not have a mentor;

Whereas youth development experts agree that mentoring is critical to the social, emotional, and cognitive development of youth, helping them navigate the path to adulthood more successfully;

Whereas mentors help young people set career goals and use their personal contacts to help young people meet industry professionals and find jobs;

Whereas mentoring is a proven cost-effective investment: for every dollar invested in mentoring, there is a 3-dollar return to society;

Whereas all of the above-listed benefits serve to link youth to economic opportunity

while also strengthening the fiber of our communities; and

Whereas despite these benefits, 1 in 3 youth will reach age 19 without a mentor, constituting a “mentoring gap” that demonstrates a need for collaboration and resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) recognizes January 2015 as “National Mentoring Month”;

- (2) recognizes the men and women who serve as staff and volunteers at quality mentoring programs and who help our young people find inner strength and reach their full potential;

- (3) acknowledges that mentoring is beneficial because it encourages educational achievement, reduces juvenile delinquency, improves life outcomes, and strengthens communities;

- (4) promotes the creation and expansion of quality mentoring programs across the country to equip young people with the tools needed to lead healthy and productive lives; and

- (5) supports initiatives to close the “mentoring gap”.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 248. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 245 submitted by Mr. BARRASSO to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 248. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 245 submitted by Mr. BARRASSO to the bill S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Nothing in this Act relieves the United States of its responsibility to consult with Indian nations as required under executive order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a subcommittee hearing entitled, "Improving the Performance of our Transportation Networks: Stakeholder Perspectives"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Employer Wellness Programs: Better Health Outcomes and Lower Costs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building to continue a hearing entitled "Attorney General Nomination."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 12 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 29, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 5 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Tony D. Bauernfeind
Colonel Vincent K. Becklund
Colonel Steven J. Bleymaier
Colonel Richard A. Coe
Colonel William T. Cooley
Colonel Barry R. Cornish
Colonel Christopher E. Craige
Colonel Andrew A. Croft
Colonel Allan E. Day
Colonel Trent H. Edward
Colonel Andrew J. Gebara
Colonel Gerald V. Goodfellow
Colonel John R. Gordy, II
Colonel Stacey T. Hawkins
Colonel Cameron G. Holt
Colonel Kevin A. Huyck
Colonel James A. Jacobson
Colonel Darren V. James
Colonel David J. Julazadeh
Colonel Kevin B. Kennedy
Colonel Chad T. Manske
Colonel Michael A. Minihan
Colonel Wayne R. Monteith
Colonel Daniel J. Orcutt
Colonel Lenny J. Richoux
Colonel Carl E. Schaefer
Colonel John E. Shaw
Colonel Brad M. Sullivan
Colonel Billy D. Thompson
Colonel Paul A. Welch
Colonel William P. West

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN73 AIR FORCE nomination of Rodrick A. Koch, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN74 AIR FORCE nomination of James F. Richey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN78 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning MORRIS A. DESIMONE, III, and ending ANDREW R. STRAUSS, which nomi-

nations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN79 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning STEVEN P. HULSE, and ending ANTHONY C. LYONS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN81 MARINE CORPS nomination of Brian L. White, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN83 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning STEVEN R. LUCAS, and ending JAMES N. SHELSTAD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 58, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 58) recognizing January 2015 as "National Mentoring Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY,

JANUARY 30, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. Friday, January 30. I ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that the Senate then be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it

stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ROB LEHMAN AND LUKE ALBEE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a couple of people with Ohio ties who have dedicated much of their careers to public service, Rob Lehman and Luke Albee. Rob Lehman served more than two decades on Capitol Hill and in the executive branch most recently, and that is when I got to know and work with him as chief of staff to my colleague from Ohio, Senator ROB PORTMAN. Rob Lehman served as chief of staff when Senator PORTMAN was the U.S. Trade Representative, so he understands why trade and enforcement of trade rules are such important issues to a State such as Ohio.

He was helpful when Senator PORTMAN and I testified together before the International Trade Commission on behalf of Ohio Steelworkers. Fortunately, in this case the ruling was on the side of Ohio manufacturers. In some cases China and now in other cases Korea have not played fair and have broken trade rules. Rob Lehman provided breadth and insight to Senator PORTMAN on this issue and so many others that are important to Ohio during my colleague's 4 years in the Senate.

I wish to also honor Luke Albee. Luke is a native Ohioan and long time Senate aide. He is a Cleveland native and, like myself, a die-hard Cleveland Indians fan.

Luke Albee had a long tenure in the office of Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont, rising from an entry-level position to become his chief of staff. He served in the same role—which he is about to leave—for my colleague Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia. He began in Senator LEAHY's office answering mail and later guided the office through the September 11 attacks, the anthrax discovery on Capitol Hill, and other memorable events while chief of staff—like a 5-hour dinner with Senator LEAHY and Fidel Castro while on a trip to Cuba in 1999. Like Rob Lehman, Luke Albee likes to bring people together and reach common ground so the Senate can move forward the way it should.

TRIBUTE TO MARK POWDEN

Mr. BROWN. I wish to also say a few words about another career public servant. He is not leaving public service, but he is leaving the chief of staff's position in my office. Mark Powden has been my chief of staff since 2009. He started with Senator Jeffords when Senator Jeffords was a Republican and then became an Independent.

Mark Powden grew up in Vermont, where he worked for his own State congressman and senator. Mark later became the staff director for the Republicans. In fact, he was the staff director for the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee as it went through its transition to a new name. He was with Senator Jeffords when Senator Jeffords switched parties in 2001.

Mark, as I said, has served as my chief of staff for more than 6 years now and will move over and be the staff director for the banking committee. At the same time, he will take with him Graham Steele, who served ably as my legislative assistant, and will also take his assistant Megan Cheney to the banking committee. Graham will be chief counsel, and Megan will be a legislative aide in the Senate banking committee.

My thanks especially to Mark Powden for the terrific work he has done as my chief of staff, and I am thrilled he is going to stay with me to do the very important job of staff director as I become ranking member of the Senate banking committee.

EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT AWARENESS DAY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, tomorrow, Friday, January 30, is Earned Income Tax Credit Awareness Day. It is a day to highlight a vital tool for Americans working—and I emphasize “working”—their way out of poverty.

Too many Americans work hard, play by the rules, take responsibility for their lives, but simply can't get ahead. They are in low-wage jobs—sometimes two low-wage jobs—and don't really have much opportunity where they live or due to their circumstances to get a job that pays closer to a living wage. There are millions of Americans living in this situation. The EITC helps provide for their children, to build economic security to allow them to pursue the American dream.

Signed into law in 1975, expanded by every single President since then, the EITC was created to make sure we have a tax system that provides an incentive to work. That is what it has done.

EITC's expansion in the 1990s led more than half a million single mothers to move from cash welfare assistance to work, making it twice as effective—without the side effects, I might add—as welfare reform. Since its cre-

ation, EITC has lifted more children above the poverty line than any other government program.

I will emphasize that it rewards work, most importantly. In 2012, 28 million American households—almost 1 million from my State of Ohio—benefited from the EITC with an average credit of more than \$2,300.

I met Juanalicia Duran in Cleveland last year. She told me she lives paycheck to paycheck not because she overspends, not because she is irresponsible, but simply because she does not make a lot of money. She said receiving the EITC is the one time of year she pays off her bills. She is barely making it, getting a little bit behind week after week, month after month, then she gets that check of—I don't know how much Juanalicia Duran gets, but on average she gets a check for a little over \$2,000. It helps her to pay her bills and maybe get a little bit ahead.

Rosa Olea of Toledo works as a manager of a fast food restaurant and makes \$9.35 an hour. Imagine that—a manager of a restaurant making \$9.35 an hour. She said her family struggles to pay bills. The EITC has been a lifesaver since she found out about it through her local VITA center.

There are thousands of stories like this, and we hear hundreds and sometimes thousands of them from Ohioans.

In last week's State of the Union Address, President Obama laid out plans to reform the Tax Code by making the current earned-income tax credit and child tax credit permanent by expanding credit for middle-class families to raise children and save for retirement. Some in this town responded—not surprisingly—by saying that reforming the Tax Code starts with cutting taxes for big business. Think about that.

Most of the time, I hear people in this town—people with good titles, paid well, dressed well, getting a good government pension and health care benefits—say that the first thing we need to do with tax reform is lower the corporate tax rate. It is all about trickle-down economics. You cut taxes on big companies, you cut taxes on the wealthy, and maybe it will trickle down and help workers and families.

Well, the experience of the last 25 years doesn't really say that. The one time we tried trickle-down for a decade—from 2000 to 2010—we had no net private sector job gain in this country. Zero. But when we tried focusing on the middle class and growing the economy from the middle out during the Clinton years, we had a 22-million—it may have been almost 23 million—private sector net increase in jobs. And since the auto rescue, when we have focused on the middle class for the last 5 or 6 years by building the economy out, we have had job growth for 56 or 57 months in a row.

If we are going to reform the Tax Code, we need to draw a line in the

sand: No tax breaks for corporations without tax breaks first for working families.

There is one glaring hole with the earned-income tax credit. Under current law, workers without children who are making minimum wage barely receive any EITC. Childless workers under 25 don't qualify at all. That makes young people and workers without children the only group who can be taxed deeper into poverty.

My State of the Union guest was Jason Jacobs, a Cincinnati resident and paraprofessional. He is a college graduate. He went to Ohio University. He has a degree to teach. He has not found a full-time teaching job. He is a paraprofessional in the West Clermont School District who works with special needs students and does the kinds of things people should be rewarded for. Last year he made less than \$16,000. I believe he is paid hourly. He is obviously not paid in the summer. He is not paid on nonschool days. Because he doesn't have children, he will miss out on this critical tax credit.

That is why my legislation, the Working Families Tax Relief Act, will nearly triple the size of the earned-income tax credit for workers without children, expand access to young workers, and will make permanent enhancements to the EITC to 2017.

We know what this will do. We know that children from low-income families where the families are eligible and qualify and earn the EITC—and I say earned the earned-income tax credit. That is why it is called earned—because these are always working families who are playing by the rules, doing the right thing, and taking responsibility. We know that children from families who have earned the EITC have higher test scores, higher high school graduation rates, and higher college attendance rates. Expanding EITC means more people attending college and more people getting GEDs. It means working more hours and higher salaries. Why wouldn't we invest in the earned-income tax credit? It means stronger communities.

If we fail to act to renew the provisions that expire in 2017, 50 million Americans would lose all or part of the EITC and CTC—50 million Americans who are doing the right thing. They are working hard and taking responsibility for their lives. We would just give up on them? We would be glad to do corporate tax breaks, but we would give up on the 50 million working Americans?

Sixteen million of them—including 8 million children, if we don't renew—will be pushed into poverty or deeper into the poverty they are already in. It is the worst kind of class warfare aimed at working families. These workers need help to get out of poverty, not to be taxed into it.

Renewing the expanded EITC will help so many people in this country. It

is not just the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do because it will bring more wealth to our communities. They will spend the money locally. It will help small businesses, and it will make a big difference in a lot of lives.

While we work to renew and expand this program, I encourage Ohioans who may be eligible for the EITC to visit the IRS Web site irs.gov or call 1-800-906-9887 or find a local Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Center, VITA. It is a vital and free resource for working families.

To receive EITC, all you have to do is file your taxes. That is it. You have earned it; just ask for it. Spread the word about EITC. It is a bridge out of poverty and serves millions of American families across Ohio and across the Nation.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:54 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 30, 2015, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MANSON K. BROWN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

WILLIAM P. DOYLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GENTRY O. SMITH, OF NORTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND TO HAVE THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE, VICE ERIC J. BOSWELL, RESIGNED.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

JANET L. YELLEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE BEN S. BERNANKE, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

KIRSTEN E. DELAMBO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

SALVATORE PELLIGRA

To be major

REBECCA A. BIRD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

DELL P. DUNN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

LATRISSE P. SEARSON-NORRIS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

FRED J. BURPO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PAUL A. BRISSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MIKELLE J. ADAMCZYK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT G. HALE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

JOHN M. GILLIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ANDRE M. TAKACS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

INES H. BERGER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RACHEL A. PASSMORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

JUSTIN R. MILLER

JAMES R. SAULLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CANDIDA A. FERGUSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

TODD S. LEVANT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JENNIFER L. BORSTELMANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RICHARD R. BARBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBERT S. THOMPSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL J. CORRADO
JULIA S. HUNT

SCOTT A. MEEHAN
BRANDON W. SHEARER
ADAM T. STRICKLAND
CRAIG C. ULLMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RORY L. ALDRIDGE
RICHARD J. ALLAIN
JEREMY D. ANZEVINO
MICHAEL W. ARMISTEAD
JAMES W. BAUCH
BENJAMIN A. BEARD
RUSSELL W. BECKER
MICHAEL A. BECKHART
PAUL G. BEEMAN
MELLANIE R. BELL-CARTER
DAVID J. BENNETT
JEFFREY P. BENTZ
JASON B. BERG
CHRISTOPHER G. BLALOCK
MICHAEL P. BRENNAN
JEREMY D. BROCKMEIER
CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN
JONATHAN F. BROWN
WILLIAM P. BROWN, JR.
TATE A. BUNTZ
BRENDAN C. BURKS
KIRK J. BUSH
LEROY B. BUTLER
PATRICK B. BYRNE
PABLO J. CABRERA
FRANCISCO A. CACERES
JONATHAN L. CAMARILLO
KEVIN A. CAMPBELL
STEPHEN J. CARL, JR.
BRODIE R. CARMICHAEL
EDWARD H. CARPENTER
SEAN P. CARROLL
DANIEL T. CELOTTO
ADRIAN R. CHAMBERS
MATTHEW C. CHAMBLISS
MELISSA D. CHESTNUT
KEVIN M. CHUNN
ERICK T. CLARK
CRAIG M. CLARKSON II
WILLIAM G. CLESTER
SCOTT A. CLIPPINGER
RIGOBERTO G. COLON
RYAN B. COLVERT
STEPHEN J. CONLEY
CHRISTOPHER F. CRIM
RICHARD J. CUSHING
MATTHEW J. CUTLER
PETER E. DAHL
JEFFREY S. DECKER
JACKSON T. DOAN
AARON M. DOTY
DANIEL J. DROSTE
JAYSON L. DURDEN
JASON D. EGAN
PATRICK F. ELDRIDGE
JOHN A. FALLON
KARIN R. FITZGERALD
IAN C. FLETCHER
JASON S. FREEBY
FRANKLIN H. FREEMAN
CHARLES W. FRETWELL
SHAYNE M. FREY
DANIEL J. GASKELL
JOHN M. GIANNELLA
JOHN C. GIANOPOULOS
BRYANT O. GILCHRIST
KENNETH K. GOEDECKE
PAUL J. GOGUEN
RONNIE L. GOODE II
GREGORY P. GORDON
WILLIAM A. GRANT III
ERIC L. GRIGGS
KEVIN S. GRINDEL
JASON S. GUTTENBERG
JOHN W. HALL
KEVIN J. HALPIN
DOMINIC J. HARRIS
BENJAMIN B. HARRISON
JOHN F. HAVENER III
JOHN K. HENDERSON
RONNEY HERRERA
JEREMIE N. HESTER
CORNELIUS D. HICKEY
NATHAN J. HILL
PAUL J. HILLIARD
RANDALL L. HORNER
TIMOTHY F. HOUGH
DAVID M. HUDOCK

PAUL C. HUDSON
ANDRE M. INGRAM
JOSEPH R. JACKSON
GALEN T. JAMES
JOSEPH M. JENNINGS
ADAM L. JEPPE
REX G. JONES, JR.
JAMES T. KAY
MICHAEL P. KELLEY
GHYNO G. KELLMAN
RORY D. KENT
ADAM M. KING
DAVID W. LABALLE II
JASON C. LANG
BRADLEY M. LEDBETTER
BRYAN D. LIESKE
PATRICK S. LINDSTROM
JOSEPH M. LIZARRAGA
TROY T. LOWE
MATTHEW D. LUNDGREN
SETH W. MACCUTCHEON
ALASDAIR B. MACKAY
MARCUS J. MAINZ
NICOLE A. MANN
NICHOLAS A. MARCIANO
OSCAR MARIN, JR.
JOHN A. MARKSBURY
RICHARD M. MARTIN
NICHOLAS A. MARTZ
PERRY D. MAURER, JR.
TODD D. MCCARTHY
RYAN R. MCCASKILL
DONALD M. MCCOWAN
THOMAS B. MCGEE
BRETT T. MCGINLEY
BRETT W. MCGREGOR
BRIAN D. MCLEAN
WINSTON G. MCMILLAN
RUGSITH D. MEELARP
DOUGLAS R. MILLER
RICHARD C. MITCHELL
WILLIAM J. MITCHELL
EDDIE MOSS, JR.
SEAN P. MULLEN
JENNIFER A. NASH
WILLIAM H. NASH
DAVID M. OBRIEN
ROGELIO S. OREGON
JACK D. PEARCE
TRACY A. PERRY
SOULYNAMMA D. PHARATHIKOUNE
TYLER L. PHIPPS
ERIC J. PIPER
STEPHEN M. PIROTTA
BOLIVAR P. PLUAS
JOHN P. PRICE
BRENT C. PURCELL
ALAN L. RAMSEY
JOSEPH W. RAY
SCOTTIE S. REDDEN
CHRISTOPHER J. REHWALDT
GEORGE F. RENIERS
MARCUS J. REYNOLDS
THOMAS E. RICHARDS III
RODNEY C. RODRIGUEZ
CHRISTOPHER P. ROY
JASON M. RUEDI
DEVIN A. RULLMAN
CHRISTIAN S. RUWE
JEREMIAH SALAME
DANE A. SALM
BRADLEY J. SAMS
GLENN D. SAVAGE
MARK T. SCHNAKENBERG
DANIEL W. SCHNICK
PETER L. SCHNURR
TOD A. SCHROEDER
ALAN L. SCHULLER
STEVEN E. SCHULTZE
AARON J. SCHWARTZ
CASEY D. SHEA
THOMAS N. SIBLEY
THOMAS M. SIVERTS
JOSHUA M. SMITH
NOAH M. SPATARO
MICHAEL A. SPEARS
SCOTT A. STAHL
MATTHEW L. STEELE
JARED K. STONE
BRENDAN P. SULLIVAN
ALLEN E. SZCZEPKE, JR.
KOICHI TAKAGI
TIMOTHY S. TAYLOR
KOHTARO TERAHIRA
JEREMY W. THOMPSON
DUSTIN R. THORN
KEITH P. TIGHE

CHRISTOPHER B. TIMOTHY
KARL TINSON
CHRISTOPHER D. TOLLIVER
JASON C. TORBENSEN
RODNEY L. TOWER
WYETH M. TOWLE
JASON K. TUBBS
BRIAN D. TURNER
JAMES R. VALLARIO
LARRY W. VINES
KRISTIAN A. VONHEIMBURG
JAMIE L. WAGNER
JONATHAN C. WAITE
RYAN B. WARD
KEITH P. WARREN
PERRY D. WATERS
MICHAEL B. WEBER
DAVID E. WESTIN
TAYLOR P. WHITE
DAVID A. WILEMON
BRUCE K. WILLIAMS III
ERIC J. WILLIAMSON
DANIEL R. WINKELER
SETH WOLCOTT
JOSEPH L. YOSKOVICH
MARK D. ZIMMER

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
the Senate January 29, 2015:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL TONY D. BAUERNFEIND
COLONEL VINCENT K. BECKLUND
COLONEL STEVEN J. BLEYMAIER
COLONEL RICHARD A. COE
COLONEL WILLIAM T. COOLEY
COLONEL BARRY R. CORNISH
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER E. CRAIGE
COLONEL ANDREW A. CROFT
COLONEL ALLAN E. DAY
COLONEL TRENT H. EDWARDS
COLONEL ANDREW J. GEBARA
COLONEL GERALD V. GOODFELLOW
COLONEL JOHN R. GORDY II
COLONEL STACEY T. HAWKINS
COLONEL CAMERON G. HOLT
COLONEL KEVIN A. HUYCK
COLONEL JAMES A. JACOBSON
COLONEL DARREN V. JAMES
COLONEL DAVID J. JULAZADEH
COLONEL KEVIN B. KENNEDY
COLONEL CHAD T. MANSKE
COLONEL MICHAEL A. MINIHAN
COLONEL WAYNE R. MONTEITH
COLONEL DANIEL J. ORCUTT
COLONEL LENNY J. RICHOUX
COLONEL CARL E. SCHAEFER
COLONEL JOHN E. SHAW
COLONEL BRAD M. SULLIVAN
COLONEL BILLY D. THOMPSON
COLONEL PAUL A. WELCH
COLONEL WILLIAM P. WEST

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RODRICK A. KOCH, TO BE
LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAMES F. RICHEY, TO BE
LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MORRIS A. DESIMONE III AND ENDING WITH ANDREW R. STRAUSS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN P. HULSE AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY C. LYONS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF BRIAN L. WHITE, TO BE
LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN R. LUCAS AND ENDING WITH JAMES N. SHELSTAD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

SENATE—Friday, January 30, 2015

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Sovereign of our Nation and Lord of our lives, thank You for infusing us with the confidence that You order our steps each day.

Give our lawmakers courage and a strong resolve to glorify Your Name, as they trust the unfolding of Your loving providence. As they remember what You have already done to bless this Nation, inspire them to march confidently toward tomorrow's difficulties with a total dependence on Your power. May they recommit themselves each day to faithfully fulfilling the awesome responsibility You have entrusted to them. Lord, be their strength and shield this day and always.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I sent a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Johnny Isakson, Marco Rubio, Roy Blunt, Pat Roberts, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Rand Paul.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the mandatory quorum be waived and that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture occur at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 3. I further ask that if the motion to invoke cloture is agreed to, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to a vote on the motion to proceed to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate's passage of the Keystone jobs bill is great news for the American people. The Senate will soon turn its attention to a few different matters.

First, we will be voting on a bipartisan measure that has been championed by the Chairs of the Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services Committees.

We lose thousands of our heroes every year to suicide. It is a tragic situation. Senators MCCAIN and ISAKSON are leading efforts to do something about it. Their legislation would provide more of the mental health and suicide prevention support our Veterans deserve. The measure already passed unanimously through the House of

Representatives. Now we hope for a bipartisan outcome on the Senate floor.

The same should also be said of a second piece of legislation we will consider. It is a debate that will challenge our colleagues on the other side with a simple proposition. Do they think Presidents of either party should have the power to simply ignore laws they don't like? Will our Democratic colleagues work with us to defend key democratic ideals such as the separation of powers and the rule of law or will they stand tall with the idea that partisan exercises of raw power are good things?

The House-passed bill we will consider would do two things. It would fund the Department of Homeland Security and rein in Executive overreach. That is it. It is simple, and there is no reason for Democrats to block it.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we are told that next week we can expect the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, which fully funds the Department of Homeland Security and includes the law enforcement priorities that were agreed to on a bipartisan basis in the House—and I think will be approved on a bipartisan basis in the Senate, hammered out in the Senate Appropriations Committee—will be coming to the Senate.

The House of Representatives has therefore voted to fund Homeland Security in essentially the way the President has asked for and the Democrats and Republicans agreed on. It is not a perfect bill for everybody, but we have to do those things. We have to agree and fund all the departments and agencies of our government.

Yet we now have a statement that our Democratic colleagues are going to block the bill. They apparently intend to say Republicans blocked the bill and that somehow Republicans didn't fund Homeland Security. That is the message they are going to try to promote.

They are going to say they want a clean bill. What does a clean bill mean? Is it a bill that funds the Immigration and Nationality Act as was passed by Congress, some 500 pages? It funds the officers and enforcement officials who carry out those duties every day. Does it fund those? Yes, it funds those.

What is it that people are complaining about then? What is this clean bill they want to see?

I would suggest it is not a clean bill they want. In reality, they want legislation that will fund action by President Obama that violates the Immigration and Nationality Act, actions that he has taken through Executive amnesty. That is the problem we are dealing with.

Apparently they believe the President of the United States, who doesn't agree with the way immigration law is written, the way it has been carried out for 30, 40 years—he is not happy with that. He asked the Congress to change it.

Congress said: No.

He said: I am going to do it anyway. Right across the river from Washington—I am going to lease a building that houses 1,000 new workers—new workers—and those workers are going to process and give out legal status, work permits, Social Security participation, Medicare participation to 5 million people. People who, according to the Immigration and Nationality Act, are unlawfully in the country and are not able to work. Businesses cannot hire somebody who is in the country unlawfully.

Is there any country in the world that says it is appropriate for a business to hire somebody who entered that country unlawfully? What kind of logic can support such reasoning?

So the President is not an imperial master. He asked Congress and Congress said no, but he wants to go ahead and do it.

Our Democratic colleagues are now telling us they are not going to support funding of Homeland Security because Congress—the House of Representatives bill and the bill I think will have a majority in the Senate—will not fund this building, the 1,000 people, and all the other activities that will be needed to execute this unlawful, unconstitutional Executive amnesty.

It is through the looking glass. I mean, what world are we in?

I was a Federal prosecutor for almost 15 years. They enforce the law, they don't enforce what some President said he would like to see done that is not lawful. Colleagues, this is so serious that the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials, their association filed a lawsuit, and they challenged the actions of their supervisors telling them not to enforce plain immigration law. They went to Federal court.

Has anybody ever heard of that before? This is the equivalent of the FBI for the immigration service. These are first-rate officers. Many of them have been there 20 or 30 years.

They say: You are asking us to not enforce the law.

They have challenged it in court. I have never heard of anything such as that before. The people in charge of en-

forcing the law having to go to court to keep from being told not to enforce the law? It is amazing.

This bill will not deny a penny of funding. It will not deny any funding for any program, activity or action that is authorized by law. It does not deny funding for any of those programs that are actually authorized by the laws of the United States. In fact, it says: Spend the money, Mr. President, on enforcing and following the law. You cannot spend money unconstitutionally to advocate and create a system of law Congress rejected—an unlawful activity.

The Congress of the United States is not helpless when it confronts the President. Colleagues, we have to get out from under our desks. Are we afraid to say to the President of the United States we don't agree with this, and we are not going to fund this?

Is that the world we are in? Are we hiding under our desks, that the President may go on television and attack us because we will not agree with his ideas? Surely not, surely not.

The Congress has the power to appropriate money. It goes back to the historic development—before America became a nation—that the Parliament took over the power of money from the King. Parliament passed the laws, not the King.

We adopted that and we created a constitutional order, instead of a King, to decide how we operate. The Parliament, and the Congress of the United States, was empowered to handle the money.

What obligation, colleagues, does this Congress of the United States have to give the President of the United States money to undermine the laws of the United States? What power does he have to compel us to do so? Zero.

We should do the right thing. And the right thing is to say: Mr. President, we are willing to consider a form of immigration law, but we didn't approve of this bill. We didn't support your bill last time and we are not going to pass your bill this time. We are going to continue to work to improve immigration law and make it better and serve the national interest of the United States—not special interests, not activist groups and not big businesses, but the average working American's interest. That is who we are going to serve in this process.

So why are we afraid to push back on that? It is amazing to me. So I don't think we will. In fact, it is sort of remarkable that this is a bipartisan position that the President has overreached. I am not going to quote the names of Senators. I will be a little bit courteous at this point and just quote some of the statements from all separate Democratic Senators in the last few months when asked about this Executive amnesty by the President. A lot of Senators have never been asked.

They are probably thankful they weren't asked.

This is what one Senator said:

... but the President shouldn't make such a significant policy change on his own.

Another Democratic Senator:

... but executive orders aren't the way to do it.

Another Senator:

I disagree with the President's decision to use executive action to make changes to our immigration system.

Another Democratic Senator:

I'm disappointed the President decided to use executive action at this time on this issue, as it could poison any hope of compromise or bipartisanship in the new Senate before it has even started. It's Congress' job to pass legislation and deal with issues of this magnitude.

Absolutely correct. It is Congress's duty to do this.

What about another Democratic Senator:

I worry that his taking unilateral action could in fact inflame public opinion, change the subject from immigration to the President. I also have constitutional concerns about where prosecutorial discretion ends and unconstitutional authority begins.

A wise quote, I think.

Another Senator:

I have concerns about executive action . . . This is a job for Congress, and it's time for the House to act.

Another Democratic Senator:

... the best way to get a comprehensive solution is to take this through the legislative process.

So I would say, colleagues, why would any Senator, Democrat or Republican—when the very integrity of the constitutional powers given to Congress are eroded in a dramatic way by the President of the United States—not want to assert congressional authority? It is important for our constitutional structure, in my view.

Well, there we are. We had hearings in the Senate on these issues and on the new nominee for Attorney General. The new nominee said she supports and will actively work for the policy the President established. The Attorney General is the chief law enforcement officer in the land. They take an oath to see that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed.

I believe strongly in this. I don't think it is a close question. It is not a close question, colleagues. The President's actions are unlawful. The President's executive actions impose a policy that is detrimental to our ability to ever establish a lawful system of immigration in America. They are against the wishes of the Congress, which rejected this proposal, and they are overwhelmingly in opposition to the views of the American people, as poll after poll has demonstrated.

Do the American people have no role in their government? They can't expect their Members of the Senate to vote for legislation that follows the law instead

of breaking the law? Aren't they frustrated already that Congress is not following the law, and they are frustrated with the President's failure to follow the law? I think they are.

Of course I would like to note that President Obama himself said 20 times he did not have the power to do this. He said, in May of 2008:

Congress's job is to pass legislation. The president can veto it or he can sign it . . . I believe in the Constitution and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We're not going to use signing statements . . .

Another time he said:

Ultimately, our nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship. And no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million people who broke these laws should be held accountable.

October of 2010:

I can't simply ignore laws that are out there.

On October 25 of 2010, he said:

I am president, I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen.

Well, even King George couldn't act contrary to the laws passed by Parliament. That statement goes on:

. . . I just want to repeat, I'm president, I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources . . . but there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I'm obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself.

Well, how true is that? That is absolutely correct. It goes on. There are 20 of these. I could continue, but we will be talking about this as the weeks go on.

Now, what do scholars say? Do the scholars say that this action is lawful and that Congress should fund it and we have an obligation to fund it or the President has the right to demand it? Jonathan Turley, who is a Shapiro Professor of Law at George Washington University, a nationally recognized constitutional scholar, testified before Congress many times, most often as a Democratic witness, has said he supports President Obama and voted for him. But he said this:

I believe the president has exceeded his brief. The president is required to faithfully execute the laws. He's not required to enforce all laws equally or commit the same resources to them. But I believe the president has crossed the constitutional line . . .

He said that again yesterday at the judiciary hearing on the Attorney General. He continues:

This goes to the very heart of what is the Madisonian system. If a president can unilaterally change the meaning of laws in substantial ways or refuse to enforce them, it takes offline that very thing that stabilizes our system. I believe the members will

loathe the day that they allow that to happen. This will not be the last president. There will be more presidents who will claim the same authority.

Well, I think that is pretty significant. Professor Turley is a supporter of President Obama personally, and someone who has been a frequent Democratic witness for Congress.

Professor Nicholas Rosenkranz of Georgetown University Law Center, in his testimony yesterday before the Senate Judiciary Committee, said—and how simple and true is this. It is pretty insightful, frankly:

Rather than declining to comply with a duly enacted statute—

The INA.

the President has decided to comply meticulously—with a bill that never became law.

What a statement that is. And it is absolutely true. He went on to say:

Congress has repeatedly considered a statute called the DREAM Act, which would exempt a broad category of aliens from the Immigration and Nationality Act. The President favored this DREAM Act, but Congress repeatedly declined to pass it.

It is not in the code. It didn't pass. He goes on to say:

Once again, the President does have broad prosecutorial discretion and broad discretion to husband executive resources. But in this case, it is quite clear that the President is not merely trying to conserve resources. . . . To put the point another way, the President shall "take Care that the Laws"—capital L—"be faithfully executed"—not those bills which fail to become law. Here, in effect, the President is faithfully executing the DREAM Act, which is not law at all, rather than the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is supreme law of the land. The President cannot enact the DREAM Act unilaterally, and he cannot evade article 1, section 7, by pretending that it passed when it did not.

How much clearer can you lay it out? This professor is simply telling the truth. There is no other way to look at this, in my opinion. Congress is being challenged at its very core by this action, and the result of this challenge will have constitutional ramifications and it will have ramifications as we consider the relative powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in the years to come.

This is not a little matter, colleagues. It really is an affront to constitutional order. We have a duty no matter what we feel about this amnesty that goes well beyond DREAM Act amnesty. We have a constitutional duty to defend the integrity of the Congress against an encroachment of monumental proportions by the President. That is the fundamental issue we will be dealing with when people complain about the funding bill for DHS.

David Rivkin, who served two Presidents in the Office of White House Counsel, and Elizabeth Price Foley, a constitutional law professor, wrote an article recently in the Wall Street Journal. It just hammers and devastates the arguments the President is

making in favor of his executive amnesty. They say this:

By announcing a global policy of non-enforcement against certain categories, Mr. Obama condones unlawful behavior, weakening the law's deterrent impact, and allows lawbreakers to remain without fear of deportation . . . These individuals are no longer deportable although Congress has declared them so.

They conclude with a statement we need to consider. I believe their concluding statement is accurate. I think it is pretty much indisputable. And if it is accurate, then Congress has a duty to stand firm.

This is what they conclude:

The President, after months, finally extracted from the Office of Legal Counsel of the U.S. Department of Justice a memorandum that allows basically what he is trying to do. It has been heavily criticized. Legal scholars say it is a poor analysis in a whole lot of ways. In fact, it is unacceptable.

This is what the authors of this recent opinion piece in the Wall Street Journal said:

The OLC's memo endorses a view of presidential power that has never been advanced by even the boldest presidential advocates. If this view holds, future presidents can unilaterally gut tax, environmental, labor or securities laws by enforcing only those portions with which they agree. This is a dangerous precedent that cannot be allowed to stand.

So this is what is at stake. And now we learn that the Democrats intend to oppose even going forward to consider the House bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security—and they intend to block that through the filibuster.

This is what Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI is reported by Congressional Quarterly as saying last night:

Senator Mikulski tells CQ that Democrats will block the Senate from proceeding to debate the DHS spending bill over immigration riders.

Have they made that decision? Surely not. Surely we should move to the bill. If they are unhappy with the language the House put in this, then offer an amendment to take it out. They will have the right to have full amendments, consistent with the rules of the Senate, on this legislation. They can offer amendments to strike the language in the House that simply says we are not going to fund unlawful Executive amnesty. It is a pretty stunning thing that we are dealing with and that we will be confronting next week. I believe it is a position that is untenable. It is untenable constitutionally, it is untenable lawfully, and it is untenable because it is contrary to the will of Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate who oppose the President's action. It is untenable politically because overwhelmingly the American people reject it.

I am flabbergasted that we are now hearing that Democrats might not even allow the bill to come up on the floor. What does that mean?

I suppose they will say: Mr. Republican Congress, are you shutting down Homeland Security?

Why? I would ask.

Well, because you are putting in language that says the President shouldn't go off and create and endorse and support and fund changing of the law of the United States that Congress hasn't changed, and we insist that you fund his activities and give him the money he needs to carry out this project.

Then Congress says: No. We don't want to do that.

We oppose it and we won't pass the bill that funds Homeland Security.

That is a bad thing to do. The American people won't like it that you don't fund Homeland Security, the Republicans may say.

And do you know what our Democratic colleagues will say?

No. You shut Homeland Security down because you kept the President from doing his activity. We are going to accuse you of not funding Homeland Security, and we are going to say you placed the Nation at risk. The President is going to accuse you of defunding Homeland Security, and he is going to accuse you of putting the country at risk. And the media? Why, they are on our side, and they are going to report it that way. When you turn on your television at night, they are going to say to the American people that Republicans didn't fund Homeland Security, and you are going to lose.

Look, we are not through the looking glass yet. Give me a break. That is not going to sell. The American people are not going to buy that and the press is not going to shill for this kind of story. It is going to be clear who is not funding Homeland Security. It is going to be clear who wants to create a lawful system of immigration and to fund it in an effective way and serve the national interests in this fashion.

I feel strongly about it. Hopefully this won't happen. Hopefully the report last night is not going to be the position of the Democratic Party.

I just read of seven or eight of them who said they don't approve of the President's action. Why would they vote not to even go to a bill? And remember, if the bill comes up and our colleagues don't like this language in it, they can move to alter it or strike it. Let's vote on it.

Sometimes you win in this body; sometimes you lose. We lost many times—many on the Republican side—in supporting the Keystone Pipeline. Now we are told the President may veto the bill that has well over 60 votes and many Democrats voting for it. Well, is Congress going to say "We are going to ignore that" and ask the law enforcement officers or the other officers to ignore the President's veto and pretend the law passed when it didn't

pass? Of course not. And neither can the President. We are coequal branches, and the President does not have the authority and the right and the power to enforce a law that never passed to grant amnesty to people who are unlawfully here.

It goes beyond prosecutorial discretion. As I said, I was a prosecutor for a long time. It is not prosecutorial discretion to give someone who is unlawfully in the country a work permit, a photo ID—as they intend to do—a Social Security number, the right to participate in Social Security, the right to work, to take any job in America. What job are they going to take? Who is offering any jobs of any numbers today in America? Not many. So these individuals who are here unlawfully will now be able to go to the trucking company and take a pretty good trucking job or maybe a forklift operator job or maybe they want to work for the county commission.

I asked the Attorney General nominee 2 days ago at a hearing would the Department of Justice sue a business that said: Well, we have job openings, but we are going to hire those people who have green cards or who came here lawfully and have a lawful status, but we are not going to hire somebody with temporary Presidential amnesty? Are you going to sue them for some sort of violation of rights?

She said she didn't know. They might. She basically said they might sue them. So this is a real danger.

The truth is, colleagues, we don't have enough jobs in America today. We have the lowest percentage of Americans actually working, in the working ages, that we have had since the 1970s. It has dropped steadily year after year. There is no doubt that if you bring more people into our country than we have jobs for, it does make it harder.

Also, an excess of labor pulls down wages, and things aren't really getting better. Median family wages since 2007 are down \$4,000. That is a stunning amount. Wages in December—last month—in America dropped 5 cents an hour.

This idea that the economy is on track, everything is wonderful—it is not so wonderful for average working Americans. Their wages went down, not up, as we have been told is happening. This is not going to help. It is going to make that situation worse.

Fundamentally, we need a lawful system of immigration that we can be proud of, and somebody needs to be concerned first and foremost about the people we represent. We should be concerned about the people who have immigrated here lawfully. Their wages are down also, in some cases even more so. In fact, they are often competing most directly against unlawful immigrants.

I would say this: This is not the right way to do it. We are going to continue

to talk about this. I believe the Congress of the United States, once it is really understood what is happening, will listen to the constituents of America. They will decide first and foremost that our duty is to create a lawful system of immigration that is fairly endorsed, that we can be proud of, and that serves the interest of the American people—the national interest. That is what is being overlooked.

People are coming from abroad. They want to come to America. We have always had the most generous immigration system in the world, and we believe in immigration. But they should come lawfully and the Congress should help create a system that supports a lawful entry into America.

The council that represents the Customs and Immigration Service Officers just January 22nd of this year issued a strong statement. They said:

The dedicated immigration service officers and adjudicators at USCIS are in desperate need of help. The President's executive amnesty order for 5 million illegal immigrants places the mission of USCIS in grave peril.

Has anybody been listening to them or do they just listen to big business? Do they just listen to activist groups? Do they just listen to lobbyists, politicians with their political schemes to win elections? Is that what they are listening to? They are not listening to the officers who are carrying out the duties.

Last fall the same group who represents these government workers—Ken Palinkas, a very able leader, said this:

Making matters more dangerous, the Obama administration's executive amnesty, like S. 744 that he unsuccessfully lobbied for, would legalize visa overstays and cause millions additionally to overstay—raising the threat level to America even higher.

It goes on with many other points.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to speak. I am very worried that our Democratic colleagues are making a mistake. I think it is the right thing in this new Senate with Majority Leader MCCONNELL who has allowed more votes in 1 day than the Republicans got from Senator REID the entire year last year. We probably doubled the number of votes this year than we had all of last year.

The Democrats are saying, we are not even going to go to this bill that would fund Homeland Security. And if we don't go to it, then Homeland Security is not funded. Are they going to block a bill that would fund Homeland Security?

Senator MCCONNELL is saying you can have your relevant amendment. If you don't like the language the House put in that says the money can only go to fund lawful activities, then you can vote to take it out and offer an amendment to take it out; but if you don't have the votes, you lose. That is the way the system should work.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.
I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

EMPLOYER WELLNESS PROGRAMS: BETTER HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER COSTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing yesterday be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYER WELLNESS PROGRAMS: BETTER HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER COSTS

This morning we are holding a hearing entitled "Employer Wellness Programs: Better Health Outcomes and Lower Costs."

Ranking Member Murray and I will each have an opening statement, then we will introduce our panel of witnesses. I ask that each of our witnesses limit their testimony to no more than five minutes. We will conclude the hearing at noon.

About half of Americans, or 149 million, have health insurance through an employer. One thing we agree upon is that it's a good thing for employers to encourage employees to be healthier. There are a few ways that employers can do this. Offering employees free gym memberships, access to weight loss coaches, and on-site nurses, to name a few. Today, we're going to hear from employers who offer lower cost insurance if their employees lead a healthy lifestyle.

Obamacare was not a bipartisan law, but it did include a bipartisan provision to strengthen workplace wellness programs. Former Senator Harkin and I worked together on this during the HELP Committee markup of Obamacare. Before Obamacare, employers relied upon a 2006 regulation which empowered them to discount employee premiums up to 20 percent.

Today, employers have certainty of law that they can give their employees up to 30 percent off of their premiums if they make healthy lifestyle choices like maintaining a healthy weight or keeping their cholesterol levels in check. The law also gave the Secretaries of Labor and Health the authority to extend this discount to 50 percent off through regulations. And the Secretaries did just that for tobacco cessation, so companies can also give employees who are smoke-free a 50 percent discount off their premiums.

But these discount programs aren't a blank check. By law, employers have to meet several conditions. First, they cannot discriminate. Employers must make these programs available to everyone and must provide a reasonable alternative if an employee cannot complete the standard requirement. Second, they have to be designed to promote health. So, your boss can't offer a reward for

a better job performance, but she can do so if you stop smoking. Third, everyone should have a chance to qualify at least once a year.

To get started, employees might simply fill out a questionnaire about themselves and their family's medical history, or undergo a basic health screening to take their weight, temperature, blood pressure, as well as a finger prick test for cholesterol or diabetes. This information provides employees a baseline from which to work with a medical professional to improve.

Today, we will seek to answer several questions. First, how well are these programs working? A 2014 study conducted for Interactive Health found 85% of 15,550 people surveyed either improved or maintained their level of health risk and companies' health care costs rose 6% more slowly. A September 2014 survey by the benefits consulting firm of Towers Watson & Co. found that 18% of employers already use outcomes-based wellness incentives and 48% plan to add one by 2017.

Next, we want to explore if any of these programs need to be changed. There are a number of laws and regulations on the books governing workplace wellness, but do employers have all the tools they need?

And we want to hear how a disturbing turn of events may affect these programs. Specifically, the action the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) is taking against companies like Honeywell for encouraging employees to lead a healthier lifestyle. I'm concerned the government is encouraging workplace wellness on one hand, and discouraging it on the other.

There is a great deal of evidence that tells us these programs can make employees healthier and happier at work, and for the investment employers make, they can see lower health care costs.

Honeywell has a wellness program that is reportedly compliant with Obamacare, provides for reasonable alternative accommodations, and protects patient privacy. And, it's working to improve employee health. 61 percent of Honeywell employees identified with more than one health risk factor eliminated at least one of those risk factors; and 46 percent eliminated all of their risk factors.

What's wrong with that? Well, the EEOC seemingly believes employers should not reward employees who make healthy lifestyle choices with lower premiums. And in October last year, the general counsel sued to stop Honeywell from doing just that.

Even the White House has expressed concern regarding the EEOC's actions. In December, when asked about the president's thoughts on the EEOC wellness lawsuits, White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said the administration is concerned EEOC's actions are, or could be, "inconsistent with what we know about wellness programs and the fact that we know that wellness programs are good for both employers and employees."

Congress was clear in the health care law. The administration was clear in the regulations. And the White House has again reiterated its support for these programs. But apparently that is not clear enough for the EEOC. The EEOC is sending a confusing message to employers—reliance on Obamacare's authorization of wellness programs does not mean you won't be sued.

So, I'm working on legislation to provide employers and employees even more clarity and certainty to continue to offer these voluntary wellness programs and encourage healthy lifestyle choices. Innovation and healthy choices should be applauded, not punished.

Workplace wellness programs give individuals some control over rising health care costs. Instead of watching powerlessly as more money comes out of their paychecks each month to cover rising health insurance premiums—wellness programs give individuals the ability to regain some control over those costs.

I admit that this represents a big shift in how we think about the workplace in relation to our health. There has been a sea change in how we talk about health at work. I remember well the smoke in the hallways of the Nixon White House. That was true in most workplaces then. These days, about the only workplace you can smoke is the Speaker's office.

REMEMBERING CHIP KENNETT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to Bayard Winslow "Chip" Kennett II, a native of Conway, NH, who passed away on January 17 at the age of 34.

Growing up in the Mount Washington Valley, Chip was a fantastic student-athlete and natural leader. At A. Crosby Kennett High School, one of two schools in Conway which bears his family name, Chip quarterbacked the Kennett High School football team and was honored with the Jack Burns Memorial Award for leadership, dedication and loyalty to his teammates on the Kennett High baseball team. His parents, Bayard and Theresa, instilled in Chip a love for the region and its people, and Chip spent his summers volunteering and working at Conway's community recreation center.

Chip would later go on to a career in public service that spanned close to a decade, rising from a college internship with then-New Hampshire Representative John Sununu to a position in Senator Judd Gregg's office, after which he returned to work for John Sununu upon his election to the Senate. Before leaving Capitol Hill to join Raytheon's government affairs practice, Chip most recently worked for Maine Senator SUSAN COLLINS as her military legislative assistant and director of appropriations. During his time in Washington, Chip was active in the New Hampshire State Society, helping to raise funds for New Hampshire students hoping to intern in the Nation's capital as he had during college. All those who knew him in the Senate recall his upbeat and caring nature, both qualities that buoyed him and his family through the difficulties of the past 2 years.

In October 2012, Chip's wife Sheila was 35 weeks pregnant when he was diagnosed with stage IV advanced lung cancer. As he learned more about his diagnosis, Chip, who was not a smoker, was struck by the lack of progress in improving the survival rate for this deadly cancer which, contrary to popular perception, annually affects more non-smokers than smokers. During his own treatment, Chip became an advocate for lung cancer and worked exceptionally hard to increase awareness of

the disease and to end the negative stigma of a lung cancer diagnosis. He gave his time and legislative expertise to LUNgevity, a lung cancer-focused nonprofit, to help fight for much-needed lung cancer research, education and support. His efforts culminated in an invitation to testify on Capitol Hill regarding the need to expedite trials for breakthrough drugs to treat life-threatening diseases like lung cancer. Throughout his own battle with the disease, Chip held out hope that one day we could all celebrate a cure for cancer.

Chip truly embodied the spirit of public service, especially in his remaining days when he served as a voice for others. I know I speak for all in the Senate when I say thank you, Chip, for providing an example of what it means to be a great father, son, husband, friend, and American.

Chip is survived by his 5-year-old son Bayard "Joe" Kennett II, his 2-year-old daughter Crosby Reynolds and his wife Sheila whom he met while they were both serving as staff members in the Senate; his mother and father, Bayard and Theresa Kennett of Conway, NH, as well as his brother and sister-in-law Tanner and Sarah Kennett of North Conway, NH.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring the life and service of Chip Kennett.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I wish to recognize the extraordinary life of my friend Chip Kennett, who passed away on January 17 after a courageous 2-year battle against cancer.

Bayard Winslow "Chip" Kennett II was born and raised in Conway, and he was a proud New Hampshire native son. The Kennetts are pillars of the Conway community whose roots in the Mount Washington Valley go back generations, and I have been fortunate to know Chip's family and to witness their countless contributions to business and civic life in New Hampshire.

Chip carried on his family's tradition of public service when he first came to Capitol Hill to serve his home State of New Hampshire. He served as a congressional staffer for nearly 8 years—first as a legislative correspondent to my predecessor Senator Judd Gregg and later as a policy aide for former Senator John E. Sununu. More recently, he was a senior aide to my colleague from Maine, Senator SUSAN COLLINS. When I first came to the Senate in 2011 and did not yet have a full legislative staff in place, Chip generously offered his counsel on national security and defense issues, for which I was very grateful.

While working for Senator Gregg, Chip met the love of his life, Sheila, who would become his wife.

In October 2012, Chip—seemingly healthy and active at the age of 31—was diagnosed with Stage IV non-

smoker's lung cancer. There was no cure. In the face of an unimaginable prognosis, Chip understood better than most that life is a gift, and he inspired us all with his determination to live his life to the fullest—making the most of the time he had with his wife Sheila and their two young children, Joe and Crosby. Together, they found joy and meaning in simply being together during everyday, ordinary moments—resolving to be "present and grateful." From family dinners to rooting for his favorite football team on "Patriots Football Sunday", Chip savored the blessings of family and friendship.

True to his compassionate nature, he turned his diagnosis into a cause for good—becoming a counselor to others battling cancer, raising public awareness of the disease and the need to reduce the stigma associated with lung cancer. The blog that Chip and Sheila started provided a "Playbook for Living" that served as a source of inspiration and encouragement to others who were fighting similar battles with cancer. Chip also put his Capitol Hill experience to work as an advocate for lung cancer research, and his efforts are credited with helping spur changes in Medicare coverage for lung cancer treatments—a legacy that will continue to touch many lives.

Chip summed up his approach to living with cancer at a hearing last May before the Senate Special Committee on Aging, where he testified that "thanks to medical breakthroughs, I have been able to experience many quality filled days. We have enjoyed spending holidays with friends and family. I have been able to continue working full time. As a family, we have sat down at the dinner table together, have attended innumerable swim lessons, soccer and tee ball practices for my son on Saturday mornings, and have sat in a church pew together on Sunday mornings. In other words, we have stayed busy—busy LIVING with cancer."

Chip's strong network of family and close friends was extremely important to him. He was always happiest being around the people he loved. After his diagnosis, his family, friends, coworkers, and former Hill colleagues—affectionately known as Team Kennett—mobilized to not only support Chip and his family but also to support their efforts to aid others fighting cancer.

The courage and strength with which Chip and his family faced his illness is an inspiration to us all. Perhaps Chip's greatest legacy is the valuable lesson he taught us all about how to live fully in each moment.

Chip was a wonderful, smart, and fun-loving man, and he had a big heart. It was a joy to know him and to call him a friend, and his loss is simply heartbreaking.

My heart and thoughts are with all of Team Kennett, including Sheila, Joe,

and Crosby; as well as Chip's parents Bayard and Theresa Kennett of Conway; and his brother and sister-in-law Tanner and Sarah Kennett of North Conway.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING BILLY'S BOUDIN & CRACKLIN

• Mr. VITTER. Madam President, many of our Nation's small businesses are well-regarded for their ability to truly showcase the local culture, food, and heritage. Small businesses have a unique perspective and opportunity to take advantage of local recipes, ingredients, and flavor profiles that allow them to provide regional favorites for residents and tourists. Without a doubt, one of the most remarkable aspects of Louisiana is our delicious, extraordinary cuisine. This week, I would like to recognize this truly special piece of Louisiana culture by honoring Billy's Boudin & Cracklin of Krotz Springs, LA, as the Small Business of the Week.

South Louisiana has created its own genre of Louisiana cooking. With traditions and recipes handed down through the generations, the charm and flavor of Acadiana is undeniable. Billy's Boudin & Cracklin was originally founded in 1995 as a convenience store. It was not long, however, before Billy Frey and his father-in-law decided they needed to incorporate something in their store to set them apart from the competition. The brilliant addition of a family boudin recipe bolstered the success of their store to what we know today. Two short years later, Billy expanded their thriving business to the nearby city of Opelousas and purchased a popular local grocery store, Ray's, to establish Billy and Ray's Boudin. Maintaining the local charm, the Frey's purchased Ray's secret boudin recipe and added it right onto the new store's menu.

Recently, the business expanded once again to the "Boudin Capitol of the World" in Scott, LA. What started out as a small convenient store has turned into a regional favorite, with over 3,000 pounds of boudin made daily between the three stores. In addition to the original boudin links, Billy's offers boudin in the form of balls, pistollettes, rollups, and sandwiches. They also have shipping options so nonlocals can enjoy authentic Cajun boudin and cracklins from across the country. The Boudin Balls have become a signature of the business, with around 1.7 million of the regular and pepperjack-filled balls sold yearly. The famous boudin recipe is so coveted that only a select few people are in the know. In fact, this is taken so seriously that each member of the staff must sign confidentiality agreements before learning the family secret.

After 20 years of thriving business in the area, it is no surprise that the Lafayette Daily Advertiser awarded Billy's Boudin & Cracklin as one of the "Best Boudin" places in their annual "Best of Acadiana" contest last year. It is great to see small businesses like this share our State's rich traditions with both Louisianians and nonlocals. Congratulations again to Billy's Boudin & Cracklin for being honored as this week's Small Business of the Week. I look forward to trying their delicious boudin soon.●

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to loans made from a qualified employer plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 325. A bill to use amounts provided for the Fund for the Improvement of Education to establish a pilot program that supports year-round public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 326. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide cancellation ceilings for stewardship end result contracting projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. Res. 59. A resolution raising awareness and encouraging prevention of stalking by designating January 2015 as "National Stalking Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KATIE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 60. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of observing the National Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Month from January 1 through February 1, 2015, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, modern slavery; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 286, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 297

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 297, a bill to revive and expand the Intermediate Care Technician Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 59—RAISING AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGING PREVENTION OF STALKING BY DESIGNATING JANUARY 2015 AS "NATIONAL STALKING AWARENESS MONTH"

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 59

Whereas 1 in 6, or 19,200,000, women in the United States have at some point during their lifetime experienced stalking victimization, during which they felt very fearful or believed that they or someone close to them would be harmed or killed;

Whereas, during a 1-year period, an estimated 3,400,000 persons in the United States reported that they had been victims of stalking, and 75 percent of those victims reported that they had been stalked by someone they knew;

Whereas 11 percent of victims reported having been stalked for more than 5 years, and 23 percent of victims reported having been stalked almost every day;

Whereas 1 in 4 victims reported that stalkers had used email, instant messaging, blogs, bulletin boards, Internet sites, chat rooms, or other forms of electronic monitoring against them, and 1 in 13 victims reported that stalkers had used electronic devices to monitor them;

Whereas stalking victims are forced to take drastic measures to protect themselves, including changing identity, relocating, changing jobs, and obtaining protection orders;

Whereas 1 in 7 victims reported having relocated in an effort to escape a stalker;

Whereas approximately 1 in 8 employed victims of stalking missed work because they feared for their safety or were taking steps to protect themselves, such as by seeking a restraining order;

Whereas less than 50 percent of victims reported stalking to police, and only 7 percent of victims contacted a victim service provider, shelter, or hotline;

Whereas stalking is a crime under Federal law and under the laws of all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories of the United States;

Whereas stalking affects victims of every race, age, culture, gender, sexual orientation, physical and mental ability, and economic status;

Whereas national organizations, local victim service organizations, campuses, prosecutor's offices, and police departments stand ready to assist stalking victims and are working diligently to develop effective and innovative responses to stalking;

Whereas there is a need to improve the response of the criminal justice system to stalking through more aggressive investigation and prosecution;

Whereas there is a need for increased availability of victim services across the United States, and such services must include programs tailored to meet the needs of stalking victims;

Whereas persons aged 18 to 24 experience the highest rates of stalking victimization, and rates of stalking among college students exceed the prevalence rates found in the general population;

Whereas as many as 75 percent of women in college who experience stalking-related behavior experience other forms of victimization, including sexual or physical victimization, or both;

Whereas there is a need for effective responses to stalking on campuses; and

Whereas the Senate finds that "National Stalking Awareness Month" provides an opportunity to educate the people of the United States about stalking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates January 2015 as "National Stalking Awareness Month";

(2) applauds the efforts of the many stalking victim service providers, police, prosecutors, national and community organizations, campuses, and private sector supporters to promote awareness of stalking;

(3) encourages policymakers, criminal justice officials, victim service and human service agencies, college campuses and universities, and nonprofit organizations to increase awareness of stalking and the availability of services for stalking victims; and

(4) urges national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, and the media to promote awareness of the crime of stalking through "National Stalking Awareness Month".

SENATE RESOLUTION 60—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF OBSERVING THE NATIONAL SLAVERY AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH FROM JANUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 1, 2015, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF, AND OPPOSITION TO, MODERN SLAVERY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KATIE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 60

Whereas the United States has a tradition of advancing fundamental human rights,

having abolished the Transatlantic Slave Trade in 1808 and having abolished chattel slavery and prohibited involuntary servitude in 1865;

Whereas because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking, which is the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of persons for labor or services through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery, and the inducement of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age;

Whereas to combat human trafficking in the United States and globally, the people of the United States, the Federal Government, and State and local governments must be aware of the realities of human trafficking and must be dedicated to stopping this contemporary manifestation of slavery;

Whereas human trafficking is estimated to be a \$32,000,000,000 criminal enterprise, making it the second largest criminal enterprise in the world, behind the drug trade;

Whereas the United Nations estimates that nearly 21,000,000 people around the world are victims of forced labor, including 4,500,000 people who are victims of forced sexual exploitation;

Whereas the Department of Justice estimates that up to 83 percent of sex trafficking victims in the United States are citizens of the United States;

Whereas beyond all differences of race, creed, or political persuasion, the people of the United States face national threats together and refuse to let modern slavery exist in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the United States should actively oppose all individuals, groups, organizations, and nations that support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking;

Whereas through education, the United States must also work to end slavery in all of its forms around the world;

Whereas victims of modern slavery need support in order to escape and recover from the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma associated with their victimization;

Whereas human traffickers use many physical and psychological techniques to control their victims, including the use of violence or threats of violence against the victim or the victim's family, isolation from the public, isolation from the victim's family and religious or ethnic communities, language and cultural barriers, shame, control of the victim's possessions, confiscation of passports and other identification documents, and threats of arrest, deportation, or imprisonment if the victim attempts to reach out for assistance or to leave;

Whereas although laws to prosecute perpetrators of modern slavery and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking, such as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) and title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 54), have been enacted in the United States, awareness of the issues surrounding slavery and trafficking by those people most likely to come into contact with victims is essential for effective enforcement because the techniques that traffickers use to keep their victims enslaved severely limit self-reporting;

Whereas January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas February 1 is the anniversary of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the 13th Amendment to the States for ratification, to forever declare that "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction" and is a date which has long been celebrated as National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code;

Whereas under its authority to enforce the 13th Amendment "by appropriate legislation", Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 updated the post-Civil War involuntary servitude and slavery statutes and adopted an approach known as the "3P" approach of victim protection, vigorous prosecution, and prevention of human trafficking; and

Whereas the effort by individuals, businesses, organizations, and governing bodies to commemorate January 11 as Human Trafficking Awareness Day represents one of the many positive examples of the commitment in the United States to raise awareness of, and to actively oppose, modern slavery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports—

(1) the goals and ideals of observing the National Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Month from January 1 through February 1, 2015, to recognize the vital role that the people of the United States have in ending modern slavery;

(2) marking this observance with appropriate programs and activities culminating in the observance on February 1 of National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

(3) all other efforts to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking.

COMMEMORATING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF THE AUSCHWITZ EXTERMINATION CAMP

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 8, S. Res. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 35) commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.

S. RES. 35

Whereas, on January 27, 1945, the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland was liberated by Allied Forces during World War II after almost 5 years of murder, rape, and torture at the camp;

Whereas 1,100,000 innocent civilians were murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas nearly 1,300,000 innocent civilians were deported to Auschwitz from their homes across Eastern and Western Europe, particularly from Hungary, Poland, and France;

Whereas 1,000,000 of the civilians who perished at the camp were Jews, along with 100,000 non-Jewish Poles, Roma and Sinti individuals, Soviet prisoners of war, Jehovah's Witnesses, gay men and women, and other ethnic minorities;

Whereas these civilians included farmers, tailors, seamstresses, factory hands, accountants, doctors, teachers, small-business owners, clergy, intellectuals, government officials, and political activists;

Whereas these civilians were subjected to torture, forced labor, starvation, rape, medical experiments, and being separated from loved ones;

Whereas the names of many of these civilians who perished have been lost forever;

Whereas the Auschwitz extermination camp symbolizes the extraordinary brutality of the Holocaust;

Whereas the people of the United States must never forget the terrible crimes against humanity committed at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas the people of the United States must educate future generations to promote understanding of the dangers of intolerance in order to prevent similar injustices from happening again; and

Whereas commemoration of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp will instill in all people of the United States a greater awareness of the Holocaust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the Senate—

(1) commemorates January 27, 2015, as the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp by Allied Forces during World War II;

(2) calls on all people of the United States to remember the 1,100,000 innocent victims murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp as part of the Holocaust;

(3) honors the legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust and of the Auschwitz extermination camp; and

(4) calls on the people of the United States to continue to work toward tolerance, peace, and justice and to continue to work to end all genocide and persecution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 35), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

NATIONAL STALKING AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 59, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 59) raising awareness and encouraging prevention of stalking by designating January 2015 as "National Stalking Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF OBSERVING THE NATIONAL SLAVERY AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 60, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 60) supporting the goals and ideals of observing the National Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Month from January 1 through February 1, 2015, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, modern slavery.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, today I have submitted a resolution with Senator KIRK recognizing January as National Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Month. We are pleased to be joined by Senators LEAHY, TOOMEY, KLOBUCHAR, COONS, RUBIO, MURRAY, WYDEN, BROWN, SHAHEEN, GILLIBRAND, KAINE, HEITKAMP, KING, and MARKEY in sponsoring this resolution.

January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation, and February 1 is the anniversary of the date that President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the Thirteenth Amendment—which abolished slavery—to the States for ratification.

In 2009, the Senate unanimously approved a resolution I introduced to establish January as Human Trafficking Awareness Month. That resolution was made to raise awareness of, and opposition to, the human trafficking. It is important that we continue to bring attention to and raise awareness of this horrific practice.

Human trafficking is a crime in which persons are forced to work

against their will in sweatshops, prostitution rings, farms, private homes, and other enterprises. The traffickers use force, threats of force, and coercion to ensure that their victims believe they have no other choice but to work for their captors. Frequently, human trafficking goes undetected because the victims are not only afraid of their traffickers, but they have been taught by their traffickers to fear law enforcement.

Human trafficking is estimated to be a \$32 billion criminal enterprise, making it the second largest criminal industry in the world, behind the drug trade. A 2014 Urban Institute study found that pimps in Atlanta can make nearly \$33,000 in just one week, which amounts to over \$1.7 million a year. The overwhelming majority of sex trafficking victims in the United States are American citizens—83 percent by one estimate from the Department of Justice.

Unfortunately, children are often victims of this horrendous crime. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has reported that one in seven endangered runaways are victims of sex trafficking.

Many of these children continue to be exploited into adulthood. A study of women and girls involved in street prostitution in my hometown of San Francisco found that 82 percent had been physically assaulted, 83 percent were threatened with a weapon, and 68 percent were raped.

Unfortunately, such abuse is common around the world. According to the United Nations, there are nearly 21 million people currently serving in some form of involuntary servitude. The United Nations also reported that in 16 percent of the 138 countries studied, there was not one trafficking-related conviction between 2007 and 2010.

Over the past decade, Congress has taken action to enhance the tools available to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect trafficking victims. We passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 and, 8 years later, passed the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. These laws strengthened Federal efforts to combat international and domestic human trafficking by expanding administrative subpoena authority, increasing penalties for traffickers, and authorizing the Justice Department to seek preventive detention of those charged with trafficking offenses.

Despite these important laws, further action is needed. Earlier this year, Senator PORTMAN and I introduced the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015. This bill would reduce the demand for human trafficking, particularly the commercial sexual exploitation of children, by holding buyers accountable and making it easier for law enforcement to investigate and prosecute all

persons who participate in sex trafficking.

In addition, I am pleased to join Senator KIRK in introducing the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act or the SAVE Act. This bill would strike at child sex trafficking where it is increasingly occurring—the Internet—by prohibiting Internet companies from profiting from allowing their websites to be used to traffic children.

We must act with urgency to end the practice of human trafficking. For every day we wait, more lives are damaged by this horrible practice.

I urge my colleagues to join me in observing National Slavery and Trafficking Prevention Month to draw attention to human trafficking and to renew our collective efforts to eliminate this practice in the United States and around the world.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m. on Monday, February 2; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that the Senate then be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 4:30 p.m., equally divided in the usual form. I further ask that the Senate then proceed to consideration of H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. On Monday the Senate will vote on the bipartisan House-passed bill on veterans suicide prevention. Chairman ISAKSON and Senator BLUMENTHAL reported out that bill from the Veterans' Affairs Committee last week, and we are moving quickly to send it to the President for his signature. That should be the only vote on Monday night.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2015, AT 4 P.M. ate, I ask unanimous consent that it There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:56 a.m., adjourned until Monday, February 2, 2015, at 4 p.m.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Sen- stand adjourned under the previous order.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, January 30, 2015

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 30, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS J. ROONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Lieutenant Commander James Dance, Chaplain, United States Navy, Office of the Chief of Navy Chaplains, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we acknowledge that the Earth is Yours and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein.

Because of whom You are, we deem it imperative that we seek You for wisdom and guidance as we endeavor to open yet another session of the House during which we shall attend to the interests of the American people.

Help us to temper our conversations with humility and patience as we give due diligence to the work that has been assigned to our hands. May we be imbued with a renewed sense of passion, purpose, and patriotism as we strive to serve this great Nation that we all love.

Bless these, our United States. It is in Your most holy Name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1. An act to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOE BARTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOE BARTON, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in connection with a criminal case currently pending before that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JOE BARTON,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE FRED UPTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable FRED UPTON, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 28, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a third-party subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana in connection with United States v. Rainey, a matter currently pending before that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 28, 2015 at 12:22 p.m.:

Appointment:
Joint Committee on Taxation.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CO-CHAIR THE TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(c) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member to serve as cochair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission:

Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 2, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

RULES AND REPORTS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(d), executive communications [final rules] submitted to the House pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1) during the period of June 11, 2014, through January 2, 2015, shall be treated as though received on January 30, 2015. Original dates of transmittal, numberings, and referrals to committee of those executive communications remain as indicated in the Executive Communication section of the relevant CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

253. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, CDC/NIOSH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Respirator Certification Fees [Docket No.: CDC-2013-0004; NIOSH-216] (RIN: 0920-AA42) received January 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

254. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications; Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 160(c) from Obsolete ILEC Regulatory Obligations that Inhibit Deployment of Next-Generation Networks [WC Docket No.: 10-90] [WC Docket No.: 14-58] [WC Docket No.: 14-192] received January 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

255. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modernizing the E-Rate Program for Schools and Libraries; Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 13-184] [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received January 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

256. A letter from the Acting Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rural Call Completion [WC Docket No.: 13-39] received January 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

257. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine [Docket No.: 141218999-4999-01] (RIN: 0694-AG43) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

258. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-589, "Early Learning Quality Improvement Network Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

259. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-590, "Education Licensure Commission Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

260. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-591, "Wage Theft Prevention Correction and Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

261. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-592, "District Government Certificate of Good Standing Filing Requirement Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

262. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action,

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Land Acquisitions in the State of Alaska [K00103 14/15 A3A10; 134D0102DR-DS5A300000-DR.5A311.IA000115] (RIN: 1076-AF23) received January 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

263. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Adding 20 Coral Species to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2014-0055; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BA63) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

264. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Listing, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Gunnison Sage-grouse [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2011-0111; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AX71) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

265. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Amendment 18 to the Salmon Fishery Management Plan [Docket No.: 130123065-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-BC95) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

266. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's correction to final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015; Correction [Docket No.: 140710571-4977-02] (RIN: 0648-BE36) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

267. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Regulatory Amendment to Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries Trawl Rationalization Program for the Start of 2015 [Docket No.: 140904753-4999-01] (RIN: 0648-BE34) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

268. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Porbeagle Shark Fishery [Docket Nos.: 130402317-3966-02 and 140429387-4971-02] (RIN: 0648-XD659) received January 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

269. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations and Atlantic Coastal Fisheries

Cooperative Management Act Provisions; American Lobster Fishery [Docket No.: 141002823-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-BE57) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

270. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update to Revenue Procedure 2014-8 (Revenue Procedure 2015-8) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

271. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update to Revenue Procedure 2014-4 (Revenue Procedure 2015-4) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

272. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Reporting Sick Pay Paid by Third Parties (Notice 2015-6) received January 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FLORES, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 623. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. McGOVERN):

H.R. 624. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 625. A bill to eliminate the incentive for corporations to continue to hold accumulated earnings offshore, to invest in domestic infrastructure, to provide for international tax reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 626. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage organizations to disclose certain information on the changes made to the MA plan offered by such organization pursuant to changes required by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 628. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 628. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 629. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain rules regarding basis adjustments to stock of S corporations making charitable contributions of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREEN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr.

ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 631. A bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 632. A bill to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the U.S. Air Forces Escape and Evasion Society, in recognition of the ceaseless efforts of American aircrew members to escape captivity and evade capture by the enemy forces in occupied countries during our foreign wars, and the brave resistance organizations and patriotic nationals of those foreign countries who assisted them; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 633. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit the sharing of personally identifiable information obtained through the Federally Facilitated Marketplace for marketing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the United States Capitol for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Jack Nicklaus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H. Res. 65. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Natural Resources in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H. Res. 66. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Dominican Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress, "the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . ."

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States constitution.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to the Social Security Act.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Clause 8, Section 3 (Power to regulate commerce)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 29: Mr. HARTZLER and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 38: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 50: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 132: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 140: Mr. BARLETTA and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 198: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 199: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 224: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 225: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 226: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 228: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 247: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 280: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 290: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 306: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 352: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 400: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 401: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 402: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 411: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 419: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 420: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 429: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 431: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DOLD, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOMMERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 439: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 448: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 483: Ms. MENG, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 503: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 509: Mr. KIND and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 524: Mr. REED, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 527: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 539: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 574: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 581: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 583: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 590: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 594: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 595: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 596: Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AMODEL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 599: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 612: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 11: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H. Res. 53: Mr. HURD of Texas and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 62: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF PENNY GAGE

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Penny Gage for her dedication and commitment to the Dental Industry. Ms. Gage has served as a Tri-County Dental Society executive director for over 30 years. During this time membership expanded from 700 to 2000 members. She was a strong promoter in building a relationship between the society and the dental students within the two dental schools in the program's area. Ms. Gage has been active in participating with the American Association of Dental Editors and Journalist organization in providing ideas and proof-reading the AADEJ's newsletters. She has also served with the American Dental Association.

During her time with the Tri-County Dental Society she developed the "Give Kids a Smile" program as well as encouraged members to help provide free dental clinics. That program has led to another exceptional program, "Give Adults a Smile", which she also supports. Ms. Gage has developed a network of relationships throughout dentistry and has been essential to its promotion and progress in these areas. Actions such as hers have helped to make more smiles possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize Ms. Penny Gage for her long time service to the Tri-County Dental Society and oral health promotion as a whole. Her achievements in expanding membership and programming helped to improve the lives of many and help everyone to smile more.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF
LAURA W. MURPHY**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the most prominent and important civil liberties and civil rights advocates of our time—my friend, Laura W. Murphy. Laura is the longest serving director of the Washington Legislative Office of the American Civil Liberties Union, and will be stepping down at the end of the month. It is my pleasure to honor her public service and to wish her well in her next chapter. Most recently, Laura was instrumental in advising Attorney General Eric Holder and the United States Sentencing Commission on ways to reduce overcrowding among federal prison populations. She worked closely with Attorney General Holder and leaders of the House and Senate in passing the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010, a law that re-

duced the sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine, which ignited a movement to finally begin to end racial disparities in our criminal justice system. Among Laura's other profound legislative accomplishments was working closely with Congress and the White House to build support for essential and federally funded reproductive health services for servicemembers and their dependents in cases of rape and incest. This was among the few abortion rights victories of the last 40 years.

Laura has been a leading voice in Washington, DC, and throughout the country for freedom of speech, including her office's tireless efforts to preserve the First Amendment in the face of calls for a constitutional amendment that would lead to laws against so-called flag desecration, that would restrict internet free speech, and that would censor lyrics in rap and other music genres. She has been a tenacious advocate for checks and balances to prevent abuses by Intelligence agencies and finally rolling back the significant overreach of the USA Patriot Act. Her work on LGBT rights, mass incarceration and racial profiling, comprehensive immigration reform, privacy, reproductive rights, and voting rights has been peerless.

Laura is a familiar face in Congress, and among the few people who can call both Representative MAXINE WATERS and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL friends, an advocate who has shown the nation how to achieve bipartisan success in these hyper-partisan times. She has testified more than a dozen times before the House and Senate and is a frequent contributor to national dialogue on critical legislative issues. One of the ACLU's most prominent spokespersons, Laura is also an author, including book chapters on homeland security and the African American community's response to the 9/11 attacks. Repeatedly named among the most influential advocates in Washington, DC, and frequently cited by the Washington Post, Laura has been an important voice for more than four decades, advising U.S. Presidents from Ronald Reagan to Barack Obama.

We in Congress are losing not only a tireless advocate for civil liberties and civil rights, we are losing a dear friend, respected and admired by all who know her. I am hopeful that she will remain close at hand and active in the fight for basic American values. Those closest to her know that fighting for justice is in Laura's DNA—she is a direct descendant of one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Philip Livingston.

I urge you to join me in wishing Laura Murphy all the best, to congratulate her as she faces new adventures, and to thank her for her many years of service.

HONORING ST. JOSEPH'S MEDICAL
CENTER FAMILY MEDICINE RESI-
DENCY PROGRAM**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, great healthcare organizations are a tremendous asset to any community. St. Joseph's Medical Center's Family Residency Program has undoubtedly been one of those fantastic assets in Westchester, helping train and ready the family physicians of tomorrow now for over 4 decades.

Established in 1974, the medical center was the first Residency Program of its kind in the entire Westchester County. Beginning with one resident in the mid-1970's, the program has grown over the years to now have 30 residents, with an annual graduating class of 10.

The program's residents learn to treat the whole patient, become aware of family dynamics, and emphasize prevention and education in the practice of medicine. Although the residency program started at a time when primary care had been outpaced by specialization, it has become increasingly more important as our nation's healthcare system and the public recognize the value of prevention and patient centered care.

All told, the Family Medicine Residency program has graduated 312 family physicians over the course of its 40 year existence. Many of those graduating physicians have chosen to stay in Westchester, and have developed into some of the finest physicians in the entire country. Others have gone on to complete fellowships and teach at major medical centers and university hospitals.

The St. Joseph's community is proud to have such a distinguished residency program that has produced so many outstanding family physicians. As the elected representative of St. Joseph's in Congress, I am equally proud to say that I have one of the premiere residency programs in the world housed within my district.

In recognition of the program's many contributions to Saint Joseph's, the Medical Center presented the Family Medicine Residency Program with the 2014 Outstanding Service Award. It was a well deserved honor and I want to congratulate all of the talented and dedicated men and women who have made the program such a tremendous success.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING BARBARA P. SMITH

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, those who dedicate themselves to improving their neighborhood become cornerstones of the community. Barbara P. Smith is one of those cornerstones in Yonkers, who for 32 years has been an educator, civic leader and crusader.

Barbara began bettering the Yonkers community in 1982 as a teacher at the Orchard School at Andrus Children's Home on North Broadway. She taught a range of subjects from math and science to social studies and home economics. Eventually Barbara was elevated to Assistant Principal and in 1994 she and the school were recognized for their efforts and achievements with an invitation to the White House to meet then President Clinton. Barbara subsequently returned to the classroom where she could take a more hands on approach to teaching.

Outside of the classroom, Barbara has engaged in a number of civic groups aimed at serving the community. For the past 36 years she has served as board member and President of the Hudson River Community Association (HRCA) of Northwest Yonkers, a once dormant organization she helped resurrect.

Barbara has also generously given her time to organizations like the Yonkers Committee for Smart Development, which she served as an advisor to in 2008, and the advisory board for the First District of Council Woman Pat McDow in 2007. When time permits, she also likes to partake in a wide array of volunteer work aimed at community improvement. Barbara shares the same goals as the organizations she works with: to stabilize, improve, support and promote the wonderful city of Yonkers. I believe she has achieved those goals admirably.

Last year, the Luther V. Garrison Masonic Foundation Inc. Scholarship Committee honored Barbara as their Woman of the Year for 2014. It was a supremely appropriate honor for one of Yonkers' most dedicated citizens. Congratulations to her on receiving such well-deserved recognition.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN TURKEY

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about the current efforts to punish and stifle freedom of expression in Turkey and to share my worry that Turkey is drifting away from the tolerant secular nation founded by Kemal Ataturk almost 100 years ago and towards religious extremism and authoritarianism.

The current Government in Turkey has arrested members of Turkish media deemed non-supportive of the government. For decades, Turkey has had a free press and the freedom to disagree and vigorous political de-

bate. It is a disturbing negative trend for the current government to reverse decades of transparency and to seek to impose authoritarianism.

I am informed that Mr. Ekrem Dumanli, editor-in-chief of Zaman, a daily newspaper in Turkey, and Hidayet Karaca, General Manager of Samanyolu Media Group, were arrested on December 14, 2014. To the shame of the current leadership, Hidayet Karaca is still in detention awaiting trial. They were not arrested for actual crimes, but on transparently political charges, thus bringing the total number of detained press and media personalities to 29. These members of the media have ties to the Islamic scholar Fethullah Gulen, a scholar who preaches tolerance and peace and who is a known critic of the Erdogan Administration.

In December 2013, allegations of corruption were levied against the Erdogan Administration based on legal investigations. Afterwards, about some 400 people (including 150 stated Gulen supporters) were monitored on Twitter and ultimately the Turkish people's access to Twitter was blocked. These arrests, and the effort to stifle opposition, have a chilling effect on freedom, democracy, and economic prosperity for all of Turkey. Turkey's bid for accession to the European Union continues to languish under these policies—before negotiations on the matter develop, Turkey must recognize basic press freedoms and the right to political dissent.

Turkey plays a critical role as an ally to the United States in the Middle East. To allow it to go down the road of sectarian extremism and authoritarianism without meaningful discussion and diplomacy is disconcerting. Turkey is a key leader in the region and a cultural, historic, and political bulwark between the Middle East, Europe, and Asia. Turkey is an important member of NATO, and I believe all rational people want to see the Turkish Government abandon intimidation and embrace a free press and tolerance of dissenting voices. The Turkey founded by Ataturk deserves our support. International remonstrance is needed to bring it back to the ranks of nations that do not fear its own people, do not fear opposition, and do not fear universal freedoms.

HONORING JERRY GALELLA

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, those who choose the path of civic engagement can accomplish wonderful things for their communities. In Yonkers there are few who can claim they have done more to support the local neighborhoods than Jerry Galella.

Born seven minutes before his twin brother, Jerry grew up in the Bronx and is the oldest of three children. After graduating from Dewitt Clinton High School, Jerry served in the United States Army from 1971 to 1973 and after his discharge became a grocery store manager for the next 40 years.

In 2007, Jerry became a full-fledged member of the Yonkers community when he joined

the ShopRite of Greenway Plaza as Store Director. Remarkably, in the seven years Jerry has been with ShopRite he has become affiliated with over 25 different churches and numerous other community organizations throughout Yonkers. His volunteer work has included helping out with three college scholarship funds, including the Yonkers African American Cultural Club, the Dominican Cultural Club of Yonkers, and the Hispanic Professional Scholarship fund. As a result of his efforts, Jerry has been honored various accolades and awards from a wide array of schools, churches, and veterans' associations, just to name a few.

As devoted to helping out the community as Jerry is, his real passion is for his family. He met his wife, Linda, at age 13 in 8th grade, and was immediately smitten. The teenage sweethearts would later become married and for the past 32 years have lived together in Carmel, NY. Over the course of their 40 year marriage Jerry and Linda have raised three wonderful children and have six amazing grand children, all who live within 15 miles of each other. Jerry also generously gives his time to many different organizations in the Carmel community, ranging from little league to organizations assisting veterans of the Vietnam War.

In 2014, the Luther V. Garrison SR. Masonic Foundation Inc. Scholarship Committee named Jerry Galella their 2014 Man of the Year. He was incredibly deserving of the honor, and I wish to congratulate him on receiving the well-deserved recognition.

HONORING LOYD IVEY

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Loyd Ivey who was elected to the Consumer Electronics Hall of Fame for his contribution and significant achievements to the industry.

As a local growing up in Scopus, Missouri, he graduated from Woodland High School and moved to Illinois to work in the steel and wood industries. In 1971 he founded Ivey Electronics to produce bookshelf speakers encased in a burn and spill-proof walnut laminate for the student market of Northwestern University.

Loyd joined the Consumer Electronics Association in 1974 and presented his first product there before merging with American Case Company to create American Acoustic Labs.

American Acoustic Labs became MiTek Corporation in 1979, which went on to become one of the United States' largest manufacturers of car and home speakers. MiTek has grown into a global enterprise with offices around the world.

Loyd has been married to his wife Debi since 1968 and is the father of two sons. He also serves as a sheriffs deputy and department pilot in Bollinger County. It is my privilege to recognize his achievements and lasting contributions before the House of Representatives.

HONORING LUBA GLASSER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, religion often has the power to inspire and motivate a person in truly remarkable ways that can shape entire communities. That has certainly been the case with Luba Glasser, a constituent of mine who has volunteered her time and energy for numerous Jewish organizations.

Luba was born in Moscow and immigrated to the United States with her family at the age of four. She was enrolled in a Jewish Day School so that she would receive a Jewish education, something she could not have attained in the former Soviet Union, and began to gain a love and appreciation for Judaism.

Luba's faith became the impetus for her volunteerism, which began in 2005 with the Russian American Jewish Experience (RAJE). Luba spent all of her free evenings and weekends helping the RAJE with the organization of their Shabbat and holiday programs, social events, and student trips to Israel, all while successfully maintaining a day job as a Real Estate Tax Consultant for New York Water Management.

In 2006, Luba joined RAJE as their full-time Fellowship Coordinator, where she was responsible for the student and young adult Jewish identity and community development programming. Over the next three years Luba staffed over 15 trips to Israel.

Luba's devotion to the Jewish community led her to return to school, where she received her LMSW from Yeshiva University in 2011. She then began working with Holocaust survivors at the Jewish Community Council of Greater Coney Island and joined the Northeast Jewish Center (NEJC) community, which became her permanent home.

Luba married Craig Glasser in 2012 and shortly thereafter became the proud mother of Aaron Dov. In spite of everything on her plate, Luba continues to open her home to the community for Shabbos dinners, cook for synagogue events, maintain the NEJC website, and teach classes. She is a beacon of light for the NEJC community and was incredibly deserving of being the organization's honoree in 2014.

GENERAL LEAVE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 46–50 due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on #46, yes on #47, yes on #48, yes on #49, and no on #50.

HONORING MARGARET O. GRIFFIN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a life filled with civic engagement enriches the soul and has the ability to raise entire communities. Such has been the case with Margaret O. Griffin, better known to her friends and family as Ollie, whose dedication to the St. Joseph's Medical Center and beyond has had a profound and lasting impact in Yonkers and the surrounding areas.

Ollie was born in Yonkers and attended St. Denis Grammar School, then Sacred Heart High School. She received her Bachelor of Science degree from Marquette University and upon graduation began working as a research aide at Sloan-Kettering Institute in Rye. After working for the Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research, Ollie returned to school for a Master of Science degree followed by a Ph.D. in Biology from Fordham University.

In 1994, Ollie retired from research and teaching which allowed her to increase her involvement in community affairs. She served on the boards of Fox House and the Ireland Fund and was a trustee of the Woman's Institute for many years. Ollie was also a long-time member of the Saint Joseph's Seminary Festival Chorale, which she was privileged to sing with at the Pallium ceremony in Rome.

Ollie continues to be an active member in several other community clubs, including the Morsemere Garden Club, the Bonita Quilters, the Pelican Patchers and the Pelican Landing Singers. The highlight of Ollie's community service though has been her work at St. Joseph's, which began in 1993 as a trustee. She has served as an active and enthusiastic member until September of 2014 and made many great contributions to the center's development and success.

Ollie's other great passion has been her three children, Colleen, Daniel, and Katherine, who she raised with her beloved husband, William, to whom she was married for 52 years. She also takes great pride in her six grandchildren, Shannon, William, Jack, Michael, Sean, and Brian.

St. Joseph's Medical Center honored Ollie with the 2014 Outstanding Service Award, and a more fitting honoree they could not have found. Congratulations to Ollie on receiving this wonderful honor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed votes on January 27, 2015. I missed recorded votes # 46–48. I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were present.

On Roll Call #46, I would have voted YEA (Adoption of H. Res. 48—The rule providing for consideration of H.R. 351—LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency Act).

On Roll Call #47, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 469, Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act).

On Roll Call #48, I would have voted YEA (Passage of H.R. 246, To improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking).

HONORING NADEM J. SAYEGH

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there are few professions that serve the public good like healthcare. Committing one's life to providing people with excellent medical care is a noble calling, a calling Nadem Sayegh has answered with distinction.

A lifelong resident of Yonkers, Nadem decided to pursue a career in medicine, and became a specialist in the field of Endocrinology.

Following medical school, Nadem opened a private practice in 1994 and later became Manager of Southern Westchester Diabetes, with offices in both the Bronx and Yonkers. In addition, he also operates Broadway Medical Services, a clinic in Yonkers serving a diverse population of residents. The clinic was scheduled to close in 2009, but through Nadem's incredible efforts the clinic is not only open, but thriving, and now treats more than 15,000 patients every year, an incredible feat.

Nadem has been recognized by many organizations over the years for his commitment to healthcare excellence. He was honored by the Jessie Banks Foundation for his contributions to those affected with diabetes, and in 2013 received the Father of the Year Award by the American Diabetes Association, an organization of which he was later named New York Chapter President.

Nadem's community involvement also extends beyond the field of medicine. He has served the Virgin Mary Church since its inception in 1966 and has done public speaking and counseling work for numerous organizations.

But for Nadem, his greatest blessing has always been his family; his beautiful wife Diana, and their three sons, all currently enrolled in college. Their love and support has been instrumental to Nadem's success and the growth of his work.

A true pillar of the healthcare community, Nadem served on the medical board of St. Joseph's Medical Center and became its President in 2006–2007. The center decided to honor Nadem with the 2014 Outstanding Service Award, and it's safe to say they found a particularly deserving honoree. Congratulations to Nadem on the honor.

CONGRATULATING DR. JOHN
"ROB" MARSH ON BEING NAMED
THE 2014 COUNTRY DOCTOR OF
THE YEAR

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the character of a community is often defined by the individuals who call it home and the actions of those individuals in service to others. Dr. John "Rob" Marsh of Middlebrook, Virginia, who practices medicine in the heart of the Shenandoah Valley, exemplifies this type of service that is truly for the betterment of his community.

It is my honor to congratulate Dr. Marsh on being named the 2014 Country Doctor of the Year by StaffCare. The Country Doctor of the Year Award recognizes "the spirit, skill, and dedication of America's rural medical practitioners." This is indeed a well-deserved recognition.

In times of great change, especially in the field of health care, it is encouraging to know that someone like Dr. Marsh is still engaged in the practice of medicine. He is dedicated to serving those in his community and not always in conventional settings. He drops by for regular house calls, makes rounds at the hospital, and presides over a long-term care facility. Dr. Marsh also serves others who are just passing through at his clinic located alongside a truck stop by the interstate in Raphine, Virginia.

Dr. Marsh's service in the United States Army as a military physician is well known. He cared for the wounded members of Delta Force in war zones and nearly lost his own life in a mortar attack in Somalia; despite his own wounds, Dr. Marsh continued to tend to others who had been injured. Dr. Marsh is a decorated military physician, having received the Legion of Merit, two Bronze Stars, a Purple Heart, the Department of Defense Meritorious Service Medal, and the Army Meritorious Service Medal.

With his wife, Barbara, and their children, Dr. Marsh has deep roots in Virginia, and for that I am grateful. It has been an honor to know Dr. Marsh over the years as well as his father, former Virginia U.S. Representative and Secretary of the Army, John Marsh.

For many in the Shenandoah Valley, Dr. Marsh is much more than a doctor. He is a friend, a fellow farmer, and a pillar of the community. Dr. Marsh's contributions are immeasurable, and this award is only the smallest token of gratitude he is owed. I wish him and his family the best.

HONORING FRANK RITI

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, civic minded community groups are only as strong and effective as the members who lead them. That is why the Bronx-Westchester South Division of

Kiwanis, under the leadership of Lieutenant Governor Frank Riti, has been so successful.

As Lieutenant Governor, Frank has overseen 12 Kiwanis Clubs in his division, including those in Bronx Shore, Hartsdale, Mount Vernon, North East Bronx, Riverdale and Yonkers. He has made 3 official visits to each club and during his tenure has made a point of hosting events that bring all divisions together to create a communal spirit in the Kiwanis organization.

Working to fulfill the goals set forth by New York State Kiwanis Governor Joseph Aiello, Frank encouraged all of his clubs to participate in the Governor's Project which centered on autism awareness. With Frank's hard work the South Division was able to raise critical funds for autism causes and hold programs dedicated to raising awareness. Frank was also instrumental in the "Treats for Troops" Kiwanis program which sent gift packages to our young men and women serving overseas. Both the Governor's Project and "Treats for the Troops" were highly successful.

Frank was also a big supporter of the Kiwanis International project "Eliminate" which deals with maternal neo-natal tetanus issues plaguing families on a global scale. Frank's ability to bring his 12 clubs together to support these causes was what made them successful, and led to their collective contributions being recognized by both the New York State District and International Kiwanis respectively.

Prior to his wonderful work with Kiwanis, Frank worked in the health care field, serving as head of occupational therapy in nursing homes in both Westchester and the Bronx. Frank was beloved by both his staff and patients and gave many years of service to the field.

The Yonkers Kiwanis Club honored Frank at a dinner which celebrated their 85 years of service to the Yonkers community in 2014. I believe there was no more fitting honoree than Frank Riti, and wish to offer him my sincerest congratulations on that wonderful recognition.

HONORING LT. COL. ED SAYLOR

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the late Lt. Col. Ed Saylor. Lt. Col. Saylor was part of the infamous Doolittle Raiders who risked their lives during World War II. These men were responsible for raising the morale of an entire nation after the devastating attack on Pearl Harbor.

Lt. Col. Saylor passed away Wednesday, but he is not gone from our hearts. His heroic actions will tell his story long after we are gone. Without him, the USS *Hornet's* plane number 15, also known as "TNT" and a critical part of the Doolittle Raid, would never have flown in 1941. Sgt. Saylor, as he was then, was able to remove and repair the engine of "TNT"—the first time this had ever been done at sea. He was also responsible for writing the words "Democracy's Ace in the Hole" on the side of the plane just before take-off. This message and symbolism would

resonate for the duration of the war, helping to remind our troops that our side was fighting the right battle.

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. Saylor went above and beyond the call of duty. He served our country in the military for 28 years; he helped America rise to greatness from the brink of despair, propelling us to victory. We will never forget him and I am proud to have called him my friend. I will always cherish his gift of a stained glass B52 Bomber he had hand-made himself.

HONORING BEATRICE CASTIGLIA-CATULLO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a simple civic organization intended to help and improve a small community can turn into a pillar of hope for an entire city. That has undoubtedly been the case with Regional Aid for Interim Needs, or RAIN, thanks in large part to its founder, Beatrice Castiglia-Catullo.

Bea has given her life to her community and always advocates on behalf of those marginalized. RAIN was founded in 1964 to serve those in need as a multi-social service agency. It provides an array of invaluable services to the senior community of the Bronx, many of whom are handicapped, home bound, or otherwise incapable of providing themselves with certain necessities.

RAIN has full-service neighborhood senior centers, home-delivered meals, transportation services, assistance with benefits and entitlements, case management and elder abuse services, in addition to community-based mobile meals for homeless and hungry persons. Their commitment to helping the elderly population has also led to the sponsorship of two residential housing projects for low-income seniors and an affiliated home attendant program that provides in-home attendant and care services.

Building off their incredible success in the Bronx, RAIN has recently expanded its services to Manhattan and has licensed to provide Home Health Care in all five New York City boroughs as well as Westchester County.

This type of wonderful advocacy has all been made possible by Bea, whose passion and drive is still to this day the heartbeat of the RAIN operation. Her legacy of procuring funding for 1600 meals on wheels, 325 daily meals to the hungry and homeless, and 11 senior centers is truly remarkable, and her life has been a tremendous inspiration to me as I serve the public in Congress.

RAIN celebrated Bea's 98th birthday at their 50th Anniversary celebration on October 30th, 2014. I want to personally thank Bea for all she has done and all she continues to do for the constituents in my district and well beyond. She has created something truly phenomenal and should be incredibly proud of the achievement.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDWARD
CABELL BRAND**HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representative BOB GOODLATTE, I submit these remarks in honor of the remarkable life of (Edward) Cabell Brand and his dedicated service to our nation and our community. Among other things, Mr. Brand was a philanthropist, public servant, and an activist, widely recognized for his efforts to improve the lives of others. Though we may not have agreed with all of his political views, we can say without a doubt that Mr. Brand made an indelible difference in the Roanoke Valley.

Born and raised in Salem, Virginia, Mr. Brand graduated in 1940 from Andrew Lewis High School. He attended Virginia Military Institute (VMI), and while there, was called to serve his country in World War II in the 70th Infantry Division. He returned to VMI to complete his education, and graduated in its class of 1944 as valedictorian.

Mr. Brand continued his studies at the Harvard Business School and at the University of Virginia. He became an economic analyst in the Intelligence Office of Berlin's Military Government and with the United States Foreign Service in Europe. By the end of his military service, Mr. Brand held the rank of Captain, and also received the Bronze Star.

Mr. Brand returned to Salem, and worked at The Ortho Vent Shoe Company, which his grandfather had started a half-century earlier. He worked his way up to President of Ortho Vent, and took it public as the Stuart McGuire Company in 1970 before selling it in 1986 to the Home Shopping Network.

In 1965, Mr. Brand founded Total Action Against Poverty (now called Total Action for Progress), which he believed to be his greatest achievement. This program provides more than 30 programs to the Roanoke Valley, including the Head Start Program, the Virginia Water Project, and more. Mr. Brand also served as Chairman of Child Health Investment Partnership (CHIP) until 1996.

In 1987, Mr. Brand established the Cabell Brand Center for International Poverty and Research Studies. As a result of this Center, more than 500 students were given the opportunity to learn and pursue various public service opportunities.

Mr. Brand received numerous awards for his efforts, including the VISTA award, the Lyndon Baines Johnson Humanitarian Award, the Virginia Governor Gold Medal Award, the first Jonathan Daniels Award from VMI, the Noel Taylor Humanitarian Award, the Salem Rotary Club's Outstanding Citizen Award, and the Roanoke-Salem Chamber of Commerce Lifetime Achievement Award. He also received honorary degrees from institutions including Washington & Lee University, Roanoke College, Ferrum College and Virginia Western Community College, and Lynchburg College. Mr. Brand was a proud author, and was also featured in other publications for his leadership and service.

Mr. Brand passed away on January 13, 2015, at the age of 91. He was predeceased

by his beloved wife Shirley; infant daughter, Ingrid Pichen Brand; sons, Marshall Cabell Brand, Edward Cabell Brand Jr., Richard Franklin Pence, and John Wilson Pence. He is survived by daughters, Sylvia Brand Knaup (Gunther) of Columbia, Tenn., Miriam Brand Kline (John) of Richmond, Va., Caroline Brand Mateja of Charlottesville, Va., and Liza Pence Urso of Dallas, Texas; grandchildren, Brandon Kline, Kathryn Kline, Philip Urso, Laura Urso, Christin Urso, Cabell Keating Brand, Rachel Pence, Shelley Pence, Thomas John Pence, Benjamin Pence, Maggie Mateja, Patrick Mateja, Jack Mateja, and Caleb Pence; niece, Virginia Hurt Johnson of Washington, DC; sister, Mary Holmes Smith of Alexandria, Va; and other nieces and nephews.

The Roanoke Valley has lost one of its finest. Though we note with great sadness Mr. Brand's passing, we are confident his legacy will live on. Our thoughts and prayers go out to Mr. Brand's family and loved ones.

HONORING LOUIS NAVARRO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, those who selflessly give of themselves to serve their country and community are a special breed. Such is the case with Louis Navarro, who currently serves as Director of the City of Yonkers Office of Veterans' Affairs.

Louis was appointed to that position in 2013 under current Mayor Mike Spano. The appointment was an easy one for the mayor, based on Louis' impressive career in the armed forces. He served his country with distinction in the United States Army for over three decades as both an active duty and reserve soldier.

Louis received numerous medals for his time in the armed forces, including the Vietnam Campaign Medals, the Good Conduct Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Bronze Star Medal and the Combat Infantry Badge.

Louis is also a member of several important veteran related organizations, including the Vietnam Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion.

On a more local level, Louis has taken an active role in many Yonkers events and committees. He served as Chairman of the Puerto Rican Day Parade Committee and was the 1st Vice Commander of the Yonkers Central Committee of Veterans Organizations, where he also doubled as the Chairman of the Yonkers Memorial Day Parade in 2013.

Despite a lifetime of great accomplishments serving his country and community, Louis remains most proud of the love and support he receives from his family, including his wife, Donna, and their children, Kaylan and James.

In 2014 the Salvation Army added to Louis' list of accomplishments by honoring him at their annual dinner. I want to echo their sentiments of congratulations to Louis Navarro for all he has done to protect and better the lives of Americans and the brave men and women who have served in our armed forces for many years. This honor is extremely well-deserved.

EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF
HOMELESS FOR VETERANS**HON. JANICE HAHN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, across the country, too many victims of domestic violence feel that there is nowhere for them to turn. Lacking resources, help and a safe place to go, some victims stay with their abusers.

Tragically, too often women veterans are among those who find themselves in this horrible situation. According to the VA, 39% of our women veterans report experiencing domestic violence, well above the national average.

In order to qualify for benefits available to homeless veterans through the VA, an individual must meet the definition of "homeless" codified as part of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. In 2009, the HEARTH Act expanded the definition of homeless to reflect our present reality and include individuals in transitional housing, persons living in motels and persons who would imminently lose their housing. A change was also made to the McKinney-Vento Act to expand the definition of homeless to include individuals fleeing a situation of domestic violence or some other life-threatening condition. This change, however, is not currently reflected in the definition of "homeless veteran."

These women are part of a growing number of homeless veterans. That is why I am reintroducing this legislation, which will correct and expand the definition of "homeless veteran" to include veterans who are fleeing situations of domestic violence. This small change will allow those veterans who find the courage and the means to leave their abusers the chance to access the benefits that should be available to all homeless veterans.

By passing this bill, we will ensure that this especially vulnerable population of veterans has the chance to access benefits the Department of Veterans Affairs already provides. This bill is one small step to ensuring every homeless veteran can access the benefits they deserve.

HONORING MARY HOAR

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a lifetime of service to one's community is a truly astonishing feat, which is why I want to take a moment to recognize the contributions of Mary Hoar to Yonkers.

Mary's story is one of continued service to better her community, both as a professional and in her personal life. Following her graduation from Cornell University, Mary began her career as a school teacher in Yonkers. Computer technology was always a big part of Mary's interests as an educator, and became a primary component of her teaching. She went on to teach computer technology to adults later in life.

While Mary was cultivating her professional career she was simultaneously beginning her foray into community service. She started by giving her time to Yonkers Jay-N-Cee, serving as Secretary, Treasurer and President. In 1977, Mary received one of the state division's highest honors, the Distinguished Service Award, and was later bestowed the Key to the City of Yonkers for her work with the organization.

Mary soon began branching out after her success with Jay-N-Cee, first by giving her time to the Yonkers Red Cross, serving as Branch Chairman and Vice Chairman as well as Chair of their Centennial, Youth Services and Competition Committees.

Mary then became involved with the Westchester March of Dimes, working on the very first Yonkers Walkathon Coordinating Committee. She then served on the Executive Board of the Northern Metro Chapter of the March of Dimes for 17 years, and was instrumental in the organizations Reading Olympics, Golden Gala and Tennis Tournament.

Mary's list of volunteer services has also included stints on the mayor's Community Rela-

tions Committee, the board of Family Services Society in Yonkers and, currently, she serves as president of the Yonkers Historical Society.

The Salvation Army honored Mary for all she has done for Yonkers at their 2014 annual dinner. The honor was incredibly well deserved. Congratulations to Mary Hoar on this recognition.

HONORING DR. TERRY BREWER

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Terry Brewer, the founder and president of Brewer Science, who recently received the 2014 SEMI award for North America as a result of his impact on the manufacturing of integrated circuits in the semiconductor industry. The SEMI Award recognizes outstanding technical achievement, and is the highest honor conferred by SEMI. As a global

industry association that is composed of 1,900 member companies that are the engine of the future, SEMI creates smarter, faster, and more economical products that improve our lives.

Dr. Brewer has distinguished himself not only as a leader, but as an innovator in the field of technology. Brewer Science is a global technology leader in developing and manufacturing innovative materials, processes, and equipment used in electronics such as tablet computers, smartphones, digital cameras, televisions, and LED lighting. On May 5, 2014, Brewer Science unveiled its new high-volume manufacturing facility at the Rolla National Airport. This expansion accommodates product demand growth and exemplifies the company's commitment to continuous improvement. From its headquarters in Rolla, Missouri, Brewer Science supports its worldwide customers through a service and distribution network in North America, Europe, and Asia.

It is my pleasure to commend Dr. Brewer for his achievements, and I am confident that his business will continue to stay on the forefront of technological advancement.